

THE NEW INTERPRETATION OF DEMOCRACY

THE NEW INTERPRETATION OF DEMOCRACY

A THESIS

Submitted to the

FACULTY

of the

SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

in

partial fulfillment

of the requirements

for the

degree of

DOCTOR IN THEOLOGY

by

JAMES CALVIN STIVENDER

1919

SOUTHERN BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
2825 LEXINGTON ROAD
LOUISVILLE, KY.

To
MY MOTHER

159181

THESES
Th. D.
St 59n
ORIGINAL
RESTRICTED
ARFA

P R E F A C E

The purpose of this volume is to give a suggestive outline of what the writer conceives to be the most significant tendencies in the development of modern democracy. Democracy thus conceived is not confined to the political realm alone, but is conceived in its broader sociological aspects as the application of the fundamental democratic principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity to the industrial, educational, and religious institutions as well. In a word, modern democracy involves the application of these fundamental democratic principles to the whole of life.

In accord with this purpose, it is evidently impossible to make an elaborate study of the infinitely numerous and varied phenomena attendant upon such a development, but it is possible for us to ascertain the general lines along which this development must inevitably proceed and to survey briefly the various fields in which these changes are being wrought out. To give more than a mere suggestive outline of so difficult and so extensive a subject in a treatise of this kind is a practical impossibil-

ity. If the writer succeeds, therefore, in making the study suggestive and provocative of further thought, he will consider his purpose accomplished. In the hope that it may attain this measure of success, the writer, fully conscious of its limitations and deficiencies, modestly presents this volume.

The general plan is one of interpretation, and the writer has not considered it necessary to treat elaborately the historical aspect of the subject. History, therefore, has been employed only as it promotes the central aim of interpretation. The treatise consists of two parts: The Principles of Democracy, and the Applications of Democracy. In Part I the aim has been to make a suggestive interpretation of the democratic principles in the light of present day thought; in Part II a suggestive outline study of the application of these principles to the political, industrial, educational, and religious institutions has been attempted. Part I is a study of the theory of pure democracy; Part II deals with the methods and means by which we may attempt an immediate and practical realization of these ideals in society.

In concluding these prefatory remarks, the writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to

Professor C. S. Gardner whose published work on "The Ethics of Jesus and Social Progress" and whose classroom lectures and notes on "Democracy and the Kingdom of God" have given valuable suggestion in the preparation of this work.

J. C. Stivender.

Louisville, Ky., April 1, 1919.

C O N T E N T S

INTRODUCTION	1
PART I: THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY	13
An Introductory Word	14
Chapter I: Liberty	15
Chapter II: Equality	29
Chapter III: Fraternity	39
Chapter IV: What is Democracy?	50
PART II: THE APPLICATIONS OF DEMOCRACY.....	56
An introductory Word	57
Chapter I: The Democratization of Political Institutions	59
Chapter II: The Democratization of Industry	79
Chapter III: The Democratization of Education	99
Chapter IV: The Democratization of Religion	113
BIBLIOGRAPHY	130

INTRODUCTION

There are three possible forms of social organization, forms which have appeared in various stages of human history. The first form is monarchy, or social control by one man. His will is the law. He rules for his own benefit and not for the benefit of the people. He has all rights and privileges; the people have none. Everything exists for the monarch who usually assumes to rule by divine right. The second form of social organization is oligarchy, or social control by a few men. In tribal society oligarchy usually takes the form of control by the elders or the old men of the tribe. In feudal society it takes the form of aristocracy, or control by the best. Here the absolute control by one man gives way to the control by a group of men, an aristocracy which heads up in royalty. This group rules for its own benefit and not for the benefit of the masses of the people. The aristocracy also claims to rule by divine sanction. In modern society the form of oligarchy is usually plutocracy, or control by the wealthy few. Here money becomes king and the few who possess it become the aristocracy. The third and last

possible form of social organization is democracy, or that form of society in which the people control. In this form of society there is no monarch, no privileged few. Social control is no longer of the few, by the few, for the few; it is of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Democracy! This is the most wonderful word of the age. It possesses magic powers. It falls from the lips of politician, propagandist, professor, preacher, and statesman; and it is uttered by the masses of mankind of every nation and clime as if its magic powers could supply their every want and need. One hears the word on the streets, in the hotels, on the trains, in lecture halls, in the churches, and almost everywhere that groups of people assemble. One can not glance at a newspaper nor a magazine without seeing this magic word. The sons and fathers of the world fought the Great War and gave their lives "to make the world safe for democracy." And today the peoples of the world are looking to democracy for salvation from poverty, ignorance, and servitude.

Not only is the term "democracy" the most wonderful and magical word of the age, but is, perhaps, the most misunderstood word. It is used in a vague and general sense by the vast majority of people, and con-

veys to the mind a general meaning but not a definite one. The need of the age, therefore, is a new interpretation of its principles and applications. "There is but one problem," says Frank Crane, "before the world - democracy."¹ Since democracy has become so significant for the world, its influence so extensive, its ideals so dominant, men have begun to study it both historically and scientifically. Surely such an important subject is worthy of our study.

The past offers us a number of interpretations of democracy. The oldest of these is that of the Greeks. It was this people who gave us the word. Its meaning is the rule of the people; *δημος*, people, and *κρασις*, to rule. Of this Greek democracy there were three leading characteristics: First, an essential condition was smallness of the social organization. It had to be sufficiently small for all the citizens to attend the general assembly and take a personal part in legislating and judging. Second, government was direct rather than representative, and it was the duty of every citizen to participate personally in all the deliberations. Third, only the citizens had a voice in government, and this meant that the vast majority

1. God and Democracy, p. 46.

of the people were excluded from participation, for only a very small per cent. of the people were of the citizen class. There were three classes of people in each of these "City-States": the citizen class, the aliens, and the slaves. And since the aliens and the slaves could not vote, there were frequently in a community six or eight times as many people who did not have a voice in social control as those who did.¹ In all the Greek republics the laboring classes were slaves and, therefore, had no voice in social control. Citizenship was always based on the possession of certain privileges and prerogatives.

It is very evident, therefore, that Greece did not know democracy as it is interpreted in modern times. But she did make an experiment in popular government which was far in advance of the government of the nations contemporary with her. And this experiment has furnished ideas and ideals for further democratic experimentation and interpretation. These Greek republics, while falling far short of present day standards, have exerted great influence through the centuries for democracy.

The Romans added nothing of importance to the

1. The Encyclopedia of Social Reform, p. 229.

interpretation of democracy made by the Greeks. For its next important development we must turn to the Mediaeval Cities. The growth of democracy in these cities resulted chiefly from economic and industrial activity. It was realized through the birth of a new class of society - the merchants and craftsmen. In feudal society, the warriors and farm laborers, or the gentry and peasants, were the two classes. With the weakening of the feudal system and the rise of towns with their trades and handicrafts, there came into existence this new middle class. This was a most significant step toward democracy. It meant a new kind of union in society. A new day had dawned. This co-operation through the manufacture and exchange of goods, together with town and city life which goes with it, brought about exchange of ideas as well as of goods. New wants and interests were created and new ambitions kindled, for people usually want what they see other people have. All this gave rise to new demands for liberty, and afforded the necessary means for backing up these demands.¹ People learned from this town life how to unite for peace and liberty; all classes learned the art and power of union. All this was valuable

1. J. H. Tufts: Our Democracy, Its Origins and Its Tasks, pp. 81-82. (Hereafter quoted as Tufts.)

training in democracy. Moreover, in this organization of life there was developed in men a consciousness of kind, and artificial distinctions largely disappeared. The government was in the hands of the masses and not of the classes, particularly in the Teutonic cities. Members of both the lower gentry class and the peasant class were constantly added to the population of these towns. In these cities and towns of northern Europe there was created a spirit of liberty, equality, and fraternity far in advance of that which characterized the early republics of Greece and Rome, for the slaves and the aliens had now become freemen and had a voice in their own government. Later, however, these free cities were merged into the enlarging autocratic states, and another splendid experiment in democracy was replaced by autocratic nationalism. But their influence for democracy lived on, and some historians declare these northern free cities to be the real parent of modern democracy.¹

The next democratic development of far reaching consequence also came from the Italian and German cities. I refer to the Renaissance and the Reformation. While these movements were not strictly confined to cities, they had their birth in the cities. The intellect and the soul, through the centuries enslaved, now

1. The Encyclopedia of Social Reform, p. 371.

demanded freedom. The two movements declared the right of men to think and to believe. "The Renaissance -- gave men new thoughts; it stirred their minds and filled them with new questionings; it awoke in them new aspirations and turned their attentions to wrongs that had too long been neglected."¹ Science and criticism became powerful weapons and were effectively used against the privileged few and in behalf of the oppressed many. "Literature became an arsenal where the poorest and weakest could always find weapons to their hand."² On the other hand, the Reformation struck a powerful blow at imperialism, declared the religious equality of men, and placed in the hands of the people the open Bible. Thus the masses of mankind began to learn the New Testament conception of equality and brotherhood; they began to learn the Christian conception of the worth of a man. Out of these two great movements there came, among other things, a new sense of the essential worth of a man, a new self-respect, an increased knowledge and self-reliance, and an independence of established institutions. The influence for world democracy of these two movements can not be estimated.

The next significant development of democracy

-
1. S. Z. Batten: The Christian State, p. 122. (Hereafter quoted as Batten.)
 2. De Tocqueville: Democracy in America, vol. 1, p. 3.

was on English soil. I refer to the representative principle of government. Out of the broken up Roman Empire emerged the nations of modern Europe, and with one exception they all developed into autocracies. This one exception is England. It is the English race that gave the world constitutional and representative government on a large scale.¹ The rights which had been won from the English throne, in the Magna Carta and otherwise, had been won chiefly by the aristocracy and for the aristocracy. Parliament, therefore, was the institution of the few; its members were elected by the few and to represent the few. Nevertheless, this principle of representative government has been one of the most important developments in the history of democracy, for it has made democracy practicable and possible for the large nations. In that age direct democracy was possible only in small social organizations; it could not function in large territories. Thus far, the history of the representative principle has been the history of political freedom.²

Another interpretation of democracy was made in the eighteenth century, the century of the French and American Revolutions, which was to have a unique

1. H. Cabot Lodge: The Democracy of the Constitution, pp. 6-7.

2. Ibid., p. 7.

and a very remarkable influence. I refer to the doctrine of "natural rights." This doctrine was not new, but dated back to the age of Aristotle. From age to age it had been given various interpretations, and these interpretations of the doctrine had not been without influence and inspiration for men in their fight for human rights. The teaching of this philosophy, in brief, was that men have certain inalienable rights which are derived not from the conventional order of society, but from the immutable laws of nature. These laws of nature are superior to the laws of the Church or the State; therefore, these conventional institutions can not justly deprive men of the rights which are theirs by the gift of the natural order. In this natural order, which preceded the conventional order of society, men were free and equal. About every man was a circle in which he was absolute, and no other had a right to encroach on his individual rights. Every man could do as he pleased so long as he did not trespass on the rights and liberties of others. It was a state of pure individualism. There came a time, however, when men, for the sake of securing common protection and other social values, voluntarily surrendered some of their natural rights and entered into a social contract. To secure these

social values of co-operation, it was necessary to give up some of the natural rights and privileges. This social contract was, however, purely voluntary and might be voluntarily dissolved.¹

With this doctrine were associated such names as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Jefferson, and others. The influence of this doctrine was very great in England and France. Jefferson and his contemporaries embodied it in the new American government, and here it grew and became the dominant philosophy of the entire social order. It was the general philosophy of the age, and "all the tendencies of the time - religious, scientific, philosophical, and political - favored the theory."²

This "natural rights" philosophy was applied to all phases of society, and it always resulted in individualism. Adam Smith applied it to the economic and industrial order; and there has resulted the present competitive system with its doctrine of "laissez-faire." It was applied to government by Jefferson and his contemporaries, and the result has been an individualism which has now become plutocracy. The application of this philosophy to society saved the nations from absolutism; it has, therefore, been of untold value. It

1. The Encyclopedia of Social Reform, p. 816.

2. Ibid.

served its day and served well. But men are living to-day in a very different world to that of the eighteenth century, and the continued application of the doctrine of individualism is producing very harmful results. Our forefathers, the apostles of this doctrine, feared government, and, therefore, left each individual largely free to do as he pleased and to get possession of what he could. As a result of this, the fortunate and the strong have got possession of the wealth, the means of production, and largely the government. The strong and the rich have become financial kings, while the poor and the weak have become impoverished and oppressed. This eighteenth century interpretation and application of democracy destroyed absolutism, but it has given in its place an extreme individualism with all its inefficiency, and a plutocracy with all its curses.

A new interpretation of democracy, one adequate to meet present day needs, is imperative. At the present day the world is attempting such an interpretation. What kind of democracy is demanded for present day needs? How does it differ from that of to-day? It is the purpose of this treatise to attempt to answer this question. In a word the democracy of to-morrow must differ from that of to-day in two respects:

First, it must be real and not shadowy and formal, a democracy that does not content itself with the mere right to vote and with political generalities about the rights of men; second, the future democracy must be a full, socialized democracy, emphasizing social rather than merely individual aims, and carrying over its ideal from the political into the industrial, social educational, and religious fields. We shall attempt in this treatise a brief discussion of both the principles and the applications of such a democracy.

PART I: THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY

AN INTRODUCTORY WORD TO PART I

I shall attempt in PART I a discussion of the fundamental principles of democracy. The primary aim is to give an interpretation of these principles that is in keeping with the thought and the need of this age. PART I consists of three chapters: LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY, and a concluding chapter on WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

In this discussion I lay no claim to completeness. My purpose is not to exhaust the subject - a task which could not be accomplished in a treatise of this kind, even if the writer were not lacking in the ability. My purpose, rather, is to make the study suggestive and provocative of further study on the part of the reader. If I succeed in doing this I shall be satisfied.

CHAPTER I: LIBERTY

The first great principle of democracy is liberty. In this chapter I shall endeavor to discuss both the negative and the positive aspects of this subject.

1. LIBERTY NEGATIVELY CONSIDERED.

"When we review this story of the struggle for liberty we see that it is almost wholly a story of negatives."¹ It has been negative both in form and in spirit, and has appeared as the deliverance of men from arbitrary power. These arbitrary powers against which men have struggled through the centuries have generally embodied themselves in military feudalism. To understand man's struggle for freedom, therefore, it is necessary to understand the system and the philosophy of military feudalism.

Feudalism through the centuries has been the existing order of society. As its support, it has had a powerful system of philosophy. This philosophical system has almost completely controlled the minds of men. The two great institutions, the Church and the

1. Batten, p. 218.

State, have been feudalistic both in form and in philosophy. They have claimed a divine right to rule mankind. They have claimed that all authority is outside the human and natural realm, outside the world of human experience, and in a supernatural world of its own. To them has been delegated authority by God Himself to rule the race. These overlords of the earth possess a monopoly on authority. This divine authority, which has been delegated directly to the Pope and the Emperor, as heads of the Church and the State, descends by a process of devolution from grade to grade - from pope and emperor to cardinal and king, to bishop and duke, to priest and count, etc. - till we finally come to the masses of the people whose only duty is to obey. In this whole system mankind has existed for the institutions, and not the institutions for mankind.

The history of liberty has been, therefore, a story of man's struggle against this feudal system and philosophy; and, while feudalism as a military and political system has passed away, the after effects of an order of things in which authority descended from the apex to the base of the social pyramid are still with us. As we shall see in part II, our present day institutions are largely feudalistic.

In their long struggle for rights and privileges,

men have used three methods.¹ The first method is fighting. With this method they sometimes succeeded, but perhaps more often they failed because they lacked intelligence and leadership. The second method is bargaining. "Men have gained more by bargaining than by fighting..... These bargains have nearly always been made by some group or class for itself. Then later on the class might be enlarged so that more would share in it."² Illustrations of these bargains are the rights of freemen secured in the Magna Carta, the rights of towns secured by special charters, and the rights of petition. A third method is that of appeal to reason and sympathy. This is the work of prophets, poets, and philosophers. The work of the prophet and his contribution to the cause of liberty can not be too much emphasized. The Christian prophet has made a unique contribution. He has preached the equality of all men before God; he has championed the cause of the masses of mankind; he has stirred men to action in the cause of justice and righteousness, and he has brought the spiritual resources of the world to bear upon the cause of freedom. The poet, also, has made his contribution. He has sung of a better day; he

1. Tufts, p. 117.

2. Ibid., pp. 120-121.

has pictured an ideal social order wherein men would be free, and he has inspired men to go forward toward these better things. The philosopher has proved that liberty is the only reasonable principle of life, and has, therefore, added his contribution to that of the poet and the prophet. His appeal has been to the reason, while that of the poet and prophet has been to the emotions and the will. Fighting, bargaining, and appealing have united in the long struggle to make men free. Each has made its special contribution to the cause.

Doubtless the "natural rights" philosophy, as it was interpreted in the eighteenth century, greatly advanced the cause of liberty. As we observed in the introductory chapter, this philosophy taught that there was a state of nature, lying back of the conventional order of society, and hence, back of feudalism and its institutions, in which men were absolutely free. Each individual possessed complete freedom, with the one condition that he must not encroach upon the rights of any other individual. These rights were the gift of Nature, or, as Christian philosophy saw it, the gift of God. These natural rights did not come through the Church or the State or any other conventional institution; they came direct from God, or Nature, to men. Liberty, therefore, is the free gift of Nature, or the

free gift of God, and is not the gift of these established feudalistic institutions. No power of Church or State, pope or emperor, can justly withhold that which is man's natural heritage. It is, therefore, the duty and privilege of men to revolt from the conventional order of society and to claim their natural rights. This men did in the eighteenth century. It was the century of the French and the American Revolutions.

But these revolutions were against militarism. Such rights as "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," which had been withheld from the people through the centuries, were now won by revolt. It was military feudalism that had withheld these rights, and men could not conceive that any other power than this could withhold human rights. Destroy military government and men would be free. This conception was embodied in the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. "The essential meaning of liberty in the principles of '76 was evidently freedom from oppression by the government. There is not a word in them about oppression of one class by another. There is not a word about burdens of poverty or unfair contracts. Men felt that if the government would let them alone they could themselves get a living and pursue happiness."¹ And

1. Tufts, p. 174.

this is the prevalent conception of liberty to-day.

We need a new interpretation of rights, for the age is outgrowing the conditions which gave meaning to this former interpretation. Rights in the old sense have little meaning, to-day, and especially for America; and perhaps the Great War has put an end to militarism in general. But conditions other than militarism have arisen to rob men of their rights. Steam, electricity, the machine, and the factory, together with the immense amassing of capital and the corporate control of wealth, have revolutionized the world; and all this has come about since the eighteenth century. The framers of the American Constitution did not foresee an industrial development of such magnitude, and they could not foresee the conditions which have grown out of it. To-day, the real enemy of the rights of men is plutocracy. It is the power of wealth and special interests that are withholding the rights of men. As our forefathers fought for human rights against militarism, men to-day must fight for human rights against plutocracy and special interests. The cry to-day is for the right to obtain by labor good food, good clothes, good houses, fresh air and proper sanitary working conditions, and adequate opportunities for the laborer and his family. The cry is for justice, for the right of men

to enjoy the values they have created; for the right of the common people to enjoy sufficient leisure and recreation; for the right to enjoy some of the intellectual, esthetic, and spiritual values of life; for the right of the people to give their children at least an average opportunity for education, religion, culture, and attainment. These are the rights men are demanding to-day. The struggle is against the kings of industry, against plutocracy. This is the interpretation of the rights of men which is demanded to-day.

Out of this "natural rights" philosophy, or parallel with it, has grown the doctrine of "laissez-faire." This doctrine has been applied to our whole American life. It is a doctrine of individualism. In a word, it means the less government the better, and that the function of the state should be reduced to a minimum. It teaches that government, as it is related to the economic realm, has only two functions, namely, the protection of property rights and the enforcement of contracts. This doctrine of laissez-faire is "the desire of the individual to be left alone, to do as he pleases, indulge his impulses, follow out his projects."¹ It teaches "that liberty and independence are synonymous terms."² The doctrine, unchecked, leads to license and

1. Bryce: The American Commonwealth, vol. 2, p. 418.

2. Lyman Abbott: The Spirit of Democracy, p. 169.

to unrestrained egotism. It has cultivated the spirit of rank individualism which characterizes our American life. Liberty, according to this doctrine, is a state of individualism in which each man is free to follow out his own likes and dislikes regardless of any social obligation.

This negative and laissez-faire conception of liberty defines law in feudalistic and military terms. Law is restraint imposed by arbitrary and external powers. Liberty is, therefore, the absence of law, the absence of social control. The less government the more liberty. From this point of view, the only obligation is to conduct one's self in such a manner as not to encroach on the rights and privileges of others. Society becomes, therefore, merely a regulation of personal rights.

This negative conception of liberty, with its emphasis on individual rights rather than on social duties, has characterized the past and is still the popular conception. Practically all the literature on the subject is written from this point of view, and very rarely does a writer give any other view of the subject. And this can be very easily explained. Our American life has been a rural life until very recent times. Our cities are a phenomenon of the last few decades. This negative and individualistic conception

and practice worked very well in rural society where the population was sparse, the social organization simple, and the division of labor not very much marked. But it is not an adequate doctrine for our modern society, for crowded cities, and for a complex social organization. It is true that we must continue to define liberty in terms of rights so long as there is a struggle between the few and the many, between aristocracy and democracy. Men must win freedom from oppression, whether that oppression come from military and political kings or from industrial kings; therefore, liberty must continue to be defined in the negative sense of rights. But it is also true that we must define it in positive terms, in terms of duties as well as rights. This new age demands a new interpretation and application of the doctrine of liberty.

2. LIBERTY POSITIVELY CONSIDERED.

Here the emphasis is on duties and obligations. "True liberty is a positive thing, and to consider its negative aspects alone is to miss its high and divine significance."¹ There is a new social spirit to-day which teaches that the fullest liberty is realized, not by each individual's going his own way independent of

1. Batten, p. 219.

his brothers, but by a common co-operation of all in the common cause. The principle of voluntary co-operation supplants the principle of pure individualism. All freedom incurs responsibility and a common service, and without this responsibility and common service there can be no real freedom. "Any attempt to claim freedom and disclaim responsibility, under whatever name or form of government, proves illusionary or self-destructive."¹ Liberty, in its fullest meaning, is possible only in a co-operative social order where common service and responsibility are basic. Positively considered, liberty is a social order in which each individual has both an opportunity and a stimulation to development and full self-realization. Society becomes an organism, no part of which can be benefited without benefiting all parts, and no part of which can be injured without injuring the other parts also. Upon each individual rests an obligation. "All power is obligation. As you can, you owe; and as you know, you owe. If you have money it is so much obligation of leadership and service."² If you have talent, political or social influence, etc., you are under obligation to society. True liberty means voluntary sacrifice for the common good, for the common life.

1. Hadley, A. T.: Freedom and Responsibility, p. 4.
2. Griggs, E. H.: The Soul of Democracy, p. 155.

The negative view of liberty emphasizes the getting for self of all that is possible; the positive view emphasizes the giving for the common good of all that is possible. This is essentially the Christian view. By the grace of God men are saved and made free, but with this freedom come new responsibilities for kingdom service.

This positive view of liberty gives us a new interpretation of law. In every form of society there must be some kind of control, and each individual must be under obligation. He must answer to some form of authority in the group, otherwise the social order ceases to be order and becomes chaos. This authority may be arbitrarily imposed from without or voluntarily imposed from within. The negative view of liberty conceived law to be restraint arbitrarily and externally imposed upon men, and it conceived liberty to be exemption from such a law. Men, therefore, feared government and union and sought to place strong checks on them. This has been, to a great extent, the American conception. Law has too long been defined in terms of the Alexanders, the Caesars, the Napoleons, and the Hohenzollerns; that is, in terms of military feudalism. The new interpretation denies that liberty is exemption from law; it denies that there is any such thing as exemption from law. In

a democracy, law ceases to be the will of an autocrat arbitrarily imposed upon men, and becomes the very nature of life itself. "Law is the nature of things, the nature of man, the nature of society, the nature of God."¹ Law is the very constitution of the universe. This law is nothing less than God in life and in the universe. To accept law in this sense, and to obey it, is to be free. It is the voluntary acceptance of an obligation which can not be escaped because it is the very law of life. To order one's life voluntarily in accord with this fundamental and universal principle of life is to be free.

The democrat, therefore, recognizes law, not as externally imposed restraint, but as the nature of his own life and the common life of which he is a part. Obedience to law means, from this point of view, obedience to one's own best self. Thus government becomes an expression of the individual. Each man sees himself as a constituent, a citizen, and not as a subject, of the State.

Liberty, from this positive point of view, becomes not an end in itself, but a means to an end. This end is the fulfilment of one's personality and the

1. Lyman Abbott: The Spirit of Democracy, p. 172.

welfare of all. This view concerns itself less with abstract theories of human nature - the kind given us by the eighteenth century philosophers and which are no longer tenable - and concerns itself more with accomplishments and results. The emphasis to-day is on achievement, function, result. The cry is for a democracy that will do things, that will furnish an environment best fitted for the realization of the fullest life and the highest development of personality.

Thus we see that positive liberty places the chief emphasis on duties rather than on rights. Government is no longer limited to safeguarding private rights, but becomes a constructive co-operation for the common weal. This view insists that all organized relations of society and all occupations be considered forms of social service and followed in the spirit of service.

"Thus far democracy has taught men the Nay of liberty, and it has taught it well. But it must now go forward and teach men the Yea of liberty, and its task will not be finished till this is done. In the yea of liberty a man says: I am free from all lesser and lower masters that I may come under the mastership of the King Eternal. In the yea of liberty a man says: the other man is as good as I, and in every way I shall seek his good. In the yea of liberty he says: I am a

man with a man's freedom and manhood that I may do a man's work and may live for the common weal. In the yea of liberty he says: The common good is the supreme concern, and I shall seek and find my good in and through the good of all."¹

1. Batten, p. 322.

CHAPTER II: EQUALITY

The present chapter is devoted to a brief discussion of the second great principle of democracy - Equality. During the centuries, equality has been considered the central and basic idea of democracy; therefore, a discussion of democracy involves a consideration of this principle.

Let us briefly consider, in the first place, the forces that are working for equality among men. We will here name three of these forces.

First, there is an instinct in men for equality. It is also true that there is in men an instinct for mastery and power. The human instinct for equality expresses itself in a number of ways. It expresses itself in a resentment of the attitude of superiority in other people, and we ourselves become uncomfortable when we persistently assume a superior attitude toward others. If men would be friends they must place themselves on a common plane. Moreover, the great religions of the world have proclaimed the equality of men in the sight of God. This human instinct expresses itself in religion, friendship, the club, good society and law. It is a

powerful contributor to the cause of human equality.¹

A second force that has greatly contributed to this cause is philosophy, and especially the "natural rights" philosophy of the eighteenth century. It declares that "all men are born free and equal." It said, "I am as good as you." As we have already observed, this philosophy goes back of the conventional order to a state of nature in which men were supposedly equal. "It goes back to a state of nature where all were equal, and supposes that 'the poor consented,' as Rousseau says, 'to the existence of rich people,' reserving always a natural right to return to the state of nature."² Perhaps no philosopher was nearer to the men who produced the American Declaration of Independence than Locke, who described this natural state of equality thus: "A state also of equality, wherein all the power and jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one has more than another, there being nothing more evident than that creatures of the same species and rank and promiscuously born to all the same advantages of Nature, and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal one amongst another."³ That such a powerful philosophical ideal has inspired men to fight for equality can not be doubted; and even

1. Tufts, pp. 277-278.

2. The Works of Matthew Arnold, vol. X, p. (Essay on Equality)

3. Quoted by Tufts, p. 274.

now, although the existence of any such natural state has been disproved, the ideal continues to have great influence over the popular mind.

The third and most potent force that has contributed to the cause of equality is Christianity. Men can not breathe the atmosphere of Christianity without feeling a sense of equality, and where Christianity has gone men have come to believe that one man is essentially as good as another. The Christian religion has taught the infinite value of the soul. It has taught that for the soul of the common man God gave His Son to die on the Cross. It has taught the equality of souls after death. Christianity is, to-day, emphasizing the priceless value and essential equality of the lives, of the personalities, of all men. The greatest equalizing force the world has ever known is the Cross of Jesus Christ. Christianity alone has laid the real basis of equality in the teaching that in the sight of God all men are equal; that all men are to be judged by the same standard of judgment; that all men are to be saved by the same Christ; and that all men are to enter together into the same reward or the same punishment. Who can estimate the influence for human equality of such a religious ideal?

This democratic principle of which we speak is

a glorious ideal, and as an ideal it has through the ages possessed and inspired men. But has it ever been realized? Is it not still a mere ideal? Do not the existing facts deny that there is any such thing as a real equality among men? We see inequalities on every hand; but where can we find equalities? Is not the thing a mere pious conception, a mere creature of the philosopher, a song of the poet, a dream of the prophet? Is there any such thing as actual, concrete, real equality among men? Have we not ignored the facts of the real world when we have said that all men are equal? The scientific spirit and method, as well as our common-sense observation of existing facts, are challenging our further acceptance of the doctrine of equality.

It can not be denied that great numbers of inequalities exist among men at the present time. How can they be explained? There are two reasons for their existence. First, men are born unequal. Men have inherited inequalities and they can not remedy matters. Some are born white, some black; some are born with normal organic equipment, others with abnormal equipment; some inherit potentialities that may develop into strong bodies and minds, others do not. Secondly, the greater difference in men is due to the conditions that surround their lives after birth; due to the character

of their parents, their food, their home and its surroundings; due to their schools and all the other opportunities or misfortunes which come to them. We see all kinds of inequalities among men, inequalities of health, possessions, influence, education, and character. In what sense are the poor, the sick, the ignorant, and the vicious on equality with the wealthy, the healthy, the intelligent, and those of strong character and large usefulness? "Professor Cattell has found that of one thousand leading men of science in the United States, one hundred and thirty four were born in Massachusetts, three in Georgia, and that for each million of population Massachusetts and Connecticut have had a hundred scientific men of high standing; the states of the Southern seaboard but two. No one can doubt that this means simply that boys in Massachusetts and Connecticut have had a better opportunity than boys in Carolina or Georgia."¹ Illustrations like this could be multiplied, but it is unnecessary. The facts are self-evident, and no one can deny the existing inequalities among men to-day.

In view of the existing facts, are we not forced to say with many students of democracy that there is no equality among men? Moreover, is equality essential to

1. Tufts, p. 279.

democracy? "The corner-stone of democracy," says Nicholas Murray Butler, "is natural inequality, its ideal the selection of the most fit. Liberty is far more precious than equality, and the two are mutually destructive."¹ Are we prepared to say the same? Butler is speaking of "natural" equality, but in what other sense can we use the term? Let us endeavor, in a further brief study, to determine in what respects there can be equality among men.

(1) Christianity teaches that all men are equal in the sight of God. For the Christian man this doctrine is a great equalizing force, and has been through the centuries. As we have already stated, this Christian doctrine has done more to make men equal than any other power. The Christian believes in a spiritual equality. He also believes that such spiritual principles should control in the concrete relations of life; he believes in the application of the spiritual principles of Jesus Christ to society.

(2) Men are equal in the sense that they all have common needs. All men need the material necessities of existence, such as food, clothing, and shelter. It is true that the quality and quantity needed

1. True and False Democracy, p. 57.

may differ with different individuals, yet all men must have these necessities of life. Again, all normal people have need for the satisfaction of the family instinct, for love, for home. All men need human sympathy and companionship, especially in times of suffering. Moreover, an opportunity for the development and expression of life is a universal human need. And finally, all men need God and salvation. They need to be saved from fear, from despair, and from sin. These are some of the universal human needs, and in this sense all men are equal.¹

(3) Again, there can be an equality of rights and privileges. There can be equal opportunity in the sense that artificial barriers - political, civil, educational, economic, social, and religious - can be removed. What did our American statesmen mean when they declared that all men are created equal? "They probably meant chiefly that men are at any rate not divided into two classes, one of which has a right to rule the other. They probably meant to protest against the view that just because a man is of royal blood he has a divine right to rule other persons, without any regard to whether he is wiser and better than they."² In the

1. Giddings: Elements of Sociology, pp. 324-326.

2. Tufts, p. 274-275.

spirit of our early American statesmen, we can go forth to destroy the artificial barriers that prevent equality in educational, industrial, social, and religious opportunity, and that deny to men the right of suffrage and a voice in social control. Perhaps there will always be inequalities among men, but they should not be the result of artificial barriers between men or classes of men. We can not make men equal, but we can make opportunities equal. The ideal to be attained is not a dead level among men, but an open door, an equal chance for every man.

Our main consideration, therefore, is not whether there is or ever will be any such thing as exact equality among men; "the fundamental idea of democracy is that every one ought to have a chance to show what is in him.... and the only way to find out what is best in a man is to treat him as your equal."¹ Equality means that all men have a right to be considered. It means that every man's personality is sacred and of infinite worth, and that no artificial condition, such as birth, occupation, or position should lessen a man's right to the proper expression and development of his personality. It means that every man has worth, and

1. Tufts, p. 279-280.

that his personality is entitled to as much honor as is that of any other man. Men are unequal in possibilities and potentialities, but they should not be unequal in opportunities to develop the powers they have. What we mean by equality is that the potentialities and possibilities of all men should be given the fullest possible development, and that the personalities of all men should have adequate opportunity to exert a full and free influence. In a word, we can have equality in the sense that every man has the right to have developed into the fullest life all his potential possibilities, and that this life so developed has a right to consideration and expression according to the weight and value of its opinions, its manhood, and its character.

This kind of equality must be achieved. It can be realized only through struggle and labor. It is not a free gift, neither does it come by any "natural right." "To say that men are equal does not make them so. The great task of the present is to make good in fact what our forefathers claimed in words or cherished as an ideal."¹ How can this equality be achieved? War can not accomplish this task, for war at best can only

1. Tufts, p. 295.

relieve men of burdens imposed on them by others. The causes of inequality must be removed. Before we can have equality among men, we must remove poverty, ignorance, vice, defective laws, and economic injustice. This task must be undertaken in the spirit of service and brotherhood. The greater men must render the greater service. The spirit of Jesus, which is to-day expressing itself in a common service for the race, is the one hope for human equality.

CHAPTER III: FRATERNITY

In the two preceding chapters we have attempted a consideration of liberty and equality. This chapter will be devoted to a brief consideration of the third and last great principle of democracy - Fraternity. For convenience of treatment, we will consider separately the two aspects of the subject, namely, the social and the religious.

1. THE SOCIAL MEANING OF FRATERNITY.

The meaning of fraternity is brotherhood. Brotherhood in the fullest and universal sense is the ideal toward which the race continues to move. In the struggle for the realization of this ideal, co-operation, unity, mental and moral homogeneity, and a common sympathy and service must necessarily be attained. The struggle has continued through history, and with the passing of each age the race finds itself nearer the ideal. And, to-day, with the League of Nations almost assured, the world is nearer the ideal than it has ever been before. The great forces of social evolution are making for unity, not only in the nations, but among the nations.

Why have men undertaken the art of living co-operatively rather than separately? Why have they united for a common life rather than each man living his own life apart from every other man? There are two main reasons for this.

The first reason is a practical one. Men have gradually learned from the experiences of the race that the fullest life can be realized only in relationships. Human experience has taught that co-operative action is not only a practical convenience but a practical necessity. Relations that were accidentally formed proved useful and agreeable, and were, therefore, maintained. Forms of co-operation, created for temporary purposes, proved successful and were continued.¹ Gradually through the ages men have learned that "no man liveth unto himself," and that no man can live to himself. Men have learned that life is social. "We are compelled to think of humanity not as a series of disconnected and isolated individuals and fragments, but as the interrelated and interdependent members of an organic whole."² The best interest of the individual, the family, or the larger group is tied up inseparably with the welfare of humanity. This is a well

1. Giddings: Elements of Sociology, p. 173.

2. Batten, p. 175.

established social fact. Through costly experience men have gradually learned this great lesson, and they are still learning it. The Great War has most forcefully, and at an enormous cost, brought this lesson home to the nations of the world.

The other reason for human co-operation and unity is a natural one. Men come together because it is their nature so to do. Since men are social beings, they seek the society of their fellows. Men are coming to feel that they are brothers because they share a common nature and a common life. History reveals an ever widening co-operation, an ever enlarging brotherhood. At first the brotherly relationship and obligation extended only to members of the family and the clan. All other families and clans were considered enemies and aliens, and there was no thought of kindness or relationship with them. Gradually, the unit of kinship and co-operation enlarged into the tribe. For a long time the tribe was the unit of co-operation, and each tribe considered itself an enemy of every other tribe, with no kinship or obligation outside its own group. From the tribe this spirit of kinship and co-operation was extended to the race and tongue, and nations supplanted tribes. "There has always been a democratic tendency, whose advance has been conditioned

by the possibility, under actual conditions, of organizing popular thought and will on a wide scale. Free co-operation is natural and human..... Accordingly we see that there has been a progressive humanism, a striving to clear away lower forms of co-operation no longer essential, and to substitute something congenial to natural impulse."¹

Will this tendency toward an ever enlarging co-operation and brotherhood supplant nationalism with internationalism? This is the question of the hour. The unmistakable lesson of history is that the area of co-operation and common life has ever been enlarging. And, to-day, this tendency is stronger than ever before, for the War has created in the peoples of the earth a sense of kinship and brotherhood never before known. Through common action and common sacrifice the peoples of the earth have been drawn close together. They have learned more than ever before that their needs and desires, their problems, their dangers, their hopes and aspirations are common to the race and are shared by all mankind. President Wilson, in the closing words of his speech to the Peace Conference at the reading of the draft of the League of Nations, said:

1. Cooley, C. H.: Social Organization, pp. 119-120.

"Many terrible things have come out of this war, gentlemen, but some very beautiful things have come out of it. Wrong has been defeated. . . . People that were suspicious of one another can now live as friends and comrades in a single family and desire to do so. Miasma of distrust, of intrigue, is cleared away. Men are looking eye to eye and saying, 'We are brothers and have a common purpose. We did not realize it before but now we do realize it, and this is our covenant of friendship.'" ¹

To-day, the world's great spokesman of internationalism and brotherhood is President Wilson. Far more than any other statesman, he has interpreted the principles of human brotherhood to the peoples of the earth. He has sought to bind the peoples together by the ties of truth, justice, and common understanding. In his many utterances on democracy and brotherhood he has expressed the ideals and aspirations, not only of Americans, but of all peoples. And he has done far more than this. He has not only given expression to the aspirations of the race, but he has inspired in all peoples new ideals, new aspirations, and new hopes of liberty and fraternity. Moreover, he is now endeavoring,

1. Reported in the Louisville Courier-Journal, Feb. 15, 1919.

by the creation of the League of Nations to give reality and permanency to the longings of the multitudes of men for peace and co-operation. "The free peoples of the world," says President Wilson, "must draw together in some common covenant, some genuine and practical co-operation that will in effect combine their force to secure peace and justice in the dealings of nations with one another. The brotherhood of mankind must no longer be a fair but empty phrase; it must be given a structure of force and reality. The nations must realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against the aggressions of autocratic and self-pleasing power."¹ To complete the work begun by the boys who gave their lives on the battle-field, to satisfy the world's hunger for a lasting peace, and to hasten the day of human brotherhood, President Wilson is leading the fight for the League of Nations. May he win the fight, and may this League of Nations be the reality of which Tennyson dreamed:

"Till the war-drum throb'd no longer, and the
battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of
the world." (2)

However, all this may not now be realized. But we may

1. Message to the Russian Government, published June 16, 1917. (Copied from Phelps: A League of Nations, p. 9.)
2. Locksley Hall.

safely say that, whatever other things may come to pass, the tendency of history toward an ever enlarging area of co-operation will continue; the peoples of the earth will be closer together in spirit, thinking, and effort; and the entire race will feel a new sense of kinship and brotherliness.

In addition to the forces making for fraternity and internationalism which have been released as a result of the War, there are some modern sociological conditions which have greatly promoted unity among men and nations. The vast extension of communication and the greatly increased facilities for transportation have linked the world into a community, and have enabled the peoples to become better acquainted and to better understand each other. Again, the increasing density of population brings people into closer contact, causing them to rub shoulders, and, thereby, stimulating the sense of brotherhood. Another condition which is working in the same direction is the highly differentiated and interdependent relations of men. The further specialization goes the more men are dependent upon each other, and the more the sense of unity and brotherhood is stimulated.

Finally, the conviction of essential equality among men, which was discussed in the foregoing chapter, is also making for fraternity. In proportion as men

realize their inherent equality, the sentiment of brotherhood will grow and spread. For the infinite in man is something more than the source of equality; it is also the source of unity.

2. THE RELIGIOUS MEANING OF FRATERNITY.

Not only is fraternity social in meaning, but it is fundamentally religious in meaning. More correctly, the social meaning finds its extension and completion in ² the religious. Religion takes this natural tendency of men and gives it cosmic and eternal significance. In the religion of Jesus we find the vital conception of brotherhood. Before the time of Christ, we find in Greece, Rome, Persia, China, and especially in Israel, whisperings of the faith that men should be brothers. We do not discredit these pre-Christian whisperings and longings; we do not discount them. But not until Jesus lived and spoke did men realize the meaning and power of the religion of brotherhood. "It was the Son of man who made these ideals current coin; he was the first to translate these ideas into life, and give them spiritual force; he it was ^{he} who wrought with human hands the creed of creeds," and gave that creed its vital power."¹ Jesus

1. Batten, p. 145.

lived a life of brotherliness. He lived humbly and lowly among men. He ignored the social conventions of his day. He chose his disciples and his associates from the various walks of life. In his attitude toward men he was always kind and like a brother. He made no social distinctions and differences, and claimed kinship with all mankind. His full consciousness of the divine Fatherhood and of his own Sonship determined his whole life and thought. And under the inspiration of his teachings, his life, and his death, the race is gradually moving nearer and nearer toward the ideal of Christian brotherhood.

For the realization of this ideal, the most potent force in the world is the Christian conception of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This conception gives meaning to the longings of men's hearts and furnishes the power for the realization of these natural human longings. "This one fundamental faith in the Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man, which is the essence of democracy, is more important as the basis of democracy than past history, more important than political or industrial or educational or religious institutions, more important than the influence of the individual, more important than home or church or popular elections!"¹ Jesus said, "Call no man your

1. Lyman Abbott: The Rights of Man, p. 335.

father on the earth; for one is your Father, even he who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even the Christ."¹ Here we have the teaching of Christian brotherhood. If God is our Father, then we must be brothers; if there is only one Source of life, then all men must share a common life, all are brothers. This Christian conception is the only adequate basis of unity and democracy, and it, if accepted by the race, must ultimately establish the brotherhood of man.

Christianity is the one great power that can unite men. It is the only "like-mindedness" that can permanently unite men as brothers. It is not a mere dream of the idealist, but it is the one practical means for bringing men together. The principles of Christianity inspired the League of Nations, and they find expression in its general spirit and in many of its articles. Christianity alone can properly evaluate human life and properly reverence personality; it alone can destroy clannishness, social exclusiveness, and race antagonisms; it alone can supply the necessary inspiration for a common life and a common service; it alone can establish the Kingdom of God on the earth. The King-

1. Matt. 23:9-10.

dom "is a social order, a system of human relations, progressively realized, in which the will of God is the formative principle and all the functions of which are organized and operated for the purpose of helping all men to realize the spiritual possibilities of humanity."¹ The kingdom of God is humanity organized and directed according to the will of God. In this Kingdom the law of service controls in all personal and organized relationships and activities; the law of service becomes the law of society. In this Kingdom perfect democracy will be realized, and men will become brothers indeed.

1. C. S. Gardner: *The Ethics of Jesus and Social Progress*, pp. 84-85.

CHAPTER IV: WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

In the foregoing chapters, I have endeavored to make a brief and suggestive study of the great democratic principles - liberty, equality, fraternity. In concluding the study of the principles of democracy, it is fitting, perhaps, that I say a brief additional word. In the light of the foregoing discussion, what, then, is democracy? Hundreds of definitions have been given, many of which are good, but none of which seems at all comprehensive or complete. There are some things that can not be adequately defined, and to define them is to confine them. Perhaps democracy is one of these things. I shall, however, quote in this connection a few of the many definitions that have been given. Most of them are more or less general and indefinite.

"The general or public phase of the larger consciousness is what we call democracy."¹

"Democracy is primarily the growth of humanity. It is the emergence of man from a state of pupilage toward the state of manhood, with all his animal appetites and passions, all his aspirations and desires, as

1. Cooley: Social Organization, p. 118.

yet neither understood nor controlled. It is the spirit of growth, of progress, of development. Democracy is a spirit of life. It is the reign of the common people in every department of life."¹

"Lord Byron cried: 'What is democracy? - an aristocracy of blackguards! But Mazzini spoke truthfully when he defined democracy as 'progress of all through all, under the leadership of the best and the wisest.'"²

"The finest and largest meaning of democracy is that all people should share as largely as possible in the best life."³

"Government of the people, by the people, for the people."⁴ This definition, however, is only of political democracy. We will discuss this definition when we come to the chapter on political democracy.

"In a word, democracy means that personality is the first and final reality. It holds that the spirit of personality indwells in every individual and that the choice to development must proceed from that individual. From this central position of personality result the other notes of democracy, liberty, equality, fraternity - symbols of the highest idea which humanity has yet reached -

-
1. Lyman Abbott: The Spirit of Democracy, pp. 23-24.
 2. Nicholas Murray Butler: True and False Democracy, p. 6.
 3. Tufts, p. 268.
 4. Abraham Lincoln: His Gettysburg Address.

the idea that personality is the one thing of permanent and abiding worth and that in every human individual there lies personality."¹ This strikes at the heart of the subject, for in a definition of democracy personality must be placed at the very center. In a democracy, personality must be considered holy and inviolable. Democracy sees personality as the supreme value, and no man can be a democrat who does not reverence personality. This has its root in the feeling that personality is the ultimate meaning of the universe; that it is the one thing of supreme value in the universe.

A democracy, therefore, is an order of life in which all personalities are free, equal, and fraternal in the sense in which these terms have been interpreted in the foregoing chapters. Democracy, as applied to the functional relations of men, is the determination of the activities of a group by the personalities that constitute the group, each having a part in the determination, according to the measure of his intelligence and character and according as his interests are directly and actually affected by the action of the group; and each aiming at the advantage of the entire group. Democracy,

1. John Dewey, as quoted by R. B. Gregg in "The Public," Vol. 21, pp. 542-543.

in the personal relations of men, is the attitude of brotherliness toward all people, and the appreciation of the value of men according to their essential personal worth.

In the light of these definitions, it is very evident that democracy is only an ideal. It is not a reality. No people, not even the American people, have ever experienced real democracy. We have only a veneer of it; our institutions are largely feudalistic. However, this ideal is the most powerful one of this age. It is creating in the oppressed peoples of the earth a new hope, a new self-assertion, a new self-respect. Under the spell of this ideal the freemen of the world offered their lives in the Great War and won the greatest military victory of the ages. Moreover, it is inspiring the leaders of the race to reorganize the world and make it a better place in which to live.

This democratic ideal is spiritual in its nature. It is a spirit of hopefulness, of activity, of energy. It is a spirit of self-respect and respect for others. It is a spirit of mutual regard and mutual respect for each other's interests and opinions. This democratic spirit is perhaps the most profound and compelling energy of contemporary life. Its central creed is faith in men. It trusts men to govern themselves,

and also believes men capable of self-restraint in submitting to government. A true democrat trusts the moral instincts of men, and has confidence in them. Coupled with this faith in men is a hope and good will for them. Not only does this democratic spirit believe that men should be free, equal and fraternal; it also hopes that they may become so.¹

This democratic ideal is also social and religious. This was discussed in the chapter on fraternity. There we observed that the powerful forces of contemporary life are making for unity and human brotherhood. Men unite for reasons of practical convenience and practical necessity; they also unite because they are social beings, because it is their nature so to do. Coupled with these social forces is the Christian conception of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Christianity teaches that all men are brothers, and that they should be brotherly in all their relations. The Christian religion is working for the realization of the brotherhood of man which will take form in an ideal social order - the Kingdom of God. This ideal social order will be a perfect democracy. It will be the Democracy of God.

This democratic ideal is a progressively real-

1. Lyman Abbott: The Rights of Man, pp. 201-205.

ized one. It is not static, for only lifeless things are static; it is dynamic, growing, becoming. It has grown much as a result of the War. The peoples of the earth have united their labors, co-ordinated their thoughts, mingled their tears, and fused their blood in a common cause, and there is resulting a new sense of liberty, equality, and fraternity among mankind. This democratic ideal must continue to grow until it controls not only in the political institutions, but in the industrial, the social, the educational, and the religious institutions as well. But this ideal can never be fully realized; it will always be in the process of becoming. Democracy will never be a finished thing. The ideal social order, which may be called the Kingdom of God, or the Democracy of God, can only be approached. The significant thing, however, is that we are constantly moving toward it. "Slowly, as measured by the impatience of earnest souls, the world moves toward that far-off goal, as our sun with its retinue of planets is drawn by the persistent force of gravitation toward a point in the distant constellation of the Pleiades. But the important fact is that the movement goes on, and the supreme duty of every man is to help it forward."¹

1. C. S. Gardner: The Ethics of Jesus and Social Progress, p. 85.

PART II: THE APPLICATIONS OF DEMOCRACY.

AN INTRODUCTORY WORD TO PART II

PART I is a study of the principles of democracy; PART II is a study of the application of these principles to society. In PART I, the purpose is to determine what democracy is; the purpose of PART II is to determine what it must do, what its task is, how it must be applied to modern society.

This modern social spirit which men call democracy is revolutionizing our whole life. It is changing all material conditions, methods of thought and action, ideals, human character, and even the very nature and spirit of man. Our institutions must also change to meet the needs of our changing life; they must be made democratic. Men are changing their conceptions of the purposes and functions of many of our institutions. They are coming to realize that institutions are made for man and not man for institutions, that personality is the one sacred thing, and that institutions are valuable only as they serve personality. Therefore, our institutions must be democratized to meet the needs of a democratic age. At present they are largely feudalistic. Although feudalism, as a political system, has passed away, its after effects still remain with us and its

ideals largely control in our present day society.

Democracy must be applied to our whole life: architecture, mechanics, invention, literature, art, the home, government, the school, industry, and religion. Liberty, equality, and fraternity must be applied to all institutions, and not merely to the political ones, if we are to have a democratic society.

In the following pages, I shall attempt a discussion of the application of the democratic principles to the political institutions, to industry, to education, and to religion. I lay no claim to completeness, for this is beyond both the scope of the treatise and the ability of the writer; I hope, however, to emphasize the important aspects of the subject, and to make the study somewhat suggestive to those who may chance to read it.

CHAPTER I: THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

This chapter is a brief discussion of government and the process of democratizing it. We can not deal with the details and technicalities of the subject. Our purpose, rather, is to consider, in so far as we have the ability, the leading principles involved.

What is government? Whatever else it may be, government is the reign of law instead of chaos. There are various kinds of government, but, whatever be the kind, it is necessarily the reign of law. This law may be imposed by one or more wills upon the masses of the people, or it may be the popular will voluntarily consented to; it may be arbitrarily imposed, or it may be self-imposed. In every government there must be both authority and power, authority to make the law, and power to enforce obedience to it. Usually some kind of government is better than none, even though it be very imperfect, for where there is no government there is no protection of life or property. Government apparently results from group pressures. Society is made up of groups and these groups are pressing for the realization of their interests. The group may be local, racial, religious, or economic. Its fundamental interest is

selfish, and it is usually indifferent to the welfare of the larger group. Service for the larger group has been neither the ideal nor the practice of past governments.

What is the function of government? In the past the function of government has been defined as police force. Its purpose has been to defend, to protect, and to maintain order. This is and always will be an important governmental function, for life and property must be protected from the antisocial members of the group and from antisocial groups as long as there are such. But by the term "protection" we mean much more to-day than formerly. The conditions in which men live to-day are very different from those of the eighteenth century; they are very different from those existing contemporary with the establishment of the American government and the production of the Constitution. Then conditions of life were far more simple and less complex, and the protection of life and the rights of men were more simple and less difficult than in our modern social order. The so-called Industrial Revolution has completely revolutionized things. Steam, the machine, the factory, and the amassing and corporate use of capital have created conditions in which our former means and methods for the protection of life and human rights are inadequate. New

means and methods must be devised; the new demands on government render imperative a new technique for our democracy. If government is properly to protect the citizenship in this age, it must have the tools and the machinery with which to do it. We shall give this further consideration in our discussion of a technique for democracy.

But government must do more than protect. Our modern interpretation extends the function of democratic government beyond a mere protection of life and property. Government must become a servant of all the people. It must promote the political, the economic and industrial, and the social and educational welfare of the citizenship. This is already being done, to a certain extent, through the various departments of state. Education, public health, agriculture, etc. are functions of our American government. Gradually men are coming to see that the political organization should be society organized, not for war nor primarily for police duty, but for a common service. Protection, of course, is one form of service, but it is by no means the only form. The application of the democratic principles to the political institutions should result in government that serves all the people and not merely one group of them. To make our modern government a faithful and efficient

servant of all the people, not merely one class of them, is the primary aim of political democracy. No intelligent man will deny that this task is both a difficult and an important one.

The tendency of history has been increasingly in the general direction of this ideal. History teaches that the evolution of government has ever tended toward the democratic form. It has been a process of admitting to active participation in government broader and broader classes of people. The autocrat was first admitted to participation. He was usually a victorious and powerful warrior and was worshiped as a hero who possessed extraordinary powers. Usually he claimed a divine right to rule the group, and when once he became established as ruler his powers were practically absolute. But after a time his absolute powers would be challenged by an organized group of men, and these would wrest from the autocrat the guarantee of certain rights and privileges. Thus the aristocrats were admitted to participation. A classic example of this is the winning of the Magna Carta from King John by the English nobility. This is the second step in the evolution of government toward the democratic form. The next step is the extending of these rights and privileges, monopolized by the autocrat and the aristocrats, to the masses of the people. This

came through struggle. Just as the aristocrats won from the autocrat their rights to participation in social control, so did the masses of the people win from the established powers their rights. Nobody has won without a struggle. Participation in government has been granted to no one without a bitter fight. The common people have always had to steal liberty from the upper and powerful classes. Through the ages, men have fought for, bargained for, and appealed for self-government.

And this struggle continues. We have just passed through the greatest war of all history, one which is resulting in the liberation of millions of men. Groups of people large and small are dethroning arbitrary rulers, throwing off arbitrary rule, and assuming self-government. The long struggle of the ages has seemingly culminated in a cataclysmic victory for the oppressed masses of mankind. But we must beware of too much optimism, for the War has by no means ended the fight. Through the centuries more and more men have won the right to have a voice in their own government, but the struggle must not end until all men win this right, and until all normal and mature people are made capable of exercising the right.

The tendency of history, therefore, has ever been toward democratic government. But what do we mean

by this term? What is political democracy?

Speaking broadly, there are only two political conceptions of the world: One conception is that government should be conducted by the few for the benefit of the few; and the other is that government should be conducted by the many for the benefit of all. The first conception may express itself in monarchy, the rule of one; in aristocracy, the rule of the best; in plutocracy, the rule of the rich: the second conception expresses itself in democracy. Plutocracy may be considered a transitional form between aristocracy and democracy. The conception that government is of the few, by the few, and for the few embodied itself in feudalism and the autocratic state. This feudalistic order conceived itself divinely ordained and divinely appointed to the work of exercising absolute and exclusive rule over the race. These overlords of the world were above and beyond all law and were responsible only to God from whom they claimed their divine right to rule. In their eyes "a nation is a mere rude mass of chaos which God has placed in the world for their sole pleasure."¹ They conceived the individual to be nothing; the governing class to be everything. Law is their will

1. Hermann Fernau: The Coming Democracy, p. 287.

arbitrarily imposed on the people.

To democratize government is to give the lie to this whole conception. Political democracy denies that government should be by the few and for the few; it denies the existence of a divine right to rule; it denies that men exist for the state, and affirms that the state exists for men; it denies that law should be the will of the few, and affirms that it should be the will of the entire group. In the victory over German autocracy, we observe the triumph of the democratic conception of government.

James Bryce defined democratic government as "a form of government in which the numerical majority rules, deciding questions of state by the votes, whether directly, as in the ancient republics, or mediately, as in the modern representative governments, of a body of citizens."¹ Democratic government may be direct or representative. In the small republics of Greece and Rome it was direct, and the citizens conducted the affairs of government without representatives. But with the rise of large states, direct government became impossible, and the representative system arose from its birthplace in England. Will democratic government continue to be representative? This

1. The American Commonwealth, vol. II, p. 463.

is a debated question, and we shall consider it later.

The most popular definition of political democracy is the one given by Lincoln, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people."¹ But what is meant by "the people"? Who are "the people"? In no country, not even in America, have the people ruled. Not even a majority of them have ruled. The feeble-minded, the criminals, the minors, and the women have been excluded from participation in social control. Suffrage has been given only to adult males, and certain classes of them have been denied it. Our present American vote is only about twenty per cent. of our population, and if women be granted the vote only forty per cent. of the people would have a voice in government. Has not our so-called political democracy been mere oligarchy? "Jefferson, like Aristotle, contemplated democracy and human slavery side by side. . . . The builders of the American Republic were, most of them, theoretical democrats; but the forces which they controlled and the means by which they controlled them were to an unsuspected extent oligarchical."² Although the situation in America is different to-day, political democracy is still an ideal and not a reality; it has

1. Gettysburg Address.

2. Nicholas Murray Butler: True and False Democracy, P. 46.

never been realized in this or any other country. The people do not rule. At best, our American government is the will of the majority of males as this will is expressed through regular political channels. But too often the electorate is controlled and directed by the combined special interests of the country, and our limited democracy gives place to plutocracy.

We must further democratize our political organization; we must continue to apply the democratic principles to government. Much has been achieved; much remains to be achieved. There are some exceedingly important problems to be solved and tasks to be accomplished by our present day political democracy. We can speak only of the most important ones, and of them in broadest outline.

(1) One task of political democracy is the work of extending to more people the right of suffrage. As has already been observed, the right of suffrage is given only to adult males; we may say, to adult white males. We have excluded the insane, the feeble-minded who are in institutions, the criminals, the minors, most of the Negroes, and the women. To which of these classes, and on what conditions, are we to grant the right to vote? Of course, the feeble-minded, the insane, and the criminals can not be given the right. Minors,

also, are unqualified, but the age of twenty-one is an arbitrary line drawn for practical purposes. Some would exclude the grossly ignorant. But what about the race and sex qualifications? Is there any reason to believe that any race, as a race, is disqualified for democracy? Some psychologists answer this question in the affirmative, others in the negative. Certainly our sense of justice and right can not deny men the right of suffrage merely because they belong to another race. What about the women? There are no psychological grounds on which to exclude them, for they represent a normal development. Many think that the present practice of classifying women with minors, criminals, and idiots is nothing less than a crime. The most forceful arguments for woman suffrage to-day, however, are based on practical grounds. It is claimed that government, and especially city government, is doing much of the work that was formerly under home control, such as the regulation of health, food, milk, education, and the protection of child life; and that women have a duty to participate in this kind of government. It is also claimed that as women themselves have been obliged to enter the business world in order to support themselves, they are much more immediately and vitally concerned with government than in former times. Again, women are informed to-day on public questions, better

informed than a large number of men, and are competent to vote intelligently. And women are gradually winning the right of suffrage. Europe is leading America here. However, in America state after state is granting equal suffrage and the National Suffrage Amendment, now before Congress, promises the right to all the states. ✓

The work of extending political democracy must be continued. The writer believes that the only practice in keeping with the democratic principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity is to grant the right of suffrage to all normal and mature people, irrespective of race or sex. All mature and normal people should have a voice in their own government, for they can be excluded neither on psychological nor on ethical grounds. But if the principles of democracy demand that all mature and normal people be granted suffrage, these principles also demand that these people be made intelligent and moral in the exercise of their suffrage; they demand that the people be made fit to participate in government. Therefore, it is the duty of the government to educate the citizenship.

(2) Another task before political democracy is the co-ordination of the governmental function with that of other institutions. The sphere of governmental control is the widest of all the institutions of society.

The state, as the law-making institution, is always an all-inclusive organization. Potentially the sphere of political control is the whole sphere of overt human relations. The political power, however, makes a self-limitation and grants control to certain institutions. But this control is not absolutely given away; it is granted on the condition that the institution to which it is granted must not tread on social control. It grants control on good behavior, and may withdraw it when the behavior ceases to be good. An example of this is the Mormon church with its practice of polygamy. It is very necessary that the state co-ordinate its functions with those of other institutions as the home, business, the church, etc., in order that the work of all the institutions may harmonize into one common service for all the people. Institutions should not duplicate work, neither should they work at cross purposes. Every institution should aim at some kind of useful service, and all of them, including the state, should unite for a common service for all the people. One of the acute problems before the American government at the present time is how to relate itself to the industrial and business order. Shall it own industry, or control it, or assume some other relation to it? Among the problems here involved is the whole question of socialism.

(3) Perhaps the most important task before political democracy is the working out of an adequate and effective governmental technique. Such a technique is our greatest need, and unless we get one adequate to meet present needs and fit present conditions, our democracy may break down. What are some of the characteristics and defects of our present technique?

In the first place, it is so complex that our citizens can not understand it, and because they do not understand it they do not take the interest in government that they should. We are living in a complex age. In modern times vast governmental states have grown up, and with them has developed a vast economic order. Human interests have multiplied, and many of them have been intrusted to the government for direction. Also, many interests once cared for by the home, the church, and other institutions are now cared for by the state. The necessary result of all this has been complexity of governmental machinery. So complex has our political machinery become that only an expert can understand it. Usually this expert is called the "boss". He appoints himself and runs the government for profits and not for patriotism. He delivers the votes to the special interests and they deliver the money to him. In this way the special interests purchase the kind of government they

desire and the kind that is favorable to them, and plutocracy supplants democracy. The need of the hour is a technique that will make impossible this "invisible government."

Not only is our governmental technique too complex to be understood by the masses of the voters, but it is also largely unadapted to present conditions. It is ineffective, awkward, and cumbersome. It does not always register the will of the people, and gives selfish interests a chance to defeat the will of the people even when that will is known. Our Constitution was intended to be a bulwark against government. Its makers feared the majority; they did not realize that the minority might oppress the majority. These statesmen planned that the individual should have as much independence as possible; they, therefore, placed but few restrictions on him. This has permitted selfish interests to grow up and reach such proportions that they oppress the majority of the people and largely control the government. Our system of checks and balances served well the purpose for which it was created, namely, a bulwark against absolutism; but this very system, which served its original purpose so well, no longer serves the best interests of the people but is proving to be a faithful servant of the special interests. In our present govern-

mental system, no one is responsible for carrying through a measure and making it an effective law. The Senate, the House of Representatives, the President, and, in cases where the constitutionality is questioned, the Supreme Court must approve a measure before it can become an effective law. It may be killed by any one of these branches, and, if it finally becomes an effective law, it may become such only after a long lapse of time. All this gives the special interests time and opportunity to do their work. It enables them to bring strong influences to bear on one or all of these branches, especially the legislative, to defeat measures unfavorable, and to enact laws favorable to their own selfish interests.

The fact that our governmental machinery is ineffective, awkward, and cumbersome is further illustrated by Professor Tufts: "Suppose that in a given year a large majority of the people wished to have the government build a canal, or railroad. They might choose representatives to Congress who might pass a measure to that end. But the senators would not be chosen at the same time with the representatives. Because of the six-year term for senators, a considerable number of them would have been chosen two or four years before the time of which we are speaking. It might happen also that the particular states which were choosing senators this year would be op-

posed to the railroad; hence there would be very little chance of agreement between the Senate and the House of Representatives. Further, if the President were chosen as it was originally planned that he should be, he would not have been chosen by the people directly but by a small group of electors. These men might not have cared anything about a railroad and when selecting the president might have had in mind something quite other than his views on the railroad. Finally, the members of the Supreme Court might have been appointed ten or fifteen years earlier. They might all of them entertain a view of government which would, in their opinion, make the building of a railroad by the government a work not authorized by the Constitution. Now it might or might not be well for the United States to build a railroad. The point is that under the plan of government provided in the Constitution it would be almost impossible for the people to try it and find out."¹

As a matter of fact, our whole constitutional and governmental system was invented to meet the needs of another age. It was intended, as we have observed, to serve as a bulwark against absolutism, to protect the individual against the majority. Its makers did not

1. Tufts, p. 231.

foresee that the majority might some day need protection against the minority. They did not foresee the new world which has resulted from the Industrial Revolution. And this is no discredit to those able and faithful statesmen. They served their generation and served well, and it is now the task of the statesmen of this generation to undertake, in the spirit of their forefathers, the task of creating a governmental technique which will meet the needs of to-day.

How can this task be accomplished? How can we create an adequate and effective technique for our democracy? I will leave this for the expert to answer, for it is beyond my powers. However, I shall merely mention one or two principles that are being advocated to-day.

First; some men believe that we have outgrown the whole representative system of government, and that we are now passing into a period of government by public opinion. As we have already observed, representative government came into existence with the birth of vast governmental states. In those times territories were sparsely settled, and means of transportation and communication were very meager. These were times before the railroad, the telephone, the telegraph, and the modern newspaper. In these early days of the representative system it was in the legislature that the nation

made up its mind. To-day, it is quite different. Each man now makes up his mind by reading the daily newspaper. With all the means and methods by which the people can now make up and express their mind, can we not have direct government? Can we not have government by public opinion? Some students of the subject believe we can. They believe that the representative system is passing and giving place to government by the direct action of the people.

Secondly; other students of the subject, declining to believe that the representative system is passing, believe, however, that the system must undergo change in order to meet new conditions. "Our political machinery," says Mr. Weyl, "national, State, and local; legislative, executive, administrative, and judicial; constitutional and extraconstitutional - our whole political machinery in all its parts must be adapted to all the changing purposes of government."¹ In this connection he further says: "The Constitution should be revised by the people. A radical revision of the Constitution by a special constitutional convention, such as was contemplated by the document itself, would be one of the greatest single steps toward the establishing of political democracy in the United States. An alternative

1. W. E. Weyl: The New Democracy, p. 313.

step, perhaps even wiser, would be, not a complete transformation of the document, but a mere change in the method of amendment, a change which would make future amendment easier and would give the power of proposing and adopting amendments to the people, rather than to the legislature, State or federal."¹

For the effecting of an adequate political machinery scores of methods and plans have been proposed. Among them are the democratic control of parties and party nominations, the democratic control of elections and the substitution of the "short ballot" for the "long ballot," the "Initiative, the Referendum, and the Recall," etc., etc. It is beyond the scope and purpose of this treatise to discuss these technical questions; the purpose has been to consider the outstanding principles. However, I wish to make one other brief observation. We have seen that our political technique is very complex, too complex to be understood and operated by any one except an expert. We have also seen that this expert is usually the "boss" who appoints himself and runs the governmental machinery for profits by selling votes to the special interests. As a result of this system our city governments too often are in the

1. W. E. Weyl: The New Democracy, p. 318.

hands of the "Ring," or the special interests of the Tammany Hall kind; our State governments are frequently controlled by "Big Business," such as the railroads, the insurance companies, etc.; and our national government is frequently influenced to a great extent by the combined selfish powers of the land. But somebody must run the government - either the "boss" or some other person. Somebody must direct the governmental machinery, and if no one else undertakes the task the "boss" does. But why not make this expert the representative or the agent of the people? Why not train men in our schools and universities to do this work as we train men for other professions? In certain countries, among them Germany, men are thus trained, and the results are proving to be good. In such an education, the social sciences must be given first place. Moreover, while we are educating experts to administer the departments of government, we should also educate our citizens, and the young who are to become citizens, in the fundamentals of society, that they may both understand and become interested in the problems of society and government.

CHAPTER II: THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF INDUSTRY.

Democracy means far more than a form of government. Political democracy is only one step toward a democratized society. The principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity must be applied, not only to government, but to all the institutions of society. At the present time perhaps no institution is in greater need of democratization than industry, and our best thinkers declare that the real issue of the present day is industrial democracy. According to our best social opinion, political democracy is in grave danger of breaking down unless our social and industrial institutions cease to be feudal and become democratic. In this chapter I shall attempt a discussion of the democratization of industry.

When our American nation was established and our Constitution formulated, industrial feudalism of the modern kind was unknown, for our present industrial organization is a comparatively recent phenomenon. It owes its origin to two revolutionizing forces: The machine driven by natural force, and the corporate use of capital. These two forces, which express themselves in modern industrialism, have completely revolutionized our modern life - our method, our education, our thought,

our religion, and our character. All departments of life have been radically affected. Furthermore, the general direction of this industrial development has constantly been away from democracy and toward feudalism and autocracy. The relations existing between the capitalist and the laborer have constantly become more and more functional and non-personal. In the early days of modern industry, when the same individual was both capitalist and manager, the relations existing between the owner and his employees were personal, and mutual confidence not infrequently existed between them. In those days only a few men were employed in any one factory, and they could, therefore, know each other in a personal way. But, to-day, all this is changed. In the vast corporations of modern times, the manager is not the owner, but a legal person who has only functional relations with the thousands of employees. The system has developed into industrial feudalism, and the former relations of common understanding and co-operation have given way to suspicion, distrust, open antagonism, and even warfare. And this warfare between capital and labor is threatening with possible disruption our whole social structure.

This condition of affairs is chiefly due to our present autocratic, feudalistic organization of industry.

Political feudalism has been replaced by industrial feudalism. We have abolished kings of nations and established kings of industry. We have railroad kings, oil kings, steel kings, and coal barons. "The simple fact of the case is that a few men, by the use of great skill and large capital, are getting control of the means of production and distribution, and are fastening upon the necks of the people an industrial autocracy more irresponsible and tyrannical than the world has ever known. In sober truth it may be said that no political autocrat of the past ever possessed more than a tithe of the real power of these modern industrial and social autocrats."¹

A brief analysis of a modern corporation will reveal the fact of the totally undemocratic organization of industry. Let us take, for example, some unit of industry such as a car factory or a chair factory, and observe the parties who actually compose it: First, the creditors who lend the corporation money. They are only indirect members of the corporation. Second, the stockholders, a number of whom are elected as directors. Third, the manager whose business is administrative. He may or may not be a stockholder, but is a trained expert in managing a big business. Fourth, the employees -

1. Batten, p. 226.

clerks, stenographers, bookkeepers, and the body of laborers. As an economic fact all four of these groups - creditors, stockholders, managers, and employees - constitute the corporation; but legally only the stockholders and directors constitute it and have a voice in its control. The vast majority of its members - the laborers - have no voice whatever. They are industrial serfs, and are tied to the factory because it affords them the only means of support for themselves and their families. Their condition is frequently no better, and sometimes even worse, than that of the mediaeval serfs. The feudal lords of industry dictate the hours of labor, the physical conditions of the factory, and the wages; the employees must submit to these dictations or starve.

To illustrate further the undemocratic nature of industry, let us suppose, for example, that \$10,000,000 in capital may be invested in an enterprise which employs 5,000 men with a total pay roll of \$5,000,000 per year. If this \$5,000,000 be regarded as a labor dividend at 5 per cent. we find in the organization of this business a labor investment of \$100,000,000 in contrast to a capital investment of \$10,000,000. Yet this enormous labor investment has no representation in the control of the business. On the basis here outlined, the board of direc-

tors represents and governs the business primarily for the benefit of 1/11 of the investment, and the other 10/11 is without representation in its government."¹

And again, "in depressed times when dividends upon capital investments are likely to be impaired, it is a common incident of big business to discharge large groups of workers, thereby depriving their families of any dividends on their labor investment. Yet upon what democratic theory can this preference of capital interest to labor interest be justified? A democratic industry would share the burdens of hard times as well as the benefits of prosperity with all its investors in proportion to their contributions, whether of labor or of capital."²

It is an undeniable fact that our industry is organized and operated on feudalistic rather than on democratic principles. And what are the results? First of all, the working classes are exploited and impoverished. The stockholders want dividends on their investments, and they employ a manager who will guarantee the largest dividends. The manager, being responsible only to the stockholders, endeavors to comply with their wishes and to do a "paying" business. To do this he will reduce

1. The New Republic, vol. 11, p. 50.

2. Ibid.

expenses to a minimum. He will deliver as much as possible of the profits to the stockholders, to whom he owes his job, and as little as possible to the employees. These laborers work long hours under physical conditions which are frequently dangerous and unsanitary, and for very meager wages. And when they are old and worn out they are thrown aside and replaced by young, able-bodied men, in much the same way as pieces of machinery are discarded and replaced by new machinery.

But not only do the laborers and their families suffer as a result of our feudal industrial system, but society is being exploited and enslaved. "We find that the industrial and social forces of society are more and more being exploited for the disproportionate advantage and enrichment of the few. Prices paid to these overlords of industry and these interceptors of trade are not an exchange of services; they are the ransom paid by the people for their lives."¹ These overlords of industry are continually narrowing industrial opportunity and initiative, and the small capitalists, being unable to compete with these overlords and their huge combinations, are forced out of business and into industrial serfdom to these feudal lords of industry.² There is no

1. Batten, pp. 227-229.

2. Ibid., pp. 230-231.

longer any such thing as "free competition" in industry. Moreover, these kings of industry are getting control of government, and government is in danger of becoming less and less democratic and more and more plutocratic. Industrial and financial consolidation and combination is the present policy. Already practically all the large industries of the country - steel, oil, coal, etc. - are controlled by one combination. This means that a few rich men even now possess immeasurable power; power to control nominations and elections, to dictate platforms and policies, and to force through our political machinery measures to their liking.¹ And the remarkable and contradictory thing about it all is that these industrial lords may be men of splendid personal character, for with them personal ethics is an entirely different thing ^{from} to business ethics. They may be good churchmen and kind and generous in their personal relations, while at the same time they cry, "Business is business," and place profits above human life.

What can be done to remedy this state of affairs? How can society be saved from industrial exploitation and possible ruin? How can justice be restored in our industrial order? The only possible remedy is the democratization of industry.

1. Batten, p. 227.

What is industrial democracy? What are its fundamental principles and its primary meaning? The fundamental principle of industrial democracy is that industry must be organized about human values and not about material values; that personality must be considered as the highest and the supreme value; and that industry must become a form of social service. It means the application of the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity to the industrial order. More specifically, it means that those who co-operate in the creation of a value shall have some voice in the distribution of that value. It means that the values of life which are created by the people must be administered by the people. It means that every man, according to his contribution, shall have a share in the control of the world's industries. It means that labor, as well as capital, must have representation in the control of the world's industries. It means a system of profit-sharing and co-operation in both the creation and distribution of values.¹ It means that the natural values, which no man has created, shall be shared by all the people and not be monopolized by only a few of them. It is a principle of industrial democracy that wealth

1. Batten, p. 249.

has its source in the people and is to be used by the people and for their benefit; that every man is entitled to the products of his own industry, because it is a part of him and into it he had invested a portion of his life.¹

How are the industrial kings thinking on the subject of industrial democracy? And does there seem to be any hope that they will give any support to the cause? From one of them there comes a confession that is little less than epoch making and revolutionizing. I refer to an address delivered before the War Emergency Congress of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Atlantic City, December 4-6, 1918, by no less a capitalist than John D. Rockefeller, Jr.² In this address Mr. Rockefeller, in no uncertain terms, champions the cause of industrial democracy. He declares that labor and capital should be equally represented in the councils that control industry. He denies that the primary purpose of industry should be to make profits and to enrich the few, and declares that industry should be a form of social service. "The soundest industrial policy," says Mr. Rockefeller, "is that which has constantly in mind the welfare of employes as well as the making of

-
1. Lyman Abbott: The Spirit of Democracy, pp. 154-155.
 2. Published in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. LXXXI, Jan. 1919. (Hereafter quoted as Rockefeller.)

profits, and which, when human considerations demand it, subordinates profits to welfare. Industrial relations are essentially human relations."¹ He further declares that "in these days the selfish pursuit of personal ends at the expense of the group can and will no longer be tolerated. Men are rapidly coming to see that human life is of infinitely greater value than material wealth; that the health, happiness and well-being of the individual, however humble, is not to be sacrificed to the selfish aggrandisement of the more fortunate or more powerful. Never was there a more profound belief in human life than to-day. Whether men work with their brain or brawn, they are human beings, and are much alike in their cravings, their aspirations, their hatreds, and their capacity for suffering and for enjoyment."² Continuing, he warns the leaders of industry that they had better not fight against the ongoing forces of democracy but had better reach an agreement through "friendly conference" with labor. He then states his own position as one "which takes cognizance of the inherent right and justice of the principles underlying the new order; which recognizes that mighty changes are inevitable, many of them desirable; and which does not wait until forced to adopt new methods, but takes the lead in

1. Rockefeller, p. 168.

2. Ibid., p. 179.

calling together the parties to industry for a round-table conference to be held in the spirit of justice, fairplay and brotherhood, with a view to working out some plan of co-operation which will insure to all those concerned adequate representation, and afford to labor an opportunity to earn a fair wage under such conditions as shall leave time not alone for food and sleep, but also for recreation and the development of the highest things of life."¹

Mr. Rockefeller says that there are four parties to industry; capital, management, labor, and the community. And these four parties must not be enemies, but partners, for they have a common interest. "Moreover, success can not be brought about through the assumption by any one party of a position of dominance and arbitrary control; rather it is dependent upon the co-operation of all four."²

These statements of Mr. Rockefeller, as one of America's greatest capitalists and leaders of industry, are very significant. They show the trend of the times and what must ultimately come in the industrial world. They also show that at least one of our industrial leaders stands for human justice and right. We

1. Rockefeller, p. 180.

2. Ibid., p. 169.

hope that other capitalists will follow this lead of Mr. Rockefeller, and that industry may be democratized by means of peaceful co-operation rather than by further warfare. But industry must be democratized, whether it be accomplished by this method or by other methods or by a number of methods. Let us here consider briefly the three primary methods by which this task may be accomplished.

(1) A large number of people believe that the only effective method for the accomplishment of this task is government ownership. "Everywhere we find evidences of industrial developments in the general direction of this goal. The Post Office embarks upon the banking business. . . . The Forestry Bureau raises and sells timber. The Reclamation Service goes into many separate businesses in connection with the building of dams and the selling of water. In the construction of the Panama Canal, the government builds roads and railroads and conducts dozens of separate enterprises. At the same time, the States and cities greatly extend the sphere of their direct participation in business, and buy and manufacture and sell on an enlarging scale."¹ But the thing desired is not government ownership for

1. W. E. Weyl: The New Democracy, p. 276.

itself, but industrial democracy. In order to realize this, however, it may be necessary to have an increasing amount of government ownership; but, because of its evident complications and dangers, it is the prevailing opinion that this method should not be used until the other methods have been thoroughly employed.

(2) Another method is government regulation. The War has unquestionably taught the people the advantages of this method. The government has extended its regulating powers over many of our industries, and it is very likely that many of them will not be returned to complete private control; for the American people will not soon forget the benefits which have resulted from government regulation. At the same time, there is nothing more evident than that the industrial kings of America, with their theory of "industrial autonomy" and their slogan, "Business must be made independent of politics," are now gathering and organizing their forces to resist any further government regulation of American industry. Can the organized selfish interests successfully resist the democratizing forces of the age? Can they defeat further government regulation. Mr. Weyl is only one of the many who believe that "in the future we must enormously increase the extent of regulation. Not only can we pursue an active social policy by means of

the regulation of industry, but we can also so direct and restrain and guide the strong economic impulses of society as to make the product of industry not only larger, but more widely and more fairly distributed."¹

One very definite thing the government can do toward the realization of industrial democracy is to enact laws which recognize all the members of a corporation - stockholders and employees - as legal members, and to have these members come together through their representatives to determine the proper division and distribution of the values which all have created. And when all the parties to industry are thus recognized as legal parties, and when they, under government supervision, come together in agreement as to the control of industry and the proper distribution of the values which all have co-operatively created, we shall have a democratized industry. Society, through its government, must have the final voice and must see that justice is received by all parties. Even Mr. Rockefeller agrees that a certain amount of government regulation is necessary; that society, as a party to industry, must have a voice in its control.

(3) A third method is that of voluntary co-

1. The New Democracy, pp. 291-292.

operation on the part of capital and labor. It is suggested that the corporation take its employees into confidence and give them a proportionate share in the annual earnings. This has been done by Henry Ford and others with good results. The laborers come to feel that they are partners rather than mere employees in the narrow sense of the term. They come to have a greater interest in the work and to put greater effort into it, and their lives and labors come to have more and more meaning.

In this connection, we shall give an outline summary of Mr. Rockefeller's plan for a co-operation of capital and labor. He gives it as follows: "I believe that the most effective structure of representation is that which is built from the bottom up; which includes all employes; which starts with the election of representatives and the formation of joint committees in each industrial plant, proceeds to the formation of joint district councils and annual joint conferences in a single industrial corporation, and admits of extension to all corporations in the same industry, as well as to all industries in the community, in the nation, and in the various nations."¹

We can not have industrial democracy until all

1. Rockefeller, p. 179.

the parties to industry have a voice in its control. If this can be realized by the method of peaceful and voluntary co-operation, well and good; but if the kings of industry persist in the policy of organized selfishness, in the policy of placing money profits above human life, in the autocratic policy of refusing to the other parties to industry a voice in its controlling councils, then society through its government must take necessary action. The methods of control and ownership will then be employed. Again we repeat, society must speak the final word.

The fight is now on. The forces of democracy are at war with the forces of industrial autocracy, and the former are slowly gaining on the latter. There are three very powerful forces fighting for industrial democracy, a brief discussion of which we shall here give.

(1) Perhaps the most powerful of these forces is organized labor. The laborer, inspired by the spirit of 1776, is demanding a voice in industrial as well as in political government. His developing self-respect impels him to win those rights and values which are essential to his fullest self-realization. He is demanding justice that he may have the means by which to provide for himself, rather than be provided for by charity. If we would learn the determined spirit of

organized labor, we have only to read the platform of the British Labor Party, a document which is revolutionising in a social, political, and industrial sense. Organized labor is determined to destroy autocracy in industry, and step by step it is forcing back its enemy. The victory seems inevitable.

(2) Another force which is making for industrial democracy is the growing conception that every industry is a public function, and that the public, as well as capital and labor, is a party to it. We are coming to believe that industry is not merely the concern of the factory owner and his employees, but that it is the concern of all the people. The people are concerned as to the hours of labor, the physical and sanitary conditions of the workshop, the division and distribution of the values, etc. We have already noted that Mr. Rockefeller recognizes the community as a party to industry. He says: "The community's right to representation in the control of industry and in the shaping of industrial policies is similar to that of the other parties. Were it not for the community's contribution in maintaining law and order, in providing agencies of transportation and communication, in furnishing systems of money and credit, and in rendering other services, - all involving continuous outlays, - the operation of capi-

tal, management and labor would be enormously hampered, if not rendered well-nigh impossible. The community, furthermore, is the consumer of the products of industry and the money which it pays for the product reimburses capital for its advances and ultimately provides the wages, salaries and profits that are distributed among the other parties."¹ The growing conviction that the community is a party to industry is a telling force for the winning of industrial democracy.

(3) The growing conscience among men for right and justice is also a powerful contributing factor. Men are coming to believe that if civil and political slavery is wrong, social and industrial slavery is also wrong. The spirit of liberty, equality, and fraternity is working in the minds and hearts of men. And the War has given birth to a new conscience. Men fought "to make the world safe for democracy;" now must they continue to endure industrial autocracy? The employer and the employee, the capitalist and the man of toil died together on the field of battle for human freedom; should not their brothers share the fruits of that freedom, industrial as well as political? The conscience of mankind answers in the affirmative.

And now, in concluding this chapter, let us ask

1. Rockefeller, p. 169.

what will be the results of a democratized industry. We have seen that, when those who co-operate in the creation of a value shall have a voice in the distribution of that value, we shall have industrial democracy. The practical plan is for all the parties to come together through their representatives and, under the supervision of the public, reach a common agreement. What, then, will be the results? Mr. Rockefeller states that a modified form of this plan is now being used in several American industries, and where it has been in use a sufficiently long time, some results are:

"First: Uninterrupted operation of the plants and continuous employment of the workers, resulting in larger returns for both capital and labor.

"Second: Improved working and living conditions.

"Third: Frequent and close contact between employes and officers.

"Fourth: The elimination of grievances as disturbing factors.

"Fifth: Good-will developed to a high degree.

"Sixth: The creation of a community spirit.

"Furthermore, the plan has proved an effective means of enlisting the interests of all parties to industry, of reproducing the contacts of earlier days between employer and employe, of banishing misunderstanding,

distrust and enmity, and securing co-operation and the spirit of brotherhood."¹

When our industrial order becomes democratic, we shall see less poverty and misery among the masses of mankind. Life for the poor and the unfortunate will possess more meaning; it will be fuller and richer. A greater opportunity will be offered all men for self-realization. The masses of the common people will have more time and means for recreation, education, religion, and all things that make life worthwhile. With the democratization of industry will come, also, a fuller democratization of the state, of the church, and of all other institutions of society.

1. Rockefeller, p. 177.

CHAPTER III: THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF EDUCATION

This chapter is devoted to a brief discussion of educational democracy. We shall consider: First, the democratization of the extent of education; second, the democratization of the method of education; third, the democratization of the content of education.

1. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE EXTENT OF EDUCATION.

The democratization of the extent of education means that educational opportunity shall be given to all the people, not merely to a few of them. It means universal education. It demands educational opportunity for white and black, rich and poor, bright and dull, young and old. None are to be excluded on grounds of race, color, sex, or conditions of life such as poverty, etc. To furnish this opportunity, the school system must be supplemented by all other available educational agencies, such as the library, the forum, the chautauqua, the correspondence course, the night school for adults, the summer school, the newspaper and the magazine. The church and the home must furnish the religious education. Every possible agency must be employed in the task of educating

the masses of the people.

There are three primary forces that are to-day demanding a universal education, education for all the people. (1) The first of these is a growing respect for personality. There is a growing conviction, as has previously been noted, that personality is the supreme value. Men are also coming to believe that the fullest realization and development of personality should be their supreme concern. Furthermore, education is to-day considered one of the most potent means to this end. Hence society is undertaking to provide educational facilities and opportunity for all the people.

(2) Self-government is also demanding universal education, for the very existence of democratic government depends upon an intelligent citizenship. If men are to vote and to vote for the right measures and the best men, they must possess both character and intelligence. An educated citizenship becomes imperative as the functions of the state multiply and the machinery of government becomes more and more complex. If the state is to solve the modern political problems and to conduct the business of a modern government, its citizenship must be intelligent. Autocratic government may be founded upon ignorance, but democratic government must have a foundation of intelligence.

(3) Again, the very existence of democracy and of democratic institutions depends upon an education for all the people. Intelligence means self-control, and self-control is the psychological foundation of democracy. Without intelligence democracy is unthinkable. Without it we can have a modern Mexico or a modern Russia with its anarchy and Bolshevism; without it we can have an autocracy, but without it we can not have a democratic society. In Russia the arbitrary restraint of autocracy has been thrown off, but self-control, which comes through intelligence and which is absolutely essential to popular government, is lacking. We see the results. In the salvation of Russia education must have an important part. "No deeper conviction pervades the people of the United States and of France, who are the most aggressive exponents of democracy, than that the preservation of liberty under the law, and the institutions that are our precious possession and proud heritage depends upon the intelligence of the whole people."¹ Since before the days of de Tocqueville, the leading thinkers on the subject have held this view. If men are to live together, they must be fit so to live. This fitness necessarily implies discipline, instruction, training; in a word, education. Democracy and education have always gone to-

1. Nicholas Murray Butler: True and False Democracy, p. 86.

gether and they must ever go together, for the former can not live without the latter.

Therefore, if education be essential to the development of personality, to the existence of self-government, and to the very life of our democratic institutions, it is imperative that educational opportunity and facilities be made available for all the people. And this conviction has led to the establishment of the public school system. At first, education was a private and ecclesiastical matter and was for only the privileged few. Not until comparatively modern times did this condition change. Although we owe a debt of gratitude to the church for its educational contribution, it could never have educated all the people because of its sectarian nature and because of its lack of means and adequate machinery. Only the political organization could accomplish this task. The state, therefore, has undertaken the work of making education available for all the people, and today our system of public education is doubtless our greatest democratizing agency. The public school is disseminating knowledge among the people; it is creating a degree of intelligence in all the people; it is acting as a safeguard against separation into classes; and it is, by means of a common language, "fostering among very diverse elements of population a spirit

of unity and brotherhood so that the sense of common interests and aims has prevailed over the strong forces working to divide our people into classes."¹ Since our public schools are so vital to our democratic life, it becomes the duty of every democrat to do all in his power to promote their welfare and to make war on their every enemy.

And at the present time there is an increasing demand for compulsory education, and some form of it has been established in almost every state. We are coming to see that it is not enough that educational opportunity be given to all the people; society must see to it that all the people avail themselves of the opportunity. Ignorance is a social menace and society must get rid of it. According to the census report of 1910, there were on that date in the United States 5,516,163 persons over ten years of age who could neither read nor write in any language. The War has revealed startling facts in this connection, all of which prove the imperative need of compulsory education. The work of democratizing education must continue until as much and as good education as possible becomes available for all the people, and until a neces-

1. Talbot: Americanization, p. 203 (quoted from a contribution by John Dewey).

sary amount of it becomes compulsory. The ideal is a society in which all forms of education, from the kindergarten to the university, are free and accessible to all the people.

2. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE METHOD OF EDUCATION

(1) The organization and control of the school must be democratic, and must be of such a nature as to train the young in democracy. The school is a specially constituted social environment within the general environment. It should be made an ideal society, with only the desirable features of the general society in it and all undesirable features excluded. This school community should be made an ideal democracy, and the democratic principles should not only be taught but should be practiced in all relationships. Every group activity should be an expression of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Play, for instance, has great possibilities as a socializing and democratizing agency. Organized and supervised play is now known to possess extraordinary powers for the development of the moral and social life of the young. It develops self-restraint and self-control. It causes the individual to subordinate self to an end, to a cause, to the winning of the game. It develops co-operation and teamwork. It develops

a respect for the personalities and rights of others. If play be properly organized and directed, it gradually develops in the young an experience of brotherhood and of essential equality, for the rich and the poor, the dull and the bright come to know each other and to respect each other's powers; and the artificial barriers give way to the social instinct of kinship and co-operation.

Likewise, the organization of all the school work and the school government should make for democracy. In the old system, the principal of the school was an autocratic ruler. His word was absolute law. He made certain "rules" which had little, if any, vital meaning to the experience of the pupils. It was a despotic and feudalistic² system of school government. When the school comes to be organized and controlled by democratic principles, all this is changed. The government becomes social, and ceases to be a method by which an autocratic ruler satisfies his whims and notions. When punishment is necessary, the child is brought into participation, and it is thoroughly explained to him that by his misconduct he has harmed himself and the entire school group, and that he is being disciplined, not to satisfy the whims of an autocratic ruler, but because the life and welfare of himself and of the group demand it.

The appeal is made to the reason and the emotions of the child. In this way, punishment comes to have a social meaning. A sense of duty, responsibility, and common life is developed in the children, and all come to feel that they are a part of the group, and have a part in its life, its duties, and its government. There is born in the pupils a sense of social obligation. Thus the school becomes a generator of democracy.

(2) But the method of teaching, as well as the method of organization and control, must be democratic. In the past, the method of teaching has too often been one of authority rather than of democracy, and the pupils have been taught to accept what a textbook says rather than to think for themselves. A uniform and traditional curriculum has been imposed on all alike. All have been run through the same mold and have come out with pauperized personalities and crushed spirits.

This is the method of autocratic society but not of democratic society. In an autocracy, the education is fitted to each class so as to equip each individual to fill his special place in society. Not so in a democracy. In democratic society there can be no caste system and no rigid gradation of people into classes. The educational method must be of such a nature as "to discover and develop in childhood and

youth the personal aptitude or gift of as many citizens as possible, in order that they may have self-realization by making their peculiar contribution toward the advancement of society."¹ We must come to see that in a democracy education is not primarily an information given to receptive pupils by teachers who assume to possess infallible knowledge, but a training, a cultivating, a developing of the potential powers within the boys and the girls. The young should be trained to think for themselves and to exercise their own intellectual powers, for this is the kind of education essential for a democratic life. A democratic society is dynamic and creative, not static; therefore, "no static set of opinions can apply to the constantly changing aspects of affairs."²

Democracy, therefore, demands an educational method which will equip people to live in the twentieth century rather than in the eighteenth century, and to live in a democratic rather than in an autocratic society. And before we can have educational democracy, this method must be employed in our public school system.

1. Winston Churchill: A Traveller in War Time, p. 159.
2. Ibid., p. 160.

3. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE CONTENT OF EDUCATION.

We must also democratize the content and purpose of education. The fundamental principle here is that our educational system should be for the fitting of people to live the best possible life. The subject matter is secondary; life is primary. The subject matter is a means to the end of developing the life, of fitting people to live. But this has not been the traditional view, and even to-day this view is only gradually being accepted. We have taught almost everything except the art of living. We have inherited from the past an educational curriculum and have imposed it upon each generation, without very seriously questioning its value. We have thought of the curriculum, rather than of the life, as the sacred thing. Democracy changes all this, and places the life at the center. It views life, not subject matter, as the sacred thing, and it endeavors to discover and teach those subjects that will best fit men to live. "Far too long the school has been half asylum, half penitentiary. Far too long it has stood alone in irrelevant isolation, knowing neither factory nor farm, neither kitchen nor voting booth. Far much too long it has been a place where ignorance has taught ignorance, where individuality has been weeded and crushed out."¹ The

1. W. E. Weyl: The New Democracy, p. 329.

need of the hour is for an education which will fully equip the individual for his industrial, political, social, and religious life. It must be an education which will aid men in their industrial pursuits, in their political activities, and in their social and religious problems. The future education must prepare people to be parents, home builders, husbands and wives; it must prepare people for intelligent citizenship and give due emphasis to social obligation and responsibility; it must prepare people to make an honest living, to produce wealth and to conserve life and health; it must prepare people to be better men and better Christians, duly emphasizing the things that have eternal and abiding value.

In order to accomplish this task every possible educational agency must be employed. We must utilize, not only the school system, but the library, the forum, the chautauqua, the institute, the newspaper, the magazine, etc. And our educational system, from the kindergarten to the university, must be organized and directed toward this end. In our educational system, theory and practice should be united. "The democracy which proclaims equality of opportunity as its ideal requires an education in which learning and social application, ideas and practice, work and recognition of the meaning of what

is done, are united from the beginning and for all."¹ Beginning with the high school, the study of society should be an important part of the curriculum. The high school should aim to give the pupil a good knowledge of the various occupations in order that he may find his place and get a sympathetic understanding of the occupations of others. Vocational guidance is now being taught in many schools. In the college and the university a critical and thorough study of society should be made. In order to acquire this knowledge, the student should not only study books, but he should make a first-hand study of the great institutions of society. Also, the college and university should train our leaders. We have too many demagogues, too many false leaders of the people. We have too many inefficient, unintelligent, and selfish leaders. The best and the wisest should be the leaders in a democracy, and for more of these we have great need. The most critical and essential thing in a democracy is leadership, and perhaps the greatest need to-day is an intelligent, social spirited, unselfish, Christian leadership. For such a leadership we must look chiefly to our educational institutions.

1. Talbot: Americanization, p. 204 (quoted from a contribution by John Dewey).

And the church also has a large educational task to perform. The church must come to be recognized as a real educational institution. There is a work that it alone can do, and this work is the teaching of religion. The state recognizes that religion is important, so important that it does not know how to teach it. Religious education must be done chiefly by the church, for the state can not teach it satisfactorily and the home has almost ceased to perform this duty. In a sense, the church is responsible to society in general for the religious and moral education of the people. In a sense, the church is a public utility. The extent of its field is the entire community. The field of religious education must extend as far as that of public education; it must include society at large, and not merely a few families of the community. The church, or the churches, must educate all the people in religion. But to accomplish this significant task there must be an adequate program and a real educational method. The Sunday School, with its thirty minutes a week for study, is inadequate to meet the need. We need more time than Sunday for the teaching of religion, the most important of all subjects. It seems that some method, such as the Gary plan, should be devised by which religious instruction could be given the

children during the week days. In this way religion would become more real and significant for the growing life.

Such is the task of democratizing education. The task includes the democratizing of the extent, the method, and the content of education. It is a very significant undertaking. Something has already been done, something is now being done, and more must be done in the future. Every intelligent individual is challenged to make his best contribution.

CHAPTER IV: THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF RELIGION

It is not sufficient that we apply the democratic principles to our political, our industrial, and our educational institutions; they must also be applied to the religious institution. We must democratize religion. In this chapter we shall offer a brief discussion of the democratization, first, of institutional religion, second, of credal religion.

1. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RELIGION.

Many stages of the democratizing process are represented to-day in church organization. On the one hand, the Roman Catholic system is completely autocratic; on the other hand, the churches of congregational polity, such as the Congregational and the Baptist, are democratic; while intermediary stages of the process are represented by such churches as the Methodist and the Presbyterian.

Now what do we mean by a democratic church organization? We mean that, for a church organization to be democratic, it must be under the control of the people who compose its membership. There is no place for an irresponsible officialdom in a democratic reli-

gious institution. There is no place for priests and bishops who claim superior privilege in the presence of God. Its officers are elected by and are responsible to the membership. In all matters of control and direction, the people have the final word. To democratize the church organization is to place its complete control in the hands of those who are its members.

The Roman Catholic Church is feudal and autocratic from top to bottom. It is autocracy expressing itself in the religious organization. The people who compose its membership are without any voice in the control; they are subordinated to the privileged and irresponsible officials. The Pope, as head of the privileged officialdom, claims the right to rule in religion as William Hohenzollern claimed to rule in the state. In his official capacity the Pope is irresponsible, arbitrary, and infallible. By a process of devolution, authority is conferred on cardinal, bishop, and priest, while the only privilege of the people is to obey these overlords. This ecclesiastical system can never fit a democratic society; the two are incompatible. This autocratic system of religious organization should be cast off with the autocratic system of political organization, for the modern world can no longer use either of them. A democratic society demands a democratic religious organi-

zation; popes and bishops, as well as emperors and kings, must be replaced by officers who are responsible to the people. At the present time, one task of democracy is to create a religious organization that will harmonize with a democratic society.

And this gives the Baptist and other democratic bodies their great opportunity to step forward and shape the religious organization of the future. Never before have the Baptists had a greater opportunity. In theory their organization is a perfect democracy. The local church is free to direct its own life and policies. It has no irresponsible officialdom that savors of autocracy, but its officers are the representatives of the membership and are responsible to the membership. It is, in a word, a church of the people, by the people, for the people. The cry to-day is for church union. But what form of organization shall this proposed united church take? Baptist and other democratic bodies should see to it that no irresponsible officialdom is created, that neither popes nor bishops, claiming special privilege and prerogative, shall establish themselves to rule over the religious life of this age. These independent bodies should now assert themselves, as the Baptist brotherhood has always done, for religious democracy. In the past Baptists have fought and died for this prin-

ciple; they now have the opportunity, if they be intelligent and alert, to shape the religious organization of this age.

But even our most democratic denominations, including the Baptist and the Congregational, are, at the present time and to a considerable extent, undemocratic. Theoretically they are self-governing bodies, but actually they are governed by a few influential members. Our church government is too often aristocratic and plutocratic. In all denominations, it is more or less in the hands of a few rich men. The writer has in mind a number of churches, the policies of which are determined by one or more of its wealthy members. In the election of officers and the adoption of policies and budgets, there is often a cut-and-dried method which is anything but democratic. Instances are known where church members in good standing have been refused information as to the financial standing of the church, which, of course, implies that the rulers may keep any or all the people ignorant of what they do. This is not democracy, for self-government permits no secrecy in the handling of the common fund. Moreover, a few rich men may determine, directly or indirectly, all the important policies of the church, such as who the pastor shall be, what the current expense and missionary budgets

of the church shall be, and, many times, what shall be preached from the pulpit. And when the churches assemble in the denominational convention, it is the voices of the rich laymen and the pastors of the more wealthy churches that go farthest. It can not be denied that our churches to-day are, to a considerable degree, plutocratic.

What can be done to free our churches from plutocratic control? How can we democratize the religious organization? One way to accomplish this is to democratize industry and education, for before we can have religious democracy we must have an equitable distribution of wealth and a higher degree of intelligence. When the people receive the values which they have created, the plutocrat will have relatively less authority; and when the people have equal educational attainment, they will then know what their rights are and how to realize them.

Church spirit, as well as church organization and control, is frequently very undemocratic. Do not our churches often represent class consciousness rather than brotherhood? Do they not often align themselves with the wealthy classes to the neglect of the struggling masses? Is it not true that distinctions of wealth, education, and social standing almost destroy the spirit

of brotherhood within the churches? Frequently the "respectables" will build a "branch" or a "mission" for the poor and unfortunate classes. Christ was not too good to associate with all the people, but some modern churchmen seemingly are. The social stratification, which exists six days in the week in business and society, exists also in the church on Sunday. How can the church continue as the representative of Jesus Christ if it persists in thus destroying the principle of Christian brotherhood? The imperative need of the hour is a warm, Christian, democratic spirit in our church life; a spirit that knows no foreigner, no rich, no poor, no class; a spirit that recognizes all Christian people as the sons of God and brothers of Christ and of all who bear His name.

Some religious thinkers are reminding us that we should also examine our meetinghouse in the light of democracy. They tell us that men of this age are not invited by the imposing church architecture which has come down from a monarchical age. Should the place in which religion is advocated possess an awesome, aesthetic, and solemn grandeur, a crystallized tradition of the sanctity and power of the historic church? Or should it be more plain and simple to invite the modern man? "It is noteworthy that the forward movements

of the church, in which it has found the people, have been marked by unconventionality and extramural effort. The open fields, market places, street corners, town-halls, schoolhouses, and rough "tabernacles" have characterized the popularization of religion from the time of Jesus to the present day."¹ Is not the stately, imposing church building an uninviting place to the masses? And does it not imply a separateness of religion from common places and common life? I do not mean by this that our stately church buildings do not possess certain rich aesthetic and spiritual values for those who enter them; the question is whether or not we could better reach the masses of men with more plain and simple ones.

And what about our public worship? Should it not be made more democratic? Its symbols and content are largely products of an undemocratic age. As yet the hopes and aspirations of the masses have been given expression (to only in a small way) through song, great statements of faith, and adequate common prayer. The old hymns which sing of "kings," "crowns," and "majesty" had meaning in former ages, but now their meaning becomes less with each generation. Many of our churches expend large sums of money for quartettes and other professional music, instead of educating the young

1. American Journal of Theology, vol. 31, p. 464.

people of the church in music and training the people in congregational singing. Moreover, the minister assumes to speak *ex cathedra*, and may take advantage of the pulpit to make statements which he would not make in private conversation, while the people have no opportunity to reply to him. Should we not endeavor to democratize public worship?

We have thus briefly spoken of the need for a democratized church organization, church government, church spirit, church architecture, and public worship. These are some of the undemocratic aspects of institutional religion, and we present them in the hope that they may provoke further thinking on the subject. Institutional religion can not be democratized in one day nor by any one method; it can be accomplished only by a gradual process, and will come with the democratization of the other institutions of society. Popular intelligence and efficient church leadership will greatly advance the cause. As the masses come to their own in other relations of life, they will, we believe, come to their own in this relation also. History teaches that the religious organization and the social organization have either been identical or parallel, and that the former usually follows a little behind the latter; therefore, if the social organization be democ-

ratized, the religious organization will also eventually become democratic.

3. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF CREDAL RELIGION.

In a discussion of the application of the democratic principles to credal religion, there are two fundamental principles which should be considered: the question of authority, and the question of theological conception and terminology. We can devote ourselves only to a brief outline consideration of these principles. There are manifold critical questions here involved that are beyond the scope and purpose of this treatise.

(1) Democracy in religion means the passing of interposing and mediating authority between the souls of men and their God. It demands that the people be free to come into direct relationship with God. It denies the authority of state, church, priest, creed, or Book to stand between the souls of men and their Maker. Religious democracy means that religion is of the people, by the people, for the people. Here is the real issue between Catholicism and Protestantism. The former says that men can not come to God except through an ordered ecclesiastical system; the latter denies this and affirms that men may find God for them-

selves without the intervention of any external authority. There is a personal quest for the Infinite; there is a personal acquaintance with God. "It is the right of man to pursue this quest unhindered; to find God for himself, in his own way, with his own faculties, after his own fashion."¹ Religious democracy destroys theological aristocracies; it breaks up monopolies on God and religion. "Agnosticism says 'we can know nothing about the Infinite.' Dogmatism is first cousin to agnosticism, for dogmatism says 'we can not know anything about God except what other people tell us.' Over against both I here put the foundation of religious liberty, - the accessibility of God to every soul, and the consequent right of every soul to find God by its own quest, in its own way."² For this great principle of religious liberty Baptists have fought through the centuries; for it all men who love religious liberty must continue to fight.

The passing of interposing and mediating authority in religion before the growing forces of democracy is working wonderful changes. It is creating a freedom of thinking within denominational lines, and a growing tolerance toward other religious bodies. It respects other men's views and convictions, believing that they too may get divine light. It also means that the church

1. Lyman Abbott: The Rights of Man, p. 191.

2. Ibid., p. 193.

has less authority, at least of the traditional kind, than it once had. "Religion can no longer be imposed upon man by authority from without. . . . Only doctrines which commend themselves to the spiritual consciousness, and which are found actually to satisfy the spiritual cravings and serve the spiritual needs of man can command him."¹ Neither has the Bible the same kind of authority it once had, and "when the minister attempts to make the Bible speak to this democratic age with the same kind of authority with which it spoke to a former autocratic age, he simply closes the minds of his hearers against its message."² And the preacher can no longer say "thus saith" and "thou shalt;" he can not force men in this age. But he has a nobler authority than the kind he once possessed; he has the authority of persuasion, attraction, and love. He can bend the free wills of men to fellowship with Jesus. Never man spoke like Jesus because he spoke to the deepest spiritual life of men, and they responded to his appeal. Jesus did not drive men, he led them; he did not force men, he drew them by the power of his personality and message. By his words Jesus evoked from men the declaration: "Yes, that is true, for our own hearts tell us

1. The Biblical World, vol. 52, p. 192.

2. Lyman Abbott: The Spirit of Democracy, p. 206.

it is." And this method and authority of Jesus is the method and authority of democracy; it is the method and authority of the preacher, the Bible, and the church. It is the only kind of authority possible in a democracy. But it will win!

(2) The application of democracy to religion means that theological terminology and conceptions are undergoing change. Many of our theological figures of speech and conceptions grew out of an autocratic age. The Christian Church began as a democracy, but it soon passed out of partially democratic Judea into wholly autocratic Rome. There the Catholic Church soon became a friend of privilege and a tool of autocracy. It took color very largely from the social institutions about it. "The successive theologies that have dominated the thinking of the church are cast in the molds furnished by the political and social conditions of the days in which they originated."¹ Therefore, they are the figures and conceptions of an autocratic society. It was a theology expressed largely in terms of "transcendental politics," in terms of "kings", "thrones", "honor", "majesty", etc. But for the religion of a growing democracy these monarchical conceptions of religion are sure to furnish difficulty. They func-

1. Biblical World, vol. 52, p. 192.

tioned in the religious life of an autocratic age. Then they had meaning. But now they are not so popular and forceful. No longer can a democrat in politics and society be a monarchist in religion. Such a theology will not satisfy the social and democratic mind. The old terminology no longer makes vital connection with the religious experience, and Christian thinking must be cast in forms which can be understood if it is to guide men in the new day. One of the most important tasks before the church is to foster a faith that can be expressed in terms intelligible to democracy, and which can therefore minister to the new age that is upon us.

Fundamental to all other change in religious thinking is the changing conception of God. The old autocratic conception of God is not as popular as it once was. There are three aspects of the autocratic God: First, His dominant aspect is His own glory; second, He is arbitrary, and does things simply because He chooses to do them and for no other reason; third, He elects to salvation and reward whom He will, and to punishment and destruction whom He will. He is the Great Monarch upon the throne, absolute, arbitrary, and irresponsible. All creation exists for His glory and honor. "A huge, magnified, holy Louis XIV projected

upon the starry firmament, He cried, 'I am the Universe,' as the Roi Soleil exclaimed, 'I am the State.'¹ This age is appealing for a new definition of God, for this autocratic conception will not meet the religious need of an age that fears, hates, and rejects autocrats and monarchs. A democratic people, were they able to believe the existence of such a God, would consider Him dangerous; but, as a matter of fact, multitudes of people have ceased to take seriously such a God. The new conception of the worth of man is destroying the religion of fear. People have ceased to think of themselves as "weak worms of the dust," and they are not willing to "be damned for the glory of God" if it be merely the personal glory of a divine Autocrat. They are coming to believe that, since human government is conceived to exist for the welfare of the governed, surely God's government must not be thought of in lower terms. The modern democrat thinks of punishment, not in terms of vindictive justice or retribution, but as a means of reformation. And the democrat "must turn with indifference from the mediaeval Czar-God, whose 'glory and majesty' do not appeal to him, and seek a God who has some of the marks of real, sterling grandeur of character."²

1. Frank Crane: God and Democracy; pp. 22-23.
2. Ibid, p. 36.

The conception of God that is necessary for the religious life of to-day is not a new one; it was given mankind nearly two millenniums ago by Jesus of Nazareth. The God Whom Jesus revealed is a Companion, a Friend, a Father. These conceptions will satisfy democracy. It satisfies us to know that God is a constant Companion and a loving Friend; it satisfies us to know that His relationship to us is a fatherly relationship. If we believe God to be like Jesus, He is the Servant of mankind, for "whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."¹ If God be like Jesus, He "is going about doing good;" serving, not Himself, but mankind; seeking, not His own glory, but the glory and welfare of the race. The God Whom Jesus revealed is a Servant, a self-abnegating Servant, rather than an Autocrat upon the throne seeking His own glory, honor and pleasure. The throne is vacant, and God is at work in the service of men, for Jesus says, "May Father worketh even until now, and I work."² The Universal Ruler is giving place to the Universal Servant, and this is resulting from the discovery that

1. Mark 10: 44-45.

2. John 5:17.

serving is greater than ruling, that serving is the greatest thing in the world, and only as ruling means service is it at all great.¹ Therefore, the God of Jesus rules the race only that He may serve the race. He is building His Kingdom, and in this Kingdom power and authority are always measured by service. The modern man does not worship God because of His sheer power, but because He serves us, loves us, and gives Himself for us. God's real throne is the Cross, and it is the Cross that reveals His real character. And because He thus loves us and gives Himself for us, we give ourselves to Him. This God of Jesus - the Friend, the Companion, the Great Servant, the Leader, the Father - will meet the religious needs of a democratic world. And if the Christian Church would regain its hold on men, if it would serve the new world of to-day, it must come back to this democratic conception. It must purge orthodoxy of its heathen ingredients and of the pictures and conceptions of a past and autocratic age, for the moral sense and the intellect of the modern world have outgrown them.

In conclusion, let us say that the very existence of real democracy depends upon the Christian

1. Frank Crane: God and Democracy, p. 29.

religion. Education is essential to democracy, and equally as essential is religion, for a citizenship must be both moral and intelligent. Autocracy can get along without religion, or with a non-Christian type of it. Ambassador von Bernstorff, a product and typical representative of autocracy, confessed, on his departure from America, that he had no religion. Ex-Kaiser Wilhelm, in his fervid and often ridiculous appeals to Almighty God, and in his sacrilegious claims to divine partnership, made no reference to Jesus Christ. His God was an autocrat like unto himself. Autocracy, I repeat, can get along without the Christian religion, but democracy can not. Christianity is the dynamo that generates democracy. The principles and the Cross of Jesus ever keep before us the worth of a man and the essential equality of all men before God. The principles and the Cross of Jesus ever assure us that we are brothers and that God is our Father. Wherever Christianity is taught and preached and its principles applied to life, there will be found liberty, equality, and fraternity. The principles and the Cross of Jesus Christ are establishing the Kingdom of God, in which ideal and perfect democracy will be realized.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

The following publications have had a more or less conscious influence on the writer's thought in this discussion. They do not pretend, however, to constitute a complete bibliography on the subject.

B O O K S

- Abbott, Lyman: The Spirit of Democracy;
New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1910.
- Abbott, Lyman: The Rights of Man;
New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1901.
- Addams, Jane: Democracy and Social Ethics;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1905.
- Allen, W. H.: Efficient Democracy;
New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1907.
- Aristotle's Ethics and Politics.
- Aristotle's Treatise on Government.
- Batten, S. Z.: The Christian State;
Philadelphia, Griffith & Rowland Press, 1909.
- Bryce, James: The American Commonwealth;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1889.
- Butler, Nicholas Murray: True and False Democracy;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1907.
- Camp, G. S.: Democracy;
New York, Harper, 1859.
- Churchill, Winston: A Traveller in War Time;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1918.
- Cooley, C. H.: Social Organization;
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

- Cram, Ralph Adams: *The Nemesis of Mediocrity*;
Boston, Marshall Jones Co., 1917.
- Crane, Frank: *God and Democracy*;
Chicago, Forbes and Co., 1913.
- Croly, Herbert: *Progressive Democracy*;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1914.
- Dole, C. F.: *The Spirit of Democracy*;
New York, T. Y. Crowell and Co., 1906.
- Dewey, John: *Democracy and Education*;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1916.
- Faguet, Emile: *The Dread of Responsibility*;
New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.
- Ferguson, Charles: *The Religion of Democracy*;
New York, Kennerley, 1911.
- Fernau, Herman: *The Coming Democracy*;
New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1917.
- Gardner, C. S.: *The Ethics of Jesus and Social Progress*;
New York, George H. Doran Co., 1914.
- Giddings, F. H.: *Elements of Sociology*;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1898.
- Godkin, E. L.: *Problems of Modern Democracy*;
New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- Godkin, E. L.: *Unforeseen Tendencies of Democracy*;
New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1898.
- Griggs, E. H.: *The Soul of Democracy*;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1898.
- Gulliver, Julia H.: *Studies in Democracy*;
New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917.
- Hadley, A. T.: *Freedom and Responsibility*;
New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- Hughes, Charles E.: *Conditions of Progress in Democratic Government*;
New Haven, Yale University Press, 1910.

- Krebiel, Edward: Nationalism, War and Society;
New York, Macmillan Co., 1916.
- Lecky, W. E. H.: Democracy and Liberty;
New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1896.
- Lodge, H. C.: The Democracy of the Constitution;
New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- Mathews, Shailer: The Making of To-morrow;
New York, Eaton and Mains, 1913.
- Mill, John Stuart: Liberty;
London, Longmans, 1878.
- Oppenheimer, Franz: The State;
Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1914.
- Phelps, Edith M. (comp.): A League of Nations;
New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1918.
- Plato's Republic.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter: A Theology for the Social Gospel;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1917.
- Rousseau: The Social Contract;
New York, Putnam, 1893.
- Sedgwick, A. G.: The Democratic Mistake;
New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- Stephen, J. F.: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity;
London, Smith, 1874.
- Taft, W. H.: Popular Government;
New Haven, Yale University Press, 1913.
- Talbot, Winthrop: Americanization (A handbook, containing
a number of recent contributions to our
subject; containing also a number of
historic documents on democracy).
New York, The H. W. Wilson Co., 1917.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de: Democracy in America;
New York, Langley, 1843.
- Tufts, J. H.: Our Democracy, Its origins and Its Tasks;
New York, H. Holt and Co., 1917.
- Weyl, W. E.: The New Democracy;
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1912.

MAGAZINES

American Journal of Sociology:

- Vol. 21, pp. 1 ff.
- Vol. 21, pp. 458 ff.
- Vol. 22, pp. 193 ff.
- Vol. 23, pp. 390 ff.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science:

- Vol. 65, pp. 57 ff.
- Vol. 67, pp. 11 ff.
- Vol. 72, pp. 28 ff.
- Vol. 81, pp. 167 ff. (John D. Rockefeller Jr.'s famous address on 'Representation in Industry').

Biblical World:

- Vol. 49, pp. 348 ff.
- Vol. 52, pp. 185 ff.

Bookman:

- Vol. 46, pp. 29 ff.
- Vol. 47, pp. 182 ff.

Century:

- Vol. 93, pp. 785 ff.

Craftsman:

- Vol. 27, pp. 451 ff.

Edinburgh Review:

- Vol. 227, pp. 209 ff.

Forum:

- Vol. 53, pp. 327 ff.

Harper:

Vol. 134, pp. 821 ff.

Independent:

Vol. 83, pp. 289 ff.

Vol. 86, pp. 53 ff.

Vol. 94, p 279.

Living Age:

Vol. 297, pp. 117 ff.

Nation:

Vol. 102, pp. 480 f.

Vol. 105, pp. 454 f.

Vol. 106, pp. 233 f.

Vol. 107, pp. 88 f.

New England Magazine:

Vol. 52, pp. 5 ff.

New Republic:

Vol. 11, pp. 49 ff.

Vol. 12, pp. 71 ff.

Vol. 14, pp. 316 ff.

Vol. 14, pp. 91 ff. (The Platform of the British
Labor Party.)

Nineteenth Century:

Vol. 69, pp. 179 ff.

Vol. 79, pp. 225 ff.

Vol. 79, pp. 658 ff.

Vol. 80, pp. 371 ff.

Vol. 82, pp. 301 ff.

North American Review:

Vol. 207, pp. 178 ff.

Vol. 207, pp. 400 ff.

Outlook:

Vol. 118, pp. 615 f.

Overland:

Vol. 72, 449 f.

Public:

Vol. 21, pp. 301 f.
 " " pp. 452 f.
 " " pp. 852 ff.
 " " pp. 885 ff.
 " " pp. 922 ff.
 " " pp. 1122 f.
 " " pp. 1144 ff.

School and Society:

Vol. 4, pp. 120 ff.
 Vol. 7, pp. 724 ff.
 Vol. 8, pp. 241 ff.
 Vol. 8, p. 305.
 Vol. 8, pp. 82 ff.

Survey:

Vol. 40, pp. 366 f.

Unpopular Review:

Vol. 5, pp. 332 ff.
 Vol. 10, pp. 343 ff.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA ARTICLES

The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform:

Democracy.

Liberty.

Natural Rights.

Cities.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica:

Democracy.

ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES

Lowell, James Russell: Democracy.

Arnold, Matthew: Democracy.

" " : Equality.

NEWSPAPERS

The Louisville Courier-Journal.

The Louisville Times.

The Louisville Post.

The Louisville Herald.

The Chicago Tribune.

The New York Times.

Cum

C. S. G.
G. R. E.

W. J. M.
F. M. P.

W. O. C.