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PREFACE

This debate was held under the auspices of "The Workers' University Society". This Society has been in existence eleven years, holding Sunday afternoon lectures in the Garrick Theater for six months of every winter season. During that period Arthur M. Lewis, the permanent lecturer of the Society, has delivered courses of lectures, varying from eight to sixteen, on Sociology, Biology, Astronomy, History and Religion. As a result of these activities seven books by Mr. Lewis have been published by Charles H. Kerr and Company and all have been successful, running through several editions.

This debate was arranged by Mr. Lewis, who has arranged others which will be held during the rest of this season. This verbatim report was taken by Maclaskey and Maclaskey, Court Stenographers, City Hall Square Building. The Society hereby expresses its appreciation of the excellence of this report and others taken by them in the past.

COMING

The Nearing-Lewis Debate.

There will be a debate some time this season between Professor Scott Nearing and Arthur M. Lewis on "Will Christianity Save the World?" This debate will take place at the Garrick Theater some Sunday afternoon. If you wish to be informed of the particulars when all arrangements are complete send your name and address to Arthur M. Lewis, 1838 Wells Street, Chicago.
Will Democracy Cure the Social Ills of the World?

PROFESSOR NEARING'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. E. C. Wentworth presided and introduced the speakers.

PROFESSOR NEARING SAID: Will Democracy Cure the Social Ills of the World? The first duty that devolves upon the affirmative is to define, or limit, the discussion of the afternoon. Democracy, as we are using the term here, means the right of a group of people to determine and decide their own public affairs. To use one of the phrases that was originated during the political democratic movements, "All governments must derive their just powers from the consent of the governed". In other words, Democracy means for today peoples' rule, the public control of public affairs. Democracy means for tomorrow—in so far as we can make it mean—equal opportunity. For today, Liberty. For tomorrow, Justice. And as I use the term, Democracy means popular rule today and equality of opportunity tomorrow. When we turn to the social ills, we face a very much more difficult proposition, and I have decided to limit what I wish to say to three of the major social evils that we now confront: Unearned wealth, or unearned income, poverty and war. I believe that these are the three worst of our present day social ills and I believe that Democracy as I have defined it will cure these ills, i.e., I believe it will very materially reduce and will tend to eliminate them. That some rudiments of unearned wealth, of poverty and of conflict, may remain under Democracy, I will not undertake to deny, but I believe that the great mass of unearned income, poverty and war, the great body of those social ills that we now confront will be eliminated by democracy or freedom.

Unearned income is a social ill because it creates, on the one hand, exploitation, and on the other hand economic parasitism. The worker, the producer, is exploited; the recipient of unearned income tends to become a parasite on the work of the exploited group. And, in the train of that exploitation and parasitism, which is, in my judgment, the most serious of all the social ills that we face,
comes poverty with its denial of equal opportunity and with its sure degeneration and deterioration of that portion of the population which is subject to its malevolent influence.

In the second place, as a consequent outcropping of the whole system under which unearned income is obtained, you have war, which on the one hand bulwarks privilege and on the other hand eliminates the fittest element from society. And I maintain, as a standard of Democracy, conceived in the terms in which I have defined Democracy, popular control today of public affairs and tomorrow equality of opportunity—that such a system of Democracy will practically eliminate those three great social ills.

It is not necessary for the purpose of this discussion that Democracy eliminate these ills in this century or in this country. We are sometimes deluded by the belief that because we think we are great that therefore we are great; and because we believe that America is the greatest nation on earth, is the seat of Democracy, it is the logical nation to carry the standard of democratic progress in the world. Because we believe that, we think it must be true, but it does not necessarily follow. The standard of Democracy which I have defined does not depend on America or Americans. It is entirely independent of any particular place and any particular time. We may work it out in this century, and it may not be worked out for centuries to come, but, I believe, that that standard of public organization represented today by popular rule in public affairs, and opportunity tomorrow, is the soundest principle of social organization that we know. Therefore, either in this country or in some other country, if not in this century, in some other century, society will gradually work itself over to that basis of social organization. And I believe when that basis of social organization is achieved, unearned income, poverty and war will be practically eliminated.

Now what will Democracy do to these three major social ills? If people are to control their own affairs—if we are to have a government of the people, by the people and for the people, there is only one conceivable basis on which such a government can exist. That basis is what Walter Bagehot called a “government by discussion”. We must have some means of informing ourselves on important public questions, of going over public questions one with another and of registering some kind of a decision with regard to them. I believe that such a public discussion is only possible when you have relative economic independence. That explains why we find the tendency to democracy so strong in communities where each man holds a little bit of land, where there is no concentration of wealth on the one hand, and no abject poverty on
the other, but where each individual is more or less economically 
independent.

Take for example Switzerland, New Zealand and certain 
other communities where they have relative economic independ-
ence, or read back into history, wherever you find economic inde-
pendence, the man with his feet on his own land, there you will 
find a relatively high standard of Democracy. Why? Because 
through that economic independence comes the true economic 
freedom without which no social freedom, or any large measure of 
social freedom can be possible.

Now, the growth of unearned wealth is a direct violation of 
that standard of social organization. As unearned wealth de-
velops it means, on the one hand, that some workers are comp-
pelled to give their labor, to give the product of their effort, to 
another, and that he is able to live without working, by the work 
that those workers do. They can not put themselves in that rel-
ative position until some economic change has taken place. That 
change as we have known it, in the United States, has been the 
change from proprietorship to landlordism.

Our ancestors in the colonies organized a method of individual 
proprietorship under which they hoped each man would hold a 
bit of land, would develop it, would produce on it the necessities 
for his own existence, would be a free independent citizen, and 
had we been able to maintain that system of economic organiza-
tion in this country I believe that today we would have very much 
fewer social ills than we now face, but the social ills have grown 
up with the breakdown of that system, with the abolition of 
proprietorship and the substitution of landlordism.

In the big cities, now, what do you find? You find people 
living in homes that they rent; living in mortgaged houses; liv-
ing in flats, tenements, and apartments; you find them non-pro-
prieters. They do not own anything except the clothes on their 
backs and a few sticks of furniture. They have no place they can 
put their feet on and say, "This ground is mine." The result is in 
these great centers of population you have masses of people ex-
plotted on the one hand and, on the other hand, you have small 
classes of people who are the recipients and the gainers through 
the system of unearned income.

Democracy, popular control of public affairs, of railroads, 
mines, steel industries, sugar refineries, that is, of all affairs on 
which all the people in the community depend would mean 
the elimination of unearned income and the substitution of 
an economic interdependence for the old economic independence 
of colonial days. What do I mean by a form of economic inter-
dependence? Why, I mean that just as the early farmer on his own farm, producing on it, was economically free because he owned it, so the modern railroad operative who produces on the railroad, in order to be economically free must work for himself, which means that he and all of his fellows must control, must own, and must decide the important policies of the industrial system of which his effort constitutes a very minor part.

In other words we must have economic democracy. We must eliminate special privilege and substitute for its popular control. Eliminate special privilege, take the franchises, take the great public utilities, take the natural resources, take the social tools of production, put them under public authority, public control, social control, instead of under individual ownership and you have created a new basis for Democracy,—the joint ownership by the entire group of the means necessary for their living.

Unearned income is based on special privilege. Special privilege means resources, franchises, and other economic opportunities in the hands of the few. It means economic control by the privileged in the United States and for the profit of the privileged.

Economic Democracy means the control of the economic resources of special privilege by the community and in the interests of the community. In other words it means industry for service, instead of industry for profit.

Given that Democracy, given that popular control of those great public affairs which we call now private industries and unearned income is impossible, because unearned income is derived through a system under which a few control and many work.

Turn the ownership and control into the hands of the many; socialize our railroads as we have socialized our rivers and our harbors; socialize our telegraphs and telephones as we have already socialized our parcels post; socialize the great industries of this country as has been done in foreign countries and the special privilege group will be driven from its position of privilege and with that goes the elimination of unearned income upon which privilege today rests.

So I believe that economic Democracy,—the public control of economic affairs would eliminate unearned income. I believe, in the second place, that the public control of economic affairs will eliminate poverty. Poverty is primarily a product of the wage system. Jacob H. Hollander, in a recent book on the abolition of poverty, says that in the last analysis the great underlying cause of poverty is low wages. Now, it does not require a college professor to tell you that and I am not quoting Hollander
on this subject because you do not know the same thing, it is perfectly obvious to anyone who has come in contact with the wage system that low wages are the major cause of poverty. I may say that because we have in the community an unfortunate attitude towards social ills and towards this social ill in particular, an attitude which leads us to blame someone for poverty just as at the present time we are blaming someone because the price of eggs is high. We tend to have a narrow view, a personal view. We personalize adverse conditions. Mr. Billy Sunday personalizes the devil, brings him up on the platform and talks to him, and then sends him back down to Hell again. We tend to personalize the social ills from which we suffer. As a matter of fact, this great social ill, poverty, which Bernard Shaw describes as the greatest of social crimes, is a social and not a personal matter. We, at the present time, are engaged in making people poor just as we are engaged in making steel rails, and rubber tires, and hemp and other economic products.

If you will take the series of reports that has recently been published by the Childrens’ Bureau in Washington, a study, the first one made in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, and others made in other industrial centers, you will find that the Childrens’ Bureau has shown the relation between infant death and poverty and low wages. They show in the case of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, that among the children of the well-to-do, fifty babies in one thousand die the first year. Among the children of the poor, in the worst ward in the city, 271 in a thousand die in the first year. And the report describes this ward as the ward in which the poorest, most lowly families in the community live, families of the men engaged in doing the physical work of the steel mills.

In other words, those men who work, as the report goes on to show, work for less than $11 a week, and those were the men in whose families this frightful infant death rate occur.

And the Cambria Steel Company at Johnstown was turning out poverty just as it turned out structural steel. Your stockyards in Chicago, your railroads centering in Chicago, your great department stores on State street, all your great industries in Chicago, are engaged in exactly the same activities—they are engaged in making poverty on the one hand, as they are engaged in turning out surplus or unearned income on the other.

If we had economic Democracy, that is, if we guaranteed to furnish equal economic opportunities, poverty would be by the very definition impossible. Shaw says, in a recent letter, that the worst kind of poverty, the only kind of poverty that really matters
is child poverty, because, he says, we never get the chill of child poverty out of our bones.

If we had a community in which equal opportunity was guaranteed, in which we had Democracy, if we had a community in which equal opportunity was guaranteed, it would be the business of the community, as Shaw suggests in this letter, to have a system of police instructed to arrest every hungry child and feed it, to arrest every naked child and clothe it; to arrest every shelterless child and provide it with proper living accommodations.

It would then be necessary for us, if we were guaranteeing equal opportunity, to begin with the physical growth of the child and guarantee to every child that was born into the world a sound physical body insofar as the guarantee of enough economic goods to provide that physical body would succeed in providing. Then, when the child got to the point of going to school, we would go on to provide not only intellectual education, but would provide bodily health as well, and if it came to the point, we might go on and provide social health as well by rehabilitating some of the homes socially, as some of our private philanthropists are now attempting to do privately. The guarantee of equal opportunity would necessarily involve the elimination of poverty because the very definition of poverty places over against the unearned income, the peculiar opportunities, the special privileges of the owning group, the lack of opportunity, the lack of physical well being, the lack of social chance of the working group. And just as the socialization or the democratization of industry would eliminate unearned income, in the same way the democratization of industry and the socialization of opportunity would eliminate poverty.

I hesitate a little to say anything about war, because it has been talked about so much lately, and everyone thinks that he knows all there is to know about the subject. On the one hand war has been, as Ruskin points out, all through the ages the sport of kings; he says it has been the greatest game of all games that society has played, and, on the other hand, tends to become in our age one of the means whereby the economically powerful group in the community—the plutocracy, as we call it here in the United States—is able to win out against its competitors, where they threaten its economic and financial supremacy.

The present war in Europe, a war between England and Germany, is essentially a trade war. Ever since the war took on its present form, the allies have been talking about the war after the war, they have been telling one another that after the war was over they would get together, and fight it out on commercial and economic lines by boycotting Germany and by giving one another
special privileges. It is common knowledge even to the undis-
cerning that the war in Europe is a war between two groups of
economic thought, the English group thinking it can survive by
exploiting the workers and the German group thinking it can stand
better by taking care of the workers.

So you have the quarrel between two types of economic atti-
tude, or economic organization, and they quarrel over world
markets. Why do they need world markets? Does England need
a place to sell her shoes, her cotton, her wool, her blankets? No!
There are people in England and there have been ever since Engels
wrote his famous "Poverty of the Working Class in England" in
1844 that needed the things England was shipping to foreign mar-
kets. Look at the things that England has produced before that
time and since. England has been steadily occupied in shipping
out of England the things that her own population needed to keep
away starvation, hunger, nakedness and all the other miseries in-
cident to poverty. Why were the English people thus deprived of
the things that they needed to maintain life? Because the ex-
ploring class, the owning class, the unearned income class paid
less in wages than the workers could buy back in products. The
product was greater than the wage. The surplus went into the
form of unearned income, and so England and Germany and the
United States and Switzerland and France need other markets out-
side of their own fields of exploitation. Not for the purpose of
a legitimate exchange of commodities, but for the purpose of fur-
ther exploiting. The exploiting fields at home have given out.

Eliminate special privilege, democratize industries, pay to
the workers for each dollar of product a dollar of wages and the
necessity for foreign markets disappears. At the same time does
the necessity for exploitation, and for unearned income and
poverty disappear.

If I may sum up briefly, the contention I wish to make is:
Democracy is popular government today and equal opportunity
tomorrow. Economic privilege stands in the way of popular gov-
ernment and equal opportunity. Special privilege stands in the
way of Democracy. Destroy privilege, establish Democracy, and
unearned income, poverty and war will virtually disappear.
MR. DARROW’S FIRST SPEECH.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Darrow will now speak for thirty-five minutes.

MR. DARROW: I have no desire to win this debate. In fact, I would like to believe in Democracy. I used to when I was a child. I would be glad to be made a child again just for tonight. If Professor Nearing can convince you, I shall be glad, and if he can convince me, I shall be happier still.

I have very little to say in reply to what the Professor has laid out. The causes of poverty, as he diagnosed them, I agree with. In the main, the remedy I agree with. Of course I think he is a bum guesser on the war. My sympathies are not with Germany. If they were, I should say he has proven my case. Because he has shown that autocratic Germany takes better care of its people than democratic England, the most democratic country on the face of the earth today. There are too many causes that enter into the war for me to bother to discuss it today, or I think for him to profitably discuss it today. But if I wanted to get up a war, I would do what the newspapers did before the trouble with Spain—I would appeal to the people; I would get out editions every half hour, with red headlines crying war. And there is no power on earth could keep the people from it. If I wanted to do anything cruel, unjust, utterly brutal, absolutely insane, then I would appeal to the people and would win.

My friend and I may not disagree as to what is the matter with the economic world, and we shall scarcely disagree as to an idealistic world, where all, if not equal, should have enough, and if they have enough then they are equal—in one way. The question that interests me is this: Will Democracy bring us to the realization of that pipe dream of the future? That is what I want to hear about. If it will, then me for the dream! If it will not, if anything else will do it, then I am for that else, even if it is war. However cruel war is, there are some things worse than war. I do not think I quite share his horror of war. There are things that are worse than war, and one of those things is peace. You may show that progress has come from war; you will have great difficulty in showing that it comes from peace. In times of peace, men get fat, and happy and contented and brutal, and that is the end of it all.

The first form of Democracy is Political Democracy which means promiscuous and indiscriminate voting. When a male citizen gets old enough, he is a peer of the realm—he can vote, and, in some states, more progressive or less, a female citizen can vote. But,
I haven't time to discuss that question; it would take a lot of time.

Is giving everybody the franchise assurance that we will reach an idealistic state? Everybody will admit that the average man is a fool. The theory of Political Democracy says that once nothing is nothing; that ten times nothing is nothing, but that a million times nothing is a billion! Ten men are idiots, even if you bring them together, but if a million of them go to the ballot box together, a million idiots, the result is profound wisdom!

I would be glad to believe that I am wrong, and if I hadn't lived so long, I might be made to believe it. I would be glad to believe that we could bring about a democratic industry by holding elections often enough. But, we cannot. We have tried. We have failed, and always will fail, I am afraid. Neither in philosophy, logic, nor history can you arrive at the conclusion that the will of the majority is the will of God. If it is, the Christian must amend his idea of God. Ibsen is nearer right when he says the majority is never right; by the time the majority gets hold of a truth that truth becomes error because we have gone past it. For no truth, as Ibsen says, lives over fifteen or twenty years. All truth is relative, and conditioned, and it takes more than fifteen or twenty years for the majority to find a truth, and then it is wrong.

Will promiscuous voting bring us an ideal state? Can the people manage government, the industrial affairs or anything else, even their own affairs? That is the question that interests me. If they can, I am glad of it, but I must be shown.

In the first place, nature knows nothing about Democracy. I am no admirer of nature except that I like to look at scenery, but I, at least, never worshipped nature. Nature is not good, and not bad. But she is powerful and busy and you must obey her. Nature knows nothing about Democracy; she makes hills and valleys, dry land and oceans. Good and bad; strong and weak, and mixes them all up to work out their way the best they possibly can. She makes all sorts of animals and fixes it so that the strong eat up the weak and are eaten up in turn by something stronger still. She knows only conflict and strife and everlasting warfare, and works without purpose or meaning or end, but simply works on and on and on, and she knows nothing about Democracy, and never did.

She makes animals to feed on each other; and she makes men, with all the instincts, and even more cunning than the animals below. She makes these to feed on each other, at least they do. My friend quoted from that ancient political speech, the Declaration of Independence. He says all people, all governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed. Sounds good,
doesn't it? It is all right until you think about it, like lots of other things. Nobody on earth ever consented to be governed. I would like to have a picture of the man! It is simply a catch phrase which Thomas Jefferson put in to catch Democrats—nothing else. When you consent to do a thing, you are not governed. People are governed because they are governed, whether it is a monarchy or Democracy. Always has been, and always will be.

All men are created equal, says the Declaration. No two men ever were created equal since the world began, and never can be created equal. They are not equal in brain power; in emotions, in needs; in production or in anything, and their votes are not worth the same, and never can be.

What is this scheme of Political Democracy, anyway? What does it mean? We say that every citizen—and we will now admit women too—over twenty-one years of age, shall have a right to boss the job—that they will run the business of the State, they will make laws for the State. The only reason the world has not been better long ago is because there were not enough people voting! And now we will let them all vote. Of course when you say twenty-one, why not say fifteen? Is there any magical line at twenty-one? It is purely an arbitrary line drawn for no reason at all. And now we get together and let all these people run the business of the government or nation; we let them pass the laws. If anybody finds anything wrong, we pass a law to cure it. If anybody else has passed a law they ought not to we pass another and repeal it. Here are the people, entrusted with power—the concentrated wisdom of great nations. They tell us what is right and what is wrong. After they speak, we know, because the majority has said it. That is Political Democracy, and out of this Political Democracy, we are to have Industrial Democracy.

Now, let us see about the people. I am not sore on them—I used to be one of them. But, let us look at them and see how much they know; let us see whether they know how high the tariff should be or how low; whether we should be prepared or unprepared; whether we should go to jail for this offense or that; whether we should have a single tax or a dozen taxes; whether we should have a co-operative commonwealth or the Devil take the hindmost state.

Who are they, anyhow, and how do they get their ideas? Philosophy has something to say about this. History has a good deal to say, but history serves the needs of all people, it speaks according to how you feel and what you pick out. But, how does the average man get his ideas, if we can call them ideas. Where do they come from and where do they go to?
Man began to live in this world before he began to think. Automatically, he formed himself into societies and groups; he established certain customs. He didn't think about them; they grew. Just as the wolves on the plain. The wolf who gets outside of his pack dies, and the man who gets outside of his pack dies. It doesn't make any difference whether he is ahead or behind; if he is too far away, he dies because the majority is thinking and doing something else.

How do ideas get into this group? They got into them by filtration, through long periods of time, and finally, the great mass grab some ideas—an idea that has been old in the world—an idea that has become commonplace and worn out with intellectual men, but an idea finally filters down, the great mass of men grab it; they do not think it. They get to it, and they hang onto it after they have got it; hang onto it until it is a nuisance and a lie, and it encumbers the earth like a man wearing a suit of clothes forever. They should be made out of steel or wrought iron, so they would last. These ideas get into the people. They become what are called the “mores” of the people—the customs, the habits of the people. The common place things to which orators appeal when they want to round out a period, or stir the crowd or get a vote.

Look back at the history of the world. A few men have given it all of its ideas, a few in science, in art, in philosophy, in literature, in life. A few great minds, coming from the great reservoir of genius, somewhere in the universe, have grasped these ideas and given them to the world. The common man lives on them, but knows nothing about them and could not originate them if he would.

Almost nothing comes from the people but work and votes. And they do not know how to vote intelligently enough to get rid of work; they never did. Will they ever?

Let's look at this Political Democracy. We are going to pass on the important subject of protection or free trade; silver money or gold; single tax or two of them. We count noses, do we not? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, on this side; one, two, three, four—seven, eight, nine, on that side! Well, this side is right, because there is ten. A long time ago a New England philosopher, Thoreau, said, that instead of counting the voters we should weigh them. We would get at it just the same. Suppose at the last election we had driven the Republicans on to one huge scale and the Democrats on to another, wouldn't Wilson have won just the same? And if the other side happened to have the heavier would it have been any assurance that it was right? Not a particle.
You can weigh avoirdupois, but you can not weigh character or genius or intellect—or, that, which is the divinest thing in man—in whose womb quickens justice, the love of liberty—imagination,—you can not weigh imagination, without which all men are clods.

It is only here and there that a few great brains have been touched by the imagination that would make them feel the sufferings of mankind; the imagination which would make them wish to make this world a better place in which to live, these had some power to make it without resorting to a vote of the common people—who never knew and never can know.

What do the common people know anyway? I never wanted an office and never expect to, so I can say what I think about it. Have they ever read Herbert Spencer? No; they would drop dead if they should try; would need a surgical operation to get it through their heads. What do they know of Spencer, or Huxley, Hume, or Charles Darwin, or what do they know of Kant, or Plato or Socrates or Schopenhauer, or Bergson.

Turn to politics, do they know anything about Adam Smith or John Stuart Mill or any man who ever said anything worth listening to, or wrote anything worth reading? No; they wouldn't go to hear Herbert Spencer make a speech; they might come here to listen to the Professor and me. They would think it was the Spencer who invented writing. They are not interested in science, philosophy, logic, government. They go to the baseball games, the movies, the saloons, the churches; and they read the newspapers. How are you going to make anything out of them? The man who speaks on history, philosophy, or science, they do not care for. It is the Billy Sundays and the Billy Bryans, the billy-goats and the billy-be-damns. They are the ones who move the crowd.

What do they talk about? Well, I don't know; I don't go. They talk about conventional morality, cheap aphorisms, use catch words, appeal to deep-rooted prejudices, wave the flag, religion, "mother home and heaven"! Anything to get a vote or a cheer. What do they talk about? Anything that enlightens the mind? If they did the public wouldn't go. Anything that adds to real culture? Anything that moves to real inspiration? They talk about the things that the people feel and those are the common place things or the people wouldn't feel them; necessarily the common place things. Why, it is a matter of arithmetic, almost. Here are a million people; some idiots at one end,—we will not count them,—some geniuses at the other, the rear, the front, few; down below them a considerable number of men of talent, but not very many. Who are the rest? Why, the common people who
live an automatic life, who hold conventional opinions, who fear change; who are moved by the common things, and nothing else.

Tell me that Democracy came from them? Let's look at it a minute! Are they great? Everybody knows they are not? They are just people. Do they understand themselves, and will they ever understand themselves? Do they know who is for them? These wise people are going to pick out their representative. They are going to vote for somebody. They will vote for Mr. Senator Good Speaker, and Mr. Governor Commonplace, and Mr. Congress-man Good Fellow, he can get them. They wouldn't vote for Mr. Senator Wise Man, nor Mr. Governor Courageous, nor Mr. Congress-man Don't Care a Dam. They would vote for the people who met their ideas, their common place feelings, nothing else. And you may look all over the world, wherever Democracy has been tried and you will find it true. It is the mediocre, the thimble riggers, the cheap players to the crowd, the men who take the customs and thoughts of the common people, who weave them into song and oratory, and feed them back to the crowd to get their votes. And from them nothing ever did come and I fear nothing ever can.

What have they of their own? What have they ever done for their own? Take Spinoza, living on a crust and dying in a garret. John Brown, whose heart throbbed for the poor black slave, raising an army of fanatics, leading them into the land of the slaves so they could rally to the standard, and the people standing stupid and dumb while they hung him, for the crime of loving the world.

Jesus,—whether mythical or real, it makes no difference,—giving out his life for the human race, loving them all and dying on the cross from the same human race that he loved.

Has it ever been different? Can it ever be different? Raise the cry of mad dog; point the finger of scorn at any institution or any individual and the dogs are after him to bay him to death. We have in this country one conspicuous illustration of the wonderful wisdom of this great mob that we call the people; we had a sailor once,—not much of a sailor,—Admiral Dewey, who went over to Manila harbor and with the best equipped machinery in the world demolished a few Spanish tubs. The whole world went crazy for Dewey. He landed in New York and all of our wonderful American citizens, who make presidents, and governors, and senators, and fix the policy of states, went crazy over Dewey, they went down to meet him, and they collected money and bought him a home, which he deeded, the next day, to his wife! And the next day they turned their backs on him and hounded him to death, so that we have heard nothing of him since.
A wonderful thing! The people cannot do it! And they never can do it! The popular idol is not great and never can be great. The great man lives in solitude whether in the heart of a city or somewhere else, he lives a life of seclusion, for his thoughts are his own. The people know him not. He can not live with the mob. Slowly he toils to the top of Parnassus. But the mountain is high and the air is thin and cold; and he lives alone and he dies alone and the People know him not.
PROFESSOR NEARING'S SECOND SPEECH.

THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Nearing will now have twenty-five minutes.

PROFESSOR NEARING:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am glad Mr. Darrow decided to make fun of the common people instead of making fun of me. I wish, however, in his next speech he would tell us what he thinks of this crowd. There must be something wrong somewhere. Somebody must have slipped a cog. Mr. Darrow says that the man in front of the pack will be killed, and he says the man behind the pack will be killed. Then, how is it, Mr. Darrow, that we are no longer in packs, but have developed and materially advanced in our art, culture, which we call civilization? We spent a million years, maybe more or less, and during that time we have come up from pack life and we have modified, not only our method of living, but our attitude of life so completely that there is very little likeness between pack life and modern, civilized life.

If Mr. Darrow's argument were correct, the pack should be today exactly where it was a million years ago.

Mr. Darrow says the people are not intelligent; what do they know, says he, of science, philosophy and government? They are the commonplace, he says again, and like only commonplace things. I should like to condemn Mr. Darrow to live for twelve months in a society, let us say, of Spencers, Huxleys and Spinozas. If he came out intellectually and physically alive, he would be a lucky man. The saving grace of people like Mr. Huxley and Mr. Spencer and Mr. Darwin is that there are so many other people who are not like them. The fellow ahead of the pack, as Mr. Darrow so well says, is dangerous to the pack, just as the fellow behind is dangerous to himself, and so the pack eliminates the man ahead, or he is eliminated; and the pack eliminates the man behind or he is eliminated as it should very logically be in the interest of who? Why, in the interest of the pack! Thank God, the majority of people do not live in terms of philosophy, science and government. They simply live in terms of life, and if they lived in any other terms the human race could not conceivably continue.

Now Mr. Darrow says we have tried, we have failed and always will fail. That is a very interesting statement. There is only one unproved proposition in the world and that is the proposition, "It can't be done". You can not prove that. There are lots of things that you can prove, but you can not prove that it can't be done. You know that you have been proving that for about a million years. People like Mr. Darrow have said exactly that thing ever
since they first began to shape the first rude implements, and to experiment crudely with the arts and crafts. Someone has always shaken his head and has said, wisely, and I hope for the sake of the crowd wittily, "Well, well, it can't be done".

During those few thousand years that we can look back to with some degree of intelligence wise men have shaken their heads wisely and they have said to Spinoza and to Spencer and to Darwin and to Jesus and to all of the rest of the forerunners, just as Mr. Darrow has said today, "It can't be done." And scientists have gone on and social reforms have gone on, and "the world do move". And the reason why, "it do move," in spite of Mr. Darrow and all he may say to the contrary, is because our human world is made up of something else except the constituent elements that Mr. Darrow seems to think are existing there.

He said ten men are idiots. They still are idiots if you bring them together. But the result of bringing a million men to the ballot box is profound wisdom. Well, you will remember that amused you when he said it, and it amused me, too, because it is true if you take ten idiots to start with, but it is not true if you go into the crowd and take ten people. Mr. Darrow should bear this in mind, and I think it is an important fact and one that we should reiterate and restate, until everybody gets it thoroughly stuck in his mind, and that is, that there are various kinds of stuck in his mind, that there are various kinds of elements in human nature. There are various kinds of genius in human nature, I know, for example, Mr. Darrow referred to home—What was that?

MR. DARROW: Mother, home and heaven.

MR. NEARING: Mother, home and heaven. Mr. Darrow, for example, referred to mother, home and heaven. I know women, who will never be heard of in the archives, whose names will never be written down, but who have the particular genius for bringing up children. I know men whose names will never be recorded, who have a peculiar genius for polishing wood, or setting tile, or doing some other commonplace things that are done. Now, it seems to me that where Mr. Darrow makes a serious mistake is in supposing, as he said, that a few people have done the great things of the world. This is not so. A few people have been recorded on the pages of history as having done the great things of the world. But around those few people—behind and before them—there have been hundreds of thousands of other people who have contributed a little less in degree, a little less effectively, but they have nevertheless assisted the one distin-
guished person whose name stands out. George Washington and
the men who stood with him wrought great things, but without the men George Washington's achievements would have been impossible. The really serious proposition that Mr. Darrow raises—none of these propositions are serious—but the really serious point that he and I must face out he puts in this way: Nature, he says, knows nothing about Democracy; she works without purpose or means or ends. But, says Mr. Darrow, she must be obeyed. Let us run over that.

Nature knows nothing about Democracy. She works without purpose or means or ends, but she must be obeyed. Now, this is a very fine text because it enables me to say exactly what I want to say in the second speech. If Mr. Darrow's ancestors had followed the behests of that nature he refers to, he would be squatting in the sands somewhere along the seashore looking for shellfish. The very element which Mr. Darrow overlooks is that man has entered nature with purposes, with means, and with ends, and that it is exactly to the extent that he has purposes and means and ends that he succeeds in accomplishing the things he sets out to accomplish.

You talk about a state of nature. Compare it with the state of man and, as Ray Lankester points out in his book, "The Kingdom of Man," you have a tremendous contrast between the things that man has done for himself and the things that nature would have done if man had not butt ed in on the proposition. And it is just this butting in of the human race that constitutes—if you take one line of argument—one form of nature, or, if you take another line of argument—that constitutes a contravention, a denial, a subversion of nature. It is exactly this butting in of the human race that I am talking about. That is what I am here for this afternoon to try to persuade Mr. Darrow that if he and the rest of the human race will butt in with enough enthusiasm, and enough vigor, and enough intelligence, and enough of the genius that he praises so highly, we can eliminate unearned income, poverty and war.

I do not mean to controvert Mr. Darrow's proposition about nature being obeyed, because I believe that, and that is one of the reasons why I am trying to make the point that I am making. Nature must be obeyed. One of the laws of nature is that we grow by experience, that we grow by activity. If you stop activity you stop life. The essential element in special privilege government is that it depends on someone else doing it for you. Monarchy, aristocracy, plutocracy, any form of government where a special group governs for the great majority, is based on the proposition that we are better off with Paternalism than with Democracy. Because we get more to eat, or because we have more to wear.
I contend that we are better off with Democracy, because Democracy is a method of public expression, i.e., instead of having somebody come in and do it for you, the people are called upon to do it for themselves.

Mr. Darrow says they bungle. I should like to ask Mr. Darrow whether his friends, the lawyers, ever bungle? I know that the doctors and the school teachers bungle. I can take Mr. Darrow to any highly trained professional group in the community and I can show him a bunch of bunglers. But at the same time I can show him marvelous achievements that have been worked out in spite of the bunglers. If the lawyers, doctors, teachers and scientists were placed in an auditorium and had the Angel Gabriel lecturing to them for six hours a day, they would never become any better lawyers or doctors or scientists or teachers. But if you put them to work with the crude knowledge and tools they have and let them experiment, and try and fail, and try again and fail some more, and finally work out the solution, then you are getting step by step an advance from the savage squatting on the seashore hunting for shellfish to the man in civilization with a relatively larger amount of leisure and culture and knowledge.

Mr. Darrow says the people have not even got intelligence enough to vote themselves out of the necessity of working. Mr. Darrow overlooks the fact that our ancestors did not have to work. You go down into the torrid and semi-tropics and you find people living now without working. Mr. Darrow can go and join them if he wants to.

One of the greatest things of modern life is the opportunity which some of us have to work out the things that we believe in, and do the things that we enjoy. If it were not for civilization we would be squatting on the seashore waiting for the waves to roll up some shellfish. Because of civilization we can write, and we can paint and experiment scientifically; we can go on with all of the multitude of activities that the modern community offers because we have had this pack growing and progressing, advancing, developing, evolving.

My proposition is simply this, that the more opportunity you give to the pack the more rapid its advancement will be. I realize that people are stupid. I know, for instance, in our profession, we are pretty stupid on the whole; we are not a bright lot. But on the other hand I know a lot of young fellows in my profession that are trying very hard not to be stupid. Occasionally, I suppose, one or more of them succeeds in doing something that is really worth while.

That is the thing that counts effectively in eliminating the
ills of society, unearned increment, poverty, war, and the other social ills with which we have to contend. A great force in the world is moral enthusiasm. And most of the men, in fact I think you can say all of the men, mentioned by Mr. Darrow this afternoon, were men who have tremendous moral enthusiasm. Men who faced insurmountable obstacles, who faced them optimistically, enthusiastically, who worked untiringly and joyously at the task they were engaged in. He says Spinoza died in a garret, that he lived on a crust of bread. What of it? He had the opportunity to practice and think out his philosophy. I submit, Mr. Darrow, would have preferred to have lived on a crust and die in a garret than to sit, squatting, on the seashore, waiting for the ocean waves to roll up shellfish.

Now, do you see the issue between us? It is quite simple. Mr. Darrow thinks that it is not worth while because the people are so "doggone stupid". I think that it is worth while just because, if we will admit it for the sake of argument, the people are "doggone stupid". And I think most of us are pretty stupid. I would rather live with a lot of stupid people than with a lot of angels, I can not imagine anything more tiresome than angels, because angels are perfect people who have arrived, and all there is left to do is to sit around with crowns on their heads, read the scriptures, and sing "Glory Hallelujah". I am not interested, and there are lots of other people I know who are not interested in singing glory hallelujah.

We want a chance to put our energies to the wheel of progress and show what we can do in the next thirty years. We have seen other thirty year periods. For example, we have seen that brilliant period that followed the American and the French Revolutions at the end of the Eighteenth Century, and we have seen that brilliant period in the first thirty years in the Nineteenth Century when such marvelous changes were wrought in the western world. And we have seen, going back of that, other periods, in Thebes, in Greece, in Rome, in Genoa. And we have seen these wonderful spots, these bright lights in the history of the development of the human race when marvelous things were done by people, when the whole race has moved upward and onward to a higher level of development. All we ask is the opportunity to use our energy and to put our activities and our enthusiasm behind this thing, to put across Democracy, and let us see what will happen. Then if the thing does not happen that we expected, we will put across something else until the thing does happen that we expect, and we would like to have Mr. Darrow join the crowd.
MR. DARROW'S SECOND SPEECH.

MR. DARROW: I should like to say in reference to my friend's suggestion that I go to the South Seas, where I won't have to work, that I would consider that except that I get along here without it. I would be glad to join him in any scheme that would fix it up so the rest of the people can do it, even if I should have to go to work myself.

He says man changes nature, but man is a part of it, as much subject to the laws of nature as any other atom in the universe. I will say to his request to butt in on his job that I did butt in on this nearly forty years ago—this business of saving the world and fixing the old thing right—but I don't think that the butting in has done much good. At the same time, I presume I shall stay butted in as long as I live. The only question is how is the way to do?

It seems to me again, that we are talking at cross purposes. I am talking about fixing this thing right with Democracy, or whether it can better be done in some other way, or whether Democracy can do it or cannot do it.

Really, I have very little to criticise in the second address of my friend, but it seems to me he has still failed to meet the issue that all of us must meet in our own minds; that every Socialist has met for twenty-five or thirty years when he goes out and watches the election returns and concludes he won't save the world until the next election comes around, and then finds he is further off than he was before.

I don't deny the good of the common people; I don't deny their place in the scheme of the universe, which has no scheme; I don't believe that making speeches or electrical supplies or writing or philosophy is all there is to life. I said nothing that ought to indicate it. It may be just as important for a man to know that Ty Cobb led the batting average every year for ten years up to the past year. It probably is. I find time to store up some of those facts and enjoy them in my own mind. I say simply that people whose lives are filled with baseball games and moving pictures, and churches and the like, are not philosophers, and know nothing about making laws or what is best for the progress of the world. I say every man to his own trade. I might make a good pair of shoes if I didn't know how to "get by" some other way, but it wouldn't follow that I would understand the tariff or the currency question, or government or the philosophy of life. Why not let
the shoe maker make shoes instead of bungling the other job? Of course I know that professors bungle their jobs, and preachers would—if they had one, and lawyers do. Is that any reason why the shoemaker should teach Latin? Or why the carpenter should practice in the courts? Or why the bricklayer should be a scientist? Or why a man who may be good in one place is good in another? Not at all. It is not necessary, he says, to life, that every man be a philosopher. No, it is not. But what has that to do with Democracy? It is not necessary, he says. Quite right, when he says that the purpose of life is living. Profound truth. I wish we could get people to believe it.

I think the purpose of life is living, and in whatever position a man or woman may be, they should get the most they possibly can out of their lives. I would be the last person on earth to lay a single thing in the way of any human being getting all they could out of their own life and making the most they could out of it. The smallest, the tiniest intellect may be quite as valuable to society as someone else’s. What is still more important, may be quite as valuable to itself; it may have all the capacity for the enjoyment of things as the wise. It should have it. I would lay nothing in the way. I am not sure that intellect adds to enjoyment. I rather think it takes it away. I think the people with the smallest amount of intellect are the happiest. There is a good deal more trouble if one can see or imagine. Genius is not necessary. Philosophy is not necessary. Art is not necessary. Let a man live his life. But to tell me that the man who has no knowledge and no capacity as to the philosophy of government should still govern, is to say that the shoemaker should be a college professor and the lawyer should be a clergyman. Is there anybody on earth who wishes to entrust the crude, rude mass of men and women, who have no grasp of history, no grasp of life, no knowledge of the emotions of man, to trust these to make fetters for the human race?

It is because I believe that every man and every woman may be and should be equally useful in their sphere that I say to people, “Hands off and let everybody develop freely as they will.” What do we get out of this promiscuous voting? He says art springs from the people. Well, everything springs from the people, and sometimes springs quite a way. Here and there a spark of genius illuminates a man and he is an artist, and he paints something that is the admiration of the world. The people could not vote for the man to be an artist and make him paint that picture. The infinite forces of nature made him one. What do the people do when they find genius? A celebrated artist made a
statute for the front of the Chicago Art Museum a while ago, and the people tore it down because it was immoral and immodest.

What do they do if a man writes a brilliant book and dares to do something that the mob does not approve of? The book goes to the flames and no one can buy it. If a painted picture does not meet the narrow conventions of narrow lives, then the picture must be destroyed. If a think of beauty is created, it must be made in the image of the mob or it is bad and cannot survive.

The people have laid their hands upon literature; they have laid their hands upon art; they have laid their hands upon the theatres, the moving pictures. Every expression of art and life, and they say, you must conform or you must die. You must go with the pack or you must die.

I think my friend defined Democracy about as it is when he says it does cut off those behind and those ahead. That is what it does.

Now, do you want it? We have got it. Why cut off those ahead of the pack? Again, I say, the ones in the front have been the ones who have lead the world forever and forever. I don't believe I said Democracy never could come. I think he misunderstood me. If I said that, I was mistaken, and I would sooner believe he misunderstood me. I don't know whether it will come or not; neither does he. Whether the time will ever come when every human being shall decide every political policy by a ballot, I cannot tell. Whether the time will come when every industry in the world will be run by a vote, I don't know. Whether all the pictures and books will be determined by a vote, I don't know. I only hope it will be after I am dead, and I am quite sure it will be, quite sure. I do not know—looking away down through the future—he said a hundred years—a thousand years—a million years—it may come. But, things a million years off do not interest me any more, or a thousand. It is hard work for me to get an emotion for things a hundred years off. My imagination does not go that far. I can find things nearer home to work on. Every once in a while the people get an idea into their heads. My friend tried to get the start of me by asking me to tell this audience what I thought of them. That is not fair. I thought you were all right when you were applauding me and I began to doubt it when you applauded him. Every once in a while the people get a fetish into their heads—something to conjure with. Today it is Democracy. Another day it is religion. Some other day it is art. Some other time it is commerce. Again, it is war. Today it is Democracy. Democracy! Anybody who says a word against Democracy is supposed to be blaspheming the living God. That is the catch word of this age.
and generation, although my friend would not even pretend to say that in this country where we have promiscuous and indiscriminate voting we have ever had Democracy.

Who was it that elected Mr. Wilson? Who chose Mr. Hughes? Who was it, anyhow, that wanted Mr. Hughes to run for president? I never knew. Was it the people? Oh, no! We didn't. Five or six people, maybe in Wall street, got together and thought that Mr. Hughes was available and they would put him over; took it up with a few newspapers, politicians and things, and finally the people voted—the people had as much to do with it as they will with the eclipse of the moon tonight—just as much.

Who was it that chose Thompson to be Mayor of Chicago? We have promiscuous voting in Chicago and not much else but promiscuous voting. Why a little bunch of fellows got together and said we think Thompson will go down with the people. And, you had a chance to vote for one of two men. Probably the one you voted for, you wish you had not voted for. I don't know. But, even where the vote is given to everybody, people cannot do it; don't do it and never did do it. Our politicians are trained and you can get anything nearly you want if you are a clever politician just as much with the people voting, as you can any other way.

Look at it. We fly from one thing to another in our efforts to get out of our own difficulty. First, we shave monarchy. That won't do it. We must have Democracy. Then we have all kinds of Democracy. In our cities when we find corruption, we try a commission instead of a mayor; then, when we find the commission does not work, we have a mayor. The politicians get together in conventions to nominate, and that won't do. Then we have direct primaries where everybody can vote.

Then we have the collective wisdom of the common herd, for that is what we are, and the collective wisdom means the collective prejudices of Democracy, their prejudices for and against little things which never affect the real issue and which never can. And we fly from one to the other.

Now, I did not promise anybody that I would lay out a scheme of reform. I used to do that when I was younger. But the people wouldn't follow it. And I was left high and dry! I cannot do it now. My friend Nearing has the advantage of a good many years under me, so he can still do it. I only hope his zeal will hold out to the end, and his confidence and trust in the universal intelligence of the common people will keep up. For it is glorious dope! And it furnishes a pipe dream that many another dope cannot give.

I can imagine what the line of progress will be. Of course, I do not know, my friend's first speech and his last seem to con-
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flict. He told you how wonderfully this world had improved; that man had a given purpose. Tell me what purpose man has brought into it? How many of them? The purpose of man is like the purpose of the pollywog, to wiggle along as far as he can without dying. No other. To hang on till death takes him.

Go out and ask the people what is the purpose! To get money. To vote. To get shelter. Hang onto life. Let me tell you: If I wanted to get a political vote for an ideal scheme in any town or state or nation, I would rather have grasshoppers and dirt than all the idealists orators you can send. Take Kansas. When her people were poor they voted the Populist ticket. When they got rich and fat they were contented and conservative. The food supply influences a man just the same as any other animal on the face of the earth, and he lives just the same, and his activities are to get food to preserve his life. How far have we come? How far is it, anyway? From the savage, squatting on his hind legs, as he put it, fighting off the flies, gobbling up oysters—how far is it from the work shops, where they enslave little children?

I would rather go back. There, at least, they are not made slaves, and they do not need to toil, and they get a chance to live according to their own philosophy. How far have we come? Let me tell you. We have not come an inch. It is two thousand years since Plato wrote—it is two thousand years since Aristotle and Socrates—has the world an ideal that it did not have then? Is there a finer brain today than there was then? Two thousand years, which is the biggest part of the recorded history of man. We have gone fast, haven’s we?

Compare our religious progress. Take Bouddha, Confucius, Christ, and compare them with Mary Baker G. Eddy and Dowie, the products of the nineteenth century! If we will all butt in we will get this thing right! The probability is that it is a close race between the time the planet will grow cold and the time we will get it right!

Now, let us see: I will give something affirmative in a minute. I think this is about the scheme, in a certain automatic way, life is working all along down through the centuries. Man lives automatically. Science has largely progressed automatically. Let man be free; let the genius work. Let them have all the contributions of the earth they can. Leave the others free as well. Let them work up into the rank of geniuses; let them work up when they will; let them do it how and as they will. Do not make them paint pictures while they are carrying a hod, because it is not their job. Don’t have them build cities while they are making shoes; it is not their job. Leave the world free—freedom to
work out each man's destiny for himself. Now and then there would come along the great geniuses, who I would be glad to think would come oftener, not only endowed with imagination and genius, but endowed with sympathy for the sufferings of their fellowmen, turning their attention not to getting these alone, but to helping their fellowmen. Men like I imagine Henry Ford is today; men with a powerful genius for organization but with a vision to see this great mass of humanity that needs help, food, clothes and comfort. His job is to help his fellowmen, but I would leave his genius unhampered, free, to do its work. And, through all this, society will automatically work out better than it will if you leave the business of the earth to everybody, especially to Democracy; for there never has been a Democracy, and never can be one competent to do it.
PROFESSOR NEARING’S CLOSING SPEECH.

THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Nearing will close the debate with a speech of five minutes.

PROFESSOR NEARING: Mr. Darrow says that it will be a close race with the time when the planet will grow cold. I would rather have a close race than no race at all. Mr. Darrow confuses two ideas, the idea of the expert and the idea of the popular control of public affairs. Nobody was ever crude enough to suppose that the people would elect a man to paint pictures. We will, however, when we are intelligent elect officers and instruct them that when they find a man who can paint pictures they are to give him the leisure and the opportunity to paint the best pictures of which he is capable.

The purpose of Democracy is to maintain such a standard of public control over public affairs that in every generation the genius, about which Mr. Darrow talks so eloquently, will first be picked out from among the rest of his fellows, and second, be given an opportunity to exercise his transcendent ability.

What is the alternative to Democracy? Mr. Darrow did not point it out. It is, Special Privilege government. Either you must run your public affairs by a class, for a class, picking the leaders in each successive generation from that special class or, you must run your public affairs by the community, for the community, picking the leaders for each successive generation from the community.

Now, if Mr. Darrow will read Ward’s “Applied Sociology,” he will get a very interesting picture of the speculations of the greatest sociologist of the last century into the relative effectiveness of picking leaders from a class and picking leaders from the mass. We have used only one-tenth of the resources of the community. We must utilize the other nine-tenths. That means the babies who die of poverty—that means the children that Mr. Darrow mentioned crushed by premature toil—that means the people who never get an opportunity to show what ability and genius they have. Mr. Darrow charges that Democracy says, Cut off those behind, and those ahead of the pack. I did not start that little game. He started by saying, They cut off those ahead and those behind the pack. I agree with him. But Democracy enlarges the radius, widens the freedom, increases the opportunity of people who get ahead or stay behind the pack. In other words, the more Democracy we have the further you will be able to get
from the pack without being called down and without losing your own individuality or being destroyed.

Now, Mr. Darrow says that the purpose of man is like the purpose of the pollywog, to wiggle along as long as he can stay alive! That is not so. The purpose of man is, first, to perpetuate his kind, and second, to improve the conditions under which successive generations will live. Self-perpetuation and amelioration, as Ward points out in his "Pure Sociology," are far more important natural and social principles than self-preservation.

This is the proposition I wish to advance: Society, as I have said, ultimately adopts the scheme best calculated to advance social purposes. In my judgment after our own experiment with special privilege government we have reached a period in the history of human institutions, where we will try out another form of social control. That form will be Democracy. I believe that form will enlarge opportunity, give greater opportunity, give broader freedom, pick out more geniuses, permit more people of talent to display their abilities and to utilize them in the interests of the rest of mankind. I believe that we grow by doing, that we progress as we expend effort, that we enlarge our capacities the more we utilize them.

Democracy defined is, popular control of public affairs today, equal opportunity tomorrow, to enable us to utilize our capacity today and give the widest liberty to those who come tomorrow to utilize their capacity.

I believe that Democracy, as I have defined it, is the form of social organization toward which the community is tending, because it is a more effective one, and because it will enlarge the opportunities of the human race.