The University and Democracy

Charter Day Address

William Rainey Harper

President of The University of Chicago

March 1899
University of California

> **Document Note:** This historical document is reproduced for educational purposes. The original address was delivered by William Rainey Harper at the University of California on Charter Day, March 1899. Originally published in *The Trend in Higher Education* (University of Chicago Press, 1905). This document is in the public domain.

If education and government sustain relationship each to the other, the highest in education must have to do with the highest in government. If national enlightenment contributes to a better and higher national life, the state's chief agent for its proper guidance must be a potent factor in its public life. If humanity, in its slow and tortuous progress toward a higher civilization, counts as its ally a power by which, one by one, the problems of that civilization are resolved, humanity and this allied power must in due time come to have interests and aspirations which bind them irrevocably together.

On the one hand, the University is an institution of the government, the guide of the people, and an ally of humanity in its struggle for advancement; and on the other. Democracy is the highest ideal of human achievement, the only possibility of a true national life, the glorious and golden sun lighting up the dark places of all the world.

The word "university" does not suggest the same idea to everyone who hears or speaks it. Sometimes it stands for "college," and rightly so; for the college, like the university (I give the usual dictionary definition), is "an association of men for the purpose of study." Sometimes it means everything, "Sometimes nothing. But whatever else it may or may not suggest, we may not overlook the peculiar circumstances in connection with which it had its origin.

The sixth century A. D. witnessed the destruction of the Roman schools, which had represented the older, pagan education. By the twelfth century the church schools, connected with monasteries and cathedrals, and devoted exclusively to ecclesiastical work, had reached their highest stage of development. Three points connected with the origin of the

university still continue to characterize it. The earliest history of the first universities shows that they were guilds or associations of men, organized in large measure for self-protection.

Here, in fact, was the beginning of that spirit which now pervades every class or trade of men. These associations were "spontaneous confederations," at times of "aliens on a foreign soil," at other times of natives, and in still other cases of the two combined. The rector was chosen by the students, and under his leadership they secured from the community privileges which as individuals they were denied, and they compelled even the professors to be deferential. The university had its birth in the democratic idea; and from the day of its birth this democratic character, except when state or church has interfered, has continued. What, in many instances, has seemed the lawlessness of students and the independence of instructors is to be considered from the point of view of the democratic spirit which gave birth to the university and has characterized every true university. In no other sphere, moreover, did men of different nationalities mingle together more freely.

A second factor was the necessity of securing opportunity for study in lines outside the range of ecclesiastical schools, especially law and medicine, but in large measure also the arts. This is seen in the fact that such instruction was given in the earliest universities; for example, medicine at Salerno in the ninth century; and likewise in the secular and catholic character of the university community, for in the university at Salerno, "at a time when Jews were the object of religious persecution throughout Europe, members of this nationality were to be found, both as teachers and learners." This secular character has at times been overclouded when the church (as in the history of the English universities) or a denomination has seen fit to lay its hand ruthlessly upon the university; but in such cases it always happens that the university ceases to exist, and a church school takes its place. That institution cannot become a university, or remain one, which to any considerable extent is controlled by a power other than that which proceeds from within itself. It is a significant fact that neither church nor state seems at first to have

appreciated what was coming, since the first four universities of Italy, after Bologna, rose into existence, like Bologna itself, without a charter from either pope or emperor.

But again, the university had its origin in the desire to make use of new methods of instruction, whereby greater independence of expression and thought might be secured. In the schools of the church there had never been an opportunity to argue; that is, to discuss different opinions. The method had been very simple, to be sure, yet very monotonous. The instructor gave that which he had been given; the pupil received it as it had come down the centuries. This method is still in vogue in some institutions which are under ecclesiastical control. But in the birth period of the university the revival of the study of logic gave rise to the introduction of a new spirit which, although exaggerated and made absurd in some forms of its development, nevertheless freed the work of instruction from the one deadly and deadening method of the past and made possible, in later centuries, the freedom of expression which is today the most distinctive mark of a real university.

The three birth-marks of a university are, therefore, self-government, freedom from ecclesiastical control, and the right of free utterance. And these certainly give it the right to proclaim itself an institution of the people, an institution born of the democratic spirit.

Such being its origin, we may ask ourselves whether it has essentially changed its nature in the development through which ten or more centuries have carried it. The proper restriction of the term must, however, be first applied. What is a university today?

I accept, with modification, a common definition: a self-governing association of men for the purpose of study; an institution privileged by the state for the guidance of the people; an agency recognized by the people for resolving the problems of civilization which present themselves in the development of civilization. According to this definition, therefore, only those institutions are universities in which adults are associated (thus excluding elementary and secondary schools, and likewise colleges

conducted for the training of boys and girls in various stages of advancement); in which definite and distinct effort is put forth to guide the people in the decision of questions which from time to time confront them, and to furnish leaders in the different callings in whom the people may have full confidence; in which facilities are furnished and encouragement afforded to grapple with the great problems of life and thought, in the worlds of matter and of mind, with the sole purpose of discovering truth, whatever bearing that discovery may have upon other supposed truth. This requires men of the greatest genius, equipment of the highest order, and absolute freedom from interference of any kind, civic or ecclesiastical.

In this connection it is worth while to note Thomas Jefferson's conception of the functions of the University: (i) To form the statesmen, legislators, and judges, on whom public prosperity and individual happiness are so much to depend; (2) to expound the principles and structure of government, the laws which regulate the intercourse of nations, those formed principally for our own government, in a sound spirit of legislation, which, banishing all unnecessary restraint on individual action, shall leave us free to do whatever does not violate the equal rights of another; (3) to harmonize and promote the interests of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and by well-informed views of political economy to give a free scope to the public industry; (4) to develop the reasoning faculties of our youth, to enlarge their minds, cultivate their morals, and instil into them the principles of virtue and order; (5) to enlighten them with mathematical and physical sciences, which advance the arts, and administer to the health, the subsistence, and comforts of human life; (6) and generally to form them to habits of reflection and correct action, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves.

The university is naturally the seat of the highest educational work; but again the word "highest" requires definition. It is the highest function of the university to prepare leaders and teachers for every field of activity. It will include, therefore, the work of the college, the secondary school,

and the elementary school (with the kindergarten work), if this work is conducted either, on the one hand, as practice work in connection with which teachers may be trained, or, on the other hand, as laboratory work in connection with which effort is being made to (work out the solution of important problems, or to secure a more perfect type of work. The sympathies of the true university will be so broad as to bring it into touch with educational problems of every kind.

The university is, further, an integral part of the public-school system. The state, by granting its charter, makes it a public institution, whether its support comes from the state itself or from private funds. As a public institution, it may not detach itself from the various forms of educational or legislative work conducted under state patronage. Its ideals control the development of all that falls below it. The university, therefore, may not stand aloof; nor may the colleges and schools shut themselves away from its strong and revivifying influence. There may be no organic connection. In most cases such organic connection is unnecessary. The bond is spiritual, and as such stronger than merely formal connection could possibly become.

The university is also an institution of the people. It must, therefore, be "privileged" and, in many instances, supported by the people. In the latter case, it must be influenced by the changes which the people may undergo in their opinions. But the people must remember that when, for any reason, the administration of their institution, or the instruction in any one of its departments, is changed by an influence from without, whenever effort is made to dislodge an officer or a professor because the political sentiment of the majority has undergone a change, at that moment the institution has ceased to be a university; and it cannot again take its place in the rank of universities so long as there continues to exist to any appreciable extent the factor of coercion. The state has no more right than the church to interfere with the search for truth, or with its promulgation when found. The state and church alike may have their own schools and colleges for the training of youthful minds, and for the propagation of special kinds of intelligence; and in these it may choose

what special coloring shall be given to the instruction. This is proper, for example, in the military schools of the state, and in the theological schools of the church. But such schools are not universities. They do not represent the people; they do not come out of the people.

The university touches life, every phase of life, at every point. It enters into every field of thought to which the human mind addresses itself. It has no fixed abode far away from man; for it goes to those who cannot come to it. It is shut in behind no lofty battlement; for it has no enemy which it would ward off. Strangely enough, it vanquishes its enemies by inviting them into close association with itself. The university is of the people, and for the people, whether considered individually or collectively.

Democracy means, in general, the supremacy of the people, government for and by those governed, co-operative government. The democracy of Greece, and the democracy of a century ago in our own land, were stages in the evolution which has been taking place from the beginning of man's history on earth. Wherever the industrial spirit has prevailed, as opposed to the predatory, this evolution still continues, and will continue until it includes within its grasp the entire world.

The essential principles in democracy are equality and responsibility to the public will. Opposed to these stand the class system and absolutism. Everywhere and during all time the struggle has gone slowly on; and democracy has surely made her way, and, absorbing from her enemy all that was good, she stands today more firmly and more triumphantly secure than ever before.

Democracy is a government in which the last appeal is to the public will; but the judge to whom the final appeal may be made must be an intelligent and educated judge. The people must be an educated people. Education, indeed, must be the first and foremost policy of democracy. It is the foundation which underlies all else. No advocate of democracy today would accept Rousseau's opinion that the people have in themselves

an innate and instinctive wisdom. All will agree with Lord Arthur Russell, that the multiplicity of ignorance does not give wisdom."

How, then, as a matter of fact, shall a democracy lo administer itself?

By accepting the guidance of those who have been prepared to lead, and by holding them responsible for the trust confided to them. Mr. Gladstone, whose life was devoted to the cause of the Liberal party, once said: "The nation draws a great, perhaps the greatest, part of its light from the minority placed above;" and elsewhere: The people are of necessity unfit for the rapid, multifarious action of the administrative mind; unfurnished with the ready, elastic, and extended, if superficial, knowledge which the work of government, in this country beyond all others, demands; destitute of that acquaintance with the world, with the minds and tempers of men, with the arts of occasion and opportunity, in fact with the whole doctrine of circumstance, which, lying outside the matter of political plans and propositions, nevertheless frequently determines not the policy alone, but the duty of propounding them. No people of a magnitude to be called a nation has ever, in strictness, governed itself; the utmost which appears to be attainable, under the conditions of human life, is that it should choose its governors, and that it should, on select occasions, bear directly on their action. History shows how rarely even this point has in any considerable manner been attained.

It is written in legible characters, and with a pen of iron, on the rock of human destiny, that within the domain of practical politics the people must, in the main, be passive.

And in such a scheme education plays an important part, both with the people and with those to whom they commit the guidance.

Democracy has nothing to do with religion, and yet it has everything; nothing with the specific form in which the religious feeling or religious teaching shall express itself, but everything in making provision for the undisturbed exercise of religious liberty. Where dense ignorance exists, there is no demand for such liberty. It is only where intelligence asserts itself, when education has done its work, that the privilege of religious

freedom is demanded. With the church as such, democracy knows no relation; with morality and righteousness in individual and nation, democracy is deeply concerned. Religion itself does not always conduce to morality and righteousness, nor is intelligence in every case a guarantee. But enlightenment of mind and soul, whatever be the single or joint agency that produces it, is the only safeguard against that which is demoralizing and degrading. Education, therefore, in connection with religion, becomes a factor in securing for democracy the very food on which its life depends.

With so much for definition of terms, let me now pass to the question I desire to answer: What relation does the university sustain to democracy?

It may be considered either from the point of view of the university or that of the democracy. What part then is the university to play in the great drama of co-operative government?

What contribution toward its growth and further evolution may self-government expect to receive from the university?

I trust that I may be pardoned at this point if for a moment I digress. As a student, for many years, of the Old Testament, the thoughts and the forms of thought of the ancient Hebrews have made deep impressions on my mind. In the course of their long-continued history they passed through nearly every form of life, from that of savages to that of highest civilization, and they lived under nearly every form of government, from the patriarchal, through the tribal, the monarchical, and the hierarchical. The history of no other nation furnishes parallels of so varied or so suggestive a character. I beg the privilege of drawing my form of expression from their history; and I do so with the more interest because, to all men who have religious sympathies, whether Jew or Christian, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, these forms of expression are familiar, and by all they are held sacred.

Democracy has been given a mission to the world, and it is of no uncertain character. I wish to show that the university is the prophet of

this democracy and, as well, its priest and its philosopher; that, in other words, the university is the Messiah of the democracy, its to-be-expected deliverer.

The university is the prophet — that is, the spokesman— of democracy. Democracy, if it continue, must include the masses and maintain their sympathy and interest. But as a system it is the product of a long period of evolution, and, as such, is not a simple system. It is, indeed, already somewhat cumbersome and complex. The principles which underhe it need constant and repeated statement by those whose statement will make deep impression. Although intended to be the expression of the popular mind, it is the outcome of movements which have been in operation fifty centuries or more. It is the result of the operation of laws of life which antedate the existence of man himself. Of the history of these movements and of the character of these laws the popular mind is for the most part ignorant. This history must be told over and over again, and the principles made very plain, that all who hear may understand.

But democracy has not yet been unified. Unmistakable traces exist of past ages. The weight of the multitude which it must carry renders progress slow in any case. And without unity the doctrine of equality may not exert its full force. Spokesmen who understand this unity and appreciate its necessity in the economy of democratic progress must proclaim it far and near, until no ear shall have failed to hear the proclamation, no heart shall have failed to heed its clear injunction. The elements which together make this unity must be drawn together and held together by influences that shall outnumber and outweigh those pitted on the other side.

The truth is, democracy has scarcely yet begun to understand itself. It is comparatively so young and untried, and the real experiment has been of so short a duration that it could not be otherwise. Democracy needs teachers who shall say, "Know thyself!" messengers who shall bring light to shine upon dark places. There is great danger that the next step, at any time, may be a wrong step. Some such have already been taken; and

history shows the terrible cost of being compelled to go back and start anew. Democracy is now able to walk alone, but not infrequently something occurs which leads us to think that there has not yet been time enough to learn how a fair and even balance may at all times be maintained.

Democracy seems to be in the ascendency; but the impartial student of the situation sees many and great fields not yet occupied, while those already occupied are hardly more than nominally possessed. We have democracy in government, to be sure, but if it is a good thing in government, it must be equally good in social relations of various kinds, in art and literature and science. That its influence has been exerted in these fields no one will dispute. But of no one of them may it be said to have taken full possession. And even in the realm of government, how slight comparatively among the nations is the progress of the last century! The occupation of these fields — not by conquest, but by invitation — would greatly strengthen democracy in the places now occupied. Who will persuade the nations to prepare the invitation?

Who will induct democracy into these new fields of arts and literature and science?

There must be teachers who know democracy and at the same time literature or science, and who, in due time, will bring about the union which promises to the world so much for human welfare.

Democracy has great battles yet to fight. Every step forward is in the face of deadliest opposition. Her enemies are those who sit on thrones and command great armies. Christianity may be democratic, but the church is too frequently hostile to the application of democratic principles. These battles, moreover, must be fought with words, not swords. The pen is far the more effective weapon. There will be many battles; some of them will be long drawn out. The mutterings of war may now be heard in many quarters, but in the end prophetic weapons will win the victory, and "the kings shall shut their mouths, for that which had not been told them shall

they see, and that which they had not heard shall they consider" (Isa. 52:15).

Sometimes, too, democracy grows despondent. Borne down by the weight of opposition, overcome by the power of those who for personal ends would see her humbled in the dust, she cries: "My way is hid from the Lord; my judgment is passed over from my God." Discouragement and despair lead to utter demoralization and failure. Under such circumstances, the words of the comforter are needed. Who can measure the density of the darkness and distress which have settled down upon the minds and hearts of the great multitude of men and women in our great cities, for whom, as individuals, there is no hope in life, save perhaps that of bare existence until kindly death shall call them away?

Yet these it is who constitute the multitude that is called democracy. "And they look unto the earth and behold distress and darkness, the gloom of anguish, and into thick darkness they are driven away; and they pass through it hardly bestead and hungry; and it comes to pass that, when they are hungry, they fret themselves, and curse their king and their God and turn their faces upward.' But now the prophet's voice is heard: "But there shall not always be gloom to her that was in anguish.... the people that have walked in darkness shall see a great light." And they shall rejoice; for all oppression shall be removed, and all war shall cease, and a new government shall be established — a government of justice and righteousness which shall endure forever. It is the prophetic voice speaking to a downcast, downtrodden people — a democracy despondent.

At times, furthermore, democracy is corrupt. Under the guise of loyalty to her best interests, those in whose hands she has intrusted herself in loving kindness assault and seduce her. Shame and reproach fall upon her. She must be cleansed and purified before she may again take up her great and glorious work for all the world with a certain hope of success. She has exhibited a fatal weakness; the result will be ruinous. Sharp and stern words must be spoken by the prophet, whose keen eye sees the situation and its dangers. No pity may be extended, no word of sympathy, until the evil has been mended. The lesson is bitter and full of

shame; but the effect will be for good, if the chastisement is severe enough. The clear voice of prophetic rebuke must be heard, whenever corruption rears its head to public gaze.

Democracy surely has a mission; and if so, that mission, is in a word, righteousness. It is an interesting fact that all the great religious truths were worked out in the popular mind before they were formulated by the thinkers. The world is waiting for the working out of the doctrine of national righteousness through democracy, and no effort to formulate the doctrine beforehand will avail. But the day is coming when the thought will have become tangible enough to be expressed. The popular mind will not be able to do this service. The prophet, whose discerning eye reads the thought in the heart of democracy itself, expressed in heartthrobs reaching to the very depths of human experience— the prophet, I say, will then formulate the teaching which will make earth indeed a paradise.

The democracy, as an institution, needs interpretation. The past must be interpreted in order that its lessons may be learned, its mistakes avoided. The greatest danger is that there shall be failure to maintain the closest connection with the past. This is necessary for the sake of comparison. Without such comparison we may never know our own position. Every event of past history has contained a message. Every life has been an utterance. These events and lives are to be treated as object-lessons which we are to contemplate, and by contemplation to learn how righteousness may be found. The rise and fall of nations, the growth and decay of institutions, the temporary influences of great characters as interpreted in the light of the present, constitute the basis for all better understanding and all better execution of the democratic idea.

The present itself must be known and interpreted. Its currents and cross-currents, while in large measure the result of forces set in movement far up the stream, must be estimated anew with each fresh dawn of day. The shallows and depths are never the same on two successive days. The charts noting danger signals must be prepared with each turn of the tide of public opinion. And, on the other hand, the slightest turn in the direction of promise is to be encouraged. It is often

the smallest variation from the ordinary that proves to be the precursor of greatest reform; for true reform always begins with the thin edge of the wedge. If the present be cared for, the future will take care of itself.

But the future of democracy must be considered. Mounting the watch-tower of observation, the true leader of democracy will make a forecast of the tendencies, in order to encourage his followers by holding up the glory that awaits them, or, by depicting the disaster that is coming, to turn them aside from a policy so soon to prove destructive.

In ancient days, the man who interpreted the past, who measured the present, and who foretold the future was called a prophet. The university, I contend, is this prophet of democracy — the agency established by heaven itself to proclaim the principles of democracy. It is in the university that the best opportunity is afforded to investigate the movements of the past and to present the facts and principles involved before the public. It is the university that, as the center of thought, is to maintain for democracy the unity so essential for its success.

The university is the prophetic school out of which come the teachers who are to lead democracy in the true path. It is the university that must guide democracy into the new fields of arts and literature and science. It is the university that fights the battles of democracy, its war-cry being: "Come, let us reason together." It is the university that, in these latter days, goes forth with buoyant spirit to comfort and give help to those who are downcast, taking up its dwelling in the very midst of squalor and distress. It is the university that, with impartial judgment, condemns in democracy the spirit of corruption which now and again lifts up the head, and brings scandal upon democracy's fair name.

The university is the prophet who is to hold high the great ideal of democracy, its mission for righteousness; and by repeated formulation of the ideal, by repeated presentations of its claims, make it possible for the people to realize in tangible form the thought which has come up from their deepest heart. The university, I maintain, is the prophetic interpreter of democracy; the prophet of her past, in all its vicissitudes; the prophet of

her present, in all its complexity; the prophet of her future, in all its possibilities.

Among the prophets of olden times, some were mere soothsayers who resorted to the ministrations of music in order to arouse themselves to excited frenzy. Some were dreaming seers, as much awake when sleep settled down upon their eyes as they were asleep to all that was about them in their waking moments. Some were priests whom the prophetic spirit had aroused, but had not wholly subjugated. Some were the greatest souls the world ever knew, whose hearts were touched by the spirit of the living God, whose eyes were open to visions of divine glory, whose arms were steeled by the courage born of close communion with higher powers. It is just so with universities. Some are universities only in name; some, forgetting the circumstances of their birth, may indeed be arrayed against democracy. But the true university, like the true prophet, will be faithful to its antecedents and, therefore, faithful to democracy.

But the university is also the priest of the democracy. But a priest is found only in association with religion. Is democracy a religion?

Yes; a religion with its god, its altar, and its temple, with its code of ethics and its creed. Its god is mankind, humanity; its altar, home; its temple, country. The one doctrine of democracy's creed is the brotherhood, and consequently the equality of man; its system of ethics is contained in a single word, righteousness.

In this religion there is much of Judaism, and likewise much of Christianity. This was to be expected, for it was Jeremiah of olden time who first preached the idea of individualism, the idea that later became the fundamental thought in the teaching of Jesus Christ, the world's greatest advocate of democracy; while the supplementary idea of solidarity, the corollary of individualism, was first preached by Ezekiel, and likewise later developed into Christianity.

The prophet in history has always been a hero; he has been applauded for his boldness and for his idealistic visions. The priest, on the other hand, has generally been thought a cunning worker, and while his

shrewdness has been appreciated, his ambition has been feared and dreaded. In modern times, as in most ancient days, the prophets and the priests have become more and more closely identified in spirit and in work; but the difference is still a marked one.

The religion of democracy is an eclectic religion. It has absorbed many of the best features of various religions and systems of philosophy. It is a broad religion, including a wide variety of belief and practice. It is, nevertheless, a definite religion, representing a clearly defined tendency of expression, both in feeling and in action. It is a worldwide religion; but the world in great part must be changed before its acceptance will be general.

It is the prophet that has to do with creed and ethics, and these have already been considered.

The priest is concerned with the religious cultus or practice, and finds his chief occupation in the upbuilding and preservation of the practice. His work is the work of service. He is the mediator between the individual and the ideal, whether abstract or concrete, which constitutes his God.

For the god of each individual is that individual's highest conception of man, his ideal man. The priest of democracy's religion is therefore a mediator between man and man; for man is the constituent element in democracy, and humanity is the ideal of all its aspirations.

The service of the priest includes, likewise, the bringing into a close communion, each with the other, of the individual and his God, the cultivation of a deep and lasting communion between the two. This service represents still further the act of consecration, on the part both of the priest and the worshiper — consecration to the highest and holiest conceptions of truth and life. It is the priest who, himself trained in all the mysteries of a religious cultus, himself the custodian of the traditions of the past, inducts those who are of a kindred feeling into those strange mysteries and their inherited treasures.

The university, as priest, is a mediator between man and man; between man and man's own self; between mankind and that ideal inner self of mankind which merits and receives man's adoration. The university, like the priest, leads those who place themselves under its influence, whether they live within or without the university walls, to enter into close communion with their own souls — a communion possible only where opportunity is offered for meditative leisure. The university guild, of all the guilds of workingmen, has been the most successful in securing that leisure for contemplation, consideration of society and of nature, without which mankind can never become acquainted with itself. And for this reason the university is in deep sympathy with every legitimate effort, made by other guilds of workingmen, to secure shorter hours of labor and longer hours for self-improvement. Communion with self, study of self, is, where rightly understood, communion with God and study of God.

The university, furthermore, performs priestly service for democracy in the act of consecration which is involved in her very constitution. And here the old and the modern views of education are combined. The university isolates itself from everything that would tend to draw her from the predetermined service which she has undertaken. Her purpose is a fixed one, and nothing may cause her to swerve from it. She has devoted herself with a consecration received from heaven to the cause of lifting up the folk of her environment — an act of consecration than which none is more holy. But now, though separated thus from all the world for the world's sake, she puts herself in touch with this same "all the world," and no gate or portal fails to greet her entrance. Set apart, and consecrated to the service of every kind of man, she leads those who will follow her to consecrate themselves to the cause of liberty and truth and righteousness, in home, in country, and throughout the world. The university is the keeper, for the church of the democracy, of holy mysteries, of sacred and significant traditions. These are of such character that if touched by profane hands they would be injured. But the initiated are given free access, and every man who will may receive initiation. No effort is made to exclude; every effort is made rather to include in the list of the initiated

the whole world; for the mysteries are such only to those who have not yet been brought to see. Home, country, and humanity — it is for these and with these that this priestly activity is put forth.

This service of mediation, of putting self in close communion with self, of consecration and initiation into sacred mysteries, is performed in the home, the altar of democracy, the most sacred altar known to mankind. The service touches father and mother long before they are father and mother, and reveals the nature of fatherhood and motherhood. It takes the son or daughter, and indirectly touches again the father and mother. Through the school system, the character of which, in spite of itself, the university determines and in a large measure controls (whenever the political machine will permit any good influence to control) — through the school system every family in this entire broad land of ours is brought into touch with the university; for from it proceed the teachers or the teachers' teachers.

The priestly service is likewise performed for and with and in the country as a whole, the great temple of democracy. Enlightenment means pure purpose and holy enthusiasm; these make loyalty to truth, and true loyalty. That religion which blindly accepts what is thrust upon it is not religion, but superstition. That patriotism which knows not what it serves, or for what it is intended, is not patriotism, but ignorant servility. Patriotism, to be a virtue, must be intelligent, must know why it is exercised and for what. Not every man is equal in the work of administering the country's business. Only those who are best can serve best her interests.

Here the priestly service of the university is most necessary, in mediating between party and party; in mingling together as in a crucible the widely diverging ideas; in holding up the standard of consecration to truth and to truth only; in unveiling the history of the past with its strange secrets of successful and unsuccessful experience. Without such work, the service in the temple would be a bewildering discord of unattuned elements out of which no harmonious sound would come to lift the soul to higher and purer thoughts of patriotic feeling.

But greater service yet, if possible, is rendered by the university in that most profound act of worship (in the broadest sense) which man performs when he lifts his thoughts beyond home and country to humanity at large, mankind. As in ordinary religion the great majority perhaps do not transcend the altar, or at all events the temple, their vision being so limited that God himself is forgotten; so home and country, for the most part, exhaust the feelings of most of the adherents of democracy's religion. But the priest, whose great duty it is to enlarge the vision of his followers, takes infinite trouble to teach men that the ties of humanity are not limited to those of home and country, but extend to all the world; for all men are brothers. Humankind is one. And now the university stands as mediator between one country and another far remote. Her service now is to extend to the utmost limits the bond of connection which will enable nation to commune closely with nation. More solemn, sacred, and significant than ever before is the consecration which now includes republics and kingdoms and empires. The inner secrets of the soul of humanity (not a single man), of mankind (not a nation) are the subjects of study and of proclamation.

The university is a priest established to act as mediator in the religion of democracy, wherever mediation may be possible; established to lead the souls of men and nations into close communication with the common soul of all humanity; established to stand apart from other institutions, and at the same time to mingle closely with the constituent elements of the people; established to introduce whosoever will into all the mysteries of the past and present, whether solved or still unsolved.

Among the priests of olden times some groveled about in the mire of covetousness and pollution, encouraging men to sin, that they (the priests) might have the sin-offering; some were perfunctory officials with whom the letter of service was all-sufficient; some were true mediators between man and God, and teachers of the holiest truths; some of them in their ministrations of divine things reached so near to God himself as to exhibit in their lives and thoughts the very essence of divinity.

It is just so with the universities. Some are deaf to the cry of suffering humanity; some are exclusive and shut up within themselves; but the true university, the university of the future, is one the motto of which will be: Service for mankind wherever mankind is, whether within scholastic walls or without those walls and in the world at large.

Some, perhaps many, will deny that democracy has a religion; but no one will deny that democracy has a philosophy; and the university, I contend, is the philosopher of democracy. The time that remains permits only the briefest statement of this proposition.

It was not always possible, in the Old Testament economy, to draw a sharp line between the work of the prophet, the priest, and the philosopher or sage.

The work of the sage entered into that of both the priest and the prophet; the prophetic ranks were often recruited from those of the priests. But, in spite of some confusion and interchange, there was a marked distinction. The prophet was the idealist; the priest, the formalist; the sage, the humanist. The prophet's thought centered on the nation; the priest's, on the church; the sage's, on the world. From our modern point of view, the prophet might be called the preacher; the priest, the trainer or teacher; the sage, the thinker.

The situation in which democracy finds herself today makes serious demands for severe thinking. By severe thinking I mean the honest and unbiased consideration of all the facts which relate to democracy. Valuable contributions toward the criticism of democracy have been made by De Tocqueville, by Sir Henry Maine, and by Mr. Lecky. But in such cases the vision was greatly restricted and cut short. Only one or two specific statements concerning democracy have been made which still pass unchallenged. The philosophical treatment of the movement has received many important contributions; but, taken altogether, these form but the beginning of the philosophic work which is urgently demanded.

This work lies along three lines. The origin of democracy is still a subject of profound inquiry; and in connection with the questions of

origin are those of ancient democracies and their connection with the ancient systems. The history of all this, so far as it includes the main facts, is tolerably well known; but the philosophy of this history is still a subject for investigation. To another division of the work must be assigned the formulation of the laws or principles of democracy. With one or two of these we are fairly familiar; but in detail the work is still the work of the future. That which is immediate and pressing are the special problems of democracy, which have been immediate and pressing throughout its history, and for the solution of which any formulation of laws must wait. These problems concern almost every point for which democracy is supposed to stand. These furnish the work of the day, and with these the philosopher, whoever he may be or whatever he may be, must engage himself. These problems are so old and so constantly before us that they scarcely need mention; and yet the longer their solution is delayed, the more serious becomes their importance. Socialism, or the extreme and exaggerated form of democracy, threatens to deprive democracy of many of her best friends, and unless checked bids fair to do incalculable injury to the movement for popular government. The rapid increase of the population in the larger cities, and the character of this population, has raised the question whether, in these cases, democracy is able to deal with municipal government, whatever advantages it may have in state and national government. The numbers of the people have greatly increased in a hundred years. Did Did the democracy of a century ago contemplate that one hundred millions of people were to be governed by themselves?

Whatever democracy may do in countries like Switzerland, the problem which presents itself in America, or even in France, is, on account of the vast numbers concerned, something most perplexing.

Within the past three or four decades great wealth has come to a few men here and there, and the relation of this accumulated wealth to democratic institutions and to democratic life has still to be determined. In a monarchy or aristocracy there is a place for men of wealth. How is it in a democracy?

Here, too, there must be a place for such; but what shall it be and by what determined?

What, too, shall democracy finally determine concerning the great business corporations which, to so great an extent, now control the commercial life of the nation?

These are not survivals from an aristocracy. They are the product of democracy. Democracy herself is responsible for them. How will she adjust herself to them and them to herself?

The law-making bodies of democracy are gradually losing strength and prestige. Another quarter of a century of deterioration, another quarter of a century without radical modification of the present plan, will put popular government in a position which will be embarrassing in the extreme. Thus far democracy seems to have found no way of making sure that the strongest men should be placed in control of the country's business. Men confessedly weak, whose private business has been a failure, are too frequently the men who are intrusted with the nation's affairs. Especially has the diplomatic and consular service of democracy (although there are notable exceptions) been weak and unsatisfactory. How shall the strong men be secured for government work?

The democracy of a century ago never dreamed that a party machine would be substituted for the will of the people. Is the government of today really a democracy, or is it rather an oligarchy?

The problem of the demagogue and the machine is on every side.

The difficulty of securing an honest vote is certainly greater than could have been anticipated. Many do not care to vote; many desire to vote too often. In some sections many are not allowed to vote who by the laws of the land are entitled to vote. How shall the vote, the whole vote, and nothing but the vote, be counted?

The church, too, is losing its hold upon the people. For this the democracy is directly or indirectly responsible. The churches are not democratic institutions. The great class of workingmen is hostile to them.

And unfortunately the masses make no distinction between the church and Christianity. Democracy has in this matter a great problem staring her in the face.

Education is the basis of all democratic progress. The problems of education are, therefore, the problems of democracy. These are numerous and varied and complex; only the expert can appreciate their gravity. It is maintained by some that in a democracy only the mediocre may be expected in the development of art and literature and science. It is the duty of democracy to meet this proposition; for, if true, it is in itself fatal to democracy's highest claims. The future of democracy is the problem of problems, including, as it does, all others. What will democracy have achieved one hundred — five hundred — years hence?

The highest and final test of every plan of government is, as Mr. Godkin has said, its ability to last.

Now, I know full well the tendency of our American republic to sneer at the theorizing of the university; to treat disdainfully all statements which bear the stamp of scholarly spirit; to look askance at everything that seems to bear the air of superiority.

But when, against the advice of experience and the plea of theory, urgent steps are taken which soon prove to be wrong steps, how quickly does this same American public turn about and adopt the idea which theory and experience advocated! The examples of this are so numerous and so familiar that I will not stop to recount them.

The university, therefore, is the philosopher of democracy, because it and it alone furnishes the opportunity for the study of these problems. Allow me to repeat the functions of the university as they were formulated by the great apostle of democracy, Thomas Jefferson: To form the statesmen, legislators, and judges, on whom public property and individual happiness are so much to depend; to expound the principles and structure of government, the laws which regulate the intercourse of nations, those formed principally for our own government in a sound spirit of legislation;.... to harmonize and promote the interests of

agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and by well-informed views of political economy to give free scope to the public industry.

What is this but to solve the problems of democracy?

I have not forgotten that the Old Testament Messiah was expected to be not only a prophet, a priest, and a sage, but also a king. But the representation as king was only an adaptation to the monarchy under which the idea had its birth. When he came, he was no king in any sense that had been expected. His was a democratic spirit; democracy has no place for a king. The dream of the Old Testament theocracy was of this Messiah, the expected one, by whose hand wrong should be set right, the high ones cast down, the lowly lifted up. And all the while prophets and priests and sages were living and working and hastening forward the realization of this magnificent ideal.

Now, let the dream of democracy be likewise of that expected one; this time an expected agency which, in union with all others, will usher in the dawn of the day when the universal brotherhood of man will be understood and accepted by all men. Meanwhile the universities here and there, in the New World and in the Old; the university men who occupy high places throughout the earth; the university spirit which, with every decade, dominates the world more fully, will be doing the work of the prophet, the priest, and the philosopher of democracy, and will continue to do that work until it shall be finished, until a purified and exalted democracy shall have become universal.

Citation: Harper, William Rainey. "The University and Democracy." Charter Day Address, University of California, March 1899. In *The Trend in Higher Education*, 1-34. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905.

Digital Source: Internet Archive. *The Trend in Higher Education*. archive.org/details/trendinhighereduooharprich