



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
146

Box
51

Folder
82

Is Democracy Desirable?, 1920.

ADDRESS BY RABBI ABBA H. SILVER, ON
"IS DEMOCRACY DESIRABLE?" AT THE TEMPLE,
SUNDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 24, 1920,
CLEVELAND, OHIO.

-0-

In my address on May 2nd of this year, on the subject of "The Next President of the United States--What Type of Man Shall He Be?", I said the following. After defining what, to my mind, ought to be the chief qualifications of the man who would aspire to be the president of this great republic, I asked: "Are there such men? I have heard many say that there is an unusual paucity of great men today; there is a dearth of great men; there is no such thing. There are plenty of good men in our land who can take hold of the reins of government successfully. It is not altogether necessary that we have a successful businessman to run our government, or a technically trained scientist, or an administrator of long years of experience, because government is much more than business. The aims of government are much more exalted than the mere efficient administration of certain departments. Business is run for profit, principally; government is run to yield the greatest happiness to the greatest number of men, by means of increasing the freedom of self-expression and self-realization to the greatest number of citizens. Government is just as much interested

in the elevation of the mind in spiritual values, in education, in art, in literature, in science, in religion, as it is in an efficient budget."

"What is needed," I said in my address of six months ago, before the conventions called to nominate the candidates for the various parties were held, "is a man who is simple and honest, who has the holy virtues of an American citizen; a man who is free of cant, hypocrisy and mere verbiage, of the loose talk that runs amuck during a political campaign; a man who is willing to face facts, to call in expert talent to deal with these facts as they are; a man who is true to the fundamental idealism of American life, who has sympathy for the struggling masses of the world and for the new ideas that are trying to find a local habitation and a name in American life. He must be a true American who is really not afraid of the exchange of ideas, not only in times of quiet, but also, and even more so, in times of stress."

There are such men, I said, and many of them. The question only is this: Has the American people the courage and the machinery to bring such men to the front and make them its leaders? Or will the old story repeat itself again, and the wire-pulling, the compromises, and the lobbying of party machinery ultimately give us a man who stands for nothing--an insipid, suave, complacent individual, who says little and means less?

Apparently the fear that I expressed six months

ago has, in some measure, unfortunately come true. The men who were chosen to be the leaders of their respective parties are not men who measure up to the emergencies and to the needs of this great hour. They are men of decided mediocre talents and abilities. You, yourself-- and I venture to say the majority of the American people-- felt a certain sense of keen disappointment when the men of the two great national parties who were chosen were finally announced.

Many of us have consoled ourselves since in one way or another. I think the happiest phrase yet coined to comfort and console us concerning these men was, I believe, said by F. P. A. in the humorist column of one of the great national dailies. F. P. A. said, "Why all this gloom? Only one of them can be elected."

The fact that at this critical time in the history not only of the United States but of the world, men are chosen first of all not by the popular will, and secondly that men are chosen who have little of the fundamental and basic qualifications for the exalted position, has made many true lovers of democracy question the very validity, the worthwhileness of democratic institutions.

Is democracy desirable? Up to very recently we regarded democracy as a dogma to be accepted in faith and not to be questioned and criticized, but in recent years a great number of men who are thinkers have begun to

question this sacred dogma of our land.

Has democracy proved true? Has it realized the ideals which it was to realize? Has it established liberty, equality, fraternity, popular government? Has it made concrete and real the will of the masses, of the people? Has it functioned beneficently to social life? Many of these critics of democracy have said that democracy has not brought about equality. In place of inequality of birth, of position, it has substituted a new inequality--the inequality of wealth. It has not destroyed the slums; it has not destroyed poverty or pauperism. It has increased the number of exceedingly wealthy men of this land, but it has also increased the number of exceedingly poor in our land.

Democracy has proved to be, so say these critics, a very inefficient, wasteful instrument of government. When during a war, in moments of dire need, a democratic government can spend one billion dollars for airplanes and receive not one for use, it is a frightful indictment of the institution of democratic government. Democracy, so say the critics, was not even made for peace. It has been maintained that monarchs and aristocracies desire war, but the peoples in democracies desire peace above all else; that the great democracies of the world are those that have the greatest navies and the greatest armies. England, France and the United States have, I believe, the three greatest navies in the

world.

And democracies are just as grasping, and just as greedy, and just as selfish, and just as eager and ready to tear at their next neighbor as the old established monarchies of the world. It has not even made for fraternity, for brotherhood. In this great democracy of ours there are twenty millions of human beings who are being subjected daily to the vilest form of racial discrimination, men who are being deprived of the very elemental rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

A democracy, so say these men, has made for a frightful mediocrity; it has a tendency to level downward instead of inspiring the exceptional, the gifted, the talented one, and encouraging him to reach the higher levels and the purer air of achievement. Democracy, being controlled by the masses, has a tendency to pull down, to degrade, to lower to a dead, monotonous level everything; it has lowered art; it has lowered literature; it has vulgarized, so say the critics, the finest sentiments and ideals of human life; it has materialized everything; it has reduced everything to the measurement of one standard--Success. A thing is good when it is successful; a thing is worthwhile when it can be translated in the coin of the realm--when it has a monetary value.

And lastly, say our critics of democracy, look

at your political parties,--how little they manifest the popular will and the popular needs! Look at these candidates who are now representing us as spokesmen and leaders of these parties! They were not chosen by the people. One of them, certainly, came to the nominating convention having the least of votes gained in the popular primaries. Both of them were nominated by groups who have in the past dominated and controlled the two parties. They were boss-selected. I don't say that they will be boss-controlled. There is no doubt that a senatorial oligarchy selected one man, and that the other man was selected by a small group. It is said that they met in French Lick, or some other place, but he was foisted upon a great party.

So that after the war, when we had hoped that the ideals of democracy would permeate the land and sweep like a prairie fire through every department of our national life, and the people would take hold of the reins of government and assert themselves, their wills, their needs, their prerogatives, we find that the same old crowd is again in the saddle and again controlling the destinies of our government.

Then our critics say, "Study this political campaign of 1920. What are the issues between the two contending parties?" We look for them and we search for them, but we look and search for them in vain. It is strange, it is almost farcical, that in a great government

such as ours the two great parties in the campaign have practically nothing at issue between them--no vital, telling, pertinent issue. Both parties have managed to work up a great deal of heat and warmth about the League of Nations, but if you have succeeded by this time in discovering just where both or either of the candidates actually stand on the League of Nations questions, you have performed a miracle.

The Republican platform came out as against Mr. Wilson's League of Nations,--for an international association--so reads the platform--which will use its power and its influence to prevent war. That is vague enough, but still there is the kernel of an idea there. The Republican candidate, however, in his speech of acceptance, ignored the platform completely. Later on, in a speech delivered at Des Moines, I believe, he made the statement that, "I am not interested in reservations in this treaty; what I am interested in is in scrapping this treaty and the league completely." In the Senate, however, Mr. Harding voted twice for the league with reservations. He has taken occasion over and over again to say that he is in favor of some sort of a Hague tribunal with teeth in it, but he is opposed to a league. And on the other hand, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Wickersham, and Mr. Root tell us not to take Mr. Harding seriously.

Mr. Cox, in the early days of the campaign, has said that he is in full accord with Mr. Wilson on the

League of Nations. Mr. Wilson has insisted stubbornly, immovably upon his League of Nations without reservations, after he had presented it. Mr. Cox, however, has said over and over again that he is not opposed to certain reservations. He has not specified the reservations that he would accept, exactly, but he is not opposed to them. He is not rigorous in his insistence.

And so when one simple, unsophisticated American citizen wants to know just what Harding thinks upon the League of Nations, he is referred on the one hand to Mr. Taft, and on the other hand to Mr. Johnson. And when he wishes to know what Mr. Cox thinks of the League of Nations, he is referred on the one hand to Mr. Wilson, and on the other hand to quite a number of declarations and statements of his own, which do not fully agree with the position of Mr. Wilson.

What does that mean? It means that even the League of Nations, an institution so sacred, round which moves the hopes of a broken and tortured world, is being made a political football; that even of that vital subject there have been no definite announcements and no definite convictions,--something that a man can set his hand to and choose either the one way or the other. That could happen, to my mind, in no other great country in the world.

Now that I have spoken of the League of Nations, I want to make my own position very clear and very definite. Those who have followed the development of

my attitude towards the subject know exactly where I stand on the League of Nations. Before the Treaty of Versailles was published and announced to the world on March 16, 1919, I spoke from this pulpit on the subject of the League of Nations--Its Friends and Its Enemies. I came out in unqualified support and endorsement of it. I even then said that there may be need for certain modifications and certain toning down of the rigor of it, but that I am in full accord with it--with its spirit and its motive.

On April 13th, a month later, in my address on "Woodrow Wilson--an Appreciation," I furthermore and again indorsed the League of Nations, assuming all the time that Mr. Wilson would have power enough to make the nations of Europe accept the ideals and the basic principles which are preparatory to any peace and to any league. And so I said in this address of April 13th, 1919,---Speaking of what Mr. Wilson has contributed to the thought of his age, "The contribution of Mr. Wilson to the idea of the League of Nations was the primary need for the democratization of the world. Satisfy the cravings of every people that is justly entitled to a control of its own destiny; rectify the ancient wrongs, heal the ancient, festering wounds of peoples, and then, having established confidence and friendship among peoples, you will be in a position to found an abiding and serviceable League of Nations. That is Mr. Wilson's contribution to humanity, and that is

another act of his life that will insure him a place in the ranks of the immortals."

That was before the Treaty of Versailles was announced to the world. But on June 1st, two months later, I spoke on "Is the Treaty of Peace a Peace Treaty?" And I began the address by saying: "If what I say this morning will sound a bit strange to ears that have been accustomed to hear nothing but of the constant unity of the aims and purposes of the Allies in this war, ears that have been accustomed to hear almost nothing but praise for the motives of the Allies from this pulpit, I hope you will attribute the strangeness to a sense of disillusionment which I have experienced since the publication of the Treaty of Paris."

I furthermore, in that same address, said, "The prospect to me seems rather unpromising. Our hopes have not been realized; our spokesman and leader, the man who for two years was the arbiter of the destinies of the world, is coming back a sadder and a smaller man. Perhaps a League of Nations may rectify some of these errors. It is rather doubtful. The League of Nations would have been a strong, binding institution if the rights of all peoples had first been established and the desire of all had first been satisfied, but as long as questions of life and death, questions which are close to the very life of a people, remain unsolved, this mechanism of a League of Nations can avail but little. It might prove to be a house of

glass, for all we know. As it reads at present, the League of Nations is very little more than an instrument to defend and protect the integrity of four great powers--England, France, Italy and Japan. It is rather questionable, to my mind, whether the United States of America is ready to subscribe to such a league, is ready to bind itself, if not absolutely legally, even morally to such a promise, and to such a program."

This was fifteen months ago. However, even then, with the agreements of Versailles before us, I felt that there was an intrinsic good in the idea of a league, and I urged it, but urged it with reservations.

In my address of February the 8th of this year, on "What Would Lincoln say to Wilson," I said, "No nation today can be completely independent. The world today is interdependent. The destiny of one nation is, to a tremendous degree, determined by the destiny of another nation. The bullet of Sarajevo killed sixty thousand Americans, and a bullet in London, or Paris, or Berlin, or Moscow may at any time kill a half a million Americans. A pebble cast into the bosom of European political life will create ringlets of influence that will touch our very shores. We cannot, even if we so wished, escape this interdependence, the intimacy which commerce and industry and the shrinking of the world have created. There is no choice for the world today but anarchy or some sort of a league. The balance of power means future wars, wars of

extermination.

"But Mr. Lincoln would say to Mr. Wilson, 'You made concessions to France, why not make concessions to the United States? It is sometimes easier to go around a mountain than to tunnel through the mountain. Accept the reservations that are being imposed upon you and presented to you. America cannot at this moment throw itself completely and whole-heartedly into a league when the nations of Europe are still dominated by a philosophy of bargaining, scheming and plotting. The world is not yet ripe for a lack of suspicion. Safeguard America; protect its initiative, its independence. Many of the reservations offered are valid and worthwhile.'"

And today I would not only indorse what I said six months ago, and a year ago, and eighteen months ago, but I would most strongly and emphatically underwrite them.

No one, no sane, humanity-loving American is opposed to the idea of making war less possible, less frequent, less precipitive, by establishing a league. No American is set against the idea of bringing the severed bits of humanity into a closer union with one another, of establishing channels for the exchange of ideas, for settlement of difficulties, for the arbitration of differences. If the nations of Europe had meant peace, if their deliberations at Versailles, at Paris and at San Remo were actuated by the earnest desire to establish peace in the world, and to heal the wounds of suffering

mankind, to adjust the evils and to right the wrongs, and to make straight the crooked ways of the world; if they had manifested in the slightest degree this desire to undo the wrongs of the past, to check all imperialistic passion that is this very day ravaging half of Europe, then America would come into such a concert of European nations in a spirit of generosity and liberality and eagerness to serve.

But when we are asked to underwrite a treaty which has shown itself during the past two years to be a breeder of war; when such a league is tacked on inseparably to a treaty which means that in accepting the league we are entering a union to perpetuate the evils of such a treaty, I urge caution; I urge watchful waiting. To build a league one must make sure that the foundations are solid. The league itself may be a wonderful, beautiful structure, but if the foundations are of quicksand, it will not last.

My criticism of the League of Nations is not per se as a league. My criticism of the League of Nations is that it is identified with a treaty which has brought misery and suffering into the world, and that this league will be used not to rectify the wrongs but in some way to perpetuate these wrongs. We are asked to join a partnership. You as businessmen would not go into a partnership when you know that the members of that concern are not only financially bankrupt but morally bankrupt.

And if you are asked to join it you would first demand a housecleaning. If England and France and Italy are earnest and honest in their desire for a league to avoid future wars, let them call a halt to their present wars; let them give evidence of their honesty; let France cease to instigate wars every six months in Russia; let Poland cease in its suicidal policy of imperialism, going far beyond the very generous boundaries that a very generous treaty gave unto it; let England do the fair and the just and the decent thing by its people, by its dependencies--by Ireland, by Egypt, by India; let Italy cease from its criminal policy of grabbing everything in sight. Then we shall know that we are dealing with a group of nations who are actually earnest in their desire to create justice and establish peace upon earth.

There are only two possible courses for the American people at this time. One is to stay out of the league entirely until the nations of Europe have manifested a change of heart; until they come clean. Or--and it is likely that the first course will not be adopted, but that the second will be adopted--if we do go into a league, that we step in cautiously. Let it be as loose, as tentative, as little binding at the start as it can be. Let us not give a blanket indorsement to the nations of Europe, to protect them in their territorial integrity. Let us not make such rash promises. I have heard people say that in two years we can get out. But it took five

days to plunge this world into war.

Let us retain our freedom of action; let us not bind ourselves morally to such a union. I have heard my friends say--and I speak of this at length because it is so close to me--"Well, let's go in, and then we will try to correct things there. With our prestige and with our influence we can change everything." Well, that is what Mr. Wilson thought in 1917. When the representatives of the foreign governments came to him to urge him to give American support to the Allied cause, Mr. Wilson knew full well that the pockets of those emissaries were chock full of secret treaties. But he said to himself, "I won't ask them now to destroy these secret treaties; I will wait until America will go into the war and assert its power and its influence, and then we shall compel them to abandon these secret treaties and accept my Fourteen Points."

But Mr. Wilson was a stranger and he was "taken in." Mr. Wilson came to Versailles imbued with the highest ideals--ideals which had been struggling in the consciousness of mankind for centuries. He was an idealist. He is to this day one of the greatest idealists of the world. For sincerity, for honesty of motive, there are few in the history of statesmen that can compare with him. But he was too late. The time to make his demands effective, the time to bring about the ideal, was when the Allies needed him, not after he had served them.

And so it is with this League of Nations. The Allies need us in the League; the European powers want us. This is the time to set our own terms for our own entrance into the League. To my mind, it will be a tragic thing--tragic as far as the destinies of mankind are concerned, if we lose this opportunity as we lost another great opportunity in 1917.

With all these deficiencies of democracy before us, one is tempted to ask: "Is democracy desirable?" I for one believe that not alone is it desirable, but that it is the highest expression of human life. In spite of all its weaknesses it remains true that democracy mines more of the precious ore of human personality in the world; democracy makes possible the development of more personalities in the world; democracy makes possible the extent of opportunity to the millions and the millions of the world who under any other system of society would not have that opportunity. Democracy makes for the free development of personality, which is the ideal and goal of education. But our democracy is not perfect; it is a blundering democracy. It is characteristic of the soul of the American people. The American is a pragmatist; he is not a theorist. The American does not start out life with a theory, and he is not satisfied until that abstract theory is achieved,--like the Russian, like the Frenchman during the French Revolution--ready to revolutionize the world for the sake

of an idea. The American moves slowly; he is experimental; his notions are tentative; he is more satisfied to have a thing successful than to have a theory; he is interested in achievement, in results; consequently, not having a definite plan of progress and evolution, he is bound to stumble and make mistakes, but he progresses, nevertheless.

Those of you who are discouraged about American democracy, if you will study American History you will realize how much we have progressed within a century. We speak with a great deal of inference of the absolute, infallible soundness of our constitution, of the great wisdom of our forefathers. They were wise men, and the constitution is one of the most remarkable documents in the history of the world, but it is also true that the constitution was written by men who were very skeptical about democracy, who tried to hedge in, confine and protect the government from the irresponsible incursions of the masses.

The President of the United States, according to the constitution, was actually intended to be elected by the electoral college; the Senate that was organized was not to be elected by the people but indirectly, and, above all, a Supreme Court was established that was to have absolute power of vetoing and nullifying an act of the people. And you know of the states in 1776 and thereafter where suffrage was absolutely restricted to property owners. In many of the states only men of a

certain religious creed and persuasion could vote. In some states only Protestants and in other states only Catholics could vote. In one state any man could become governor of the state that had in his possession and was worth ten thousand pounds. The negro was altogether disenfranchised.

Now, we have progressed since, in spite of the rapid development of our country. Within a hundred years we grew from seven millionsto a hundred millions. Our population increased almost fifteen-fold, and our wealth probably a hundred-fold. In spite of the tremendous problems of exploiting a continent, of taking wealth out of the soil, of expanding the frontiers of our republic to the Pacific, we yet had time to extend the privileges of democracy, to correct its ills, to make this government more representative. And that tendency, my friends, is continuing today. I am not at all pessimistic inspite of a campaign like 1920. I am not at all pessimistic as to the future of democratic government in America.

There are certain things that must be done and should be done at once. In the first place, direct primaries must be made universal. This system of having primaries in some states and not in others, and then having nominating conventions--two institutions that are mutually exclusive--must be abolished. Direct primaries must be made universal throughout this land. On one day all the citizens of the United States should select their

candidates to represent their parties. And the nominating convention must be abolished because it has shown itself not alone useless and unnecessary, but a vicious institution, dominated and controlled by privileged classes.

In the second place, the citizens of America, and more especially the new citizens of America, must realize that he who votes blindly, by party affiliation and party loyalty, does not serve the highest interests of America. Above party loyalty is American loyalty. Men must vote for principles, for ideals, for issues and not for parties. Because of the unfailing loyalty of our people to parties ~~there~~ has crept in, a host of irresponsibles and corrupt politicians, who have preyed upon the sentiment of party loyalty; we have got to clean house, and the way to do it is for the thinking man and the thinking woman to destroy the superstition of party loyalty and vote for ideas and principles and convictions and not for parties. And the man or woman who does not vote hurts the cause of America and the cause of democracy, because the ward heeler and the politician and the unscrupulous trader in ^{the} politics of the land not only vote once but vote more than once.

Then lastly, to my mind, the time has definitely arrived--and I want you to take this idea and think of it; don't meet it with a spirit of hostility--for a new political alignment and the foundation of a new political party in the United States. I believe that there is need

in the United States for two distinct parties--not the Republican and the Democrat parties, because they are today fighting sham battles; they have outlived their usefulness; there are no issues between them,--but for two parties representative of the ~~tamper~~ and tone of the citizens of America; a party that would retain the conservative sentiment of America. And that is a legitimate sentiment. A conservative sentiment is the ballast for a country; it is absolutely vital in a land to have that steadying influence of a conservative group who are not over-hasty, precipitous and reckless.

There is need for a conservative party; there is need for a ~~liberal~~ party--not revolutionary or socialistic, but a liberal party representing the spirit of progress and liberties in America; of the men and the women who are not afraid of experimenting with new ideas, who believe in democracy, but in a growing, developing democracy; men and women who are not revolutionary and experimental. There is need of such a party, and I believe the time has definitely come for the formation of such a party.

That party would be the greatest antidote, to my mind, to any radicalism in this land. I have said more than once to you men and women that for one, I was never frightened by the rantings of propagandists, who said that this country was about to face a great revolution that would uproot it completely. This country is facing no such thing because there is no need here for it.

Revolutions come about by hunger, by abject poverty and pauperism, by suppression; and there is no hunger, but there is a social surplus, there is enough to go round. When people can be enriched without impoverishing anybody, there is no possibility nor any likelihood of any revolution.

Now, the party that preaches this doctrine of enriching the masses of the people without confiscation and without impoverishing anyone, of giving the government greater control over its interstate commerce and industries,-- the party would preach of democratic aspirations in industry is a party, to my mind, that should find itself in a strong position within the next few years.

To sum up, democracy is highly desirable, but it must be rapidly and swiftly improved upon. We must never be satisfied with the status quo--the things as they are, because that means stagnation and death. Each age is a dream that is dying, and one that is coming to birth. Nothing endures but everything passes over into something else more fit, more adaptable, more responsive to the needs of the age. And our institutions in themselves have no validity and sacredness only so far as they serve the needs of the people.

Democracy must be rendered more efficient, more directly functioned by the united will of the people--by you; by educating and disciplining yourselves to the spirit, and the temper, and the duties, and the responsibilities

of democracy. Democracy if it is anything is a religion. It is a religion, and it has its ritual; it demands your devotion and your consecration. You must go out as champions of the cause of democracy. Only as you do that will we save it from the taint of mediocrity, of vulgarization, of imperialism, with which it has been tainted in the past.

My reflections of the campaign of 1920 lead me to the conclusion that there is very much to be done for loyal men and women in the very near future in the way of improving our institutions, and facilitating the free expression of the popular will in the affairs of our government.



1. Not made for Equality. ① Social - birth vs wealth.
austerity of coat, soap, and biscuits.

② Economics - shams - crust. + empty
stomach: 15,000 millionaires + 100,000,000
of paupers.

2. Popular front. ① Ruled by privileged classes
~~no~~ not a by & by third - to-day by wealth.
govt by controlled legislators & newspapers.
Choice list. patches unreal. The Boss,
Mr. Murphy - Tassant, Revenue, the lobbyist
the demagogue - the strong speaker etc.
1. members at last election

3. Inefficiency: ① Billion for aeroplanes.
Shipping scandal. Annual Rivers
+ Harbors Bill. ② Good men do not
seek office: word politician.

4. Peace. When just as greedy & imperialistic.
3 powers descend. have 3 pocket armies
& navies in the world.
1. France to-day -

5. Medicine - gen. quelling downward. Trade
Union. Art. Best coat is best seller
Best rel. cure toothache. Success is
success or success & this success is also trial

6. Motherhood. Negro problem not solved
12 m. ② Rel. antagonism. Reut
③ Anti Sem - Wise & Hobbs -

7. Materialism - oil prospector and
school teacher. 143,000 school
teachers leave school bec. of starva-
tion wages. 5,000 closed. Less
than 100 a yr.

8. Autocracy - voice of kind, uninformed
becomes dominant in our policies
credulous, generally cruel personality
of the mob takes hold of dem. "Kill
him. Lynch him, deport him, shoot
him" - Jefferson, Public Opinion

Conclusion. ① Truth in all charges. ②
U.S. has not justified itself - may
yet crumble into ruin, prosperity
no proof of it. It is prop. that makes
for dem. and demer. for prosper.
- little Babylon -

1. Believe in U.S. bec. I bel. in that blundering
unscrupled, fathering, proph. there palpable man-
seeds of regeneration - ultimately of
ultimate victory.

1. Believe in ul. huc. of belief in Man -
Failures - man
2. Man's destiny - oblivion gets at the snow.
① but can make his life -
3. One Lincoln - settlement writers -
4. Wem. Values - social assets -
autocracy - ① limits ② force ^{Based on -}
③ dictatorship ④ love -
5. Educator's mission - angle for rules
6. Must look to Soul of ul but institution
9. ① Faith in form. Parade -
② Unmediated -
6. Soul of Ulemore.
1- Self-realization in ✓
2. Unity and unity ✓
3. Warlike spirit race etc ✓
4. Not alone path -
7. Education in Ulemore informal
~~vote - hold of~~
8. Rel. & Ulemore - 1. Service ✓
2. Philosophy ✓
3. Social Reasoning

"Social war or massacre would seem to be the natural ending of the dem. philosophy. Ulem. is the system of fools or of leveling downward. Ulem. has insisted on degrading the public service to a common level of incapacity. Ulem. has failed to justify itself" Henry Adams.

The degeneration of the Ulem. Ulogma

"The first cause of the gradual extirpation of culture among us is this: the increased hold of the dem. fallacy on the public mind". Agnes Repplier.
Modes and Morals.

"Effective dem. exists neither in the politics nor in the industry of any nation". Hopson - Englishman.
"Ulemocracy after the War".

Religious leaders - Outspoken Essays
Ulem of St. Paul - } *opportunity*
with what course to democracy

①

The E. M. Gantz Co.

PROPRIETORS
Garfield Hotel

3848 PROSPECT AVENUE

CLEVELAND, O.

1. This is a severe indictment. ~~But~~ It is an indictment not alone of D. itself but of those social agencies which have assumed to be its champions and sponsors - Religion and Education. - For in keeping with the pragmatic tendencies of an age we have given birth to religion and education on the objective of democratizing ~~society~~ - the human soul of man, and the opportunities of ^{social} life.

2. There is much in this wholesale indictment that is true. ~~And~~ ^H Would you - these charges are made not by naive + over-enthusiastic radicals but by staid + conservative thinkers of the privileged or endowed classes of society.

1. This is severe indictment - also
of rel. and education -
2. These changes made not by
radicals -
3. We who believe in D. must
meet these charges -
4. D. is to day | challenged -



(see over)

The E. M. Gantz Co.

PROPRIETORS
Garfield Hotel

3848 PROSPECT AVENUE

CLEVELAND, O.

2

There are not propaganda ^{pamphlets} ~~which~~ ^{which} ~~are~~ ^{are} ~~considered~~ ^{considered} ~~judgment~~ ^{judgment} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~men~~ ^{men} ~~turning~~ ^{turning} ~~who~~ ^{who} ~~have~~ ^{have} ~~no~~ ^{no} ~~personal~~ ^{personal} ~~prejudice~~ ^{prejudice} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~work~~ ^{work} ~~out~~ ^{out}.

3. We who believe in ^{must} ~~meet~~ ^{meet} ~~these~~ ^{these} ~~charges~~ ^{charges} ~~which~~ ^{which} ~~condemn~~ ^{condemn} ~~them~~ ^{them} ~~on~~ ^{on} ~~with~~ ^{with} ~~earnest~~ ^{earnest} ~~efforts~~ ^{efforts} ~~aimed~~ ^{aimed} ~~at~~ ^{at} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~correction~~ ^{correction} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~abuses~~ ^{abuses} ~~charged~~ ^{charged} ~~complained~~ ^{complained} ~~off~~ ^{off} ~~we~~ ^{we} ~~do~~ ^{do} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~meet~~ ^{meet} ~~them~~ ^{them} ~~with~~ ^{with} ~~intolerance~~ ^{intolerance} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~prejudice~~ ^{prejudice} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~catch-~~ ^{catch-} ~~phrases~~ ^{phrases} - Certainly educators, ~~who~~ ^{who} ~~are~~ ^{are} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~final~~ ^{final} ~~analysis~~ ^{analysis} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~defenseless~~ ^{defenseless} ~~apostles~~ ^{apostles} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~its~~ ^{its} ~~defenders~~ ^{defenders} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~teachers~~ ^{teachers} - ~~cannot~~ ^{cannot} ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~entrusted~~ ^{entrusted} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~their~~ ^{their} ~~own~~ ^{own} ~~merits~~ ^{merits} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~this~~ ^{this} ~~unforgotten~~ ^{unforgotten}

The E. M. Gantz Co.

PROPRIETORS
Garfield Hotel

3848 PROSPECT AVENUE

CLEVELAND, O.

3

loyalty - they mistake stand-
pats for patriotism - and
prejudice thinking and
experimentation for revolution.
There is nothing so revolu-
tionary as reaction, and
nothing so conservative
as progress.

U. S. is to-day being challenged.
We cannot defend it if we
are compelled to defend ~~the~~
its weaknesses ^{as well as}
its strength ^{as well as} its ~~strength~~ ^{failures} together
with its ~~achievements~~ ^{achievements}. We must
denounce the ~~present~~ ^{present}
and separate the chaff from
the wheat -

The E. M. Santz Co.

PROPRIETORS
Garfield Hotel

3848 PROSPECT AVENUE

CLEVELAND, O.

Maxwell fold

4

5. Failures of D. charged —

6. In spite, it, I believe in it — I believe in Man — Failures — Reactions —

7. Man's destiny — means — I have within
his power to achieve — I am man — Am I?
common belief — is path Man —

8. One firm value — teaches — Settlement
workers — I know that very fact
in W. is not misplaced

9. Value of D — wherein is it superior —
for what is reality —

① More than Voting — Philosophy.
② Self-realization — Individualization —
— 9000 steps — in image of 1900 — Gen. of Man

③ Increases social asset — obligation
③ Elevates their experience — what —

④ Friendship — Angel — amoral children
Believe in verbiage
Democracy is the pedagogy of
civilization — It is education in
doing —

⑥ Is only road —

The E. M. Gantz Co.

PROPRIETORS

Garfield Hotel

3848 PROSPECT AVENUE

CLEVELAND, O.

Herein is due allusion to D. S. Day

10. Function of School to keep this
in minds of men. -

(1) D. is a religion - ritual -
creed - high altars -

(2) ~~aim of life~~ - is not one

(3) Efficiency in education -
efficient education - not
for job or professions but for
life - Prussian - God
created Man -

(4) What is success - for
boys who become successful
for man - but failing failing
as citizen as father as friend

(5) Contentment already exploited.
Show things on lines -
get acquainted - not much
than life - culture -

The E. M. Gantz Co.

PROPRIETORS
Garfield Hotel

3848 PROSPECT AVENUE

CLEVELAND, O.

11. Real educated man is not
only he who knows how to do
his mind effectively - how
to solve a given problem -
how to communicate - but
also he who is —

that is, he who has a
12. W. in Politics - W. in Industry
W. in Social life - W. in Art is

To prepare mind and
man for real life in
the world.

W. S. Gephart Co
460 E. Ohio St

Chicago
Ancient Hebrew Map

WRHS

