



CLARENCE S. DARROW

*Darrow-
Starr
Debate*



*Is
Civilization
a
Failure?*



PROF. FREDERICK STARR

Coming!

Watch the weekly program of this Society very closely for the next few weeks for the announcement of the greatest Darrow Debate held so far.

A new and brilliant antagonist will enter the lists on a new and vital question. This battle of battles is in process of negotiation and you will be given the news as it develops in the weekly program.

It is expected to take place in the latter part of January. And when it does, look out and pick your seats two or three weeks ahead.

Arthur M. Lewis.

Is Civilization a Failure?

The Chairman: The subject of the day is of my choosing and I say that before anyone else charges me with it. I thought, for a long time, it would be a splendid subject for a debate. I had the pleasure on one occasion of dining with Professor Starr and Mr. Darrow, and we talked back and forth in a sort of triangle. That and other conferences have lead to what you see today. I will now ask Mr. Darrow to open the debate.

MR. DARROW'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. Darrow said: Your attention has been called to the fact that I am taking the affirmative of this question. You see I am getting constructive! I suppose I will soon be loosing my mind. But, after all, it is a sort of a destructive constructiveness, so perhaps I will get along with it.

Is Civilization a Failure? Of course we fellows who debate could spend a lot of time on definitions, and, perhaps, it would be well in a way to define two words here. One is "civilization" and the other "failure". I shall define them in the language of the dictionary—it may be a very poor definition, but I generally mean to stick by the dictionary; even if I do not like it. The Standard Dictionary defines "civilization" or "to civilize": "To give laws, culture, humanize, recall from savagery, to make civil, transfer from military to civil government, advancement in knowledge, refinement and art." Civilization, of course, implies something like books, pictures, automobiles, telephones, jails—all of those things that are worth while to the modern man.

Now, what is it to fail? I ought to know, but I will give you the dictionary for it. "Fail: To forsake, to leave, to be wanting, not fulfilled, become short of, to go bankrupt." So, the question is whether this thing which we call civilization,

“Is Civilization a Failure?”

DEBATE

Affirmative: Clarence S. Darrow

Negative: Prof. Frederick Starr

Chairman

ARTHUR M. LEWIS

Held at the Garrick Theater
Sunday Afternoon, Nov. 28, 1920

Under the Auspices of
The Workers University Society

Reported by
MACLASKEY & MACLASKEY
Shorthand Reporters
Chicago, Ill.

and which the dictionary calls civilization, goes bankrupt or unfulfills what is generally expected of it, or falls short. I don't know just how far short, but we will not discuss that. Neither Professor Starr nor I have any ambition to win a debate, and so I am willing to discuss this in the ordinary meaning of these ordinary terms. I presume it would be expected that I should recount all of the places where civilization fails, but I haven't time. I want to put it on a broader basis than that.

I don't know whether I can seriously say that barbarism is a better state than civilization or not. I never lived in any civilized countries or barbarous countries and have no first hand means of comparison, and perhaps civilization has some advantages over barbarism. To tell all the things where our civilization falls short would be a waste of time, and it would settle no question. I have no doubt Professor Starr, who has been a great traveler amongst primitive peoples, could tell you many places where savagery fell short, and that would not settle the question. And it is just possible the question will not be settled even after we get through. But, anyhow, I would rather place it on some scientific or philosophical basis the best I can and more or less cut out these disagreeable questions of which at least civilization is full.

Of course this question involves largely what is life all about and what is the best way to live; and as to the best way, Professor Starr and I have agreed before this; the most happy way, or, the least unhappy way, as I would put it, and I am quite sure Professor Starr would be willing to accept this, and believe that I had probably taken the hardest definition. Then, before we can settle which is the happiest or which the least unhappy way of life, we have, first of all, to settle what life is for. That is what it must be for; to you and me and what it must be for, to this great mass of sentient beings awakened from nothing, and staying awake for a brief second and then going back to nothing. For my part at least, it leaves out of account any question of a future life or any kind of a conscious, divine power at least a beneficent one; it takes man as man is, so far as science can see him—a little bit of unconscious clay, that for a brief space of time is awakened into consciousness, and then goes back to nothingness. That being the case, which is the more natural, and which, after all, is the more tolerable? The life of the barbarian or the life of the civilized barbarian? Of course we

civilized people build higher buildings and have more railroads and telephones and bigger jails and penitentiaries and more crazy houses and more diseases, and go to the hospitals oftener and get more things cut out of us and off of us, and read more books and get less out of them, and look at more pictures, than the savage can.

Does that make life easier or does it make it harder? And, if it makes life easier, does it make life easier for the great mass of men who come and go upon the earth; or does it make it easier for just a few and harder for all the rest? Now, I do not wish to be in the attitude of talking about the glories of barbarism. Life of any sort is tough enough. Is civilized life harder for the great mass of men who live and die, or is the life of what we call the savage, or one step beyond the barbarian; is that more intolerable for the great mass of men? Is there anyway to settle it?

It seems to me that there is a way, rather uncertain and not at all conclusive. Man is a natural product. He is akin to all of the other animal life on the planet; he is born practically the same way and lives practically the same and dies practically the same way. In passing across the stage he is obliged to make certain adjustments to life, and those adjustments may be simple or they may be complex. They may be easy or they may be hard. But, these adjustments with the rest of Nature, he is bound to make, and when he can no longer make them, he dies. In which state of society can he make them the easiest and on the whole make them the most satisfactorily? That seems to me to be the question. It is not a question of whether here and there looms up a brain which is very much larger than the savage brain; it is not a question of whether here and there is a life which, after all, is very much more pleasurable than the savage life. But, it is a question of taking man as he is, over the long sweep of centuries. How does he adjust himself the best? In the state which is the nearest to Nature, or the state which is the farthest from Nature, which is civilized life, as we believe.

We not only have civilized men, but we have civilized animals. We civilize cattle. We have civilized pigs. By our marvelous brain, we have produced the kind of a hog—I am speaking of animals now—which has a great deal of fat and can scarcely waddle and is mostly all lard, weighing perhaps fifteen hundred pounds, whereas a natural hog would weigh five hundred. Which is the best hog? That depends upon

whose standpoint you view it from, whether from the standpoint of men or from the standpoint of the hog. As food for man you can get more out of him if he is civilized. But, looking at it from the standpoint of the hog, turn out a Berkshire hog with a razor-back he will not last long and cannot live. The Berkshire hog is so civilized and has so come into contact with civilized man that he will die. He is good for a man but bad for a hog. And that is practically true with the animals that man has polluted with his civilization. It means this: That Nature's laws are supreme. They are pretty tough, of course, but, they are all-powerful and the life is the easiest and the life is the simplest and on the whole, the life is the longest, that conforms closely to the laws of Nature. And I have an idea that no one would question for a minute when it comes to animals but what the life is simpler and easier the more man leaves it alone and the more it conforms to the laws which Nature makes and which are invincible.

What about man, is he any different? He must have lungs and a stomach and legs and some brains, not much, but he must have some because he is made that way. With these he goes out to conform himself to those things which are about him and which are always threatening him with death. He creates civilization. The savage man wants to eat; he chases the buffalo and the deer and he is able to digest his food. The civilized man rides in an automobile and he takes medicine. In the end, he will find that his legs have no function to perform, and he is a bundle of germs and a bundle of diseases, and that is about all.

Assume the civilized man—or that portion that is fairly lucky—as he exists today, is happier. Then, what? Civilization carries with it the germs of its own destruction, and its physical destruction and its mental destruction, because it is too far away from life. This is not a new question. This is not a new civilization. Farther back than human history can go—and there have been civilizations perhaps as great as this at least—as far back as history can tell, there have been civilizations which were most likely the equal of this, that were the equal of this in every way that we can measure the usefulness or the happiness of man. This world even within historical times has been swept over and over with civilizations which have grown and flourished and decayed, and gone back to the primitive again. We have had

the civilizations of Persia, of Mesopotamia, of Assyria, of Greece, of Egypt, of Rome, one after the other, many of which are only remembered today because of the great monuments that their civilization has left behind them; nothing else. Their people, living far from Nature, growing diseased, have over and over again, given place to the barbarian, who can live better and more in conformity with Nature, and through them, and their own diseases, have been destroyed.

Our civilization is just like the rest. To me, human life is one great succession of barbarism, or savagery, of civilization, of decay, back to barbarism and savagery, and again on the growth to civilization and back. One thing after another. But we people like every other people of the world, live in the present, live for today, close our eyes to the past and never dream of the future. We believe that this civilization is the only civilization the world has ever seen; and if it is going upward it will go on and on and on until man will have a brain as tall as a flag pole. He can live on ideals, although everybody knows that ideals do not go with civilization!

Now, I picked up some figures the other day which to me pretty closely tell this story. These came from Goddard, who has a notion running through his head that perhaps he can reform the world by picking out who ought to raise children and who ought not. He could probably civilize the race off the face of the earth, which is not bad; but, it will not happen. The first series of figures are made up from the army tests, within the last few years. An intelligence test of nearly two million boys between twenty and thirty, twenty being the age put down in the test as being the time when the faculties are perhaps the most alert. Not a test of knowledge, but a test of intelligence and, coming from the great mass of young men of the United States, between twenty and thirty. This test shows that of our intelligent young men of America of those between twenty and thirty, ten per cent average ten years of age. That is the moron age. Fifteen per cent average eleven years of age. Twenty-five per cent of all of them, thirteen and a half years of age. Seventy per cent of all of them, of all the young men of America, run below fourteen years of age. Now, that is what we get out of civilization. These tests are very easy. They are made up simply of tests of the grade of intelligence that an ordinary person ought to have and the average of this country, fourteen years of age, and

that is better than the average because there are left out of that all the real imbeciles that have been discovered; all the insane; all of the criminals that have been captured—all of those have been left out—and seventy per cent average fourteen years of age or less; and we are a civilized country! We are the most civilized country on earth. I can prove that by any one hundred per cent American in the United States!

To follow this test a little farther: Sixteen and one-half per cent averaged fifteen years of age only. Nine per cent sixteen to seventeen, and only four and one-half per cent up to an ordinary standard.

Now, those figures are supplemented by other figures not made in that way. The school record is given also; not of the army, but of everybody. And it almost tallies with the test made by the army. In the school record thirteen per cent of the people of the United States leave school in the fourth grade. Twenty-seven per cent before they ever get through with the eighth grade, making sixty per cent who never get through the eighth grade. Of all the people in the richest country on earth; the most self-satisfied country on earth; the most intelligent country on earth. And, I can prove this by the American citizens; I can prove it by all the preachers in the United States and all the bankers. Twenty-three per cent reach the eighth grade, only ten per cent that ever enter a high school, and only three per cent graduate from a high school; and only one per cent go to college. Of course. I do not know which that would be, but it is only one per cent, whatever it is.

Now, take another test: Wages. This, of course, includes men and women both. Six per cent earn \$150 to \$200 a year—I do not mean earn it; I mean get it. Twelve per cent, \$250 to \$300 a year. Sixteen per cent, \$350 to \$400. Thirty-one per cent, \$450 to \$600. Sixty-eight per cent get less than \$15 a week, and that is less than the minimum fixed for keeping a family. Sixty-eight per cent of them! Twenty-seven per cent get \$750 to a thousand, and only two per cent get over \$1,250. Only two per cent! Now, civilization in America—and civilization in America is civilization in England and in every civilized country in the world—has produced a class of people where the majority are not much above the moron in intelligence! Where the large majority never get through the eighth grade in school.

Where the large majority live upon less than the standard wage that is given for keeping a family alive—\$15 a week! And on the other hand, a very small percentage are accumulating all of the wealth of the world, and all of the knowledge of the world, and this wonderful civilization is for a fraction of the people who live in a civilized community!

Now, let us take this great mass; this seventy per cent. Who are they? First, there is no evidence that the brain power of civilized man is any better than the brain power of the barbarous man. I think perhaps Professor Starr will agree with me on that. If he can think of enough other things to say I am sure he will agree with me on that. The brain power is very poor and very weak. They are living on the verge of want; they have no education; they could get along pretty well with an easy life; they could get along in a land that was not civilized; they could live in tribes where people live simple and close to Nature. But, around these people is built the environment of civilization, an environment which sends a great mass of them to jail, to the insane asylums, and to institutions; an environment that is too strong for the ordinary man, no matter whether he is savage or civilized; and they are decaying, and decaying fast.

This mass could adjust itself to simple living and surroundings, and conditions; but it has no power to adjust itself to civilization. This civilization is unnatural, and not made for their intellect, for their capacities for their advantage, and it kills them. The savage and the barbarian got along very well; they had many of the high virtues; they had fewer diseases; they never had appendicitis. If they did, they didn't know it, which is the next best thing to not having it. There was equality. No man ate unless everybody could eat. The stranger would get fed and entertainment. There was some comradeship. And, in spite of hardships, there was an adjustment of the individual to life.

We have reared a monster which we call civilization; which leaves the great mass of men entirely unfitted for the structure we have built; and they wander around blindly in this dizzy maze until they destroy what there is and go back; go back to the barbarism from whence they came; and we go over the old, old weary round again. The great mass of men are like the great mass of animals, of whom they are a part. They must live close to life; they must live close to

Nature. Civilization cannot possibly maintain itself. I am not obsessed of the human race. Perhaps the best thing that could happen to it would be to die. But, it is not going to die; that is the trouble with it.

Let me see what civilization does for the human race. Build a high stone wall, north and south across Chicago, and fence in about a mile adjoining the lake—that puts all of us swells in that pen where we ought to be—and in two hundred years, if we had no contact with the outside world, nobody would be alive. They cannot produce life and they cannot sustain life, and life comes from the primitive peoples who are near Nature, who are near the source of supplies; from those primitive peoples who come to us from other countries, from those who have not been infected and destroyed by this wonderful civilization which is the glory of everybody who does not think about it! The civilized men and women have a short life and a merry one, and get through with it in one or two generations. If they leave any children behind they will be so few that they will not leave any grandchildren or certainly not any great-grandchildren.

Life cannot be sustained except through the primitive, and the trouble with civilization—one trouble—it will not even destroy life, because there will always be left enough of the uncivilized to take up life where civilization throws it down, and carry it on. Life is everlastingly being preserved by the primitive people of the world and going over the same old weary round. Take some of the old civilizations. Take Mesopotamia, with its great cities and wonderfully fertile plains. Today, sands are drifting through those cities. Today the civilization is gone. All the old civilizations have gone, and perhaps after hundreds of years, or thousands of years, they will start to build up once more. But, the high hopes that unthinking men have of civilization, that it is some dream; that sometime this world will be so much better; that sometime there will be more intelligence; that sometime there will be fairness and equality is nothing but a dream. It involves one of two things. Either that there is a beneficent creator—who got it into his head that if you gave him the time he would make something out of man; but has made a poor start and must have more time—that there is a beneficent creator who has plenty of time—more than we have—because we have not got eternity—and that he has fallen down on us; anyhow. But, give him the time and he will

make something out of the human race. Or else the idea that some evolutionists believe in—I don't know why—that insistent in life itself is beneficence; which is another religious idea, for beneficence implies consciousness, and the evolutionist of the Ingersoll type, has simply taken God out of the skies and put him into man and now you can see how and what he looks like. Both of them are utterly unscientific; purely religious; have no basis in fact; and cannot be proven by any of the experiences of human life!

The Chairman: I will now ask Professor Starr, whom you all know as the Anthropologist of the University of Chicago, whom we have listened to many Sundays and hope to see again. Professor Starr will now reply to Mr. Darrow.

PROFESSOR STARR'S FIRST SPEECH.

Professor Starr said: I confess to a feeling of extraordinary surprise. I never expected to debate against a man who started out by saying that it was evidence of losing his mind to take the side that he took. In this case, of course it is!

I am at a great disadvantage when I talk with Mr. Darrow—debate with him. I am at a great disadvantage, because there are some things I cannot say that he can. There are some things I cannot say that he does. And those things are the very ones that you applaud the most loudly. Now, for instance, it is impossible, absolutely impossible for ME to stand up here in a serious discussion and talk about good-badness, or sad-joy. And yet you know he indulges in that kind of thing all the time. I cannot, because it means nothing. Listen to this: It is the sort of thing I cannot say under any circumstances. He says: "In civilization men read more books and get less out of them than they do in savagery." Now, of course they read no books in savagery, therefore get nothing out of them. You see the kind of things you applaud and delight in when Mr. Darrow says them. But, I cannot say that kind of things.

Of course, we both start out with some definitions. I didn't think he was going to do it. But when I heard him, it seemed to me eminently natural, and it interested me very much. He undertook to define the first two words. I was going to start out with defining the word "civilization." I was also interested because I was one of the editors of that valuable work, to which he went, the Standard Dictionary—for his definition, which is just what I did. But, I was astonished at the difference between our results. Let us see: "Civilization: Observing the propriety of social intercourse." Now, that is really nicer than anything that he gave us. "Not rude or discourteous. Pertaining to the relations between the citizen and the state, or between citizens as regulated by law."—"Civility: The state or quality of being civil, propriety or courtesy of behavior in social intercourse. The state of being civilized, civilization." Of course, he used the

verb, to civilize, so that there was some excuse for a difference in the definitions. I looked for the word "civilization", which is in the subject of the discussion. **To civilize** does not come into the argument at all; civilization does. The state of being civilized; a condition of human communities characterized by political and social organization and order, advancement in knowledge, refinement, and the arts, and progress in general.

In looking at definitions and in defining words, there are three different things we may take into consideration. There are three different kinds of definitions. The first one of course is the etymological definition. The second is the definition of words as they occur in ordinary use by good writers. The third way in which we may think of definitions is when they are used in a somewhat technical sense. We may think of this word civilization from those three points of view. First from its etymology. The root of the word civilized, civilization and civilian—in all of these it is the same—and it comes down to the same thing as in city or citizen. I suggested that definition, quite by chance, when we were having one of our previous debates.

What is civilization? It is the adaptation that enables human beings to live together in masses. Mr. Darrow talks about savagery. Human beings do not live together in masses in savagery. No. People live few, very scattered, in those beautiful situations which he has pictured to you. People may live in savagery, yes; but if they really are going to live together in numbers they must be civilized. Civilization is simply the adaptation of human beings who live together in numbers, to live in that way.

Now, we may take words and define them according to their ordinary and regular and general use, as good writers writing for ordinary readers employ them. In that same valuable work of reference, I find some quotations. For instance: "Civilization, therefore, in its most general idea is an improved condition of man, resulting from the establishment of the social order in place of the individual independence and lawlessness of savagery or barbarous life. It may exist in various degrees; it is susceptible of continuous progress." We are justified in taking a definition from Guizot. He uses words that are generally understood. Again: "What is civilization? It is the humanization of man in society, the satisfaction for him in society, of the true law of

human nature." That is the usual meaning of civilization. We may twist it from the usage, but Matthew Arnold uses it that way, and surely he knew how to use English. We are justified, when we make a discussion in regard to certain words in using those words as ordinarily and generally used by good writers, for intelligent readers.

However, words may be used technically. I have been introduced to you as an anthropologist, and we have an anthropological usage of the word civilization. Part of my subject is the study of the development of culture, and we use the word civilization quite definitely and technically in culture-history. I could define civilization by saying it is an aggregate of certain achievements which man has worked out; they may be good or bad. We are not concerned with that, but the definition is sharply made, and when we talk about civilization the word has a precise meaning and names something characterized by certain qualities.

So much for the defining of the word civilization. Now, as regards the word "failure". I will be quite honest. I did not look up the word failure in any dictionary. It did not seem to me quite necessary. I do not think any of you are in doubt about the meaning of the word failure, nor am I. But let us look at some facts in regard to failure. If we know facts in regard to success, we know facts in regard to failure. I suppose Mr. Darrow and I—he has a kindly way of saying we would agree upon things, so when I find something we CAN agree upon, I am glad to call attention to it—I suppose Mr. Darrow and I would agree that civilization, whether it is good or bad, whether it is a success or a failure, is a growth or development. I said that I like to think of it as an adjustment between human beings, an adjustment which enables them to live together in masses. It is a growth or development. It must then be judged by the same rules as ordinary growths and developments are judged by. What constitutes success in a growth or development? Before we ask what constitute success, let me call attention to the fact that it is possible to think that a thing is a success if it makes a good showing without its really being so. I shall quote from an author that I have read in connection with this preparation.

Crozier says: "Without history, indeed, it would be difficult to know whether the large and imposing organizations that confront us on every hand were gaining or losing ground,

were waxing or waning, were rising in power or sinking in decay.

"Without history, indeed, it would be difficult to know whether the large and improving organizations that confront us on every hand were gaining or losing ground; were waxing or waning; were rising in power or sinking in decay. The Catholic Church, for example, still stretches its vast network over Europe as it did in the palmiest days of Papacy. How, then, can I tell whether it be a rising or a declining power, but by tracing its history from the days when kings shuddered before its anathemas, to the time when, pressed by relentless foes on every side, and still fighting like a parthian in its retreat, it finally yields to the enemy its last heritage of political power? Royalty is still surrounded with all the trappings of authority—with all the pomp and circumstance of state. To know whether it is in its prime, or its dotage, we must follow it from the time when it held, in its single hand alone, each several rein of authority and power, to the time—when, stripped one by one of its prerogatives, it at last becomes, as a political power, a myth and symbol merely. (So, too, with aristocracy. * * * How, then, can I know whether militarism is gaining or losing ground in the world.)"

In other words, if we are going to judge as to whether the Catholic Church is today prosperous and a success; in regard to whether royalty is prosperous and successful; in regard to whether aristocracy is powerful and successful; in regard to whether democracy is powerful and successful, we must look back; we must trace the history; we must see whether the thing is gaining or whether it is losing ground. Frequently we may be deceived by an apparent, beautiful blossom into thinking prosperity is present when it is truly absent and decline is on.

Recognizing that fact, let us see what marks success. Let us see how we shall judge of any growth or development, as to whether it is a success or not. First of all, persistence, certainly, is an evidence of success in any evolution or growth. Mr. Darrow is fond of suggesting how civilizations rise and fall; how things begin, culminate and decay. As a matter of fact, civilization has never disappeared since it first was achieved. It has been continuous for ten thousand years. There has never been a time when there was no civilization

since the first civilization of which we know anything. It is a mistake to talk of civilization disappearing; it is persistent, and persistence is one of the evidences of success.

Secondly: Expansion, in a growth or development, is certainly evidence of success. And if civilization, considered as a growth and a development, is expanding; if it is spreading; if it is covering a larger area it may be considered a success, because expansion is one of the elements of success in a growth or development.

However, water might be expanded over a very large area, but be exceedingly shallow. We must not only have expansion and persistence, but we must have penetration, and if any growth is really vital and successful, it should be penetrating as well as possessing these other qualities. And, of course, in any organization, any growth, any development, if it truly has a future before it, and is a success in the present, it must be changing, modifying, adapting itself to the conditions that it meets at the present time. Nothing is a success, as a growth or evolution, unless it is continually adapting itself to changing conditions. It seems to me that we may say, finally, in regard to judging whether a growth or development is a success, if it succeeds in making new adjustments, it is a success; if not, it is failure.

Now, I hope that I have brought that clearly before your mind. It is my belief that we may apply these different requirements to civilization. We find that it meets them all. In other words, instead of being a failure, it seems to me that civilization—one of the most remarkable developments—must be considered not a failure, but a great success!

It is true it may show itself in a series of manifestations. I recognize the series of civilizations, one after the other, of which Mr. Darrow told you. The earliest, perhaps, was in the great Mesopotamian district; one after another, great civilization has been developed there. There was Greece; there was Rome; there was Egypt; there was India. It is true that all came to an end. There have been local failures of civilization; or rather, there have been decays. Civilizations have disappeared to a degree again and again. It is not true however as Mr. Darrow suggested that any population that once was civilized, has gone back to a condition that is primitive. No, no. You cannot have a person actually born again. You remember the old question, when a religious

teacher was speaking about being born again? Nicodemus asked if it was possible for a man, when he is old, to enter into his mother's womb and be born again? Never, never. A civilization may be weakened by old age; it may lose its vital powers; it may eventually die. But, no population, once civilized, ever returned to a state of primitiveness. What Mr. Darrow says about turning, like wheels, from savagery, through barbarism to civilization, and back again in a repeating cycle, is not a fact. To talk in that way is to lose the view of things as they are.

There are two points of view. I was interested that Mr. Darrow mentioned these because I felt when the thought first came to me that I had something that probably would be overlooked, and, it seems to me it was pretty good, too. I was going to say, with a good deal of force, there are two ways in which we may look at civilization. We may consider it from its own point of view, or from the viewpoint of the material in which it shows itself. I thought I had found something quite novel. But when I picked up a book this morning by Stanton Coit: *Is Civilization a Disease?* I found that he had this same "new thought". So, I am afraid there is no great originality in this thought after all. I am pained when I thought I was striking at something new to find it so common-place. Stanton Coit said: Take a man who is suffering from locomotor ataxia. He goes on to tell about the sad condition of such a man. It seems that locomotor ataxia is a dreadful disease which is due to some germ which affects the spinal cord and gradually reduces the man to impotence, so far as his limbs are concerned. Such was Coit's illustration of civilization. Now, he said, we may think of two things: We may think of the germs or we may think of the man who is suffering. You see? We may think of civilization as a thing apart and we may think of the human mass upon whom and through whom and in whom it shows itself. And, it might very easily be said that civilization, considered as a thing apart, was a great success, just as those germs, considered in and for themselves, were flourishing mightily, but the man was suffering. Now, in the same way, it is entirely possible that a civilization might be bad in itself; the results might be cruel; the results might be brutal. Yet, we might genuinely say that the civilization itself was no failure. I am not, however, going to take refuge in any such subterfuge as that, because I do not need to. But, I want to distinguish these two things. We may think of civilization as a thing

abstract from and separate from man, and we may think of it as working in and through man. And, it might be a success in one way, viewed from itself, and as a mere principle or an application of a thing, or it might be a failure and an awful catastrophe, for its subjects, in its application. I do not believe it is a catastrophe in its application, but I suggest the two possibilities at this stage.

As to that book of Coit's—I was vastly disappointed in it. I read it with some care. I hoped to find something useful in it. I do not think there is much in it either for Mr. Darrow or myself. But, that is neither here nor there. I shall refer once or twice more in the course of my argument to Coit's book, but I do not want you to think I consider it a great or a useful book. There are some suggestions in it which I shall quote to you, occasionally.

Now, Mr. Darrow and Coit both thought that there is a parallel between domestication of animals and civilization of man. Hearing Mr. Darrow's references to domestic animals, my heart really bled for them. Their hearts bleed for us, too, I suppose, regularly. Coit suggested that what man had done to the dog and horse, the chief did to human beings who came under his control. That seemed to me an extraordinary statement far from the actual facts in the evolution of lower culture. He said:

"But it is evident that what mankind had caused to happen to the dog and the horse, the chief had accomplished in regard to the human beings who had come under his power. He had tamed them; they were no longer wild animals. They had rendered up individual liberty and self-reliant independence such as we see among many species of wild beasts. But instead, as the price of obedience to a will outside their own, they had received a thousand creature-comforts."

Coit thinks that here is an analogy; so does Darrow. There is no analogy about it. Coit tries to make the analogy by suggesting that the chief civilized a crowd of people in order to use them. No chief ever civilized any people in order to use them. Civilization is not the process of something working down from above into humanity in order to reduce it for use by the upper power. The analogy breaks down the moment you realize the fact. To talk about human beings in civilization as domestic animals, trained, raised and elevated by an outside power, simply for his own advantage,

is a misleading assumption which ought to carry no conviction with it, whatever.

Now then, I leave this matter and Coit to Mr. Darrow. By the way, he was to have twenty minutes; I was to have forty; he forty and I twenty. Now, as near as I can guess—I didn't look at my watch when he began—but, as near as I can guess he has used thirty-five.

Mr. Darrow: I think it was forty.

Professor Starr: Probably; but if he takes forty in his introduction, he will take eighty in his next, but no matter. Before I give way, I want to call your attention to one or two points in his argument. I have already spoken about the false analogy between domestic animals and man. I took up this because there was this quotation in Coit in which the same false analogy was made. But, let me call attention further to Mr. Darrow's argument: When he painted that picture of the dreadful condition of those two million—or whatever number—of boys examined for the army, his claim sunk deep. I hope the situation he found in the case of school children made ITS due effect. I appreciate the unfortunate situation, that, instead of being a population with what might be assumed to be the reasoning power of twenty-one years, we really are a population with the reasoning power of fifteen years. Of course, it is evident that the people who made out the examination and the people who draw up the schedule must be fools. Don't you see what I mean? People should demand from a general population not something which is clearly above what the population actually presents.

However, I want to tell you that, after all, it is not so strange or bad, this showing, not so bad. Who has ever made a serious investigation of the intelligence of a band of savages? Nobody. I do not hesitate to say that if we were to examine any band of savages, living in that beautiful, free, independent, natural condition of which Mr. Darrow so much loves to think—if anybody were to make an examination of such a group of savages, I should be much surprised if they found that the average intelligence of the entire population would reach the requirements which Mr. Goddard makes of a class of children of eight years. I mean that quite seriously. There are certain things in which the savage is shrewd; there are certain things that the savage does better than we can do. But, judged by similar intelligence tests to those Mr. Darrow

emphasizes so touchingly, the populations of savagery, I sincerely believe, could not under any possibility, reach the requirement of eight years.

So, do not let us groan too much over the sad showing of our young men and our school children. And let me tell you another interesting fact. I lived once in the midst of black Africans, through a very considerable period of months, and was much interested in this fact:—among those people (who were not savages, by any means, but were rather gifted barbarians) I noticed that every chief of any consequence, had an adviser at hand. And who was his adviser? You might think it would be some old man of experience; someone who had known the world. As a matter of fact, the adviser of an African chief is a child twelve to fourteen years of age. In other words, talk about the intelligence of a fourteen year old—the intelligence of fourteen year old children, in savagery and barbarism, is regularly higher than the intelligence of people of thirty or forty years. So, what are you kicking about, if we average a population with an intelligence that Goddard demands from children of fourteen?

Of course, there were some other things Mr. Darrow said that seem to be rather weak. He spoke of civilized man as a bundle of germs and diseases. You know that dear little savage baby—that barbarian baby, most of whom die long before they get away from the mother's breast—what are they? No germs or disease there? With an infant mortality that surpasses anything, even in the slums of our great cities? Talk about the wholesome, healthy conditions of lower stages of culture—Mr. Darrow knows, if he has looked into the matter in the least, that there is more health, that there are less germs, that there is more soundness of body in civilization a great deal, and in OUR civilization than in savagery and barbarism. Of course, you may say I am only making assertions here. To a certain degree, that is true, but, on the other hand, I know my savage and my barbarian, and he does not.

Well, you know Mr. Darrow spoke of how civilized man is gaining—on and on and on, until the brain is as tall as—but why talk about that?

MR. DARROW'S SECOND SPEECH.

Professor Starr has some advantage of me in that he has lived longer with the barbarians than I have. I have read something about both the savage and the civilized, and I am quite certain that while Professor Starr is right in speaking of the mortality of savage babies; that the mortality of those beyond childhood is greater with civilized people. Now, I cannot prove this, so do not ask me to. The civilized man is so civilized that he has taken every part of the world where you can raise a baby anyhow, and left the hot climates, which are very poor places for babies.

I have tried the best I could to find out what the facts are. I do know that our wonderful civilization manages to preserve a great many deficient babies; it is evident they do, from what we see around us. I know that the average age of man in civilized countries is about thirty-six years. I know that infant mortality is very great among savages and I am pretty fairly convinced that the number of old people amongst what we call barbarians, is greater than it is among civilized men. Now that is a question that needs a lot of study, and so far I have never been able to find any thorough statistics, and I presume there are none in existence. As to Doctor Goddard's figures: Now, I did not make them. But they are made with care; they are figures used everywhere; they were figures used to test armies; they are figures used in psychopatic institutions and they determine fairly well the degree of intelligence that ought to be possessed by a twenty-year-old body. I am quite certain that there are no comparative figures as to savages.

Now, on that question I have not had the personal observation of my friend, but I have given it as much study as I could, and I think the conclusion is that it is impossible to show that there is any greater degree of intelligence amongst civilized people than amongst savage people. That as to the strength, of the brain, or the capacity of the brain, man has not improved since we have the record of the first man. Why, we never have produced a civilization which was equal to the

civilization of Pericles, counting civilization as books, art, pictures, nimbleness of mind. We haven't approached the civilization of his time; or the general civilization; or probably the peak of civilization. But, to go further back, twenty, thirty or forty thousand years, which can, of course only be arrived at through the remains of the human forms back there, there is absolutely nothing that shows that man has improved in his mental structure since he became a man. And so far as the evidence of travelers is concerned, so far as we can find it, it is uniform that while the savage cannot read books; he cannot do this or that, but the degree of intelligence, as near as we can get it, is as great.

But, here is where Professor Starr has the advantage. All these statements of what makes civilization are made by civilized people. All these statements as to the comparative degree of the intelligence of a savage and civilized man, are made by civilized people. If we only had a chance to listen to the barbarians it might be different. I can prove very readily that America is the greatest country on earth. I can prove that England is the greatest country on earth. I can prove that France is the greatest; that China or, I can prove that Ireland is the greatest! I can prove that Liberia is one of the greatest. I just read Professor Starr's book on Liberia, trying to get at something that I didn't get. Because, I found most of the people of Liberia were people who had been slaves in America and learned to write and went over there.

Neither do I believe civilization is as old as Professor Starr says. Civilization is not as old as barbarism. As far as we can get the fact, it is not as persistent as barbarism. It is not as persistent as the simple life of the primitive man. Whether the civilized man ever reaches the position of getting de-civilized, I am not certain. I know that civilized man, persons, cities, get over it. They could not stand it; they die from it. And over and over, the world has to be repopulated and rebuilt from and by the primitive people who live upon the earth and who live according to the laws of Nature, and laws of life as Nature has said we must conform, otherwise the race would die.

The Professor admits that civilization decays and dies. Whether it has to be replenished entirely from some other line, I do not profess to be sure; I only know that it does die. And, so far as we can see, there is no exception to the rule. And, of course, civilization as Mr. Starr puts it, is a modern

thing. It may not have time to completely die. Why not give it a chance? See if it persists upon this earth as long as the primitive people persist. See whether it can live in the false, unnatural atmosphere of civilized life. See whether the common man can stand the fierce environment that civilization has thrown about it.

Now, let me take my friend's definition of civilization. I am sorry he quarrels with my definition got out of his dictionary. The main definition I found of civilization was to be civilized. And so I looked for civilizing, to civilize, and that is how I got it. And it all comes to the same thing, even if Professor Starr looked for civilization and I looked for civilize; it all means the same thing anyway, and our statements mean the same thing. It means pictures, books, buildings, and all the thousand and one things—of people who live on glory and pride—other people's glory and their own pride.

Professor Starr says a better definition would be ability to live together in masses. Well, now, let us see about it. The ability to live together in masses. Why in masses? I am inclined to think that a great city is the most striking evidence of disease that civilization has furnished. Why should the human race live together in masses? They are drawn together because the ideal of civilization is money. And this ideal is responsible for every really great city on the face of the earth today. And, it is destroying itself. Why isn't the more primitive life of man, where he lived further apart and roamed a greater area, a more natural state of man, and after all, a happier state for the great mass of men who live upon the earth? Now what is our ability to live together in masses? And is it a success or failure? How do we do it? Why, I will tell you how we do it. Take Chicago, New York or London. Now about three per cent have nearly all there is; they have most of all the lands, and the wealth and the accumulated stores that the labor of the world gives; and they live together in masses, how? Why, by hiring lawyers and policemen! By building jails; by keeping the masses at bay by main force and by fear. And do you suppose a civilization like this could rest, except through fear? Not for a moment. Do you suppose two or three per cent of the human beings of civilized communities could own everything there is and see the great majority living close to want and still live together in masses, except by the club and by the jail? Is that a success?

If this a success, we ought to find a new definition for success! In Chicago, right now, what do we see? We see the great newspapers and the good people—meaning those who have money—we see the great newspapers and the good people lashing Chicago into a state of frenzy as if a foreign foe was at our gates; lashing the people of Chicago to protect itself against the bandit and the highwayman as if we were living in the most barbarous of the barbarous countries that we could conceive! Where a man's life was not safe and where liberty was not safe, urging people to shoot at sight and to hang almost at sight. Is that a success? Or, is it a failure?

No such condition of gross inequality, of hopeless brutality, can be pointed to, I believe, amongst the uncivilized peoples of the earth. The gross inequality and injustice which civilization has given to the world is preserved as distinctions were preserved in barbarism, by the club and by fear. And the preachers and the teachers and the lawyers would never think that they had created a civilization where a man could go to sleep at night unless a policeman was standing outside his door with a club. Now, that is our civilization. And this handful of civilized people who are the owners of civilization and the dictators of life and of liberty, are kept alive by an army of doctors, examining their blood, making tests, hunting germs, vaccinating them for smallpox, for diphtheria, taking out appendix, adenoids, and pulling out whatever teeth they have left. Everything to keep this bunch alive. Why, look at the mass of lawyers, doctors, policemen, jailers, newspapermen, that are called in to aid to keep up this civilization! Where men do not live together in masses because they know the art of living together in masses; but where the chief pursuit is some form of robbery, and overreaching and where men are held together by force and nothing else. Is it a success? I will have to go to the dictionary and see if I can find a new definition of success.

PROFESSOR STARR'S SECOND SPEECH.

The Chairman: Professor Starr will have the next speech.

Professor Starr said: There is one thing in what Mr. Darrow last said that I shall refer to. It is his suggestion that he would not take the trouble to prove anything. Who would expect him ever to prove anything? You know a lawyer may make a thing look very plausible, but, so far as proving anything, that is not his business. However, no matter. I am sure what I shall say in the remaining time will sound very tame after this we have heard. I am not much of a hand at appealing to the emotions, and of course there is much that can easily stir emotions in any presentation of any stage of culture of any time or any place in the world's history. In other words, I could, if I were in that business, stir your hearts and arouse your emotions by really painting savagery for you. I could do the same by taking any phase of barbarism anywhere at any time, and by taking any civilization anywhere at any time. There are many sad things in humanity; many dreadful things in humanity. But, after all is said and done, there is no question but the course of civilization has, on the whole, been one of amelioration. Let Mr. Darrow paint the picture of Chicago, New York or London; and, personally, I think London is the worst. Let him paint any picture of New York, London or Chicago, as black as he may, it is light compared to old Rome. It is even light compared to that splendid day to which he so constantly refers in ancient Greece. It is light compared to the enforced labor, the cruelty, the brutality of that splendid civilization which was Egypt; compared with the old civilizations of Babylonia and Mesopotamia, it is gentle, it is kindness. I realize all that he has said or can say in regard to the horrors of many people living together. Yes. And yet people will live together. One of the essential, fundamental things that makes man is that he is a social animal. Mr. Darrow is very fond of emphasizing our relation to the animal kingdom. It is to be expected from a man who has delved so deeply into biology. But, one of the striking things that make man is the fact that he IS a social animal, and the result is that humanity flourishes and prospers. There must be crowding; there is the necessity more and more

of human beings living close together; there is greater and greater certainty that there must be great masses of humanity. And civilization is not a thing outside. Civilization is a thing within, and it is the effort to so adjust relations between individuals, not from the outside, but through practice, through movement, through action, that makes civilization.

What has always been the motive in such masses? What has been the thing which has kept things no worse than they are? It is the fact that things have been scrutinized by all. It is true that a few men in Chicago, a few men in any civilization, a small percentage, have a large proportion of the gains, the advantages, the wealth. But, it is also true that you help in establishing the situation; it is true that an enlightened public opinion, is the thing which pushes and helps on civilization; it is true, notwithstanding the terrible things in the crowd today. It is true that the civilization of today is a humaner, more genuine, more actual living together in fair happiness, and with a good deal of satisfaction, than any civilization Mr. Darrow can point to in the past, and that is something to be thankful for. Just as in savagery, it is popular opinion that controls, holds things, directs, helps, just as in barbarism, it is public opinion that guides, directs, controls, so it is in civilization, and always has been. And, public opinion is better today, even with your fourteen-year intelligence—public opinion is more sane, more awake, more forceful, makes itself felt today better than at any other time in the world's history. And it ought to go on to better and higher things.

However, I want to say one thing in that connection. There are after all two kinds of civilization. I have spoken of this to you before. I would gladly not repeat myself to the same audience. But, as a matter of fact, if Mr. Lewis will select a subject such as this, I must repeat myself to some degree. And so I remind you that there are two types of civilization. There is the civilization of the far East; there is the civilization of the bustling West. The civilization of the East has been a fine thing, and millions of people have lived crowded together in a way that we have not the slightest conception of here in our western world, with a fair degree of decency and honesty and purity and truth. There are two forms of civilization, both of which are adjustments of human beings to live together with other human beings to the best advantage. I shall read you a passage from Crozier in regard

to this matter and the things that this other civilization has some sort of development and improvement. In speaking of the end, the object of civilization, he says that all the culture of the past, all governments that have been established, at different times, at different places, no matter whether they are savage, barbaric or civilized—he is speaking of all forms of government—he says: "They have consciously or unconsciously as their object, one or other of the following ends—either the order, symmetry, and durability of **society as a whole**, or the elevation and expansion of the **individual mind**. Those who support the one, would subordinate the enlargement and elevation of the individual to the order and symmetry of society as a whole; those who support the other, would postpone the symmetry and order of society to the elevation and expansion of the individual. The one would make each man a mere cog or wheel in the vast organized mechanism of society, the other would make him conversant with the highest his nature is capable of, and would make room for him to expand to the utmost limit of his being. * * * the watchword of the one is Order, of the other Progress; of the one Despotism (more or less disguised perhaps), of the other Liberty. * * * the ends of the latter are more in harmony with the constitution of the world and the nature of man than the former—that, in short, **the elevation and expansion of the individual is the goal of Civilization, the true aim of Government.**"

I believe that is sane; I believe it is sound. It is true that we fall far short; it is true civilization has made many errors; it is true we can put our hands on many sores. That does not affect the fact that after all this adjustment has been made, that it has continued through the ages, that it continues today and that, on the whole, it is improving; that it is under the direction, the guidance, and the constant supervision of public opinion; that it makes for better things. There is no question, I believe, of the reality of that thing. The same writer says in regard to the lines of civilization movement:

"The movement of what is called civilization has been along two lines—the one an upright **verticle** line, the other a **horizontal** one. The upright vertical movements is seen in the gradual rise of men's ideals from that prowess and mere brute courage which was the ideals in the early life of all peoples (and still is so in the lowest savage races) up through the times when military strategy, cunning, and diplomacy

shared with personal courage, man's admiration, onward to the present day, when the most serious sections of the most civilized nations have as their ideal, that intellectual power, which, in its many different aspects, has produced all that is great and admirable in civil and national life. * * * But, besides this **upward** movement which characterizes advancing civilization—the rise in men's **ideals**—we note a **lateral** horizontal movement, as seen in the more equable administration of justice, the wider area for intellect and character, the wider distribution of wealth, the wider diffusion of knowledge, the wider extension of liberty and equality."

I am sorry that the expansion has not been higher than fourteen years of age. But that is much more than has ever been in the world's history before. Instead of claiming that we have made no progress, we would accomplish more if we do what we can and do it in the direction of continued advancement. Personally I look forward with hope, though I am no optimist. I have always refused to let Mr. Darrow put me in the position of an optimist. He is proud of being a pessimist. I was never proud of being an optimist, but I would hate to be a pessimist. However, that is neither here nor there. I look forward to something better, and I look forward to something better because civilization has demonstrated itself a success. Viewed as a growth, as a development, those points I have mentioned, persistence, expansion, penetration, adaptation, and achievement, mark civilization as a real success. I look forward to a better—I look forward to a higher—greater civilization and culture than we have ever yet had. I told you on one occasion, that to me the present contact between the great East and the great West is an important thing. I believe that the hope of the world, the hope of humanity, hope for ourselves, lies in that contact. And the place where that contact is the most marked, where it is most definite is in the old world, in Asia. In that district, where one civilization has followed another we shall perhaps see a culture develop which shall be better than any other because it will contain in it as contact-results the best things of the great domestic civilization of the far East, (based primarily upon the altruistic ideas) and of Western civilization, (based upon its ideal of individual development). I have great hope in the interaction of Russia and of Asia. The results should be enormous. When that time comes; (we may not live to see it), but, when that time comes, people will look back upon such questions as we have been discussing

here today, as purely futile and not worth while; because civilization will then be seen as evidently an upward growth, and will then have culminated in a so much higher form than the world has seen, that no such question could be possible!

(FINIS)