

With Compliments of the Writer.
Cover

~~PAID 140.13~~
~~for sh~~

The Passing of Evolution

I

The Involution of Man

II

The Bearing of Involution on
Education

By

CORA L. WILLIAMS

Principal of the A-to-Zed School

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

No. 1. A-to-ZED PUBLICATIONS; 50 CENTS A COPY

Phil 197.25.7



Prof. G. L. Hitchcock

Copyright 1912
By C. L. WILLIAMS

THE INVOLUTION OF MAN

IN the book of the Cosmic Order, the chapter entitled "The Evolution of Man" is drawing to a close. It is written in such phrases as individual competition, natural selection, survival of the fittest. Though stained with blood and marred with all that we call bad, its pages are fraught with vital interest for us. But while we would linger to decipher a line, to interpret a passage, another chapter is in the writing.

It is the purpose of this discussion to show that science, in order to give a complete account of the phenomena of life, must postulate, as operative with Darwinism, a process, the antithesis of Darwinism both in principle and action; that, for the establishing of biological continuity, as well as a logical synthesis, evolution must be supplemented by its inverse, involution; that the one process necessitates the other. The attempt to explain these two processes by means of the same hypothesis has led, not only to much confusion in scientific thought, but to great retardation of that thought. What ever laws may be set up for evolution, there is a change of meaning in kind, sooner or later, when it comes to their application to the phenomena of life. For the hypothesis that I shall here attempt to put forth, the life-movement is not a direct, but an alternating current, periodically reversing its direction. Evolution accounts for one direction of the force, involution for the other. In the interrelation of the two is to be found that nexus for the life-chain which evolution has not been able to forge—a nexus of such strength, I believe, as to make possible the bridging not only of the chasm between the inorganic and organic realms, but the far greater chasm between the organic and the psychical.

Before considering a new theory of the world-order, it were perhaps well to look to the balance-sheet of things as they now stand. We read as follows: In the drifting of the cosmic atoms, there is nothing fixed or permanent; behind the flux of phenomena there is no ultimate purpose; man is but a channel for impulses, which come and go, and over which he has no control; morality is a matter of expediency; religion is an ultra-

rational sanction for a belief which has no other basis; freedom and immortality are mere illusions; and finally, nature in her larger processes but cancels herself. * * * This is the result of fifty years of evolution. *Quid peius?*

Inasmuch as evolution has brought man to his present height, so that from a lowly origin he has come to inherit the earth, it is not to be wondered that he should think himself still the object of its solicitude. But as the struggle for existence passes from that level whereon man contends with man, to the higher level where society competes with society, there is manifestly a change in the unit of operation. Even while man is re-writing its laws to his own aggrandizement, evolution has passed on to greater things—societies and civilizations have become its concern.

We stand at the meeting of two evolutionary periods—the period of the man-unit and the period of the group-unit. The gap between individualism and socialism is of cosmic depth. But history repeats itself, even though it is the history of the cosmos. This is not the first break that has occurred in the life-current. Evolution is not the continuous process, even for the movement of organic life, that it postulates itself to be. The problem of socialism for us today is the problem that has always confronted the structural unit in every development serial with our own, however remote the period. It comes to us in a somewhat different form perhaps from that which it assumed for the polyp in the ages past, but, from a biological point of view, the question at issue is the same, namely, collective versus individual consciousness. Since this is so, the solution is to be found through a consideration of operations and not of elements—a method known to the Algebra as the theory of groups. A group is made up of a set of operations which are unaffected by a change in the subject; the combination of an operation and its inverse, is called the identical operation. The fundamental characteristic of a group is that certain quantities, called invariants, are unchanged by the transformation. Hence, if we can set up a group for the structural unit, we shall be able to determine those values which have been permanent and which we should seek to preserve if the life-process is to be, as a whole, a constructive one.

It shall be my purpose, then, so to state the problem before us, builders of our destiny, as to make possible a comparison of its operations

with the operations affecting earlier structural units, to the end that we may discover a few of the invariants of the life-process.

Before the individual knows it, he becomes involved in the complex that usurps his place in the scheme of things. His social wants grow apace with his individualization. The more highly specialized he becomes, the greater his dependence on others. His interests are closely involved with the interests of the aggregate; likewise his activities. Then, too, there is an exaltation to be had from forming part of a mighty whole; few can resist the pleasure of the larger life-throb that comes with being one of many. Thus, almost imperceptibly, is man drawn into the vortex of the new unit—the social body.

Although the development of the individual is largely dependent upon the development of the social unit, it is not one with the development of that unit. A state may desire that a general mean of knowledge be spread among its people, but it does not look with favor on independent judgment, nor on the scruples of individual conscience; it wants obedience, and not criticism; self-restraint, not self-assertion. The development of the individual, in that which is most peculiar and individual in him, was what made the political unity of Greece impossible. In its spirit of individual self-abnegation lies the political strength of modern Japan. While a society has the strongest interest in educating, training and organizing the powers of its members, that interest is in no wise concerned with the interests of the individual and may be quite opposed to his interest.

As the process of evolution swings from the individual to the social body, the mathematician must needs mark what the scientist has overlooked—the change in the operand. This is a change not to be accounted for on the basis of variation; the social unit is not a derivative of the individual unit that it displaces in the Darwinian movement. Moreover, the factors making for its formation cannot be subsumed under evolution, for they are in direct opposition to the principles underlying the struggle for existence. The mutual incompatibility of altruism and natural selection goes without saying. Darwinism is in no sense socialistic.

But there is not only a break in the process at the point where evolution takes up the relay-unit; there is, for the individual, an actual inversion of values. The practice of the ethically best, as demanded by the social

order, involves a course of conduct in all respects opposed to that which leads to a survival of the fittest. The theory of evolution, formulated on the basis of past experience, is unable to cope with this entirely new order of things. Moreover, there is closely connected with this conduct a vast variety of phenomena, categorized as religious, which science utterly repudiates, for the reason that it, operating on our other experiences, cannot foretell these specifically religious experiences in advance of their actual coming; nor can it describe in terms of past content the new content wherewith the old is thus transcended. Evolution, to maintain its place as a world-theory, has been forced to ignore a wide range of phenomena to which we individually attach much significance. An hypothesis, to establish itself as a law, must give a coherent and self-consistent account of the facts. This, evolution has not done; its solution of the problem of life, besides being incomplete, is one of confusion, both as to element and as to operation.

The biological explanation of this reversion of the life-process is not far to seek. There is a limit to which evolution can carry the development of life, unless there is an accumulative change in the environment. Without such a change, it is only a question of time for an organism to lapse into a state of equilibrium with its surroundings. As the development of life thus approaches an end, the compounding of the unit can alone save the situation. By such compounding, new and larger contacts are formed, demanding new adjustments, which in their turn give rise to larger activities and more complex functioning. The new unit inaugurates a higher, more complex evolutionary period. Mr. Bernard has established biologically a series of four such periods on the basis of the structural unit.*

As far, then, as the operations governing the life-process have been traced, we find the persistence of a group (as defined by Algebra); the direct operations of this group produce the diversity of form, and the inverse operations the rise in the complexity of form. There is no reason to think that this group-process is confined, in its application, to the range thus far established for it. Our senses enable us to perceive but a small range of the gamut of sight and sound; we are doubtless likewise limited in our perception of life. "There may indeed be," to quote Prof. Shaler,

*Some Neglected Factors of Evolution; H. M. Bernard. Page 301.

“system within system of individualities in indefinite extension into the infinite of the minute as into the infinite of the great.”

For the group-analysis, the direct operation necessitates the inverse; hence, if the element has undergone differentiation, the identical operation requires that integration follows. There is but one conclusion to be derived from this;—viz.: as man includes, in his genesis, the cell-life below him, there are higher entities likewise inclusive of him. *Zeitgeist*, mob-mind, class spirit may well be more than metaphors. We seek to breathe a spiritual meaning into the material forms of the old mythologies; rather we should seek to know the spiritual entities of our own thought-cosmos. Nature's one increasing purpose through all her creatures is the forming of an ever higher type of consciousness. We cannot assert that purpose to culminate in man, inasmuch as he stands in the same structural relation to the social congerie that earlier units stand to their respective colony formations. Then, too, because of his ability to respond more effectively to his environment than his predecessors in the series, the more insistent and imperative is the need for him of larger adjustments.

Nor does the social unit fail, on its part, to meet the criteria of an organic structure; it is self-maintaining and self-perpetuating, and is also characterized by the inter-action of its part-processes. Moreover, the development of the social unit is, in its turn, serial with that of the lower colony formations; for the same stages may be traced in the growth of the latter that we have in governments as they become more centralized. The question of physical connection among the components of a social body should give us no trouble. It is a question that, for any colony formation, howsoever low its degree, resolves itself into one concerning the transference of stimuli, and it is certainly immaterial whether nerves or thoughts serve this purpose.

Inasmuch as we have postulated evolution for the differentiation of man, we must postulate involution for his integration. The two processes are essential for the complete realization of individuality; the organization of the homogeneous is not accomplished through differentiation alone; such organization means more than mere difference; it means individualization. A true individuality is to be acquired only through certain unique inter-actions with the whole realm. This is an important theorem; its

proof, however, is simple. The environment is not uniform for even the smallest organism, and for no two organisms is there the same identical contact with the external world. In the equilibration of forces that sets in as a consequence of the varying strains and stresses between outer and inner media, different functionings with resulting characteristics follow. The individualizing of the creature starts with its response to the environment. All growth makes for larger contact and greater instability with respect to the environment, resulting in progressively more complex functioning and higher mechanism. When the inter-relations between the organism and its external world of fellow creatures and inorganic force have attained their highest potentiality, the individuality is then perfected. This happens, as is manifest, when the integration is complete. On the other hand, the integration is complete because the creature has taken its particular place in the whole.

Our theorem might be stated thus: Each has to that extent a place in the larger whole that he has realized himself, and conversely, he has realized himself to the extent that his relations with the whole are perfected. Along with the tendency, then, to form different personalities, goes the tendency for these personalities to form larger centers of action. The first, the differentiating tendency, has been fully accounted for by the theory of evolution; the second, the integrating tendency, demands an inverse process which logically must be called involution; the two result in the identical process which, interpreted in terms of personality, is self-realization.

To summarize: Evolution accounts for the great variety of forms of a given unit; involution, for the rise in complexity of the unit; the one describes the action of the external world upon the organism; the other, the action of the organism upon the external world; the two account for the process we call life. Evolution is written largely in terms of fixed forces and inherited characteristics; involution, in terms of personal freedom and spontaneity. The two processes are diametrically opposed; whatever is posited in evolution is negated in involution; the good of the one is the bad of the other, and vice-versa.* In their opposition is to be found, not only an empirical basis for the conflict of good and evil, but also the genesis of the moral judgment.

*The realization of this drove Nietzsche insane.

The operators, or factors, as we call them, of evolution, are well known; those of involution are yet to be determined. The social pressure about us is enormous. The supremacy of the self is constantly threatened, not only by uprisings in the subconscious part of the realm, but by the domination of new powers from its supra-conscious borders. Long-suppressed, forgotten elements within would combine with unknown, mythical creatures from without for its complete overthrow. While it is a question how much the individual mind should fall back upon the collective one out of which it has risen to self-recognition, it is a still greater question to what extent it should relegate its power to the forming of higher complexes of thought-activity.

In the course of any development there may be movement which is not toward the highest goal; that which today lies in the line of our potentialities, may, by the misdirected effort of tomorrow, be lost forever. The monkey can never attain the pinnacle now occupied by man, though for his progenitors, some æons back, that height was a possibility. That is not progress, whatsoever advance it may mark, which does not leave the way open to further attainment. The evolutionary road had its collateral branches as well as its main line; there are doubtless many ways that one may go astray on the involution road. The integration of the social insects, although forming highly organized involutions, has, so far as we are able to determine, reached its culmination. While the groups have differentiated to a certain extent, they do not seem to have organized for larger complexes. As an instance of the same sort among men, the caste system of India has not tended to national growth. These group involutions were based on so low a degree of individualization that there has not been impetus sufficient to carry them beyond a slight variation. In this connection we may note that the essential weakness of a democracy lies in the importance that it assigns to the average man. A government is not a fortuitous growth; the intellectual make-up of a people decides the form of its political institutions. The potentiality of a unit for further involution depends on the degree of individuality attained by its elements. The cause of socialism is impeded whenever its standards fall below those of personal integrity, whatsoever the loyalty back of them.

The most potent force for the forming of human involutions has been

religion. It is the amalgamating principle in the building up and maintenance of national character throughout history. Faith and communion are the factors of religious formations. The Christian religion has, to a larger degree than any other institution, furthered involution; the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the giving up of self, are most effective forces for integration. Professor James has shown that common to all religions is a sense of a higher life, a union or harmonious relation with which being the true end; that religious involutions are characterized by a new zest for life. And if the criterion of involutory advance were the potentiality for differentiation, religious bodies would certainly be in the line of progress; a differentiation, however, which does not make for higher unity, in its turn, is a mere dissipation of energy. That the many and diverse religious beliefs are resulting in a liberalism of thought, there can be no doubt, but that this liberalism will ultimately bring a higher corporate loyalty, we cannot yet say.

Before proceeding further in our quest for the involutory way, we should perhaps distinguish between the unity that comes through instinct, and the unity that comes through insight; the one results from an expansion of the feelings and is a sinking back to the previous involutory period; the other can result only from a concentration of the will that reaches to something beyond itself. The naturalistic tendency of the day is to look to the unconscious part of our being as the source of all good. But since no distinction is made between the sub-conscious and the supra-conscious, the lower rather than the higher side of our nature is apt to be thus invoked. The will becomes weakened, the subsidiary centers of nerve force regain control, and the disintegration of personality follows. The only gain that can come from such atavistic relapse is the recovery of rudimentary powers, powers which in the long process of involution have become eliminated, and doubtless for some good reason. It were well to unravel the work of nature if by so doing we are sure of picking up only desirable stitches. But of this we may be certain, that in sacrificing the reason to feeling, we rehabilitate the primitive man in us.

While it is not possible to describe the higher life in terms of the lower, we should be able to induce from previous involutions of the life movement, certain laws that would at least point the way for the involution

of the human unit. Mr. Bernard found, as characteristic of the structural unit, whatsoever its biological period, a high degree of plasticity rendering it most sensitive to outward influences, and also great activity which gave it more and more profound perception into the nature of the environment. While the survival of the organism was contingent upon the concentration of its powers of reaction and response, its involutory growth came through an active storming of the environment. From these invariants of life transformations, we would infer that in his potentiality for the mastery of a progressively widening environment lies the foundation of the higher life of man. But when we stop to think that with the actual conquest of the environment goes an equilibration that lowers the vitality of the organism, the solution is not so simple as it would appear. Harmonious adjustment, a sense of peace, may mean death, not an enlarged, uplifting unification.

So nearly complete is man's conquest of the physical world that his only hope of further self-realization is in the intellect and the problems it may present for his solution. Involution has reached the stage where it can no longer depend upon physical factors; it must look to thoughts and aspirations for the integration essential to its progress. While love is the great formative principle in the socializing of man, law is, after all, the formal principle, since only those actions which are habitual are structure-forming. The vital law of one's being is something quite distinct from outer authority. Nor is it to be found through the emotions. Its discovery demands not only effective thinking, but effective self-discipline. The individualizing process is one of concentration and selection; the law of the higher unity is self-restraint and not self-expansion.

A coherent involution must then have for its formation, an impelling and self-developing purpose. It is not the resultant of physio-chemical forces, but of the directing idea behind them. The inward life of ideals, purposes, loyalties, of the component elements, determine the outward life of forms, customs and institutions of the larger unit. The self is not a fixed entity, but a dynamic, growing reality. The fulness of its life depends upon the complete energizing of the forces composing it. From the realization of individuality, on the part of its elements, is established the form of that organic unity which is the end of the involution.

For the hypothesis of involution, personality is a creative purpose, acting through a hierarchal series to the end that the series shall attain the unity of a synthetic whole. For involution the idea exists, as Aristotle had it, in the world of matter, and not apart from it. Being is not something complete and static, and therefore separate from matter, but is a process of becoming. Matter and concept are relative terms, neither of which may exist without the other. Matter is the involutory process looked at from the side of potentiality—of what is as yet unrealized, but which has the possibility of the unification. Form, or the concept, is the same process seen from the side of actuality—the unification realized; it is the inner purpose or idea expressing itself concretely in material form. The transition from the potential, the differentiated, to the actual, the integrated, is involution. Reality, therefore, for involution, as for Aristotle, is not something apart from the phenomenal world, but is its entelechy—a possibility made real, the potential actualized. For involution also, as for Aristotle, the idea and the matter may be in a way distinct in that the idea is not complete; that is, the purpose is not known to the self. The involution, in that case, is transitory, subject to disintegration. Matter and form are one: the unit, or element, is matter to what lies above it in the scale; the complex, or integrand, is form to what lies below it. This leads to a graded series of realities necessitating the time-process for their culmination.

While the way of the progressively larger life is a fixed one, the individual unit is free to take it or not as he chooses. If he would realize a complete self-hood, he must do so through his relations to others; there is no development for him apart from his fellows, but the degree of this self-realization lies with himself. Although he may not be free to set up his own life-function, he may, nevertheless, choose the element with respect to which he would integrate it. In other words, he may decide what for him shall constitute the "eternal values." Concerning the question of freedom, the mathematician will find solace in the fact that the constant of integration allows for a certain amount of indetermination;* the individual may at least fix for himself the height of his goal. While the universe

* See Bergson; Creative Evolution. Page 32.

is possibly a block one, as Professor James called it, for the mass, it is not necessarily so for the unit.

The superhuman entities that are the manifestation of human ideals and aspirations, must in their turn submit to a competition for survival of the fittest. That which seems reality to us now, will lapse again into appearance; truth into error, perfection into imperfection, to integrate again into higher forms. Reason is not only generated by involution, but is the necessary condition of progress through it. By faith we transcend our individual consciousness, but faith without knowledge is blind. We set up for ourselves graven images and bow down to unknown gods in our gropings for a higher life, but there is no good or truth for us apart from a final systematization of our purposes. Disintegration and evil come because our will is not yet known to ourselves. Our towers of Babel are forever toppling through a confusion of purposes, but when we shall come to think with one accord, nothing can be restrained from us which we have imagined to do; then verily our temple shall reach unto heaven.

THE BEARING OF INVOLUTION ON EDUCATION

THERE is an old Icelandic myth which tells of the discomfiture that the god Thor underwent at the hands of the giants, who set him the task of lifting the Midgard Serpent, a snake so great that it reached round the entire earth, but by illusion was made to appear the size and shape of an ordinary cat. Our failure to solve the educational problem is due to a similar misconception—what we take for the child-mind is a psychic entity as world-embracing as the Midgard Serpent, and, like the mighty Thor, we have need to summon all of our divine power if we would wrestle with it effectively.

That we fail in the education of our youth, as all are agreed, is due, not to the passing of Latin on the one hand, nor to the lack of vocational training on the other, but to a world-process that we little ken. From the cosmic order to the school-room may be a long way, yet not so long

as many a causal road that has come to be an accepted highway of thought. The centripetal force played its part with the centrifugal in the making of worlds and the setting of them in the firmament, and no less a place has it taken in the life-process as that process stands revealed to us today. Nature differentiates in order that she may integrate into higher complexes of activity. This is as true of the psychical as of the physical order.

Never before in the history of civilization has the crowd taken so important a place in the affairs of mankind. The substitution of the unconscious action of groups for the conscious activity of individuals is the most marked characteristic of our age. The collective mind is coming to be an ever-greater menace to the individual. Of no country is this truer than of our own, the land of the common school. We train our children to gregarious habits of thought and action, and then are surprised that they fail to meet the intellectual and moral standards of individual growth and development. Our educational system is indeed out of joint, and in a far deeper sense than we are aware.

It is a generally recognized fact that an agglomeration of men will present, under certain influences, characteristics very different from those of the individuals composing it. It has not occurred to us in this connection, however, that children are "but men of lesser growth," and, inasmuch as their individuality is not yet established, are all the more subject to collective impulses. It is my thesis to show that in the bringing together of large numbers of children in schools, we set in operation most powerful forces making for the crowd mind; furthermore, that the process of integration thus established is sufficient to account for the qualities that we all deplore in our Rising Generation. In the study that follows, I have based my conclusions upon the characteristics of the group mind as determined by Le Bon in his notable work, "The Crowd."

There is a certain aligning power in association itself, especially when association is frequent and of long standing. That this holds of the school-room, witness the class-spirit with which the child is imbued almost from his first day at school. Although its numbers are not, alone, sufficient to induce the crowd consciousness, the class aggregate begins the process most effectively by breaking down whatsoever individuality may have been established. The child receives from it a new sense of power, and with that

sense comes the tendency to cast aside all control. Instincts which have been kept under restraint gain the mastery. Finding himself one of many, the child also loses what little sense of responsibility he may have acquired. Then, too, there is quite the danger of mental contagion that there is of bodily. Sentiments and actions spread with great rapidity, as we all know.

Add to association, as the school-room does, the direct action of a common physical environment, the participation in common tasks, and, above all, the same directing personalities of teacher and class-leaders, and the outward conditions are certainly complete for a homogenous whole. Moreover, the subjective conditions are quite as complete for the overthrow of the Self. Obedience, the orientation of attention, the attitude of expectancy, the narrowing of the field of consciousness, the inhibition of voluntary activity, and all the other prerequisites of good class-instruction, are the very essentials of group formation.

As if the school were not of itself able to bring about the complete organization of the group consciousness, the very characteristics of childhood seem designed to augment its tendency to homogeneity. The most potent factors for mental unity are, without doubt, suggestion and imitation. Suggestibility is at its maximum in children. Binet tells us that most children above the age of seven are hypnotizable, and we need no authority to speak of the imitativeness natural to all children. The inhibitive power can be maintained only if the suggestions received differ from one another; if the suggestions reinforce each other, as they do in the class-room, no personal resistance can withstand them. Men of strong character are carried off their feet by the volume of suggestion that emanates from numbers; how much more so children! When we stop to think that fatigue accentuates suggestibility, we must realize the utter powerlessness of any but the exceptional child to cope with the mighty forces of integration at work in our schools to draw him into the vortex of the super-conscious. There is, in fact, no assignable limit to the mastery of the crowd-self over its unfortunate constituents. Nor does the effect of this dominance end with the separation of the individuals forming the group. Not only is their individuality greatly weakened, but the crowd-habit is likely to persist throughout life. The large number of fraternal orders and societies of all

kinds testify to the truth of this assertion. Ours is indeed an "era of crowds."

We talk much of personality because we are losing it. Whoever are the individuals composing the group, however diverse their mode of life, their temperament or intelligence, they are so dominated by the collective mind as to think, feel and act as one and in a manner quite different from that of each individual of them in a state of isolation; this is the law of the mental unity of crowds. Its confirmation is found in the fact that our youth must read the same book and wear the same necktie. And because that uniqueness which marks a well-defined personality is denied them, they seek pitifully after some freakishness in manner or dress for the distinction that was their birthright.

The young people of the present are generally arraigned as shallower, feebler, more flippant and less intellectual than their grandfathers. In their cause I would answer that the collective mind is intellectually very inferior to the individual mind. It is not an average even of the elements composing it, but simply possesses those qualities which racially they have in common. For instance, to quote Le Bon: "The decisions affecting matters of general interest come to by an assembly of men of distinction, but specialists in different walks of life, are not sensibly superior to the decisions that would be adopted by a gathering of imbeciles. The truth is they can bring to bear in common on the work in hand only those mediocre qualities which are the birthright of every average individual. In crowds it is stupidity and not mother-wit that is accumulated."

It is also true that our young people were never so thirstily avid of pleasure as now, nor so irresponsible and devoid of a sense of duty. But the wonder would be if this were otherwise, for the special characteristics of the group-mind are defined as irresponsibility, incapacity to reason, absence of judgment and of the critical spirit. In consequence, its members lack the virtues born of self-control: veracity, prudence, thrift, perseverance, respect for another's right, obedience to law. The individual isolated possesses the capacity of inhibiting his reflex action, but the individual of the crowd is the "creature of his spinal cord." The Sunday Supplement and the cheap show foster, but do not create, the trivialness by which

they flourish. They are simply indications of a mental reversion to a lower thought-form of development.

But with all their faults, it is conceded that the Rising Generation is amiable, attractive and lovable. This should not surprise—it also follows as a natural result of their socialization. Crowds are impulsive; suitably influenced, they are ready to sacrifice themselves for an ideal. They exaggerate the sentiments; sympathy quickly becomes adoration. While the crowd mind is always intellectually inferior to the isolated individual, its emotions and acts may be better, for the suggestion determines their character. Appeals to sentiments of glory, honor and patriotism are particularly likely to influence the individual forming part of a crowd. In fact, collectivities alone are capable of great disinterestedness and devotion. From this aspect of their nature has come the power of our schools to assimilate and make good citizens of the riff-raff cast upon our shores. And because of this, there are those who would solace themselves that we have a broader, instead of a more deeply thoughtful, intellectual life, a more socialized ethics instead of stronger individual virtues. The philosophy of the day would abandon intellect and fall back upon intuition. We are to lose ourselves in the creative flow, but such an abandonment to instinct is merely a reversion to the gregarious impulse of our animal ancestry. The integration that marks progress for us can come only through the bonds of a deeper insight. Each is able to take his place in a whole only as he is uniquely himself. One's duty to others as well as to oneself is to attain the most complete selfhood that is possible.

Our devotion to the ideal of democracy, combined with our loyalty to what we so justly consider our greatest institution, our school system, has closed our eyes to the real issue in the educational problem; this, as I hope I have made evident, is not a question of method nor of curriculum, but of the massing of children.

The emphasis in education has perforce been placed on the memory faculties, not because our teachers do not realize the importance of developing the reasoning faculties, but because such faculties are lost to the group mind. Our children cannot spell nor write correctly, for the group mind again lacks observation, sees things as a whole and is blind to distinctions. They become nervous and "fall down" in examinations because they have

learned to do team-thinking. In latter life they make sychophants and demagogues, inasmuch as they are but fitted to take what place they may in a larger whole. The class mind is likewise accountable for the fact that the "best students" usually amount to little in after life—they are the ones most plastic to suggestion and consequently leave school with correspondingly diminished individuality. Unless a place is made for them in the world of affairs, they rarely secure one.

That this evil has fallen upon our day and country is not ascribable to teacher nor parent, nor above all to the children. A more conscientious, able body of people than the teachers of our public schools does not exist; instruction has never been better than today. The young people are innately as earnest and anxious to meet life efficiently as their parents or grandparents were. With the scientific advancement in all lines, the influences making for mental quickening have greatly increased. Parents are taking a more vital, because a more intelligent, interest in the education of their children than did their ancestors. The spiritual and ethical influences are more potent for the upbuilding of character than in former times, notwithstanding the crumbling of old beliefs. Search as we may elsewhere, the great fault of our education is to be found in our present class system of instruction. I speak as one having experience, for I have taught in all schools, inclusive of primary and state university. Ten years of tutoring hundreds of students has revealed to me the enormity of the crime to which I was, as a class teacher, an accomplice.

Our salvation as a nation lies, I believe, in the subdivision of our schools. It will be said that the expense of such a measure is prohibitive, howsoever desirable it may be. But the cost of education would not necessarily be greater, if quality were to be substituted for quantity. Let us have far less instruction, if need be, but let it be more individualized in its application. If a child were to have even two hours of schooling a day in company with eight or ten of like capacity with himself, he would advance far more rapidly than the much-taught child of the present large class. The phenomenal development of children of which we are reading much is but the natural result of the stimulus coming from the one-to-one contact between minds. It would be no unusual thing for the

ordinary boy or girl to compass the four years' high-school course in two years without cramming if he worked under the proper conditions.

But the school should not be replaced by the tutor, for while the child-mind requires special methods of presentation to bring it to its highest development, it also requires the stimulus of contact with other minds. By proper control, suggestion and imitation may be made most potent factors for education. While too much emphasis cannot be placed on the fact that the instruction should be largely individual, the pupil should have a certain association with his fellows; for only thus may he learn to appreciate the work of others and to derive inspiration from their recognition of his own attainments. A neotutorial system with a special teacher for each subject, closely correlated in its various branches by a careful school organization, is, I believe, the ideal system. While our schools have universalized education to the common good, as our factories have done for ready-made clothing and veneered furniture, with the return of the hand-wrought in garment and chair should come the individual in education.

During the readjustment which I propose, the cost of instruction would perhaps be increased, but if so, only temporarily, for there would soon come a lessening of numbers from the more rapid covering of the course of study and the fewer failures that would ensue. The nation learned too late that the Civil War might have been averted for less than it cost; the liberation of our children from the slavery of mind and soul promises to be an even greater struggle; let us spare no expense to compass it.