

girl on both occasions watching me. She asked me why I did this and I tried to explain to her, and her comment was, "Why don't you fill up the hole?"

I had never thought of that.

That is the way our minds work, and that, it seems to me, is what we have been doing here this evening, except that we have not been even looking for the hole. We have not been seeking the cause of the congestion. We have heard that congestion is responsible for the poverty, but we have avoided that thing, which we foster with our lies, because it enables the keen and the strong to live upon the simple and the weak, namely, speculation in land.

There is such a thing, I know, as people preferring to live in the slums, just as it is said that Dr. Johnson got a taste for putrid meat because he had had to eat it when he was so poor, but I tell you the people who live in these places, live there because they must, and the sweat-shop boss when he has made a little money, wants the first thing, to move up to the Bronx or somewhere where he can live with his children half decently. That is the first desire that springs up in their minds. It is becoming a commonplace that the poor pay more for their accommodations than the rich. Why? Because they are so poor that they have to live near their work, and, because by the appropriation of land and holding it out of use, and because of the speculation in land, our city is not one-quarter built up, but covered in whole areas with old shacks, "tax payers," as they are called, waiting a rise in the value of land which shall enable us to live without working at the expense of our poorer brethren. That is the main cause of these things.

We have been talking of poverty and crime and degradation and disease, and these are the things you and I have permitted and are permitting today by our acquiescence in and support of this system by which some men are allowed to possess themselves of the earth and then charge their brothers a fee for living at all. I wish we could think a little about this main cause of congestion. As we look at these tenement houses and see the valueless buildings in which most of the people live, and the enormously valuable land underneath, and realize that you can get anywhere in the country a decent house for five dollars a month, while you must pay for a single room in New York more than five dollars in the very poorest districts, we must see that this is the cause of congestion.

Materials are cheaper in New York than in the country, but the value of land is enormously higher, and we keep up that price and profit by it, and have a system of legislation to tax the immigrants and leave off the taxes from the values of land, so that we practically paralyze a man who tries to build model tenements, by raising his taxes, and so encourage him to keep the land vacant in order that somebody may profit by its

ascending value. If we are going to do anything but talk, we must take the value of the land in taxes and open up to labor and living and life the illimitable opportunities of the universe for living and making a living that have been approved by nature from all eternity.

✦ ✦ ✦

WHAT'S THE USE?—OF EDUCATION.

Address by Louis F. Post on Graduation Day at Miss Howe and Miss Marot's School, Dayton, Ohio, June 15, 1911.

When I was a boy, "What's the use?" was a favorite specimen of boys' slang. If some of the boys wanted another to play with them when he was already "played out," he would be very likely to drawl, "Aw, what's the use?" Not as a question, however, but as an assertion. If his mother told him to fetch her an armful of firewood, when he had more important business on hand, he would probably respond with, "Oh, what's the use?" If his father told him to—Well, no. I don't think that we boys of those days used to ask "What's the use?" when our fathers told us what to do.

This very slang of our boyhood has now become the serious slogan of a serious study, a test phrase of a school in philosophy. For several years some of you may have been hearing about pragmatism, or reading about it; and "What's the use?" is a slogan of pragmatism. What pragmatism is, I don't believe that I know; which might not be remarkable but for the fact that those who do know find the task of explaining it even to other philosophers so very difficult. This much, though, I think I may say, that when a philosophical problem confronts you, and the pragmatist tells you to ask yourself "What's the use?" he means that unless you can figure out a use for its solution, if the problem were solved, then it is of no use, at least to you under existing circumstances, and you had better think of something else.

It is in that view of the problem of education that I am proposing that you join me today in asking "What's the use?" of an education. And this pragmatic question seems to me to be peculiarly appropriate at the graduation of a class from school; for that which a school has been to its graduating class, the world is to be through all the rest of their lives.

You will please observe that the thought I have just expressed is not original with me. No doubt you have heard it often before now. In one phrase or another it is probably as old as graduation ceremonies, and in essence it must be as old as teaching and learning. This is my reason for repeating it, because it is old; for I think of the old thoughts, the time-tested thoughts, as the true thoughts.

So did Solomon. That is where Solomon and

I are alike. When he said there is nothing new under the sun, he was not dreaming an idle dream; he was describing a veritable vision. So profoundly true was his vision that one might almost say of a new thought even now, that it is a false thought, a misleading thought. New and true forms of thought we certainly have, but are they new in *essence*? New experiences, but hardly new principles. Old truths with new facts for variety of expression, yes; but new truths? We may at least doubt it. Listen with human sympathy to the ancient mythologies, and you catch the heart beat of all religious experience. Tap the new philosophies for their wisdom, and you get in essence the wisdom of the old philosophies. Examine into your ethics, and their truths hark back to the Ten Commandments and the Ancient of Days. Sift the multifarious mechanical facts of our mechanical age, and how many mechanical principles do you find that are really new? The lever and the inclined plane come down to us through generations of workers from a mouldy antiquity, unchanged in anything but name and forms of use. Gigantic greyhounds of the sea, what is their propeller movement but sculling, advanced from muscle power to steam power? The locomotive is an evolution from the wheel; and any sidewalk seller of toys can show you that wheel-motion and leg-motion are in principle indetical. We do not get aviation from ballooning, which is probably new and now seems to have been misleading; we get it from the flight of birds, which dates back to Eden—however remote that may be. One of the very forms of aviation is reported now to have been developed in the long ago of geological ages by bi-plane flying-fishes of the ocean. Even literature, when it gives us new fables, for instance—I mean fables of genuine human interest,—it is only in form that they are new; and although our literature is flooded with jokes, isn't every good one a chestnut—and antediluvian at that?

Speaking of jokes reminds me that I must not take my little plagiarism about school graduations too seriously. Of course I must justify myself for saying what some one never fails to say on an occasion like this—or hardly ever; but it is probably enough to quote Solomon, without burdening myself and you with an effort to help him out. All I wish is to put life into that graduation-day platitude, that the world is to be, through all the rest of their lives, what a school has been to its graduating class.

And isn't it a true and useful saying, old as it may be? And not alone for the graduation classes of the hour, but for undergraduates as well, and for teachers and parents and friends? Isn't it as true for all that great host of men and women of every class, condition, purpose, motive and activity, who constitute the world of human society?

Our world is indeed a school—a school even like

this Dayton school—with its utilities and its ideals, its tasks and its play spells, the problems of teachers, the talents of pupils, and its graduating honors. Hath not Emerson written it, the Emerson who wrote so many good things, all old in substance but new and charming in form? And let no older one among us think that the lessons of the world school are only for new comers. If we who have long been pupils in that great school were as true to its higher lessons in the fullness of our powers as those *intend* to be who are coming into it from such schools as this, our world would be a better world.

It is as we come into the great school of responsible human society, and as we graduate out of it, that we are at our best; and of the two, the graduating out of it impresses me as making the stronger appeal to whatever of the angelic there may be in any of us. One of our great graduates has so voiced that appeal as to make it a glorious inspiration—for the young and the old, the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor. This is what he said: "When our time comes, what does it matter whether we have fared daintily or not, whether we have worn soft raiment or not, whether we have a great fortune or nothing at all, whether we shall have reaped honors or been despised, have been accounted learned or ignorant—as compared with how we have used that talent which has been intrusted to us for the Master's service? What shall it matter, when eyeballs glaze and ears grow dull, if out of the darkness may stretch a hand, and into the silence may come a voice: 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'"*

Must we sacrifice dainty fare, then, and soft raiment? No; not unless we get it at the expense of others unjustly. If we get it unjustly we must let it go, provided the getting be individual and restoration is possible; if the getting be social, individual restoration being therefore impossible, we must at any rate denounce it for what it is if it is unjust. "Thou shalt not steal!" was never spoken for burglars and pickpockets alone. That command is one of the time-tested truths, and vital. It yields to no human law. Stealing by act of the legislature and with the consent of the courts is stealing just the same, except for prison purposes. But no sacrifice of justly earned wealth is involved in our use of the talent we have been entrusted with.

The question regarding riches is one of comparison. When we come to graduate after a life of luxury, the test of how we have used that talent of ours will not be that we are rich; it will be how our riches compare with how we got them. How we have spent them, too, of course; but

*Henry George in "Social Problems," chapter ix, pages 89 and 90.

mainly how we got them—whether we have given value for our wealth, value in brain and brawn of our own, or whether we have screwed our wealth out of somebody else. For the supernal honors of graduation when our time shall come to see that hand stretch out of the darkness and to hear that voice come into the silence, we must have *served our fellows*—the men and women and children who in the world's school shall have lived their lives with us.

Served them how? By teaching? Some of us, but not many. By preaching? Some, but not many. By propagating the old and everlasting moral truths in new settings and getting ourselves crucified for it? Some, but not many. For the most part, our service to our fellows must be by useful work in one or another of the multifarious vocations of human society. As to the vocation itself, the decisive factor is its usefulness; as to us, the decisive factor is our faithfulness.

But this is still not enough. We do not use our talent well in the Master's service if we ignore our citizenship. The pupil in a school like this of yours cannot hold aloof from the school as a whole without detriment to both; no more can men and women hold aloof from human society as a whole. Each of us, says Emerson,* "is a bundle of relations, a knot of roots whose flower and fruitage is the world." By older similes, we are interdependent "like feet, like hands, like eyelids, like the rows of the upper and lower teeth." Some there be who say that each of us should mind his own business. It sounds well. But "this is the gospel of selfishness," comes a response echoing down the years—"the gospel of selfishness, soothing as soft flutes to those who, having fared well themselves, think everybody should be satisfied."†

To me, that contentment which those of us who fare daintily preach to the discontented at whose expense it may be that we fare so well, is always a reminder of the prayer of the child who had not yet learned to use language so as to conceal thought: "O, Lord," she prayed, "teach Martha Smith to be a good little girl, so that I may take her playthings away from her and she won't make any fuss about it."

In one sense of "contentment," the doctrine that everybody ought to be contented is good doctrine; but as usually preached it means or is taken to mean "satisfied," and this is bad doctrine. If all men had always been satisfied with their lot, we should be savages yet. Discontent, if by that word you mean dissatisfaction, has given us all the labor-saving invention we have; and it is labor-saving invention that gives us civilization. Do you recall the anecdote of the lazy but ingenious boy who was hired to pull a string, now at one end and now at the other of a part of a steam engine, so as to alternate the steam pressure and

thereby produce wheel-motion—do you remember how his employer caught him one day playing ball in working hours? If you do you will remember that the boy had discovered a way of making the engine itself pull the string. He was discontented. So he made a labor-saving invention which has enriched the world. Incidentally, he lost his own job.

The writer I have just quoted, urges us further to realize that "he who observes the law and the proprieties, and cares for his family, yet takes no interest in the general weal, and gives no thought to those who are trodden under foot, save now and then to bestow alms, is not a true Christian, nor is he a good citizen."* That may be a high standard of citizenship, but it is none too high. And if any other or wider associations than business, family and citizenship be conceived, then the talent entrusted to us for the Master's service must be devoted to our fellows in those associations too.

Nor is it enough to use our talent merely as it has come to us. To do so would be like wrapping money in a napkin. We are derelict if we do not train ourselves to the highest efficiency in order that we may be all the more useful. What's the use of education? That is the use of it. Better service to our fellows. That is its use in the kindergarten, its use in the grammar grades, its use in high schools and preparatory schools, and in colleges and universities. Even more emphatically is that the use of education throughout all the rest of our lives,—better and better and ever better service to mankind, irrespective of race or nationality, of sex or age or color or creed or station; aye, or of goodness or badness.

Not service by sacrifice for anybody, unless in some emergency, but service for service. For is not each of us a unit of human society and equal in rights,—an equal in all the problems of fair play with every other human unit? Then it must be as unwholesome socially for others to flourish upon our unrequited work as for us to flourish upon theirs. "Thou shalt not steal!" means also that thou shalt not be stolen from, and this too is one of the old thoughts.

If it be true, then, that usefulness to mankind is the function of education, that its use is to make our inborn talents more and ever more efficient in human service, we are confronted with the task of tackling the problem of *head-education* versus *heart-education*. This is one of the first tasks before us, perhaps the very first. The problem is an old one; if it were not, it might hardly be worth while. It has probably bothered pedagogues ever since pedagogues came to be. I am not trying, though, to invade their special realm. It is their specialty to train the young mind, the undergraduate mind; but I address myself more par-

*Ralph Waldo Emerson's essay, "History."

†Henry George's "Social Problems," chapter 1, page 9.

*Henry George's "Social Problems," chapter 1, page 9.

ticularly to the graduate mind, to that mind of us older ones which is called mature—out of respect I suppose for the age of the body that carries it.

Education of the intellect alone seems to me a poor kind of education. To borrow from an Italian immigrant girl a phrase that has impressed me profoundly, one must have "a listening heart" in order to understand folks in this world. If we haven't got listening hearts we can't educate them; but if we have, they need training as much as a talent for music does. Our heart talent as well as our head talent must be educated—educated in the training school of youth, educated in the social school of the world. If there be any difference, it were better, perhaps, to educate the heart than the head. There is truth, old time truth, in Bourdillon's lines:

The night hath a thousand eyes, the day but one;
Yet the light of the whole world dies at set of sun.
The mind hath a thousand eyes, the heart but one;
And the light of the whole life dies when love is done.

But may there not be somewhere a normal balance between those functions of human life which we loosely distinguish as "head" and "heart"? The *thinking* function and the *feeling* function must go together. Of course this is not necessary for a trick lion, or a learned pig; but it is necessary to produce the best human effects.

Could we conceive of a being with perfect thinking faculties perfectly trained, but with no feeling faculties, all head but no heart, I suspect that he would come pretty near to filling out our notion of the Devil. On the other hand, it must be admitted that if there were a being with abundant feeling faculties and none for thinking, all heart but no head, he might be a perfect model for a tolerably useless crank. But imagine strong thinking faculties and warm feeling faculties in balance, and you have a man, a gentleman; or a woman, a gentlewoman. Were we to conceive of a being with those two faculties infinite in scope and perfect in balance, we should have a concept of God.

But the natural talents of individual men and women vary in their tendencies of "heart" and "head" one way or the other. Some lean more to the heart-side than to the mind-side, others the reverse. It has sometimes seemed to me that here we have the difference that makes of one an artist and of another a mechanic. Both artist and mechanic have mind, and both have heart; both think, both feel. But feeling is predominant with the artist, reasoning with the mechanic. The mechanic must have the heart, the feeling, the imagination to perceive mechanical possibilities; but unless his thinking faculties are what card players would call his stronger suit, he is more likely to potter away at perpetual motion than to improve a locomotive or to make a flying machine. The artist also must think, but unless feeling is his stronger suit his landscapes may be in mathe-

matical perspective and his portraits only facial diagrams.

In the domain of art, education of the heart, of the affectional or feeling faculties, of the imagination, does get attention. In that domain every school for the training of youth fosters the feeling faculties. There are few of us any more who do not understand that in painting and sculpture and to some degree in architecture, the heart must be educated. We may differ in our terms, but that is what we mean. This is true also of poetry, of fiction, probably of the whole range of literature, unless we except the scientific. Even in scientific literature there are traces of heart education, as there ought to be. An all-head-and-no-heart book on physics, for instance, may be useful as a hand book until its "head" work has got discredited by scientific discoveries prompted by "heart" action. But what more foolish is there, unless for back reference, than such a book that is out of date—except one of the same kind that is further out of date.

If I were asked to specify scientific literature in which there are no traces of heart education, or in which the traces are faint, I should turn instinctively first to modern economics; and were you then to confront me with some particular book on economics with "heart" in it, I could probably checkmate you by proving that it is in bad standing at the universities. But of all the sciences, where else than in economics can education of heart as well as head be more appropriate or more necessary? Economics has to do with human relationships in which sentiments of fair play and temptations to foul play are powerful factors. Its laws do indeed spring out of insentient physical nature; but they spring also out of human nature. Here is the science that relates to child labor, to women's work, to employer and employe, to intensity of work and the pay for it, to capitalist organizations and labor organizations, to slavery in fact though it be not so in form, and to what Herbert Spencer once called "man's right to the use of the earth." In the solution of all such problems human feeling must go double with impersonal thinking. Education of heart as well as head cannot here be ignored with safety. Colleges may leave the heart out, but when they do they are like the student who questioned a professor about the tides with the moon left out. "Young man," said the Professor, "you may leave out the moon, but God didn't." Neglect of heart education in connection with economic subjects has evolved social conditions which Arnold Bennett describes and accounts for in a single sweeping sentence when he refers to "the vast unconscious cruelty that goes with a perfect lack of imagination."

Of those social conditions I shall have something further to say, but right here I wish to dwell a little upon what it is that constitutes education.

Much of what we call education is something else. To distinguish that something else from education I shall call it "tutoring." I don't mean education by a tutor. What I mean by tutoring is the filling up of the mind from outside instead of drawing the mind out from the inside. To educate a mind is a different process from tutoring it. A tutored mind is a machine, doing over and over again what it has learned to do; an educated mind is a thinking man, a thinking woman, a thinking boy or girl, equipped with things to think about and methods to think by. When the tutored but uneducated soldier was asked why his sword had a curve, he said it was to make it fit the scabbard. Was his unthinking reply any more unthinking, was it any more absurd, than the theories of men who tell us that matter produces mind instead of mind producing matter? One may be tutored to overflowing without being educated; and if besides merely tutoring the mind you neglect the heart, or tutor that too, you get a specimen for a museum. Did you ever hear that an educated fool is the worst of fools? That is what it means—a person who has been tutored, and thinks he is therefore educated.

Education is training in feeling and in thinking. Things are to be learned of course, and so there must be tutoring. And for much of this we must cultivate a memory, for much of it also a forgettery. The things we learn are food for education, and not education itself. Education has its analogue in bodily digestion. It is not what we take in, but what we assimilate that constitutes our education. The heart is educated by feeling and thinking, the head by thinking and feeling. And neither can be trifled with. Delicate functions are the reasoning faculties and the conscience! To play make-believe with either is to run great risks of setting up a fallacy factory in the head or of cultivating an inverted conscience in the heart.

Of method in education I have never seen a better lay-out than "Gregory's laws." Some of you may know who Gregory is, or was. I do not. If I ever did, his identity has gone into my forgettery. It is of no importance, anyhow, except to give credit where credit is due, and that I am offering. Gregory must have got his laws from a good way back, for they are too true to be very new. Intended for teachers of children, they are applicable also to us children of older growth, and to every thing any of us may do that is worth the doing—be we teachers or learners, workers or idlers. If everyone with a problem to solve would recur to those educational laws, more problems would be solved right. If they were always applied in determining policies of action—household, business, professional, political, civic—policies of action would work out easier and better. If everyone would turn to them and be guided by them in writing, in speaking, when reading or listening,

we should have an infinitely better society in which to live—a better school from which to graduate when our day comes.

Gregory's laws are seven. The first is that the teacher must know the thing to be taught, and the second that the learner must be interested in it. That the language used must be common to both teacher and learner is the third, the fourth that the unknown must be explained by the known, and the fifth that the learner's mind must be aroused and used to form within it the desired thought. The sixth explains that learning is thinking an unfamiliar thought or truth into one's own understanding, and the seventh that the test of thinking is re-thinking.

If comparisons may be made I should say that the seventh is the best of all. The test of thinking is re-thinking. And when we re-think, it is highly important that we distinguish mere tutoring from educating. The unlettered boy had the right idea crudely. "This is A," said the teacher. "How do you know?" asked the boy. Well, she didn't know how she knew! In that respect she had been tutored rather than educated; and she answered: "My teacher told me." But the boy had no notion of allowing himself to be tutored; he wanted to be educated; so he replied with another question, and rather more rudely than I shall quote him: "How do you know your teacher told you the truth?" he asked.

There is a better way than that boy's, however, of testing thinking by re-thinking, and I shall formulate it. I don't remember whether this formula also is from Gregory's laws. If it is, let us be grateful to Gregory; if it is not, let us be grateful anyhow—in a general and abstract way: This is the formula: What? Where? When? How? Why? and What's the use? If this formula were applied—with unselfish motives, intellectual honesty, and moral courage—to the social problems of our time, there might soon be an end to that "vast unconscious cruelty which goes with a perfect lack of imagination."

Let us try it. Let us do a little re-thinking according to that educational formula. I make no decisions for you. I have no intention of tutoring anybody full of anything. All I ask of others is that they think. Then that they re-think. And that they do both intelligently, feelingly—with heart and with head. Not as amiable cranks, all heart and not much head; nor as devils, all head and little heart. But that they think and then re-think unselfishly, from the heart; with an honest mind, from the head; and with that courage which is the synonym not for battlefield bravery but for moral stamina, remembering, to quote Emerson again, that "God will not have his work made manifest by cowards."

The first question to ask ourselves is, *What?* To answer it we must call upon our observation, our experience, our reading, upon all the pertinent

facts we know, and give our imagination a chance—not our wild fancy, but the same loyal imagination that serves us so well in our more selfish concerns. If we do this, we shall see an appalling picture of poverty. High lights there may be as well as dark shadows, but the highest lights will have a sickly hue. We cannot see this picture from comfortable homes that look out upon green lawns and beautiful boulevards, nor through the windows of our limousines. But the picture is there—just beyond, just beyond. Glimpses of it may be got in drawing rooms through some of Mrs. Browning's verse—her "Cry of the Children," for instance; but only glimpses, and glimpses only of the dramatic reality. The real reality is beyond our ken unless we experience it ourselves. We must live the poverty life to know what it is. We must live it now. Memories of having lived it before we got rich won't do. We boast of our magnificent charities for the worthy poor; but these very institutions testify, and the more magnificent they are the stronger do they testify, to conditions of dreadful poverty among the worthy poor. Magnificent charities for the worthy poor cannot exist unless the worthy poor are in need of them. Jane Addams tells us that the usefulness of a Hull House is not so much the help it enables the well-to-do to bring to the working poor, as the knowledge of the lives of the working poor it brings to the well-to-do. This is the *What* of our re-thinking as far as we need go with it here.

The *Where* of it is our own country, which we as citizens govern if we will; the *When* of it is the present time.

And then the *How*? Here we may have to do some hard thinking, and there is authority for saying that hard thinking hurts the head. "To think," says Emerson—and I am making him largely my authority today—"is the hardest task in the world."* Now, good friends, if we lived in a simple civilization, our *How* might be easy to answer. But our civilization is complex, and the tracing of effect back to cause through its complexities is no easy task. Yet it is one of the tasks we are in this world for. These graduating pupils have unraveled complexities in this school; shall any of us in the world's great school say, "Oh, what's the use?" to the task of unraveling social complexities there? Shall these graduating pupils say it as they grow older?

If we re-think the *What*, the *Where*, the *When* and the *How*, we have yet to re-think the *Why*? And there's the rub! When one fares daintily in leisure, while others fare harshly in work, it is a crucial test to ask oneself *Why*? and then to answer unselfishly, with intellectual honesty, and with moral courage. We may explain to our comrades, to our clergyman, at political meetings, in editorial leaders, at trade conventions (whether of

laborer or employer), and with a good face, or a fine imitation of one; but could we explain to ourselves on the great graduation day, with that vision then before us of the hand stretching out of the darkness and the voice coming into the silence? This is a question each of us must answer for himself and to himself.

But after all, and this is the final question of our formula, *What's the use* of our *Why*, of our *How*, of our *Where*, of our *When*? aye, of our *What*? What's the use of marring our own comfort by thinking of the misery of others? What's the use of it even if their misery be the awful price of our comfort, as many of them are pretty boldly beginning to say it is? What's the use of bothering our heads about the *How*, or our hearts with the *Why*? This question is answered by the answer to another: What's the use of education?

If education is merely to serve our own self-interest, merely to cater to our vanities, merely to enable us to get the better of our fellow men, then the answer is that all this pother about *What's* and *Why's* is of no use at all. But what if we have higher aspirations? Of such as have, let me ask what's the use of education if it cannot grapple with every public question—thoughtfully, feelingly, honestly, courageously, and in the spirit of brotherhood?

The labor question, for example, is an old question, and we can study it in history. It has had many forms, but it is the same question in essence today as in the time of the Gracchi. We have had it in many centuries and places and shapes; and again and again does it appear in history to have brought on terrible social struggles—awful revolutions. We accustom ourselves to think that revolutions are made by wicked men. Our histories teach us better. We might as well say that wicked men make smallpox epidemics. Taine read history aright when he wrote that "great revolutions are not introduced by court intrigues and official cleverness, but by social conditions and popular instincts." To ascertain the conditions which inflame the popular instincts and remove them, is not that one of the highest uses of education?

But are we doing this? or trying to? If not, what is the use of education? Will the young men and women who are coming now into responsible human society,—will they do it, or try to? If not, what is the use of *their* education? We cannot leave public questions alone, nor can they; for those questions do not let us or them alone, and never will. And we exert an influence whether we intend to or no. On one side or the other, the right side or the wrong one, everybody who thinks at all or acts without thinking, as so many of us do sometimes, turns his influence into the scale of public opinion.

I might discuss specific questions, but this would not be an appropriate occasion for that, even if the necessary time were at my command. There

*Emerson's essay, "Intellect."

are some facts, however, some great big facts, that we can hardly escape knowing, and about which, if we have an education or are getting one, we ought to think—intelligently, honestly and courageously.

Here we are upon an island, a great island in space. We call it the earth. It is a fruitful island, with an ingenious and skillful and constantly increasing population.

Some say the fruitfulness of this island is giving out. But that can't be true; we have hardly begun to scratch the surface of it; and no sooner does its fruitfulness diminish in one respect than it multiplies in others. The older ones among us can probably remember when there were great fears that with the disappearance of forests we should have to deal with the problem of getting along without firewood. Then came the discoveries of coal deposits beyond the few of which we had known. But even coal deposits can not last forever. Hardly had we begun to think so, however, when electric inventions assured us that though wood and coal give out, we can depend upon every running stream for heat, and for light and power thrown in.

Some say that our island in space is crowded. But there is more vacant room by far even in the most crowded spot of all, New York City, than there is of occupied room.

Some say invention has reached its limits. But we keep on inventing. Labor per man now produces vastly more than ever before, and the tendency still is toward greater productive power.

Nevertheless, and for all this richness of our island in space, and all our progress in labor saving invention, masses of the people are poor and the rest of us are in constant fear of poverty. I have my own opinion about the question that thus arises, but I am not inerrant. I do not press my opinion upon you, for I may be mistaken. Yet I should like to leave the question with you. What do you think about it? Not what do you wish to think about it, nor whether it may be to your interest, but what do you think? What do you really think, as men and women of education and influence?

Could there be any better use of education than applying it diligently, progressively, unselfishly, with honest minds and moral stamina, to the questions of human relationship as they arise, and especially to those that involve God-given rights and God-imposed duties? If education ought to be devoted to religion, here is religion in one of its two great phases; it is loving your neighbor as yourself. If to good government, here is the sine qua non of good government: a democratic foundation. If to material progress, you devote it to material progress here; the fairer the distribution of wealth the more abundant and varied its production. If to ethics, here is the root of ethics: equality of social rights. If to one's calling, here is its most profitable application; for neighborli-

ness, good government, abundant production, fair distribution, equality of all social rights—these make for the continuous prosperity of every worker in every occupation.

* * *

THE LAND OF HEART'S CONTENT.

"A sail! a sail! Oh, whence away

And whither, o'er the foam?

Good brother mariners, we pray,

God speed you safely home!"

"Now wish us not so foul a wind

Until the fair be spent;

For hearth and home we leave behind!

We sail for Heart's Content."

"For Heart's Content! And sail ye so.

With canvas flowing free?

But, pray you, tell us, if ye know,

Where may that harbor be?

For we that greet you, worn of time,

Wave racked, and tempest rent,

By sun and star, in ev'ry clime,

Have searched for Heart's Content.

"In ev'ry clime the world around

The waste of waters o'er;

And El Dorado have we found,

That ne'er was found before.

The isles of spice, the lands of dawn,

Where east and west are blent—

All these our eyes have looked upon;

But where is Heart's Content?

"Oh! turn again, while yet ye may,

And ere the hearths are cold,

And all the embers ashen-gray,

By which ye sat of old,

And dumb in death the loving lips

That mourned as forth ye went

To join the fleet of missing ships,

In quest of Heart's Content!

"And seek again the harbor lights.

Which faithful fingers trim,

Ere yet alike the days and nights

Unto your eyes are dim!

For woe, alas! to those that roam

Till time and tide are spent;

And win no more the port of home—

The only Heart's Content!"

—William Young.

BOOKS

"PRAYERS OF THE SOCIAL AWAKENING."

For God and the People. By Walter Rauschenbusch.
Published by the Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1910.

Modern man as a conscious part of the social whole has yet to find literary expression for his religious emotions. As an attempt at such expression Walter Rauschenbusch—the widely-known