AJES Vol. 8 No. 3 APR 1949 pp 239-249

Edward Bellamy and the Spiritual Unrest

By Louis Filler

Edward Bellamy's name almost inevitably conjures up memory of his utopian novel, "Looking Backward, 2000–1887"; it rarely suggests more, and this is a pity. For Bellamy wrote other tales, and essays, too, which are worth the attention of the student of post-Civil War America. It should be better recalled than it has been that before "Looking Backward" made him famous, Bellamy had already achieved a substantial reputation as a teller of fanciful stories. William Dean Howells suggested that he had inherited the mantle of Nathaniel Hawthorne.

Hawthorne was also the author of a utopian novel, or rather a novel about a utopian venture. Although Hawthorne later thought of Brook Farm as the great romance of his life, "The Blithedale Romance" was written in the tone of disenchantment. Yet Brook Farm had asked no more of its tenants than that they cooperate for their mutual benefit. Hawthorne, unlike Bellamy, had no great need for utopias, certainly not to the extent of recapturing in his prose the feeling of high enterprise which had charged the Eighteen Forties. It might be well to remind ourselves how intense was that feeling.

> Whoever has had opportunity [wrote Emerson in 1844] of acquaintance with society in New England during the last twenty-five years, with those middle and with those leading sections that may constitute any just representation of the character and aim of the community, will have been struck with the great activity of thought and experimenting. His attention must be commanded by the signs that the Church, or religious party, is falling from the Church nominal, and is appearing in temperance and non-resistance societies; in movements of abolitionists and of socialists; and in very significant assemblies called Sabbath and Bible Conventions; composed of ultraists, of seekers, of all the soul of the soldiery of dissent, and meeting to call in question the authority of the Sabbath, of the priesthood, and of the church.[1]

All this points directly to the existence of widespread spiritual unrest years before Bellamy came to the front. Subsequently, we will attempt to distinguish between the psychic tone of the Eighteen Forties and of the Eighteen Eighties. For the present let it suffice to note that Bellamy held himself to be a legitimate successor of those whose "socialistic enthusiasm," as he said, ". . . swept the United States . . . and led to the Brook Farm

[1] Ralph W. Emerson, "Essays, Second Series," Boston, 1884, p. 239.

colony and to scores of phalansteries for communistic experiments."[2] It is also appropriate to define the phrase "spiritual unrest" before proceeding further. As used here it refers not only to unrest arising from religious preoccupations, but to all disturbances of the human spirit. The unemployed person and the maladjusted person may be as unsettled in their views and attitudes as one whose cosmic conceptions are unrationalized, and sometimes more so. As long as it is understood that religious motivations can be as potent in human affairs as economic compulsions there need be little ground for debate.

Hawthorne's casual treatment of Brook Farm has been noted. Bellamy, on the other hand, had only accidentally stumbled upon a social panacea which required nothing less than that all Americans accept a kind of Brook Farm mode of living. Yet he became more and more enamored of his discovery, more and more convinced that the Word, as he himself had laid it down in "Looking Backward," was destined to become flesh. In 1875, while reviewing a utopian forecast by John Ruskin, he had asserted that the Englishman's notion would take a thousand years to realize. Now, in 1888, in a postscript to "Looking Backward," he remarked that:

> Although in form a fanciful romance, "Looking Backward" is intended in all seriousness as only forecast, in accordance with the principles of evolution, of the next stage in the industrial and socal development of humanity, especially in this country, and no part of it is believed by the author to be better supported by the indications of probability than the implied prediction that the dawn of the new era is already near at hand, and that the full day will swiftly follow.[3]

Something had happened to Bellamy between 1875 and 1888 which made a heaven upon earth mortally necessary to him—here—now—without further delay. But what made his vision of the year 2000 A.D. so compelling to his many readers? There have been greater utopias than "Looking Backward," including that one by Sir Thomas More which gave them their name.[4] Rousseau's "Social Contract" had an infinitely greater social impact. There are numerous stories, written in the style of "superscientifiction," which populate the world with technological wonders to which "Looking Backward" can offer no competition. And yet "Looking Backward" and its companion-piece, "Equality," have and should continue to have a special place in the history of American society, and to find new

[2] "Edward Bellamy Speaks Again!" Kansas City, Mo., 1937, pp. 132–3.
[3] Edward Bellamy, "Looking Backward," Boston, 1926, p. 334.
[4] Assuming it is a utopia; see Arthur E. Morgan's "Nowhere Was Somewhere," Chapel Hill, 1946.

readers. For they cast a peculiar light on Americans, certainly those of the time in which Bellamy wrote.

I

EDWARD BELLAMY not only inherited the mantle of Hawthorne; he also inherited a New England environment the integrity of which had been challenged by two sociological factors. The first involved a change in the character of American industry, combined with a growing *nationalization* of the problems it created. The second related to the psychic or religious climate in which Bellamy lived. Re-read Emerson's analysis of his own times quoted before; it will be clear that these two factors cannot be separated. They can no more be separated in an analysis of Bellamy's age. It is the contention of this essay that the world of Edward Bellamy represented an extension of that of the Eighteen Forties[5], and that as the earlier period has produced Brook Farms, so the Eighteen Eighties produced the "nationalism" of Bellamy. It is therefore necessary to set side by side the socio-economic and religious milieus of the Eighteen Forties and Eighteen Eighties and compare them.

There can be little doubt that Brook Farm and similar enterprises were to an extent effects of the Panic of 1837. The reason for their appearance, however, was not purely economic. The opening date of Robert Owen's New Harmony colony had been 1825, and other communities based on like principles had flourished even earlier. Perhaps it is not necessary to underscore too heavily the ethical and moral bases of the earlier utopian experiments, or to explain elaborately that they were not opposed to fundamental American experience. The principles which dictated the establishment of the Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Georgia, and other colonies are well known.

The Fourierite colonies were largely middle-class in leadership, and individualistic in origin. They were as much a protest against the business and politics of the Eighteen Forties, as determined an effort to live uniquely, as Thoreau's sojourn in Walden. The Fourierites satisfied every condition of Frederick Engels' definition of the utopian socialist: They were idealists; their enterprises were conceived in reason and eternal justice, rather than in the compulsives of objective conditions; and they did not solicit the

[5] This is, however, not to say that Bellamy's utopia *depended* on those projected in the Eighteen Forties. The differences between literary utopias in pre-Civil War and post-Civil War times are treated—though they could bear further discussion—in Robert L. Shurter, "The Utopian Novel in America, 1865–1900," Ph.D. thesis, Western Reserve University, 1936.

8 16

support of any one economic or social class.[6] They reacted in *opposition* to the middle-class American state, but they did not settle down very far from it. They did not idealize the workers as a class, and their friend Emerson preached a philosophy of self-reliance which, particularly after his death, became the very voice of successful free enterprise.

The importance of the early utopian experiments must not be exaggerated. Hawthorne is noted for his fiction, not for his contribution to Brook Farm. Charles A. Dana, George William Curtis, and others, also made their names elsewhere. If we seek the seeds of a collectivist society in the modern sense, we must look not into the middle-class experiments of the Concord theoreticians or the Fourierites. We must look, rather, into the efforts of those who, like George H. Evans, sought to unite the laboring groups, invoke the power of the State to protect their interests—in short, to compensate them for their individual weaknesses.

Bellamy was a true successor to the New England scribes and idealists of the Eighteen Forties. Like them he was an individualist. The paper utopia which he erected in "Looking Backward" was essentially no more revolutionary than their phalansteries, as will be shown. If "Looking Backward" made a more direct political impression on the early Eighteen Nineties than the colonies did upon the Eighteen Forties, it was because of conditions over which neither Bellamy nor his predecessors had any control.

Differences between Bellamy and earlier reformers are much sharper when we examine his spiritual life—distinguished once more from the narrowly religious—and contrast it with what came before. Whatever else may be said about the religious groups of Emerson's time, it is evident that no class, liberal or conservative, lacked faith—faith either in personal survival after death, or in the validity of human endeavor. Anti-clerics were often practicing reformers. Atheism was, essentially, an outlaw on the social scene, but even atheism was fervently supported by its partisans with, so to speak, a religious zeal.

Emerson, in his reference to "the soul of the soldiery of dissent," affirmed that the Church was being attacked, but it should be recognized that religion itself was not placed in the pillory. Far from being anti-religious, the utopians had a serious concern for problems relating to the spirit. Brook Farm almost became a religious community.[7] To be sure, the great

[6] Frederick Engels, "Socialism Utopian and Scientific," New York, 1935, pp. 33. 43. 52–53.

[7] John Humphrey Noyes, "History of American Socialisms," Phila., 1870, pp. 108 ff.

slavery issue split the Protestant churches north and south,[8] but it did not rob them of their strength. Anti-slavery partisans were often among the firmest believers in the cosmic justice of their cause; even those pro-slavery advocates who challenged them were convinced that they were fighting "practical atheism" at its basest.

It would take us afield to consider in detail why this sturdy religious impulse decreased in strength in the post-Civil War period. Reference can only be made to the effect of "come-outer" propaganda against the church, to the coming of Darwinism, to the multiplication of material objects and the growth of a materialistic philosophy. The Gilded Age did not lack churches; it *did* lack religious zest and conviction. Although the theory of evolution did not *necessarily* destroy the tenets of religion, it might just as well have done so, for all the good it did those who lacked the ability to reconcile new conditions and old faiths.

II

THUS, EDWARD BELLAMY, the son of an impecunious Baptist minister, came to manhood in the Eighteen Seventies in an atmosphere of agnosticism and a confusion of social aims. For Darwinism created social-Darwinism, the business-philosophy of the trust-maker. It suggested that where nature was red in tooth and claw, it was idle for men to seek to be less so. And since it was now seen to be clearly possible that nature was indifferent to human personality, it followed that there might be no reward, no compensation, for one who had failed to fit himself for worldly conquest, and so been passed by.

Bellamy suffered most of the mental ills which afflicted his fellow-citizens, particularly those of his own middle-class. He could sympathize with the religious doubter, for he had himself doubted. The "religion of solidarity" which he so earnestly conceived in his youth, and which contains the true core of his future utopia, originated in part in his need for establishing a oneness with universal things, for finding elements in life which were of more than transient importance. The religion of solidarity, broadly put, recommended a sinking of the individuality into the impersonal and eternal realities of life, a fostering of the objective, rather than the subjective, traits of human nature. It lacked the fuzzy warmth which was provided by several of the consoling mysticisms of the new time, notably Christian Science. It was not quite identical with the "religion

[8] It also diverted thought away from socialist experiments; and properly so, according to Bellamy, since it was necessary to sweep away slavery before "talk of a closer, kinder brotherhood of man was in order, or, indeed, anything but a mockery" ("Edward Bellamy Speaks Again!" pp. 132–3).

of humanity" practiced by free church followers or the more categorically political Christian Socialists. It should be kept in mind, then, that Bellamy belonged to no religious sect, but had elements in common with most of them.

Popular social attitudes toward post-Civil War America which did not presuppose class war—as both social Darwinism and the less influential Marxism did—were cloudy and immature. For example, "The Breton Mills," a novel by Charles J. Bellamy, Edward's brother, was as crude a defense of the laborer and his cause as John Hay's "The Breadwinners" was an attack. John Hay called upon organized government only to crush the deluded malcontents of his story, and Charles J. Bellamy invoked the power of organized labor only to bring a grasping industrialist to his senses. Both writers argued for a simple, personal relationship of employer to employee based on the current platitudes of religion and morality.

To be sure, there is much to be said for certain political movements, like that of the Greenbackers, developed in the post-Civil War period; and much to be said, also, for such reformers as Henry George, Terence V. Powderly, and Henry Demarest Lloyd. It should be emphasized that a great and worthy work was done by those who set themselves against the irresponsible growth of the trust. But now we encounter a condition which radically changed perspectives for the utopian of the Eighteen Eighties, as compared with the Eighteen Forties—a condition which had momentous consequences for Bellamy.

For post-Civil War events vividly demonstrated that the future *was* with organization: organization of capital, and organization of labor. The days of a simple employer-employee relationship—which was fairly legendary even upon the terms of John Hay and Charles J. Bellamy—were over. A decade of legislation was required to show that competition (at least, on the older model) could not be legislated. Economic conditions were much more desperate than they had been before in that the trust was incomparably more imposing a force in the Eighteen Eighties than it had been in the Eighteen Forties. There was no longer any escape from it, on a significant scale, either by land migrations, private enterprises, or co-operative ventures—certainly not by Fourierite colonies.

Thus, in an America racked with industrial war such as had never been imagined during the Eighteen Thirties and the Eighteen Forties, "Looking Backward" was issued. The date was 1888. Trades unions were increasing in size, rather than diminishing, as they had after the panic of 1837. It was now the middle-class, and not the unskilled workers or the craftsmen, which had to consider what its future might be: an insecure

middle-class, the moral, political, and religious foundations of which were being energetically attacked from the right and the left.

Published as a novel written in a vein of fantasy such as Bellamy had exploited for years, "Looking Backward" was issued and purchased by early readers. On re-reading, it appears that the story element of "Looking Backward" is rather thin; and one can understand, without concurring in, the reaction of some first reviewers who found it a disappointment after Bellamy's earlier fiction. The utopia described in "Looking Backward" is less impressive than that which Bellamy later developed in his sequel, "Equality," where sharper and more elaborate discussions of social questions are offered. "Looking Backward"—and this is significant in any analysis of its history—*tells* the reader less than it *suggests*. On the score of vividness alone, the Old Brook Farm experiment was vastly more persuasive a demonstration of the possibilities of co-operative living than was "Looking Backward."

Hence it is doubly astonishing to recall the reception which "Looking Backward" was accorded: the successive editions into which it went; the controversies it conjured up; the "nationalistic" movement which it inspired. Overnight, the nationalization not only of railroads, but of all public enterprises was put on the political agenda; and not by avowed radicals, nor by foreign-born citizens, but by native Americans, "Bellamyites," in many cases, of pronounced conservative tendencies. This fact alone points to the acute social need for which the novel satisfied, a need which would not be satisfied with the erection of socialistic communities. Instead, it found expression in the Nationalist crusade, and has earned permanent remembrance in the annals of the Populist revolt of 1892.

There is no need to review in detail the distinctive features of Bellamy's utopia. One can remind himself that an enormous quantity of good will was imagined as stored in the general population; that at a certain time named the Great Revolution, the old competitive system was said to have shriveled and disappeared of itself; that a type of Fourierite colony on a national scale was said to have risen from its ashes—one in which workers received promotions according to desert, unpolitical generals ran the affairs of their separate professions and trades, and themselves elected American presidents without reference to the opinions of the citizenry. The economics and politics of "Looking Backward" are meagre; and one student of utopias with justice questioned the explanations of social planning and administration in the year 2000 made by Bellamy's protagonist, Julian West, as in the following passage:

Mr. West was satisfied, but I want to know more; I want to know how workers were graded, who did the grading, and what were the criteria of good work; I want to hear more about this system of promotion by the generals; I want to ask whether retired workers would not get out of touch with technical improvements and whether they would not tend to elect moderate, old-fashioned, steady, slightly obstinate old gentlemen as Presidents.[9]

Here are valid questions about Bellamy's pleasant narrative of co-operation, rewarded virtue, and mutual understanding which his novel never recognized. "Looking Backward," more than any other book or program of its time, offered everything to everyone, without necessarily taxing anyone's mental or physical resources. That is, it fed unformulated economic aspirations, unformulated desires for a society which was fixed, stable, and secure. And it is important to observe that it did so while satisfying the religious drought which large sections of the population suffered. Is it not significant that the two most famous creators of panaceas for social ills of the time—Henry George and Edward Bellamy—should both have sought to reconcile religion with economics? As readers could scan George's brilliant "Law of Progress" in "Progress and Poverty" and find in it freedom from the doubts spread by evolutionists and intransigeant Marxists, so they could read Bellamy's parables of the old time and the new and dream of a kingdom of God on earth. To be sure, "Looking Backward" foretold the vanishing of creeds; but it so bathed the unknown in a soft light of tolerance and hope as to rob it of its terrors, and to stimulate a new interest in temporal crusades. Arthur E. Morgan has performed a service in demonstrating, in his biography of Bellamy, how the Nationalist movement had its origins in the organizational efforts of Boston theosophists. Nationalist clubs became oases—it is interesting that one-third of them should have arisen in California—for men and women of good will who sought a practical social plan, but no less sought human and spiritual fellowship.

A series of dialogues which Bellamy developed in his weekly, *The New Nation*, indicates the potential appeal of his movement. Among those to whom Bellamy's talks were addressed were the investment banker, the farmer, the opponent of paternalism, the believer in the Bible, the advocate of restricted immigration, and the evolutionist. It is obvious (as in Bellamy's conversation with the advocate of restricted immigration) that very conservative persons indeed could indorse Bellamy's movement with no damage to their principles. Also, it was possible to be a Nationalist without doing anything in particular about it. Labor unions functioned

[9] Harry Ross, "Utopias Old and New," London, 1938, p. 148.

at the point of wage demands, reform movements and parties with reference to other immediate needs. But Nationalism in large measure offered no better guide to bridging the gap between 1888 and the world prophecied for 2000 A.D. than did "Looking Backward" itself.

III

IN ACCOUNTING for the vogue of "Looking Backward," in showing its genesis in the same native conditions that produced Brook Farm, in explaining its peculiar social impact in terms of the greater and more desperate economic and religious dilemmas of the Eighteen Eighties which afflicted Bellamy and his contemporaries—it might appear on the surface that every conclusion of those who slighted Bellamy and his work has been reached. "Looking Backward" is vague, it offers no guide and little plan. It taxes one's faith in human nature. It appeals to everyone, and, in effect, to no one. What serious consideration does it merit?

Yet it should be noticed that if it did not ask the last full measure of its reader's devotion, it did give him something, whoever he was. Daniel De Leon found inspiration in its pages and so did Eugene V. Debs, and many others who, much more than these two, found the "scientific socialism" of Europe unappetizing. It has been said that "Looking Backward" made more American socialists than any other tract or movement. At the very least, those who received "Looking Backward" as a premium with their subscription to the *Farmer's Alliance*, and those who read Bellamy's follow-up articles in the *North American Review*, the *Forum*, the *Christian Union*, and the *Ladies' Home Journal* were prepared by him to consider programs for social change without feeling their heritage of individualism threatened.

"Looking Backward" a work of individualism? This may seem much to say for a plan like Bellamy's which created an "industrial army," assumed that all who were capable would work (for equal wages) at tasks desirable to the State rather than to themselves alone, and created a hierarchy of leadership based upon seniority and a State-guided career. Yet it remains true that "Looking Backward" was a work of individualism—as much so as Brook Farm—and appealed to individualism.

The first and obvious fact is that being a utopia, or, at least, not imminently realizable upon the basis chosen by the theosophists and other supporters of Nationalism, it presented no real threat to the then-current American way, economically or otherwise. But even to consider it upon its own terms, it can be argued that Bellamy did not aim to destroy individualism. He hoped, rather, to open new avenues for it. It was because Bellamy feared regulation by irresponsible trusts that he was driven to

finding beauties in his mechanistic system of State socialism. The aim of "Looking Backward" was to preserve what could be preserved of individualism in a society which demanded a high degree of organization. Bellamy, in a word, was defending the humane outposts of individualism. The ultimate goal of Nationalism was precisely that of European socialism —the obliteration of all classes—but Nationalist tactics were utterly different from Socialist. For where the Marxists based their efforts on the collectivist working-class concept, and co-operated with other classes only for immediate purposes, Bellamy deprecated class-consciousness, and emphasized the needs of the poor and of the laboring groups only because they were so immediately pressing.

Bellamy's faith in human nature, his conviction that the Nationalist system would inevitably come, was not necessarily more "utopian" than the faith and conviction of the genuine collectivists. Indeed, a study of utopias published in 1879 was sub-titled, "From Sir Thomas More to Karl Marx."[10] But the multiplication of trusts and unions (which were much too busy to conjecture about the future), and the growth of Marxist and neo-Marxist organizations, after 1900, did diminish Bellamy's light. Socialism, that is, as it was understood in America in the decades following Bellamy's death, was not the purpose of "Looking Backward." No wonder it was forgotten—forgotten, except by the selfsame persons who had first discovered it: the ordinary readers. Only, now, they merely found in it stimulation or entertainment, rather than a program which Bellamy would have approved.

Was Nationalism, then, a fad, one that was superseded by other and more important movements and ideas? Heywood Broun, in 1931, averred that it was more important than it had ever been before; but it is doubtless true that as the economic depression continued in the years that followed 1931, it became easier and easier to read "Looking Backward" and believe that it was irrelevant and immaterial—that time was better spent studying works relating to "scientific socialism," so-called.

It is not our purpose here to evaluate the achievements or failures of those who claimed Karl Marx for a leader, but rather to ask consideration of another phenomenon of the Nineteen Thirties: the existence in most cities of America, during that period, of buildings and enterprises identified by red, white, and blue signs on which were inscribed the initials "W. P. A." The interested student could at that time have come upon all manner of construction and non-construction operations in progress, seen adults attending education classes of every kind, come upon harmoniously-ordered

[10] Rev. M. Kaufmann, "Utopias; or Schemes of Social Improvement," London, 1879.

handicraft projects, and, in fact, encountered much of the business of the world being conducted by the government of the United States. The most curious and individualistic enterprises were granted a place under the aegis of the relief administration, and formal regulations were painfully drawn up for their guidance. Hard-headed administrators, particularly after the return of the W.P.A. projects to the states in 1939, were even known to insist that creative activities be more carefully supervised, and, as a result, artists, for example, were often required to sign in and sign out from work at their easels.

The New Deal was created at the point of social tension, that is, poverty and unemployment, but is it not somewhat reminiscent of the world of Edward Bellamy, a step in its direction? Perhaps it might be compared to the period of the Great Revolution celebrated in "Looking Backward"—a bloodless revolution such as Bellamy hoped for, and one which, in the Nineteen Thirties, apparently capped an era of highly sanguinary revolutions and counter-revolutions outside the United States.

"Looking Backward" was a middle-class dream, a kind of psychic equivalent for what was in the actual field of social politics attempted by those who engaged in the Populist struggle, and, after, in the Progressivist crusade. It was only with reluctance and following much provocation that the middle-class entered into unfamiliar areas of reform. Has our middle-class been mean and insignificant for that reason? Has it merited the contempt it so often received from critics of the right and the left? It may be, in view of our experience with more ruthless means of social change, and more questionable goals, that we might well congratulate ourselves on the methods Americans have devised for modernizing our society. Our reforms were accomplished in open day, and with the sanction of the broad voting population. To the solution of economic and spiritual dilemmas which beset this country, the Populists, the Single-Taxers, the Nationalists, and others, made their several contributions. They drew upon the preconceptions, the specific interests, and the general unrest of the population. They were *natives*, and created *native* movements which crisscrossed the social and economic classes and sections, and in so doing helped to bind them together. They served to unify the country for times of domestic and world crises.

"Looking Backward" provided one of the means by which such unity was attained. It is likely to be remembered, if only as a symbol of that unity.

Antioch College

handicraft projects, and, in fact, encountered much of the business of the world being conducted by the government of the United States. The most curious and individualistic enterprises were granted a place under the aegis of the relief administration, and formal regulations were painfully drawn up for their guidance. Hard-headed administrators, particularly after the return of the W.P.A. projects to the states in 1939, were even known to insist that creative activities be more carefully supervised, and, as a result, artists, for example, were often required to sign in and sign out from work at their easels.

The New Deal was created at the point of social tension, that is, poverty and unemployment, but is it not somewhat reminiscent of the world of Edward Bellamy, a step in its direction? Perhaps it might be compared to the period of the Great Revolution celebrated in "Looking Backward"—a bloodless revolution such as Bellamy hoped for, and one which, in the Nineteen Thirties, apparently capped an era of highly sanguinary revolutions and counter-revolutions outside the United States.

"Looking Backward" was a middle-class dream, a kind of psychic equivalent for what was in the actual field of social politics attempted by those who engaged in the Populist struggle, and, after, in the Progressivist crusade. It was only with reluctance and following much provocation that the middle-class entered into unfamiliar areas of reform. Has our middle-class been mean and insignificant for that reason? Has it merited the contempt it so often received from critics of the right and the left? It may be, in view of our experience with more ruthless means of social change, and more questionable goals, that we might well congratulate ourselves on the methods Americans have devised for modernizing our society. Our reforms were accomplished in open day, and with the sanction of the broad voting population. To the solution of economic and spiritual dilemmas which beset this country, the Populists, the Single-Taxers, the Nationalists, and others, made their several contributions. They drew upon the preconceptions, the specific interests, and the general unrest of the population. They were *natives*, and created *native* movements which crisscrossed the social and economic classes and sections, and in so doing helped to bind them together. They served to unify the country for times of domestic and world crises.

"Looking Backward" provided one of the means by which such unity was attained. It is likely to be remembered, if only as a symbol of that unity.

Antioch College