

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-8717

LD3907

.E3 Parsons, Vesta Marie, 1902-
1951 The social criticism of Paul
.P3 Elmer More.
x, 301p.
Thesis (Ph.D.) - N.Y.U., School
of Education, 1951.
Bibliography: p. 295.-301.

C83594

1. More, Paul Elmer, 1864-1937.
2. Social problems in literature.
3. Dissertations Academic - N.Y.U.
- 1951. I. Title.

Shad List

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

//
(Thesis accepted
Date Dec 30 1955)

THE SOCIAL CRITICISM OF PAUL ELMER MORE

by

VESTA M. PARSONS

Sponsoring Committee:

Dean Thomas C. Pollock
Professor Abraham I. Katch
Professor Emil Lengyel

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the School of Education of
New York University

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It is with a deep sense of gratitude that I acknowledge my indebtedness to Dean Thomas C. Pollock, Professor Emil Lengyel and Professor Abraham Katch who have served as my sponsoring committee in the preparation of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter I A Biographical Review	1
Chapter II On Education	20
Chapter III On the Church	78
Chapter IV On Property and Poverty, Part One .	101
Chapter V On Property and Poverty, Part Two .	137
Chapter VI On Crime	161
Chapter VII On Humanitarianism	199
Chapter VIII On the Artist and His Environment. .	241
Chapter IX On Recognition of More as a Social Critic	259
Chapter X Summary and Conclusions	280
BIBLIOGRAPHY	295

INTRODUCTION

Paul Elmer More (1864-1937) was a representative of the New Humanist school of American literary criticism. Born in St. Louis, Missouri, and educated in the classical tradition at Washington and Harvard Universities, he upheld conservative and scholarly standards through half a century of work as teacher, editor, and literary critic. More's teaching of classical literature began at Smith Academy, St. Louis, progressed through the stage of instructing at Harvard University and Bryn Mawr College, and ended with some twenty years of graduate seminars at Princeton University.

More twice broke with teaching. Finding little personal satisfaction in the routine of secondary school work he left St. Louis in 1892 to study comparative religions at Harvard University. Here he began a life-long friendship with Irving Babbitt, whose anti-romantic and pro-humanistic doctrines were to influence deeply More's own critical thought. More remained three years in Cambridge, completing his Master's degree and instructing in Sanskrit. In 1895 he was appointed an instructor at Bryn Mawr. Two years later he resigned from the faculty of Bryn Mawr. More was then thirty-three years old, but he still had not found work to which he could give his complete allegiance.

In a manner reminiscent of Thoreau at Walden, More lived for two years and three months as a recluse at Shelburne, New Hampshire. Away from society he was able to reach a conclusion as to what he would do with the rest of his life: he would become a critical writer, examining literature from the

point of view of its presentation of the dual nature of man.

More's journalistic career began with free lance writing, progressed through literary editorships of the Independent and the New York Evening Post and reached its climax in five years of editing The Nation. It was during his journalistic years that More wrote the bulk of the Shelburne Essays. These volumes brought him a scholarly reputation and are sometimes called America's closest approach to the Causeries du Lundi of Sainte-Beuve. More left journalism in 1914 to devote his entire time to philosophical writing. His six-volume study The Greek Tradition brought him further recognition for its critical exposition of Platonism and early Christianity.

The last decade of More's life was devoted, in the main, to literary criticism. In this period he wrote his three volumes of New Shelburne Essays, in addition to his teaching at Princeton University. As he himself remarked, his life and work comprised a series of circles.

More is recognized as a literary critic of considerable stature. A high position, for example, is clearly given him in the American tribute: "His fine scholarship and effectiveness of method placed him in the front rank of American critics."¹ The Britannica praises especially More's work as an editor, saying that he did "much to develop taste and maintain high critical standards in America."² Fred Pattee, himself an important historian and commentator in the field of American literature, adds to these judgments

-
1. "Paul Elmer More," Encyclopedia Americana, 1946 edition, Vol. XII, p. 444.
 2. "Paul Elmer More," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1946 edition, Vol. XI, p. 794.

by calling More the only American critic worthy of the name in the period between 1870 and 1915.³ The comparatively recent Literary History of the United States names the Shelburne and New Shelburne Essays as "the most ambitious and often the most penetrating body of judicial literary criticism in our literature."⁴ More appears in such standard reference works as Who Was Who in America, The Reader's Encyclopedia, and The Oxford Companion to American Literature.

More has also received attention in two doctoral dissertations. William Otto Zoller's The Literary Criticism of Paul Elmer More was accepted at the University of California in 1945. Seymour Gordon Link's Matthew Arnold's "Sweetness and Light" in America, 1848-1938, written at George Peabody College for Teachers, 1938, presents a historical study of Arnold's attempts to spread his cultural theories in America. The thesis maintains that Arnold's immediate failure became an ultimate triumph. His educational philosophy, Link concluded, was reflected in the work of the New Humanists, including that of Paul Elmer More.

More was a controversial as well as a scholarly figure. Especially in regard to his social thinking, his writings met with enthusiastic praise and bitter denunciation. Literary commentators and reviewers were sharply divided in their judgments. More's insistence that the past must be a living force in the present raised the question, for example, of whether his social thinking was realistic and sound or merely reactionary. His

3. Fred Pattee, A History of American Literature Since 1870 (New York; 1926), pp. 433-434.

4. Robert Ernest Spiller, "The Battle of the Books," in A History of American Literature Since 1870, eds., Robert Ernest Spiller and Others (New York; 1948), Vol. 2, p. 1151.

statements regarding property as a social force were widely quoted. They were attacked and defended. Van Wyck Brooks, for example, accused More of being dominated by "acquisitive instincts" and of "supporting a 'natural aristocracy' of economic power."⁵ Granville Hicks wrote that "the humanists' insistence that the only way to alter society is to alter the individual made it possible for them to oppose all humanitarian and radical proposals without specifically defending capitalism."⁶ Malcolm Cowley categorically denied that the humanists had a social program.⁷ On the other hand, Shafer insisted that More's social criticism had been determined by his sense of important distinctions and by "his steady conviction ... that imperfect or imperfectly distributed freedom is better than slavery, that experience is safer than theory, and that peaceful, ordered growth is preferable to revolution."⁸

This divergence of opinion, even as indicated by the limited number of illustrations given, indicates that the question of More's social criticism is unsettled. Whether More and his humanist contemporaries offered no program of social thinking, as their opponents indicated, or whether the humanists' program differed from that of other schools of thought are two quite different matters. Whatever the answer may be, there is obvious confusion as to the exact nature of More's social thinking. It seemed valuable, therefore, to attempt to determine what were the social attitudes of one of

5. Van Wyck Brooks, Letters and Leadership (New York, 1919), p. 157.

6. Granville Hicks, The Great Tradition (New York; 1935), p. 231.

7. Malcolm Cowley, "Humanizing Society," in The Critique of Humanism, ed., C. Bartley Grattan (New York; 1930), p. 68.

8. Robert Shafer, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism (New Haven; 1935), p. 205.

the exemplars of the New Humanists through analyzing the social criticism of Paul Elmer More. The thesis problem of this investigation has been to discover and analyze the social theories of Paul Elmer More, as those theories are revealed in his published writings.

To speak of More's social criticism is to speak in general terms of his reaction to and his interpretation of society. "Social criticism" obviously needs to be broken down into more specific terms. But before the details of More's social criticism are analysed, the background of More's life, especially its environmental influences and his early life, needs analysis. The biographical material in Chapter One attempts to place More in his cultural setting. More's social criticism was directed toward at least three organized social institutions: the colleges and universities, the church, and the agencies of law enforcement and crime prevention. It was also directed toward property as a force in civilization and toward the social problem of poverty. Chapters Two through Six present these aspects of More's social criticism.

More realized that the terms humanism and humanitarianism are frequently confused. His own position, he wrote, was substantially that of Irving Babbitt, as discussed in the latter's Literature and the American College.⁹ Babbitt wrote that the origins of humanism were classical and Renaissance. He took as his classical authority the definition of humanitas by the Latin writer Celsus.¹⁰ The meaning of humanitas, as interpreted by

9. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, footnote, p. 238.

10. Irving Babbitt, Literature and the American College, p. 6.

Babbitt, included doctrine and discipline. Babbitt wrote that an aristocratic rather than a democratic attitude was implicit in humanitas.

Babbitt characterized the spirit of Renaissance humanism as an intensification of the spirit of classical humanism.¹¹ The spirit of selectivity was gradually magnified into a spirit of exclusiveness. Scholars and critics of the Renaissance, Babbitt added, aimed to improve society through perfecting the individual. In time this Renaissance exclusiveness of spirit came to be associated with the social exclusiveness of aristocratic rank and privilege.¹²

The origin and development of humanitarianism are quite different. Whereas the origins of humanism are classical and Renaissance, the origins of humanitarianism, Babbitt says, are Christian¹³ and Elisabethan.¹⁴ With Christianity the idea of unselective sympathy came into the world. With Bacon came the idea of the progress of the race based on scientific investigation and discovery. The humanitarian seeks breadth rather than concentration and would elevate mankind as a whole rather than perfect the individual. This attitude is what Babbitt calls scientific humanitarianism.

In the eighteenth century a new influence became part of the humanitarian philosophy. This influence is represented by Rousseau's teaching of the natural goodness of man and of the natural enmity between the individual and society. This attitude is what Babbitt calls sentimental humanitarianism.

11. Ibid., p. 11.

12. Ibid., p. 14.

13. Ibid., p. 9.

14. Ibid., p. 35.

More saw certain dangers in making humanitarianism the guiding philosophy of society. He argued, for example, that humanitarianism is essentially a materialistic philosophy whose aim is physical rather than spiritual welfare.¹⁵ He insisted that man is not another animal submerged in the natural law but that man is a free moral agent accountable for his choices of conduct.¹⁶ More's application of his humanistic, rather than humanitarian, philosophy to social problems is analyzed in Chapter Seven.

Since More was a literary critic, it is not surprising to find that his social criticism included a discussion of the relationship between the literary artist and his environment. An analysis of More's point of view on this subject appears in Chapter Eight.

More's literary and philosophical criticisms have overshadowed his social commentary to the extent that he is generally not listed by authorities as a social critic. The question arises of whether contemporary estimates accorded him any place as a social critic. The problem is not whether contemporary judgments were favorable or unfavorable regarding More's social criticism but rather the extent to which recognition of social criticism was accorded. An analysis of contemporary reaction to More's social criticism is presented in Chapter Nine.

The most important source materials for this study are, of course, More's own writings, especially his critical essays. The eleven volumes

15. Paul E. More, The Jessica Letters, p. 322.

16. Paul E. More, On Being Human, pp. 320-321.

of Shelburne Essays and the three volumes of New Shelburne Essays form a reasonably comprehensive and yet definitive basis for research; moreover, these essays represent More's social point of view for more than thirty years.

A supplementary body of writing which merits attention is the editorials of The Nation from 1909 to 1914, the years of More's editorship of that magazine. Even though the editorials were written by a staff of editorial writers, More was the editor for five years. More's social point of view and that of The Nation under his editorship are closely parallel. Evidence for this statement occurs in the analyses and comparisons which are made in Chapters Two through Seven.

The references already made to Irving Babbitt point to a close relationship between him and More. More is recognized as Babbitt's earliest disciple.¹⁷ From the time that the two men were graduate students at Harvard University, Babbitt exerted a lasting influence on More.¹⁸ One manifestation of this influence was in More's break with Christianity. More had broken with Calvinism before he left St. Louis. He had rejected Christianity by the time he left Harvard.¹⁹ A part of More's rejection of Christ's teaching is traced by Shafer to "an unfortunate side of Professor Babbitt's influence."²⁰ More, himself, late in life in commenting on his early friendship with Babbitt and the conversations which

17. Robert E. Spiller, "The Battle of the Books," in A History of American Literature Since 1870, eds., Robert Ernest Spiller and Others, Vol. 2, p. 1130.

18. Robert Shafer, Paul Elmer More and American Literary Criticism (New Haven, 1935), p. 70.

19. Paul E. More, The Jessica Letters, pp. 122-123.

20. Shafer, op. cit., p. 212.

they had had on philosophy and literature stated that Babbitt, even in the Harvard days, had had a deep distrust of the church.²¹ The second manifestation of Babbitt's influence was in the development of More's literary taste. He led More away from romanticism and toward classical literature.²²

It was Babbitt's contention that man should base his philosophical position on his humanity. He argued that since man is dualistic by nature, he should govern his life by his human reasoning rather than allow himself to be governed by his animal instincts or by his alleged qualities of divinity.

Babbitt carried his humanistic philosophy of life into his work as a literary theorist. He believed that Renaissance humanism had been corrupted by scientific theories of Elizabethan origin and by sentimental theories of eighteenth century origin. Babbitt sharply questioned contemporary humanitarian and naturalistic trends in life and literature. He insisted that aesthetic thinking must be corrected by a return to the classical concept of humanity. This concept has been explained by Foerster as "a resolute distinction between man and nature and between man and the divine."²³

More publicly acknowledged his debt to Babbitt for his own anti-romantic and pro-humanistic beliefs. These two convictions colored both More's literary and social criticism. It is important to understand Babbitt in order to understand More. A detailed analysis of the effects of Babbitt's

21. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 37.

22. Shafer, op. cit., p. 70.

23. Norman Foerster, Humanism and America (New York, 1930), p. 318.

antagonism to humanitarianism on More's social thinking appears in the chapter On Humanitarianism.

A fourth source of primary materials for this study was contemporary reviews and obituary notices and editorials. These pieces were examined to determine the attitude of the press in More's own day regarding his social criticism. The results of this research are set forth in Chapter Nine.

Chapters One through Nine of this study present analyses of and conclusions concerning specific areas of More's social criticism. To understand More's social commentary in its entirety, these specific findings need to be drawn together. The general trends of More's social thinking including its relationship to general trends in the social thinking of his day need to be made clear. This information based on the first nine chapters appears in the summary and conclusions which constitute Chapter Ten.

Chapter I

A BIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW

The life story of Paul Elmer More, 1864-1937, falls into four distinct parts: the St. Louis period, the Harvard-Shelburne period, the New York period, and the Princeton period. Considerable variety in environmental influences accompanied these divisions of his life. In order to understand his social attitudes, it seems important to consider the significance of each of the four periods. This study is begun, then, with some attempt to place More in his cultural setting.

More's St. Louis Years

Paul Elmer More's native town of St. Louis in the last half of the nineteenth century was a provincial mid-Western city of 450,000 inhabitants. According to Theodore Dreiser, the town lacked both physical beauty and cultural opportunities.¹ In appearance, Dreiser wrote, St. Louis followed the pattern of over-pretentious homes for the very rich, monotony for the middle class, and ugliness for the poor. Dreiser judged the city's artistic level by its theatrical offerings, which he characterized as sentimental in tone and poor in execution.²

That Dreiser's picture of St. Louis was essentially correct was substantiated years later by More in his essay on Dreiser. More likewise pointed out the failure of the town to provide a stimulus for either the imagination or the intellect.

-
1. Theodore Dreiser, A Book About Myself (New York, 1922), p. 101.
 2. Ibid., p. 177

Take a boy of humble origin in a mid-Western town some forty years ago. The only breath of immaterial things to reach him would be through religion, in the case of Mr. Dreiser a perfectly uncritical Catholicism, but with most of the others a thin poverty-stricken Protestantism from which all ritual and symbolism had dropped and from which every appeal to the imagination had exuded. Art and letters would be about as remote from him as from the Bushmen of Africa.³

As indicated by his biographer, as well as by his own later confessions, More's immediate family ^{may} have contributed somewhat to his dissatisfaction with his early environment. There was evidently a certain amount of financial insecurity in the More household, intellectual ambition on the part of the mother, and a strict adherence by both parents to the Calvinist creed in religion. The economic status of the family is clearly implied by Shafer in his analysis of the business capacities of the father.

. . . he found it easier to start a business than to keep it going. After his marriage, he took his wife West, and established himself in Dayton, Ohio, where he built up a profitable trade as a bookseller. This he abandoned about 1860, largely so as not to be separated from a minister who had come to exert considerable influence over both him and his wife. When the Civil War broke out, he actively supported the Cause of the Union and attained the rank of Brigadier General in the Commissary Department. . . . The remainder of his life was spent in St. Louis where he engaged with varying success in a number of business enterprises.⁴

This quotation follows Shafer's stated belief that it was through the determination and self-sacrifice of the mother that the younger children of the family were enabled to complete their education.

Into the environment offered by a provincial city and a family of intermittent prosperity and marked religious tendencies, Paul Elmer More

3. Paul Elmer More, The Dawn of the Absolute (Princeton, 1928), pp. 65-66.

4. Robert Shafer, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism (New Haven, 1933), p. 61.

was born. He was the seventh of eight children of the parents, Enoch Anson More and Katharine Elmer More. He attended the public schools of St. Louis and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Washington University in St. Louis, in 1887. Following graduation he taught in Smith Academy, also in St. Louis, for five years and in 1892 received a Master's degree from Washington University for a thesis written in Latin. The thesis was later destroyed so that it is impossible to comment on it beyond the statement that here was, fairly early, tangible evidence of More's interest in the classics, an interest which he was to evince repeatedly in his later years as a critic.

In St. Louis, too, More became dissatisfied with the religion of his parents. In his Pages from an Oxford Diary, which, according to Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., More prepared for press during the last few months of his life and finished only a few days before his death, More indicated that his quest for a satisfying religion had begun in his youth and had extended throughout his life. Furthermore, he listed seven successive "distractions" in the various stages of his religious: childish faith, romanticism, rationalistic scepticism, critical curiosity, classical taste, Platonism and /probably/ Anglo-Catholicism.

His "childish faith" had been Calvinism. The story of More's breaking away from the institutional faith of his parents is viewed by Shafer as being the natural enough outcome of More's diversified reading interests,⁵ but More's own version of his loss of faith, as related in a magazine article four months before his death, is told in a more sensational vein.⁶

5. Ibid., p. 62.

6. Paul E. More, "Marginalia," The American Review, VIII (November, 1936), p. 23.

In childhood he had lived in the inherited faith of Calvin, but doubts came with the years so that he began to question the Calvinistic concept of God. The doubter made his "irrevocable decision," the article continues, one morning in church when the preacher "was expounding the terrible text, 'And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.'"⁷

That More's loss of his childhood faith was not more tragic in its consequences, Shafer attributes to the fact that More had already become deeply interested in German romanticism. This interest Shafer also believes was a natural enough step from reading Carlyle, Emerson, and Thoreau. More himself evidently agreed with his point of view since he listed romanticism as his second "distraction" and even named Novalis, Tieck, and the Schlegels as the romantic writers by whom he was most influenced.⁸ These were the years in which More composed lyrics, tragedies, and an epic. In these writings his own misery and morbid introspection were reflected, he says, but for a time he felt assured that his unhappiness was a sign of his "mission" to the human race. Possibly in reading this criticism by More concerning his early writing, it should be remembered that this estimate was made long after he had become the enemy of romantic writing in general. More next became interested in rationalism and planned a "project of New Philosophy which should prove once for all that the world and men are the products of a fatalistic Law of Chance and Probability."⁹ Like the theses in Latin, the romantic and rationalistic writings were

7. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

8. Paul E. More, Pages from an Oxford Diary, fol. 5^v.

9. *Ibid.*

later burned with the result that, in later years, even the author purported not to remember the contents.

Teaching was More's first attempt at earning a living, and for five years, 1886-1891, he was a teacher of Latin at Smith Academy, St. Louis. His dislike for teaching is made clear in The Great Refusal, published in 1894. In this little book of approximately one hundred fifty pages, More posed as editor of a group of letters which a philosophic recluse in New York wrote to a young woman called Esther. These letters, with the exception of the preface and the concluding section, were genuine, Mather says, but the identity of the author was withheld "both to conceal the identity of the woman addressed and to direct attention away from the merely personal aspect of the letters to their meaning."¹⁰ To Esther, More revealed himself as a failure. He pictured himself as a teacher of Latin with "deplorable results," especially to his own health. He called the work "dreary" and the year "barren." Later in his letters he was even more emphatic: "... day by day the conviction had been forced upon me that such a life was worse than death, was beyond my powers of endurance."¹¹ On the surface this looks as if More's attitude toward his first teaching was comparable in emotional intensity to his attitude toward Calvinism.

The St. Louis period of More's life drew to a close with another emotional experience which led to a turning point in his intellectual history. In 1891 he read Bauer's Manichaisches Religionsystem. According

10. Frank A. Mather, Jr., "Paul Elmer More," 1864-1937, American Academy of Arts and Sciences Proc., LXXII (May, 1938), pp. 368-372.

11. Paul E. More, The Great Refusal (Boston, 1894), p. 130.

to his own statement, eighteen years later, this reading was the experience that first gave him a glimpse into the mysteries of independent faith.¹² Then More went on to study St. Augustine, to read the literature of mediaeval Christianity, and to approach the religious writings of India.

Harvard - Shelburne Years

In 1892, More went to Harvard University to equipt himself linguistically for the study of comparative religions. He began by studying Sanskrit and Pali, and he and Irving Babbitt formed the whole of an advanced class. The converting of More from romantic to classical tastes in literature apparently was one of Babbitt's accomplishments. More later wrote of the long discussions that the two men frequently had concerning their reading, of his own predilection for romantic literature, and of Babbitt's distaste for the romantic, a distaste that included the romantic element in the Upanishads, the Bhagavad Gita, and the Vedantic theosophy.

While any extensive consideration of the critical theories of Irving Babbitt is outside the scope of this study, the reasons for his distrust of romanticism should possibly be reviewed briefly. Such a resume may well be more of an explanation than a digression. For this purpose the leading tenets of Rousseau and Romanticism will probably suffice. Although Babbitt's study of romanticism was not published until 1919, More says that his friend's philosophical views were formed early and remained substantially unchanged. The arguments which Babbitt, as a graduate student, offered at Cambridge, then, may very well be indicated by those which he advanced years later and in which he pictured romanticism as an international movement away from civilization.

Rousseau and Romanticism is an exposition and denunciation of the

effects of the philosophy of emotional naturalism upon life and literature. Babbitt's treatment of his subject is developed through a study of six selected topics: romantic genius, romantic imagination, romantic morality, romantic irony, nature and romanticism, and romantic melancholy. His interpretation of romantic genius was that the Rousseauistic refusal to imitate represented more than a rebound from the neo-classicist belief in imitation of models. It represented, Babbitt maintained, a rebound from both the Christian and the classical concepts of obedience and decorum.¹³ In its search for spontaneity, Babbitt continued, romantic genius in its cult of the primitive actually regressed from the traditional sources of wisdom.¹⁴ Babbitt placed romantic imagination at the center of the romantic movement. He contended that extreme emancipation of the imagination was merely the pursuit of illusion through excessive daydreaming into a land of heart's desire.¹⁵ The danger, Babbitt pointed out, was that many daydreamers eventually fail to discriminate between fact and fiction.¹⁶ Babbitt devoted some one hundred pages to his exposition of romantic morality. He argued that the ideal and the real of this aspect of romanticism are diametrically opposed. "The ideal of romantic morality . . . is altruism. The real . . . is always egoism."¹⁷ Babbitt dealt in a similar vein with the subject of romantic love. He defined it as selfishness and a confusion of the planes of being, often represented by the creation of a

13. Irving Babbitt, Rousseau and Romanticism (Boston, 1919), p. 36.

14. Ibid., p. 68.

15. Ibid., pp. 72-73.

16. Ibid., p. 73.

17. Ibid., p. 192.

dream character in love with its creator.¹⁸ Accepting Schlegel's definition of romantic irony as identical with paradox, Rabbitt argued that the paradoxes of Rousseau "reduce themselves on analysis to the notion that man has suffered a loss of goodness by being civilized."¹⁹ Rabbitt's own conclusion as to the significance of irony was that it represents a way of showing the "supremacy of mood over decorum."²⁰ The romantic definition of nature was, to Rabbitt, an unfortunate deviation from the classical definition. Whereas nature to the ancients had meant normal, representative human nature, to the romanticist nature meant a refuge from society and a background for the subjective moods of man. Pantheistic reverie, Rabbitt believed, has become a painless substitute for genuine spiritual effort.²¹ Rabbitt concluded his analysis of romanticism with his consideration of romantic melancholy, the concept of man as the victim either of fate or of society. The judgment again was adverse, that romantic melancholy had ended by producing "the greatest literature of despair the world has ever seen."²²

On various occasions Rabbitt denounced romanticism or any other naturalistic philosophy because he believed it dehumanized man. It was Rabbitt's conviction that man may experience life on any one of three levels,--the naturalistic, the humanistic, or the religious. He confessed to his own indebtedness to Aristotle and to Buddha. Just as he called the point of view of the scientific and utilitarian naturalist Baconian and that of the emotional naturalist Rousseauistic, so he called the point of view that analyses moral action from facts and from actual life Aristotelian.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 225.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 247.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 265.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 286.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

As a corrective for the naturalism of modern times Babbitt recommended a critical humanism.²³ The loss of humanizing influences he argued was especially "to be deprecated in higher education."²⁴ He maintained that the purpose of higher education is to produce leaders and that "if the leaders of a community look up to a sound model and work humanistically with reference to it, all the evidence goes to show that they will be looked up to and imitated in turn by enough of the rank and file to keep that community from lapsing into barbarism."²⁵

Babbitt's influence on More is probably more understandable in light of the fact that More responded vigorously to religious and philosophical argument. He admits that he finally rejected Calvinism because he could not accept the thesis of a specific sermon. He admits, also, that his decision to study comparative religions was a direct outgrowth of his reading of Bauer. The evidence already presented indicates that he tended to put his emotional response to words into a course of conduct. But even though we may grant that More's previous attitudes and activities indicate somewhat impulsive tendencies in his reaction to emotional appeal, it still seems necessary to present the available evidence on the implied question of Babbitt's persuasive powers.

Various commentators have characterized Babbitt as a much more effective speaker than writer. This point of view is repeatedly emphasized in Irving Babbitt: Man and Teacher, a collection of thirty-nine memoirs by fellow-professors and former students. Commentators included Frank A. Mather, Jr., a fellow-instructor with Babbitt at Williams College, and John

23. Ibid., p. 382.

24. Ibid., p. 389.

25. Ibid., p. 390.

Livingstone Lowes and Louis J. A. Mercier, fellow-professors with Babbitt at Harvard University, as well as authors T. S. Eliot and Austin Warren. Repeatedly the point is made that Babbitt not only had strong opinions but also that in conversation he could utter them persuasively and buttress them with effective allusions and quotations. Illustrations of the estimates of Babbitt's conversational powers follow. Regarding conversations Mather and Babbitt held in 1895 when they spent a summer together in Florence, Mather wrote:

I often wished, and I have not ceased to wish it, that Irving Babbitt might have found a Boswell; for cogent as is his writing, his talk was better, being, even in monologue, graced by a shy and ingratiating desire to persuade. There was nothing in him of Stoical satisfaction with being right in his own eyes; he wished to communicate, to carry others with him.²⁶

John Livingstone Lowes, speaking of the loss which Babbitt's death represented to Harvard University, wrote ". . . There was no personal feeling in his intellectual dissents. . . . One could regard it only as an honor to be considered worthy of his steel."²⁷

T. S. Eliot appraised Babbitt's conversational skill thus: "Those who knew Babbitt only through his writings, and have had no contact with him as a teacher and friend will probably not be able to appreciate the greatness of his work."²⁸

Such testimony probably should not be admitted as unbiased judgment. It is the testimony uttered by Babbitt's friends; it may be the conventional

26. Frederick Manchester and Odell Shephard, eds., Irving Babbitt: Man and Teacher (New York, 1941), p. 45.

27. Ibid., p. 321.

28. Ibid., p. 101.

eulogies for a friend who has died. Yet it is doubtful if it can be completely discounted. Babbitt's anti-romanticism must probably be included in any list of the environmental influences which More experienced at Harvard University.

More's withdrawal from the church became, at some time between his break with Calvinism and his publication of The Great Refusal in 1894, not only a break with Calvinism, but an actual rejection of Christianity. He had apparently come to look upon his leaving his parents' faith with some pride.²⁹ In a still later letter, More restated his disavowal of Christianity.

I am not a follower of Jesus. I do not know his God, cannot find him, do not know his voice. The great self-abnegation and passion of Jesus seems to me often a greater mistake; for what blessing has he brought into the world? To miseries which he cannot alleviate, he has added only the further miseries of sympathy. I am not a disciple of Dante. His vision of heaven and hell has passed away forever. His faith is a thing outworn.³⁰

In connection with this disavowal of Christianity, it must be remembered that More had been reading the literature of other religions before he came to Harvard. Shafer believes that the letters to Esther as quoted above predated the Harvard period. As for the professed devotion to Brahma for which More supposedly wist aside his love for Esther, it is quite possible that this conversation may be discounted. In the first place the incident occurs in the ending which Mather has revealed as fictitious. In the second place, Zoller, in his doctoral study, indicates that More's Platonic philo-

29. Paul E. More, The Great Refusal, p. 107.

30. Ibid., p. 122.

ophy shows traces of the influences of Aristotle, Hinduism, and Christianity, but he does not show evidence that More ever completely accepted an Eastern philosophy.³¹ In the third place More among his "distractions" as listed in Pages from an Oxford Diary does not list this conversion. There is evidence in the essay "The Forest Philosophy of India" that More admired, and perhaps admired romantically, the eremites of the forests of the Ganges. The evidence furnished by More's own statement, however, is of greater importance. He was convinced by Babbitt that the Buddhistic rather than the Brahmanic concepts represented the consummation of Hindu thought.³² More does not admit that he was converted to Buddhism.

There seems to be evidence, however, that More's rejection of Christianity lasted over a period of years. The "distraction" of these years More named as "critical curiosity." In this connection he writes that his reading of many volumes was motivated by a search for an explanation in humanity for the meaning of existence.³³

There seem to be certain implications in the foregoing statement. The volumes referred to very likely were among those which More read between 1901-1914, the years when he was doing the bulk of his work as critic and editor. The assumption, then, that these thirteen years of More's critical reading were devoted to another purpose than that of earning a living must be considered. The point of view that More, at fifty years of age, had not affected a reconciliation with Christianity probably must also be accepted as fact.

31. William O. Zeller, The Literary Criticism of Paul Elmer More (University of California dissertation, 1945), p. 6.

32. Paul E. More, "Marginalia," American Review, VIII (November, 1936), p. 26.

33. Paul E. More, Pages from an Oxford Diary, fol. 5^v.

Classical taste and Platonic philosophy were listed by More as his fifth and sixth "distractions." His preference for the classical over the romantic quality in literature was expressed on various occasions in The Shelburne Essays. These volumes were completed in 1921. The first two volumes in the series The Greek Tradition were completed in 1923. The very fact that More engaged in this detailed study of Greek thought would be evidence that the "distraction" in his own mind was important.

It was in the summer of 1924 that More wrote the notes on what he called "a very real experience." Thirteen years later this material was published, after More's death, under the title Pages from an Oxford Diary. More spent this summer of 1924 at Oxford University. Under the guise of an Oxford don he wrote his reactions to the University, the clergy, the town, certain authors, and Christianity. In the first part of the book More depicts his reaction to the clergy through depicting his judgment of the expressions on the faces of the men of the church. He concludes his description of the dullness, worldliness, unhappiness, cunning, arrogance, or fear which he read on their faces with this comment: "Of all the arguments against religion the faces of the professional custodians of the faith, with rare exceptions, are to me the most disconcerting--more troublesome than the vacuity of these sermons."³⁴

In the summer of 1924, More was nearly sixty years old. Until this time he evidently had not solved for himself the problem of a satisfying religion. To be sure a change in the tone of his writing soon became apparent--even in the book from which this last quotation is taken. The

34. Ibid., fol. 2^v.

fact still appears, however, that even in his sixtieth year More knew dissatisfaction in his personal religion.

More's dissatisfactions have been dealt with here at some length, since various sources seem to indicate that they were strengthened at Harvard University. Shafer believes that this prolonged scepticism was one of the "unfortunate" aspects of Babbitt's influence on More.³⁵ Shafer, however, does not document this statement of belief, but More himself, through his own statements of Babbitt's attitude toward Christianity, seems to substantiate Shafer's inference.³⁶ He characterizes Babbitt's viewpoint as anti-Christian, a view that had been formed and fixed before Babbitt came to Harvard, and a view that never changed.³⁷

More, aside from his discussion of Babbitt's antagonism for the Christian religion, points out another side of Babbitt's philosophical attitudes, his interest in humanism. He says that he and Babbitt used to discuss humanism in their Harvard days. The two men later came to be considered the major exemplars of the New Humanism in American literary criticism. More specifically stated that Babbitt's principles were fixed early, and that his point of view never changed. We probably may assume, then, that Babbitt's point of view regarding humanism, as expressed in his preface to Rousseau and Romanticism, was substantially the one that he had expressed in the Cambridge discussions. Babbitt argued, it will be remembered, that man could experience life on three levels--the naturalistic, the humanistic and the religious.³⁸ That Babbitt subscribed to the second "level" is evidenced in the same work:

35. Robert Shafer, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism, p. 212.

36. Paul E. More, On Being Human (Princeton: 1936), p. 31.

37. Ibid., p. 37.

38. Irving Babbitt, Preface, Rousseau and Romanticism, p. xix.

I have been struck in my study of the past by the endless self-deception to which man is subject when he tries to pass too abruptly from the naturalistic to the religious level. The world, it is hard to avoid concluding, would have been a better place if more persons had made sure they were human before setting out to be superhuman.³⁹

In summarising the story of More's break with the church, the evidence is clear that he actually denied a belief in Christianity, but there is no proof that he ever accepted an Eastern religion. His attempts to be satisfied with humanism as a substitute for religion apparently lasted into his sixtieth year. Possibly More's long-continued rejection of Christianity was like his conversion from romanticism to classicism, another influence from his days at Harvard University with Irving Babbitt.

More received his Master's degree from Harvard and again tried teaching. At Bryn Mawr College he was an instructor in Sanskrit and lectured on Greek and Latin literature. He gave courses in Horace, Lucetius, Homer, and Aristotle. He filled this position for two years, but just as he had been dissatisfied with secondary school teaching, so he was dissatisfied with college teaching. In 1897, he left the teaching profession.

Upon leaving Bryn Mawr, More went to live in seclusion in Shelburne, New Hampshire. This experience he described in the first series of The Shelburne Essays. Dissatisfied with life in the America of the time, and uncertain as to the course he would pursue in earning a living, he withdrew for a period of meditation.

Two years and three months later More returned to civilization "as ignorant of its meaning as when he left it." Yet he had achieved certain scholarly accomplishments. He had translated A Century of Indian Epigrams from the Sanskrit. He had published The Judgment of Socrates. This volume included translations of "The Apology," "Crito," and closing scenes of

39. Ibid., p. 33.

"Phaedo." He had translated Prometheus Bound by Aeschylus and he had written a few critical essays on English and American subjects. Most important of all, perhaps, he had formed his decision to become a critical writer. Mercier says that More left Shelburne with a formula of literary criticism. "He would examine the works of thinkers and poets to determine how far they had appreciated or ignored the conception of the double nature of man."⁴⁰

The New York Period

In pursuit of his goal of criticism More settled in 1900 in East Orange as a free lance writer. Mather says that the venture proved inexpedient and that the opportunity to become literary editor of The Independent in 1901 proved to be the solution to the financial problem of earning a livelihood through the medium of professional writing.⁴¹

In 1903, More became literary editor of The New York Evening Post and in 1909 succeeded Hammond Lamont as editor of The Nation, in which position he remained until 1914. During these years as literary editor, and as editor, More wrote many of the pieces which were collected and published as the Shelburne Essays.

Oates, in 1946, portrayed More's schedule of work during his years as an editor.

Monday through Friday he completed his editorial tasks, reserving each evening for the particular critical problem in which he was currently absorbed. Saturdays and Sundays found him devoting twelve to

40. Louis J. A. Mercier, "The Challenge of Paul Elmer More," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XXXIV (Sept. 1925-June 1926).

41. Frank H. Mather, Jr., "Paul Elmer More 1864-1937," American Academy of Arts and Sciences Proc., LXIII (May 1938), p. 369.

sixteen hours each day to composition. He followed this routine unswervingly and hence was able to extend his reading and at the same time achieve mastery of writing critical prose.⁴²

More's influence as editor of The Nation is discussed by at least two commentators. Zeitlin states that once a contributor had won More's confidence, no particular conformity of opinion with that of the editor was exacted.⁴³ Oates expresses the judgment that More "built the literary sections of The Post and The Nation into a position of literary authority in this country which has perhaps never been rivalled by any other organ since that time."⁴⁴

More concluded his major work in journalism in 1914 when he resigned the editorship of The Nation "so that he might find more leisure for his own writing,"⁴⁵ yet he remained for about a year with the magazine in an advisory capacity. The bulk of the reviews and articles which constitute the tenth and eleventh series of the Shelburne Essays were written after his "retirement" from journalism. Publication of the last of the series was in 1921.

The Princeton Period

During his twenty-three years at Princeton, 1914-1937, More divided his time between writing and teaching. He completed the Shelburne Essays, wrote the five-volume study, The Greek Tradition, the three volumes of the New Shelburne Essays, and Pages from an Oxford Diary. From 1921-1934 More

42. W. J. Oates, "Paul Elmer More" in The Lives of Eighteen from Princeton, edited by Willard Thorp, p. 306.

43. Jacob Zeitlin and Homer Woodbridge, The Life and Times of Stuart Sherman, I, p. 221.

44. Oates, op. cit., p. 306.

45. E. Godkin, "Former Editors of the Nation," The Nation, CI (July 8, 1915), p. 69.

lectured and held graduate seminars in the Department of the Classics at Princeton University for one term of each academic year. On his estimate of More's influence among Princeton students, Oates wrote that More "never attempted to impose his doctrines upon another, but rather realized fully the greatest principle in education: that each individual must forge for himself his conclusions, his convictions, his intellectual and spiritual integrations, if they are to be worth the name."⁴⁶

More was recognized as one of the major exemplars of the New Humanist school of literary criticism. His efforts in the critical controversy between the New Humanists and the naturalists included an article in The Bookman in March, 1930, in defense of humanistic principles, and his first volume of New Shelburne Essays. This collection, entitled The Union of the Absolute, is an attack upon the naturalistic movement in modern literature, particularly American and French. The attempt of modern writers, he believed, to identify man with nature invalidated their work as art. More was a target for considerable bitter comment from the opposing naturalistic critics.

Various universities recognized More's achievements. In addition to the degree of Master of Arts which he was granted at both Washington and Harvard Universities, he held honorary doctorates from Washington University, Columbia, Dartmouth, Princeton, and Glasgow.⁴⁷

In 1930 and again in 1934 he was "prominently" mentioned for the Nobel Prize in Literature.⁴⁸

46. Oates, op. cit., p. 308.

47. Obituary, "Paul Elmer More," New York Sun (March 9, 1937), p. 22.

48. Obituary, "Paul Elmer More," New York Post (March 9, 1937), p. 4.

More died in Princeton, New Jersey, March 9, 1937.

Summary of Chapter

Paul Elmer More, born in 1864, in St. Louis, Missouri, grew up in an environment of financial insecurity, provincial surroundings, religious intensity, and traditional education. At the age of twenty-eight, he went to Harvard University for linguistic training. At Cambridge he came under the influence of the anti-romanticist, Irving Babbitt. In 1895, More was appointed instructor in the classics and Sanskrit at Bryn Mawr, but dissatisfied with teaching, he resigned his position to live in seclusion in Shelburne, New Hampshire, from 1897 to 1899. From 1901 to 1903 he was literary editor of The Independent; from 1903 to 1909, literary editor of the New York Evening Post; and from 1909 to 1914, he was editor of The Nation. From 1914 to 1937, he lived in Princeton, New Jersey, where he wrote The Greek Tradition and The New Shelburne Essays and taught at Princeton University. He was a major figure in the critical quarrel between the naturalists and the New Humanists. He held five honorary degrees and was mentioned for the Nobel Prize in Literature.

CHAPTER II

ON EDUCATION

Part A Educational Criticism as Expressed in the Essays of Paul Elmer More More's Writing Occasional

A fact which probably should be remembered in any study of More's critical thought is that much of his writing was occasional. His work as reviewer, literary editor, and editor doubtless tended to focus his attention upon recently published material and events of the day. "Recently published," however, does not necessarily mean first publication. In More's case, it frequently meant new editions or new studies of established authors. The extent to which More's collected criticism was occasional is illustrated, for example, in the contents of The Shelburne Essays. Of the one hundred twelve essays in this collection, sixty-four are reviews and discussions of recently published works. Eight more have to do with special events such as the Centenary of Longfellow or the Bicentenary of Franklin. In other words, over sixty per cent of the essays in The Shelburne Essays are occasional pieces. This adaptation of the choice of subject to current materials or problems is illustrated again in the shorter pieces specifically ascribed to More in the volumes filed in the offices of The Nation. It was the policy of the magazine to publish a great bulk of its material unsigned; however, in the editor's files the names of the authors have been written on these unsigned articles. Of the one hundred twenty items thus attributed to More, eighty-one are reviews

or book notices. As far as numerical count is concerned, nearly seventy per cent of the items from More's own pen were occasional pieces. In other words, before More began The Greek Tradition, a span of approximately twenty years of his writing life had been devoted to the production of occasional writing.

The amount of space devoted to social criticism in More's writing is somewhat uneven. Some pieces carry considerable social comment; some carry little, and some carry none. Probably such unevenness is to be expected. In the first place, a critic is not completely free to choose his subjects for reviews. In the second place, not all writing that a reviewer examines lends itself to social criticism. We possibly may assume, then, that this variation in the amount of space devoted to social criticism, as it occurs in More's literary criticism, is normal and to be expected.

Scope of Questions to be Considered

Part A of this chapter is an attempt to set forth More's theories concerning education as a social factor. Seven questions have been selected as bases for arrangement, classification and summary of the findings.

The questions are as follows:

1. What percentage of More's writings on education were expressions of opinion concerning education at the college level?
2. What aims, or aims, if any, did More list as suitable for college and university teaching?
3. What curriculum reform, if any, did More advocate?
4. What specific educational trends, if any, did More evaluate and how did he evaluate them?
5. What recommendations, if any, did More make for improving the status of teachers or professors?

6. Which of his educational theories, if any, did More most consistently defend throughout the years of these publications?

7. By what statements, implications, or arguments did More indicate his concept of the social value of education?

A summary of the findings follows in the order of the questions listed above.

Percentage of Writing Aimed at College Level

A numerical count of More's essays which are concerned to any extent with education as a social factor shows that approximately eighty per cent of his writings on education are expressions of opinion on education at the college or university level. This statement is illustrated, for example, in the fact that of the forty-three essays in The Shelburne Essays which make some reference to education, thirty-four deal with education at the college or university level. Of the four essays in The New Shelburne series which deal with education, all are commentaries on education at the college or university level. Of fourteen other essays, not included in either of the Shelburne series, but dealing with education, eleven are concerned with education at the college or university level. From these figures, it is evident that More's thinking on educational problems was primarily concerned with education above the level of the secondary school.

Aims Appropriate to Higher Education

More began his educational criticism in the same field as that in which he had done his teaching. In 1903, while he was literary editor of

The Independent, More published an attack upon what he stated were unsound practices in the teaching of the classics. The article was aimed primarily at the tendency to stress minutiae of grammar rather than the human values of literature.¹ By implication, at least, More condemned the aim which this teaching represented. He wrote, "It is merely the pursuit of knowledge and erudition apart from any consideration of their intrinsic value, of their influences on human life, or of their relation to true culture."²

Five years later, More approached the same point again; namely, that teachers of the classics were too much interested in philology for the proper presentation of literature, but this time he added a specific statement as to the aim which should be sought. It is well-known that through More's writing runs the theme of the distraction provided by the opposing dualism in life of the permanent and the temporary, the real and the illusory, the "one and the many." He wrote that he had struggled with his problem in this retreat at Shelburne, New Hampshire. Since he felt that in Greek literature, especially, a balance appeared between these opposing forces, More recommended greater stress upon the human element of the literature in order "to aim at the attaining of the balance provided by the classics between 'the one and the many.'"³

In 1913, More published the eighth volume of the Shelburne series The Drift of Romanticism. Included in this volume is his essay, "Nietzsche," which is a review of a then recently published translation of the works of

1. P. E. More, "Pedantry and Dilettantism in the Classics," The Independent LIV (February 5, 1903), pp. 338-40.

2. Ibid., pp. 338-9.

3. P. E. More, "The Teaching of the Classics," The Independent, LIV (August 6, 1908), p. 327.

Friedrich Nietzsche. More evaluated as basically sound Nietzsche's philosophy of the potential importance to society of the brilliant student. "He /Nietzsche/ saw, as few other men of our day have seen, the danger that threatens true progress in any system of education and government which makes the advantage of the ordinary rather than the distinguished man its first object."⁴ In this quotation a broadening of More's point of view is apparent in that he definitely referred to the possible influence of education upon society.

Two years later, More's "Academic Leadership" set forth in some detail the stated aim of social efficiency as the "real end" of education.⁵ More denied the theory that the "practical" man is the only one who can succeed in politics as well as the theory that there is no place in politics for the "intellectual aristocrat."

. . . Unless the educated man can somehow, by virtue of his education, make of himself a governor of the people in the larger sense, and even to some extent in the narrow political sense, unless the college can produce a hierarchy of character and intelligence which shall in due measure perform the office of the discredited oligarchy of birth, we had better make haste to divert our enormous collegiate endowments into more useful channels.⁶

More believed that traditional educational aims would support the aim of social efficiency. He contended, for example, that the aim of mental discipline must be recognized.⁷ And he also argued that development of the imagination through knowledge of the past must be sought.⁸

4. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism (Boston, 1913), p. 183.

5. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice (Boston, 1915), p. 53.

6. Ibid., p. 52.

7. Ibid., p. 46.

8. Ibid., p. 56.

The latter attainment he especially stressed as a necessary adjunct for leadership. More urged the colleges to adopt "the scheme of the humanist" in order to train men specifically for political leadership. This plan represented a disciplining of the higher faculty of the imagination to the end that the student might behold, as it were in one sublime vision, the whole scale of being in its range from the lowest to the highest under the divine decree of order and subordination.⁹ More found in British writing his authority for this need of imagination in the governors of society. As illustrative of his argument, More referred to Eliot's Boke Named the Governour published in 1531, Blackstone's "conception of the British Constitution and of liberty under law," and Burke's theory of statecraft.

In 1916, possibly under the impact of the war, More in his "The Old Education and the New" made a plea for the preservation of the aims of selected schools in the United States and England, rather than the acceptance of the aims of the gymnasium.¹⁰ In this article, More asserted that the aims of Rugby and St. Paul's placed religious and moral principles first, gentlemanly conduct second, and intellectual ability third. On the other hand, he accused the German schools of placing intellectual ability first, with gentlemanly conduct and moral principles in a subordinate position. In connection with this alleged stress on intellectual attainment in the German schools, More criticized the German approach of scientific research and "sifting data" in the study of traditional subjects. He advocated instead a concern for the effects of humanistic interpretation of

9. *Ibid.*, p. 56.

10. E. More, "The Old Education and the New," The Nation, CII (June 29, 1916), pp. 694-696.

the subjects upon the students' conduct and character. In other words More seems to indicate the belief that the reconciling of the aims of developing moral character and of developing scientific efficiency represents one of the great problems of modern education.

I cannot suppress a doubt whether, in the present vast development of scientific knowledge, a man whose first interest is in the things of the spirit and the niceties of honor does not suffer a terrible disadvantage in competition with one who has trained himself relentlessly for the control of material forces and made to himself a god of 'Efficiency.'¹¹

This necessity for placing the aim of moral training above the aim of intellectual training More reiterated the following year. He defended his position on the grounds that such an emphasis was desirable both for the individual and for society. "In 'Taste and Tradition,' which is primarily an article in defense of standards, More wrote, "Teach a boy to take pleasure in things that are fine and pure and strong and of good repute, and you have prepared him for a life wholesome and happy in itself and useful to the community."¹²

In 1921 with the publication of the eleventh and last volume of The Shelburne Essays, More, who by that time was devoting the major portion of his writing to his Greek Tradition, again set forth his concept of the aim of college education. This exposition is a combination of the earlier pleas for the restoration of the classics to their former place in the curriculum, for the development of the abler youths, and for the stressing

11. Ibid., p. 696.

12. P. E. More, "Taste and Tradition," VIII, The Unpopular Review (July, 1917), p. 131.

of spiritual values.

If the college as an institution is to retain any value above the shop and the market place, if the pursuit of scholarship as an end in itself is to offer any satisfaction for the finer spirits of men, then in some way those studies must be restored to authority which give zest and significance to the inner life of the soul.¹³

After 1917, More wrote less frequently on education. For a number of years he devoted his efforts to philosophical writing, and even when he returned to social problems his comments on education were relatively few.

Curriculum Reforms Advocated by More

As has been previously indicated, More's writings on education are, in general, concerned with college and university education. He commented on the curriculum of both undergraduate and graduate study; however, on a few occasions he made reference to education below the college level. The plan for the presentation of findings on this aspect of More's educational criticism is to proceed from his consideration of education at the undergraduate level to education at the graduate level, with a brief introductory reference to his views on pre-college reading, especially as he believed that reading affected college scholarship.

More's criticism of college preparation was pretty much limited to a consideration of student inadequacy in the ability to read and write. As early as 1907 he had characterized the reading public as "a generation of slipshod readers." He had condemned libraries as flooded with books

13. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others (Boston, 1921), p. 284.

lacking in form and substance.¹⁴ And in 1915 in appraising the year's market of leading books for children, he expressed his opinion of the current juvenile literature as being unworthy material even for recreational reading.¹⁵ He also argued that the required literature of schools and colleges could not compensate for vitiating effects of sub-standard recreational reading.

His /the student's/ Latin and algebra are not going to prevail against the vulgarising influences of his pleasures. He will come to college, as every instructor tells us our boys are coming, with a grotesquely impoverished vocabulary, with no sense of style for practical or aesthetic purposes, and no power of self-expression. At college you will see him in his club before a table spread with all the cheap magazines, but you will be lucky if you ever see a book in his hands except for required reading; and he will leave college in about the same state of innocence.¹⁶

In the word "reform" the idea of the removal of faults or abuses is implicit. More's educational criticism sets forth on various occasions two characteristics of the college curriculum that he evidently considered abuses: the elective system, and the stress on linguistics in the classical departments.

As the enemy of romanticism in general and Rousseau in particular, More was unsparing in his criticism of the effects of Emile.

Rousseau's 'education of nature' has deeply modified, if it has not entirely transformed, the ~~Pr~~ ^{Pr} ~~face~~ ^{face} of our schools. It is seen at work in the ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~ages~~ ^{ages} of the elective system, in the

14. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series (Boston, 1905), p. 122.

15. P. E. More, "Children's Books." The Nation, CI (December 2, 1915), p. 652.

16. Ibid., p. 122.

advocating of manual training as an equivalent for books, in the unbounded enthusiasm for nature study, in the encroachment of science on the character discipline of the humanities, in the general substitution of persuasion for authority.¹⁷

Probably in this criticism of Rousseau, "the encroachment of science on the character discipline of the humanities" is particularly important in view of More's interest in maintaining the classics in the college curriculum.

In addition to the influence of Rousseau, the teachings of Huxley were designated by More as a basis for the development of the elective system. Calling Huxley a master sophist, More expressed the belief that Huxley's influence was very wide-spread. "Sophism took possession of England in education, morals, religion, and government."¹⁸ More gave the following illustrations of this "sophistical" influence: "usurpation" of the college curriculum by scientific studies; failure to place the study of science in professional courses following a general education; and the "unhampered" elective system.¹⁹ He characterized the elective system as a revolt from Latin and Greek, a laxity of mind, and a repugnance for good reading.²⁰

More also charged President Eliot of Harvard University with promoting unsound thinking in the policies of higher education. Eliot in his program of education for service and power had fostered the elective system. More's opinion of Eliot's procedure is illustrated in Academic Leadership.

In one of his annual reports some years ago President Eliot, of Harvard, observed from the figures of registration that the majority of students still at that

17. P. E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series (Boston, 1905), p. 231.

18. Ibid., Seventh Series (Boston, 1910), p. 217

19. Ibid., p. 236.

20. Ibid., p. 236.

time believed the best form of education for them was in the old humanistic courses, and therefore, he argued, the other courses should be fostered. There was never perhaps a more extraordinary syllogism since the argal of Shakespeare's gravedigger.²¹

Obviously, More believed that the elective system was neither good for, nor in the beginning desired by, the undergraduate college student.

Closely allied, apparently, with More's disapproval of the elective system was his dissatisfaction with the increased stress on science in the college curriculum. In each volume of the Shelburne Essays, with the exception of the tenth, there are one or more essays which carry disparaging comments on the prominence and effect of science or scientific studies, either in or out of the curriculum. It is very probable that the first cause for More's antipathy to science was the fact that scientific subjects were crowding the humanities out of the curriculum.

The second change in the college curriculum which More advocated with vigor and consistency, especially from 1903 to 1916, was the lessening of the philological content of the courses in Greek and Latin. He particularly decried making the classics a scientific discipline in philology. He contended that he had no quarrel with science as such but with the application of the methods of science to the study of literature. As far as literature is concerned, he stated, "The study of grammar and archaeology in itself leads to nothing."²² He continued the argument with the expression of belief that if the scientific method were too much continued in a non-scientific field, the student, dissatisfied with the pro-

21. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Ninth Series, p. 51.

22. F. E. More, "Classical Teachers and the Public," The Independent, LIV (February 26, 1903), p. 511.

cedure, would be very likely to turn his attention to "genuine science" or to some other field of study, "The old authority of the classics has been dissolved, and the teachers of them, instead of seeking a new authority in the historical method have been misguided by the clamor of science into blind paths."²³

As early as 1908 More pointed to signs that indicated the continuance of stress in college teaching upon the philological aspects of Greek. In "The Teaching of the Classics," he advanced the criticism that in several years not one book of genuine human interest had been produced by a classical scholar in the United States.²⁴ As a specific illustration of the stress on linguistics, More referred to the fact that only one man had taken his doctorate at Harvard that year in the classics and that his work had been of a purely linguistic nature. The effect on the professors of this highly specialized training, More believed, was to narrow their knowledge to the point where they were unable "to meet the demands of great literature in our own age."²⁵

More's demand that the stress on the grammar of the classics be reduced is especially strong in his "Victorian Literature." In this essay he called the teaching of the classics by the methods of science such a failure that the classics had become superfluous in the curriculum. "If Greek affords no corrective to the influence of science and different from that in which modern tendencies are expressed, the study is merely

23. Ibid., p. 511.

24. P. E. More, "The Teaching of the Classics," The Independent, LXV (August 6, 1908), p. 227.

25. Ibid., p. 327.

an enormous waste of time."²⁶

More blamed the influence of the German universities for the tendency in American education to stress the philological rather than the social content of the classics.²⁷ Expressing the opinion that a German scholar's standing depended upon the "brute mass" of his learning, More pictured the German classical scholar as "very much occupied with sifting the data of tradition and with erecting on these data huge schemes of interpretation."²⁸ He deplored, moreover, the tendency in American schools to swing toward the German method.²⁹

To replace the elective system and the "practical" subjects in the college, as distinguished from the university, More advocated a common body of learnings.³⁰ The justification for the proposed change he found in society's need "for some commonground of strength and purpose in the first principles of education and law and property and religion."³¹ To this need of society he added his belief in the need of the students for mental discipline and habits of discriminating and critical study. He was apparently convinced of the value of mental discipline.³² On the basis of these two needs, common learnings and mental discipline, he recommended that colleges select one group of subjects to serve as the

26. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 256.

27. P. E. More, "The Old Education and the New," The Nation, CIII (July 29, 1916), p. 695.

28. Ibid., p. 695.

29. Ibid., p. 695.

30. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 59.

31. Ibid., p. 43.

32. Ibid., p. 46.

core of the curriculum.

But it is of prime importance. . . that we should select one group of studies and unite in making it the core of the curriculum for the great mass of undergraduates. It is true in education as in other matters that strength comes from union, and weakness from division, and if educated men are to work together for a common end they must have a common range of ideas, with a certain solidarity in their way of looking at things.³³

More chose the classics as the practicable group to select as the core of undergraduate studies.³⁴ It is true that he allowed a choice in outlying fields but at the same time he limited the opportunity for selection by indicating his belief that philosophy and mathematical science would be logical accompanying subjects.³⁵

This quite specific recommendation seems to represent a crystallizing of More's earlier thinking on the nature of the most suitable college curriculum. In 1906, he had expressed doubt as to a student's gaining from too early specialization.³⁶ On that occasion he had mentioned the humanities, history, modern languages and the classics, as the best background for specialized work in medicine, engineering, practical sciences, and journalism. He had expressed a disapproval of economics as substitute for the classics.³⁷ His grounds for his belief were that with immature minds the study of economics contributed to the "peril of socialism," or to a belief that the events of history were wholly determined by economic con-

33. *Ibid.*, p. 50.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

36. P. E. More, "The Value of Academic Degrees," *The Bookman*, XXIV (August, 1906), p. 651.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 652.

ditions, or to the belief that the evil in society is essentially the result of property.

With the recommendation of the common learnings curriculum, More seems to have shifted from the rather negative attitude of saying what he believed was not desirable to the relatively more positive attitude of offering a program of studies.

Evaluation of Trends

The problem of More's suggested curriculum reforms and the problem of his evaluation of educational trends seems to overlap to some extent. At least, they are very closely related problems, More's belief in the need for common learnings at the undergraduate level, for example, is probably in itself one evaluation of the elective system in the colleges. Yet even at the cost of some recapitulation of idea, it seems wise to note briefly his specific evaluations of the effect of the trend to the elective system, as well as the trend away from the classics, even though this evaluation may have been implicit in the earlier discussion of these subjects in this chapter.

More's writings clearly indicate that he considered the elective system in the colleges to have had injurious effects upon the students, the professors, and the curriculum. He contended that the effect upon the students was manifest in a poorer quality of scholarship and in a tendency toward too early specialization in medicine, engineering, and the practical sciences.³⁸ He also argued that the elective system was "one of the main

38. Ibid., p. 652.

causes of the curious fact that scarcely any other class of men in social intercourse feel themselves, in their deeper concerns, more severed from one another than those very college professors who ought to be united in the battle for educational leadership." In the third place, More maintained that the elective system had weakened the college curriculum through lessening the value of the A.B. degree and through encouraging a disproportionate enrollment in the "practical" courses, especially in sociology and economics.⁴⁰

In a critical vein similar to that in which he had estimated the effects of the elective system, More expressed his concern for the effects of a pragmatic philosophy of education. Admitting that the influence of William James was far-reaching, More wrote, "Pragmatism is the slogan of the hour, and there is a kind of truth in the remark thrown out recently in an English review that William James was the most influential leader in the spiritual life of the present generation."⁴¹ More's use of the phrase, "slogan of the hour" may well be an indication of his unfavorable judgment of James, since "slogan" means "catchword of a particular party." An examination of More's essay on James bears out the impression which the summary statement just quoted implies. In this essay More supported the point of view taken in certain current reviews unfavorable to James, on the grounds that James was equivocal in his expression of his philosophical theories. "There is something like the hilarity of sport in dragging out the inconsistencies, if not the insincerities, of a philo-

40. *Ibid.*, p. 650.

41. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 252.

osopher who has tried to defend rationally a system which is professedly an attack on rationalism."⁴² Furthermore, he accused James of being too much concerned with the present and of being characteristic of the mental life of the present generation, that is, too much cut off from "all the rich experience of the past."⁴³

Although More had praised James for turning aside from the philosophy of Monism and the whole school of German Intellectualism, still More found the cost of accepting Pragmatism high.⁴⁴ Referring to Dewey's definition of Nature as "an indefinite congeries of change" More disparaged Pragmatism as representative of "a one-sided rationalization of the data of experience."⁴⁵ Among the other social manifestations of the law of change, More listed two educational trends: the elective system, and the shift of emphasis from the humanities to the scientific or quasi-scientific studies.⁴⁶

In other words, More in this essay added the names of William James and John Dewey to those of Rousseau and Huxley as indicative of the origins of certain educational trends which he, More, opposed.

A third educational trend which More has evaluated in some detail is that of the trend in schools and colleges away from Latin and Greek. He contended that the lack of a strong, widespread classical tradition in the transcending imagination had resulted in a corresponding loss of transcending imagination. More seems to have implied that he believed that a vital

42. Ibid., p. 197.

43. Ibid., p. 202.

44. Ibid., p. 200.

45. Ibid., p. 253.

46. Ibid., p. 265.

part of the imagination was memory.⁴⁷ He gave from American history instances of the characteristics of American thought in attempts to substantiate his point of view. The Puritans, for example, furnished an illustration to More of people who were too much cut off from the continuity of tradition, with the result that they represented only one segment of contemporary thought. To this narrowness of background, More attributed their narrowness of vision; and to their influence, More attributed much of the "poverty" of American art and letters.

It is a rule from which there is barely, if at all, escape, that those who forget the past are in their turn forgotten. Now the lack of imagination among the Puritans showed itself in contempt of the arts and in many other manifest ways, but in none more clearly than in their violent break with the continuity of tradition.⁴⁸

More also listed American figures who, in his opinion, exemplified the effects of a lack of the classical tradition. First he named Benjamin Franklin as a man who by his versatility and efficiency of intellect, as well as by his lack of deeper qualities of the imagination, typifies American intellectual development.⁴⁹ These same qualities, More believed, were reflected in Franklin's writings. "As a writer he has all the clearness, force, and flexibility that comes from attention to what is near at hand; he lacks also that depth of background which we call imagination, and which is largely the indwelling of the past in the present."⁵⁰

XXIV

47. P. E. More, "The Value of Academic Degrees," The Bookman (August, 1906), p. 652.

48. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series (Boston, 1905), p. 190.

49. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fourth Series (Boston, 1902), p. 152.

50. Ibid., p. 154.

On another occasion, and in even stronger language, More named another historic American, Philip Freneau, as one whose works represent the alleged American characteristic of excessive interest in contemporary events and material things. "Here you shall read glorification of commerce and science such as our national poet, if such existed, might write; here you shall see the past disparaged in the classics, and that self-flattering absorption in the present which has gapped the very roots of the New World's imagination."⁵¹

In addition to More's appraisal of the effects in American national life of the trend away from the classics, there is also his treatment of the significance of the same trend in its effect upon education. He contended that the classics lost their central position in the college curriculum as the result of the philosophy of "sheer change." In More's opinion the change had been unfortunate both in the immediate effects upon the college professor and in the long-term effects upon students.

In the case of college faculties, More pointed out a loss of professional unity,⁵² a loss of conviction of the importance of teaching,⁵³ and a loss of social prestige.⁵⁴ More's point of view is here illustrated. As early as 1905, he had indicated his belief in the lack of unity among professors of foreign languages. "And in our universities we now see the classical and modern-language faculties separated into semi-hostile groups

51. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series (Boston, 1908), p. 102.

52. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 122.

53. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 245.

54. Ibid., p. 245.

of pure philologists on the one side, and shallow dabblers in literature on the other."⁵⁵ Fifteen years later, he wrote again of the lack of harmony between professorial groups. This time his comments indicated a belief in interdepartmental hostilities. He pictured the professors of science and sociology as "jaunty and supercilious," while the professors of the humanities showed the "desperation of men beaten in the race."⁵⁶ Both groups, however, had one conviction in common: a lack of a sense of importance in their work.⁵⁷ More observed that the professors of science and sociology probably felt the "unreality of their work in the classroom in comparison with the vitality of similar interests in the practical world" while the professors of the humanities had "no strong conviction of the privilege of scholarship in itself and for its rewards to the scholar himself."⁵⁸

In addition to the possibly harmful effects of a loss of morale among the professors, More claimed that learning itself had decreased in prestige. He supported this contention with the reflection that a hundred years ago a fellowship at Oxford or Cambridge was regarded as one of the "prizes of life," but that professors in the twentieth century are treated, even by writers, either with open mockery or gentle irony.⁵⁹ And as far as the general public is concerned, More argued that the lack of professorial prestige extends so far that "deprecatory comparison between a professorship and a career in the world is common."⁶⁰

55. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 122.

56. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 245.

57. Ibid., p. 245.

58. Ibid., p. 245.

59. Ibid., p. 240.

60. Ibid., p. 247.

A still larger group of people affected by the changing emphasis in the college curriculum, More insisted, was that of the students whose education did not include the classics. As far as the individual student is concerned the problem resolves itself, in More's opinion, into three "losses." First there is the contemporaneity of the "intellectual upstart."⁶¹ Second there is danger of distraction from clashing miscellaneous interests.⁶² Third there is the loss to Christian teaching of the secular traditions of the classics.⁶³ As far as representative government is concerned, More seemed to believe that the change would also be significant. "It means a new kind of men in the seats of authority, a new sort of life as the aim of government, a new standard of morality, other hopes and other prizes, a world set free from its moorings."⁶⁴

A fourth educational trend which More evaluated was that of the prevalence of science in the college curriculum.

Before presenting a summary of More's attitudes expressed toward the place of science in the college curriculum, it may be well to summarize his attitudes in general toward the study of science. More's writings, early and late, show that he seemed to have no quarrel with the study of "pure science." Such was the point of view which he expressed in 1903.⁶⁵ Midway in his writing career, moreover, More advocated the "accompaniment of philosophy and the mathematical sciences" to his proposed core curriculum of Latin and Greek. Again, in 1928, he paid a tribute to the possi-

61. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, p. 162.

62. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 50.

63. Ibid., p. 85.

64. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 212.

65. P. E. More, "Classical Teachers and the Public," The Independent, LIV (February 26, 1903), p. 512.

bilities of the accomplishments of science. "Science as an accumulation and classification of observed facts may go on from victory to victory."⁶⁷

On the other hand, More held quite a different point of view regarding certain sciences. His contentions regarding biology may be noted as an example. He stated: "... popularly there is little distinction between positive, hypothetical and philosophical science."⁶⁸ In biology, More argued, Huxley had added to the general confusion between observed facts and hypotheses.⁶⁹ More's concept of the seriousness of the effect of Huxley's teachings is indicated in his earlier statement that as a people we have entrusted our destiny to Darwin, and Spencer, and Huxley,⁷⁰ and he estimated the cost of accepting Huxley's teachings as the equivalent of a dogmatic new religion, with an undue stress on mechanical progress.⁷¹ In the possibility of application of scientific knowledge for the ultimate happiness of mankind, More apparently saw no hope. "He who attempts to find peace in any formula of science or in any hope of historic progress, is like one who labors on the old and vain problem of squaring the circle."⁷² It is clear that More admired pure science but distrusted science as a philosophy.

He believed, moreover, that the study of science properly belonged in the professional school. "Positive science is a noble vocation, but just so sure as it is made in considerable part the basis of education, instead of being treated as a profession, like law or medicine, just so surely

67. Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 50.

68. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 193.

69. Ibid., p. 211.

70. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series (Boston, 1904), p. 95

71. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 123.

72. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 263.

the confusions of philosophical science will follow and claim authority in our schools."⁷³

While More admitted the prevalence of the concept of education for "service and power," he seriously questioned its soundness. He said that he based his opinion on statistics of courses elected and public utterances of undergraduates. As a result of his observations, he concluded, possibly ironically, that the college "has so far lagged behind in the march of progress that it has become neither unrepentantly an engineering school, nor frankly an experimental station for applied sociology."⁷⁴

When the minds of students fluctuate, More continued, between the ideals of scientific control and socialistic combination they lose a sense "of life as a thing possibly valuable in itself and worthy of cultivation."⁷⁵ In brief, he believed that major stress on science at the college level produced inadequate and socially dangerous education.

A fifth phase of the educational pattern to come under More's judgment was the graduate school. Between 1908 and 1928 he made three attacks on the requirements for the doctorate in philosophy and the methods of the seminar. The earliest criticism in 1908 appears in an essay that More wrote on James Thomson. More seemed especially disturbed concerning the printing of a doctoral dissertation on the works of Thomson and took the occasion to express his opinion on the relative lack of value of this dissertation in particular and doctoral dissertations in general.

73. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, pp. 235-6.

74. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 244.

75. Ibid., p. 243.

This study possesses some value as a compendious statement of facts, but is otherwise a hodge-podge of stale pendants. It sometimes seems as if to the German university mind the whole intellectual world between Kant and the card catalogue, between metaphysics and mechanism, were nonexistent; as if it had no sense for the great practical region where life and books come together.⁷⁶

To this attack on one dissertation and the methods of the German graduate schools More added his expression of doubt concerning the value of the dissertation as a mark of scholarship.

The inconsiderate printing of doctoral and other perfunctory theses in Germany and also in America, has grown to be a menace to sound learning. If they have any virtue, it is in dragging into the light of day the absurd theory that original production is the right discipline and the only test of scholarship. And now Thomson has received his crown of thorns at the court of the Seminar.⁷⁷

In 1915, More by implication, at least, indicated again his lack of approval for the methods of the graduate school. In "The Paradox of Oxford" More championed the idea that the classics had more value than the writings of the Middle Ages which he designated as "so much cadaver for seminar."⁷⁸ In other words, he apparently meant that the method of the seminar was that of dissection, an inappropriate method to the graduate school.

In 1928, More returned to the point of view indicated in the two preceding illustrations. Commenting on the tendency to find isolated "experts" rather than influential writers and scholars on the staffs of graduate schools, More placed the blame on the English departments of the

76. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, footnote, p. 170.

77. Ibid., p. 171

78. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 88.

colleges.

They are unsympathetic, it is comically exaggerating to say antipathetic, to the kind of training that would produce and hold such man. They want experts in Anglo-Saxon and medieval French and Chaucerian bibliography and are suspicious of any student who turns aside from the narrow path prescribed for the doctors of philosophy to acquire any real philosophy of life.⁷⁹

In short More evaluated the requirements for the doctor of philosophy as unsatisfactory in three respects: original contribution is not necessarily a sound test of scholarship; too much effort is spent on relatively unimportant material; the system tends to divide rather than unify the members of the teaching staff.

More was unsympathetic in his delineation of the role of the college president.⁸⁰ To compete in size with other universities, More asserted, a president is too often tempted to lower the academic standards in the name of social service. Such a program More held to be less valuable than the program which attracted the best minds and offered the "narrow and tried paths" of learning.⁸¹

Recommendations for Improving Status of Teachers or Professors

More's writings show clear evidence of interest, on his part, in the improvement of the economic and professional status of professors and teachers, especially the status of professors. This attitude is probably a natural enough one, since his primary interest in teaching was directed toward college teaching. Between the years 1903 and 1921, More made speci-

79. Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 75

80. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays Third Series (Boston, 1905), p. 129.

81. Ibid., p. 129.

fic recommendations regarding the promotion and pay of professors. First, he condemned what he considered the over-emphasis upon scholarly writing as a means of promotion on college staffs.⁸² Taking his examples from the literary output of the classical man, More five years later argued the same point again, stating that many of these writings were merely "economic potboilers," designed to attain for their authors the goal of promotion. He also contended that the energy which was directed to the production of specialised writing of "questionable" scholarly value might better be directed toward wider general scholarship and improvements in methods of teaching.⁸³ In other words, according to More a professor, as distinguished from a research worker, should be recognized for promotion in relation to the excellence of his teaching. Likewise, More expressed himself vigorously in regard to a lack of interest on the part of the public concerning adequate pay for teachers in comparison with the concern for increasing the pay of other groups. "Let us, in the name of a long-suffering God, put some bounds to the flood of talk about the wages of the bricklayer and the trainman, and talk a little more about the income of the artist and the teacher and the public censor ..."⁸⁴

More also analysed to some extent the evidence, as he saw it, of a lack of professional unity among professors and made recommendations for achieving greater unity; for instance, he found a lack of common aims to be apparent between professors even in such related groups as the classical and modern foreign language faculties, dividing them into "semi-

82. P. E. More, "What Are Our Classical Men Doing?", The Independent (May 1, 1903), p. 328.

83. P. E. More, "The Teaching of the Classics," The Independent, LXV (August 6, 1908), p. 328.

84. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 32.

hostile groups."⁸⁵ As one of his arguments for making one group of studies the core of the curriculum for undergraduate work, More accused the elective system of fostering a spirit of isolation between departments.⁸⁶ Second, he pointed out the isolation in which scholars in different universities in the United States work in relation to each other. More seemed to believe that the lack of any recognized center of culture in America prevented professorial unity as well as deserved recognition. This last argument appeared late in More's career in his review of Foerster's Humanism in America, to which various professors from various parts of the United States had contributed papers. Having characterized the contributors as being at once "successful teachers and sound thinkers and forcible writers," More advanced the theory that the isolation brought by distance itself tends to prevent great scholars, working in universities in different areas of the country, from achieving their potential social effectiveness.⁸⁷ "Possibly there would be great consequences if one of our major universities had the courage and the foresight to gather into its faculty such a group of men as I have mentioned. Each would be fortified and comforted by the others, and together they would make such a push as would be felt from the Atlantic to the Pacific."⁸⁸

Educational Theory Most Consistently Defended

The material already presented in this chapter seems to show a definite trend. A review of More's professed aims for college education shows recon-

85. Paul EL More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 122.

86. Op. cit., p. 51.

87. Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 75.

88. Ibid., p. 75.

recommendations that colleges should attempt to develop humanistic appreciations, mental discipline, and depth of imagination through the study of Latin and Greek. His proposed instrument for developing social efficiency and moral responsibility was the college curriculum of common learnings of which Latin and Greek were the proposed core. He cited the effects of the lack of a classical background as a prime cause for what he considered excessive contemporaneity and materialism in American art and thought. He considered college education under the elective system and with the prevalence of scientific and "practical" subjects to be conducive to too early specialization on the part of educated people. The findings that are summarized in the four preceding sentences seem to indicate clearly that the educational theory most consistently defended by More was that of the defense of the classics as a possible developmental and unifying force in education and in society.

More's Concept of the Social Value of Education

The number of statements that More made in which he specifically defined his position regarding the social value of education are relatively few. Moreover, those few statements are pretty largely confined to the Shelburne Essays, Series Nine, and the New Shelburne Essays, Series One. Yet the evidence seems clear that More considered education, with its concomitant opportunities and obligations, to be the means by which society had a chance to progress.

In the earlier volume, More considered the problem of social justice. He attempted to analyze justice, including the just apportionment of awards in society. He advanced the theory that justice is synonymous with the happiness which people obtain when their activities are determined by

reason, rather than by feeling. To these happy people and, hence, superior people, More argued, belong the honors that society has to bestow. Such justice, he believed, would be neither the result of the theory that might makes right, nor of the theory that equalitarianism makes right. The first functionary that More named as the agent for the accomplishment of this "rational" distribution of power and privilege is the law giver; the second, is the teacher. "Of both lawgiver and teacher the work is one of mediation, as social justice is itself always a shifting compromise."⁸⁹ This indication of belief that the teacher must be a strong social influence, seems to be in harmony with More's theory that the educated man must assume social, including political, leadership.⁹⁰

In 1928, More returned to the theme of the social value of education. He championed the importance of education with this statement, "... the difficulties now confronting civilization, if solution there must be, must be solved by education."⁹¹ He evinced, moreover, some optimism as to the possibility that education would be equal to the task. One evidence for his belief he found in the then so-called New Humanist movement in criticism. In it he saw signs of a revival of the traditional learnings for which he had argued for approximately a quarter of a century, "signs of the discipline of a classical humanism which will train the imagination in loyalty to the great traditions, while cherishing the liberty to think and the power to create without succumbing to the seductions of the market-place or the gutter."⁹²

⁸⁹ Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 122.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 45.

⁹¹ Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, New Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 75.

⁹² Ibid., p. 76.

Summary Part A. More's Criticism of Education

Of the sixty-one essays in which More devoted more or less space to education, forty-nine or about eighty per cent expressed opinion concerning education at the college or university level.

More recommended the adoption of five aims for college and university teaching. Above all other goals he stressed moral responsibility. He also strongly advocated training for social responsibility, including political leadership. He believed that the aims already mentioned could be accomplished through stress on humanistic appreciations, mental discipline, and imaginative understandings.

More advocated three curriculum reforms, including abolishment of the elective system, lessening of the philological content of courses in Latin and Greek, and establishment of a curriculum of common learnings of which Latin and Greek should be the core.

A review of More's evaluation of the possible effects of ^{the} trend toward a lack of training in the classical tradition indicates that his arguments fall into two main categories: the prolonged effect upon the American mind; and the immediate effect upon twentieth century education. In the first instance, More pointed out a resulting narrowness in point of view and barrenness in art. Of these two characteristics, he listed the Puritans as exemplars. He also characterized the American people as being conspicuously preoccupied with contemporary and material affairs. Of these attitudes, More listed Franklin and Freneau as exemplars. In the second part of his evaluation of the effect of this trend away from the classics, he pictured the twentieth century college professors as being low in morale and prestige; he pictured college students as distracted by multitudinous

interests; and he prophesied the likelihood that representative government would undergo a marked change in personnel, because of the arrival of "practical" men in positions of political power. In his evaluation of the increased popularity of science in the college curriculum, More approved of including mathematical science in his suggested program of common learnings. However, since he believed that general education made the best possible background for specialization, he advocated placing the study of specialized sciences in the graduate school, to be studied there as a profession. Closely related to More's frequently expressed distrust of the application of scientific methods of non-scientific material was his disapproval of the research requirements for the doctorate in philosophy. In this matter, he contended that research is no proof of great scholarship. In addition to his comments on the teaching methods and curriculum content of the colleges, he took a stand on methods of college administration, arguing that college presidents understood their positions in the wrong sense of working for increased enrollment and larger plants rather than of improving the intellectual tone of their institutions.

On the basis of the variety of More's educational recommendations and evaluations in which he named the classics as a possible constructive force, it seems clear that the importance of a classical education was the educational belief which More most consistently defended.

More's evaluation of the status of professors and teachers was that they were lacking in sufficient economic reward and sufficient social distinction. He urged greater unity among professors and he believed that promotions should be based on excellence of teaching rather than scholarly writing.

More's recognition of the social importance of education is clearly stated. As early as 1914 he argued that teachers should be a unified social force and that educated men should assume social, including political, leadership. As late as 1928 he maintained that only education could solve the social problems of the day.

Part B

Educational Criticism as Expressed in The Nation, During Years of More's Editorship

The second part of this chapter represents an attempt to discover and set forth the educational criticism, if any, which occurred in the editorial articles of The Nation, May 20, 1909 to March 12, 1914, the years of More's editorship.

The procedure, as planned, is to apply to the editorials the same questions that were applied to More's own writings, with the word editorial substituted for the word essay, and the name The Nation substituted for the name More. The same seven questions will be used as bases for arrangement, classification, and summary of the findings. The questions are as follows:

1. What percentage of the editorials dealing with education are expressions of opinion dealing with education at the college level?
2. What aim or aims did The Nation list as suitable for college and university teaching?
3. What curriculum reform, if any, did The Nation advocate?
4. What specific educational trends, if any, did The Nation evaluate, and how did it evaluate them?
5. What recommendations, if any, did The Nation make for improving the status of teachers or professors?
6. Which of these educational theories, if any, did The Nation most consistently defend, 1909-1914?
7. By what statements, implications, or arguments did The Nation indicate its concept of the social value of education?

Percentage of Editorials Aimed at College Level

During the period of approximately five years when More served as editor of The Nation, a total of one hundred twenty-eight of the magazine's editorials were expressions of opinion on education. Seventy-five of these one hundred twenty-eight editorials were expressions of opinion concerning education at the college or university level. In terms of percentage slightly over fifty-eight per cent, or a clear majority, of the editorials on education in The Nation, May 20, 1909 to March 12, 1914, then, were expressions of opinion concerning education at the college or university level.

Aims Appropriate to Higher Education

An examination of the editorials in The Nation during the years of More's editorship discloses the fact that, among other problems of college and university education, the editorial writers to some extent took cognizance of the question of suitable aims. Perhaps the aim that should be mentioned first is that of fostering the classical curriculum, since the editorial writers repeatedly indicated a belief that through this instrument of education various aims might be achieved.

In defense of the Liberal Arts curriculum The Nation advocated the aim of teaching for ultimate value rather than for immediate utility. This point of view is emphasized in various editorials. For example "The Romance of Learning"¹ stresses the argument that Greek must mean more

1. Editorial, "The Romance of Learning," The Nation, XCIII (August 10, 1911), pp. 116-117.

then mental discipline, and that the college must struggle against the spirit of immediate utility,"... for the college can never, while still remaining a college, employ the methods of technical schools, since its chief function is by definition, to give a general education."²

In connection with its stated belief that the classical curriculum should be maintained, The Nation expressed editorial approval of those college and university presidents who in their public utterances maintained or implied the same point of view. "The Opportunity of the Small College" is a clear expression of editorial opinion favoring traditional learning.³ Herein the advice was that the small college abolish the degree of bachelor of science and maintain a sure order and hierarchy in the classics. Specific approval was directed to the speech of newly-elected President Alexander Meiklejohn of Amherst College for declaring his intention of maintaining a classical curriculum.⁴ The editorial added an admonition, however, that Greek literature without Greek philosophy, specifically the philosophy of Plato, should not be considered. The following week, the magazine took the opportunity to commend President John Hibben of Princeton University for his statement, "The university is not specifically designed for the purpose of fitting a man directly for the daily duties of his future work in life."⁵ Previous to these expressions of approval al-

2. Ibid., p. 117.

3. Editorial, "The Opportunity of the Small College," The Nation, XCII (March 3, 1911), p. 211.

4. Editorial, "Dogmatism as Virtue," The Nation, XCVI (May 9, 1912), p. 535.

5. Editorial, "Where Princeton Stands," The Nation, XCIV (May 16, 1912), p. 485.

ready noted, The Nation had taken exception to the conclusion by President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University that what subjects one took as an undergraduate made little difference in the professional school, but that the grades attained made a great difference.⁶ "In Language and literature, it makes all the difference in the world whether one takes Greek or English; in natural science, whether the choice is physics or geology; in history and political science, whether it is political economy or modern history."⁷

In maintaining the aim of education for ultimate values rather than the aim of education for immediate utility, The Nation warned the colleges against three influences which possibly could be detrimental to liberal education.⁸ The first one named was the specialized university. The occasion for this editorial was Lord Roseberry's suggestion that each university concentrate its efforts on whatever group of subjects it felt itself most qualified to teach. The editorial expressed its disapproval of this proposed idea on the grounds that the universities should sacrifice some efficiency to preserve the catholic temper of university life; in the proposed change a fine humility would be lost to learning; Latin and Greek could not be preserved in isolation.⁹ The second danger to classical learning in the colleges which The Nation saw was the growing demands of the secondary schools that everything that is well taught in the secondary schools should be recognized for college entrance.¹⁰ Six months later the

6. Editorial, "In College and After," The Nation, XCI (December 2, 1910), p. 598.

7. Ibid., p. 599.

8. Editorial, "The Specialized University," The Nation, XC (March 31, 1910), p. 312.

9. Loc. cit.

10. Editorial, "The Fight on the Colleges," The Nation, XCI (July 14, 1910), July 14,

magazine returned to the problem of the high schools and college entrance with the question of how far the colleges should go to meet the demands for a withdrawal of college entrance examinations. The editorial conclusion was, "Not far enough to endanger the old ideal of intellectual aristocracy, if the best interests of the country are to be considered."¹¹ Demands by advocates of vocational education were cited as a third possible danger to the maintenance of the classical curriculum in the colleges. Reviewing the tremendous strides in this century in vocational education, both here and in Germany, the magazine contended that its more short-sighted promoters are jealous of liberal education.¹² With the warning against a cleavage between endowed schools and state schools, and the closing of the higher privileges of education to all but the well-to-do, the editorial concluded:

To avoid this harsh discrimination we should not require a general hardening of occupational lines, leaving the topmost stratum of society alone to cultivate the liberal studies. It must be realized that education is primarily for life and not for livelihood, and that new forms and new institutions must have plenty of time to grow, even in this impatient age."¹³

Aside from the aim of ultimate values in a classical education, The Nation in its editorial columns listed certain other educational aims which might be achieved through the study of Latin and Greek. As far as the benefits to society as such were concerned, The Nation advocated a "human" education as the proper background for men preparing for political leader-

11. Editorial "Colleges and High Schools," The Nation, XCII (January 12, 1911), p. 30.

12. Editorial, "Vocational Education," The Nation, XCVI (July 3, 1913), p. 8.

13. Ibid., p. 8.

ship. The editorial based its thesis on the fact that Ascham and Feacham and Locke and Milton and Chesterfield had espoused this same idea.¹⁴ To this end the editorial recommended that the colleges strive to interest promising young men.

In this age of intolerance for purposeless and indolent Goodness and Beauty, perhaps the hope of future usefulness for the college of liberal arts lies in frank competition with its rivals not for the women and weaker brethren, but for the young men of ambition and promise, desiring to qualify themselves for the careers - more numerous now than ever before - open to liberal scholars and gentlemen.¹⁵

In connection with the aim of social leadership, The Nation also advocated classical education in the colleges for men who expected to become scientists.¹⁶ Referring to a recent inquiry in which thirty-five scientists were reported to have expressed the opinion that the classics are helpful to students of science, the editorial contended that our scientists were not taking their proper place in our social and political life.

... they have locked their doors against the ideals, the imaginations and even the vicissitudes of mankind; because in a word they have sometimes forgotten that the heart of education is still the knowledge of men and not of things. If those masters themselves see this, our humanist need not shudder over Dartmouth's choosing a physicist for president.¹⁷

A more generalized social aim which The Nation mentioned as deserving the attention of the universities was that of raising the level of citizen-

14. Editorial, "Confessions of a Professor," The Nation, XC (March 24, 1910), p. 339.

15. Ibid., p. 339.

16. Editorial, "Science and Culture," The Nation, LXXXVIII (June 17, 1909), p. 598.

17. Ibid., p. 599.

ship While the magazine tended to support the colleges in the controversial question of college entrance, still it admitted that endowed universities could not afford to neglect the public schools.¹⁸ In this connection, The Nation admitted that any university which became indifferent to "the best strength of the country" would deserve support from no one.

Aside from the professed aim of social efficiency, including political leadership for some students and improved citizenship for many students, The Nation also supported the specific aims of mental discipline to benefit the individual, as an individual. This aim, the magazine maintained, could be achieved through a study of Latin and Greek. On at least four occasions in the five years under consideration, an editorial appeared in defense of the theory of mental discipline. The first of this series of articles attempted justification of the purpose of mental discipline rather than that of service to one's fellow-men.¹⁹ The second was the argument that the probability of success in the graduate schools depends upon the mental discipline and the mental habits engendered by the subjects of the undergraduate curriculum.²⁰ The third was an exposition of the idea that training the mind is important in order to develop the capacity to see new facts, to discriminate as to their significance, and to reason out general conclusions.²¹ The fourth article specified subjects suitable for providing mental discipline.

18. Editorial, "Colleges and High Schools," The Nation, XCII (January 12, 1911), p. 31.

19. Editorial, "The Aim of the College," The Nation, XC (June 16, 1910), p. 601.

20. Editorial, "In College and After," The Nation, XCI (December 22, 1910), p. 599.

21. Editorial, "Practical Education," The Nation, XCV (September 26, 1912), p. 279.

. . . if we think of the study of language not merely as the search for a tool, but the striving for a bracing exercise of the mind and a discipline of the perceptive and reasoning powers, the classical course offers a robust training than can be got by the ordinary boy out of any modern grammar.²²

One of the strongest statements on the aim of mental discipline made in the editorial pages of The Nation was in disparagement of using scientific procedures and precision in speculative science and the failure to discriminate clearly between hypothesis and fact.²³ From such procedures, the editorial contended, scientific education "tends to dull that conscious distinction between what one knows and what one does not know, which is almost the highest aim of education."²⁴

Curriculum Reforms Advocated by The Nation

An examination of the editorials of The Nation during the years of More's editorship indicates that the first curriculum reform advocated in these columns, at least from the point of view of chronology, was that of improvement in general reading habits.²⁵ Editorial comment was that the monthly magazines were having a hard time to maintain a high intellectual standard, and that the quarterlies had all but disappeared. Free public education was charged with the responsibility for this change in reading tastes. The schools were accused of turning out readers satisfied merely with newspaper reading and unwilling to exercise mature judgment in reading.

The first demand for curriculum reform which The Nation aimed specifically at the colleges was that of reform in the elective system.²⁶ Accord-

22. Editorial, "Utility and Discipline," The Nation, XCVI (January 23, 1913), p. 75.

23. Editorial, "Scientific Speculation," The Nation, LXXXIX (August 19, 1909), p. 154.

24. Ibid., p. 155.

25. Editorial, The "Quarterly" Centenary, The Nation LXXXVIII (May 27, 1909), p. 529.

26. Editorial, "President Lowell's Opportunity," The Nation, LXXXIX (September 9, 1909), p. 228.

ing to The Nation, the press in anticipation of Lowell's inaugural address as President of Harvard University, had expressed the opinion that President Eliot's successor would announce a proposed policy of improvement in the elective system. The Nation agreed that the situation was urgent. "Mr. Lowell's great opportunity is, therefore, to devise some plan by which freedom of choice shall become freedom of intelligent choice in consonance with a man's future career."²⁷ A few weeks later The Nation returned to the subject to express general approval of Lowell's address in which he had advocated a "recasting" of the elective system at Harvard.²⁸ And on December 16, 1909, The Nation hailed a statement from Cambridge that a new plan was being formulated to require a considerable amount of work in some one field with the rest of the courses "well distributed."²⁹

The Nation, moreover, recommended that the elective system in the colleges be replaced by a program of common learnings.³⁰ This plan, The Nation argued, would restore the unity of scholarly interests which over-specialization had destroyed. The magazine admitted that since the universities by their very nature might feel that they could not surmount the problem, the small colleges could and, to this end, might possibly abolish the degree of bachelor of science.

And, whatever may be said here and there against the 'dead languages'; however they have been abandoned for easier and seemingly more direct paths to success, there are no studies other

27. Ibid., p. 229

28. Editorial, "President Lowell's Inaugural," The Nation, LXXXIX (October 14, 1909), p. 342.

29. Editorial, "Harvard and the Elective System," The Nation, LXXXIX (December 16, 1909), p. 592.

30. Editorial, "The Opportunity of the Small College," The Nation, XCII (March 2, 1911), p. 210.

than Latin and Greek that can be practically proposed as the center of such a system.³¹

This is essentially the same choice that was made by The Nation a year later in its plan for restoration of subjects for the sake of mental discipline.³² The only difference is that the last editorial added mathematics to the classical languages to provide more material for "gymnasium work for the mind."³³

A change in requirements for the degree of Master of Arts was the fourth curriculum reform advocated by The Nation under More's editorship.³⁴ An editorial reviewed the history of the degree including its being made a year of graduate work. The article continued with the contention that a great many graduate students of serious purpose have no vocation for research and no need for research in their professional work as teachers or writers. Since the doctorate is a certificate of proficiency in research but not an evidence of teaching capacity, many teachers and writers do have a need for a second or third year of graduate work. Under the present plan, however, The Nation pointed out, the one year master's had become an unsatisfactory goal. "We need a way of keeping men a little longer at work without forcing them into the routine of preparation for the doctor's degree If the master's degree were granted for two years instead of one, we should have an arrangement well adapted to the wants of a great many graduate students."³⁵

31. Ibid., p. 211.

32. Editorial, "Practical Education," The Nation, XCV (September 26, 1912), p. 279.

33. Ibid., p. 279.

34. Editorial, "Toward an Improved M. A.," The Nation, XCII (February 23, 1911), p. 186.

35. Ibid., p. 186.

Evaluations of Trends

Among the educational trends evaluated by The Nation, between 1909 and 1914, the greatest number of editorials were divided between two quite different trends in education: the increasing number of candidates for the Ph.D. and the popularity of athletics. Three other trends were considered more briefly.

Commenting on the statistics gathered by Science showing that the number of doctorates granted by American universities for each of the two preceding years had been one hundred in excess of the average for the past ten years, The Nation in 1909 expressed immediate disapproval of this new trend in higher education.³⁶ It satirized the subjects for dissertations and wondered how all the young Ph.D.'s could be assimilated by the "crowded" staffs of university instruction or the "limited capacities" of research laboratories. Furthermore, the magazine argued, since no knowledge of philosophy was necessarily required for the Ph.D., there was no assurance that these scholars were not mere "unilateral specialists," developed according to the German system. Again, the following year, the magazine questioned the necessity of the Ph.D.³⁷ In 1912, The Nation returned to the subject with advice that English and modern foreign language departments change their program of graduate studies.³⁸ The recommendation urged affiliation with the classics instead of mediaevalism, including considerable Elizabethan drama, and also urged the honoring of an assimilative degree beside the German doctorate. The Nation advanced as grounds for these last

36. Editorial, "The Output of Doctorates," The Nation, LXXVIII (September 2, 1909), p. 200.

37. Editorial, "Americans as Linguists," The Nation, XC (April 14, 1910), p. 370.

38. Editorial, "Scholarship of Ideas," The Nation, XCII (May 11, 1911), p. 463.

recommendations the contention that the thesis for the Ph.D. tends to confuse "the meaning of productive and creative scholarship and to establish wrong standards of excellence."³⁹ A few months earlier, The Nation had advocated⁴⁰ the "Improved M. A." as more suitable for many graduate students. Later the magazine came to the point of view that one serious impediment to reform lay in the "ignorance of the presidents and trustees of colleges who insist on a Ph.D. after the names of members of their faculties."⁴¹ The Nation also cited the reluctance of Oxford and Cambridge Universities to compete with the German Universities in attracting American students interested in earning the Ph.D.⁴² Interpretation of the British attitude toward American graduate students was that the degree was too closely connected with financial value and represented a kind of educational snobbery.

The Nation likewise expressed its repeated disapproval of college athletic programs on several grounds: that such programs represented the "cult" of a few students rather than the "sensible pursuit" of many;⁴³ that football under the existing rules was actually dangerous;⁴⁴ that the time taken from undergraduate studies for athletics lessened a man's chances for success in the graduate school;⁴⁵ that too much of a "professional"

39. Ibid., p. 463.

40. Editorial, "Toward an Improved M. A.," The Nation, XCII (February 23, 1911), p. 186.

41. Editorial, "Scholarship of Ideas," The Nation, XCII (May 11, 1911), p. 463.

42. Editorial, "British University Problems," The Nation, XCV (August 8, 1912), p. 120.

43. Editorial, "Athletics on the Defensive," The Nation, LXXVIII (May 27, 1909), p. 529.

44. Editorial, "The Football Deaths," The Nation, LXXXIX (November 4, 1909), p. 426.

45. Editorial, "Physical Training in College," The Nation, XC (May 26, 1910), p. 530.

spirit was apparent in college athletics.⁴⁶

In a similar vein The Nation attacked the trend toward other extracurricular activities in college. The editorial directed its attack especially at Cornell University and remarked that an extracurricular program was not sponsored at Oxford University. The Nation argued that these extracurricular interests ranged from the relatively indifferent to the positively harmful.⁴⁷ The editorial concluded with the admonition that until these "tentacles" were removed undergraduate life would not be free from the "reproaches" now connected with it. What The Nation apparently considered a specific illustration of "reproaches" appeared in an editorial a few months later condemning the opportunity open to the undergraduate to learn all the devious ways of politics in his capacity as manager in various types of activities. The program of extracurricular activities was characterized as a rather inferior training school for politicians.⁴⁹

A trend in the undergraduate program of studies which was rather briefly evaluated was that of the increasing number of college courses offered in science. Two editorials appeared in this connection. The first stated that there was a tendency in colleges not to discriminate between hypothesis and established fact.⁵⁰ The attitude of the editorial was satirical, indicating that perhaps in science as well as in poetry it might be difficult,

46. Editorial, "The College Athlete," The Nation, XCVI (January 2, 1913), p. 7.

47. Editorial, "Student Activities," The Nation, LXXXIX (August 5, 1909), p. 115.

48. Ibid., p. 115.

49. Editorial, "The Undergraduate as Politician," The Nation, LXXXIX (December 23, 1909), p. 619.

50. Editorial, "Scientific Speculation," The Nation, LXXXIX (August 19, 1909), p. 155.

eventually, to differentiate between fact and fancy. The second editorial, written in relation to the resignation of a professor of anthropology at Oxford, praised his research work and the scientific method, but also raised the question of whether we have not accumulated science faster than we have been able to assimilate it.⁵¹

Regarding the problem of college entrance, The Nation indicated its approval of a new trend in higher education, that of having teachers on the committee for the Harvard Entrance Examinations.⁵² This expression of approval followed an earlier recommendation that the colleges and high schools should come to an agreement through a

full and frank conference between the faculties of the colleges and the teachers of the high schools. Experience has shown that there is far less divergence of interest when the parties get together than when they attack each other at conventions in phrases aimed at the headlines in the next day's press. College men cannot afford to pass by the fund of wisdom and experience amassed by the men in the schools; and they owe honest and zealous support to the system of public schools as to one of the cornerstones of our civilization.⁵³

Recommendations for Improving the Status of Teachers or Professors

On at least ten different occasions the editorial columns of The Nation during the years of More's editorship carried an expression of opinion in favor of improving the status of professors or teachers. The earliest editorial of this nature was evidently an attempt to elicit sympathy for professors. The world pays for services rendered by the pioneer,

-
51. Editorial, "Science Lost in the Sciences," The Nation, IX (February 10, 1910), p. 132.
 52. Editorial, "Harvard's New Entrance Tests," The Nation, XVII (January 26, 1911), pp. 80-81.
 53. Editorial, "Colleges and the High Schools," The Nation, XCII (January 12, 1911), p. 31.

the inventor, the philosopher, the teacher, and the prophet, the editorial stated, inversely as the cube of the value rendered.⁵⁴ The editorial attempted to illustrate its point by arguing that for a poet to have to earn his living at an office desk is not much worse than for a college professor to have to "eat his heart out in a roomful of drones while the opus of his life keeps retreating before him."⁵⁵

While The Nation in a later editorial conceded the need for adequate salaries in order to draw superior men into teaching, it still argued that money was probably a secondary question.⁵⁶ Proper recognition of the importance of the professor, the magazine maintained, would "naturally" tend to the making of such salaries as are needed to render professorships fairly attractive in a material sense. The same editorials then expressed a warning against letting "our best" professors drift into administrative tasks, and urged that this loss to teaching be prevented through making the professorships sufficiently attractive in point of salary, honor, leisure, and sympathetic environment.

The Nation made a stronger plea, at least in number of editorials devoted to the subject, for the need for tenure and security for professors than it made for increased salary. Five editorials on this subject of tenure appeared in The Nation between August 1910 and February 1913. The first editorial was on the occasion of the opening of Reed College in Oregon. The advice given to the president of that college was that he should re-

54. Editorial, "John Keat's Porridge," The Nation, LXXXVIII (May 20, 1909), p. 505.

55. Ibid., p. 505.

56. Editorial, "Universities and Intellect," The Nation, XCVI (March 13, 1913), p. 261.

frain from following the pattern of aristocratic domination in a democratic society. In brief, The Nation declared, "A college faculty does not need a boss; its efficiency is neither to be attained nor to be measured by the methods that apply to a factory or department store."⁵⁷

The second editorial defending professorial status apparently was a reply to a statement by President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia and others in which a denial had been made that college presidents dominate the professors. The editorial took exception to the fact that the professors were spoken of as the "instructional force," arguing that such an expression, in itself, was indicative of factory methods.⁵⁸ In connection with the need for proper recognition of the personal importance and dignity of the professor, The Nation pointed to the importance attached in European Universities to the position of professor. "It is the permanence of tenure of professors, the undisputed honor and dignity of their position that have made the great universities of the Old World what they are. And no substitute for the vitalizing influences of these essential elements can be provided by any amount of supervisory meddling or administrative perfection."⁵⁹ The third editorial maintained that after careful choice has been made, tenure should be given to all university professors.⁶⁰ The fourth editorial is an unqualified condemnation of the Committee on Efficiency announced by President Guy Benton of the University of Vermont.⁶¹ Such a

57. Editorial, "The New College in the West," The Nation, XVI (August 11, 1910), p. 117.

58. Editorial, "The Status of the Professor," The Nation, XCII (March 9, 1911), p. 236.

59. Ibid., p. 236.

60. Editorial, "The Government of Universities," The Nation, XCII (April 20, 1911), p. 391.

61. Editorial, "The Professor and the President," The Nation, XCIII (February 13, 1913), pp. 146-7.

committee, The Nation stated, represents "crude application" of the ways of factory supervision and pronounces in advance the doom of real superiority. The fifth approach to the subject of professorial status is an attempt to show that the superiority of college students in France over those in America is the result of two factors.⁶² The first one named is that there is no sharp line of division in France between university work and that which precedes university work, while the American college student is a "cross between a school-boy and a university student." The second reason offered is that more men of "real ability" go into teaching in France and Germany where teaching is held in greater honor, where the teaching hours are fewer, and where the administrative machinery is less. The Nation concluded its arguments on behalf of tenure with, "Perhaps we should do well if we were to fix our thoughts more on the need of getting the best possible men into the professorships and teacherships, and less on the problem of managing them after we have got them."⁶³

One editorial considered the question of academic freedom and defended a fuller recognition of the privilege by saying that even more for the sake of the students than for that of the professors, the intellectual integrity and independence of the professor must be upheld.⁶⁴

Educational Theories Most Consistently Defended

To determine which, if any, of the educational theories already sum-

62. Editorial, "A Question of Education," The Nation, XCVI (February 13, 1913), pp. 146-7.

63. Ibid., p. 147.

64. Editorial, "Free Speech and the Professors," The Nation, XCVIII (January 15, 1914), p. 51.

marized The Nation defended most consistently, it seemed necessary to determine both the actual number of times which editorials appeared in defense of a given theory and the consistency with which editorials appeared in defense of a given theory, from May 20, 1909, to March 12, 1914.

Omitting educational theories, or arguments, or suggestions, concerning which fewer than five editorials appeared in the five years, a table of the distribution follows:

Year	Number of Editorials Defending the Classics in College Education	Number of Editorials on Improve- ment of Status of Teachers and Professors	Number of Editorials Indicating Concept of Special Value of Education	Number of Editorials Attacking Ph.D. degree	Number of Editorials Attacking College Athletics
1909	1	1	2	1	2
1910	4	1	2	1	2
1911	2	5	1	2	0
1912	3	0	1	1	0
1914	2	2	0	0	1
1914	0	1	0	0	0
Total	12	10	7	5	5

From the figures in the preceding table it appears that the defense of the importance of the classics in college education ranks in first place. More editorials appear in defense of this theory than of any other. The spread of editorials by years in defense of the position of the classics equals the spread of editorials by years for the next highest theory, that of the necessity for improvement of status for teachers and professors.

Concept Expressed of Social Value of Education

In seven editorials during the period under consideration, The Nation made some expression of opinion concerning either the possible or actual social value of education, especially in the realm of social or political leadership. The first editorial in this group, for example, discussed the "common assumption" that honor men at college remain unknown in public life.⁶⁵ The criticism expressed by the magazine of this condition, if it were true, was that such a failure represented a waste of our best potential energy and that men who have been honor men at college should be more prominent in government and society. "Thus to insist upon the fact that proficiency at college means, if anything, a very moderate share of success in life is an indictment both of our public life and of our colleges."⁶⁶ In further defense of its theory of the importance of educated men in public life, the following year The Nation published an editorial giving credit to the contributions made by college trained men in New York City government.⁶⁷ The editorial referred to work done on the East Side through the efforts of college settlements and college investigators, to work in Mayor Gaynor's administration toward "progressive democracy," and to work in improved bookkeeping in the Finance Department.

Subway construction, school building, playground development are now gone at in the belief that the city is made for the well-being and happiness of its people, and not of the politicians. And

65. Editorial, "The Disadvantage of Being First," The Nation, LXXXIX (July 1, 1909), p. 7.

66. Ibid., p. 3.

67. Editorial, "College Men in Politics," The Nation, XC (March 17, 1910), p. 257.

that sentiment of the "people" in the city is largely the product of a campaign of education carried on by college men. Here, then, is a class of unofficial statesmanship which is coming to count more and more in our political life, and which the college is entitled to cite on its side of the question.⁶⁸

An evidence of The Nation's belief in the importance of college men in politics on a wider scale than municipal government is its praise of Wilson, "a scholar in politics who knows books but who also knows men and government."⁶⁹ On an international scale, The Nation expressed some hope that the Rhodes Scholarships in time might contribute to a closer knowledge and better understandings among nations.⁷⁰

Summary of Part B - The Educational Criticism of The Nation, 1909-1914

A numerical count of the editorials in which The Nation, during the years of More's editorship, expressed any point of view on education shows that about fifty-eight percent of the magazine's commentary on education was an expression of opinion concerning education at the college or university level. These editorial articles contain a three-fold expression of aims suitable for college and university education: first, to strive for the ultimate values of a classical education; second, to train individuals for social and political leadership as well as to raise the level of citizenship; third, to provide mental discipline.

To assist in the achieving of these aims, The Nation made four recommendations for curriculum reform; first, improvement in the teaching of

68. Ibid., p. 258.

69. Editorial, "A Real Scholar in Politics," The Nation, XCI (September 22, 1910), p. 257.

70. Editorial, "The Rhodes Scholarships," The Nation, XC (Mar 12, 1910), p. 477.

reading; second, revision of the elective system in the colleges; third, adoption, especially in the small colleges, of a program of common learnings, with Latin and Greek as the center of the program; and fourth, a Master of Arts degree which should be the goal of two, or perhaps three, years of graduate study.

The Nation evaluated five trends which it found apparent in college and university education. Four of these evaluations were unfavorable to existing conditions; one was favorable. The four trends which The Nation evaluated adversely included the growing enrollment of graduate students for the Ph.D. degree; the program of college athletics; the organization of extracurricular activities, and the relatively important position of science in the college curriculum. The Nation expressed approval of what seemed to be the beginning of a policy on the part of teachers and professors to work together on the problem of college entrance examinations.

As to the status of teachers and professors, the evidence cited indicates that The Nation was concerned with their welfare since it supported three recommendations in their behalf; the first, that some attention be given to adequate salaries for teachers and professors; the second, that professors be given tenure of office and freedom from supervision; the third, that universities maintain the policy of academic freedom.

Of the various educational theories defended by The Nation during these five years under consideration, it appears that the necessity for the maintenance of the classics in college education was the theory most consistently defended.

The concepts which The Nation expressed pertaining to the social value

of education included a statement of belief in the possibility that education could improve social and political leadership.

Part C

Conclusions as to Extent of Agreement Between More's Educational Criticisms and the Educational Criticism of The Nation during the Years of More's Editorship of this Magazine

Since the editorials of The Nation were not written by the editor, at least during the years of More's editorship, they may have represented the point of view of either the editor or of the editorial writer, or the policies of the magazine itself. This comparison, then, cannot be construed as a measure of More's influence on The Nation. It is merely an indication of certain points of view on which the writings of More 1901 - 1937 and the editorials of The Nation, May 20, 1909 - March 12, 1914, were in agreement or disagreement. The conclusions that follow are based on Parts A and B of this chapter.

In both bodies of writing, a majority of the pieces commenting on education are expressions of opinion concerning education at the college or university level. In the case of More's essays, "the majority" is eighty per cent; in the case of the editorials, the majority is fifty-eight per cent.

The evidence indicates considerable agreement and some divergence of opinion, as expressed in the essays of More and the editorials of The Nation, on the subject of aims recommended as suitable for college and university education. Both strongly recommended the classical curriculum as the educational background most likely to be effective in the development of social efficiency and political leadership. The Nation also recommended the classical curriculum as the suitable educational background for training for scientific leadership. Both More and The Nation subscribed

to a belief in the theory of mental discipline as an appropriate aim in education. Divergence of opinion exists in regard to the highest aim in education. More called moral responsibility the highest aim. The Nation named ability to discriminate as "about" the highest. While The Nation, during More's editorship, did not specify one aim as the highest goal, its nearest approach to such a statement was, as indicated, power to discriminate.

The curricula advocated by both More and The Nation were essentially in agreement. In both bodies of writing, a plea for improved teaching of reading appeared. In both bodies of writing, the elective system in college education was condemned. In both bodies of writing the recommendation that colleges establish a program of common required learnings appeared. More selected the classics to be the "core" of such a curriculum; The Nation selected the classics as the "center" of such a program. Agreement is evident, then, in three recommendations for curriculum reform.

Each made one other recommendation, not mentioned by the other. More recommended less stress on philology in the classical curriculum. The Nation recommended a longer period of study than the one year usually required for the degree of Master of Arts. There is no evidence in the material examined to indicate that either of these last two opinions put forward by the one would have been denied by the other.

There is considerable agreement in opinions, also, in the matter of evaluation of educational trends. More evaluated and disapproved of the trend away from the classics to contemporary, "practical" and scientific subjects. He stated that the resulting divisions in learning were reflected in a lower morale on the part of the professors and intellectual dis-

traction on the part of the students. He expressed fear for the effects upon society when these "practical" men should come into positions of political power. While The Nation did not evaluate this trend away from the classics, agreement is clearly implied in its criticism of the elective system and in its recommendation that the small colleges abolish from their curricula the work leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science. Both More and The Nation evaluated the trend in graduate study toward the Ph.D. as undesirable. Both also expressed disapproval, in one way or another, of trends in college and university administration. More believed that college and university presidents were too much concerned with material growth. The Nation believed that college and university administrators, not limiting the criticism to presidents, were too much concerned with adopting the goals of efficiency sought by institutions of other types. The Nation criticized the program of college athletics and other extracurricular activities. More did not specifically evaluate this trend. On the other hand, The Nation expressed approval of what seemed to be a beginning in co-operation between the colleges and the schools on the question of college entrance. More did not evaluate this trend. In other words, there is agreement expressed or clearly implied between More and The Nation in regard to three of the five trends evaluated, with no expression of opinion from More concerning the other two.

More and The Nation were substantially in agreement on the question of improvement of status of professors and teachers, although their proposed programs for improvement differed somewhat. More advocated larger economic rewards and increased social prestige for teachers and professors. He strongly recommended that promotions for college teachers and professors be based

on excellence of teaching rather than productivity in writing. The Nation recommended that more security and prestige be attained for professors, through tenure rights for all professors, little or no supervision, and defense of the principle of academic freedom. But The Nation expressed the editorial opinion that salary was second in importance to security and prestige and that improved salaries would probably be a natural outgrowth of heightened prestige.

The educational belief most consistently defended by both More and The Nation was the importance of the classics.

Both indicated a clear concept of the social importance of education, and a belief that on education depends the possibility of improved citizenship and leadership and the possibility of solving, if they can be solved, the problems of society.

In conclusion, then, the evidence indicates that the criticism of education expressed in More's own writing is essentially in agreement with that in the editorials of The Nation during the years of his editorship

Chapter III

ON THE CHURCH

Part A - More's Criticism of the Church as a Social Institution

The first part of this chapter is intended to be a study of More's critical commentaries on the church as an organization in modern society. It is not intended to be an analysis of More's writings on comparative religions or an evaluation of his search for a personally satisfactory creed. Since More's statement that the church had lost much of its former authority in society appeared in 1898, this date has been selected as the dividing line between More's criticisms of the church as an institution in historical society and his criticisms of the church as an institution in modern society. This chapter, then, is concerned with the church as a social organization since 1898.

To attempt to clarify More's meaning in his criticisms mentioned above and to attempt to determine whether he maintained his critical position, the investigator selected these five questions as bases for investigation and summary:

1. On what specific weaknesses or strengths in the church, as a social institution, did More comment?
2. To what historical causes, if any, did he trace any weaknesses?
3. Did he criticize adversely or favorably any particular church as a social institution? If so, on what grounds?
4. Did he indicate any belief that society needs a strong church?
5. What, if any, specific recommendations did he make for improving

the situation which he had, in an earlier day, criticised?

An examination of the Shelburne Essays shows relatively few comments on the church in modern society, although there are numerous references to the church of earlier periods. Such comments are concerned, for example, with the early Church, the Church of the Middle Ages, the Reformation, Puritanism in England and America, Transcendentalism and the Oxford Movement. The comments seem to lie outside the scope of this study.

The major part of More's writings on the church as an institution in modern society appears in his later works, specifically in his works published between 1928 and 1937.

The purpose of this part of this chapter is now to summarize the evidence pertaining to the five selected questions.

Specific Weaknesses or Strengths

In the ninth and eleventh volumes of the Shelburne Essays More repeated and elaborated upon his earlier charge that the church as a social institution had lost much of its former prestige.¹ He specifically attributed this waning influence to a weakening of faith in the supernatural.² He argued that the church itself had contributed to its debility through substituting stress on the Second Commandment for stress on the First.³ Moreover, he sharply questioned the sincerity of purpose of the modern church. "Worship

1. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 213.

2. Ibid., p. 213.

3. Ibid., p. 208.

in the temple is no longer a call to contrition and repentance, but an organized flattery of our human nature."⁴ His judgment of the theological seminary is equally severe. "The theological seminary is fast becoming a special school for investigating poverty and preaching agnosticism."⁵ In fact, More argued that we had shifted the emphasis from individual salvation to social improvement, and that the influence which we had taken from religion we had given to sociology.⁶ He illustrated this point of view by declaring that we had made the People our judge and offered the appeasement of a service of sympathy.⁷ "Sympathy has been grasped by the People as a law of combination for themselves and in defiance of their rulers. The result is not harmony but a division of society."⁸

With his return to critical writings seven years later, More again attacked the church as an institution in society. He evaluated the modern sermon as mere flattery. Flattery, he said, had replaced moral teaching which had become unpopular. He added, moreover, that dislike for moral teaching was not limited to laymen. The preachers, themselves, he asserted, had no use for moralizing sermons.

Even the exhorters from the pulpit know that this is not the road to popularity, and you may hear an unctuous preacher applauding our youth of the day because they have thrown over the traditional codes and assuring a college audience that he would not think of talking to them about right and wrong or ask them to "live a righteous life" since it is sufficient to be an artist and live a beautiful life.⁹

4. *Ibid.*, p. 208.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 208.

6. Paul E. More, *A New England Group and Others*, p. 254.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 254.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 254.

9. Paul E. More, *The Demon of the Absolute*, pp. 98-99.

One social danger from this doctrine, More concluded, is that youth in its docile way may turn to art rather than to religion, only to learn that beauty may be antipathetic to common morality.¹⁰

More carried this attack on the preachings of the church still further in his essay "The Church and Politics." He admitted the need for social re-organisation in the early 1930's.¹¹ On the other hand, he expressed concern for the political direction that the church was taking. He characterized the trend of the sermons as an argument for a "sentimental socialism" and "a vague ideal of equalitarian brotherhood."¹²

In brief, the modern tendency of the church to stress the ideals of social service and the brotherhood of man was regarded by More as a usurpation of the ideals of love of God and concern for the salvation of one's own soul.¹³ Having carried this point of view to a consideration of what the "love of God" means in modern society, More came to two conclusions: first, that beyond being a beautiful phrase, the expression rarely meant anything to the congregations, and, second, it possibly meant nothing clear and definite even to the preachers.¹⁴ In this vagueness on both parts, More read a depletion, rather than a surplus, of faith and a dullness toward things of the spirit accompanied by a fervor for economic change.¹⁵

Pointing out the reminder that preaching the Kingdom of Heaven in an eschatological and not sociological sense had been the means of starting the church upon "its victorious course," More stressed the need for a re-

10. *Ibid.*, p. 98-99.

11. Paul E. More, *On Being Human* (Princeton, 1936), p. 144.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 145-146.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

turn to a sense of spiritual values.¹⁶ A continuation of emphasis by the church upon the sociological aspects of religion, he maintained, would result in three undesirable courses: a still further waning of spiritual sensitivity; a disappearance of the ideal of the brotherhood of man; and a hastening of "the advent of an anti-religious state governed by those who understand human nature better than she."¹⁷ /the present church/

Historical Causes for Weakness in the Church

The chief weakness, as More saw it, of the church in the twentieth century was the substitution of sociology for theology. He attributed this change first to the influence of Rousseau and The Social Contract. On this point he quoted Rousseau: "There is, then, a profession of faith purely civil of which it pertains to the sovereign people to fix the principles not exactly as dogmas of religion, but as substitutes of sociability without which it is impossible to be a good citizen or a faithful subject."¹⁸ More considered Rousseau's definition to be either that of a "vain Utopia" or of a "terrible despotism" but indicated a belief that it has "wrought enormously in the civilization of the present day."¹⁹ To this influence of Rousseau, More later added an acceptance of Nietzsche's viewpoint.²⁰ This viewpoint, as More interpreted it, was that when belief in God has perished, the exaltation of the poor and humble in itself becomes a kind

16. Ibid., p. 156.

17. Ibid., p. 157.

18. Jean J. Rousseau, The Social Contract, as quoted by Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 234.

19. Ibid., p. 236.

20. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 178.

of substitute for Christianity.²¹ "These, the immediate offspring of Rousseauism and German romanticism, are, as Nietzsche saw, the actual religion of the world today."²²

More also named certain influences of the twentieth century which he argued had contributed to an increase in irreligion. Among these he mentioned, in a general way, the business of the world and an industrial civilization.²³ As a specifically contributing factor, he indicated the teachings of John Dewey. More charged Dewey with having taught that religion is a fallacy of the reason, having the single purpose of benefiting the economically more fortunate members of society.²⁴ More further took exception to what he called Dewey's materialistic concept of progress on the grounds that disappointment, mutual distrust, and hatred are inherent to any idea of progress which is based on social discontent.²⁵

Criticism of Particular Churches

A reading of More's essays seems to indicate that, in general, his comments on specific churches of the twentieth century were pretty much limited to discussions of origin or creed rather than to discussions of the church as an institution in modern society.

While this investigation is not planned to be in any sense of the word a study of More's work on comparative religions, his commentaries on a particular faith, as such, seem, in a few instances, to carry over into a consideration of that particular creed as an organized social institution. The importance

21. Ibid., p. 178.

22. Ibid., p. 178.

23. Paul E. More, The Sceptical Approach to Religion (Princeton, 1934), p. 189.

24. Paul E. More, On Being Human (Princeton, 1936), p. 123.

25. Ibid., p. 140.

of the Roman Catholic faith as an institution in society, for example, is clearly evaluated by More, in his expression of belief that on the concept of the Incarnation, and on the attitude of other churches toward that concept, Christian theology must stand or fall.²⁶ In other words, More ascribed the possible continuity of the Christian Church to its acceptance and support of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

His judgments of the Anglican Church are less specific but also favorable. He praised this institution for having reflected the "English tendency" to avoid extremes in rationalism.²⁷ Through following this middle course in logic, The Anglican Church, More continued, had cut through superstition to develop a religion characterized by liberty and spiritual imagination.²⁸

On the other hand, More expressed strong disapproval of a type of Protestant service which is dependent mainly on a "good sermon" but is not particularly enriched by pageantry and traditions of ritual.²⁹ He described such services as "poverty-stricken" and rated them as failures, "possessing all the defects of individualism without its virtues."³⁰ This particular commentary is added here because of its implication that these churches may be weak in their influence as social institutions.

Society's Need for a Strong Church

This question of More's belief, or disbelief, in society's need for a

26. Paul E. More, The Catholic Faith, pp. 197-198.

27. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 92.

28. Ibid., p. 92.

29. Paul E. More, The Catholic Faith, p. 202.

30. Ibid., p. 202.

strong church would seem to be closely related to the meaning of his opinion expressed in 1898 that the church retained but a shadow of its former authority.³¹

More's illustrations or repetitions of this statement, as they appear chronologically, tend to indicate that he held to his 1898 point of view. The first apparent clarification of his meaning appears in the 1904 volume. Here is his statement of belief that the church had lost influence, first, through neglect of its function as the means of salvation for the individual, and, second, through its assumption of responsibilities as a social agency.³² This second role More criticized sharply as "a desecration and denial of religion and an unsettling of the social order."³³ In 1909 More carried his criticism of the social program of the church to the conclusion that in the substitution of sociology for theology we are all Socialists.³⁴ In 1915, as he reviewed the unsettled conditions of the times, he expressed the opinion that thoughtful men felt vaguely "that in the decay of religion the bases of society had somehow been weakened."³⁵ This is a new note in that More implies the possibility that society needs the church. In the same collection of essays, More decried the growing secularization of Oxford University, concluding with the statement of belief that, in general, the medieval meaning of atonement had been lost and that the chief consolation of the church in modern times is through its power of aesthetic appeal.³⁶

31. P. E. More, "The Judgment of Socrates," reprinted in Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 242.

32. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 227.

33. Ibid., p. 227.

34. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 98.

35. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Ninth Series, p. 41.

36. Ibid., p. 85.

In 1921, More again offered a strong illustration of his belief in the disappearance of faith, through indicating his concept of the steps by which faith had been lost in certain areas--from Calvinism, to Unitarianism, to free thinking, to a great denial.³⁷ And even as late as 1934 More asserted that the majority of people have no immediate intuition of God.³⁸

Yet in spite of his repeated declarations that he considered the church to have lost much of its former authority, the evidence, especially in his later writing, indicates that More believed in society's need for a strong church.

More, for instance, cited his belief that the hope of faith was the only possible alleviation for the "black despondency" of the economic problems of the early 1930's. Without hope, he contended, humanity "whether in the mass or in the individual, sinks into frivolity, or apathy or despair."³⁹ But hope, he continued, is the summons to adventure. He further suggested that possibly the loss of hope was the chief weakness of the times, "a sort of craven timidity before the high spiritual adventure that we call religion."⁴⁰

In addition to the "solace and spur" of the hope offered by religion, More cited references from various eras in the world's history to indicate that great men have long considered religion to be a regulating influence in society.⁴¹ Then he presented an analysis of three different evaluations which people place on religion as a social force: that it is beneficial; that

37. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 123.

38. Paul E. More, The Secptical Approach to Religion, p. 3.

39. Ibid., p. 187.

40. Ibid., pp. 192-193.

41. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 119.

it is merely a deterrent from crime; that it is detrimental to the progress of mankind.⁴²

Finally, in his last collection of essays, More admitted that he, too, believed that the church has a social function. He agreed that religion tends to alleviate discontent and to act as a brake on innovation. He further added that religion is needed in modern society to offset the discontent arising from greed and materialism, and, hence, that religion contributes to the peace of society," . . . and the conservatism it inculcates is not the ally of sullen and predatory privilege but of orderly amelioration."⁴³

Specific Recommendations

More's first recommendation for improving the position of the church as an institution in society appears in the 1915 collection of essays. In "Academic Leadership" More wrote that "natural champions of order . . . need to rediscover some common ground of strength and purpose in the first principles of education and law and property and religion."⁴⁴ This raises the question of what More meant by "first principles" in religion. The answer is probably in a statement published in 1936. "The call of religion is first of all and last of all to a soul conscious of its own guilt, the function of religion is first of all and last of all to offer to a soul despairing of this world's peace the promise of eternal life."⁴⁵ This definition seems to be consonant with the opinion, expressed in 1915, that

42. Ibid., p. 124.

43. Ibid., p. 143.

44. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 43.

45. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 153.

personal integrity, rather than obligation to society, is the primal law, and that while social justice is desirable, the responsibility of each man to himself for his own character is his first responsibility.⁴⁶

In the last decade of his life, More devoted relatively more attention to recommendations for improving the position of the church in modern society. In 1928, for example, his essay "The Demon of the Absolute" was an attack on what he designated as a spirit of absolutism in various phases of society. He pictured this so-called Demon of the Absolute as "wreaking havoc" in religion, through offering the alternate choices of an absolute, omnipotent God or no God at all.⁴⁷ His own solution to the problem is probably reflected in his 1931 analysis of the need for an authoritative church.⁴⁸ He argued that, at the last, religion can be neither purely individualistic nor purely determined. Hence he advocated a compromise. Each man must make his own choice of church in relation to his conscience. Each man for stability of worship might make the concession of participating in a traditional liturgy.⁴⁹ "That is what I mean by an authoritative as contrasted with an absolute church."⁵⁰ His social justification for these concessions is expressed in forceful terms. "The zealot who forces upon hesitant doubters the harsh and false dilemma of submission to an infallible church or of irresponsible individualism. . . has simply signed the death warrant of organized Christianity. The execution of the warrant may be delayed; but it will come in due time."⁵¹

46. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 216.

47. Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 2.

48. Paul E. More, The Catholic Faith, p. 204.

49. Ibid., p. 204.

50. Ibid., p. 204.

51. Ibid., p. 205.

In the period of the widespread economic dissatisfaction of the 1930's, More reiterated his disapproval of the purely economic view of life. He listed three principles as he saw them: sympathy does not spring from the law of nature; the idea of progress based on social discontent is materialistic; with no supernatural hope there is no refuge of peace.⁵²

His third recommendation was offered as a palliative to economic suffering. He urged that the church preach, in contrast with the theory of individual or class economic progress, the theory of contentment with one's own lot, including, if need be, the acceptance of poverty.⁵³

We need rather to emphasize the simple truth that poverty is not the only, or indeed the worst of mortal evils, that happiness does not consist mainly in the things which money can buy, --- that the purest satisfaction is in the sense of work honestly done and duties well met, and a mind and conscience at ease with itself.⁵⁴

Summary - - Part A, More's Criticism of the Church as a Social Institution

More argued that the chief weakness of the modern church lay in its attempts to substitute a program of social betterment for a program of individual salvation. He traced this alleged shift in emphasis to the teachings of Rousseau and Nietzsche as well as to current pragmatism and materialism. Yet, in spite of his repeated statement that the church had declined in authority, it is apparent that he recognized society's need of a strong church both to provide hope and to serve as a regulative force. He made three recommendations for strengthening the influence of the church: stress

52. Paul E. More, On Being Human, pp. 138-140.

53. Ibid., p. 141.

54. Ibid., p. 141.

on individual salvation; a plan of compromise for an authoritative but not an infallible church; the preaching of contentment in one's economic lot.

Listings Showing Numerical Count on Seven Selected Items from More's Own References to the Church as a Social Institution

Number of References to the Church as a Social Institution	Number of References in Agreement with Policies of the Church	Number of References in Disagreement with Policies of the Church	Number of Types of Strength Listed	Number of Types of Weakness Listed	Number of Types of Recommendations for Change in Social Policies	Number of Times Recommendations were made for changes in Social Policies
51	6	33	4	8	3	11

On the basis of an analysis of the preceding summary as well as the figures listed above, the conclusion seems clear that More remained critical of the church as an institution in modern society. There are, for example, more than five times as many references in disagreement with the policies of the church as there are in agreement; there are twice as many types of weakness listed as of strength. More's first recommendation for change in policies came at a mid-point in his writing career. There is no evidence that he ever departed from that point of view. His second recommendation appeared in 1931 and his third in 1936. More's death was in 1937. There is no evidence that he ever recanted his views expressed in 1898 that the church had lost much of her former authority in society. While More, late in life, re-affirmed his personal belief in God, there is no evidence that this conversion changed his critical point of view concerning the church as an institution in modern society.

Part B - The Nation's Criticism of the Church as a Social Institution

The purpose of the second part of this chapter is to present the findings of an investigation of the editorials of The Nation, during the years of More's editorship, relating to that magazine's criticism of the church as an effective institution in modern society. Editorials pertaining to the church were examined from the point of view of these three questions:

1. On what specific weaknesses or strengths, if any, in the church as a social institution did the editorials of The Nation comment?
2. Did The Nation criticize adversely or favorably, as a social institution, any particular church? If so, on what grounds?
3. What, if any, specific recommendations did The Nation advocate for making the church a stronger social institution?

Specific Weaknesses or Strengths

Of the twelve hundred thirty editorials published in The Nation from May 20, 1909 through March 12, 1914, the period of More's editorship, fourteen, or slightly more than one per cent, dealt with the subject of the church as an organization in modern society. In contrast with the amount of space devoted to some other subjects, politics, for example, the amount of space devoted to the church was relatively small. Investigation indicates, however, that fairly definite editorial attitudes is apparent. Six of the fourteen articles review apparent weaknesses in the church; two stress its actual or possible strength, while the other six represent neither point of view completely.

On three different occasions, The Nation expressed the point of view that the church in modern times showed evidence of ineffectiveness in appeal to society. That weakness, The Nation contended, was clear in the decreased attendance. The first discussion of such weakness set forth the point of view that the country church weakened by sectarianism had become "a proving ground for the beginner or an asylum for the decrepit."⁵⁵ The second consideration was to the effect that the problem is not how to save the person who does not attend church but rather how to save the church.⁵⁶ The third was an attempt to show why the church had suffered a decrease in its enrollment: first, that in the past, the church had exaggerated its importance through professing to know more than it actually did about the origin and destiny of man; second, that in the present, all the non-theological functions are being assumed to a considerable extent by other agencies.⁵⁷

In a similarly critical vein, The Nation accused the church of using a weak method, namely a program of social service, for combating the problem of decreasing prestige. Evidence of this point of view occurs in three of the fourteen editorials on the subject of the church as a social institution. The criticism appears first in an attempted refutation of two then recently published articles. These writings had recommended that sociology, economics, pedagogy, and ethics should replace Greek and Hebrew in the curriculum of the theological seminary.⁵⁸ The purpose for which this

55. Editorial, "The Country Church," The Nation, LXXVIII (June 17, 1909), p. 599.

56. Editorial, "The Mission of the Church," The Nation, LXXV (June 6, 1912), p. 560.

57. Ibid., p. 560.

58. Editorial, "Socializing Religion," The Nation, LXXVIII (June 3, 1909), p. 552.

change had been advocated was that of better preparation of candidates for the ministry in relation to problems of society, especially the alleged problem of the drift from Protestantism to socialism. The Nation, on the other hand, argued that the recommendation was unsound. It stated that the Catholic Church had the strong support of the working people yet was opposed to socialism, and that if the proposed subjects were included in the already crowded curriculum of the theological seminary, the necessary inadequacy of the work would probably result in "letting loose in the pulpits crude notions about one 'social applications of Christianity' together with sadly muddled economics."⁵⁹

Further evidence of this critical attitude appeared in an editorial the following year denouncing a recently publicized sermon directed against the "criminally rich."⁶⁰ The Nation ridiculed the subject of the discourse on the grounds that such preaching represented an attack on a class which had no self-conscious existence. The editorial concluded that evidence of sound preaching would more probably be found in an attack on the criminally poor. The "criminally poor" was defined by the editorial as those people who are poor as the result of wasted opportunities, dissipated energies, and irrational and immoral conduct.⁶¹

A third editorial dealing with the subject of the tendency of the church to make social service a major part of its program criticized the tendency as representative of undue stress upon what was inherently a secondary pur-

59. Ibid., p. 552.

60. Editorial, "Courage in Attack," The Nation, XCI (September 29, 1910), pp. 283-284.

61. Ibid., p. 283.

pose of method. "To give coffee and rolls to a hungry man is to serve God, if you want to put it that way, but if the church stops with coffee and rolls, it makes a ludicrously and pitifully inadequate use of its resources."⁶²

Moreover, The Nation satirized certain other, and probably lesser, weaknesses of the church, as the magazine discussed those weaknesses. These faults seemed to represent attempts to modernize the service or the clergymen. Examples cited included the modernizing of the language of the Decalogue,⁶³ the substitution of "sentimental trash" for the church music of the Middle Ages,⁶⁴ and the proposed measuring of the effectiveness of a pastor in terms of efficiency.⁶⁵

Regarding the church in Europe, on the other hand, The Nation in three editorials pointed out the weakness of the catholic Church abroad as that of a lack of recognition of changes which in modern times had developed in the structure of society. To be specific, The Nation, in 1910, attributed much of the anti-clericalism in Spain and Italy to unsuccessful Papal diplomacy.⁶⁶ In 1910 Papal anger was reported to exist relative to public Protestant worship in Spain. The Nation stressed the "inflexibility" of the Pope as unfortunate.⁶⁷ In reference to the anti-clerical feeling in Portugal, The

62. Editorial, "The Mission of the Church," The Nation, XCIV (June 6, 1912), p. 360.

63. Editorial, "Rewriting the Decalogue," The Nation, XCIV (January 25, 1912), p. 80.

64. Editorial, "Weeding Out the Hymn Book," The Nation, XCIII (October 19, 1911), pp. 359-360.

65. Editorial, "Efficiency Tests for Clergymen," The Nation, XCV (October 31, 1912), p.

66. Editorial, "European Anti-Clericalism," The Nation, XVI (July 7, 1910), pp. 5-6.

67. Editorial, "Spain and the Vatican," The Nation, XCI (August 11, 1910), pp. 114-115.

Nation expressed the hope that the Catholic Church had not lost the spirit of flexibility which it had exhibited in the past.⁶⁸

Against the evidences of weakness in the church as a social institution in modern society, The Nation found one clear evidence of strength in the support of the church by wage-earners.⁶⁹ With examples in support of its contention, the editorial denied the charge that there was hostility between workmen and the church in America. The editorial made the point that in the Catholic and Jewish faiths workmen constituted a majority of the membership, and that in industrial areas the Protestant Church could not survive without the support of the workmen.⁷⁰ As a possible explanation for the presence of some unchurched workmen, the belief was advanced that many of this group were recent immigrants whose indifference or hostility could be traced to church oppression abroad.⁷¹

The Nation also named inspired preaching, if and when it existed, as a potential source of strength to influence society. In its obituary editorial on Robert Collyer, "the black-smith preacher," who had fought for Unitarianism, the magazine pointed out the work of Collyer as an encouraging example to "those who despair of the future of the pulpit."⁷²

Criticism of Particular Churches

Investigation indicates that The Nation during the period under consideration tended to express its editorial comments on the church under such

68. Editorial, "The Church and the Revolution," The Nation, XCI (October 13, 1910), pp. 331-332.

69. Editorial, "Churches and Wage Earners," The Nation, LXXIII (August 12, 1909), pp. 134-135.

70. Ibid., p. 134.

71. Ibid., p. 135.

72. Editorial, "Robert Collyer," The Nation, XCV (December 5, 1912), p.

inclusive terms as Protestant, Catholic, country, or city churches. There are, however, two specific exceptions to this policy. The first concerned the Christian Science Church. The article discussed certain possible advantages and disadvantages of this faith and expressed the point of view that the growth of Christian Science is illustrative of the popularity of new cults among Americans.⁷³ The second was an evaluation of the work of William Booth. Rather divided in attitudes, the article praised the work of the Salvation Army "in the dark alleys of modern life" but criticized Booth's allegedly authoritarian methods.⁷⁴ The Nation stated, for example, that publicly contributed funds were not accounted for to the public and that his "great machine" was controlled by Booth alone.⁷⁵

Specific Recommendations

Examination of the editorials on the church shows that to a certain extent The Nation offered recommendations for making the church a stronger institution in society. One problem considered was that of decreased attendance in both country and city churches. In the case of the country church, the magazine expressed the recommendation that the Country Church Association should continue its efforts to alleviate the problem of denominational strife. In the case of the city church, The Nation expressed the opinion that any institution must justify itself not by its past record but by its present program. In line with this belief, the editorial argued that the

73. Editorial, "Mrs. Eddy's Career," The Nation, XCI (December 8, 1910), pp. 542-543.

74. Editorial, "General Booth and His Army," The Nation, XCV (August 29, 1912), pp. 184-185.

75. Ibid., p. 185..

church through effective preaching should reassume the task of elevating themselves that activate men and women.⁷⁷ The work needed to be done, the editorial continued, but was not being done by any other organization in any formal way.⁷⁸

Regarding the spirit of anti-clericalism in certain European countries, The Nation recommended that the Vatican become more sensitive and conciliatory to modern thought.⁷⁹

In relation to its apparently less important criticism of the church, The Nation recommended holding to the forms of ritual established through long usage.⁸⁰ It also recommended avoidance by a particular church of investing full direction of the policies in the hands of one person.⁸¹

Summary - Part B. The Nation's Criticism of the Church as a Social Institution

The evidence indicates that The Nation under More's editorship supported the point of view that the modern church had lost influence as a social institution. Decreased attendance was cited as evidence of decreased influence. The program of social service was criticized as representative of stress upon a secondary purpose. Anti-clericalism in Europe was characterized as a result of inflexibility in the policy of the Vatican. The Nation, however, found in the support of the church by the American working people and in

77. Editorial, "The Mission of the Church," The Nation, XCIV (June 6, 1912), p. 560.

78. See cit.

79. Editorial, "The Church and the Revolution," The Nation, XCI (October 13, 1910), p. 332.

80. Editorial, "Weeding Out the Hymn Book," The Nation, XCIII (October 19, 1911), p. 360.

81. Editorial, "General Booth and His Army," The Nation, XCV (August 29, 1912), p. 185.

isolated examples of effective preaching two evidences of strength in the modern church.

Two specific churches were criticized by The Nation in relation to their position in society. The Christian Science Church, by implication at least, was called a cult. The leadership of William Booth in the Salvation Army was called authoritarian.

The Nation recommended that the Protestant Church try to regain influence through avoidance of interdenominational strife and through improved preaching. The Magazine recommended that the Vatican become more sensitive to modern thought.

Tabulation of Fourteen Editorials in The Nation, 1909-1914, With Reference to the Church as a Social Institution

Number of References to the Church as a Social Institution	Number of references in Agreement with Policies of the Church	Number of References in Disagreement with Policies of the Church	Number of Types of Strengths Listed	Number of Types of Weaknesses Listed	Number of Types of Recommendations made for Change in Social Policies	Number of Times Recommendations were made for change in Social Policies
14	4	11	3	5	5	8

On the basis of analysis of even the rather limited number of editorials, one conclusion seems clear: that in the main The Nation was critical of the church as an institution in modern society. Against four references in agreement with church policies, there were nine in disagreement; against three actual or possible types of strengths listed, there were five types of weak-

ness listed. More than half of the editorials on the subject of the church, moreover, made some recommendation for change in policies.

Part C - Conclusions as to Extent of Agreement Between More's Criticism of the Church and the Criticism of the Church Published in the Editorials of The Nation during the Years of More's Editorship

These conclusions are not to be construed as a measure of More's influence as an editor, but simply as an indication of certain points of view on which the writings of More and the editorials of The Nation, May 20, 1909, - March 12, 1914 were in agreement or disagreement.

Apparently the most obvious agreement is that the church, as an institution in modern society, has become weakened. In both cases the number of references criticising the policies of the church considerably exceeds the references favoring the policies of the church. In both cases the number of types of weakness listed considerably exceeds the number of types of strength listed. Both More and The Nation made recommendations designed to make the church a more effective institution in society.

There is some agreement apparent as to causes or evidences of weakness in the modern church. Both More and The Nation expressed disapproval of primary stress on a program of social service and of socialising the church. Both expressed a belief that there had been a diminution of faith in the supernatural, although they disagreed as to the causes named for the change in attitude. In general, both More and The Nation refrained from criticism of the policies of particular churches as institutions in society. There is certainly an implied agreement that society needs the church in that both made recommendations for policies to strengthen the church.

There is less agreement expressed as to evidences of strength in the modern church. Such evidence as More listed tended to be concerned with the intangible values of the church. Such evidence as The Nation listed tended to be concerned with specific methods employed, or possible to be employed, by the church.

There is some question as to the agreement in the recommendations as to what program should replace the program of social service. More urged more stress on atonement and personal salvation; The Nation urged more stress on "elevating the motives that activate men and women." The proposed courses of conduct may be the same. The Nation recommended effective preaching and praised a traditional form of church service. More urged, on behalf of both the individual and the church, a compromise between individualism in judgment and submission to authority in the church. The result he defined as being an authoritative but not infallible church. More made this last recommendation some fifteen years after he had finished his work as editor of The Nation. There is no evidence in the editorials of The Nation, 1909 to 1914, that the magazine would have either supported or condemned this recommendation.

CHAPTER IV
ON PROPERTY AND POVERTY

Part One

More's Concept of Property and Poverty as Social Forces

More's writings on the importance of property to society drew criticism from various sources. Much of this reaction was unfavorable; a limited amount was favorable. The essay "Property and Law" was singled out for special attention. Of seven representative "liberal" critics, for example, who opposed More's views on the rights of property, three made specific reference to "Property and Law." Brooks accused More of inability to understand human values and attributed More's alleged defection to a sympathy for the acquisitive instincts of man.¹ Brooks cited as his basis for this judgment More's statement, "Looking at the larger good of society, we may say that the dollar is more important than the man and that the rights of property are more important than the right to life."² Kasin also offered an adverse judgment of the same essay. He labelled the argument "dubious" and he called the thesis of the essay, "an elaborate rationalization."³ Kasin's own summary of the essay is as follows: "Where property is unsafe, society is in danger, and when society is in danger, culture is impossible."⁴ Hicks denounced More's psychological and sociological theories on two scores.

-
1. Van Wyck Brooks, Three Essays on America (New York, 1934), p. 160.
 2. Paul E. More, as quoted by V. W. Brooks in Three Essays on America, p. 160.
 3. Alfred Kasin, On Native Grounds (New York, 1942), p. 299.
 4. Ibid., p. 299.

His first objection was that the theory of the "inner check" was an argument detrimental to the welfare of the masses, since if it were accepted, it would serve "to stifle protest and prevent revolution."⁵ Hicks' second objection was that More's expression of disapproval regarding the destruction of property by striking miners represented the activating spirit of More's economic beliefs.⁶ Calverton, writing primarily of Irving Babbitt, interpreted the entire New Humanist movement as "literary Fascism." He concluded his argument with the following recommendations: "Humanism is not to be fought as a literary disease; it must be fought as a philosophy of social reaction."⁷ Farrell, arguing for the inevitability of Marxist Socialism, denied the validity of New Humanist literary criticism. He specifically mentioned More and judged the New Humanist position to be closely akin to the Roman Catholic view and to share assumptions with it. A sweeping denunciation of the theories of the New Humanists was made by Cowley. "Economically, socially, their doctrine is based on nothing and answers no questions."⁸ Gold's opinion of the New Humanist point of view was in a similarly condemnatory vein. Accusing these critics of being devoted to the ikons of Church, Class Pride, Patriotism, and Capitalist Law and Order, Gold contended that New Humanism represented "a startling and sly introduction of Fascism into

5. Granville Hicks, The Great Tradition (New York, 1933), p. 251.

6. Ibid., p. 251.

7. V. F. Calverton, "Humanism: Literary Fascism," The New Masses (April, 1930), p. 10.

8. James Farrell, A Note on Literary Criticism (New York, 1936), p. 186

9. W. Cowley, "Humanizing Society," in C. H. Grattan's The Critique of Humanism (New York, 1930), p. 68.

this country."¹⁰

On the other hand, there were from More's contemporaries in the field of criticism expressions of approval for his social point of view, including his interpretation of the importance of property as a social force. Phelps praised primarily More's concept of the causes of the weakness of the modern church as a social institution, but he also accepted More's defense of conservative principles in economics. "Even as science is powerless to save the world and has fallen into a bankruptcy more desolating than any financial depression, so no new system of economics or change in political government can either redeem mankind or renew the individual."¹¹ Chamberlin praised the Neo Humanists for providing a middle ground for getting away from war disillusionments but recommended that they make a study of modern society as a basis for predicating their discriminations.¹² Elliott attributed the unpopularity of More to the possibility that his thinking was too severe for the soft, gentle modern reader.¹³ Hough praised More's "proud old Tory principles and his 'daring to tell the bitter truth.'"¹⁴ More's biographer, Shafer, admitted that More was not primarily a social critic and he argued that "disgraceful" events or activities more or less "unfortunately colored" More's exposition of principles.¹⁵ Shafer also questioned the practicality of some of More's proposals,¹⁶ but he contended that More's theories on

10. Michael Gold, The New Masses (April, 1930), p. 3.

11. W. L. Phelps, "Paul Elmer More," in The Academy, 1938, p. 350.

12. J. Chamberlin, Review of Foerster's Humanism in America, in New York Times, Book Section (February 23, 1920), p. 2.

13. G. R. Elliott, "Mr. More and the Gentle Reader," in The Bookman, LXIX (April, 1929), p. 143.

14. L. R. Hough, "Paul Elmer More and our American Civilization," in Christian Century, LII (October 30, 1924), p. 1408.

15. Robert Shafer, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism, p. 204.

16. Ibid., p. 205.

property are realistic. "And in no direction has his honest realism been more evident than in his treatment of property, for which he deserves the heartfelt gratitude of all who wish to see clearly and to think justly."¹⁷

Since these evaluations are widely divergent, it seems wise to examine More's concept of the place of property in society.

Five questions were formulated for surveying More's writings in order to determine his concept of property as a social force. The questions follow:

1. Specifically what is the argument of the essay "Property and Law," and in what connection is the statement ". . . the rights of property are more important than the right to life" used?
2. Did More here or elsewhere in his essays indicate any defense of special rights or property? If so, what?
3. Did More in his essays indicate any interest in the effects of poverty, especially the poverty of the slums?
4. With the passing of years, did More indicate any evidence of an increasing or decreasing awareness of social problems connected with property or poverty?
5. What, if any, attitude did More express toward either socialism or communism as a possible means of solving the social problems of poverty?

Occasion for and Summary of "Property and Law"

"Property and Law" is an expression of More's opinion concerning the

17. IBIA., p. 203.

destruction of property in the 1913-14 strike in the mines of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company. According to Keir, the attitude of the company was "feudalistic"; that is, he states that the company owned the houses, streets, stores, and post office of the town; no "free" meetings were allowed; medical care was not open to choice; there was disregard for the state law of the eight-hour day; armed guards were constantly present and no known union organizers were allowed.¹⁸ By 1913, however, enough men had been secretly organized to attempt, through striking, to secure redress for alleged grievances. The company in retaliation evicted all strikers and their families from their homes, swore in marshals and sheriffs, and employed strike breakers. Militia was sent by the Governor of Colorado. The unrest and dissatisfaction reached a climax in May, 1914, in the battle of Ludlow.

This skirmish is frequently referred to as the Ludlow massacre because, in addition to the men killed in the battle, two women and eleven children were smothered under the burning tents of Ludlow.¹⁹ Riot and murder raged for a week in the mining properties of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company. As civil war was sweeping the state, the Governor asked for Federal troops.

Various "peace offers," including recommendations by President Wilson, were refused by either one side or the other. Then John D. Rockefeller, Jr., representing his father as the largest stockholder, went to Ludlow. The miners lost their fight for an independent union. Instead a "company union" was organized. The strike was settled in December, 1914.

18. Malcolm Keir, Labor's Search for More (New York, 1937), p. 103.

19. Ibid., p. 105.

In his introduction to "Property and Law" More called attention to the newspaper publicity and the labor demonstrations in New York which followed the "Ludlow Massacre." He quoted socialist writer Morris Hillquit, who had called Rockefeller a murderer.²⁰ More also quoted Rockefeller's official reply which was a statement in defense of the right of people, including non-union people, to work.²¹ Then More raised the question of what are "the rights of property itself, as at least a substantial element in civilization."²²

More advanced the theory that in twentieth century society there seemed to be an inclination to consider property-holding to be somewhat unethical.²³ He attributed the historical explanation of this alleged attitude to the theories of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. A summary of More's analysis of Rousseau's theories pertinent to the question follows: that civilization and injustice followed the creation of property; that property fixed and reinforced the natural inequalities of man's faculties; that to compensate for inequalities in numbers, the strong members of society deluded the mass into passing laws to protect property; hence that law is at once the support of civilization and of injustice.²⁴

More's evaluation of these assumptions was two-fold: first, that it is true that property has long been the basis of civilization, and that with

20. P. E. More, "Property and Law," in Aristocracy and Justice, p. 127.

21. Ibid., pp. 127-28.

22. Ibid., p. 128.

23. Ibid., p. 129.

24. Ibid., pp. 139-31.

property there came a change from natural inequality to what is assumed to be a natural injustice; second, that it is false that barbarism generally represents a state of innocence and happiness.²⁵ More also denied Rousseau's recommendation that the state should substitute the volonté générale for existing forms of government.²⁶ More's judgment was that the volonté générale represented "the unrestricted desire of the majority at a given moment," a desire which "does not mean a careful regard for the rights of property."²⁷ His concluding estimate of Rousseau's treatment of the subject of property was, first, that Rousseau's theory was confusing, but, second, that it possessed "the virtue" of laying bare "the truth" that property is the basis of civilisation.²⁸

Following his analysis of the importance of property in human society, More next considered the relative desirability of communal versus private ownership of property and expressed his approval of the latter method.²⁹ Having gone to some length with this argument, he then admitted that the "serious" question is not the importance of property but the justice of its present distribution.³⁰

More contended that even Rousseau could not deny the natural inequalities of man, although More admitted that property tends to magnify a natural injustice into what appears to be an unnatural injustice; yet he still argued

25. Ibid., p. 13.

26. Ibid., p. 132.

27. Ibid., pp. 132-33.

28. Ibid., p. 133.

29. Ibid., p. 134.

30. Ibid., pp. 134-35.

that the "unnatural injustice" was a "fatal necessity."³¹ Our only alternative, he maintained, would be the destruction of civilization.³² Admitting the absurdity of this possibility, More expressed his belief that "nearly all" that makes the life of man more significant than the life of the beasts is "associated with our possessions."³³ As a result, he concluded that ". . . to the civilized man the rights or property are more important than the rights to life."³⁴

From his discussion of the place of property as a constructive force in society, More moved to a discussion of the purpose of law. He advanced the point of view that law must exist for practical rather than idealized purposes; hence, law must recognize, first, the actual nature of man and, second, the importance of property as a social force.³⁵ Specifically, More contended that law to be practical must "recognize property as the basis of civilization and admit the consequent inequality of conditions among men."³⁶

In his argument for the protection of the rights or property, More included a statement of his belief in the right of labor to receive what it had bargained for and the right of the laboring man to be secure in his possessions.³⁷ In this connection, More also insisted that labor's rights should be on a property basis rather than on a basis of sentiment or on a basis of abstractions concerning social justice.³⁸ Then follows the some-

31. *Ibid.*, p. 135.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 135.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 136.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 136.

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 140.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 140.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 140.

times quoted statement, ". . . the rights of property are more important than the right to life."³⁹

More carried this argument of the importance of property to the conclusion that laws which permitted labor's violation of contracts and the making of war on property run counter to the first demands of society.⁴⁰ Although he conceded the possibility that extreme veneration for property allowed a certain amount of "legalized robbery," yet he maintained that ". . . it is better that legal robbery should exist along with the maintenance of law, than that legal robbery should be suppressed at the expense of law."

One defense that More offered on behalf of legal recognition of the importance of security in property was the possibility that the failure of such recognition would make property a despot.⁴² By this contention More apparently meant that only as men's minds were free from worry as to the legal security of their possessions, would men turn their efforts to non-materialistic quests. Thus he subscribed "with very limited restrictions" to a belief in private ownership of property, including its production and distribution. Thus he expressed approval for the attitudes of the church and the university, both of which, he stated, possess a conservative point of view against innovations which would threaten the entrenched rights of property.⁴⁴

39. Ibid., p. 141.

40. Ibid., p. 141.

41. Ibid., p. 141.

42. Ibid., p. 145.

43. Ibid., p. 147.

44. Ibid., p. 148.

Defense of Special Rights of Property

In the first volume of his last series, the New Shelburne Essays, More denied the accusations of certain of his reviewers of an earlier decade that he had been interested primarily in the welfare of an economically privileged class of people. He dismissed, for example, as "mere silliness" Mumford's opinion that he, More, was interested only in the rentiers of the Lawrence or Fall River Mills.⁴⁵ He also described Hackett's review of With the Wits as "wilful misunderstanding" of his writings, particularly of the volume Aristocracy and Justice.⁴⁶ Hackett's review was a scathing denunciation of More's social point of view. The article accused More of having the temperament and habit of mind of a conservative banker; of having had too much experience with the classics and too little with the problems of human beings; and finally of being an "ignorant, egotistical and exasperated provincial."⁴⁷ While his language was more restrained, Stuart Sherman, who had been a contributor to The Nation while More was editor, also expressed dissatisfaction with what he interpreted to be More's interest in an aristocratic class.

Having Plato as his monitor, Mr. More sides politically and socially with the little group of Americans who hold that there are only half a dozen great families, all in the Republican party, capable of governing and guiding the destinies of the United States. Though they may pass without question for "good" citizens, distinguished and patriotic, they have never accepted one characteristic word that Jefferson wrote into the political scripture of the American nation.⁴⁸

45. Paul E. More, Preface, Deacon of the Absolute, p. vii, I, p.

46. Ibid., p. ix.

47. F. Hackett, "Mr. More Moralizes," New Republic, LXVI (April 6, 1921), pp. 163-164.

48. S. P. Sherman, "P. E. More and the Wits," Review, II (January 17, 1920), p. 66.

It was criticism of this type that More called a "wilful misunderstanding," or "mere silliness."

In his Natural Aristocracy, More had defined the natural aristocrats, who, he believed, should be the leaders of a democratic society, as "men of simple and rational desires, lords of their souls and so masters of other."⁴⁹ More had, moreover, advanced the theory that a "natural aristocracy" would not demand the restoration of privilege or a relapse into the "crude" domination of money, that it would not be synonymous with oligarchy or plutocracy.⁵⁰

Yet, in spite of the definition of "natural aristocrats," written before 1915, and also in spite of the denials, written more than a decade later, More on various occasions clearly implied a desire to protect economic distinctions. As early as 1908, for example, in his essay on the writings of Mrs. Gaskell, More took occasion to rebuke the average reform-novelist for attempts to preach "a millennium of brotherly love" through inflaming the hatred of the poor against the rich.⁵¹ He listed Zola and Tolstoy as being representative members of this "dangerous" class of reformers. While he expressed doubt as to the immediate actual effectiveness for reform of modern "reform" novels, More indicated a belief that the ultimate effect of such writing might well be "hatred and revolution and pauperism and decay."⁵² More also showed a certain veneration for great names. In

49. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 9.

50. Ibid., p. 30.

51. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, p. 73.

52. Ibid., p. 77.

the same volume in which he was later to accuse reviewers of "wilfully misunderstanding" More's tribute to high birth appears. "Whatever may be in theory our democratic distaste for insignia of birth, we cannot get away from the fact that there is a certain honor of inheritance and that we instinctively pay homage to one who represents a noble name."⁵³ Concern for the welfare of families of inherited wealth also appears, yet More denied having an interest in "the idle and wasteful rich." He praised, for example, the English novelist, Trollope, as one whose writings had held his, More's, interest through a life time of reading.⁵⁴ He praised, among other qualities, Trollope's respect for inherited property. ". . . he was sensitive to the effects of that cult, still active in his age, which made an ancestral estate into something more than a mere parcel of land and which imposed on its present possessors a sense of sacred responsibility to the past and to the future."⁵⁵

More's interest in the safety of property includes acquired property as well as inherited property. He made this point especially in his strong protest against the economic difficulties of the so-called "white collar" group of the middle class. He noted in his "Natural Aristocracy" that there were organizations to influence public opinion in favor of a better economic status for working men. By this group More evidently meant "organized labor," but he also contended that for men not involved in production of material goods or in supplying "sensational pleasure," economic conditions were growing steadily worse. ". . . they are ground

53. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 64.

54. Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 89.

55. Ibid., p. 123.

so to speak between the upper and nether millstone."⁵⁶ In this "distressed" group, More listed specifically the artist and teacher and public censor. In other words, these three groups represented the workers with whom More as writer, professor, and editor had been associated. He admitted that he was not sure that organization was what these people desired; however, he expressed the belief that some kind of "certain class solidarity" was necessary. Through class solidarity, More believed, these "silent" members of society would have the means by which their influence would "spread opinion"⁵⁷ More recommended that this "class solidarity" on the part of educated people could be achieved through restoring in the colleges a required core curriculum for all students, so that learning, itself, would be a common bond of union.

In "Academic Leadership" More continued his protest concerning the economic difficulties of the middle class. A footnote calls attention to the fact that "Academic Leadership" was written before World War I.⁵⁸ The essay opens with an expression of concern that economic conditions of "recent" years had caused "a growing uneasiness of mind among thoughtful men." The cause for this worry More found in "the unsettlement of property and the difficulties for men of moderate means in providing for the future."⁵⁹ More did not refer to any specific event or series of events as illustrative of the term "unsettlement of property." He may have meant the econo-

56. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 35.

57. Ibid., p. 36.

58. Ibid., p. 41.

59. Ibid., p. 41.

atic effects of the panic of 1907, or the effects of the slight depression of 1914, or both. He may have meant the comparatively low salaries of many professional people. He more probably was referring to the fact that an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in 1914 had made a federal income tax lawful. This last assumption seems to be supported by the fact that in another essay More took occasion to speak against the income tax.

We need to remind ourselves that laws which would render capital insecure and, by a heavy income tax or other discrimination in favor of labor, would deprive property of its power of easy self-perpetuation, though they speak loudly in the name of humanity, will in the end be subversive of those conditions under which alone any true value of human life can be realized.⁶⁰

Still another expression of More's belief in the need for privilege of property occurs in his defense of the Church and the University.⁶¹ These institutions, he wrote, have maintained a reactionary attitude toward any change which would affect adversely the entrenched rights of property. He denied that they were moved by greed of possession. Instead, he argued that the safety and usefulness of their institutions are dependent upon their being free from "hasty" legislation.

They are the jealous guardians of that respite from material labor which they hold in fee for those who are by character destined more specifically to be the creators and transmitters of the world's intellectual and spiritual heritage.⁶²

More's sympathy for the inviolability of property is clearly implied again in his criticism of the English Liberal, John Morley. Morley was

60. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

61. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

62. *Ibid.*, p. 148.

President of the Council in the British House of Lords on the occasion of the passing in 1911 of the legislation which for the first time established by statute the legal relations of the two houses of Parliament on the subject of money bills.⁶³ Since that time, any money bill on proper certification by the Speaker "could not be rejected or amended by the House of Lords and was to become law on the Royal assent being signified."⁶⁴

Morley's part was one of coercion. In 1909-10 the Lords rejected the People's Budget.⁶⁵ The growing demands of the social program had necessitated a larger budget. Methods proposed to raise the needed revenue included heavier taxes on annual incomes of three thousand pounds and higher, increased death duties, increased costs on liquor and tobacco, and a new plan for evaluation and taxation of the land. The Lords rejected the budget. The action, of course, was significant. If the Lords could reject a budget, they could hold the popular chamber at their mercy. By 1911, to facilitate the passage of the Parliament Bill making it possible for the Commons to have the exclusive right of budget control, the Government had secured permission from the King for the creation of new Peers. It was Morley who successfully overcame the final opposition by threats that every vote against the Parliament Bill could be considered a vote for a large and prompt creation of Peers.⁶⁶ According to Marriott the majority "... preferred to accept the Parliament Bill with all its consequences

63. John A. R. Marriott, Modern England, 1855-1932 (London, 1934), p. 306.

64. Ibid., p. 306.

65. Ibid., p. 288.

66. John A. Sponder, Great Britain, Empire and Commonwealth, 1886-1935 (London, 1936), p. 394.

rather than permit the Constitution to be travestied and expose the Peers to the indignity of receiving into their bosom five hundred Radical Peers."⁶⁷

In his essay "Viscount Morley," More indicates a certain disapproval, or regret for, the role played by Morley as Leader of the House of Lords. He attributes Morley's conduct to a "certain thoughtlessness, a certain unheeding straightforwardness" in helping to deprive the House of Lords of its power and prerogative.⁶⁸ This argument represents essentially the same point of view that More had expressed earlier in "Aristocracy and Justice." In other words, More's arguments support the side of legality. Of course, in 1909-1910 it was "legal" for the Lords to reject a budget, since no statute had been passed to the contrary. In 1913-1914, the Colorado Iron and Fuel Company may have remained within its "legal" rights. In each case, More expressed no concern for the opponents of rights of property, but he expressed a definite concern that the rights of property be maintained. In each case More tied the possible destruction of special privilege of property to the power of public opinion, which he defined "as the unrestricted desire of the majority at a given moment."⁶⁹ In "Property and Law" More had written that whether "public opinion" and "justice" were synonymous depended upon one's point of view and interests, but that it, public opinion, does not mean a careful regard for the rights of property.⁷⁰ In "Viscount Morley" More wrote again of the "tyranny" of public opinion.⁷¹ Apparently

67. Marriott, *op. cit.*, p. 305.

68. Paul E. More, *A New England Group and Others*, p. 222.

69. Paul E. More, *Aristocracy and Justice*, p. 122.

70. *Ibid.*, p. 133.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 220.

the passage of six years and the social and economic changes engendered by World War I had made no change in More's opinion.

Interest in Effects of Poverty, Especially Poverty of the Slums

An examination of More's writings reveals the fact that his comments on the effects of poverty, especially the poverty of the slums, are relatively few. Possibly one reason for this lack of material in More's reviews is to be found in his implied admission that he had not read widely in books dealing with the effects of poverty; for example, in his negative treatment of the writings of Jane Addams, More deplored the number of current books dealing with the social problems of the city slums. "At this moment there lies before the writer of this essay a pile of books, all recently published, which are devoted more or less specifically to the subject, /the slums/, and from all of which if he had the courage to go through them, he might cull abundant examples and quotations."⁷² "If he had the courage to go through them" seems to be a clear admission that More did not read widely on the subject of slum problems.

Aside from More's comments on humanitarianism, which will be considered in a later chapter of this study, his writings on the effects of poverty are from one of two approaches: poverty and religion, or poverty and its effects upon the creative artist.

The idea of the acceptance of poverty as essentially a religious obligation appears both early and late in More's essays. In the first volume of

72. Ibid., pp. 196-197.

the Shelburne Essays, for example, More refers to Christ's teaching to His disciples as they went forth to preach to take neither gold nor script for their journey, nor two coats. More likewise refers to the story of Jesus' command to the rich young man to sell his worldly goods and to separate himself from the world. More's own reaction seems to be one of acceptance. "However repugnant to modern notions this rule of absolute poverty may be, yet it certainly contains elements of real beauty."⁷³ Again near the end of his writing life, in the last volume of the New Shelburne Essays, More, in reference to the depression of the 1930's, points to Christ's acceptance of poverty. "Christ did not confuse religion with food or think it should be deferred until the hunger of the body was satisfied. Hunger is an evil no doubt; it should be alleviated. But hunger is not the only evil in life, or the most devastating."⁷⁴ While the second reference does contain the admission that extreme poverty is an evil rather than a thing of beauty, it is still predominantly an expression of the belief that poverty is a burden to be accepted.

In considering the effects of poverty upon specific individuals, More's tone is considerably less detached. His interpretation of the poet George Crabbe, for example, is sympathetic. He believed that the "atmosphere of gloom" which hangs over Crabbe's writing is simply the reflection of the economic hardships of the poet's early life. More pointed out these difficulties in some detail: Crabbe's youth in a "miserable" fishing hamlet on the Suffolk Coast, his "starving years" of literary apprenticeship in

73. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 234.

74. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 152.

London, his dependency as a private chaplain. Beside noting these possible causes for Crabbe's "gloom," More concluded that years of comparative prosperity could not entirely obliterate poverty's effects. He also condoned the poet's gloom by saying that it is not moroseness or morbid sentimentality but a note of stern judicial pity for the frailties and vices of the men Crabbe knew and portrayed.⁷⁵

More's criticism of the English novelist George Gissing represents an even more sympathetic attitude. He attributed Gissing's death at forty-six to years of toil and privation and condemned Gissing's environment in the "cruel and primeval nether world of London. Poverty, the gaunt, greedy struggle for bread, the naked keen reality of hunger that goads the world onward -- how this grim power reigns in all of Gissing's early novels, crushing the unimured dreamers and soiling the strong."⁷⁶ More praised Gissing for his success in picturing all the "suffering and foulness and crime of want" in the slums of London. He praised Gissing especially for accepting a sense of personal responsibility for his own lot. He argued that through graphic and sometimes appalling scenes the novelist made clear the point of view that he was still concerned with the inner effects of poverty and that his problem was "the ancient, insoluble antimony of the one and the many."⁷⁷ More admitted that Gissing's characters were probably the victims of circumstances, yet he commended the author for refusing to accept any excuse for himself for indigence or vice. "Had not he, George Gissing been caught

75. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 137.

76. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, p. 46.

77. Ibid., p. 56.

in the cruel network of circumstances, and had he not preserved intact the feeling that he was personally accountable?"⁷⁸

Other creative artists whom More mentioned as having suffered irretrievably from the effects of poverty include Whittier, Sterne, and Dickens. He also listed Sainte-Beuve, Blake, Thomson, and MacLeod as victims of their poverty, for at least a portion of their lives.

It is obvious, then, that there is something of a divergence in More's point of view regarding the problem of poverty for a whole class of people and poverty for individuals. For people as a group More interpreted poverty to be an instrument for religious discipline; for individuals he saw poverty as a thing of evil, capable of ruining human life. Yet even for the individual with whom he sympathized, More moralized on individual responsibility.

More's tendency to feel compassion for the individual rather than for a group is in harmony with his interpretation of the social theories of Morris and Rossetti. In his essay, "William Morris," More wrote unfavorably of Rossetti's comment that Morris was never interested in the economic sufferings of individuals but was interested in the economic suffering of people in the mass. "There is a profound lesson in this difference of temperament between Rossetti, the man of genius, and Morris, the man of talent. In Morris it is connected with the same inability to fix attention on a stable point, the same fluidity, impatient of fact, that form the chief characteristics of his verse."⁷⁹

78. *Ibid.*, p. 58.

79. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 118.

More's distinction between sympathy for an individual and sympathy for a class of people is also in accord with Babbitt's belief in a "disciplined and selective sympathy." More acknowledged his indebtedness to Babbitt for the latter's exposition of humanism in Literature and the American College.⁸⁰ The following excerpts indicate Babbitt's concept of the social attitudes of the humanist, both modern and ancient. The humanist is interested in "perfecting the individual" rather than in schemes "for the elevation of mankind as a whole."⁸¹ "The true humanist maintains a just balance between sympathy and selection."⁸²

More's Increasing or Decreasing Awareness of Social Problems Connected with Property or Poverty

In this study of More's criticism of property as an institution in society, it seems pertinent to consider the question of possible changes in his point of view. The Shelburne Essays cover the years 1904 to 1921; the New Shelburne Essays, 1928 to 1936. These two groups of essays not only represent twenty-five years of writing but also two clearly defined periods of writing, for the years between 1921 and 1928 were devoted to philosophical study. The Shelburne and New Shelburne Series, then, would seem to provide an adequate and definite basis for research to determine whether with the passing of years, More indicated any evidence of an increasing or decreasing awareness of social problems connected with property or poverty.

The following tabulation shows publication dates of volumes of essay and numbers of essays in each volume in which More commented on property or poverty;

Tabulation Showing Publication Dates and Relative Frequency of More's Expressed Opinions on Subjects of Property and Poverty as Expressed in Shelburne Essays and New Shelburne Essays.

Volume, Copyright Date and Number of Essays in Volume	Number of Essays Making any Reference to Property or Privilege	Number of Essays De- fending Special Rights of Property	Number of Essays At- tacking Special Rights of Property	Number of Essays Making any Ref- erence to Poverty	Number of Essays Showing any Aware- ness of Effects of Poverty	Number of Essays Making Recom- mendations for Com- batting Problem of Poverty
<u>Shelburne Essays</u>						
First Series 1904 11 Essays	3	1	0	9	2	1
Second Series 1905 11 Essays	2	0	0	3	1	0
Third Series 1905 11 Essays	4	0	0	4	3	0
Fourth Series 1906 11 Essays	5	1	0	1	0	0
Fifth Series 1908 11 Essays	8	1	0	5	3	1
Sixth Series 1909 9 Essays	6	2	0	3	0	0
Seventh Series 1910 12 Essays	6	2	0	2	1	0
Eighth Series 1913 7 Essays	6	0	0	1	1	0
Ninth Series 1915 8 Essays	8	5	1	4	1	3

Volume, Copyright Date and Number of Essays in Volume	Number of Essays Making any Reference to Property or Privilege	Number of Essays De- fending Special Rights of Property	Number of Essays At- tacking Special Rights of Property	Number of Essays Making any Ref- erence to Poverty	Number of Essays Showing any Aware- ness of Effects of Poverty	Number of Essays Making Recommen- dations for Com- bating Problem of Poverty
Tenth Series						
1919	4	0	0	1	0	0
10 Essays						
Eleventh Series						
1921	8	1	0	4	0	1
10 Essays						
New Shel- burne Essays						
Vol. 1	3	1	0	1	0	0
1928						
6 Essays						
Vol. 2						
1934	1	0	0	0	0	0
8 Essays						
Vol. 3						
1936	3	0	0	2	1	2
9 Essays						
Total No. of Essays	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
134	67	14	1	40	13	8

An analysis of the preceding tabulation shows definite trends in More's attitudes regarding property and poverty. In a total of one hundred thirty-four essays in the two series, sixty-seven essays, or fifty per cent of the total, make some reference to property. Forty essays, or roughly twenty-nine per cent of the total, make some reference to poverty. Of the sixty-seven essays referring to property, sixty essays, or eighty-nine per cent, were published by 1921. Of the forty essays referring to poverty, thirtyseven essays, or ninety-seven per cent were published by 1921.

The volumes in which the highest frequency of reference to property and poverty occurs were those volumes published between 1908-1915. Of the fourteen essays defending special rights of property, ten were published between 1909-1915. Of the thirteen essays showing some awareness of the effects of poverty, six were published between 1908-1915. A total of eight essays make recommendation for dealing with the problem of poverty. Four of these eight were published between 1908-1915.

The volumes published between 1928 and 1936 show the lowest frequency of references to property or poverty. No other three volumes in any combination of years show as few essays referring to property or poverty as the 1928 to 1936 volumes. Of the twenty-three essays of the New Shelburne series, seven essays or thirty per cent make reference to property. Three essays or thirteen per cent make reference to poverty. One essay in this series defends special rights of property; one essay shows the author's awareness of the effects of poverty.

On the basis of the frequency of More's comments, then, three conclusions are clear: first, More consistently showed more interest in property than in poverty; second, More showed the most sustained and varied interest in the problems of property and poverty in the years 1908 to 1915; and

third, in the last decade of his writing, More's expression of interest in the social problems connected with property and poverty, especially of poverty, appreciably decreased.

Another measure of More's increasing or decreasing awareness of social problems connected with poverty or property might be the increasing or decreasing specificity of his naming of social problems. A summary of the specific effects of poverty mentioned by More and listed by frequency of reference in column six of the preceding tabulation probably furnishes an adequate index.

In the First Series of the Shelburne Essays there are two references to the effects of poverty. The first is to the pessimism which Carlyle expressed regarding the horrible sights of the London slums.⁸³ The second is to More's belief in the inherent danger of arousing class hatreds through "wild and mischievous notions" of humanitarian economy.⁸⁴

The Second Series contains one essay which shows an awareness of the effects of poverty. This reference is to the privation and toil of George Crabbe, including his "early life in a miserable fishing hamlet" and "his starving years of literary apprenticeship."⁸⁵

The Third Series contains three essays setting forth the effects of poverty. The first reference portrays the effects of Whittier's lack of opportunity for education.⁸⁶ The second refers to the years when Sainte-Beuve was a "poverty-stricken hack."⁸⁷ The third attributes the more brutal

83. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 80.

84. Ibid., p. 250.

85. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 137.

86. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 30.

87. Ibid., pp. 54-55.

aspects of Sterne's character to the vagrancy of his childhood.⁸⁸

Series Five also contains three essays showing More's awareness of social problems connected with poverty. Of these essays, the first, dealing with Dickens, portrays the "nervous exacerbation" of the novelist, resulting from his youthful knowledge of debtors' prison, pawnshops, decayed lodging-houses, and child labor.⁸⁹ The second reference is to the broken health and early death of George Gissing, "broken down by years of toil and privation."⁹⁰ The third is to the exploitation of the poor by the rich during the "hungry forties in the manufacturing districts of England."⁹¹

The Seventh Series contains an essay on Francis Thompson. It pictures his struggle as a writer in London and implies that he resorted to opium-eating.⁹²

The Eighth Series portrays briefly the hardships and despair of William Sharp in his struggle to earn his living by writing.⁹³

The Ninth Series refers to the exploitation of the miners and factory workers in England in the 1830's and attacks John Bright for his opposition to legislation for regulation of hours of work, child labor, and safety devices on machinery.⁹⁴

Two volumes of the Shelburne Essays contain articles dealing with social

88. *Ibid.*, p. 181.

89. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, pp. 30-31.

90. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

91. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

92. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 155.

93. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 124.

94. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, pp. 171-172.

problems connected with great wealth. In the Eighth Series, for example, in the picture in some detail of the fantastic waste of money by William Beckford on "an Aladdin's Palace."⁹⁵ The Tenth Series, likewise, contains consideration of a social problem connected with great wealth. The final portrayal of Lady Mary Wortley Montague is the delineation of a miserly recluse.⁹⁶ The study of Philip, Duke of Wharton, is the picture of an extravagant and irresponsible profligate.⁹⁷

In the New Shelburne Series, Volume Three, in reference to the economic depression in the United States in the 1930's, More admits a need for social reorganisation in "these days of unrest and fear and cruel unemployment."⁹⁸

In the Shelburne Series More referred to twelve specific types of social problems growing out of poverty; he referred to three types of social problems growing out of property. In the New Shelburne series, on the other hand, More referred only in a general way in one essay to the "unrest and fear" that accompany poverty. He did not in this second series of essays discuss social problems connected with wealth.

On the basis of specificity of reference to property and poverty, the conclusion seems obvious that with the passing years More's expressions of interest in the social problems connected with property and poverty decreased. This conclusion is in agreement with the conclusion based on research in frequency distribution of reference to property and poverty.

95. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 4.

96. Paul E. More, With the Wits, pp. 227-229.

97. Ibid., p. 185.

98. Paul E. More, On Being Human, pp. 145-146.

More's Criticism of Socialism or Communism as Possible Means of Solving the Problems of Poverty

From the First Series of the Shelburne Essays, 1904, through the last volume of the New Shelburne Essays, 1936, More maintained the point of view that a reorganization of society along socialistic lines would fail to dispel the economic problem of poverty. His disapproval of socialism, as expressed in both series of his essays, is concerned with what he listed as the same basic fault; namely, a desire to apply sentimental yearnings to the field of economics. In 1904, for example, More wrote, "The laws of society are fixed, and no amount of sentimental yearning will alter their nature, although it may very well create infinite distrust and class-hatred."⁹⁹ In 1934, More wrote, "If there ever was a party of practical socialists who held that an equalitarian state could be established and maintained on the sentimental love of man for man, it certainly does not exist now; it was a dream very quickly extinguished by the stern lessons of history."¹⁰⁰

More attributed the origins of socialism to two sources: the teachings of Rousseau, and the doctrine of laissez-faire as interpreted by Cobden and Bright. In fact More considered Marx's division of mankind into the great mass of workers, on the one hand, and the few ruthless capitalists, on the other, quite consonant with Rousseau's teaching of the dualism of society and the individual.¹⁰¹ Of the theory that competition will cease

99. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 250.

100. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 146.

101. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 240.

when the workers become aware of their "sovereign power" and seize the sources of production of wealth, More was scornful. He placed the practicality of the theories of Marx, along with those of Nietzsche, in the category of impossibilities.¹⁰²

It is like a bad jest to suppose that under the Nietzschean regime, when the liberated superman has thrown off all sense of responsibility and self-control, the masses would not be driven by unity of interest to combine for retaliation. To many it will seem an equally bad jest to pretend that a social sympathy based avowedly on class hatreds would not, if relieved from the constraint of that opposition, fly into an anarchy of egotisms.¹⁰³

More also stated that socialism developed as a reaction from the economic philosophy of Cobden and Bright. These two men are usually accredited with having been largely instrumental in securing the repeal of the British Corn Laws. Both men, along with their political activity in behalf of free trade, advocated parliamentary reform, economy and retrenchment, and a policy of non-intervention. More admits that the economics of laissez-faire had been one of the real advances of the eighteenth century, but, as it was interpreted in the nineteenth century by Cobden and Bright, More labels laissez-faire as "one of the crudest and harshest creations of the human brain". . . The reaction from that heartless trust in let-alone is felt today in the laws of retributive justice and in the excesses of socialism.¹⁰⁴

In More's opinion socialism has been nourished by class hatred in-

102.. Ibid., p. 240.

103. Ibid., p. 241.

104. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, p. 73.

spired in its turn by demagogues, "reform" writings, and the church. The theme of class hatred was expounded early and late by More; for example, the term appears in the First, Fifth, Seventh, and Ninth Series of the Shelburne Essays and in the third volume of the New Shelburne Essays. In the First Series of his essays More protested that the pleas for humanitarian economy, which he identified with sentimental socialism, would create class hatreds.¹⁰⁵ In the Fifth Series, he stated his belief that reforming novelists would inflame the hatred of the poor against the rich.¹⁰⁶ In the Seventh Series he contended that class hatred had been the slogan, the driving force, and the principle of solidarity of the socialist party.¹⁰⁷ In the Ninth Series, he deplored the internecine materialism which, he believed, would accompany the advent of socialism.¹⁰⁸

In the last volume of his New Shelburne Essays, More expressed his belief that the Church has a responsibility to help avert socialism. He believed that she must return to her former stress on spiritual values and individual salvation. In this connection, he especially warned the church not to encourage sentimental sympathy.

History proves too clearly that the feeling for others, whether religious or naturalistic, in general simply crumples up at the touch of the feeling for self when the more unruly passions are aroused. The capitalistic society of today is our witness, and the lords of the Russian Communism have learned the truth which the sentimental socialists of the Church are refusing to face. Lenin understood that the success of revolution depends on capitalizing, so to speak, the individual's will to power as the will of a particular class.¹⁰⁹

105. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 250.

106. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, p. 73.

107. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 190.

108. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 118.

109. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 152.

More strongly attacked political candidates who, he believed, inspired class hatreds, and, in general, he identified the reform candidate with the demagogue. He defined the term "demagogue" in the United States as the political candidate who, to flatter the people, would support the removal of any obstacle between the opinion of the moment and the enactment of that opinion into law, and who would encourage the people to trust to their first emotional impulse.¹¹⁰ This discussion is an attack on Theodore Roosevelt, and on the proponents of the Initiative and the Referendum. More also indicated his belief that the most dangerous demagogue of all is to be found in the press with its millions of readers.¹¹¹ He pictured the methods of the press as those of flattering the people into believing that our public crimes are not our own. Even the supposedly conservative journals, More charged, were leading America toward socialism in their support of candidates "subversive of property and constitutional checks," in their "zeal for the brotherhood of man," in their "loose dealing" with facts, and in their "clamor for specious extension of the franchise."¹¹² More saw a danger of revolution from the top downward rather than from the lower ranks upward. As his illustrations from history, he cited the influence of the corrupt factions of the Senate in the Roman republic and the teachings of the philosophers of France.¹¹³

A generation later More returned to the argument of the danger of socialism in leadership. On this occasion he attacked the leadership of the Church.

110. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, pp. 23-26.

111. Ibid., p. 110.

112. Ibid., p. 111.

113. Ibid., p. 33.

In his Commencement Address at the General Theological Seminary, New York, May, 1934, More rebuked the church for the political tenor of current sermons. He classified many sermons as political to the extent that they advocated a "sentimental socialism."¹¹⁴ He insisted that the ideal of equalitarian brotherhood is an illusion; that the ideal has no justification in either the economic fatalism of Marx or the theory of the Soviet rulers of Russia; that both govern by discipline of force and not by appeals to the heart.¹¹⁵

Aside from his disapproval of the origin and encouragement of socialism, More repeatedly expressed a strong distrust of the possibility of its economic practicality. In 1910, More ridiculed Morris' News from Nowhere as a tiresome piece of writing, quite impractical, portraying all the world "off on a perpetual May-day."¹¹⁶ In 1915, More questioned two assumptions of socialism: first, the practicality of communal ownership to eliminate greed and injustice; and, second, the practicality of communal ownership to maintain material productivity.¹¹⁷ In 1921, More satirized the communal experiment at Fruitlands as "one of the funniest and, for some of those involved, one of the saddest attempts to disregard the facts of life and human nature."¹¹⁸ In 1934, More explained again his disbelief that society would actually be organized along equalitarian lines. Instead, he argued, people fall into three groups--- "the mass of those who must be controlled by fear or

114. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 146.

115. Ibid., p. 147.

116. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 117.

117. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, pp. 113-134.

118. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 90.

er by blind obedience; a ruling body, whether individual or committee...; and an intermediary class who voluntarily submit to direction and upon whose allegiance to the principles embodied in the actual government the stability of the state depends."¹¹⁹

At different periods in his life, More made recommendations for averting socialism. First, the cure for democracy should be not more democracy, but better democracy.¹²⁰ He advocated the development of this "better" democracy through developing some means of selecting leaders from among the "best" and through bestowal of power on the "best."¹²¹ These "best" would comprise a natural aristocracy, those men who by character and intelligence and discipline have the qualities which "lift men out of the crowd."¹²² Second, "a counter class-consciousness" of the "aristocracy" should oppose the class-consciousness of the masses.¹²³ Third, the church should re-awaken to the needs of "restoring in the individual human soul a sense of responsibility extending beyond the grave."¹²⁴ Fourth, people should feel less concern for the material prosperity of their neighbors and more concern for the health of their own soul.¹²⁵

Summary of Main Points, Chapter IV

This chapter seemed especially necessary because of the widely divergent criticisms of More's concept of the place of property in society. On

119. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 165.

120. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 29.

121. Ibid., p. 30.

122. Ibid., p. 32.

123. Ibid., pp. 34-35.

124. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 158.

125. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 255.

the one hand, he was labelled as being reactionary and fascistic; on the other, soundly conservative, "middle-of-the-road," and realistic.

Since many of these judgments were in reference to "Property and Law," a rather complete analysis of that essay has been included. In brief, More's "Property and Law" is an attempt to show that the rights of property should be inviolate, on the grounds that property is the basis of civilisation. The essay, which, in general, strongly supports the economic system of private enterprise, argues that contractual agreements should be fulfilled, denounces the strike as warfare against property, and sanctions special economic prerogatives for such institutions as the Church and the University.

More expressed concern for the perpetuation of property and criticized reform writers whose utterances he judged subversive to property rights. He advised some kind of class solidarity for certain "white-collars" groups of the middle class, both to extend their influence and to improve their economic status. He believed in the perpetuation of property and disapproved of the establishment of the federal income tax.

More's writings on the effects of poverty are, in general, limited to a consideration of the effects of poverty upon individuals, especially literary men. He expressed relatively little interest in the effects of poverty upon groups of people.

Through the years, More devoted relatively more space to the consideration of property than to the consideration of poverty. His discussion of the effects of both property and poverty, as judged by the frequency and specificity of his comments, decreased considerably after 1921.

More denounced socialism as dangerous to property and unproven as a practical theory of economics. He traced the origin of the theories of socialism to the writings of Rousseau and to reaction from the economics of laissez-faire. He attributed the growth of socialism to class hatred inspired in its turn by demagogues, reform writers and the social program of the Church. He recommended four means by which he believed America could avert socialism: a more careful choice of leaders; the development of a counter class-consciousness; the preaching of immortality rather than social service; the recognition of individual spiritual responsibility.

Conclusions

The evidence indicates that More was fundamentally conservative in his concept of the place of property in society. First, he never retracted or revised his statement that since property is the basis of civilization, the rights of property are more important than the right to life. Second, in his two series of essays he made sixty-seven references to property as against forty references to poverty. Third, on fourteen occasions he upheld special rights or privileges of property, while he attacked special rights or privileges of property but once. Fourth, he criticized political and literary reformers who attacked special rights of property, especially when that property belonged to the landed aristocracy. Fifth, he denounced the strike as warfare against property. Sixth, he opposed socialism, or any form of communal ownership.

The evidence also indicates that More was consistent in his concept of the place of property in society. He was consistent, likewise, in his belief that poverty must be alleviated through individual rather than through group assistance.

He specifically supported the theory of capitalistic management and opposed theories hostile to capitalism. His defense of capitalistic enterprise in 1915 is essentially the same as his attack on socialism in 1936; namely, that capitalism is necessary to the "material progress and stability of society" whereas the advent of communal ownership would be accompanied by "internecine warfare."

CHAPTER V
ON PROPERTY AND POVERTY

Part Two

Editorial Opinion on the Subjects of Property and Poverty as Expressed
in The Nation during the Years of More's Editorship

In order to determine the editorial policy of The Nation during 1909 to 1914 on questions of property and poverty in society, three of the questions already applied to More's essays were used again in surveying the editorials of The Nation. Reworded to apply to The Nation, these questions read as follows:

1. Did The Nation, 1909-1914, indicate in its editorial articles any defense of special rights of property. If so, what?
2. Did The Nation, 1909-1914, indicate in its editorial articles any interest in the effects of poverty, especially the poverty of the slums? If so, what?
3. What, if any, attitude did The Nation express toward either socialism or communism as a possible means of solving the problem of poverty?

Concurrent with the survey of the editorial from the point of view of finding the answers to the three questions selected, a tabulation was made to show the number and percentage of the editorials bearing on subjects of property and poverty.

Tabulation Showing Relative Space, in
Number of Articles Written, of Editorial
Articles Published in The Nation, 1909-1914,
on Subjects of Property and Poverty

Year	Number of Editorials	Number Dealing With Sub- jects of Property and Poverty	Number Defending Property Rights	Number Concerned With Problem of Poverty	Percent in Defense of Property Rights	Percent Con- cerned with Effects of Poverty
from (5-20-09)						
1909	153	44	4	7	2.6	4.5
1910	241	37	7	7	2.9	2.9
1911	238	43	9	1	3.7	.4
1912	271	39	13	7	4.7	2.5
1913	244	52	13	4	5.3	1.6
to Mar. 12						
1914	57	12	0	0	0	0
Total	1204	227	46	26	3.8	2.9

This tabulation by frequency of subject in the 1204 editorials published in The Nation, May 20 1909 - March 12, 1914, shows that a total of two hundred twenty-seven articles, or more than eighteen per cent of the total number, made some reference to property or poverty. Many of these articles are expository rather than argumentative in nature; many do not express a specific editorial policy; however, seventy-two editorials state or clearly imply opinion which defends rights or property or expresses

concern for the problems of poverty.

Since these editorials are founded on news items current at the time and, presumably, of national interest, discussion is centered around broad political, social, and financial problems. Through its editorial opinion on such topics as taxes, corporations and trusts, public expenditures, syndicalism, socialism and labor problems, The Nation, to some extent, expressed a defense of the rights of property. On the other hand, through its editorial opinion on such topics as the tariff, exploitations of immigrants, and inadequate salaries for certain middle class groups, The Nation to some extent expressed concern for the problem of poverty.

Defense of Special Rights of Property

Under More's editorship, The Nation published forty-six editorials in defense of the rights of property. Forty-one are grouped around five subjects. The distribution is as follows: twelve deal with current taxes; nine uphold corporation policies; seven attack socialism; three are denunciations of syndicalism. The other five represent consideration of a variety of topics, but all are directed to the same argument, that property rights should be maintained.

Liberal trends in politics and economics which seemed to indicate that traditional rights of property were in jeopardy drew more attention from The Nation than any other subject connected with property rights. Twelve editorials criticized liberal movements either in this country or abroad. Considerable discussion, for example, was given to Lloyd George's plan for financing his social program. A tax on unearned increment in land values had been proposed by the English budget-makers. The proposal was

popular with members of the middle class. Stressing the argument that an ill-advised and oppressive tax may be just as popular as a good tax, The Nation contended that "...sound finance and wise taxation cannot be as fickle as the caprice of the crowd."¹ As far as the English budget problem was concerned, The Nation was prompt to label Lloyd George's liberal program as socialistic.² The editorial, moreover, expressed a warning that little faith should be put in the returns from an approaching bye-election in Bermondsey on the ground that that particular London constituency was composed of casual laborers.³ Among the campaign promises of the English Liberals were those of pensions to paupers and salaries to members of the House of Commons. The Nation deplored the fact that "such an important question had to be settled so rapidly."⁴ There was also an expression of editorial concern that the general election was to occur so soon on the question of the veto power of the House of Lords.⁵ When the Liberals had won the election, The Nation recommended that a compromise be worked out to provide for a "...dignified and efficient second chamber, as ready to consider Liberal measures on their merits as conservative."⁶

Substantially the same criticism of the English Liberals was continued

-
1. Editorial, "Popular Taxes," The Nation, LXXXIX (August 19, 1909), p. 154.
 2. Editorial, "Troubled English Politics," The Nation, LXXXIX (October 28, 1909), pp. 398-399.
 3. Ibid., p. 399.
 4. Editorial, "England's Political Troubles," (The Nation, XCI (November 24, 1910), p. 488.
 5. Editorial, "The Dissolution of Parliament," The Nation, XCI (December 1, 1910), pp. 514-515.
 6. Editorial, "What the English Election Settled," The Nation, XCI (December 22, 1910), p. 597.

in The Nation through 1911. The argument was advanced that even though the House of Lords had tended to delay liberal legislation in England, the loss of power in the conservative element of the government represented a danger to the country.⁷ As the victorious Liberals began to make good the pre-election promises with a plan for government expenditures for Workmen's Insurance, The Nation protested that the bill had been founded in politics and was economically unsound.⁸ This same point of view was stressed again later in the year in an analysis of a current book setting forth the fraud and red tape in Workmen's Insurance in Germany.⁹

Recommendations in the United States for ameliorating the economic lot of people also drew criticism from The Nation. Exception was taken, for example, to Brandeis' pleas for Workmen's Insurance.¹⁰ Such aid, The Nation argued, would become too powerful as a political weapon. "With millions of men taught that it is the duty of the government to support them, and not of them to support the government, everything except the degree of that support would sink into insignificance in their political calculations."¹¹ An anti-labor attitude was also reflected in editorial opposition to a minimum wage law for women.¹² The argument appeared, not once, but twice.¹³ Still another illustration was apparent in the edi-

7. Editorial, "Written and Unwritten Constitution," The Nation, XCII (April 13, 1911), pp. 361-362.

8. Editorial, "England's Great Experiment," The Nation, XCII (May 11, 1911), p. 463.

9. Editorial, "Workmen's Insurance in Germany," The Nation, XCIII (December 21, 1911), p. 596.

10. Editorial, "Insurance and Democracy," The Nation, XCIII (June 15, 1911), p. 596.

11. Ibid., p. 596.

12. Editorial, "A Far-Reaching Question," The Nation, XCVI (February 20, 1913), p. 170.

13. Editorial, "A Minimum Wage Law for Women," The Nation, XCVI (April 10, 1913), pp. 350-351.

torial which upheld the point of view that one "sequel" to labor legislation was proving The Nation's earlier opinion that illnesses are longer when there is insurance for workmen.¹⁴

From 1909 to 1914 The Nation attempted to stem the tide of increased taxation. It printed ten editorials on the subject. Five called attention to "excessive" governmental expenditures; five protested an income tax.

Discussions of money spent by the government centered around costs for war and costs for public buildings. Disapproval was expressed for allowing pensions to any Civil War veteran who had served ninety days because the plan would add \$13,000,000 to existing tax appropriations.¹⁵ A second criticism of the pension bill was that the proposed measure failed to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving veterans and that the pension was "honey combed with fraud."¹⁶ The Nation also attacked alleged naval waste.¹⁷ Another editorial called attention to the fact that our military cost since the Philippine "adventure" had run to \$150,000,000 annually.¹⁸ In 1913, The Nation pointed to the "pork-barrel" of public building expenditures.¹⁹

-
14. Editorial, "Sequel of Labor Legislation," The Nation, XCVII (September 4, 1913), pp. 203-204.
 15. Editorial, "Pensions Military and Civil," The Nation, XC (May 3, 1910), pp. 450-451.
 16. Editorial, "The Pension Bill," The Nation, XCI (November 17, 1910), pp. 462-463.
 17. Editorial, "Our Naval Waste," The Nation, XCI (August 25, 1910), p. 159.
 18. Editorial, "Paying the Piper," The Nation, XCIV (February 22, 1912), p. 176.

The Nation for three years consistently expressed opposition, in one way or another, to income tax legislation. In 1910, it approved Governor Hughes' message, especially his contention that while the government ought to be allowed to levy an income tax in an emergency it ought not to ratify the "present loosely drawn plan."²⁰ "Free Sugar and the Income Tax" expressed an adverse reaction to a recommendation by the House Democrats that the tariff on sugar be removed and that annual incomes above \$5,000 be taxed.²¹ The editorial admitted that an income tax at some future date was virtually certain but it also contended that to look for a "retching" political issue instead of laying a financial program before the people was an unfortunate course.²² The Nation was critical in its analysis of the 1913 Amendment to provide for a federal income tax. In April an editorial contended that there were two dangers involved: first, that a federal income tax would allow very great extravagance on the part of the government; second, that the estimates of revenue might not be correct.²³ In May, The Nation reviewed the bill, found the proposed exemption too high, and expressed the opinion that a lower exemption had been avoided to escape political unpopularity for the measure.²⁴ The editorial, moreover, in pointing out the danger in regarding a small proportion of the population as the only people who should bear the new expense, concluded, "Any system, the adoption of which would mean a radical change in the status of property

20. Editorial, "Governor Hughes' Message," The Nation, XC (January 13, 1910), p. 28.

21. Editorial, "Free Sugar and the Income Tax," The Nation, XCIV (March 7, 1912), p. 228.

22. Loc. cit.

23. Editorial, "The Income Tax," The Nation, XCVI (April 17, 1913), p. 382.

24. Editorial, "The Income Tax," The Nation, XCVI (May 1, 1913), p. 432.

does not embody social justice."²⁵ The Nation recommended a uniform rather than a graduated scale of taxation and criticized the income tax plan as "lopsided," discriminating against richer sections of the country as well as against individuals.²⁶

Defense of corporations placed third in The Nation's editorial efforts to support property rights. The magazine offered two objections to the Supreme Court's finding the Corporation Tax of 1909 constitutional.²⁷ The first was that in some states corporations would have to pay double and triple taxes. The other was that the Corporation Tax would wreak hardship on many small business enterprises and partnerships. The Nation even raised a voice against the suit to dissolve the Steel Trust, since the public had allowed each amalgamation with "enthusiasm." Now, the magazine argued, ". . . sobriety rather than vindictiveness should characterize the investigation."²⁸ This policy of editorial defense of big business continued. There was a denial of the efficiency of Carnegie's suggestion that the government fix maximum prices for corporations.²⁹ Theodore Roosevelt's demand for government regulations of trusts was called unwise, on the grounds that government regulation leads to government ownership.³⁰ Opposition was expressed to the idea of government control of railroads.³¹ A graduated ex-

25. Ibid., p. 432.

26. Editorial, "The Lopsided Income Tax," The Nation, XCVII (September 11, 1913), p. 224.

27. Editorial, "The Corporation Tax Decision," The Nation, ICII (March 16, 1911), p. 259.

28. Editorial, "The Suit to Dissolve the Steel Trust," The Nation, ICIII (November 2, 1911), p. 410.

29. Editorial, "Price Regulation by Government," The Nation, ICIV (January 19, 1912), p. 51.

30. Editorial, "The Third Party and the Trusts," The Nation, XCV (September 19, 1912), pp. 253-254.

31. Editorial, "Another Labor Dispute Settled," The Nation, XCVI (May 1, 1913), p. 434.

cise tax on tobacco manufacturers was censured.³² The refusal of a certain Missouri Insurance Company to do business in Missouri was labelled as the "logical consequences of the fanatical view of the Sherman Act."³³ Finally the great business enterprises were pictured as the only debtor class in the country of any serious magnitude.³⁴

Attacks on socialism represented The Nation's fourth major attempt between 1909 and 1914, to defend the rights of property. There are seven editorials in this discussion. The magazine satirized parlor socialists and concluded that America had little to fear from them.³⁵ Later, socialists were accused of unjust errors in their procedures.³⁶ One "error" cited, for example, was that of picking out individual cases and treating them as typical of the whole. Another "error" was the teaching of the "ill-grounded belief that the existing order has meant the degradation and ruin of the mass."³⁷ The socialistic argument that the Constitution of the United States was made for a society of hunters and farmers and, hence, was no longer a suitable instrument of government was denied.³⁸ Reported failures of socialism in New Zealand provided the basis for editorial opinion that a socialistic government could hope for no better success in the United States.³⁹ In 1912, the socialist party suffered a considerable

32. Editorial, "The Attorney-General and Big Business," The Nation, XCVI (June 12, 1912), pp. 583-589.

33. Editorial, "Missouri's Queer Insurance Doings," The Nation, XCVI (June 26, 1913), pp. 634-635.

34. Editorial, "The Debtor Class Recidivists," The Nation, XCVII (August 7, 1913), pp. 114-115.

35. Editorial, "Cheerful Destroyers," The Nation, LXXXVIII (May 27, 1909), pp. 527-528.

36. Editorial, Socialism versus Democracy, The Nation, XCII (January 12, 1911), p. 28.

37. Loc. cit.

38. Editorial, Getting Along with the Constitution, The Nation, XCII (April 27, 1911), pp. 414-415.

39. Editorial, "Currents in American Socialism," The Nation, XCII (June 15, 1911), p. 594.

loss of votes in a municipal election in Milwaukee. The socialists, according to The Nation, claimed victory in defeat by saying that they had scored a victory in breaking down party lines. But The Nation argued that the victory was really a victory against socialism since the evidence clearly indicated that the people were not ruled by party shibboleths.⁴⁰ Twice in 1913 The Nation denied the soundness of socialistic propaganda. The magazine first referred to the fortune built up by Altman and named it as an illustration of socialistic error in saying that the old forms of opportunity are gone, that it has come to a choice between monopoly by a handful of individuals, on the one hand, and monopoly by government, on the other.⁴¹ The second denial was the attempted refutation of "the familiar claim" that the government's success in building the Panama Canal was proof of the possibilities in socialism. "The Socialists themselves consider that control by the government with present classes still existing is State Capitalism rather than Socialism."⁴²

The Nation went on record three times as being opposed to the policies of the I. W. W. In the case of the McNamara bombing of the Los Angeles Times building, the magazine left no doubt as to its judgment. "Society must stop this war on property." The Nation also carried an expository editorial on the meaning of the term syndicalism and strike tactics which were characterized by direct action.⁴⁴ The third editorial

40. Editorial, "The Milwaukee Election," The Nation, XCIV (April 11, 1912), p. 353.

41. Editorial, "Great Fortunes Without Monopoly," The Nation, XCVII (October 23, 1913), pp. 377-378.

42. Editorial, "Panama and Socialism," The Nation, XCVII (November 13, 1913), pp. 453-454.

43. Editorial, "Sense and Hysteria on McNamara Affair," The Nation, (January 11, 1912), p. 28.

44. Editorial, "Syndicalism," The Nation, XCIV (March 28, 1912), p. 304.

summarized the impracticality of the whole syndicalist movement with its violence and property destruction.⁴⁵

Individual editorials defended the rights of property in various ways. One, for example, expressed approval of a proposal that the English government subsidize wheat whenever the price fell below one dollar three cents per bushel.⁴⁶ Another editorial in questioning the meaning of the term "social justice" demanded whether the expression meant "confiscation of property and intensifying class hatred."⁴⁷ The third denied that magazines are tools of property.⁴⁸ The fourth satirized certain so-called literary "revolutionists," notably Wells, Galsworthy, and Shaw.⁴⁹ The fifth denied the theory that immigration had lowered the economic standard of the workman in America. Our high percentage of foreign labor in mills, the editorial continued, was the result of lack of native labor; native labor had probably advanced to positions of greater authority.⁵⁰

Regarding the Problem of Poverty

Of the twenty-six editorials in which The Nation expressed concern for the effects of poverty, thirteen were protests against the protective tariff. The most common criticism was that the tariff unjustifiably increased the cost of living for people in low income brackets. "The price

45. Editorial, "Socialism and Syndicalism," The Nation, XCIV (May 30, 1912), p. 533.

46. Editorial, "An English Plan for Bounties," The Nation, XCIV (February 1, 1912), pp. 101-102.

47. Editorial, "Social Justice," The Nation, XCIV (March 14, 1912), p. 253.

48. Editorial, "Strangling the Magazines," The Nation, XCIV (May 2, 1912), p. 431.

49. Editorial, "Amateurs of Revolution," The Nation, XCV (July 11, 1912), p. 27.

50. Editorial, "Metaphysical Standards of Living," The Nation, XCV (November 7, 1912), pp. 425-426.

of the mill worker's cost goes up the moment a tax is clapped on clothing, but his wages rise ultimately." . . . The city school teacher sees everything go up but her salary — rent, clothes, food recreation. Her salary will go up, ultimately."⁵¹ While the magazine judged the Payne-Aldrich Tariff to be the best one ever enacted by the Republican party, still the editorial designated as "an outrage" the lack of reduction of duty on wool and cotton.⁵² The tariff on zinc-ore also received attention. Calling zinc "the poor man's metal," another editorial denounced this means of revenue-getting as that of making the poor man pay tribute to the zinc mine owners.⁵³ In 1912, as in 1909, The Nation protested the tariff on wool.⁵⁴ In 1913, however, there was some progress in the program of tariff reduction. The Nation, in the interests of working people, expressed approval of the measure. It praised highly the accomplishment of placing sugar and wool on the free list and accredited the victors with having put the tariff on a national basis.⁵⁵ Further approval was signified by calling the tariff change a reflection "of a fiscal and political revolution."⁵⁶

The Nation maintained that the purpose of the protective tariff was the protection of the rich and that the method of securing the tariff was

51. Editorial, "A Short Way with Consumers," The Nation, LXXXVIII (May 20, 1909), p. 526.

52. Editorial, "The Tariff Outcome," The Nation, LXXIX (August 5, 1909), p. 112.

53. Editorial, "The Zinc-Ore Tariff Outrage," The Nation, LXXIX (September 2, 1909), p. 200.

54. Editorial, "A Mistaken Veto," The Nation, XCV (August 15, 1912), p. 158.

55. Editorial, "A Splendid Achievement," The Nation, XCVII (September 18, 1913), p. 254.

56. Editorial, "Political Discounting," The Nation, XCVII (October 9, 1913), p. 326.

that of political chicanery. In 1909, an editorial charged the Republican party which had supported a duty on iron ore with being drunk with power and prophesied a disagreeable awakening.⁵⁷ This attack was quickly followed with a protest against the proposal in the Aldrich Bill to raise the tariff on lemons, and the accusation was made that the plan probably represented payment to the California senators for having supported the tariff on cotton, wool, steel, and iron.⁵⁸ When the Payne-Aldrich Tariff was passed, The Nation scored the right to levy on the common people, ". . . granted in one of those midnight agreements with manufacturers which makes the protective tariff a sink of corruption."⁵⁹ The last attack by The Nation in 1909 on the Payne-Aldrich Tariff was a reaction to an article in the Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers. The article reviewed the steps by which a protective tariff had been maintained on wool. The Nation characterized the accomplishment as having ". . . made the lot of the poor harder and swelled the ravages of tuberculosis."⁶⁰

By March, 1910, The Nation was pointing to signs of dissatisfaction with the tariff. An editorial hailed a democratic victory in the Fourteenth District of Massachusetts as a flat rejection of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff.⁶¹ Next, The Nation reported that increased prices were all being

57. Editorial, "The People Losing a Weapon," The Nation, LXXXVIII (May 20, 1909), p. 502.

58. Editorial, "More Tariff Immoralities," The Nation, LXXXVIII (June 3, 1909), p. 550.

59. Editorial, "The Tariff Outcome," The Nation, LXXXIX (August 5, 1909), p. 112.

60. Editorial, "A Facet in Wool," The Nation, LXXXIX (October 7, 1909), pp. 318-319.

61. Editorial, "The Handwriting on the Wall," The Nation, XC (March 31, 1910), pp. 308-309.

laid to the tariff.⁶² Still another editorial called Republican leaders insensitive to the will of the people in that they had allowed special interests to write the acts of Congress. The expressed belief was that the special interests, woolen, cotton, steel, and sugar, would have to yield as "railroads and the private exploiters of the public domain" had had to yield.⁶³ In 1912 The Nation attacked President Taft for vetoing a reduction in the wool tariff and surmised that his judgment had been determined by nomination affiliations.⁶⁴

Contrary to its policy before the victory of the English Liberals, The Nation in 1910 published three editorials in support of the proposed social program in England. The first editorial in the group expressed the opinion that very revolutionary changes would have followed a Conservative victory.⁶⁵ The second approved an English Commission to investigate the high cost of living.⁶⁶ The third discussed the inevitability of the Liberal victory. "The democratic sentiment of the time will not much longer endure the possession by a purely hereditary body of power so substantial as that which the peers now exercise."⁶⁷

Three other subjects which showed some concern for the effects of poverty were treated somewhat briefly. Each received two editorials.

62. Editorial, "An Issue Hard to Kill," The Nation, XC (May 3, 1910), p. 450.

63. Editorial, "The New Feeling about the Tariff," The Nation, XC (June 16, 1910), p. 598.

64. Editorial, "A Mistaken Veto," The Nation, XCV (August 15, 1912), p. 158.

65. Editorial, "The English Elections," The Nation, XC (January 20, 1910), pp. 56-57.

66. Editorial, "Cost of Living," The Nation, XC (January 27, 1910), p. 78.

67. Editorial, "The Constitutional Struggle in England," The Nation, XC (April 7, 1910), p. 336.

Twice in 1912 The Nation noted economic difficulties existing among people of the middle class. The magazine discussed the inadequate pay received by government and other public employees.⁶⁸ It also reported the findings of a recent survey showing that the cost of attending college had increased twenty per cent in twenty years. The editorial commented that this increased cost presented "a sober problem for citizens of moderate incomes."⁶⁹ In 1912, also, The Nation considered the economic difficulties of immigrants. It expressed approval of legislation designed to reduce the exploitation of immigrants.⁷⁰ It also attacked the economic exploitation of women and children in factories.⁷¹

In contrast with its 1912 expressions of concern for exploited workers, The Nation in 1913 upheld the point of view that women could get along very well with low salaries. A servant girl earning six dollars a week was pictured as being able to save two hundred dollars a year, purchase an annuity, and at the age of forty-five have an independent income.⁷² A survey reporting working conditions in department stores was reviewed. The findings indicated that the average American weekly wage for twenty-two thousand saleswomen was nine dollars and thirty-one

68. Editorial, "Serving the People for Pay," The Nation, XCIV (March 21, 1912), p. 280.

69. Editorial, "Cost of Going to College," The Nation, XCV (December 12, 1912), pp. 557-558.

70. Editorial, "Protecting the Immigrant," The Nation, XCIV (March 28, 1912), p. 306.

71. Editorial, "The Cost of Progress," The Nation, XCV (December 19, 1912), p. 588.

72. Editorial, "A Story of Thrift," The Nation, XCVII (July 10, 1913), pp. 28-29.

cents. The conclusions in the report, as quoted by The Nation, were that little connection exists among women between occupation and immorality or even between want and immorality.⁷³

In four other editorials The Nation briefly considered other aspects of the lives of people in low income groups. The obituary tribute to Richard Watson Gilder, who had served in New York on the Tenement House Commission, recognized the importance of his work in improving slum conditions.⁷⁴ A discussion of the future status of property rights included the prophecy that people would not long be willing to forego the revenue to be secured from inheritance taxes.⁷⁵ The occasional need for wage adjustment was admitted, although the efficacy of the general strike was questioned.⁷⁶ The common belief that the "new immigration" was lowering the American standard of living was denied.⁷⁷

Regarding Socialism or Communism as a Possible Means of Solving the Problem of Poverty

An examination of The Nation's editorials, 1909 to 1914, indicates that editorial policy consistently attacked the theories of socialism and specifically defended the tenets of private enterprises.

From 1909 through 1913, The Nation took the stand that socialistic theories were not being translated into successful actuality and listed

73. Editorial, "Facts About the Department Store," The Nation, XCVII (August 31, 1913), pp. 94-95.

74. Editorial, "Richard Watson Gilder," The Nation, LXXXIX (November 25, 1909), pp. 505-506.

75. Editorial, "Taxation Difficulties," The Nation, XCII (January 12, 1911), p. 29.

76. Editorial, "The Labor Strikes," The Nation, XCIV (March 28, 1912), pp. 329-330.

77. Editorial, "Metaphysical Standards of Living," The Nation, XCV (November 7, 1912), p. 426.

specific illustrations in support of this contention. In 1909, an editorial stated that it was the belief of admirers of Henry George's Progress and Poverty that the proposed land tax in England and the established land taxes in Germany were evidence that the theories of Henry George were coming to pass.⁷⁸ The soundness of this belief was denied. First, the editorial maintained that the idea of taxing unearned increment or of confiscating unearned increment had come from John Stuart Mill, whereas total confiscation of the land value had been advocated by George.⁷⁹ The editorial also noted that the proceeds of the unearned-increment tax in Germany amounted to about 0.76 mark per head, "not even a beginning in the abolition of poverty."⁸⁰ In 1911, a former socialist candidate for Governor of New York was quoted to the effect that New Zealand under a socialist regime still had poverty, slums, monopolies, landlordism, and a government subservient to class interests.⁸¹ In 1912, the results at the polls both in Germany and in America were interpreted by The Nation as no triumph for the socialist party. In the first instance, the increase of socialist seats in the German Reichstag was judged to be simply a protest vote against reactionary elements.⁸² In the second instance, the loss by the socialists of the municipal election in Milwaukee was con-

78. Editorial, "The Unearned Increment Tax and Land Ownership," The Nation, LXXXIX (November 18, 1909), p. 477.

79. Ibid., p. 477.

80. Ibid., p. 477.

81. Editorial, "Currents in American Socialism," The Nation, XCII (June 22, 1911), pp. 594-595.

82. Editorial, "The German Elections," The Nation, XCIV (February 1, 1912), pp. 102-103.

strued to be a real victory for the opponents of socialism in that the people were not ruled by party shibboleths.⁸³ In 1913, The Nation denied that there was any truth in the claim that the government's achievements in building the Panama Canal was proof of the possibilities inherent in socialism. Even the socialists, the editorial continued, know that the idea is false and "consider control by the government with present classes still existing to be an example of State Capitalism."⁸⁴

For five consecutive years, The Nation published editorials analyzing the lack of soundness in socialistic doctrines. An editorial in 1909, for example, attempted to show the futility of accepting socialistic philosophy because one may be tired of struggle in a planless world.⁸⁵ The editorial pointed out that while there is nothing in Edward Bellamy which suggests struggle, lack of struggle is an unattractive condition to men of vigorous nature. In 1910, The Nation attacked socialistic doctrine by advancing the theory that any scheme of regulation which would prevent poverty would also be subversive to liberty.⁸⁶ The editorial maintained that to distribute men in fields of work so that supply would be adjusted to demand could only mean to distribute by authority. "Since every man's position under socialism would be a public position, the men against whom this authority would be wielded would always be those com-

83. Editorial, "The Milwaukee Election," The Nation, XCIV (April 11, 1912), p. 353.

84. Editorial, "Panama and Socialism," The Nation, XCVII (November 13, 1913), pp. 453-454.

85. Editorial, "Socialism and Human Nature," The Nation, LXXXIX (December 9, 1909), p. 560.

86. Editorial, "The Liberty to Starve," The Nation, XCI (December 27, 1910), p. 385.

manding the least political influence, or in the position of being able to make the least political fuss."⁸⁷ In 1911, The Nation reminded its readers that a social program and socialism are not the same. In 1912, The Nation questioned the meaning of the term "social justice," inquiring whether the term meant confiscation of property and the intensifying of class hatreds.⁸⁹ In 1913, The Nation listed the fortune built up by Altman as a specific evidence of the falsity of the socialist claims that the old opportunities are gone.⁹⁰

The Nation also attempted to show that much of the alleged significance of socialist propaganda should be seriously questioned. In 1910, for example, the magazine published an analysis and evaluation of a recent study of economic, health, and educational conditions prevailing in a Polish colony of eighty thousand people in Buffalo.⁹¹ As quoted by The Nation, the study showed that of the eighty thousand, seventy thousand had come to America since 1881; that sixty per cent of the workers were common laborers, and thirty per cent, semi-skilled; that the colony held real estate valued at twelve million dollars, with mortgages amounting to four million; that the Poles had savings accounts

87. Ibid., p. 385.

88. Editorial, "The Ravenous Social Program," The Nation, XCII (April 13, 1911), pp. 363-364.

89. Editorial, "Social Justice," The Nation, XCIV (March 14, 1912), p. 253.

90. Editorial, "Great Fortunes without Monopoly," The Nation, XCVII (October 23, 1912), pp. 377-378.

91. Editorial, "Philanthropy and Statistics," The Nation, XC (June 9, 1910), pp. 376-377.

amounting to two million, five hundred thousand dollars; that the colony furnished thirty-three per cent of the city's charity cases; that it furnished twenty-five to twenty-eight per cent of the court cases, thirty-eight per cent of the infant mortality in the first year; and thirty-eight per cent of the juvenile delinquents. The Nation questioned whether these figures were particularly shocking. It argued that since many of the immigrants doubtless had arrived in a condition of extreme poverty, they should furnish twice as many applicants for charity as should other groups. The editorial minimized the importance of the high rate of infant mortality with the query as to whether the Poles' birth rate may not have been very high, also. An attempt was made to discredit the truancy figures with the reminder that the Polish school population was nearly half as great per capita as that of Buffalo at large. In short, The Nation concluded that the figures in the report actually had little significance.⁹²

The figures have no profounder or more startling significance than that there are rich and poor among us. This we all know without the figures; and before these are accepted as constituting a new arraignment of the existing state of society -- a kind of arraignment abundantly used for promoting socialist agitation -- it is our duty to ask whether they add anything to the general facts which no one denies, and with which the world has been dealing in a spirit of conservative progress for a century.⁹³

The following year, 1911, The Nation published a reply to another

92. Ibid., p. 577.

93. Ibid., p. 577.

piece of socialist writing, an article by Fagan in the current Atlantic Monthly.⁹⁴ The reviewer began by evaluating the article as one "that appears honest and admits that democracy has achieved much," but the editorial continued with the point of view that the article in question illustrated the unjust error made by many socialists of selecting individual cases and treating them as typical of the whole of society. The criticism continued with the statement of belief that many people accept the ideal of socialism because of an "exceedingly ill-grounded belief" that the existing order has meant the degradation and ruin of the mass of people. The Nation also maintained that many philanthropists in describing situations make irresponsible statements which are interpreted by many people as arraignments of the existing order of society.

In addition to its criticisms of socialism already noted, The Nation also published a defense of the tenets of private enterprise. This editorial summarized Marxian dogma, first as being the unqualified denial of the right of capital, as such, to any share in the products of industry and, second, as assuming that owners draw interest and dividends without having contributed anything toward the creation of the product.⁹⁵ In refutation, The Nation argued that this "simple" doctrine involves a "fatal falsehood." In support of this statement, the editorial contended that confiscation must be based on something more than "the fiction that interest is robbery"; that the owners have contributed because they have stored-up capital for purposes of future production. In conclusion, the editorial

94. Editorial, Socialism versus Democracy, The Nation, XCII (January 12, 1911), p. 28.

95. Editorial, "The Backbone of Socialism," The Nation, XCI (November 10, 1910), p. 436.

summarily denied the truth of the basis of collectivism. "The practicality of collectivist management is debatable. The fiction that 'interest is robbery' must be wholly abandoned; and with that gone, the backbone of Socialism as an emotional crusade is broken."⁹⁷

Summary of Main Points, Chapter V

During the period of More's editorship The Nation was essentially conservative in its stated attitudes toward the place of property in society. Four major utterances bear out this conclusion. First, there was adverse criticism of the cost involved in the social program of the English Liberals and of the loss of veto power by the House of Lords. Second, there was consistent opposition to new or to increased taxes. Third, there was repeated denial of the soundness of socialistic doctrine and propaganda. Fourth, there was unqualified condemnation of syndicalism as being representative of war on property.

The Nation expressed some concern for the problem of poverty in that it consistently attacked the protective tariff on the grounds that the tariff permitted a few individuals to profit from taxes levied on necessities bought by the common people. "Common people" was defined to include the middle class. After the Liberal victory in England had occurred, The Nation reversed its earlier position by acknowledging the need for a social program. While the magazine stated that it was opposed to any policy of exploitation of immigrants or factory workers, it condoned the practice of paying low wages to domestic workers and saleswomen.

97. Ibid., p. 437.

The Nation strongly denied the possibility that socialism could solve the problem of poverty. The magazine argued that there was no evidence that socialistic theories were in successful operation anywhere and gave examples of failures of socialistic activities, trends, and alleged trends in various countries in support of the denial. Consistently, over the five year period, articles were published to show that the philosophy of socialism is unsound. On specific occasions socialistic propaganda was criticized for alleged unjustness of claims. On the other hand, The Nation defended the tenets of private enterprise.

Conclusions as to Extent of Agreement between More's Writings on Property and Poverty and the Editorials of The Nation on Property and Poverty During the Years of More's Editorship.

Results of research on the subjects of property and poverty indicate substantial agreement between More's point of view and the editorial policy of The Nation, 1909 to 1914. First, both bodies of writing argued that the safety of property should be maintained; both denounced the strike as warfare against property. Second, both bodies of writing argued for the perpetuation of property through arguing against the establishment of a federal income tax. Third, both expressed dismay regarding the defeat of entrenched privilege, as that defeat was illustrated by the loss of veto power in the English House of Lords. Fourth, both expressed solicitude for the economic welfare of certain middle class groups. Fifth, both failed to show a sustained interest in the problem of poverty. More, for example, showed some concern for the effects of poverty upon individuals but little concern for the effects of poverty groups of people. The Nation criticized repeatedly the effects of the protective tariff in making harder the financial

lot of the poor; but The Nation was opposed to the policy of workmen's insurance and to the improvement of the economic status of saleswomen and domestic workers. Sixth, both the essays and the editorials expressed strong conviction that communal ownership, specifically socialism, represented an impractical theory founded on an unsound philosophy.

CHAPTER VI

ON CRIME

Part A - More's Comments on Crime As a Social Problem

More's writing life coincided with years of great social change in the United States. Sociologists believe that in periods when social mores are modified rapidly, there is a greater tendency for some members of the population to fail to adjust themselves to society; therefore a summary of certain outstanding changes in American life is included at the beginning of this chapter in an attempt to bring More's comments on crime into clearer focus.

Among the very obvious changes during 1890-1937, for example, were the growth of great cities, including the so-called metropolitan areas, the widespread use of the automobile, the effects of the Volstead Act, the reaction from the first World War, and the economic depression of the 1930's. Various modern commentators on crime indicate a belief that each of these changes was of the type that either contributed to increase of crime or, at the time, was considered to have contributed to the increase of crime.

Population increases were enormous in and near such cities as New York, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Cleveland. Coincident with this rapid increase in population within relatively limited areas was the increase in the problem of housing. There were sections which, properly speaking, were neither residential nor business areas. Houses were neglected, dilapidated. These were the slum areas, heavily over-populated and blighted with poverty, delinquency, and disease.

It is a commonly accepted fact that widespread use of the automobile facilitated the criminal's escape and increased the difficulty of his apprehension. The automobile became, moreover, the means for developing new types of crime, such as automobile theft and traffic violations. As the result of traffic accidents the use of the automobile added to the number of homicides reported.

Another influence in the 1920's toward a new type of crime was the Volstead Act. The widespread violation of this law, which had only partial public support, resulted, especially in certain metropolitan areas, in a partnership of crime and politics. This combination brought about powerful underworld gangs.

In the late 1920's it was commonly believed that crime had greatly increased following the termination of the World War. The general concern regarding the "Crime Wave" was reflected in the inaugural address of President Herbert Hoover, who named disregard for and disobedience to the law the most "malign" influence in the country. At his request, Congress authorized the appointment of a National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. This commission, commonly known as the Wickersham Commission, completed its work in 1931. The Commission's findings probably were an influence that contributed to the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. A report on crime was included in the study presented in 1933 by the President's Research Committee on Social Trends.

In the first half of the 1930's, the economic depression with its millions of unemployed, produced great poverty. Sociologists generally list economic inadequacy as one cause of crime, especially crime against property.

In addition to the changes already mentioned, there developed, during the years of More's writing life, a division of opinion concerning the treatment of criminals. The point of view of advocates of severe penalties, perhaps publicly ~~executed~~ executed, had been based on the assumption that every individual is a free moral agent and that severe penalties would deter people from committing crimes. By 1924, however Sutherland had defined crime as the "joint product of an individual and a social factor."¹ This newer concept brought a corresponding change in the point of view of many people on how to modify human behavior. This change in opinion was reflected in many of the more recent recommendations for the treatment of criminals and the prevention of crime. Recommendations included simplification and modernization of the procedures of criminal courts, dignifying the police service, freeing judges from political influence, elimination of the slums, and encouraging of public respect for law and order. There had also been a gradual lessening of the number of states demanding the death penalty for homicide as well as the substitution of the probation and parole systems for the penalty of extended imprisonment.

It seemed desirable in a study of More's social criticism to examine his writings for the purpose of determining what, if any, views he expressed on the problem of crime. Three questions were formulated as bases for research. The questions follow:

1. Where, if anywhere, did More place the responsibility for crime?

1. Edwin, S. Sutherland, Criminology, p. 111, as quoted by Robert C. Dexter, Social Adjustment (New York, 1927), p. 302.

2. On what, if any, institutions in society did More place the responsibility for combating crime?
3. Is there any evidence in More's writings of either an increasing or a decreasing interest in the social problem of crime?

Since much of More's writing on crime was incidental, his scope was somewhat limited. The majority of the authors discussed in his critical essays were men or women with no criminal records. In fact, there were comparatively few whose lives or works provided the critic with an opportunity to express judgment concerning the causes of crime.

With the completion in 1909 of the Fifth Series of the Shelburne Essays, however, More had written on five authors whose lives, at least at some point, had been spent in an environment generally recognized as being conducive to crime. In each case, More had carefully described that environment. In three of the five cases he had ascribed the author's inability to adjust himself to society, or even the author's weaknesses as an artist, to the influences of an unsatisfactory environment. In two cases, More had expressed admiration for the author's display of moral strength in not yielding to the pressures of poverty and crime.

More interpreted Laurence Sterne, Charles Dickens, and James Thomson, for example, as men who in childhood had been the victims of undesirable environments. The occasion for More's analysis of Sterne was the publication of the Cross Edition of the complete works of the noted sentimentalist. The review expressed agreement with Cross in the point of view that Sterne was not so essentially dishonest in his plagiarisms as earlier critics had indicated, but the review criticized Cross for not taking more account of the possible effects on Sterne's morals of his childhood environment.²

2. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Series Five, p. 181.

It is indeed a vagrant and Shandean childhood -- The father, a lieutenant --- passed from engagement to idleness, and from barrack to barrack, more than was the custom even in those unsettled days -- Other children had been given to the luckless couple, and more were yet to be added, but they were dropped on the wayside in pathetic graves, leaving in the end only two... The difficulties of the mother as a hanger-on in camps seem to have hardened her, and her temper was "clamorous and rapacious."

More attributed not only a certain dishonesty but also an implied obscenity to Sterne's "Shandean" background.

The publication of the National Edition of Dickens' works in forty volumes led More not only to appraise the popularity of the novelist but also to take some note of his weaknesses. More contended, for example, that the economic extremes of Dickens' life may have been a contributing factor to the novelist's inability to learn discipline and suppression, yet More attributed the greatest share of harmful influence to the environment of Dickens' childhood: the improvident father, the heartless mother, the apprenticeship in a blacking factory, the foul spots of London, the debtors' prison, the pawnshops.⁴ "He came up from the descent into ignominious drudgery in a state of nervous exacerbation. The memory of it rankled in his breast, and he never forgave his mother for her willingness to abandon him to that base misery."⁵

More also analysed the probable effects of the childhood environment of the poet James Thomson, who as the result of intemperance died at forty-

4. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Series Five, pp. 30-31.

5. Ibid., p. 31.

eight. The father for twenty years was a helpless paralytic; the mother, a victim of melancholia; the child, at eight, admitted to an asylum.

"Superstition, disease, poverty, and, one suspects, intemperance must have made the child's home scarcely more desirable than the Asylum."⁶

More's appraisal of George Crabbe runs along somewhat different lines. Again it is the story of a man who had known poverty and vice, both in a "miserable fishing village" and in the slums of London. More judged that the frailties and vices portrayed in Crabbe's characters were typical of the men whom the poet knew. They were drawn from the ranks of the humble and the poor, but "...they rarely ever descend, like Dickens' portraits, into caricature, for the reason that their divergences grow more from some inner guiding moral trait, and are less the mere outward distinction of trick and manner."⁷ More believed that Crabbe exceeded Dickens in sincerity of character drawing and advanced the argument that Crabbe's own reaction to the sorrows of poverty was responsible for the superiority. In other words, according to More, Crabbe's Calvinism made it possible for the poet to "magnify the free will and to avoid the limp surrender of determinism."⁸

Of the five men, More's highest praise was for George Gissing. Gissing through years of toil and privation told the story of the "crime of want" in the slums of London. According to More, Gissing wrote from his own experiences "...the chilling of brain and heart, the unnering of hands, the slow gathering about one of fear and shame and impotent wrath."⁹ The

6. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Series Five, p. 171.

7. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Series Two, p. 136.

8. Ibid., p. 138.

9. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Series Five, p. 48.

critic praised Gissing especially for never losing the sense of personal responsibility for his own acts. "Had not he, George Gissing, been caught in the cruel network of circumstances, and had he not preserved intact the feeling that he was personally accountable?"¹⁰

In the Shelburne Essays written between 1910-1917 More's explanation for the cause of crime in the lives of individuals shifted from that of undesirable childhood environment to that of a lack of moral responsibility. His analyses of Thompson, Shelley, and Wilde, for example, are illustrative of this later attitude.

More admitted some hesitancy to deal with Thompson ("B. V."), but on the whole the essay implies that the tragedy of Thompson's life and comparatively early death lay in his own weakness. The "visionary terror" of the poet's early days in London was presented by More as having been the result of opium rather than poverty, although poverty was also a factor.¹¹ More acknowledged certain elements of greatness in Thompson's writing and showed some appreciation of the poet's religious searchings, but he explained Thompson's failures, artistic as well as moral, in terms of the poet's failure to act as a free moral agent and, hence, to cease in his career as a drug addict. Thus in placing Thompson in the line of English writers, More wrote, "But his affiliation is rather with the lines of poets and visionaries of the nineteenth century who have combined a worship of heaven with subjection to the angel of the darker drink..."¹²

More's interpretation of Shelley, in connection with the suicide of

10. Ibid., p. 58.

11. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Series Seven, p. 155.

12. Ibid., p. 166.

his wife, Harriet Westbrook, is completely unsympathetic and is an unqualified expression of belief that Shelley's conduct was the result of a lack of moral strength. According to More, Shelley substituted "each emotion as it arose in his breast" for moral strength.¹³

Nowhere was More more specific in attributing crime to a lack of moral strength and a sense of personal responsibility for one's conduct than in his statement concerning the perversion of Oscar Wilde. "He was himself not unaware of the treachery of the path he had chosen."¹⁴

The importance of moral responsibility in governing behavior became the basis for More's criticism of modern treatment of crime. He sharply denied the efficacy of current methods and described the newer attitude as an offshoot of the romantic concept that progress and change are synonymous.¹⁵

We no longer punish the criminal as a being responsible for his own acts, under the belief that there is in man a voluntary power to shape his own character, but when we punish him at all, we do so apologetically, as if society and not he were the guilty party, and as if his crime were merely one of the products of evolution, like any disease to be cured by fresh air and flattery.¹⁶

In his argument that modern practices in the treatment of crime were wrong, More wrote that he based his judgment both on expert opinion and comparative statistics. On the need for "sure and sharp sentences" More quoted Police Commissioner Waldo of New York to the effect that suspended

13. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 231.

15. Paul E. More, *The Drift of Romanticism*, p. 239.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 238.

sentences and incompetence of the criminal courts contributed to the "excess of lawlessness in New York."¹⁷ In addition, More reviewed statistics from the London Nation to show the extent to which lawlessness in New York exceeded that in London.¹⁸

More's lack of sympathy for American treatment of crime included disapproval of modern treatment of juvenile delinquents. He strongly questioned Jane Addams' theories that many youngsters were led into delinquency merely through a love of excitement and a desire for adventure.¹⁹ He ridiculed certain of her case reports, especially one intended to show the ill-effects of extreme poverty and premature economic responsibility.²⁰ He admitted that social sympathy had accomplished much in the way of alleviating harshness, but he classed social sympathy as "...the consummation of a long and deep-seated revolution."²¹ He concluded that social sympathy in the treatment of crime not only represented a procedure based on fallacy but also represented an attitude that is dangerous to the delinquent.²²

And "social sympathy" erected into a theory which leaves out of account the responsibility of the individual and seeks to throw the blame of evil on the laws and society, though it may effect desirable reforms here and there in institutions, is bound to leave the individual weakened in his powers of resistance against the temptations which he can never eliminate from human life.²³

17. Ibid., p. 239.

18. "The Breakdown of Justice," The Nation (London) March 30, 1912, as quoted by P. E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, pp. 239-240.

19. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 196.

20. Ibid., p. 196.

21. Ibid., p. 197.

22. Ibid., p. 211.

23. Ibid., p. 211.

Institutions Responsible for Combating Crime

More's statements regarding the responsibility of institutions in combating crime are relatively few. This fact is consistent with his frequently expressed belief that on the individual rests the responsibility for his own conduct; however there are implications and occasional statements which indicate More's definite belief in the necessity for certain institutions to follow a program of correction of criminals or prevention of crime.

More, for example, in observing that punishment should be swift and sure implied a belief that legislative bodies must be responsible for giving society a firm code of laws both to deter the individual member of society from becoming a criminal and to protect society from the activities of the criminal. He defined effective laws, moreover, as those that are made under the recognition of the actual, rather than the idealized, nature of man.²⁴

Law is not a code of ideal virtues nor a guide to individual perfection, but a rule for regulating the relations of society for practical purposes. Just so soon as in any large measure, it fails to recognize the actuality of human nature, or pronounces in conformity with an ideal of human nature, it becomes inoperative or mischievous. If law supposed that all men were honest what would be the consequence?²⁵

As a parallel in importance to the criminal code, More listed the importance of efficiency in the procedures of the criminal courts. He apparently subscribed to the belief that a strong factor in promoting crimes of violence in New York was the increased number of suspended sen-

24. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 139.

25. Ibid., p. 139.

tences and the "general feeling among the criminally disposed that the courts will not convict."²⁶

In his denunciation of the sensational press as an institution that encourages crime, More implied clearly his belief that on the press rests a serious responsibility for restrained and honest reporting. He accused the press of journalistic demagoguery in stirring-up national and racial hatreds.²⁷ He scathingly attacked the playing-up of sensational crime, the portrayal of "the loathsome debauchery of a murderer and his trull as the spiritual history of two young souls finding themselves in the pure air of passion; or some sordid liason will be virtually listed above marriage by the terms 'affinity' or 'heart wife.'"²⁸

More placed on the schools the responsibility of being the "natural champions of order" and of re-discovering some common ground of strength and purpose in the first principles of education, and law, and property, and religion,²⁹ but he specifically warned the schools of the need for moral teaching "...teach a boy to take pleasure in things that are fine and pure and strong, and of good repute and you have prepared him for a life wholesome and happy in itself and useful to the community."³⁰

Evidence of More's Limited and Decreasing Expression of Interest in Crime

The following tabulation shows the publication dates, frequency of reference, causes listed, and correction suggested in More's essays dealing with the social problem of crime:

26. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 239.

27. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 27.

28. Ibid., p. 28.

29. Ibid., p. 43.

30. P. E. More, "Taste and Tradition," Unpopular Review, VIII (July, 1917), p. 130.

Tabulation of More's References to Crime as Expressed in His Essays, 1904-1936

Year of Publication	Number of References	Type of Cause Listed	Means of Correction Suggested
1904	0	--	--
1905	2	1. Poverty 2. Vagrant childhood	Sense of moral responsibility
1906	0	--	--
1908	3	1. Poverty 2. Undesirable childhood environment	Discipline of character. Sense of moral responsibility.
1909	0	--	--
1910	3	1. Intemperance 2. Lack of moral sense 3. Hedonism	Sense of moral responsibility.
1913	2	1. Environment of indulgence. 2. Concept that crime is to be treated as a disease.	Sure and sharp punishment
1915	2	1. Sensational press 2. Social sympathy	1. Better leadership 2. Individual responsibility
1917	1	1. Lack of moral teaching	Moral teaching in youth
1919	1	1. No moral resistance	Sense of moral responsibility.
1921	0	--	--
1928	0	--	--
1934	0	--	--
1936	0	--	--

Summary, Chapter VI, Part A

More's writings on the causes of crime fall into two divisions: crime in connection with the life or work of an individual author; crime as a major social problem. As far as individual authors were concerned, More in a majority of the cases which he discussed in his 1905 to 1910 statements traced the causes of immorality and crime to the effects of undesirable childhood environments. He showed these environments to have been characterized by poverty, intemperance, insecurity, and lack of parental guidance. As far as people in general were concerned, More in his 1910 to 1919 writings traced immorality and crime to lack of moral responsibility as well as to undesirable environment. During these years his concept of "undesirable environment" included the example offered by modern treatment of criminals, sensationalism in the public press, and lack of moral training of young people.

At least three of his recommendations for the prevention of crime were in accord with the point of view of modern sociologists. As early as 1905 and as late as 1917 he implied or stated his belief in the need for desirable childhood environment. He recognized the need for competence and justice in the criminal courts. He urged that education both in the schools and by the public press recognize a responsibility for developing a respect for law and order.

On the other hand More's acceptance of the importance of the theory of punishment as a deterrent from crime led him to express disbelief in the efficacy of certain comparatively recent practices in the treatment of potential criminals. He distrusted the philosophy of "social sympathy" as that philosophy was manifested in the treatment of juvenile delinquents;

hence he was critical of the work at Hull House in Chicago and of the parole and probation systems.

More's comments on the subject of crime cover a period of fourteen years, less than half of his writing life. This fact, however, cannot be interpreted as proof of a loss of interest in the subject. It may simply represent a lack of expression of interest in the subject.

Part B - The Nation On Crime 1909-1914

During the years of More's editorship, The Nation printed forty-one editorials on the subject of crime. This number represents approximately three per cent of the total number of editorials printed. Of course, the editorials pertaining to specific crimes tended strongly to be in connection with criminal acts which received national news coverage. Crimes of such widespread interest are illustrated by the bombing of the Times Building in Los Angeles by the McNamara brothers and the murder of the gambler Rosenthal in New York by Police-Lieutenant Becker. The treatment of criminals had become a problem of such recognized importance that a Governors' Conference was devoted to a consideration of improving the means of prevention of crime and correction of criminals; hence these questions of dealing with the problem of crime became national news and, in turn, subjects for editorials comment by The Nation.

To determine the editorial point of view of The Nation 1909 to 1914, on the social problem of crime two questions were selected as bases for research. The questions follow:

1. Where, if anywhere, did The Nation place the responsibility for crime?

2. What institutions, if any, did The Nation name as having a responsibility for combating crime?

Responsibility for Crime

Research shows that The Nation listed ten different causes for crime: ineffectual procedures in dealing with crime; sentimental attitude on the part of society toward criminals; corruption within both the municipal government and the police force; inadequate police force; public indifference; lack of constructive childhood environment; lack of moral character in the individual; failure of the church; defiance of the law by political leaders, and congenital tendencies in the individual.

On the basis of a numerical count, it is apparent that The Nation rated "ineffectual" procedures in dealing with criminals as the major cause of crime. Thirteen of the forty-one editorials illustrate this point of view. Seven of the thirteen editorials criticize either by direct statement or by clear implication any deviation from strict enforcement of the law; three condemn lack of promptness in execution of sentences; two discuss "unsatisfactory" attitudes regarding evidence, and one discusses the limitations of juvenile courts.

In its editorial policy of recommending strict enforcement of the law, The Nation was consistent both in dealing with specific instances of treating crime, and in commenting on general principles in treating crime. Its first specific illustration in the period under consideration was in connection with election night disorders in Cleveland in November, 1911.¹ The editorial treated the occurrence as proof of the failure of the "Golden Rule Plan" which the police chief of Cleveland had

1. Editorial, "Humanitarianism and Crime," The Nation, LXXXIX (November 18, 1909), pp. 478-479.

insurgated; furthermore, the editorial argued, any abatement of crime in Cleveland during the two year in which the plan had been in operation was probably the result of constant police watch on places "known or suspected to be disorderly or of criminal character rather than the result of The Golden Rule Plan."² The editorial concluded with an attack upon the idea of any indeterminate-sentence plan as failing in the primary object of imprisonment, that is, the "detering of others from crime by the fear of punishment."³ Continuing this same trend of argument, The Nation, the following year, objected to the passage of the Federal Parole Bill on the grounds that parole was suitable only for minor offenses and a large proportion of first offenses.⁴ Insisting that the person who had been convicted of criminal financial operations too easily becomes a model prisoner and is likely to be paroled, The Nation concluded that he should be kept in prison so that the knowledge of his punishment might prevent others from committing similar crimes.⁵ Next, The Nation, in offering its argument for the psychological necessity of associating the idea of punishment with that of crime, came again to the same conclusion on the importance of punishment as a deterrent. "We do not know what crimes would be committed but for the fear of the law." The Nation expressed strong approval of the promptness of English criminal procedures.⁷

2. Ibid., p. 478.

3. Ibid., p. 479.

4. Editorial, "An Important Bill Hastily Passed," The Nation, XC (May 26, 1910), p. 528.

5. Ibid., p. 528.

6. Editorial, "Crime and the Law," The Nation, XCI (August 11, 1910), p. 116.

7. Editorial, "Crime and the Law," The Nation, XCI (November 3, 1910), p. 409.

"If there is anything at all in the deterrent efficacy of legal punishment, prompt and impressive disposal of criminal cases--in so far as it is compatible with the ascertaining of the truth--is of the essence of the matter."⁸ Moreover, The Nation denied that leading criminologists unanimously agree that punishment is not a deterrent. The editorial then listed four "fallacies" in the argument that England's criminal code of the eighteenth century was evidence that punishment is not a deterrent from crime. The first was that the earlier code had "brutalized" the populace. The second, third, and fourth were that modern education and sanitation, more effective policing, and illumination of the streets, rather than a more lenient criminal code, had probably resulted in fewer crimes.⁹

In 1913, The Nation published three more editorials stressing approval of upholding the law. First, the magazine expressed approval of evidence that vigor in New York in persecution of police corruption, as well as systematic bringing to punishment of members of an arsonist gang, was resulting in improved administration of the law.¹⁰ In other words, the editorial specifically attributed the improved condition to the deterrent effects of laws rigidly enforced.¹¹ Second, The Nation took cognizance of a study in degeneracy which indicated that one out of every one hundred fifty-five people in Burlington County, New Jersey, was a delinquent.¹² Concerning the implications of this report, as far as crime was concerned,

8. Ibid., p. 409.

9. Ibid., p. 410.

10. Editorial, "Re-invigorating the Criminal Law," The Nation, XCVI (January, 23, 1913), p. 72.

11. Ibid., p. 73.

12. Editorial, "A Study in Degeneracy," The Nation, XCVII (August 17, 1913), p. 383-384.

the editorial conceded the point that special laws might be necessary to "bring such breeding of imbecility and criminality under restraint." The article also maintained the argument that the situation could be "enormously" improved by enforcing the laws already in existence.¹³ Third, The Nation supported the court in the conviction of the I. W. W. agitator, Quinlan, in Paterson, New Jersey, with the comment, "The issue really before the people of New Jersey is not whether Quinlan is guilty, but whether the law is supreme."¹⁴

In addition to its policy of supporting the contention that strict law enforcement is a primary deterrent from crime, The Nation upheld the theory of swiftness in execution of sentences, on the grounds that swiftness and adequacy of punishment to be effective must go hand in hand.¹⁵ Two months later, The Nation returned to this same point with a statement of approval for the speed with which a convicted murderer in England is executed.¹⁶ On the other hand, The Nation severely criticized the delay in America's executions.¹⁷ The editorial took as its illustration of the preceding contention the twenty-two months delay between the conviction of a murderer by the name of Walter and his execution. Naming such a situation a "scandal," the magazine called for reform in administering our criminal machinery.¹⁸

Moreover, The Nation argued that American justice tends to be too

13. Ibid., p. 384.

14. Editorial, "Labor and the Law," The Nation, XCVI (May 22, 1913), pp. 515-516.

15. Editorial, "Crime and the Law," The Nation, XCI (August 11, 1910), p. 116.

16. Editorial, "Crime and the Law," The Nation, XCI (November 3, 1910), p. 409.

17. Editorial, "Our Criminal Machinery," The Nation, XCIV (February 1, 1912), pp. 100-101.

18. Ibid., p. 100.

lenient in the matters of securing and admitting evidence of guilt. First, an editorial satirized the law that no person shall be compelled in any criminal case to testify against himself. Arguing that the law had its origin in the days of the Stuarts and ecclesiastical trials, The Nation recommended reasonable rather than extravagant interpretation.¹⁹ "To strengthen that [our criminal] procedure is one of the crying needs of our national life and is at last coming to be so recognized."²⁰ The second illustration of The Nation's editorial policy of recommending greater severity in regard to evidence occurred in an editorial which strongly advocated the admission of circumstantial evidence in securing conviction for murder. Referring to sensational murder trials then current in Virginia, Massachusetts, and California, The Nation flatly stated in regard to the accused persons, "All must be convicted on circumstantial evidence."²¹

Its fourth type of illustration of the importance of strictness in law enforcement was in The Nation's interpretation of a report concerning the efficacy of the Chicago Juvenile Court. Published at the end of the first decade of the court's existence, the report, according to the interpretation by The Nation, showed that children cannot be dealt with as isolated units, but must be considered as organic parts of families and neighborhoods.²² On the basis of this information, the editorial offered two conclusions: the juvenile court is but a temporary help for trouble;

19. Editorial, "The Criminal's Privilege," The Nation, XCII (February 2, 1911), p. 106.

20. Ibid., p. 107.

21. Editorial, "Circumstantial Evidence," The Nation, XCIII (November 9, 1911), p. 438.

22. Editorial, "The Children's Court," The Nation, IOV (August 15, 1912), p. 139.

the main work of the children's court is to preserve the family intact.²³

Research further shows that under More's editorship The Nation consistently criticized evidence of a tendency toward sentimentalism toward criminals. On the basis of the number of editorials devoted to the subject, the evidence indicates that the magazine placed sentimentality toward criminals in second place as a cause for crime.

The first illustration of the preceding statement is the argument in an editorial already mentioned, which by clear implication identifies humanitarianism with sentimentality.²⁴ Under the title, "Humanitarianism and Crime," the editorial calls attention to the failure of Police Chief Kohler's Golden Rule Plan in Cleveland, including the idea of an indeterminate sentence plan, yet the editorial does support the idea of segregation and special treatment of youthful culprits and the development of the probation system as "one of the most beneficial of recent advances" in the treatment of offenders against the law.²⁵

The Nation expressed a warning against allowing sentimentality to weaken penal administration. The Nation admitted that there might be no harm in the establishment of such reform methods as the juvenile courts and the probation system, "even though the encouragement were drawn from exaggeration." Still the editorial was unequivocal in its statements of belief that institutions of penal justice are fundamentally sound and that any softening of their administration only leads to more crime.²⁶ "Many

23. Ibid., p. 140.

24. Editorial, "Humanitarianism and Crime," The Nation, LXXXIX (November 18, 1909), pp. 478-479.

25. Ibid., p. 479.

26. Editorial, "The Punishment of Crime," The Nation, XCII (May 18, 1911), p. 496.

students of penology, both in this country and England, believe that a considerable part of the crime of recent years is to be attributed to this sentimental enfeeblement of criminal administration."²⁷ In the matter of fraudulent financial operations, The Nation found refutation for the theory that society, rather than the individual, is responsible for crime.²⁸ The editorial praised Taft's refusal to pardon the convicted "bank-wreckers," More and Walsh. The fact was pointed out that these men had had every advantage of education and wealth. The Nation insisted that their crime not only discredited the "notion" that society and not the criminal is responsible for crime but also the "notion" that reform and not deterrence must be regarded as the object of punishment.²⁸

The fourth exposition of the danger of sentimentality regarding criminals, concerned expressions of public sympathy for a murderer.³⁰ The Nation satirized the sending of expressions of "human interest" to "a boy" who at twenty-five was the murderer of his wife; moreover, the editorial attributed this public reaction specifically to the sentimental reporting of the trial. Thus The Nation condemned the sensational and sentimental press for encouraging crime.

The Nation rejoiced in the confession of the McNamarae concerning the

27. Ibid., p. 496.

28. Editorial, "Bank-Wrecking and Clemency," The Nation, XCII (June 1, 1911), pp. 547-548.

29. Ibid., p. 548.

30. Editorial, "Sentimentalism and Crime," The Nation, XCIII (November 30, 1911), pp. 514-515.

bombing of the Los Angeles Times Building.³¹ It also happened that confessions from the murderer mentioned in the preceding paragraph and from a murderer in Massachusetts occurred in the same week. These three confessions, the editorial stated, should be a "rude and healthy shock" to the sentimentalists. From this conclusion, the editorial moved to a definition of the origin of the sentimental attitude. "The sentimental attitude is a survival of the anarchistic instincts which thousands of years of civilization have failed to eradicate in us. It is the instinct which is always 'agin' the government, rather than for the man whom society accuses of having violated its laws."³²

Closely connected with the criticism which The Nation expressed concerning sentimental reporting was its criticism of writers who, carelessly or otherwise, portray marriage as a passing convention rather than a fundamental fact in human society.³³ The occasion for this editorial was the widely publicized suicide of two young people who "had decided to defy what the writers call the 'convention' of society." In its consideration of "The Right to Happiness," The Nation rejected the phrase as sentimental nonsense. "The individual has no 'right to happiness' other than such right as is consistent with the happiness and well-being of all mankind."³⁴

In the case of Ollie Taylor The Nation found an illustration of "amazing credence."³⁵ According to newspaper reports, the editorial

31. Editorial, "Crime and Confession," The Nation, XCIV (January 11, 1912), p. 29.

32. Ibid., p. 29.

33. Editorial, "The Right to Happiness," The Nation, XCIV (February 8, 1912), p. 128.

34. Ibid., p. 128.

35. Editorial, "The Case of Ollie Taylor," The Nation, XCVI (May 29, 1913), pp. 540-541.

stated, Ollie, at ten years of age, had been sentenced to prison for eleven years for stealing a bottle of soda water. The reading public was indignant. Further investigation showed that Ollie, who had stolen consistently while he was on probation, had been sent to a county industrial farm. In the public willingness to condemn the court and to sympathize with the delinquent, The Nation read a dangerous sentimentality.

The one instance in this particular series of editorials in which The Nation took the viewpoint that lawlessness was actually decreasing in New York was in 1913.³⁶ One of the three reasons cited for the alleged improvement was that at least temporarily there was less "humanitarian" demand for not punishing the criminal.

On the basis of the number of editorials published, The Nation named corruption, at least in 1912 and 1913, as the third major cause for crime. The magazine interpreted the shooting of the gambler Rosenthal by Police-Lieutenant Becker as being illustrative of the "unprecedented degree" to which murder was being systematized in New York.³⁷ Asserting that too many members of the police force were the tools of crime, The Nation recommended swift and sure punishment of Becker as a deterrent to other officers. "When the certainty of punishment is balanced against the profits of murder, the assassin's trade will be sharply checked."³⁸ When the jury returned the verdict of murder in the first degree, The Nation hailed the judgment as a most "tonic event."³⁹ The following year an editorial again pointed out police corruption as a cause for crime, with the

36. Editorial, "Reinvigorating the Criminal Code," The Nation, XCVI (January 23, 1913), pp. 72-73.

37. Editorial, "The Murderer's Trade," The Nation, XCV (October 17, 1912), p. 349.

38. Ibid., p. 350.

39. Editorial, "The Becker Verdict," The Nation, XCV (October 31, 1912), p. 400.

statement that corrupt police officers contributed more than economics to the cause of the prostitute.⁴⁰ Moreover in its campaign against commercialised vice, The Nation praised the Flexner report on prostitution in Europe.⁴¹ "Mr. Flexner has dealt a shrewd blow to the theory that toleration, official approval, and medical inspection form the really scientific method of dealing with prostitution."⁴²

The Nation also attributed prevalence of vice in New York to corrupt municipal officers as well as to a corrupt police force.⁴³ While the editorial conceded the point that vice might not be so great in New York as in some cities and that economics might be a factor involved, still the article stressed the point that vice in New York in 1912 was a force in the city government and that vice was able to continue by "settling with Tammany."⁴⁴

The nine remaining editorials dealing with causes of crime are largely individual articles on varying causes rather than a series of articles concentrated upon a single cause.

Public indifference and undesirable family environment as causes for crime were each the subject of two editorials in The Nation between 1909 and 1914. In reviewing a current article in Cosmopolitan magazine on the subject of army desertions, The Nation took the point of view that deserting the army is not considered by the public to be a criminal act.⁴⁵ In other words, The Nation saw public indifference to crime as a cause of crime.

40. Editorial, "Demoralising Talk of Morals," The Nation, XCVI (March 13, 1913), pp. 248-249.

41. Editorial, "A Real Social Evil Prevalence," The Nation, XCVIII (January 22, 1914), pp. 75-76.

42. Ibid., p. 75.

43. Editorial, "Vice and Government," The Nation, XCV (December 26, 1912), pp. 605-606.

44. Ibid., p. 606.

45. Editorial, "Army Desertation" The Nation, XC (September 1, 1910), p. 181.

Further, public indifference to a lack of a sense of honesty in the individual, The Nation noted, is illustrated in the fact that scoundrels succeed in rising in politics.⁴⁶

Relatively little space was devoted to any consideration of the effect of home environment in the problem of crime. Only two editorials deal with this factor, although in each case the point of view is clearly stated. The first reference is a summary of a report by a committee of social workers, indicating a belief that moral, educational, and social influences, and defects in character are the primary causes for girls' accepting a life of prostitution.⁴⁷ A similar, though somewhat more specific, statement in a later editorial bore out The Nation's acceptance of the theory of the importance of early environment.⁴⁸ "To circumstances, then, and particularly to the home environment and the home education, must be traced in large measure the failure of an individual to come up to the requirements of a respectable life."⁴⁹

Other possible causes for crime were mentioned in single editorials. The first of these articles, chronologically, was an evaluation of Lombroso's theory of the part played in criminality by congenital physical attributes. The editorial dismissed Lombroso as unsound, incapable of seeing the limitations of a theory, and tending to accept dogma with inadequate evidence.⁵⁰ As far as society is concerned, the editorial pronounced Lombroso's theory dangerous.

46. Editorial, "Other Americans Who Rise," The Nation, XCII (March 2, 1911), p. 208.

47. Editorial, "Soberness and Progress," The Nation, XCVII (July 3, 1914), pp. 4-5.

48. Editorial, "Heredity, Environment," and Duty, The Nation, (February 2, 1914), pp. 127-128.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

50. Editorial, "Lombroso's Work," The Nation, LXXXIX (October 21, 1909), pp. 374-375.

Regarding the criminal as a special type of human race, and placing responsibility for his acts upon his heredity and environment would result in a gradual but steady undermining of the whole notion of personal responsibility for crime or immorality... For the everyday man it is sufficient to know that the cases are extremely few in which the criminal impulse is so deep-seated and imperative as to be utterly beyond the reach of what for want of a better name we call the will.⁵¹

The church was also named for failure to maintain responsibility to prevent crime. Referring to outbreaks of rioting in connection with dock strikes in London, Liverpool, and Manchester, The Nation accused the church of having neglected its duty in that it had "more and more drawn away from the classes in which, it now appears, rowdies and incendiaries have been created wholesale."⁵² Furthermore, the editorial argued that the example of politicians shouting defiance of the law might well have an exceedingly unfortunate influence.⁵³ "Determination not to submit to the will of the people is of the essence of hooliganism."⁵⁴ The third editorial lists lack of moral character rather than any economic theory of morals as a primary cause of crime. "Above all we must cling to the fundamentals of character and the old moralities, come what will."⁵⁵ The fourth and last editorial in this group points out the danger of maintaining an inadequate police force. Discussing the need for State Police in New York the article maintained that the breakdown of the sheriff system was obvious

51. Ibid., p. 375.

52. Editorial, "The Making of Hooligans," The Nation, XLIII (September 7, 1911), p. 205.

53. Ibid., p. 206.

54. Ibid., p. 206.

55. Editorial, "Demoralizing Talk of Morals," The Nation, XCVI (March 13, 1913), p. 249.

both in preventing crimes and in apprehending criminals.⁵⁶

Institutions Named by The Nation as Responsible for Combating Crime

Research shows that The Nation specifically named eight institutions, or groups, as being responsible for combating the social problem of crime. These eight institutions, or groups, may be divided into two classes: those which The Nation listed from three to six times each, and those which The Nation listed but once. In the first group appear the officers of the law, the prisons, the criminal courts and the press; in the second group, army officers, political leaders, the U. S. Mails, and the home.

On the basis of number of references made in its editorial columns, 1909 to 1914, The Nation placed officers of the law in the position of the group having the greatest responsibility for combating crime. This point of view is expressed in six different articles printed during the period under consideration. The fact that the city of Cleveland was able to report in 1909 that crime had decreased in the preceding two years was the result, in the opinion of The Nation, of intensified efforts on the part of the police.⁵⁷ Two years later, in connection with the bombing of the Los Angeles Times Building, the determination of the District Attorney of Los Angeles to hold both of the McNamaras guilty was judged by The Nation to be a most commendable attitude, one which "placed the whole country in his debt... Such a clear cut conception of the sworn officers of the law, it is refreshing to encounter."⁵⁸ Labor Leader William D. Haywood, accord-

56. Editorial, "The State Constabulary," The Nation, XCVIII (January 1, 1914), p. 5.

57. Editorial, "Sanitarianism and Crime," The Nation, LXXXIX (November 18, 1909), p. 478.

58. Editorial, "The McNamaras and After," The Nation, ICIII (December 7, 1911), p. 538.

ing to The Nation, frankly admitted that the bombings represented war on society.⁵⁹ The reply of The Nation was an unqualified demand for retaliation. "Those who make war upon society must be prepared to suffer the consequences; and on the other hand those who stand for the defense of society, and not for its surrender, must be prepared to inflict, or to sanction the infliction of, the penalties which war decrees. In civil war there is no room for neutrals."⁶⁰ The fourth and fifth reference to the necessity for loyalty to duty on the part of officers of the law was clearly implied in The Nation's editorials on the subject of the murder in New York of Rosenthal by Police-Lieutenant Becker. From the beginning, editorial demand was for punishment of corrupt officers.⁶¹ Then, following the trial, The Nation praised the judgment against Becker as representing a conviction that was necessary for public safety"... a demonstration that the weapons of the law are sharp enough and strong enough to cut through the network of collusion of police with crime."⁶² The sixth and last editorial on the importance of officers of the law in the prevention of crime was an expression of approval for the plan that New York establish a state police force.⁶³ The Nation supported the project, first, on the grounds of need. The editorial argued that the sheriff system had broken

59. Editorial, "Philanthropy and Murder," The Nation, XCIV (January 4, 1912), p. 5.

60. Ibid., p. 5.

61. Editorial, "The Murderer's Trade," The Nation, ICV (October 17, 1912), pp. 349-350.

62. Editorial, "The Becker Verdict," The Nation, ICV (October 31, 1912), p. 401.

63. Editorial, "The State Constabulary," The Nation, XCVIII (January 1, 1914), pp. 5-6.

down to the extent that it was no longer able to prevent rural crimes or to apprehend offenders. Causes listed for the existing situation included changed traffic conditions and a heterogeneous population. Second, The Nation supported the project of a state constabulary on the grounds of economy. Calling the estimated cost a bargain, the editorial concluded with this statement: "Crime is the most costly thing with which a state has to deal. It always spells outgo and no return."⁶⁴

The second largest number of editorials dealing with an institution responsible for combating crime was devoted to a consideration of prisons. Five articles discuss the purpose and possibility of improvement of penal institutions. Four of the five articles combine a statement of belief that imprisonment is, and must be, a deterrent with a statement of belief that there may be limited possibilities for reform in the parole and probation systems. This combined viewpoint is clearly made, for example, in the editorial which adversely criticizes the idea of the indeterminate-sentence plan. "To support this idea is to forget that the primary object of imprisonment is the deterring of others from crime by the fear of punishment."⁶⁵ Yet the article does conclude with a statement favorable to the theory of segregation and special treatment of youthful culprits and calls the development of the probation system one of the most beneficial of modern advances in penal reform.⁶⁶ A second illustration of the same attitude appeared six months later. In connection with the Federal Parole Bill,

64. Ibid., p. 6.

65. Editorial, "Humanitarianism and Crime," The Nation, LXXIX (November 18, 1909), p. 479.

66. Ibid., p. 479.

The Nation admitted that the parole was suitable for minor offenses and for a large proportion of first offenses but was unequivocal in its statement of belief that for such crimes as murder, rape, incest, and fraud, any convicted criminal should be kept in prison for one purpose: "...that knowledge of the dire punishment which society thinks it necessary to impose for his crime may prevent others from committing it."⁶⁷ The Nation attempted to answer current criticism that our procedures in treatment of criminals had been worse than useless. On the question of more humane methods than imprisonment, The Nation expressed the rather guarded opinion that there might be no harm in encouraging the juvenile courts, the probation system and genuine reformatory methods. The editorials insisted, however, that the value of these reforms must be limited.⁶⁸ "Take away or undermine the feelings that institutions of penal justice, whatever their defects, are fundamentally sound, and you cannot fail to make their administration less energetic and more uncertain."⁶⁹ In 1913, The Nation took occasion to commend what appeared to be an improvement in the administration of criminal law in New York. In this connection, the editorial represented approval of farm labor colonies and urged the employment of a better type of men as prison officials,⁷⁰ yet the editorial concluded with The Nation's consistent recommendation, the need of prisons to deter people from crime. "But so long as the varieties of men are what they

67. Editorial, "An Important Bill Hastily Passed," The Nation, XC (May 26, 1910), p. 528.

68. Editorial, "The Punishment of Crime," The Nation, XCII (May 18, 1911), XC 496.

69. Ibid., p. 496.

70. Editorial, "Reinvigorating the Criminal Law," The Nation, XCVI (January 23, 1913), p. 72.

are, it would be madness to overlook or belittle the primary function of the penal system" -- the function of deterrence."⁷¹ On the question of the caliber of prison officials, The Nation had already spoken. In September, 1911, a conference of Governors had devoted some time to a consideration of prison questions. It seemed to be admitted that many county prisons were a reproach to the country. In this respect, The Nation recommended that more careful attention be given to the quality of the prison officials and denounced the system of selecting prison officials on a basis of politics. "To make guardianship of wretches a reward to party workers and 'ward healers' is a hideous monstrosity."⁷²

The Nation devoted three editorials to argument for the need of greater efficiency in the procedures of criminal courts of the United States. Contrasting the speed of the work of the English criminal courts with the slowness of American, The Nation decided in favor of the English method.⁷³ A few months later, The Nation substantially repeated the foregoing opinion. "To strengthen that procedure [that of the criminal court], to make it efficient and impressive, is one of the crying needs of our national life and is at last coming to be so recognised."⁷⁴ The most specific recommendation concerning the overcoming of slowness of procedure in criminal courts was in connection with a twenty-two months' delay between the date of conviction in a murder trial and the date of execution.

71. Ibid., p. 72.

72. Editorial, "The States and their Prisons," The Nation, XCIII (September 21, 1911), p. 258.

73. Editorial, "Crime and the Law," The Nation, XCI (November 3, 1910), pp. 409-410.

74. Editorial, "The Criminals' Privilege," The Nation, XCIII (February 2, 1911), p. 107.

The Nation called this delay a national "scandal" and concluded that the duty of removing such a scandal "rests upon public spirited members of the bar."⁷⁶ In other words, while The Nation recognized the criminal court as an institution very responsible for the duty of combating crime, it criticized the American criminal court for yielding much of its potential strength through its dilatory procedures.

On three occasions The Nation either clearly implied or definitely stated that the press has a responsibility for combating crime. In the first instance, the magazine denounced the sentimental reporting of a murder trial in Virginia, since the result seemed to be the arousing of misplaced sympathy for the criminal.⁷⁶ In the second instance, The Nation criticized the "want of thought or looseness of language" by which writers seemed to be encouraging young people to defy the "convention" of marriage.⁷⁷ The implication is clear. Since The Nation took the stand that sentimental reporting and dishonest writing tended to produce sympathy for the criminal or even to lead to crime, The Nation stood for unsentimental reporting and honest writing as means of preventing crime. In fact, the third editorial in this group bears out the foregoing conclusion.⁷⁸ In April 1913, an editorial was printed in praise of the conditions which seemed to indicate that lynching in the South was diminishing. The Nation attributed the change to the fact that the Southern press was against lynching and con-

75. Editorial, "Our Criminal Machinery," The Nation, XCIV (February 1, 1912), p. 100.

76. Editorial, "Sentimentalism and Crime," The Nation, XCIII (November 30, 1911), pp. 514-515.

77. Editorial, "The Right to Happiness," The Nation, XCIV (February 2, 1912), pp. 127-128.

78. Editorial, "Murder and the Law," The Nation, ICVI (April 3, 1913), pp. 326-327.

cluded that as leaders of the community the various publications would be able to kill the prejudice that results in lynching.⁷⁹

On four other occasions, The Nation referred in a single editorial to an institution or group of people as having a responsibility for combating crime. The first group so named was army officers. In referring to the matter of frequency of army desertions, The Nation recommended that officers be held responsible for the desertions, "or, in other words, for the happiness of their commands."⁸⁰ Second, in connection with a wave of lawlessness in England, The Nation pointed out the danger from the determination evinced by men in high places to denounce, or to refuse to obey, the law. "And it behooves us all, especially those set in authority, to see to it not only that the laws be upheld, but also that no example of disrespect for the law, no prompting to brutality, no glorification of might above right, come from above."⁸¹ Third, The Nation criticized the refusal of the United States Post Office Department to allow the findings in 1911 of the Chicago Vice Commission to be sent through the mails.⁸² This criticism was based on the theory that the report should be used for educational purposes. "Now, people have come to realize that under proper conditions this question must be debated and studied precisely as people have discussed the scourge of consumption."⁸³ Last and with brevity, The Nation indicated

79. Ibid., p. 327.

80. Editorial, "Army Desertions," The Nation, XC (September 1, 1910), p. 182.

81. Editorial, "The Making of Hooligans," The Nation, XCIII (September 7, 1911), p. 206.

82. Editorial, "Discussing the Social Evil," The Nation, XCIII (October 5, 1911), pp. 308-309.

83. Ibid., p. 309.

a belief in the theory that the home as a social institution has a responsibility for combating crime.⁸⁴ "To circumstance, then, and particularly to the home environment and the home education, must be traced in large measure the failure of an individual to come up to the requirements of a respectable life."⁸⁵

84. Editorial, "Heredity, Environment, and Deity," The Nation, XCVIII (February 5, 1914), pp. 127-128.

85. Ibid., p. 128

Tabulation of References in Editorials of The Nation, 1909-1914, on the
Subject of Crime

Total Number of Editorials	Total Number of Editorials on Crime	Number of Times Any Given Cause is Listed	Number of Times Any Given Institution is Listed as a Possible Deterrent or Other Preventive	
1204	41	Ineffectual Criminal Pro- cedures 13	Officers of Law Prisons	6 5
		Sentimen- talism 8	Criminal Courts	3
		Corruption 4	Public Press	3
		Public In- difference 2	Army Officers	1
		Home En- vironment 2	Example of People in Authority	1
		Congenital Causes 1	U. S. Post Office	1
		Church 1	The Home	1
		Example of Authorities 1		
		Lack of Moral Character 1		
		Inadequate Police Force 1		

Summary, Chapter VI, Part B

From the foregoing survey and tabulation, it is obvious that during 1909-1914, The Nation, in the main, supported long established concepts as to the cause of crime and the treatment of criminals, but in each area there is some evidence of more modern concepts.

The first evidence of this changing point of view is apparent in the fact that The Nation expressed divergent opinions on the philosophy of punishment itself. The major opinion is two-fold: that the primary function of the punishment of criminals is to deter other people from acts of crime; and that prompt prosecution, conviction, and punishment of criminals are not only the responsibility of the agencies of law enforcement but also are characteristic of effective agencies of law enforcement. On the other hand, editorial opinion wavered between recommendations for avoidance of undermining criminal administration through the adoption of "humane" methods, and recommendations for the establishment of juvenile courts, segregation of young criminals, and use of the parole and probation systems.

The second evidence of a changing editorial attitude exists in the naming of the causes of crime. The cause most frequently listed was that of the alleged failure of the agencies of law enforcement to uphold the law and to prosecute the criminals with sufficient severity. The second cause listed was that of the alleged encouragement to criminals by humanitarian attitudes; however there is some evidence that editorial opinion of The Nation recognized the causes of crime to be complex rather than simple and sociological as well as individual. Illustrations of this changing point of view occur in the brief attention that is given to public indifference, physical maladjustments, or inadequate homes as possible causes for crime.

The third illustration of the conclusion is to be found in the editorials on prevention of crime. The Nation interpreted the duty of crime prevention to be, in the main, an institutional rather than a community responsibility. As a result of this point of view, The Nation looked to the agencies of law enforcement to supply a program of careful surveillance and strict punishment; however, there is some evidence that The Nation was beginning to recognize preventive potentialities existent in other agencies, including constructive newspapers and adequate homes.

Aside from this evidence that editorial opinion of The Nation was in a state of transition concerning causes for crime and possible treatment of criminals, there is some evidence that The Nation was aware that modern inventions had made society more complex; hence the recommendation that an earlier form of police organization in local units needed to be superseded by a force with at least state-wide authority.

Extent of Agreement between Point of View of More, as Expressed in His Essays 1904-1937, and Point of View of The Nation, as Expressed in Its Editorials, 1909-1914

The evidence indicates that the arguments on the causes of crime and the treatment of criminals, as expressed in the essays and the editorials, tend to be in agreement rather than in disagreement. Both bodies of writing strongly support the theory that crime represents the failure of the individual to make moral choices, but both also recognize the possibility that environment affects the behavior of people. More included undesirable childhood environment, incompetency in the agencies of crime prevention, and humanitarian attitudes toward criminals among the sociological causes of crime. The Nation included the complexity of modern society,

incompetency in law enforcement agencies, and humanitarian attitudes toward criminals.

Essays and editorials were also substantially in agreement in their recommendations for the prevention of crime and treatment of criminals. Both stressed the importance of moral responsibility in the individual, but both also indicated the belief that social institutions bear a share in the responsibility. The importance of the agencies of law enforcement was especially stressed. More urged the necessity of providing an adequate environment for children. The Nation noted this point briefly. Both expressed the belief that education should be a means of crime prevention. More argued that the schools should accept the teaching of respect for law and order as a primary duty. The Nation charged the public press with the same responsibility.

CHAPTER VII
ON HUMANITARIANISM

Part A - More's Comments on Humanitarianism as a Social Force

Extremes of divergent reaction were called forth by More's writings on humanitarianism. To his admirers, More in opposing humanitarianism as a social goal demonstrated an economic and sociological acumen far in advance of his times. To his critics, More was a reactionary who had no concept of the needs of modern society.

One of the most strongly expressed defenses of More's anti-humanitarian tenets is to be found in Shafer's Paul Elmer More and American Criticism. Shafer distinguishes between the necessity for men who live together in communities to be bound together in a sense of "fellow-feeling" and the necessity for setting up "material well-being or comfort as the ideal of mankind."¹ Shafer scornfully denies the assumption that everybody will be "good" when the feeling of economic insecurity or the sense of economic inequality is removed. Shafer further maintains that More reasoned logically as to the ultimate results of the social philosophy of humanitarianism. "Thus as Mr. More perceived, when it was much less obvious than it is today, humanitarianism melts into, and is finally indistinguishable from, Marxian Socialism, or as it is now called, communism."²

The champions of humanitarianism, on the other hand, were unhesitating

1. Robert Shafer, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism, p. 105.
2. Ibid., p. 105;

in their denunciations of More's views. His statements regarding the attitudes and efforts of Jane Addams were dismissed by Cory as being "close to libel."³ More's opposition to humanitarian programs, in general, was criticized by Hicks as representing "an indirect defense of capitalism."⁴ The whole New Humanist group was characterized by Cowley as having "no social program."⁵

Since the extent to which the humanitarian aim should be carried out in society is still a controversial topic, and since there are such varying estimates of what More meant, it seemed necessary to include a study of More's own statements on the subject.

The following questions were selected as a basis for research:

1. To what historical or philosophical origins, if any, did More trace the concept of humanitarianism?
2. What relationship, if any, did he indicate between humanitarianism and humanism?
3. In what instance, if any, did he express an opinion for, or against, humanitarianism as a constructive social force?
4. Was More's opinion of humanitarianism consistent and sustained? Did it seem to be a major interest?

Philosophical and Historical Origins

An examination of More's writings indicates that he attributed the concept of humanitarianism, philosophically and historically, to four

-
3. R. E. Cory, "Aristocracy and Justice," Review, The Dial, LXI (October, 1930), p. 18.
 4. Granville Hicks, The Great Tradition, p. 250.
 5. Malcolm Cowley, "Humanizing Society," The Critique of Humanism, ed. Hartley Grotz, p. 68.

major sources: certain teachings of Christianity, certain aspects of the Romantic Movement, certain political and economic theories of the nineteenth century, and modern scientific thought.

In "The Religious Ground of Humanitarianism," More traces the idea of the brotherhood of man to the teachings of Christ, but More also states that the concept of humanitarianism actually represents an unfortunate mingling of the religious instinct with worldly policy. He further argues that the results of this union are "equally responsible for the 'nihilism' of Tolstoy and the collectivism of Karl Marx."⁶

More attempted an explanation of his charge of "confusion of religious instinct with worldly policy." In discriminating between the various elements that enter into Christianity, More placed the spiritual phase, faith, hope, and love at one extreme, and the code of prohibitive morality the Decalogue, at the other extreme. In between these two extremes, he placed "a body of positive or spiritual morality which bears directly on constructive sociology."⁷ By spiritual morality More meant the virtues of humility, non-resistance, perfect poverty, and chastity, the virtues stressed by Christ's own life and teachings. More contended that Christ expected these teachings to be followed by a select few, rather than by society in general, and that these medial virtues are not applicable to society.⁸

The doctrines of Christ if accepted by the world in their integrity--the virtues, that is, of humility, non-resistance, and poverty--

6. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 228.

7. Ibid., p. 231.

8. Ibid., p. 243.

would not institute any such desired revolution in society; they would simply make an end of the whole social fabric; and if to these chastity be added, they would do away with human existence altogether.⁹

Instead of a need for these religious virtues, More indicated a belief in the need for the substitution of certain secular virtues: justice for humility, mercy for non-resistance, liberality for poverty, and temperance for chastity. He argued that failure to discriminate between religious and secular virtues is not only absurd; it is dangerous.

Humanitarianism is just this vague sentimentality of a mind that refuses to distinguish between the golden rule and the precept of Apollo. There are gross and manifest evils in the actual working of the law of competition, no one denies that. But they are to be set right, if right is possible in this world, by a clearer understanding and a more faithful observance of the worldly virtues, and not by the sickly yearnings of sentimentalists. It is still well that we render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.¹⁰

In brief, More named the religious teachings of Christ, although he claimed those teachings had been misinterpreted, as the earliest source, historically, of the concept of humanitarianism.

The teachings of Pelagius, dating from the fourth and fifth centuries, More maintained, furnished the second source. It is an historical fact that Pelagius disagreed with St. Augustine on the theory of total depravity. It is also a fact that Pelagius maintained the argument that it is the human

9. *Ibid.*, p. 243.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 251.

will which takes the initiative and is a determining factor in the salvation of the individual. More maintained that the teachings of Pelagius formed the second source for modern social and religious concepts of humanitarianism. "It was implicit, no doubt, in the first contention of Pelagianism that salvation is primarily the work of man, but it has become the driving force of society only since the notion of a needed reconciliation with God has been quite eliminated."¹¹ More admitted that the evolution of the secular belief in the essential goodness of human nature is difficult to trace, but he also argued that the Pelagian concept of "man's ability to satisfy God" is the mark of modern humanitarianism, not the mark of classical authority or mediaeval theology.¹²

Within the sphere of influence of Christianity, More found a third step, historically, in the evolution of the humanitarian concept. This third step, he believed, was the reaction, especially in America, from the Puritan concept that man is inherently evil.¹³ The reversal in thought, More argued, was natural. He further maintained that the new belief in the essential goodness of man untampered by spiritual ideals led to a spirit of exaggerated sentimentality and the formation of various reforming sects. More's chief criticism seemed to be that the growing spirit of humanitarianism was essentially materialistic.¹⁴

More named the preaching and the social program of the modern church

11. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 218.

12. Ibid., p. 218.

13. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 185.

14. Ibid., p. 187

as the fourth step, as far as religious influences are concerned. His severe criticism of the tendency, as he saw it, to substitute the love of man for the love of God has already been discussed in Chapter III of this study. Yet it may be well to indicate briefly again the fact that More held the clergy largely responsible for the change which he called a loss of faith.

In the age of the Revolution, the church, both Catholic and Protestant, was still strongly entrenched in the old beliefs and offered a violent resistance to the substitutions of humanitarianism for responsibility to the priest and to God. Now this last barrier has been almost swept away. Indeed not the least remarkable feature of this literature is the number of clergymen who are contributing to it, with their constant appeal to the New Morality as the test of faith.¹⁵

The effects of the teaching of Rousseau and the German romanticists were listed by More as representative of philosophical causes for the evolution of the concept of humanitarianism. More argued that the attempt to maintain Christianity in a nihilistic society had failed, that belief in the supernatural had perished. He continued with the statement that when this change had occurred, the only defense left for those in authority was "the humanitarian exaltation of the humble and common and undistinguished, in itself a kind of simulacrum of Christianity."¹⁶

Among the English literary men who were prominent in the Romantic Movement, More singled out Wordsworth for special criticism.¹⁷ He believed Wordsworth was never able to reconcile the "still sad music of humanity"

15. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, pp. 205-206.

16. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 178.

17. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. #4.

with the dreary intercourse of daily life and that the Lake poet was so much the victim of illusion that he substituted reverie for judgment. In addition, More clearly implied his belief in a certain inadequacy in Wordsworth, whom he discussed as a typical humanitarian. "... and it is worthy of remark that Wordsworth, who mused so pathetically on the lot of the dalemen about him, had no power of entering into their individual lives and was commonly distrusted by them."¹⁸ In other words, More claimed that Rousseau's teachings of the innate goodness of man and the natural conflict between the individual and society coupled with the efforts of the romanticists had been a strong impetus to the growth of the concept of humanitarianism as a social force.

As the third type of cause for the evolution of the concept of humanitarianism, More took into account certain political and economic factors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He identified socialism, equalitarianism, humanitarianism, and, possibly, democracy, as all being terms representative of the same philosophy.¹⁹ The contributing political factor of the nineteenth century especially noted by More was Cobden's theory of laissez-faire. Cobden of course is remembered for the repeal of English Corn Laws, for a mutual reduction of the tariff between England and France, and for continued activity in the cause of peace. He is also remembered for advocating the policy of laissez-faire in industry. He opposed early reformers of the factory system on the grounds that he disapproved of the principle of government interference. On various occasions,

18. Ibid., p. 39.

19. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 119.

More spoke alightingly of the "Manchester School" of economics and even attributed to its policies a retaliatory growth of liberal tendencies. "The reaction from that heartless trust in let-alone is felt today in the humanitarian palterings with the laws of retributive justice and in the excess of Socialism."²⁰

The characteristic of twentieth century economics which More discussed as contributing to the spread of humanitarianism was the growth of the power of labor in an industrial civilization. More stressed this point in his review of Poole's The Harbor, a novel setting forth the paralyzing force of a strike in the harbor of New York. The Harbor tends to express considerable sympathy for the cause of the strikers. In his unfavorable review, More interpreted Poole's description of the strike as an illustration of his own belief that workers are bound together in bonds of fear and hatred. He further interpreted the attitude of liberal employers as the "humanitarian repentance" of the "intelligent and successful."²¹

Modern scientific thought, according to More, provides another basis for humanitarianism. He noted that under the influence of Darwinism the concept of change and evolution had carried over in popular thinking from biology into sociology.²² Thus people thought to see the same law of progress in regard to the future and the perfectibility of man which they be-

20. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fifth Series, p. 73.

21. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 251.

22. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 254.

lieved had worked in the past. "Hence have arisen the manifold dreams and visions of socialism, altruism, humanitarianism, and all the other isms that would fix the hope of mankind upon some coming perfectibility of human life and like Prometheus in the play have implanted blind hopes in the hearts of man."²³ More characterized humanitarian sympathy as one illustration of modern scientific "worship of change."²⁴

In the last volume of the New Shelburne Essays, More attacked modern psychology for what he considered to be its elimination of the supernatural, even to the extent of elimination of the idea of a personal God and personal salvation. He asserted that modern psychology had contributed to the growth of materialism, or, in other words, to the growth of humanitarianism. Dualism versus monism was one of the questions concerning which More and John Dewey were in disagreement. More contended that modern psychology "preyed on the intellectual defeat and spiritual dismay of the times" and saw man as "a slave of temperament, or a mechanism propelled by complexes and reactions, or a vortex of sensations—with no direction of purpose to rise above the influences that carry him hither and thither."²⁵

Relationship Between Humanism and Humanitarianism

Twice in his career, More published a statement indicating his views concerning the difference between humanism and humanitarianism. The first statement appeared in 1909; the second, in 1936.

23. Ibid., p. 254.

24. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 266.

25. Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 6.

In 1909, as a footnote to his essay on Rousseau, More recognised publicly his agreement with and indebtedness to the thinking of Irving Babbitt. "The place of egotism and sympathy in Rousseau's system and the general distinction between humanism and humanitarianism have been discussed fully and incisively in Irving Babbitt's Literature and the American College. I take pleasure in recording my large indebtedness to that work."²⁶

Such a clear announcement makes necessary an inquiry into Babbitt's distinction between humanism and humanitarianism, since More, by his own statement, accepted the general distinction made by Babbitt.

Literature and the American College is, as the sub-title indicates, a collection of essays in defense of the humanities. As far as this summary is concerned, the first two essays suffice. They represent an attempt not only to define humanism, but also to show how humanism differs from humanitarianism. The author acknowledges the existing confusion (as of 1908) regarding the meaning of the two terms, gives the historical development of both movements, analyses the point of view inherent in each, and sets forth reasons for his own position as a humanist.

Taking the Latin writer, Celsus, as his authority, Babbitt asserts that humanitas originally implied doctrine and discipline and represented an attitude applicable only to a few people; in other words, humanitas represented an attitude that was aristocratic, not democratic, in its implication.²⁷

Babbitt, moreover, found that the classically aristocratic temper,

26. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, footnote, p. 238.

27. Irving Babbitt, Literature and the American College, p. 6.

as exemplified in humanitas, was "intensified" in Renaissance humanism.

"The man of the Renaissance felt himself doubly set above the 'raskall many,' first by his doctrine and discipline and then by the learned medium through which the doctrine and discipline were conveyed."²⁸

According to Babbitt there was considerable difference between the spirit of early and later humanism. He called early humanism an emancipation of the senses, intellect, and conscience. With emancipation, a certain lack of decorum and selectivity in Rabelais is a not unnatural characteristic. With the passing of time, however, a growing selectivity and discipline developed into considerable exclusiveness in such a writer as Malherbe. To Castiglione in Italy and Sydney in England, Babbitt pays special tribute, naming them as illustrative of the "splendid vitality of the Renaissance."²⁹

Men of the later period of humanism, including the neoclassicists, Babbitt continued, aimed at concentration rather than expansion of intellectual development, yet they were also concerned to be humane, to avoid one-sidedness or extreme specialization. Unfortunately this aristocratic temper gradually came to be associated with rank and privilege. "The sense of intellectual superiority was reinforced by the sense of social superiority."³⁰

Whereas the historical origins of humanism were of the classical and Renaissance periods, the beginnings of humanitarianism were, according to

28. Ibid., p. 11.

29. Ibid., p. 18.

30. Ibid., p. 18.

Babbitt, Christian and Elizabethan. These beginnings were Christian, he points out, to the extent that the idea of unselective sympathy came into the world only with Christianity.³¹ These beginnings were Elizabethan to the extent that they are founded in the scientific naturalism of Francis Bacon.³² Scientific humanitarianism, Babbitt argued, inspired the positivist and utilitarian movement, for Bacon believed in the progress of the race as a whole through scientific investigation and discovery.³³ Then in the eighteenth century the writings of Rousseau laid the foundations for sentimental humanitarianism and the romantic movement.³⁴

By the beginning of the twentieth century, according to Babbitt, the word humanism had become confused with philanthropy, associated with the idea of progress. Thus Babbitt came to his definition of a humanitarian as a person "who has sympathy for mankind in the lump, faith in its future progress, and a desire to serve the great cause of this progress."³⁵ Instead of seeking concentration, the humanitarian relies on breadth of knowledge and sympathy. Whereas the humanist would perfect the individual, the humanitarian would elevate mankind as a whole.³⁶

Babbitt maintained that humanitarianism is a dangerous social philosophy. His criticism of scientific humanitarianism is that it would substitute quantitative and dynamic standards for human standards, and his criticism of sentimental humanitarianism is that it would substitute social pity for religious

31. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 41.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

restraint.³⁷

An unrestricted application of the law of love to secular affairs will lead, not to love, but to its opposite, hatred... At this crisis when our crying need is for a humane principle of restraint, the best that our sentimental and scientific humanitarians can evolve between them is a scheme for training for service and training for power.³⁸

In 1936 More presented, for himself, his understanding of the psychological differences between humanism and humanitarianism. The occasion was his review of Norman Foerster's Humanism and America. This book is a symposium which, according to its sub-title, is comprised of "Essays on the Outlook of Modern Civilization."

There are certain points in Foerster's preface which seem to need consideration. The first is his definition of humanism, "a working philosophy seeking to make a resolute distinction between man and nature and between man and the divine."³⁹ Foerster claimed for the book a two-fold purpose: first, to indicate the fundamental needs of America as a dominant world power and inadequate model of civilization in the twentieth century; and, second, to inquire into the fundamental needs of humanism.⁴⁰ Among these needs Foerster included "the interest and efforts of the 'rather considerable leaven of intelligent people.'"⁴¹ Contributors included, among others, Irving Babbitt, Paul Elmer More, T. S. Eliot, and Robert Shafer.

The book received a very favorable review by More, a review which was later included in the third volume of the New Shelburne Essays. More asserted, as a reviewer, that his own contribution had been negligible, since he

37. Ibid., p. 65.

38. Ibid., pp. 66-67.

39. Norman Foerster, Humanism and America, p. vii.

40. Ibid., xvi.

41. Ibid., xvi.

had written nothing new for the symposium.

From the preface and the fourteen essays, More summarized the divergencies between the psychology of the humanist and the psychology of the humanitarian or naturalist. He endorsed the humanist point of view. His first contention was that while the humanist "recognized the materialism and futility" of the times, the anti-humanist "preyed on the intellectual defect and spiritual dismay" of the times.⁴² "The anti-humanist sees man as a slave of temperament, or a mechanism propelled by complexes and reactions, or a vortex of sensations, with no will to govern himself, no center of stability within the flux, no direction of purpose to rise above the influences that carry him hither and thither."⁴³ To illustrate his protest More listed four specific points on which he claimed that monistic and dualistic philosophies were in disagreement. The first difference noted was that while the naturalists consider man to be an animal submerged in the natural law, the humanists consider man, by his very quality of being human, to be set off from the other animals.⁴⁴ The second difference was that while the naturalists consider man to be merely a cog in the machine of the universe, the humanists recognize man as an individual personality, endowed with potentialities of free will and answerable for his choice of good or evil.⁴⁵ Third, while the naturalists consider man's behavior to be the result of a "chaos" of sensations and instincts, the humanists believe that man by exercise of the inner check can restrain his instincts and govern his responses to them.⁴⁶

42. Ibid., p. 5.

43. Ibid., p. 6.

44. Ibid., p. 7.

45. Ibid., p. 7.

46. Ibid., p. 8.

Fourth, while the naturalists accept the theory of man's instinctive total goodness, the humanists see man as a free agent accountable for "defalcations and aberrations."⁴⁷ "The cause of humanism is identical, as we have seen, with the belief in free will and purpose as the traits that distinguish humanity from nature, or, if you will, from the rest of nature."⁴⁸

More's Opinion of Humanitarianism as a Social Force

An examination of More's writings indicates that his comments on humanitarianism as a social force appear rather consistently throughout his writings life. They appear, for example, as early as 1904, and as late as 1936. These comments not only present More's understanding of humanitarianism as a social force, they also present his judgment of the effects of that philosophy upon specific social institutions.

More denied that humanitarianism is a constructive social philosophy. His first argument is that humanitarianism tends to produce a sentimental and materialistic society. He interpreted the ideal of social service as a false emphasis, both in its stress upon the need for physical welfare and in the effects of a program of altruism.⁴⁹ He retorted categorically to Jane Addams' criticism of the inadequacies of individual morality in an age demanding social adjustment. "There is no distinction between individual and social morality."⁵⁰ His disapproval of the humanitarian program establish-

47. Ibid., p. 8.

48. Ibid., p. 17.

49. Paul E. More, The Jessica Letters, pp. 63-72.

50. Ibid., p. 66.

ed at Hull House is illustrated in, "I say that an age to which poverty is only a degradation without any spiritual compensation is an age of materialism."⁵¹ He expressed the fear that an exaggerated concern for material things would eventually lead to a barren and unspiritual way of life, possibly as undesirable as had been the other extreme of Puritanism.⁵² "Now, as the hunger of humanity begins to assert itself unhampered by its own importunate needs, are we to behold a new ideal create in turn another half-civilization, blindly materialistic as its predecessor was harshly spiritual?"⁵³

A decade later in discussing the then comparatively recent changes at Oxford University, More returned to the point of his concept of the prevailing interest in materialistic values. He argued immediately that the literature of Greece and Rome could offer the humane content which he thought necessary to offset the "inhumanity of our scientific absorption," but he again raised the question of what could be offered "to balance the humanitarian absorption in comfort and things of the world."⁵⁴

In an earlier volume he had answered the question at least in a negative way, by saying that the solution of the problem would be obtained through no economic theories ". . . nor under the existing worship of change whether economic theory follows the individualism of Cobden or the Collectivism of Marx, can there be any escape from the present domination of material

51. *Ibid.*, p. 72.

52. Paul E. More, *Shelburne Essays, Second Series*, p. 187.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 187.

54. Paul E. More, *Aristocracy and Justice*, p. 94.

forces."⁵⁵

That More's point of view remained essentially unchanged is evidenced by his statement on the same subject in 1936. The occasion was his arraignment of the modern church for stressing what he called political rather than spiritual teachings. Concerning the social discontent that was common during the economic depression of the 1930's, More again denied the power of material gains to provide human happiness and spiritual contentment.⁵⁶

What we need is rather a clearer perception of, and a firmer insistence on, those immaterial values which it is within the power of every man to make his own, whatever may be the seeming injustice of his material condition. We need rather to emphasise the simple truth that poverty is not the only, or indeed the worst, of mortal evils, that happiness does not consist mainly in the things which money can buy, but the man of narrow means may enrich himself with treasures which only he can give to himself.⁵⁷

In addition to his opposition to humanitarianism as a philosophy of materialism, More condemned the idea of unselective social sympathy as being inherently anarchistic. More made the second criticism in repeated statements extending over a considerable number of years. He believed he had found evidence of his charge of anarchy in two aspects of the philosophy of humanitarianism; its absorption in contemporaneity and its freedom from restraining principles.

The charge of excessive contemporaneity was again directed against the social philosophy of Jane Addams, although this second criticism of Hull

55. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 266.

56. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 141.

57. Ibid., p. 141.

House was written approximately ten years later than the first. He accused Miss Adams of combining a certain vagueness in her concept of integrity with an unjustifiable assumption of originality.⁵⁸ More attributed this assumption of originality to a lack of any sense of roots in history.

"Nothing is more notable in the humanitarian literature of the day than the feeling that our own age is severed from the past and opens an entirely new epoch in history."⁵⁹ In this sense of severance from the past, More read the anarchy of disorder and confusion, and ever "fresh schemes for giving efficacy to the immediate will of the people."⁶⁰

This alleged lack of historical perspective was interpreted by More to be closely related to the second anarchistic force of humanitarianism, that is, the lack of restraining principles. Historically, More returned to Rousseau's inability to accept restraint. More contended that the foundation of sentimental humanitarianism rested on the belief in the original goodness of mankind, as expressed in Rousseau's teachings. In criticism of Rousseau, More argued, "... the union of aggravated egotism with humanitarian doctrine brought about the conviction that the whole human race was plotting his ruin."⁶¹ And More's estimate of the value of Rousseau's theory of the volunte générale was that it was either a vain Utopia or a prophesy of despotism, but that whatever it was, it had had great

58. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Ninth Series, pp. 204-205.

59. Ibid., p. 205.

60. Ibid., p. 207.

61. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 14.

influence in modern civilisation.⁶² In other words More was in disagreement with Rousseau's doctrines, as those doctrines are described in this paragraph, both in relation to their effects upon their originator and upon society in general.

In his consideration of the effects of the forces of confusion, More regarded the teachings of sentimentality to be paralleled in disastrous possibilities by the common belief in the value of change. "Relax these brutal bulwarks /the forces of material dominance/ against the inrush of ungoverned change and the result is simple anarchy."⁶³ This reference to the theory of social progress through change was, of course, More's interpretation of the effects of transferring to the social world of the twentieth century the concept of progress through change developed in the biological science of the nineteenth century. More wrote that he could see no evidence of relief in existing thought for the confusion wrought by constant change. He especially denied the possibility of help from the principle of humanitarian sympathy.⁶⁴

Nor is there real hope from the mitigating influence of that humanitarian sympathy which has accompanied the growth of scientific intellectualism; for such sympathy is but another aspect of the same absorption in change, being an attempt of the individual to flow, so to speak, in the direction of every emotional impact from the world. It contains no power of resistance or principle of restraint, but tends on the contrary to make a more helpless prey of the ever-encroaching flood.⁶⁵

While More charged that a lack of restraint has been a pervading characteristic of humanitarian philosophy, he also accused the humanitarians

62. Paul. E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 236.

63. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 266.

64. Ibid., p. 266.

65. Ibid., p. 266.

of attempting to use the restraint of kind words and of having failed in the attempt. He asserted that the "masters" of society have tried to replace the older concepts of obligation and command with "humanitarian sympathy and love," that they fear the growing power of the "proletariat" who are united not by bonds of sympathy but by bonds of class hatred.⁶⁶

More further denounced the philosophy of humanitarianism by pointing to two happenings which he called results of one phase or another of the social philosophies of scientific and sentimental evolution. First he called attention to the fact that before World War I Germany was fairly generally regarded as the most scientifically efficient country in the world. He maintained that, according to the common faith in the power of science to improve society, Germany most nearly approached the ideal of scientific humanitarianism. Yet she was primarily responsible for the "most hideous war in history."⁶⁷ Second, More pointed to the unrest that exists in modern industrial society. By the standards of the sentimental humanitarians, he argued, society must be united in bonds of sympathy and brotherhood; actually the workers are united in bonds of hatred against the masters of society. The latter try to cover their fear of the proletariat by various forms of "humanitarian repentance."⁶⁸ In other words, in his attempted illustration of his theory that anarchy is an essential part of humanitarianism, More actually made the clear implication that humanitarianism may be a cause for war and for class hatred.

66. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, pp. 251-252.

67. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, p. 250.

68. Ibid., p. 251.

More further attempted to develop his contention that either scientific or sentimental humanitarianism is unsound as a social philosophy by showing the effects of each aspect upon specific institutions in society. Among the institutions, for example, that he used as illustrations were the universities and the church.

His criticism of modern education, especially at the college and university levels, has already been considered at some length in Chapter II of this study. In this particular illustration, then, it is probably necessary only to mention specific instances of More's disapproval. He criticized for example the widely influential philosophy of Pragmatism as being too contemporaneous in outlook.⁶⁹ He deplored the use of the elective system and the shift from the humanities to scientific or quasi-scientific studies as a process that was a manifestation of the idea of social progress through change.⁷⁰ He seriously questioned the goal of much of modern teaching by his reference to "the danger that threatens true progress in any system of education and government which makes the advantage of the ordinary rather than the distinguished man its first object."⁷¹

More's criticism of the modern church has also been considered at some length in a previous chapter. Again, all that is probably necessary here is a statement of the fact that More insisted that the preaching of humanitarianism had eliminated from religion the old beliefs in a personal God and in personal salvation.⁷²

69. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 252.

70. Ibid., p. 256.

71. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 183.

72. Paul E. More, Aristocracy and Justice, pp. 93-93.

Thus More criticized the spirit of scientific humanitarianism as he saw it reflected in education, and the spirit of sentimental humanitarianism as he saw it reflected in religion. Both tendencies, he maintained, were contributing to the materialistic philosophy of the twentieth century.

To combat this spirit of materialism More argued for the necessity of a moral regeneration in mankind. In 1921, he pointed out his fear of the effects of scientific humanitarianism. "Scientific evolution without a corresponding moral evolution, scientific evolution absorbing the thoughts of men to the exclusion of other considerations, has not brought greater control of the savage passions of men, but has simply created more efficient instruments for the use of that passion."⁷³ In 1936, More expressed his scorn of attempting to place physical welfare ahead of personal salvation. "Certainly Christ did not confuse religion with food or think it should be deferred until the hunger of the body was satisfied."⁷⁴

Proportion in Number of Essays Pertaining to Subject of Humanitarianism and Other Subjects Selected for Study

As a basis for determining an answer to the question of whether More showed an interest in humanitarianism that was proportionate or disproportionate to his interest in other social forces, only The Shelburne and New Shelburne Essays were considered. It is true that in addition to the Shelburne Series there are other references in various chapters of this

⁷³. Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, pp. 250-251.

⁷⁴. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 152.

study; for example various other essays were used in the chapter on education, and The Catholic Faith and Pages from an Oxford Diary were used in the chapter on the church. In this chapter on humanitarianism are references to The Jessica Letters, but in determining the answer to this question of proportion, it seemed desirable to use only the writings which had thus far formed a fairly constant basis of reference. The tabulation which follows shows from each volume the total number of essays which carry opinion on the various chapter subjects.

Tabulation from Shelburne and New Shelburne Essays Showing Relative Frequency of Essays Commenting on Education, The Church, Property, Poverty, Crime and Humanitarianism

Volume	No. of Essays Refer- ring to Education	No. of Essays Refer- ring to the Church	No. of Essays Refer- ring to Property	No. of Essays Refer- ring to Poverty	No. of Essays Refer- ring to Crime	No. of Essays Refer- ring to Humani- tarianism
<u>Shelburne Essays</u>						
First Series	4	5	3	9	0	2
Second Series	4	2	2	3	1	1
Third Series	3	1	4	4	1	3
Fourth Series	3	1	5	1	0	0
Fifth Series	4	0	8	5	3	2
Sixth Series	4	5	6	3	0	1
Seventh Series	4	2	6	2	3	2
Eighth Series	5	3	6	1	2	2
Ninth Series	4	5	8	4	2	6
Tenth Series	0	1	4	1	1	2
Eleventh Series	3	3	8	4	0	1
<u>New Shelburne Essays</u>						
Vol. I	2	2	3	1	0	1
Vol. II	0	2	1	0	0	0
Vol. III	0	3	3	2	0	2
Total	40	35	67	40	13	25

Conflicting conclusions seem clear from this tabulation. On the basis of consistency of reference to the subject, More's interest in humanitarianism was a major interest. Of the thirteen volumes under consideration, only one volume fails to contain at least one essay which expresses his opinion concerning humanitarianism as a social force. These essays from 1904 to 1936 cover a span of thirty-two years. There is no evidence that humanitarianism was a subject to which More gave transitory attention. On the other hand, by numerical count the number of essays referring to humanitarianism are in next to last place. There are fewer than half as many essays referring to humanitarianism as there are essays referring to property. From this point of view, More's interest in humanitarianism seems relatively minor.

On the basis of the conflicting evidence, it seems fair to conclude that More showed no disproportionate interest in this particular subject. It is very possible that the criticism which More's writing on this subject aroused was more for the reason that he attempted to resist a popular movement than for the reason that he wrote extensively on the subject.

Summary - Part A

Research indicates that More attributed the origin and growth of the concept of humanitarianism to four major sources: certain teaching of Christianity in the first and fourth centuries, certain aspects of the Romantic Movement in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the theory of laissez-faire and the accompanying industrial exploitation in the nineteenth century, and considerable scientific thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In connection with the Christian religion, More named four contributing sources. Historically, he placed first the teachings of Christ, including especially His stress on humility, non-resistance, poverty, and chastity. More contended, however, that these precepts were never meant to be applied to secular society but were confused with the secular virtues of justice, mercy, liberality, and temperance. Historically, More placed the teachings of Pelagius second. More argued that the Pelagian stress on the importance of the initiative of the individual will in obtaining salvation was the opening wedge to an attitude which put man in first place and failed to recognise any necessity for reconciliation with God. More named the reaction from Puritanism, especially in America, as the third contributing factor and the tendency in ^{the} modern church to preach the brotherhood of man as the fourth.

As a second type of cause, More listed the philosophical thinking of Rousseau and the romanticist writers. He judged the romantic elevation of the poor and humble to be the natural outcome of Rousseau's teachings, both of the natural goodness of man and of the conflict that exists in civilisation between the individual and society.

As a third type of cause, More listed the reaction against the political theories of laissez-faire and the economic exploitation of nineteenth century industrial workers.

As a fourth type of cause More named the effects of modern scientific thought in the fields of biology and psychology, since he claimed that the result had clearly been a popular tendency to believe in the evolutionary perfectibility of man and the corresponding loss of belief in the

necessity for personal salvation.

Babbitt and More together defined the difference between the social point of view of the humanist and the social point of view of the humanitarian. The viewpoint of humanism is selective; that of humanitarianism is equalitarian. The goal of humanism is to perfect the individual while the aim of humanitarianism is to elevate the masses. The humanist would perfect the individual through inculcating in him the culture of the past. The humanitarian would elevate the masses through broad application of the findings of modern science. Humanitarianism as a social philosophy was condemned as dangerous, in that unselective sympathy would lead to class hatred and struggle.

The psychological difference between the humanistic and the humanitarian, or naturalistic, concepts of man was outlined by More late in his writing career. He denied the theory that man is governed only by instincts, emotions, and environmental conditions; instead, More advanced the humanist argument, the belief that man through his will is able to make free moral choices and, hence, to determine the course of his own conduct. The humanist would stress the importance of the quality of being human rather than the importance of the qualities of being animal or of being divine.

More and Babbitt divided humanitarianism into two aspects: sentimental and scientific. More denied the possibility that either or both could be, ultimately, a constructive social force. To sentimental humanitarianism, More attributed a tendency to stress physical welfare and social morality rather than spiritual welfare and individual morality. To scientific humanitarianism More attributed a tendency for over-concern with the present and

the belief that change and progress are synonymous. He argued that from these humanitarian principles flow not brotherly love, but hatred and greed which cause class struggles and war.

More maintained that the effects of the "materialistic philosophy" of humanitarianism are reflected in twentieth century education and religion. The effects in education, he argued, were evident in the elective systems, in the shift in emphasis from the humanities to the scientific and quasi-scientific studies, and in the gearing of education to the ability of the ordinary, rather than the distinguished, student. The effects in religion, More continued, were evident in the general policy of preaching the concept of the brotherhood of man instead of the concept of the need for a personal God and personal salvation.

To combat this spirit of materialism and sentimentalism, More urged the necessity of moral evolution to correspond to scientific evolution, and a return to concern for the spiritual welfare of one's own soul to replace the concern for the physical welfare of one's neighbor. The evidence indicates that More's criticism of humanitarianism was a sustained and consistent interest, although there is no evidence that he devoted a disproportionate amount of space to setting forth this interest.

Part B - The Nation on Humanitarianism

The second part of this chapter is an investigation of the editorials of The Nation during the years of More's editorship to determine what, if any, social criticism this magazine may have expressed on the subject of humanitarianism.

The following questions were selected on a basis of research:

1. To what historical or philosophical origins, if any, did The Nation trace the concept of humanitarianism?
2. What relationship, if any, did The Nation indicate between humanitarianism and humanism?
3. In what instances, if any, did The Nation express an opinion for or against humanitarianism as a constructive social force?
4. Was the opinion a sustained one?

Philosophical and Historical Origins

Research indicates that as far as direct statements are concerned there are no references in the editorials of The Nation, during the years of More's editorship, to the historical or philosophical origins of humanitarianism.

There are, however, comments in connection with the news of the period which may be construed as being implications on the subject of the origins of humanitarian concepts. There is, for example, a clear implication of romantic origins. The Nation censured the so-called sentimental tendency on the part of the public to sympathize with a prisoner accused of, or even worse, convicted of a crime. The editorial criticized this attitude of sympathy as a survival of anarchistic instincts coupled with the Byronic

point of view that "the individual is out of gear with society because society at its best is a clumsy instrument, at its worst a vicious one."¹

It will be remembered that More in The Shelburne Essays had stressed his belief that reaction to the policy of laissez-faire had represented an economic cause for the spread of the concept of sentimental humanitarianism. He had spoken disparagingly of Cobden and Bright and the "Manchester School" of economics. The Nation, on the other hand, ran a eulogistic editorial about Bright on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of his birth. Bright was praised for his devotion to the causes of free trade, democracy, education, and peace "as part of the struggle to procure the benefits of civilization for the struggling masses of mankind."² The article also attempted to deny the reproaches of "littleness of soul and absorption in the immediate profits of the counting house or factory" that had been directed rather commonly against the Manchester School.³ Such notions, The Nation maintained, could be corrected by a study of the life of Bright, who was worthy of such adjectives as sturdy, practical, tender, and magnanimous.⁴

The implications of The Nation as to the place of modern science, in developing the concept of humanitarianism, were definitely critical. Like Babbitt and More, The Nation deplored the extent of the shift in educational emphasis from the humanities to science. In line with this editorial policy, the magazine praised, for example, a statement by President Richard Mac-

1. Editorial, "Crime and Confession," The Nation, XCIV (January 11, 1912), p. 29.

2. Editorial, "John Bright," The Nation, XCIII (November 23, 1911), p. 488.

3. Ibid., p. 489.

4. Ibid., p. 489.

Lauren of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology that science and culture must go hand in hand "to make for that broad liberal outlook in the world that is the mark of a really cultured man."⁵ The article went on to point out the danger of a lack of social training in studies which are primarily materialistic. Most social and political leaders, the editorial maintained, are not from the ranks of the scientists because "... they have locked their doors against the ideals, the imagination, and even the vicissitudes of mankind; because, in a word, they have sometimes forgotten that the heart of education is still the knowledge of men and not of things."⁶

A critical point of view also appeared in the article commenting on the unveiling of a statue in London to Francis Bacon. While the editorial praised Bacon for having exemplified the habits of patient and prolonged inquiry in repeated experiment, it also expressed distrust for certain beliefs concerning science, especially the belief "that instruments of scientific precision will enable us to say precisely what man is and what God is."⁷ The article closed with the statement of belief that while men of science often are tireless workers, they are also sometimes guilty of "overweening vanity."⁸

Relationship Between Humanism and Humanitarianism

During the five years that More was editor, The Nation carried one

5. Editorial, "Science and Culture," The Nation, LXXXVIII (June 7, 1909), p. 598.

6. Ibid., p. 599.

7. Editorial, "The Scientific Atmosphere," The Nation, XCV (July 8, 1912), p. 51.

8. Ibid., p. 51.

editorial article in which a definition of humanism was attempted. The occasion was Livingstone's publication of The Greek Genius and Its Meaning to Us.

On the whole, the review seems to be an attempt to justify humanism as a philosophy by which to live. The review, for example, answers affirmatively the author's question of whether it is right to take a strictly human view of life and assume that man is the measure of all things.⁹ It also agrees with the point of view that no one can do one's duty and live one's life without reference to the unseen.¹⁰ Going even further the review states that while humanism rejects the superhuman, and, in a sense, the supernatural, anyone who assumes that humanism rejects the highest elements of human nature itself has missed the scope of the philosophy.¹¹

The article adds that many writers have confused the word "humanism" with the word "humanitarianism" which is its "very opposite."¹² Thus it seems to become necessary to understand that

. . . virtue is the golden mean of compromise rather than any excess of self-sacrifice, but that the golden mean is rightly known only to him who desires in contemplation to behold the unmoved, all-moving unity. If we forget this composite meaning of humanism, we shall confuse it with the hard dry formalism of the pseudo-classics or with the sentiment of modern humanitarianism.¹³

In addition to its editorial defining humanism, The Nation in some half-dozen articles clearly implied its acceptance of two humanistic principles in education, as those principles were laid down by Babbitt and

9. Editorial, "Humanism," The Nation, XCIV (August 15, 1912), p. 140.

10. Ibid., p. 140.

11. Ibid., p. 140.

12. Ibid., p. 141.

13. Ibid., p. 141.

More: first, the importance of perfecting the culture of the individual; second, the need for study of the humanities in accomplishing individual cultural development.

The Nation on two occasions defended the educational aim of acquisition of the cultural heritage. The first expression was in answer to the question of whether college funds, as a public trust, could justifiably be used to promote individual culture rather than to promote public service.¹⁴ The affirmative reply argued that there is as much justice in diverting public funds, or quasi-public funds, to the liberal education of the individual as in diverting public funds ". . . to build handsome public buildings, to beautify parks, or to acquire works of art, while bad streets, inadequate school houses, and insufficient provision for the poor still exist."¹⁵ The second defense of liberal education was a reply to current criticism that the humanities provide a non-utilitarian education. The Nation argued that culture in spite of criticism by "enthusiastic educational reformers" and by "preachers of humanitarian doctrines" had survived. The editorial continued by evaluating as pseudo-scientific a very recent statement that a knowledge of Latin and mathematics not used in later life actually represented a drain upon the nervous system.¹⁶ As an illustration of its argument that the criticism was unsound, the editorial pointed out the relative difficulty that would be involved in proving that the classical education long provided by the English universities had been

14. Editorial, "The Aim of the College," The Nation, XCI (July 16, 1910), p. 601.

15. Ibid., p. 601.

16. Editorial, "Culture Under Fire," The Nation, XCI (September 22, 1910), p. 258.

useless or dangerous. ". . . it will be hard to explain the splendid efficiency of the Oxford and Cambridge men who have, generation after generation, grappled with the administrative problems of the British Empire."¹⁷

In its replies to two college presidents The Nation made clear its negative stand regarding the possibility that science could replace the classics in providing a humanistic culture. While the magazine praised, as representative of the humanist ideal, the statement by President MacLauren that science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology was being studied and taught to make for a broad, liberal education, yet the editorial expressed doubts as to whether MacLauren's statement was based on realistic evidence.¹⁸ ". . . and if it still leaves undetermined the question whether science can alone effect this kind of culture, we must bear in mind that it was spoken in a school where the lathes leave scant time for Theocritus."¹⁹ The Nation replied still more sharply to President Wilson of Princeton. It took exception to his statement regarding the need for preparation ". . .to be a master-adventurer in the field of opportunity." The Nation's editorial criticized Wilson's point of view as being dominated by a materialistic and contemporaneous philosophy.²¹

17. Ibid., p. 259.

18. Editorial, "Science and Culture," The Nation, LXXVIII (June 17, 1909), p. 598.

19. Ibid., p. 598.

20. Woodrow Wilson, as quoted in editorial, "The Function of the College," The Nation (October 28, 1909), p. 399.

21. Ibid., p. 400.

Are we to admit that "things are in the saddle" so absolutely that to be a gentleman of taste or refinement, or of a generous and unambitious interest in high and beautiful things it to "be nobody"? With all its restless progress and restless changes, there is still we trust room in the world for the quiet and cultivated gentleman; and we do not think it would be going too far to say that the college will lose sight of what is the most beneficent part of its entire activity when it ceases to regard with pride and satisfaction the furnishing of this haven to our overstrung and strenuousness-ridden society.²²

Humanitarianism as a Social Force

The editorials of The Nation, 1909-1914, which deal with humanitarianism as a social force fall into two classifications: those which consider the effects of humanitarianism on government; and those which consider the effects of humanitarianism upon religious and educational programs.

Divergent views appear regarding the subject of humanitarianism as a force in government. On the question of the government of New York City, The Nation on one occasion expressed high praise for the men and women in social service.²³ "Here, then, is a class of unofficial statesmanship which is coming to count more and more in our political life."²⁴ The article credited social service workers with having accomplished much in helping overthrow Tammany, in making the East Side part of the common body politic, and in serving in Mayor Gaynor's administration.²⁵

Yet, four years later, The Nation was critical of reports issued by

22. Ibid., p. 400.

23. Editorial, "College Men in Politics," The Nation, XC (March 17, 1910), pp. 257-258.

24. Ibid., p. 258.

25. Ibid., p. 258.

social workers on the East Side. Taking the stand that social workers tend to magnify in their reports the conditions of crime, vice, and tuberculosis, the editorial maintained that social workers need to reflect on the slanders they commit against the very people they are trying to help.²⁶

On the national scene the social program also drew The Nation's criticism on the basis of mounting cost. The article called attention to the constantly rising demand for expenditures for hospitals, schools, good roads, public health, and better housing.²⁷ Attention was called, moreover, to the new governmental machinery needed to administer old age pensions and workmen's insurance. This condition had been allowed to develop, The Nation argued, because many humane people acted not from fixed conviction but from philanthropic impulse. The article concluded with the warning that ". . . it ought to be clearly understood that every man who advocates a new form of benevolent social activity on the part of the government is really advocating a new tax."²⁸

The Nation was also critical of the growing emphasis upon humanitarianism in the program of the modern church.²⁹ In an editorial concerning the lack of individual conviction of the need to go to church, The Nation ridiculed the possibility that social service could replace effective preaching. While the article admitted that the practice of giving coffee and rolls to a hungry man might represent service to God, it also contended that the

26. Editorial, "East Side and the Under World," The Nation, ICVI (May 1, 1913), p. 435.

27. Editorial, "The Ravenous Social Programme," The Nation, XCII (April 13, 1911), p. 363.

28. Ibid., p. 346.

29. Editorial, "The Mission of the Church," The Nation, ICIV (June 6, 1912), pp. 559-560.

church which stopped with this kind of service was making "ludicrously and pitiably" inadequate use of its resources.³⁰

The point of view of The Nation has been stated in earlier pages of this chapter concerning the possible effects of the principle of substituting a so-called utilitarian education for education in the humanities. The magazine made still more specific recommendations in individual cases. It stood, for example, against the specialized university. "If they /Latin and Greek/ are to take anything like their former position, it will be rather from a common reestimation of their value at the heart of education than from any such artificial separation."³¹ The Nation twice expressed disapproval of the practice of substituting vocational for academic education. On the first occasion, the magazine argued that multiplicity of subjects in the American educational system represents an unjustifiable pride in breadth of learning.³² On the second occasion, The Nation warned working parents not to overstress the importance of vocational education, since education everywhere "is primarily for life and not for livelihood."³³ Recommendations for adult reading were in a similar vein. Busy people, The Nation maintained, should spend a long time, perhaps a year, on a given subject. Authors recommended included Bryce, Carlyle, and Macaulay. The effect, said the editorial, would be to remove the danger of ". . . losing a sense of proportion between the present and the past."³⁵

30. Ibid., p. 560.

31. Editorial, "The Specialized University," The Nation, XC (March 31, 1910), p. 312.

32. Editorial, "Work and Play in Education," The Nation, XCV (September 12, 1912), pp. 228-229.

33. Editorial, "Vocational Education," The Nation, XCVII (July 3, 1913) p. 8.

34. Editorial, "Books for the Busy Man," The Nation, XCV (October 3, 1912), pp. 303-304.

35. Ibid., p. 304.

Proportion in Number of Editorials Pertaining to Subject of Humanitarianism
and Other Subjects Selected for Study

Tabulation from the Editorials of The Nation,

May 20, 1909 - March 12, 1914

Total Number of Editorials	Number Pertaining to Education	Number Pertaining to Church	Number Pertaining to Property and Poverty	Number Pertaining to Crime	Number Pertaining to Humanitar- ianism
1204	128	14	227	41	23

The frequency of distribution would seem to indicate that the maker or makers of the editorial policy of The Nation, 1909-1914, considered the subject of humanitarianism to be of relatively minor importance. In relation to the number of editorials on other subjects considered in this study, the number of editorials on humanitarianism stands in next to last place.

On the other hand, there are editorials pertaining to humanitarianism during each year of More's editorship, except 1914. The number of editorials by years is as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Editorials</u>
1909	3
1910	5
1911	2
1912	3
1913	5
1914	0

On the basis of frequency distribution and on the basis of annual number of editorials, it would seem that the interest displayed by The Nation, 1909-1914, in the subject of humanitarianism, as a social force, was a minor but consistent interest.

Summary - Part B

Comments by The Nation as to origin of humanitarianism as a social force were definitely limited. The magazine offered no direct explanation of a philosophical, historical, or economic background but implied that sentimental humanitarianism showed Byronic aspects of romanticism.

The Nation defined humanism and called it the opposite of humanitarianism. The Nation defended the program of humanistic education advocated by Babbitt and More; namely, the perfecting of the individual through training him in classical culture. The possibility that scientific studies could replace the humanities in developing a person of broad, liberal culture was denied. Toward the program of humanistic studies in the colleges and universities The Nation expressed sympathy, in that it defended the use of public funds for what seemed like individual attainment of impractical education. In this same connection, The Nation criticized extreme emphasis in the universities on utilitarian subjects as being representative of a materialistic and over-contemporaneous attitude.

Editorial opinion was divided on the subject of humanitarianism in politics. One article praised the social service workers of New York City for being a constructive force in city government. Another article carried the warning that national emphasis upon a program of social welfare could

result only in increased taxation.

Regarding the church and the schools, editorial policy was critical. The Nation maintained that as far as the church is concerned no program of social service could adequately replace a program of effective preaching; and that as far as education is concerned, the substitution of utilitarian for academic subjects represented a weakening of the American educational system.

In general the editorial policy of The Nation, 1909-1914, was consistently critical of humanitarianism as a social force.

The evidence indicates that the interest displayed by The Nation in humanitarianism was a consistent but minor interest.

Part C - Conclusions as to Extent of Agreement in Findings of Part A and Part B

An examination of the findings in Part A and Part B of this chapter indicate that there is considerably more agreement than disagreement in point of view. The agreement, moreover, seems to be apparent in major points, such as the relationship between humanism and humanitarianism and the probable effects of humanitarianism as a social force.

In regard to the origins of the concept of humanitarianism, agreement and disagreement, or agreement and lack of comment, are equally divided. More, in agreement with Babbitt, named early Christianity as the religious origin of humanitarianism; the editorials of The Nation made no comment as to religious origin. More stated that romanticism was a contributing factor to the development of humanitarianism; the editorials clearly implied that humanitarianism has a romantic origin. More called humanitarianism a

result only in increased taxation.

Regarding the church and the schools, editorial policy was critical. The Nation maintained that as far as the church is concerned no program of social service could adequately replace a program of effective preaching; and that as far as education is concerned, the substitution of utilitarian for academic subjects represented a weakening of the American educational system.

In general the editorial policy of The Nation, 1909-1914, was consistently critical of humanitarianism as a social force.

The evidence indicates that the interest displayed by The Nation in humanitarianism was a consistent but minor interest.

Part C - Conclusions as to Extent of Agreement in Findings of Part A and Part B

An examination of the findings in Part A and Part B of this chapter indicate that there is considerably more agreement than disagreement in point of view. The agreement, moreover, seems to be apparent in major points, such as the relationship between humanism and humanitarianism and the probable effects of humanitarianism as a social force.

In regard to the origins of the concept of humanitarianism, agreement and disagreement, or agreement and lack of comment, are equally divided. More, in agreement with Babbitt, named early Christianity as the religious origin of humanitarianism; the editorials of The Nation made no comment as to religious origin. More stated that romanticism was a contributing factor to the development of humanitarianism; the editorials clearly implied that humanitarianism has a romantic origin. More called humanitarianism a

reaction from the economic policy of laissez-faire and criticized that policy severely; the editorials made no reference to the possible effects of laissez-faire in the development of humanitarianism but praised the work of John Bright. More called modern scientific thinking the fourth factor in the development of humanitarianism and criticized modern science for its inhuman qualities; the editorials failed to state the place of modern scientific thinking in the development of humanitarianism but did contend that modern science cannot precisely explain man or God. In other words, there is complete or partial agreement in viewpoint in two out of four subjects.

Concerning the relationship between humanism and humanitarianism, agreement is more pronounced. Both the Shelburne Essays and the editorials of The Nation agree that while the terms humanism and humanitarianism are often confused, they are actually opposite in meaning. More and Babbitt subscribed to the idea of the necessity for perfecting the individual; The Nation concurred in this viewpoint. More and Babbitt defined a humanitarian as one who would elevate the masses, has faith in progress of humanity, and would serve that progress; The Nation did not define the term humanitarian. More endorsed the belief that one should govern his conduct by the quality of being human rather than by the quality of being animal or of being divine; The Nation accepted the viewpoint that "man is the measure of all things." More directly stated that humanitarianism is materialistic; The Nation implied that overstress on utilitarian aims would place "things in the saddle."

On the question of humanitarianism as a social force, More and The Nation were in agreement on two out of three points. The point of disagreement was that of the effect of social workers. While More criticized

the work of Jane Addams in Chicago, The Nation praised the "unofficial statesmanship" of social workers in New York. More and The Nation were in agreement in their evaluation of the effects of humanitarianism on the church and on education. They agreed that social service represents an inadequate substitute for the preaching of personal salvation and they agreed that the substitution of scientific and other utilitarian subjects for the humanities represents an unbalanced and excessively contemporaneous educational program.

On the twelve points considered, then, there was complete or partial agreement in eight. It would seem fair to conclude that there was substantial agreement in the point of view expressed by More, in his own writings, and by The Nation, in its editorials, 1909-1914, on the subject of humanitarianism as a social force.

CHAPTER VIII

ON THE ARTIST AND HIS ENVIRONMENT

That the social influence of literature and the literary artist may be considerable is a rather widely accepted opinion, even though that influence probably cannot be objectively measured. More's literary criticism was highly praised by certain scholarly authorities; on the other hand, quite contrary views were also expressed. Farrell, for example, called the outlook of the entire New Humanist group "narrowly academic."¹ Blackmur contended that the New Humanists, as a group, "fail to see that art must be a part of the social order in which it exists."² Because of the divergence in opinion, it seems reasonable to assume that a study of More's social views should include a consideration of his writing on the place of the literary artist as a member of society.

Three questions were selected as bases for research on this aspect of the problem of More's social criticism. The questions follow:

1. According to More what, if any, moral obligation does the literary artist have to society?
2. According to More what, if any responsibility does society have toward its literary men?

¹ James T. Farrell, A Note on Literary Criticism, p. 26.

² Robert B. Blackmur, "The Discipline of Humanism", in The Critique of Humanism, edited by C. H. Grattan, p. 258.

3. What literary artists, if any, does More select as being, or having been, essentially the reflection of their environment?

Moral Obligation of the Literary Artist to Society

An examination of his essays clearly indicates that More considered a sense of morality in the creation of character to be the first responsibility of the writer of fiction, including drama. In this type of achievement, More names Hawthorne and Poe among the few genuine American writers. He also asserted that they worked in a tradition that had been unbroken from Colonial days "...the voice of a stern and indomitable moral character."³ More illustrated his statement by dwelling at some length on the sense of solitude in Hawthorne's writings and indicated a belief that solitude is the universal lot in the modern world. That the sense of solitude and superstition should have found its "deepest expression in the New England heart" was a normal development, More maintained, among the Puritans. He pointed out four reasons for this alleged condition: the persecution and insult which the Puritans had endured in England; the perilous journey to the New World; the attempt to work out a stern purpose in colonizing; and the terrors and difficulties of the wilderness.⁴ Thus, More argued, Hawthorne and Poe se-

3. Paul H. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 53.

4. Ibid., p. 55.

cured an element of force and realism in their work because they wrote from the profound moral experience of their people.⁵

More names a number of writers whom he considers to have been lesser artists in that, in his opinion, they failed to maintain a sense of moral integrity in their work. There are examples among the literary men of various centuries. First, from the point of time, were the Elizabethan dramatists, Beaumont and Fletcher. More called Beaumont a sentimentalist and Fletcher a prostituted genius.⁶ Aside from the indecencies of their language, the real moral indictment against these men, More stated, is that they loosed the bonds of character by failing to portray "...that element of our nature which stands apart from the passions as a governing power."⁷ In other words, they left human nature a bundle of instincts and saw in conduct no law of cause and effect.

Among the nineteenth century writers whom More specifically criticized for a lack of moral integrity were the poet, Thomas Hood, and the novelist, William Sharp. In each case, More accused the author of writing what the popular market would buy, even though the product represented a lower level of work than that of which the man was capable. Hood thus became a humorist for money and wrote "with all the misery of such a conscious degradation."⁸ Sharp, as a servant of the press, wrote in the vein desired by popular magazines and

5 .Ibid., p. 54.

6 .Paul E. More, With the Wits, p. 3.

7 .Ibid., p. 20.

8 .Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, pp. 50-51.

repressed his sense of mysticism and philosophy of nature.⁹ Actually, More implied a similar criticism against a much better-known name of the same century. He attributed, for example, a certain lack of force in Tennyson's In Memoriam to the poet's official attitude of compromise, the compromise between science and religion. After advancing the argument that Tennyson lacked both the simple, objective faith of Milton and the honest questioning of Matthew Arnold, More concludes, "With Tennyson, unfortunately, the task is always to separate the poet of insight from the poet of compromise."¹⁰

Two novelists of the twentieth century listed by More as failing to evince a sense of moral responsibility in delineation of character were Ernest Poole and Theodore Dreiser. Poole's lack of integrity in viewpoint, More stated, was reflected in his failure in The Harbor to speak the whole truth as to what constitutes excellence in character. This excellence, More argued, is not illustrated either by efficiency on the part of masters of men or by the instinctive thrust of the masses struggling for material advantage.¹¹ The critic also expressed disapproval against a whole group of twentieth century writers who seemed to him to be convinced that art has nothing to do with religion or morality.¹² In this group More placed Theodore Dreiser, although he also added that Dreiser's theory of life's unsolvable disorder and brutality

⁹ Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 124.

¹⁰ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 94.

¹¹ Paul E. More, A New England Group and Others, p. 242.

¹² Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 56.

was mingled with the sentimentality of the novelist's rural mid-west origins.¹³ An American Tragedy, More concluded, represents a greater tragedy than its author realized when he chose the title.

If only he had known the finer aspects of life as he knows its shabby underside; if only his imagination had been trained in the larger tradition of literature instead of getting its bent from the police court and the dregs of science; if only religion had appeared to him in other garb than the travesty of superstition and faded fanaticism; if only he had had a chance, he might possibly have produced that fabulous thing, the great American novel.¹⁴

More's charge of immorality in portrayal of character is probably most sharply and consistently expressed in his condemnation of certain so-called decadent writers. It is true that in his first volume More admitted the possibility that there might be some truth in the saying, "The essence of art is to be found in the union of illusion and disillusion",¹⁵ but he maintained that a true illusion, as well as a false illusion, exists in art. This true illusion, More said, occurs in Milton's "Comus" and "Lycidas" and in Shakespeare's Hamlet and Tempest, whereas false illusion exists in the lyrics of Arthur Symonds with their stress on artificial passion. Philosophically, More differentiated between true and false illusion by saying that true illusion "...does not confuse things of the spirit with things of the world", whereas

¹³ Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, p. 68.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 68-69.

¹⁵ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 122.

"...false illusion is blind because there enters into it no faith in the joy of things unseen."¹⁶ Symonds' sense of illusion was condemned by More for being the representation of an "ecstasy of unrest", a "morbid curiosity" and the "terror of satiety."¹⁷ More's strong disapproval of satiety was expressed again in the third volume. "Satiety is the most immoral word in the language."¹⁸ More returned to the subject in the tenth volume of his essays in his consideration of the work of Oscar Wilde. The primary cause, More maintained, for the attitudes of Wilde and his associates was that they lacked any moral philosophy which might have prevented their translating satiety of the flesh into moral fatigue.¹⁹ More saw a possibility of social danger from the decadent writers in that other people might follow their pattern of thinking. "But other men, and this is the whole charge against decadent wit, will be forgetting that art, so long as it is human, must concern itself with the portrayal of character - triumphant or defeated, still character - just as surely as religion is concerned with the creation of character."²⁰

What More had said in his earlier volumes on the subject of immorality in "Art for Art's Sake" he substantially repeated in his last volume of essays. This time he was concerned with the symbolists, in general, and with Proust, in

16. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 127-128.

17. Ibid., p. 139.

18. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 104.

19. Paul E. More, With the Wits, p. 285.

20. Ibid., pp. 303-304.

particular. More categorically stated, "Pure art severed from reality just does not exist."²¹ Then he attempted to answer the question, "What is the matter with Proust?" His conclusion was, first, that symbolism as a reaction from naturalism had come to a great vacuum, and, second, that art must be concerned with the emotions and thoughts and activities of human beings. "Back to the 'life of society' literature must come or perish of inanity."²²

It has become apparent through these repeated criticisms that More held the literary man responsible for the creation of characters in whose conduct the effects of the moral law are apparent. Actually More carried this requirement further, to the extent of holding the literary artist morally responsible for his portrayal of nature. To illustrate this point, More named Thoreau as the outstanding exemplar of a literary man who had written honestly about nature. Thoreau, More contended, sank into no pantheistic reveries, possibly because in the New England of the nineteenth century man's struggle with nature had not been lost in antiquity.²³ Thus, Thoreau still recognized nature as an alien creature who gave her bounty, as she had given it to the Pilgrims, only reluctantly. More accepts without question Thoreau's purpose in the Walden experiment "...to combine the hardness of the savage with the

21. Paul E. More, On Being Human, p. 58.

22. Ibid., p. 67.

23. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 17.

intellectualism of civilized man,"²⁴ Whatever wonder and awe Thoreau expressed in the face of nature, More also accepted and judged Thoreau's feelings to have been essentially the same as those felt by the Puritans in an untried wilderness.²⁵

---and this sense of an awful aloofness, which to a certain extent lay dormant in the early writers, did nevertheless sink deep into the heart of New England, and, when in the lapse of time, the country entered into its intellectual renaissance and the genius came who was destined to give full expression to the thoughts of his people before the face of nature, it was inevitable that his words should be dominated by just this sense of poetic mystery.²⁶

Thoreau's attitude toward nature, More argued, was more wholesome than the attitude of either Wordsworth or Byron. In the reverie of Wordsworth, More saw not only a sense of surrender to the world's defeat but also a misplaced attempt to understand mankind in the elements of nature, instead of in the clamor of society.²⁷ In the admiration of Byron for the force of nature, More saw primarily an expression of the poet's revolutionary tendencies.²⁸ Thus More implies the existence of a certain dishonesty in Wordsworth and Byron in that they read into the manifestations of natural forces their own attitudes toward society.

On three occasions More also expressed his point of view regarding the moral obligations of the critic of literature.

24. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, p. 17. *ibid.* is

25. Ibid., p. 14.

26. Ibid., p. 14.

27. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 47.

28. Ibid., p. 13.

27. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 47.

28. Ibid., p. 13.

centered about the French critic as the writer of the Lundi essays. More called them, "the incomparable Lundis." He claimed for Sainte-Beuve the title of "maitre universel of the century."²⁹ He attributed the achievements of the French critic to the combination of integrity of mind and notable industry. "Sainte-Beuve possessed that inquisitive passion for truth, without which all other critical gifts are as brass and tinkling cymbals."³⁰

More condemned any dishonesty in criticism. On this score, he censured Walter Pater's Plato and Platonism. He admitted that Pater's work should be read by every student of Greek and of life, since the study is a work of art in itself, but he also maintained that the book differs absolutely from Plato "...and is nothing less than a betrayal of a critical trust."³¹ More's third attack on dishonesty in criticism refers to a modern edition of the works of Aphra Behn, a Restoration wit. Saying that the editor in his appraisal had tended to slur over Behn's immoralities, More wrote, "To belittle in this way the importance of ethical truth in literature is to surrender the most decisive instrument in the hands of a critic."³²

Responsibility of Society Toward its Literary Men

More repeatedly stressed the warning that a materialistic society does not create the environment which is conducive to the development of the literary artist. In 1902 this warning took the form of a protest against what More understood to be

29. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 55.

30. Ibid., p. 66.

31. Paul E. More, The Drift of Romanticism, p. 86.

32. Paul E. More, With the Wits, p. 75.

the natural outcome of the "national ideal of wealth."³³ The artist, More explained, is bound to carry out the ideal of the people with whom he lives and works. In a country, then, where money is the most natural expression of the national life, the artist cannot be truly creative. Instead, art becomes a "mere veneering."³⁴ More saw this artistic "venezering" expressed in America not only in books written merely to be sold in great numbers but also in meaningless pictures and houses.

A further evidence of materialism in American art, More contended, was apparent in the literature of humanitarian propaganda.³⁵ This contention, of course, is in keeping with More's belief that the philosophy of humanitarianism is essentially materialistic. While More admitted the possibility that the only serious literary work of the period was in connection with humanitarian concepts, still he refused to grant any permanent value to the writing. He denied, for example, that Markham's work was of lasting importance and condemned humanitarian literature in general for the narrowness of its subject, "...the pathos of despair or the bitterness of revolt."³⁶ Insisting that both of these attitudes were simply a projection of the imagination into the popular ideal of wealth, More

denied the possibility that any artistic renaissance could be

33. Paul E. More, "Wealth and Culture", The Independent, LIV (May 1, 1902), pp. 1058-1062. [V

34. Ibid., p. 1061.

35. Ibid., p. 1061.

36. Ibid., p. 1062.

36. Ibid., p. 1062.

built on sudden and enormous facilities for producing wealth.³⁷

This point of view was extended in a later discussion concerning the purpose of art.³⁸ The essay reviews various historic concepts and controversies on the subject and identifies currently conflicting opinions as being representative of the quarrel between the imagination and the scientific spirit. More questioned the soundness of any extremist belief, regardless of whether that belief represented the theory of "Art for art's sake" or art for social or economic propaganda. Thus he criticized Tolstoy's theory that art exists primarily to transmit feeling from man to man, as another humanitarian, and hence materialistic, concept, destined to be only of utilitarian value.³⁹ "Nor, until some ulterior goal is proclaimed, can I see that the humanitarianism of Tolstoy or of any other doctrinaire saves us from this vicious circle of attempting to unite man for the mere sake of union."⁴⁰

The thesis that art does not thrive in an essentially materialistic environment was defended again by More in his evaluation of what he called the third act of the New England drama.⁴¹ In the first act, he stated, the dogmas of faith had produced the harshly spiritual writing of Cotton Mather. In the second act the shift of emphasis from the conscience to the imagination had provided the source for Hawthorne's art. In the third, the "nervous impotence" of Mrs. Freeman

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1062.

³⁸ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, First Series, pp. 194-215.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

⁴¹ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, pp. 180-187.

had replaced the imaginative isolation of Hawthorne. This "nervous impotence", More concluded, was only the reflection of the "stagnant New England towns filled with frustrate lives", towns which offer no freedom either to life or to literature.⁴²

More considered the problem of the responsibility of society toward its literary men, however, from a positive as well as from a negative viewpoint. His first recommendation was that society should provide a canon of taste for its writers.⁴³ What More apparently meant was that the legitimate functions of the critic should be more widely recognized. More carried this argument to the point of recognizing the critic as a person who would fulfill the social obligation of leading the artist to observe both aesthetic and moral laws;⁴⁴ thus More interpreted criticism as becoming "almost identical with education."⁴⁵

Certain specific writers were listed by More as men who, in his opinion, might have become greater artists if society had provided critical education for them. Among his illustrations were Whittier, Shakespeare, and Fletcher. Concerning the sentimentality of many of Whittier's abolitionist pieces, for example, as well as the uncertainty of Whittier's critical judgment, More noted that above all else the New England poet lacked the sense of discrimination which training provides.⁴⁶

⁴² Ibid., p. 157.

⁴³ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 218.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 233.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 244.

⁴⁶ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fourth Series, p. 34.

In developing his argument of the need for a canon of taste, More defined the ideal situation as that in which the critical atmosphere controls the artist's taste without dulling his impulse by too much deliberation.⁴⁷ Such an atmosphere, More believed, had been created by Boileau about Moliere and Racine. If such an atmosphere could have been created by a Boileau and an Elizabeth, More continued, the work not only of Shakespeare but also of the lesser Elizabethan dramatists might have been of greater consequence. "We should have had our own classics, and not been forced to turn to Athens for our canons of taste."⁴⁸

More's second positive recommendation was in relation to twentieth century America. Just as he had accused Elizabethan England of not having provided a constructively critical atmosphere for her poets and dramatists, he censured the United States of the 1920's for not providing a constructively cultural atmosphere for her humanist critics.⁴⁹ He argued that America needs a recognized center of culture. This recommendation accompanies his statement that such writers as Babbitt, Mather, Frye, and Gass had not received the recognition they deserved. More also expressed the belief that if these men had done their writing in France, they would have become very influential, whereas in America they had remained comparatively unknown.⁵⁰ Among other influences

47. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 69.

48. Ibid., p. 71.

49. Paul E. More, The Demon of the Absolute, New Shelburne Essays, I, p. 75.

50. Ibid., p. 75.

that prevented wide recognition of scholarly American writers, as listed by More, were the size of the country and the indifference of the universities.⁵¹

The Literary Artist as a Reflection of his Environment

While More questioned the complete dependability of Taine's determinist theory of race, culture, and epoch, it is obvious that the American critic, himself, subscribed rather consistently to the belief that a literary artist is the reflection of his own period in history. This conclusion is borne out, for example, in More's critical judgments concerning English writers. In his criticisms of writers of five different centuries, More repeatedly wrote, "He was of his age."

This point of view appears in regard to English writers ranging from the sixteenth through the twentieth centuries. From the Elizabethan Age, the representative artists include Beaumont, Fletcher, and Shakespeare. More, in this illustration, argued that while it is difficult to comprehend the characters in the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, the fictitious characters of the plays are no more difficult to understand than the actual characters of Henry VIII, Mary Stuart, or James I.⁵² The judgment concerning Shakespeare is in the same vein. "He was, after all, a child of his age. There was always present with him that sense of the eternal flux of

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 75.

⁵² Paul E. More, With the Wits, p. 23.

things which is so characteristic of the Renaissance."⁵³

Among the writers of the seventeenth century about whom More wrote critical essays were Browne, Bunyan, Herbert, and Wharton. Sir Thomas Browne is remembered for his Vulgar Errors, the record of his experiments to determine the extent of scientific truth in current superstitions. More regarded Browne's efforts as the result of a "...single idea dominant in his age. The two aspects of that idea were rationalism and science."⁵⁴ In connection with the influence of the times upon a writer, More attributed Bunyan's declining popularity to the theory that the Puritan was too much the product of his own day and place. In other words, Bunyan was too much cut off from the past and the continuity of tradition.⁵⁵ On the other hand, More praised the effect of environment upon George Herbert. Regarding the personal note in the religious lyrics of Herbert, More wrote, "It is one of the glories of Herbert's age that it introduced into poetry that quick and tremulous sense of the individual soul."⁵⁶ Of the profligate Jacobite, the Duke of Wharton, More's judgment was as follows: "If any man of that age exemplified by his activities the current philosophy of the ruling passion, it was His Grace of Wharton."⁵⁷

The list continues with names from the eighteenth cen-

53. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 28.

54. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Sixth Series, p. 160.

55. Ibid., p. 190.

56. Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fourth Series, p. 92.

57. Paul E. More, With the Wits, p. 226.

ture. Sterne was criticized as dishonest, and Fanny Burney as prudish. In each case, More met the criticism with a reference to the author's environment. He attributed Sterne's moral weaknesses to the effects of "a vagrant and Shandean childhood."⁵⁸ He attributed any lack of passion or originality in Miss Burney's novels to the dullness of her surroundings.⁵⁹ "The fact is, she was a victim of that peculiarly British worship of the social order which from the days of Hobbes had been slowly permeating the national consciousness...so that her prudishness and her snobbery became not so much individual as national."⁶⁰ Even Blake was represented by More as having been representative of his times; in this case More admitted that the environmental influences were obscure, yet Blake was the "spokesman of the subterranean streams."⁶¹

More chose two writers as representative of the nineteenth century: Shelley for the first quarter and Tennyson for the Victorian Age. Shelley, according to More, suffered profoundly from the prevailing forces of his age.⁶² "With a childlike credulity almost inconceivable, he accepted the current doctrine that mankind is naturally and inherently virtuous, needing only the deliverance from some outwardly applied oppression to spring back to its essential perfection."⁶³ More

⁵⁸ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Third Series, p. 181.

⁵⁹ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Fourth Series, p. 59.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 59.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 217.

⁶² Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series, p. 7.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 7.

also stated categorically that Tennyson epitomized the official opinion concerning the political, social, scientific, and religious questions of his day. Tennyson was the official voice of the land "...turning its hard affairs and shrewd debates into the glamour of music before flattered eyes and ears."⁶⁴

Of the twentieth century English writers, Kipling was selected by More as the literary artist who was not only the most representative of his people and his age but also the best loved writer of his age.⁶⁵ More advanced a number of reasons for Kipling's appeal. The first is that Kipling actually formulates the experiences and needs of the Anglo-Saxon people in their ever-growing self-consciousness.⁶⁶ Next, Kipling's imperialistic concepts add to the poet something of the stature of a statesman.⁶⁷ Third, Kipling interprets a civilization of iron and steam.⁶⁸ Fourth, his sense of order and obedience are founded in a deep-seated emotional characteristic of his people.⁶⁹ "The Anglo-Saxon race, more than any other, has retained the real temper of Hebraism."⁷⁰

Summary

On the basis of the research presented in this chapter, three conclusions seem clear. First, More's writings indicate a strong conviction on his part that literary men have

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 72.

⁶⁵ Paul E. More, Shelburne Essays, Second Series, p. 105.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 106.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 108.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 109.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 110.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 110.

specific moral obligations to society. For creative writers this obligation includes a recognition of the moral law of cause and effect in the delineation of character, as well as honesty in the portrayal of nature. For literary critics this obligation includes a love of truth and a presentation of honest judgment. Second, More's writings indicate his belief that society, and especially American society, has three responsibilities toward its literary artists: to teach its people that a society which is preoccupied with the acquisition of wealth does not provide an environment which is conducive to the highest development of the artist; to encourage critics to provide a canon of taste for literary artists; and to develop a recognized center of culture, especially for scholarly writers. Third, More's writings show definite evidence that he believed that writers are essentially a reflection of their environment. He illustrated his viewpoint by finding Renaissance complexity of character and sense of change in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Shakespeare; seventeenth century concern for questions of religion and science in Bunyan, Herbert, and Browne; eighteenth century conventionality in Fanny Burney and undercurrents of revolution in Blake; nineteenth century romanticism in Shelley and Victorian compromise in Tennyson; and twentieth century spirit of empire and order in Kipling.

CHAPTER IX
EXTENT TO WHICH MORE'S WRITINGS
WERE RECOGNIZED AS BEING OF SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

The purpose of this chapter is to determine to what extent critical estimates of More attribute any social significance to his writings. One possible field for study is that of the contemporary reviews of his books, but reviews of current publications tend to represent immediate rather than definitive judgment. To obtain a fair survey, then, it seemed necessary to examine evaluations of More's complete contribution as a social critic. For this reason, obituary estimates were also examined.

There are certain limitations that seem reasonable and practical in the use of reviews. Since the bulk of More's social criticism appears in the Shelburne and New Shelburne Essays, reviews that are considered in this chapter are limited to reviews of these two series of volumes. Articles that were expressions of controversial opinion during the literary quarrel of the 1930's are not included, since these articles are concerned with the viewpoint of the whole group of New Humanist critics rather than specifically with More's viewpoint.

Part A - Extent to Which More's Writings Were Recognized by Reviewers as Being of Social Significance

Five questions were selected as a basis for analysis of the reviews. The questions follow:

1. What percentage of the reviews make any mention of More's social criticism?
2. What percentage of the reviews were favorable to his social criticism?
3. What percentage of the reviews were unfavorable to his social criticism?
4. To what extent, if any, do reviews which may be found to express favorable opinions concerning More's social criticism agree in the choice of subjects selected for approval?
5. To what extent, if any, do reviews which may be found to express unfavorable opinions of More's social criticism agree in the subjects selected for disapproval?

Fifty-five reviews of the Shelburne and New Shelburne Essays were examined. Reviews are from the list prepared by Malcolm Young. His bibliography is published by the Frankston University Press. A tabulation of selected items pertaining to Questions 1, 2, and 3 follows:

Tabulation Showing Frequency with which Shelburne Essays and New Shelburne Essays were Recognized as Social Criticism and Frequency of Favorable and Unfavorable Reviews of Social Criticism.

Volume	Reviewed in	Mention of More's Social Criticism	No Men- tion of More's Social Criticism	Favorable Review of More's Social Criticism	Unfa- vorable Review of More's Social Criticism
Shel- burne Essays	The Inde- pendent		X		
First Series	The Nation	X			X
Second Series	The Academy		X		
	The Forum	X		X	
	The Nation	X		X	
Third Series	The Nation		X		
Fourth Series	Philadel- phia Public Ledger		X		
	New York Times		X		
	Putnam's		X		
	Spectator		X		
Series One to Four	Atlantic Monthly	X		X	
Series Five	Outlook		X		
Series One to Five	Athen- aeum		X		
Series Six	Catholic World	X		X	
Series Seven	Academy		X		

Volume	Reviewed in	Mention of More's Social Criticism	No Men- tion of More's Social Criticism	Favorable Review of More's Social Criticism	Unfavorable Review of More's Social Criticism
Eighth Series	The Athen- aeum		X		
	Bookman (London)	X		X	
	Catholic World	X			X
	Current Opinion		X		
	The Dial	X		X	
	The Inde- pendent	X		X	
	New York Times	X		X	
	North American Review	X		X	
	Yale Review	X		X	
Ninth Series	The Dial	X			X
	The Nation	X			X
	The Nation (London)	X			X
	New States- man	X			X
	The Spec- tator	X		X	
Tenth Series	Athen- aeum		X		

Volume	Reviewed in	Mention of More's Social Criticism	No mention of More's Social Criticism	Favorable Review of More's Social Criticism	Unfavorable Review of More's Social Criticism
<hr/>					
Tenth Series (cont.)	The Review	X			X
	The Review	X		X	
	The Spectator	X		X	
<hr/>					
Eleventh Series	The Dial	X			X
	The Independent	X			X
	The Nation	X			X
	The Nation (London)	X			X
	New Republic	X			X
	New York Times	X		X	
<hr/>					
New Sholburne Essays					
Vol. I	Books	X			X
	New Republic	X			X
	New Student	X			X
	New York Times		X		
<hr/>					
Vol. II	Catholic World		X		
	Christian Review		X		

Volume	Reviewed in	Mention of More's Social Criticism	No Men- tion of More's Social Criticism	Favorable Review of More's Social Criticism	Unfavorable Review of More's Social Criticism
Vol. II					
(cont.)	The Cri- terion		x		
	Living Church		x		
	Open Court		x		
	New York Times		x		
Vol. III					
	Books	x			x
	Cri- terion	x		x	
	Living Church	x		x	
	Review of Religions	x			x
	Saturday Review	x		x	
	Theo- lophical Forum	x		x	
	Total Number	Total Number	Total Number	Total Number	Total Number
	55	35	20	18	17

A study of this tabulation seems to justify the conclusion that in his own day More was regarded to some extent as a social critic. Sixty-three per cent of the reviews examined made some reference to More's social criticism, although it

was not until 1913 that his essays were more than occasionally reviewed on the basis of sociological content. In 1913, however, with the publication of the Eighth Series of the Shelburne Essays, reviewers quite generally began to take cognizance of More's social views. This trend, moreover, is apparent in the reviews of all remaining volumes of the Shelburne and New Shelburne groups, except in the case of the second volume of New Shelburne Essays. Lack of comment on social criticism in this volume is to be expected, since the book is primarily a study of the development of Christian thought. While More is generally regarded as a literary critic and philosopher, it also appears that for approximately a quarter of a century his work was evaluated by reviewers in terms of his social criticism.

The preceding tabulation not only indicates that in his own day More was regarded as a social critic; it also indicates that there was considerable division of opinion regarding the soundness of his views. Slightly more than thirty-two per cent of the fifty-five reviews favored More's social criticism; slightly more than thirty per cent rejected it.

Attention to the social problems which More considered is fairly evenly distributed in the contemporary reviews examined. Nineteen topics were discussed in the eighteen reviews favoring More's writing. (One review considered his criticism of two social problems.) These nineteen evaluations are divided in subject as follows: four analyze his comments on education; three, his views on the modern church; three,

his statements on politics and property; three, his attitude toward humanitarianism; and five, his beliefs concerning the relationship of the literary artist to his environment. Of the seventeen reviews in disagreement with More, two consider his criticism of education; two, his views on the church; eight, his writings on politics and property; four, his criticism of humanitarianism; and one, his beliefs concerning the relationship of the literary artist to his environment.

It seems reasonable to assume that a more exact reflection of the judgment of More's reviewers is needed here than the figures in the preceding paragraph show. For this reason specific comments on his social criticism follow.

A limited number of his recommendations concerning education received critical review. In 1913, the Dial supported More by arguing for the restoration of the classics to their former position of importance in the college curriculum.¹

The North American Review agreed with More in expressing disapproval of the growing importance of science in higher education.² The New York Times praised More for exposing tenuous scientific claims.³ A review of a more general nature seven years earlier had praised More's educational views and had attributed to him the ability to serve as an official critic.⁴

¹ W. Peckham, "The Drift of Romanticism", Dial, LIV, (May 16, 1913), pp. 416-417.

² "The Drift of Romanticism", North American Review, CXCVII (May, 1913), pp. 716-718.

³ "The Drift of Romanticism", New York Times, (April 27, 1913), p. 255.

⁴ G. M. Harper, "More's Shelburne Essays", The Atlantic, XGVIII (October, 1906), p. 569.

While the reviews which supported More's criticism of the modern church came at two rather widely spaced intervals, the point of view was the same. The Bookman (London) praised More for his attacks on the effects of romanticism on the social program of the church.⁵ The Living Church recommended "The Church and Politics" in On Being Human to people who were confused by the social and economic problems of the 1930's.⁶ The Criterion agreed that the force of the church must be eschatological not sociological.⁷ The Theosophical Forum characterized More's criticism of the social program of the church as being representative of ripe judgment.⁸

Three reviews supported More's attitudes regarding politics and property. The Spectator (London) called Aristocracy and Justice the high water mark of reflective and critical comment on American life and letters.⁹ The same magazine later saw evidence in More's essay on Halifax that a peculiar bond of understanding exists between the American and the English people.¹⁰ The Review countered an attack by Stuart Sherman on the subject of More's alleged Toryism with the reminder that not only Jefferson but also Washington, Hamilton, and Marshall had contributed to the American tradition of political thought.¹¹

5 W. Barry, "What Was the Romantic Movement", Bookman (London), XLIV (September, 1913), pp. 255-258.

6 B. I. Bell, "The New Volume of the New Shelburne Essays", Living Church, XCV (December 26, 1936), p. 758.

7 P. E. Richards, "On Being Human", Criterion, XVI (April, 1937), pp. 514-516.

8 M. M. Tyberg, "On Being Human", Theosophical Forum, I (June, 1937), p. 472.

9 "Aristocracy and Justice", Spectator (London) CXVI (May 20, 1916), p. 633.

10 "With the Wits", Spectator (London), CXXV (July 24, 1920), p. 189.

11 "With the Wits", The Review, III (September 1, 1920), p. 189.

Three reviews expressed approval of More's criticisms of humanitarianism. The Catholic World called the promises of humanitarianism temporary and illusive.¹² The Independent accepted the humanist theory of perfecting the individual rather than the humanitarian theory of elevating the masses.¹³ The Yale Review carried an article by Irving Babbitt which criticized humanitarianism as a substitute for true spiritual discipline.¹⁴

Five reviews discussed More's writing regarding the relationship between the literary artist and his environment. Both The Nation¹⁵ and the Forum¹⁶ accepted More's interpretation of the debilitating effects of a materialistic society upon New England writers. Two critics supported More's insistence that the artist observe moral standards in his work. Even after More had been called reactionary by various critics, Brander Matthews in the New York Times praised him for continuing to work in the tradition of judging an author's work by the value of its abiding message to mankind.¹⁷ Henry Seidel Canby agreed with More in the latter's interpretation of Proust and Joyce that the "chaos" in their writing was caused by their lack of guiding principles in a society which also lacked guiding principles.¹⁸ Substantially the same thought appeared

¹² Catholic World, LXXXIX (August, 1909), pp. 675-678.

¹³ "Romanticism and its Reaction", Independent, LXXIV (May 29, 1913), p. 1200.

¹⁴ I. Babbitt, "The Drift of Romanticism", Yale Review, III (January, 1914), pp. 386-388.

¹⁵ "Shelburne Essays, Second Series", The Nation, LXXXI (August 3, 1905), p. 104.

¹⁶ Forum, XXXVII (October, 1905), pp. 252-255.

¹⁷ B. Matthews, "Concerning a Cosmopolitan Critic", New York Times (July 10, 1921), p. 9.

¹⁸ H. S. Canby, "Paul Elmer More and Moral Nihilism", Saturday Review of Literature, XV (December 26, 1936), pp. 10-11.

in Criterion which noted More's understanding of modern trends in great but joyless writers.¹⁹

In the main the charge of an undemocratic point of view runs through the reviews which expressed disagreement with More's social criticism. The Dial called More's aims for college education the representation of an aristocratic purpose and an attempt "...to keep in order a tumultuous democracy which may disturb the scholar in his task."²⁰ The Nation (London), ridiculing More's "nostalgia" for the old Oxford with its curriculum dominated by classical studies, said that the Greek ideal represented an attempt to put human evaluation on truth rather than to maintain a conservative habit of mind.²¹

More's criticism of the social program of the modern church did not go unanswered. A review in Books argued that More's eschatological aim if it were implicitly followed would destroy the need for the church as a social institution.²² Review of Religions granted the point that salvation is a personal matter but condemned More's attitude as being representative of "a cold exclusiveness and a Tory hauteur."²³

19 "On Being Human", Criterion, XVI (April, 1937), p. 514.

20 J. M. Murry, "Puritan or Platonist?", Dial, LXXI (August, 1921), p. 241.

21 The Nation (London), XXIX (June, 1921), pp. 473-475.

22 A. Guerard, Sr., "On Being Human", Books, (December 27, 1936), p. 2.

23 H. N. Fairchild, "On Being Human", Review of Religions, II (January, 1938), p. 221.

As far as his treatment of the social problems of property and politics was concerned, More was repeatedly accused of aristocratic or reactionary viewpoints. The Dial review of Aristocracy and Justice accused More of being isolated from the hopes of society through being fundamentally sympathetic with "predatory" capital.²⁴ A review of the same volume in the Nation (London) accused More of showing undue interest in the middle class.²⁵ Francis Hackett's review of the Eleventh Series concluded that More was completely ignorant not only of the struggle to earn a living but even of most human experience.²⁶ More's concept of an "ordered" society in which people would follow and respect their right leaders was questioned by the Nation.²⁷ Stuart Sherman asserted that More showed no interest in the welfare and thinking of the common people.²⁸ More's Demon of the Absolute was called an attempt to teach the "dogma of Control."²⁹ The last volume of New Shelburne Essays was criticized on the grounds of advocating political views that demanded too much obedience with no offer of a constructive program "...as though obedience to stupidity or force were in itself a virtue."³⁰

²⁴ H. E. Cory, "An Aristocratic Voice in the Wilderness", Dial, LXI (June 22, 1916), pp. 17-18.

²⁵ "Aristocracy and Justice", The Nation (London), XIX (May 13, 1916), p. 193.

²⁶ F. Hackett, "Mr. More Moralizes", New Republic, XXIV (April 6, 1921), pp. 163-164.

²⁷ "Natural Aristocracy", The Nation, CI (December 16, 1915), p. 720.

²⁸ S. P. Sherman, "Mr. More and the Wits", The Review, II (January 17, 1920), pp. 54-56.

²⁹ "The Demon of the Absolute", The New Student, VIII (April, 1929), p. 21.

³⁰ G. F. Whicker, "On Being Human", Books, (December 27, 1936), p. 6.

Four of the reviews examined attempted to discredit More's writings on humanitarianism. The earliest, in 1904, dismissed as a lame excuse More's explanation that Jesus' "counsels of perfection" do not require general obedience.³¹ Two reviews in 1921 were also unfavorable. The first satirized More's view that modern society was ill and in need of moral education to accompany scientific education.³² The second disposed of More's criticism of humanitarianism with the remark that Tories are very often right since they never experiment.³³ A review in 1929 of The Demon of the Absolute called New Humanist More a "noble anachronism."³⁴

Among the accusations levelled at the New Humanists during the literary quarrel of the 1930's, the charge of inadequate understanding of modern authors appeared. Frequently this accusation was aimed at the New Humanists as a group rather than at More in particular, but More was attacked in writings other than reviews for his failure to appreciate the psychological and sociological problems of writers, especially modern writers. Adverse criticisms of More's attitude toward literary artists are to be found, for example, in Grattan's A Critique of Humanism, Brooks' Three Essays on America, Calverton's The Newer Spirit, Farrell's A Note on Literary Criticism, Kasin's On Native Grounds, and Hicks' The Great Tradition. These pieces, however, are not reviews.

31 "Shelburne Essays, First Series", The Nation, LXXIX (October 27, 1904), pp. 341-342.

32 "When Right Meets Left", The Nation, CXIII (July 27, 1921), p. 101.

33 "The Religion of the Day", The Independent, CVII (November 12, 1921), pp. 167-168.

34 "Mr. More Speaks Out", Books (January 6, 1929), p. 4

Among the reviews examined, one by Allen Tate in 1928 considered More's criticism of modern authors. Tate granted that the New Humanist was able to point out moral deficiencies in modern authors but maintained that More was unable to understand basic causes for behavior.³⁵

Part B - Extent to Which Obituary Estimates Express Recognition of More's Social Criticism

As was stated in the introductory paragraph of this chapter, it was decided to make some analysis of obituary estimates of More's work to determine to what extent at the time of his death More was recognized as a social critic. In this study obituary estimates include not only obituary editorials but also biographical sketches written on the occasion of the subject's death. This decision was based on the belief that these final estimates would provide judgments that were based on More's complete critical contribution rather than on the critical contribution of a single volume.

The following questions were formulated as bases for research:

1. What percent of the obituary estimates of More's work made any reference to him as a social critic?
2. What per cent of these estimates gave favorable recognition to More as a social critic?
3. What per cent gave unfavorable recognition?
4. What, if any, specific social views in More's writings were most often given favorable recognition in these estimates?

³⁵ "Mr. More, the Demon", New Republic, LVII (December 12, 1928), p. 116.

5. What, if any, specific views were most often criticized adversely?

Twenty-two obituaries and obituary editorials were examined.

The following tabulation shows the sources of these pieces as well as the specific writings which made or did not make any reference to More's social criticism.

Publication	Date	Reference to More's Social Criticism	No Reference to More's So- cial Criticism
American Academy of Arts and Sciences	May, 1938	x	
American Review	May, 1937	x	
American Scholar	Autumn, 1938		x
Boston Evening Transcript	March 9, 1937	x	
Christian Century	March 24, 1937	x	
Commonweal	March 26, 1937	x	
Living Church	March 20, 1937		x
Nation	March 20, 1937	x	
Newark Evening News	March 9, 1937	x	
New Republic	May, 20, 1937	x	
New York Herald- Tribune	March 10, 1937	x	
New York Post	March 9, 1937	x	

Publication	Date	Reference to More's Social Criticism	No Reference to More's So- cial Criticism
New York Sun	March 9, 1937	x	
New York Sun	March 10, 1937	x	
New York Times	March 10, 1937		x
New York Times	March 10, 1937		x
Poetry	September, 1937		x
Princeton Alumni Weekly	March 19, 1937		x
Saturday Review of Literature	March 27, 1937		x
Sewanee Review	Oct. - Dec. 1937		x
Wilson Library Bulletin	April, 1937		x
Total Number of Publications		Total Number of Publica- tions Refer- ring to More's Social Criti- cism	Number of Publications not Referring to More's Social Criti- cism
22		13	9

On the basis of this sampling, it would appear that at the time of More's death, well over a half of the obituary estimates made at least some reference to his social criticism.

Of the thirteen obituaries or obituary editorials which made reference to More as a social critic, there were eight references expressing approval of his fight against a

275

naturalistic and materialistic philosophy of life. Amount of space devoted to this particular aspect of More's social criticism varied from a single statement to a somewhat detailed discussion of that statement. Among the briefer allusions to More's reaction against a philosophy of naturalism were the references to that subject in the Boston Evening Transcript, Christian Century, Newark Evening News, New York Post, and New York Sun. The American Review referred specifically to More's strong reaction against "religionistic humanitarianism" as the most significant point in his Christian thought.³⁶ Commonweal stated that the "chaotic world of the nineteenth century could never, in the light of More's writings, look quite the same again."³⁷ The New York Herald-Tribune editorial was one of the most laudatory.³⁸ Having reviewed briefly the story of the literary quarrel in the 1930's between the New Humanists and the Naturalists, the editorial advanced the opinion that there was an important philosophical significance involved in the controversy. A basic reason that the disagreement received so much public attention, the editorial continued, was that confusion and dissatisfaction are inherent in soulless movements and forces.

One could talk about "forces" - political or economic, or psychological - but all these "forces" were involved in the end in the mystery of the human spirit. In the enormous uncertainty suddenly surrounding us, that had to be recognized. Humanism was dragged

³⁶ G. R. Elliott, "More's Christology", American Review, (May, 1937), p. 44.

³⁷ Editorial, Commonweal, (March 26, 1937), p. 596.

³⁸ Editorial, "Paul Elmer More", New York Herald-Tribune, (March 10, 1937), p. 24.

down into a fad and died; but its significance has lingered beyond the study, woven into the attitude of the times, and Professor More was one of its prophets.³⁹

More's adherence to tradition was favorably mentioned in two obituary estimates. The Nation, of which he had once been editor, in an editorial of divided opinion, concluded with the statement that there was an element of permanent value in More's social and political thinking--that his writings would last "...as long as our swift processes of national growth need to be tempered by an appeal to tradition. He will be remembered more than he was recently read."⁴⁰

Somewhat later, a testimonial in the Proceedings of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences agreed that More had treated political and moral issues in an ultra-conservative spirit, but maintained that it was the integrity of his conservatism which had made enemies for him as well as friends.⁴¹

One whole editorial was devoted to supporting More's humanistic concept of education to perfect the individual.⁴² The New York Sun reviewed More's criticism of the shallowness and crudeness of modern life and literature and the protest which More's judgment aroused. The article gave high praise to More's own scholarship and maturity of mind and prophesied that generations of students would find "mental nourishment" in his writing. "It will be a sad day for the race when his

³⁹ ibid., p. 24.

⁴⁰ Editorial, "The Last Puritan", The Nation, CXLIV (March 20, 1937), p. 313.

⁴¹ Mather, Frank J. Jr., "Paul Elmer More 1864-1937", American Academy of Arts and Sciences, CXII, No. 14 (May, 1938), pp. 368-372.

⁴² Editorial, "Paul Elmer More", The New York Sun, (March 10, 1937), p. 22.

ideal of individual culture has no champions."⁴³

Of the twenty-two obituary articles which mentioned More as a social critic, only two specifically expressed adverse criticism. The Nation's editorial of divided opinion already mentioned argued that More, as a journalist, grew increasingly out of sympathy with the age in which he lived, and hence became reactionary in his social and political thought.⁴⁴ "To him the human was the antithesis of the natural, and for that reason liberalism in politics and romanticism in literature seemed parts of the same great evil--respect for the natural impulses."⁴⁵ The New Republic, which had formerly criticized More for being aristocratic and reactionary, continued to the end in the same vein. It is true that the article recognized More as an independent scholar who had criticized the insincerity and incompetence of the colleges, and as a critic of great culture; but it also interpreted More as a critic so much absorbed in the culture of the past that he could not properly appreciate the culture of the present.⁴⁶ "The same confounded old academic inertia... the same old proprietary interest in the classics which would make them (More and others) unwilling to believe that anything new could have great value."⁴⁷

⁴³. Ibid., p. 22.

⁴⁴. Editorial, "The Last Puritan", The Nation (March 20, 1937), p. 312.

⁴⁵. Ibid., p. 312.

⁴⁶. E. Wilson, "Mr. More and the Mithraic Bull", New Republic, (May 26, 1937), pp. 64-68.

⁴⁷. Ibid., p. 67.

Summary Chapter IX

The evidence clearly indicates that More in his own lifetime was regarded as a social critic. This point of view is supported by the evaluations of More in the contemporary reviews of his books and in the judgments offered by obituary editorials.

The fact that More was regarded as a social critic does not mean that his views were received with uniformity of reaction. Opinion, as indicated by the reviews examined, was rather evenly divided regarding the soundness of his social criticism. More's reviewers who expressed approval of his educational theories supported especially his belief in the necessity for the restoration of the classics to their former position of importance and shared his disapproval of the growing importance of science in higher education. Those reviewers who commented favorably on his essays dealing with the modern church also found the social program of the church materialistic and political. Those who wrote favorably concerning his essays on humanitarianism agreed that a literary phenomenon had expanded into a world movement in which the concept of sympathy was exalted into a substitute for religion. Those who expressed approval of his views concerning the relationship between artist and environment also subscribed to a belief in the danger to the artist of trying to work in a materialistic society and a naturalistic philosophy. Those who defended his politics admittedly defended a conservative point of view.

The summary of the content of the reviews in disagreement with More's social criticism shows that there was considerable agreement in the reason selected for opposition to More. Twelve reviews out of seventeen, for example, expressed the judgment that More's social concepts were undemocratic. His recommendations regarding education, the program of the church, the function of property and government, the significance of humanitarianism as a social movement were all, to some extent, condemned as being fundamentally aristocratic in concept. This tendency to stress a single point of attack may represent greater agreement among the men who disagreed with More than existed among the men who supported him for a variety of reasons, although the number of reviews favoring More was slightly in the majority.

There was in the obituaries examined a greater expression of approval than of disapproval concerning More's social criticism. Fifty per cent expressed agreement with some aspect of More's social comment. His opposition to any philosophy of life which would tend to produce a naturalistic and materialistic society was most commonly approved. Fewer than ten per cent of the obituary articles which made reference to More's social criticism specifically expressed adverse criticism. These two adverse commentaries represented disapproval of More's allegedly reactionary attitudes toward life and literature.

CHAPTER X

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Part A - Summary of Findings

The preceding chapters have presented a somewhat detailed analysis of the social criticism of Paul Elmer More, who is primarily regarded as a literary critic and a philosopher. The evidence makes clear that More's social comments are pertinent to at least six areas of society. A summary of those comments follows.

More as an educational theorist was chiefly concerned with the reformation of education at the college and university levels. His criticism of existing practices and trends included commentary on aims of education, methodology and curriculum. His advocacy of the goals of moral responsibility, human understandings and social, including political, leadership was closely allied to his argument that the humanistic rather than the philological approach was suitable for the proper teaching of classical literature. An enemy of the theory of "education for service and power", as that theory was expounded and followed at Harvard University, More attacked both the practices of the elective system and the prevalence of scientific studies in the undergraduate curriculum. He recommended for the college a common program of humanistic learnings of which Latin and Greek should be the core. Science,

as a professional study, he maintained, belongs in the graduate school in order to avoid early specialization on the part of the student without a background of liberal education.

In his writings relative to the graduate schools, More expressed strong disapproval of the requirements for the doctorate in philosophy. He argued that original contribution is not necessarily a test of scholarship, that too much effort is spent on relatively unimportant material and that extreme specialization tends to divide rather than unify members of teaching staffs.

Administration of higher education was also considered by More to the extent that he recommended that college and university presidents devote their energies to raising the intellectual tone of their institutions rather than to increasing enrollments and to extending physical facilities of plants.

More's consideration of higher education also included criticism of the relatively inadequate financial remuneration and the lack of social distinction which have frequently accompanied teaching. He urged professors for their professional welfare to strive for greater unity in their ranks, and he argued that promotions should be based on excellence of teaching rather than on scholarly writing.

The church as an institution in modern society also received critical attention from More. He consistently disapproved of the modern program of social service which many

churches follow. He insisted that the church has substituted materialistic and pragmatic goals of economic and social betterment for its earlier goals of moral teaching and individual salvation. The change, he asserted, had resulted in a loss in spirituality and in an increase in scepticism; furthermore he found worldly attitudes apparent not only in the congregations but also in the seminaries and the pulpits.

Yet in spite of his disapproval of the policies of the modern church, More supported the belief that society needs a strong church both as a source of hope and as a force for stability. He made three recommendations for increasing the influence of the church: the preaching of individual salvation rather than social service, the preaching of contentment in one's economic lot, and a plan of compromise for an authoritative but not an infallible church.

More's comments on property are probably among his most frequently quoted writings. On the one hand he was labelled as reactionary and fascist; on the other, as soundly conservative and realistic. "Property and Law", which was the target for considerable unfavorable criticism, supports, in general, the economic theory of private enterprise, argues that contractual agreements should be fulfilled by both labor and management, denounces the strike as warfare against property, sanctions special economic prerogatives for the church and the university and names property as the basis of civilized society. More's concern for the welfare of property, including the perpetuation of property, was apparent both in

his recommendation for some kind of class solidarity for certain "white-collar" groups of the middle class and in his disapproval of the establishment in the United States of a federal income tax. He criticized "reform" writers whose work he considered to be subversive of property rights.

More expressed relatively less interest in the effects of poverty. His writings on this subject tend to be limited to the consideration of the effects of poverty upon individuals, especially literary men. His discussions of the effects of both property and poverty, as judged by the frequency and specificity of his comments, decreased considerably after 1921.

His judgment of socialism as a means of combating poverty was an expression of unqualified disapproval. He condemned socialism as being both dangerous to property and unproven as a practical theory of economics. Since he saw in socialism the danger of increasing class hatreds, he dismissed socialistic leaders as demagogues. He recommended four means by which he believed America could avert socialism: a more careful choice of leaders, the development of a counter class-consciousness, the preaching of immortality rather than social service and the recognition of individual responsibility.

More's analysis of social problems also included critical writing on the problem of crime. His commentary falls into two divisions: crime in connection with the life or work of an individual author; crime as a major social problem. As far as individual authors were concerned, More in a majority

of the cases which he discussed in his 1905 to 1910 statements traced the causes of immorality to the effects of undesirable childhood environments. He showed those environments to have been characterized by poverty, intemperance, insecurity and lack of parental guidance. As far as people in general were concerned, More in his 1910 to 1919 writings traced immorality and crime to lack of moral responsibility as well as to undesirable environment. During these later years his concept of "undesirable environment" included the example offered by modern treatment of criminals, sensationalism in the public press and lack of moral training of young people.

At least three of his recommendations for the prevention of crime were in accord with the point of view of modern sociologists. As early as 1905 and as late as 1917 he implied or stated his belief in the need for adequate childhood environment. He recognized the need for competence and justice in the criminal courts. He urged that education both by the schools and by the press recognize a responsibility for developing a respect for law and order.

On the other hand More's acceptance of the importance of the theory of punishment as a deterrent from crime led him to express disbelief in the efficacy of certain comparatively recent practices in the treatment of potential criminals. He distrusted the theory of "social sympathy" as he saw that philosophy exemplified in current treatment of juvenile delinquents; hence he was critical of the work at Hull House in Chicago and of the parole and probation systems.

More's criticism of humanitarianism as a social force was rather widely noted. In his early writing he maintained that he had no quarrel with the goal of economic and social improvement of one's lot except as that goal became elevated into one's primary goal and, hence, became a substitute for a spiritual goal. In his treatment of the subject More traced the origins of humanitarianism to four sources. He called the teachings of Christ and Pelagius the earliest source, the philosophy of Rousseau and the romanticist writers the second, laissez-faire and economic exploitation the third, and modern scientific thought the fourth.

Babbitt and More together made clear their concept of the difference between the social point of view of the humanist and the social point of view of the humanitarian. The viewpoint, they wrote, of humanism is selective; that of humanitarianism is equalitarian. The goal of humanism is to perfect the individual; the aim of humanitarianism is to elevate the masses. The humanist would perfect the individual through inculcating in him the culture of the past. The humanitarian would elevate the masses through broad applications of the findings of modern science. More condemned humanitarianism as a social philosophy because he believed that it was essentially materialistic and that unselective sympathy would increase class hatred and struggle.

More outlined his understanding of the difference between the humanist concept of the dual nature of man and the humanitarian concept of the monistic nature of man. He denied any

theory that man is governed only by instincts, emotions, and environmental conditions; instead, More advanced the humanist argument that man through his will is able to make free moral choices and, hence, to determine the course of his own conduct. The humanist would stress the importance of the qualities of being human rather than the importance of the qualities of being animal or of being divine.

By his own statement, More accepted Babbitt's two-fold division of humanitarianism: sentimental humanitarianism and scientific humanitarianism. To sentimental humanitarianism More attributed a tendency to stress physical welfare and social morality rather than spiritual welfare and individual morality. To scientific humanitarianism More attributed a tendency for over-concern with the present and the belief that change and progress are synonymous.

Twentieth century education and religion, More wrote, reflect the effects of the "materialistic philosophy" of humanitarianism. He saw the effects on education in the elective system, in the shift in emphasis from the humanities to scientific and quasi-scientific studies and in the gearing of education to the ability of the ordinary, rather than the distinguished, student. He saw the effects in religion in the policy of preaching the concept of the need for the brotherhood of man instead of the concept of the need for a personal God and a personal salvation.

To combat this spirit of materialism and sentimentalism, More urged the necessity of moral evolution to correspond to

scientific evolution and a return to concern for the spiritual welfare of one's own soul to replace the concern for the physical welfare of one's neighbor.

As might be expected from a literary critic, More also expressed his opinion regarding the responsibility of the literary man toward society and the responsibility of society toward the literary man. He believed that the obligation of the creative writer is to show a recognition of the moral law of cause and effect in his delineation of character as well as honesty in the portrayal of nature. He believed that the obligations of literary critics are to possess a love of truth and to observe honesty in judgment. He insisted that literature cannot exist apart from society. Society, he stated, has three responsibilities toward its artists: to realize that a society which is preoccupied with the acquisition of wealth does not provide an environment which is conducive to the highest development of the artist; to encourage critics to provide a canon of taste for literary artists; and to develop a recognized center of culture, especially for scholarly writers. On various occasions he indicated a belief that writers are essentially a reflection of their environment.

The evidence based on a sampling of contemporaneous reviews indicates that in his own day More received attention as a social critic. In the reviews favorable and unfavorable reactions to his social criticism are about evenly divided. In the obituary editorials favorable reactions to his social criticism were in the majority.

The evidence presented in previous chapters indicates that there was extensive agreement between the social point of view expressed in More's essays and that in the editorials of The Nation during the years of his editorship. This agreement is apparent in all the areas considered in this study.

In the two bodies of writing there is considerable concurrence of opinion regarding education as a social institution. In their consideration of higher education both essays and editorials strongly recommended the classical curriculum. Both subscribed to a belief in the theory of mental discipline. Both condemned the elective system and both recommended that the colleges establish a program of required common learnings. Both criticized adversely the trend in graduate study toward the doctorate in philosophy. More and The Nation were in agreement as to the need for improving the status of professors and teachers and both indicated a clear concept of the social importance of education.

As far as criticism of the church is concerned, the most obvious agreement is in the points of view that the church as an institution in modern society has become weakened and that primary stress on a social program has been a major cause for the loss of influence. While there were different methods suggested for strengthening the church, the fact that both essays and editorials made such suggestions indicates agreement in the belief that society needs a strong church.

Results of research on the subjects of property and poverty indicate substantial agreement between More's point of

view and the editorial policy of The Nation. Both bodies of writing argued that the safety of property should be maintained and denounced the strike as warfare against property. Both expressed disapproval of the establishment of a federal income tax and expressed solicitude for the economic welfare of certain middle class groups. Both failed to express a sustained interest in the problems of poverty. Both strongly opposed socialism.

The essays and the editorials also show considerable agreement regarding the causes of crime and the treatment of criminals. While both bodies of writing support the theory that crime represents failure to make moral choices, both also recognize the possibility that environment affects the behavior of people; hence both bodies of writing recognize that social institutions bear a share in the responsibility for crime prevention. More urged the necessity of providing an adequate environment for children. The Nation noted this point briefly. Both More and The Nation expressed the belief that education should be a means of crime prevention. More argued that the schools should accept the teaching of respect for law and order as a primary duty. The Nation charged the public press with the same responsibility.

Regarding the question of humanitarianism as a social force, More and The Nation were in agreement on two out of three points. The point of disagreement was that of the effect of social workers. While More adversely criticized the work of Jane Addams in Chicago, The Nation praised the

"unofficial statesmanship" of social workers in New York; but More and The Nation were in agreement in their evaluation of the effects of humanitarianism on the church and on education. They agreed that social service represents an inadequate substitute for the preaching of personal salvation and they agreed that the substitution of scientific and other utilitarian subjects for the humanities presents an unbalanced and excessively contemporaneous educational program.

Part B - Conclusions Regarding More's Social Criticism

From this study of the writings of Paul Elmer More the evidence seems to justify ten reasonably clear conclusions.

More, who was widely recognized as a literary critic and philosopher, was also a social critic. Despite the fact that such general reference works as the Encyclopedia Britannica and the Encyclopedia Americana do not extend to him the name of social critic, the fact remains that eleven of his fourteen volumes of Shelburne and New Shelburne Essays received attention in contemporaneous reviews for their social as well as their literary or philosophical content. A majority of the obituary editorials examined for this study also made reference to one or more aspects of More's social criticism. The fact that More was reviewed as a social critic, however, does not mean that his social criticism was popular. On the basis of the obituaries examined, the evidence indicates that at the time of his death there was considerably less controversy concerning More's social views.

In regard to social problems or to means for social reform, More tended to interpret society in terms of the individual or in terms of the few, rather than to view society en masse. His humanist aim of education was the perfection of the individual. His concept of the purpose of the church was that of helping the individual to attain salvation. He interpreted the problem of poverty through analyzing its effect upon individual authors. He understood the danger of inadequacy of childhood environment in relation to effects on individuals. All of these illustrative attitudes seem consonant with the humanist attitude which More and Babbitt described as selective.

In his criticism of higher education More's opinions ranged from forward-looking to conservative. In 1915, he advocated the adoption by the colleges of a requirement of a body of common learnings with Latin and Greek as the core of the proposed curriculum. While Latin and Greek have not been made the core as More advised, there has been something of a movement in the last twenty years to require a common body of humanistic studies in the undergraduate curriculum. The Chicago Experiment was initiated in 1931 and the St. John's Experiment in 1937. There is no evidence to indicate that either experiment was influenced by More. In at least one respect More's educational thinking was evidently a reflection of his times. In 1909 he severely criticized the elective system as it was followed at Harvard. In December of the same year, The Nation reported that President Lowell

had announced that a plan was being formulated for the abolishment of the elective system. In at least one respect More's educational thinking did not keep pace with that of his times. As late as 1915 he defended the study of Latin, Greek and mathematics for their value as formal discipline, yet faculty psychology by that time had come to be seriously questioned. William James had published his Principles of Psychology in 1890. While this book had offered the first significant challenge to the theory of formal discipline and transfer of training, and while a number of other studies had supported James' findings, More still accepted the earlier point of view.

Regardless of his statement in 1898 that the church retained but a fraction of its former social influence, and regardless of the years of his personal withdrawal from the church, it is clear that More came to recognize society's need of the church. This conclusion is apparent in his recommendation in 1934 that greater unity be a goal and that each individual accept the church even at the expense of some compromise in creed. In his criticism of the studies in the seminaries the implication seems clear that he saw the possibilities inherent in the training school for modification of the program of the church.

More was consistent in his support of capitalism and in his opposition to economic theories hostile to the system of free enterprise. His statement in 1915 that capitalism is necessary for the material progress and stability of society

was essentially repeated in his statement in 1936 that the advent of communal ownership would be accompanied by internecine warfare. There is no evidence to indicate that his opposition to labor's use of the strike as warfare against property was ever retracted.

To say that More had no concept of the struggle involved in earning a living, however, is not completely just to him, despite his lack of sympathy for the methods of organized labor. He voiced a strong expression of interest on behalf of unorganized workers, specifically on behalf of middle class groups represented by such people as teachers and writers, whose financial problems he knew from personal experience. He advocated that such groups find some kind of unifying bond which would help them to become a stronger force in society. The fact that he wrote little on the problem of poverty after 1921 may be construed to represent either a lack of interest in the subject or merely a lack of expression of interest.

As for More's views concerning the problem of crime and the treatment of criminals, it seems fair to conclude that his attitude was more liberal in recognizing the environmental factor when he was discussing the case of an individual than when he was considering people in general.

More made fewer references to humanitarianism than he made to any other subject in his social criticism except the subject of crime, yet his comments on humanitarianism appear in twelve of his fourteen volumes of essays. One may probably conclude that More's opposition to humanitarianism represented

a sustained but not an engrossing conviction. His attitude, however, was at variance with a strong social trend which was upheld by many liberal writers and leaders. More's attempt to promulgate a minority view by advancing Babbitt's rather abstruse definition of scientific and sentimental humanitarianism obviously afforded an effective opportunity for the proponents of humanitarianism to label More as reactionary.

The charge that More was a moralist who did not understand or was unsympathetic to the problems of artists in modern society was not entirely accurate. It is true that he insisted that the artist recognize the moral law of cause and effect in the delineation of character and that the critic recognize the same law in his judgment of literature. It is doubtful, however, that More was too sympathetic with the acquisitive tendencies of man to understand the problems of the creative artist in modern industrial America. On various occasions he interpreted artistic weakness as a reflection of the artist's environment, and he specifically stated his belief that a society which is dominated by a materialistic philosophy is not conducive to the production of great art.

Since More as editor of The Nation from 1909 to 1914 did not write the editorials, this study never attempted to measure the extent of More's influence with the magazine during the years of his editorship. One conclusion, however, seems inescapable. The extent of agreement between More's social point of view and the editorial point of view of The Nation indicates a close parallelism between the social attitudes of the editor and the editorial policies of the magazine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

"A Conservative Utopia," Nation (London), XIX (May 13, 1916), pp. 193-194.

"An American Critic," The New Statesman (London), VII (June 24, 1916),
p. 284.

Babbitt, Irving, "The Drift of Romanticism," Yale Review, III (January,
1914), pp. 386-388.

Literature and the American College. Boston: Houghton
Mifflin Company, 1908.

Romanticism and Romanticism. Boston and New York: Houghton
Mifflin Company, 1919.

Barry, William, "What was the Romantic Movement," Bookman (London), XLIV
(September, 1913), pp. 255-258.

Bell, Bernard I., "The New Volume of the New Shelburne Essays," Living
Church, XLV (December 26, 1936), p. 758.

Brewster, Dorothy, "When Right Meets Left," Nation, CXIII (July 27, 1921),
pp. 101-102.

Candy, Henry S., "Appreciation," Saturday Review of Literature, XV
(March 27, 1937), p. 8.

"Paul Elmer More and Moral Nihilism," Saturday Review of
Literature, XV (December 26, 1936), pp. 10-11.

Chamberlain, John, "Humanism and America," New York Times (February 23,
1930).

Cory, Herbert B., "An Aristocratic Voice in the Wilderness," Dial, LXI
(June 22, 1916), pp. 16-20.

"The Demon of the Absolute," New Student, VIII (April, 1929), pp. 21-22.

"The Drift of Romanticism," North American Review, CXCVIII (May, 1913),
pp. 716-718.

Editorials, Nation LXXXVIII - XCVIII (May 20, 1909 - March 12, 1914).

Elliott, George R., "Mr. More and the Gentle Reader," Bookman, LXIX (April, 1929), pp. 143-147.

_____ "More Christology," American Review, (May, 1937), p. 44.

Fairchild, Moxie H., "On Being Human," Review of Religions, II (January, 1938), pp. 214-222.

Foerster, Norman, "The Drift of Romanticism," Dial, LIV (May 16, 1913), pp. 416-417

Guerard, Albert, Sr., "On Being Human," Books, New York Herald-Tribune, December 27, 1936, p. 6.

Hackett, Francis, "Mr. More Moralizes," New Republic, XXVI (April 6, 1921), pp. 163-164.

Harper, George McLean, "More's Shelburne Essays," Atlantic, XCVIII (October, 1906), p. 569.

Hough, Lynn H., "Paul Elmer More and Our American Civilization," Christian Century, XLI (October 30, 1924), p. 1407.

"Humanism or Conservatism," Nation (London) XXIX (June 27, 1921), pp. 473-475.

"Last of the Humanists," Christian Century, LIV (March 24, 1937), pp. 372-373.

"Last Puritan," Nation, CXLIV (March 20, 1937), p. 312.

Leo, Brother, "Paul Elmer More," Catholic World, CXVI (November, 1922), pp. 198-211.

Matthews, Brander, "Concerning a Cosmopolitan Critic," New York Times (July 10, 1921), p. 9.

More, P. E., "An Absolute and an Authoritative Church," Criterion, VIII (July, 1929), pp. 616-34.

_____ Aristocracy and Justice, Ninth Series, Shelburne Essays. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915.

_____ The Catholic Faith. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934.

_____ "Children's Books," The Nation, CI (December 2, 1915), pp. 651-2.

_____ "Classical Teachers and the Public," Independent, LV (February 26, 1903), pp. 511-13.

_____ The Reason of the Absolute. Vol. I. of New Shelburne Essays. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1928.

_____ The Drift of Romanticism. Eighth Series, Shelburne Essays. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

_____ The Great Refusal. Being Letters of a Dreamer in Gotham. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1894.

_____ Salons and Occasional Poems. New York: Putnam, 1890.

_____ The Ibsen Letters. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1904.

_____ "Lost of Empire," The Nation. LXXXIX (October 22, 1914), pp. 493-5.

_____ "Marginalia: Autobiographical Notes," American Review. VIII (November, 1936), pp. 1-30.

_____ "Milton After Three Hundred Years," The Nation. LXXXVII (December 3, 1908), pp. 542-5.

_____ "Naughty Decade," The Nation. XCVIII (May 14, 1914), pp. 566-568.

_____ A New England Group and Others. Eleventh Series, Shelburne Essays. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921.

_____ "New Stage of Pragmatism," The Nation. LXXXVIII (May 6, 1909), pp. 456-9.

_____ "Old Education and the New," The Nation. CII (June 29, 1916), pp. 694-6.

_____ On Being Human. Vol. III of New Shelburne Essays. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936.

_____ Pages from an Oxford Diary. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1937.

_____ "Pedantry and Dilettantism in the Classics," Independent. LV (February 5, 1903), pp. 338-40.

_____ "Problem of Poverty," Universal Review. VI (October, 1916), pp. 231-45.

_____ "Revival of Humanism," Bookman. LXXI (March, 1930), pp. 1-11.

_____ Rational Approach to Religion. Vol. II of New Shelburne Essays. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934.

_____ Selected Shelburne Essays. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1935.

_____ Shelburne Essays. First Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1904.

- _____ Shelburne Essays. Second Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1905.
- _____ Shelburne Essays. Third Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1905.
- _____ Shelburne Essays. Fourth Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1906.
- _____ Shelburne Essays. Fifth Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1908.
- _____ Shelburne Essays. Sixth Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.
- _____ Shelburne Essays. Seventh Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1910.
- _____ "Some Parallels on Henry Vaughan." The Nation, CI (October 28, 1915), pp. 516-17.
- _____ "Taste and Tradition," Unpopular Review, VIII (July, 1917), pp. 112-32.
- _____ "Teaching of the Classics," Independent, LXV (August 6, 1908), pp. 327-9.
- _____ "Theodore Dreiser, Philosopher," Review, II (April 17, 1920), pp. 380-1.
- _____ "Value of Academic Degrees," Bookman, XXIII (August, 1906), pp. 650-3.
- _____ "Wealth and Culture," Independent, LIV (May 1, 1902), pp. 1058-62.
- _____ "What Are Our Classical Men Doing?" Independent, LV (January 22, 1903), pp. 216-18.
- _____ "With the Wits. Shelburne Essays. Tenth Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1919.
- Norrow, Felix, "The Serpent's Essay, Mr. More as a Social Thinker," Exposition, I (April, 1930), pp. 168-193.
- Hanson, Garham B., "American Criticism and the Fighting Hope," Yale Review, XX (March, 1931), pp. 568-582.
- Murry, J. Middleton, "Puritan or Platonist," Dial, LXXI (August, 1921), pp. 236-241.
- "Natural Aristocracy," Nation, CI (December 16, 1915), p. 720.

- "Paul Elmer More," Boston Evening Transcript, March 10, 1937, pp. 1-2.
- "Paul Elmer More," Commonweal, XXV (March 26, 1937), p. 595.
- "Paul Elmer More," Newark Evening News, March 10, 1937, p. 11.
- "Paul Elmer More," New York Herald-Tribune (March 10, 1937), p. 24.
- "Paul Elmer More," New York Post (March 10, 1937).
- "Paul Elmer More," New York Sun (March 10, 1937), p. 22.
- "Paul Elmer More," New York Times (March 10, 1937), p. 22.
- Richards, P. E., "On Being Human," Criterion, XVI (April, 1937), pp. 514-516.
- "Romanticism and its Reaction," Independent, LXXIV (May 29, 1913), p. 1200.
- "Shelburne Essays," First Series, Nation, LXXIX (October 27, 1904), pp. 341-342.
- "Shelburne Essays," Second Series, Forum, XXXVII (October, 1905), pp. 252-255.
- "Shelburne Essays," Second Series, Nation, LXXI (August 3, 1905), p. 104.
- "Shelburne Essays," Sixth Series, Catholic World, LXXXIX (August, 1909), pp. 675-678.
- Sherman, Stuart P., "Mr. More and the Wits," Review, II (January 17, 1920), pp. 54-56.
- Tate, Allen, "Mr. More, The Demon," New Republic, LVII (December 12, 1928), pp. 116-117.
- Tyberg, Marjorie M., "On Being Human," Theosophical Forum, X (June, 1937), p. 472.
- Wilson, Edmund, "Mr. More and the Mithraic Bull," New Republic, XCI (May 26, 1937), pp. 64-68.
- "With the Wits," Spectator (London), CXXV (July 24, 1920), p. 189.

Secondary Sources

- Babbitt, Irving, The New Lookout. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1910.
- _____ On Being Creative. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932.
- Brooks, Van Wyck, Three Essays on America. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1934.
- Calverton, Victor F., The Newer Spirit. A Sociological Criticism of Literature. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1925.
- Collins, Seward, "Criticism in America," Bookman, LXXI (June, 1930), pp. 241-256.
- _____ "Criticism in America, II," Bookman, LXXI (July, 1930), pp. 400-415.
- _____ "Criticism in America, III," Bookman, LXXII (October, 1930), pp. 145-164.
- _____ "Literary Prophets," Bookman, LXII (September, 1930), pp. 35-44.
- _____ "Where Youth is Turning," Bookman, LXXI (March, 1930), pp. 65-80.
- Dexter, Robert C., Social Adjustment. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
- Dreiser, Theodore, A Book About Myself. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1922.
- Eliot, Thomas S., "Paul Elmer More," Princeton Alumni Weekly, XXXVII (February 5, 1937), pp. 373-4.
- Farrell, James T., A Note on Literary Criticism. New York: Vanguard Press, 1936.
- Foerster, Norman, ed., Humanism and America. Essays on the Outlook of Modern Civilization. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1930.
- Foerster, Norman, Toward Standards. A Study of the Present Critical Movement in American Letters. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1928.
- Grattan, C. Hartley, ed., The Critique of Humanism. A Symposium. New York: Brewer and Warren, Inc., 1930.
- Hicks, Granville, The Great Tradition. New York: MacMillan Company, 1933.
- Kazin, Alfred, On Native Grounds. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1942.
- Keir, Malcolm, Labor's Search for More. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1937.

- Manchester, Frederick and Shepherd, Odell, eds., Irving Rabbitt: Man and Teacher. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1941.
- Marriott, Sir John A. R., Modern England, 1885-1932. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1934.
- Mather, Frank J., Jr., "Paul Elmer More 1864-1937," American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Proc. No. 10 (1938), pp. 368-72.
- Mercier, Louis J. A., The Challenge of Humanism. An Essay in Comparative Criticism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- _____, "The Challenge of Paul Elmer More," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XXXIV (September 1925, June 1926).
- More, Louis T., "Shelburne Revisited," Sewanee Review, XLVIII (October, 1940), pp. 57-60.
- Phelps, William Lyon, "Paul Elmer More." American Academy of Arts and Letters. New York, 1938.
- Shafer, Robert, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933.
- Sherman, Stuart, "The Religion of the Day," Independent, CVII (November 12, 1921), pp. 167-8.
- Spender, John Alfred, Great Britain, Empire and Commonwealth, 1886-1935. London: Cassell and Co., Ltd., 1936.
- Spiller, Robert B. and others, eds., Literary History of the United States. Macmillan, New York: 1948.
- Thorp, Willard, ed., Wrightson from Princeton. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.
- West, Rebecca, "A Last London Letter," Bookman, LXXII (August, 1930), pp. 513-522.
- Wilson, Edmund, "Notes on Rabbitt and More," Nation, CXLII (June 24, 1936), pp. 808-10.
- Young, Malcolm, Paul Elmer More. A Bibliography. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941.
- Zeitlen, Jacob and Woodbridge, Homer, The Life and Times of Stuart Sherman. 2 vol. Murray Hill: Farrar and Rinehart, 1929.
- Zabel, Morton D., Literary Opinion in America. New York: Harper, 1937.
- Zoller, William Otto, The Literary Criticism of Paul Elmer More. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of California, 1945.