SOME HINDRANCES TO THE FUNCTIONING OF

DEMOCRACY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

APPROVED:

Lt. A. Odum
Major Professor

James F. Webb
Minor Professor

Lt. A. Odum
Director of the Department of Education

Dean of the Graduate Division
SOME HINDRANCES TO THE FUNCTIONING OF
DEMOCRACY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North
Texas State Teachers College in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Glydene Oliver, B. S.

Los Angeles, California

August, 1946
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. DEMOCRACY IN THE POLITICAL REALM</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. DEMOCRACY IN THE SOCIAL ORDER</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DEMOCRACY IN THE ECONOMIC ORDER</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. CONCLUSION</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Fundamentally, American society is democratic in structure. The American nation was founded by a group of people who were zealous for individual freedom in all phases of life, and the democratic ideal has continued, to the present day, to characterize America and its people. But even so, there are certain weaknesses in American democracy, and in various phases of human experience there are factors which operate to hinder the effective working of democratic principles. These facts do not mean that we do not have democracy in the United States; they mean, rather, that democracy is hindered from being as pure in practice as it is in theory, and that democratic principles remain more of an ideal than they are a practical way of life.

Though American democracy has become world-renowned, it is short of perfection in many respects. There is nothing wrong with the theory and the concept of democracy, but the weaknesses lie in the human element, indicating that people sometimes forget democratic principles if to do so will perhaps enhance their own selfish interests, or if to practice democratic principles should prove inconvenient in some
situations.

It is the purpose of this study to discover and define certain hindrances to the functioning of democracy in American society. Data for the study were obtained from a reading of numerous books and magazine articles on the subject. The writer has attempted to evaluate fairly the information thus gleaned, and to compile it in such a way as to present a logical treatment of the subject.

In Chapter II the ideals of democracy, including its fundamental concepts, are presented.

Chapter III deals with the functioning of democratic principles in politics, indicating some of the hindrances in political life to the perfect application of democratic ideals.

Chapter IV has to do with democracy in the social order and points out ways in which American society has departed from original democratic concepts.

Chapter V is a treatment of democracy in the economic order, together with a discussion of economic hindrances to its effective functioning.

Chapter VI concerns the working of democracy in education and the American school system, and emphasizes educational hindrances to effective democratic living.

In Chapter VII is presented the writer's conclusions concerning hindrances to democracy in American life, together with suggestions for the greater application and utilization of democratic principles in all phases of American society.
CHAPTER II

IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY

Even in America, chief among the world democratic governments, we are, as one writer has put it, "less a democracy than we like to think."\(^1\) This nation, founded as it was upon fundamentally democratic principles and ideals, and incorporating as it has the concepts of democratic values in its legislation and international relationships, still falls far short of democracy in its simple state, in its main values for human living. Though perhaps in America democracy has reached its highest expression in modern times, there are still in American life and government many practices that tend to nullify the full expression of the democracy which Americans boast of. Though the ideal of democracy remains uppermost in the thoughts and desires of the American people, in practice democracy is likely to be less perceptible or even to be relegated to one side if to do so furthers the interests or individuals or groups. The weaker ones in society tend to be the most aggressive champions of democracy, while those who have attained to positions of power or prestige may work

to subvert the functioning of democratic principles and to replace them with autocratic practices in order to increase their own power and authority over their fellows. Personal interests seem to have interfered with the simple concepts of democracy as set forth by the early fathers of America.

The purpose of this study is to examine some of the weaknesses of democracy as it is practiced in America today and to point out certain obstacles in society to the full realization of the democratic ideal as originally conceived by those who founded the American nation. Books published within the past decade have been the sources consulted for this survey. The writer makes no claim that this is an exhaustive or comprehensive study in its field, for it is recognized that it is impossible to treat adequately so vast a subject in the limited scope of a paper of this type. But an attempt has been made to point out certain of the more significant hindrances to the operation of democratic principles in the field of politics, in the economic order, in the social order, and in education. Whereas this first chapter presents a discussion of the ideals of democracy, the final chapter of the study includes conclusions regarding the present status of democracy in America and lists certain recommendations for putting some of the democratic ideals into practice.
One writer has stated that there is "no front-page news in the statement that democracy is under fire. It always has been." Since its beginnings democracy has been, among the world theories of government, somewhat of a radical idea, frowned upon alike by rulers and subjects in the old established governmental orders. Democracy has been on the defensive at all times, and it does not need to be said that it has not always defended itself valiantly. In America was set up the first outstanding modern experiment in democratic living, but even here there were many who watched the process with their tongues in their cheeks. There were even many who wanted Washington to assume a crown and a scepter and become King George I of America. By and large, the populace lacked faith in the wisdom of their brave undertaking; yet the convictions of the leaders and the early successes of the youthful government soon won popular acclaim.

That the early Americans should be skeptical of the new experiment in government is easily understandable when it is remembered that "in the beginning we, as a nation, set up housekeeping with borrowed furniture. Our philosophy, our literature and art, our economic outlook, were borrowed along with our citizenry."
Since the beginning, Americans have been kept busy interpreting and explaining their system of government and their concept of social relationships to people of other nations. As a result, much theorizing has been done about the meaning of democracy, but not enough actual practice of democracy has been evident in our land.

Now that the second great world conflict has been concluded and people of the earth are seeking a way of peace, it is necessary that we in America re-examine our philosophy of democracy and determine whether it is adequate and wherein it may appear inadequate for these times.

There is no problem before the American people which even approximates in importance the problem of what democracy is to mean in our own day and generation.\(^4\)

When America was young, there was not so much theorizing about democracy -- that was to come later -- but there was much practice of democracy in personal relationships, neighbor with neighbor. The hardships of the frontier were rendered endurable because the people who blazed trails into the wilderness recognized the necessity of undertaking things cooperatively. Hence neighbors would "swap" work, building log cabins for each other, clearing land, harvesting crops, caring for the sick, and working together on all other jobs that would have been difficult

---

\(^4\)Boyd H. Bode, *Democracy as a Way of Life*, p. viii.
or impossible for the individual settler.

But with the settlement of the country and the coming of machinery to the farms and to factories, the spirit of community effort was largely lost and with it, the practice of democracy in its simplest and most meaningful forms. Men began to talk about democracy instead of to live it in their everyday relationships; and democracy became an ideal instead of a way of life. Naturally, the utilization of democratic principles in human life became more difficult as society grew in complexity; and America made its great mistake in permitting industrial progress to leap far ahead of democratic progress.

... I know that there has been more drivel talked about democracy than about anything else in our universe. And I know that crimes have been committed in its name. But these are signs of vitality. You don't imitate a shadow, and you don't speak in the name of a nullity. ... Ours will be a ghastly blunder if we do not recognize that democracy is substance as well as dream. It is something to die for, to live by, to give our talent and energy to extending.5

In 1944 Beery wrote:

The developing world crisis which culminated in the present war has been in a large measure responsible for this increased discussion of democracy. It is to be expected that when an institution is under fire there should be a revival of discussion and critical appraisal of it. The rise of totalitarian forms of government in other parts of the world was recognized as a threat to our own democratic way of life long before this country became involved in the armed conflict. It is now generally recognized that our defense is not entirely a matter of guns,

5Max Lerner, Ideas for the Ice Age, p. 29.
tanks, planes. The ultimate defense against these rival theories of government must be a constant renewal of informed and devoted loyalty to the fundamental principles of democracy.\(^6\)

Today, in the face of conflicting theories of government and of differing social codes, democracy is indeed a bit out of fashion and out of favor. Those who opposed it and who feared it for its threat to their own interests or ideals have lost much of their fear of it, partly because they have come to believe that democracy is incapable of producing the results which were originally expected of it. Those who were enthusiastic champions of democracy have lost much of their zeal for it, perhaps for the same reason. Many people have reached the conclusion that democracy as a way of government and of life cannot "deliver the goods"; therefore it is to be regarded with tolerance or with indifference, as an ideal to be lauded in patriotic speeches, but not to be taken seriously in everyday living.\(^7\)

Counts, one of the nation's leading educators, has said that "it is no exaggeration to say that in all probability the present generation and the generation immediately to follow will be called upon to decide whether democracy is to survive, and, if so, in what form."\(^8\) Thus he seems to realize the seriousness of the state in which democracy


now finds itself, and warns Americans that democracy must be made more vital in all relationships of life if it is to survive the bombardment of other isms and theories of government which have risen to contend for man's allegiance.

The fact that the idea of democracy is being challenged in every part of the civilized world cannot be passed over lightly. Movements like communism and fascism may owe their existence, at any rate in part, to the shortcomings of the historical concept of democracy. ... The idea of democracy will have to be examined and reinterpreted, in the light of rival concepts, so as to make it adequate for the conditions of present-day life. 9

Counts has pointed out that blind loyalty and lip-service to the traditional forms and symbols of democracy, without regard for democracy's character and spirit in its fundamental concept, and without any conscious effort to bring democratic principles into vital relationships with life today, are doubtless the surest ways to destroy democracy. He warns that democracy will be destroyed in this manner if its present and potential enemies should prove successful in their subtle attacks upon it; for they pay outward homage to the ideals of democracy while undermining its spirit by subversive activities. 10

Yet those who recommend that democracy be laid aside as an outmoded way of life have nothing better to offer in its stead. 11

---

9Bode, op. cit., p. 3. 10Counts, op. cit., p. 10.

The first thing to notice about democracy is that it rests on a new idea about happiness and particularly the happiness of ordinary people. The early democrats insisted that the day-to-day happiness of ordinary persons was immensely important. They maintained that the principal object of all government and Governments should simply be the happiness of the population. And they went on to assert that everyone has an equal right to the same kind of happiness.\(^{12}\)

It has become the fashion, in certain groups even in America, to say that democracy has failed and that something else should be tried. Among the factors that are leading many people to believe that a fascist or communist type of government is needed may be named the present worldwide economic disorders, the rise of dictatorships abroad, the apparent inability of American governmental agencies to cope with our maladjusted economic situation, and the rise of class and racial hatreds. Such criticism is a fundamental challenge to the millions of people in America who still value democratic social ideals and institutions.\(^{13}\)

One of the most famous of the German intellectual exiles who sought refuge in America when Nazism rose to power in the Reich is Thomas Mann, who has written:

Even America feels today that democracy is not an assured possession, that it has enemies, that it is threatened from within and from without, that it has once more become a problem. America is aware that the time has come for democracy to take stock of itself, for recollection and restatement and conscious


\(^{13}\)Samuel Everett, Democracy Faces the Future, p. 139.
consideration; in a word, for its renewal in thought and feeling.\textsuperscript{14}

In spite of all the opposition to democracy, and in spite of the strength and appeal of other theories of government that conflict with the fundamental principles of the democratic way of life, democracy remains "the great force in the world today, whether as dream or as reality." Lerner, whose words have just been quoted, asserts that the force still exerted by democracy upon the thought of the world is

greater than capitalism, which was once a force, or liberalism, which has never been a real one, or communism, which has too eagerly thrown its strength away, or fascism, which once it goes down the skids will go fast, or internationalism, which may yet emerge as a great force.\textsuperscript{15}

Justice Frank Murphy of the United States Supreme Court in his pamphlet \textit{In Defense of Democracy} states that in all public discussions there is probably no word more frequently used than the term democracy. He says that it is fine that this word is so often repeated in public meetings, and expresses the hope that in the untold ages of the future, the American people will still be using that word, "using it with the devotion that men give to their most priceless possession." But Murphy fears that often the word democracy is bandied about carelessly on the

\textsuperscript{14}Thomas Mann, \textit{The Coming Victory of Democracy}, pp. 9-10.

\textsuperscript{15}Lerner, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 29.
tongues of political orators, and that it is used in the everyday conversation of the American people, without anyone's thinking much about what it means. "I wonder," he muses, "if we have not become a little numb to the significance of the idea of individual liberty that is the secret of democracy. How often do we profess our faith in democracy and forget to associate it with the things in our own lives that are democracy?"\textsuperscript{16}

Democracy, to be effective, cannot stand still. It must constantly move ahead, changing its implications as the conditions of life change.\textsuperscript{17} Its failure to change in meeting the changing needs of modern society is due to man's failure to apply democratic principles to the ongoing progress of civilization; yet democracy is blamed for its obsolescence, and we say that it was good for a culture which was simple and frontier-centered, but it is not applicable to a highly industrialized society. Democracy can change to meet and function in any situation if men will alter their concepts concerning it. Democracy is not antiquated -- it is modern. Man is antiquated in his thinking when he fails to see the limitless implications of democracy for life today.

\textsuperscript{16}Frank Murphy, \textit{In Defense of Democracy}, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{17}Beery, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 7.
Nevertheless, there is nothing new in the struggle now going on between democracy and the other governmental and social theories of the times. Wherever and whenever democracy has appeared in human history, it has had to contend with autocracy. However, there is a novelty in the twentieth-century conflict which has not been present heretofore -- dictators have achieved power through an appeal to the broad masses of the populace. For instance, in Germany, a country long renowned for its cultural achievements and for its high intellectual level, Hitler built the most powerful political party, took over the reins of government by constitutional means, and immediately destroyed the republic. The ease with which Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin hoodwinked the people and took over the government by constitutional means and then destroyed popular liberty and established tyranny, is the most disturbing feature in the present political upheaval in the world, according to Counts.18 Even in America, where the populace is supposedly well grounded in democratic ideals and principles, such popular leaders as Huey P. Long and Father Coughlin found it easy to build up immense followings through the use of similar subversive practices.

Despite much concern about democracy and its utility in the present-day world, there also seems to be much

18Counts, op. cit., p. 5.
uncertainty about the meaning of the term. Many books and articles have insisted upon the necessity of education for democracy, but few try to clarify the basic principles and implications of democracy which must serve as a foundation-stone for that education. Someone has said that it is easier to die for democracy than to define it. Despite general uncertainty as to its meaning, democracy as a term or concept receives the strong allegiance of the American people. This condition of loyalty to a principle which remains vague in the public mind is unfortunate, for a term so widely "suffused with emotional approval and so loosely defined" may become a powerful weapon in the hands of demagogues or special-interest groups.¹⁹ No one can deny that this has already happened -- in America as elsewhere.

In concluding this chapter the writer will present a number of quotations dealing with the ideals of democracy and intimating some of the hindrances which have risen to interfere with the functioning of democratic concepts in modern society.

One of the most powerful American traditions is that of democracy. For generations the United States has been regarded by the other nations of the world as a country carrying on a tremendous experiment in democracy. This tradition, which embraces the ideals of equality of opportunity, freedom of speech, universal suffrage, respect for the rights of others, social justice, and a classless society, is among our most cherished possessions.²⁰

Democratic government . . . involves three ideas: first, that we give a very inclusive group of people the right to vote; second, that we organize our government so that persons who are responsible to the people make the most important political and governmental decisions; third, that the things which our government does must be, on the whole, pretty satisfactory to the great mass of people.  

Democracy is a form of political association in which the general control and direction of the commonwealth are habitually determined by the bulk of the community in accordance with appropriate understandings and procedures providing for popular participation and the consent of the governed. . . .

Democracy is the best form of political association that the mind of man has been able to devise thus far, either by analysis or from observation and experience. Democracy is the ideal form of association. Democracy as a form of political association may disappear from time to time, be eclipsed, but it does not die. It is a continuing type of political association which has its roots in the very nature of the community, whose common affairs are decided by the community. This is a basic principle of association, and in the long run, whatever may happen in the various interims, this principle will triumph. The common good in the long run will be determined by the community.  

Democracy is more than a form of political government; it is a moral and social conception and way of life. All aspects of life are involved. Belief in the worth and dignity of human personality is the foundation of the democratic idea.  

Democracy is that total form of organized social life in which the people as a whole determine the ends their public agencies are to serve, determine what common needs will be provided by public facilities, determine what controls over all sorts of individual and group activities are needed to give

---


23 Jesse H. Newlon, Education for Democracy in Our Time, p. 67.
reality to a maximum possible freedom for all; and which so conducts its purposes, policies, procedures, and personal leaders that the growth of individual personality is both safeguarded and enhanced.²⁴

The trouble with most of us is that we take our American citizenship for granted as much as we do our health. Its full meaning is seldom brought home to us. Let disease run epidemic around us or let us suffer enough from some acute illness, and we begin to sense what good health really means. Similarly, we become self-conscious American citizens chiefly when the threat of foreign "isms" has reached the epidemic stage or when we have been exposed to the inconveniences of other ways of living.²⁵

The supreme faith of democracy is that the strife of ideas is a productive strife, and that when all individuals actively defend that course which upon investigation seems best to them, the resultant compromise is not weaker but stronger than any alternative decision could be. It is stronger not only because the chaff has been winnowed out in the public forum, but because it gains strength by representing the common will.²⁶

Defense in the realm of ideologies lies in the development of our own superior ideals to such an extent that they can be compared side by side with others with no doubt as to the outcome. It is only natural that when our way of life is being challenged there should be renewed concern about basic principles. Our strength will lie in clearly understood ideals of our own. We cannot fight the ideological war with emotional attachment to a vague concept of democracy. We must have a citizenry so thoroughly aware of the meanings and implications of democracy that the resultant faith will be so strong that no attack, ideational or physical, can be successful.²⁷

Beery, who recently studied American concepts of democracy by sending questionnaires to several thousand

²⁴Tead, op. cit., pp. 116-117.
²⁶Ibid., p. 264.
²⁷Beery, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
persons representing a cross section of the people of the
United States, has summarized his findings as follows:

The foundation of democracy is faith in the essential worth of each individual human being without regard to occupational, social, economic, or hereditary status. Human personality is of supreme value and must be respected in all dealings. No man is to be regarded as a means to the attainment of ends not his own. Those who are to be bound by a decision should share as far as is humanly possible in making it. Dealings between individuals and groups should be based on mutual tolerance.

The maximum development of each individual, when attained without infringing the rights of others, is in the best interests of all. It is important that ability be conserved and developed wherever it be found. It is assumed that all men can be educated and that every man can make some contribution to his own happiness and to the general welfare.

The state exists for the welfare of the individual, and not the individual for the welfare of the state. Democracy seeks to provide the opportunity for all the people to enjoy the highest values that modern life now affords to the most privileged. . . . Each person must receive the essentials necessary for a healthy body and an educated mind in so far as the ability of the society permits. Material security and independence are required for all. . . .

Two kinds of equality are involved in democracy. Strict equality is limited to certain fundamentals, as equality before the law, equality at the ballot box, and equality in basic minimum ways of life. The second kind of equality has to do with aspirations and opportunity. Any individual should be able to aspire to any status or position on the basis of his personal merits. . . .

All individuals are to be considered as having equal rights to happiness. Each person deserves an education, suited to his needs and abilities, which is as good as any other person's. . . .

There can be no democracy without the guarantee of civil and religious liberty to every citizen. . . . Liberty does not mean doing what one pleases, but the individual's liberty should be limited only by considerations of the general welfare and the preservation of like liberty to others. . . .

A basic premise of democracy is that the great masses of men have an inalienable right to govern themselves. Government exists only to serve the people,
and the military authority must be subordinate to the civil authority. . . .

Democracy requires the fullest participation of the people in government, but this does not necessitate direct legislative action by the people nor does it reject the use of representative government. All citizens should have equal voice in the selection of those to whom political power is delegated. The highest good for all cannot come unless all participate in seeking it.

Rule is by majority decision, but the majority must always be restrained by respect for the rights of the minority. . . .

Issues which affect human welfare should be decided by reason, not by arbitrary authoritarian imposition. . . . Democracy is based on the principle that the best source of knowledge and wisdom to guide collective action is the pooled experience of all the people. . . .

Democracy requires that the individual be as conscious of his duties as he is jealous of his rights, for all rights imply obligations. The responsibilities of citizenship are among the highest duties of man, and it is the duty of all to participate in the governing process. . . .

The democratic citizen . . . keeps an open mind to the opinions of others; he is willing to face the truth in his own thinking. . . . He is sensitive to the lot of others, and bases his action on mutual recognition of rights.28

Adams has pointed out that most people find it relatively easy to detect aggressive foes from without who are deliberately attempting to wreck the democratic concepts of life that have grown into the American way of life. These foes are zealously attacked, driven out, or suppressed, the American people rallying spontaneously to the defense of democratic principles. But there are other and less obvious foes of democracy present within our own borders, and they thrive on the indifference of the people who

28 ibid., pp. 65-69.
believe that danger to the American way of life lies only from without. These inner enemies we tend to tolerate because they appear not wholly bad and often they seem quite plausible. Adams lists as the first of these insidious foes to human freedom

stubborn conservatism which refuses to change things even when they stand most patently in need of change. It is a self-defeating conservatism, for it invariably leads to the destruction of those very values which it would conserve. History should teach us once and for all that change will come as surely as tomorrow, and that ours is the task of directing it to profitable ends -- not the impossible task of avoiding it altogether.29

Perhaps the greatest foe of democracy is our own indifference to abuses which arise within it. The growth of monopolistic power is one of these abuses. Such power has always been the foe of freedom, even while presenting itself as a doer of good deeds. When it grows too strong in the economic realm it must be controlled by government. When it grows too strong in the political realm it must be controlled by an alert electorate. The instruments which are used to overcome one tyranny can themselves become tyrannous unless kept from it by a vigilant people jealous of their freedom. Indifference is an open invitation to the abuse of power.30

A sterile conservatism and a paralyzing indifference join hands with a third foe of democracy -- intolerance. That the will of the majority should find expression is the very essence of democracy, yet our forefathers wisely provided for the protection of minority rights so far as they can be protected by law. But the spirit of democracy must transcend all legalism if it is to remain a positive force. We must become enthusiastic not only about democratic values, but about the means of preserving them. Among the greatest of these values is the respect for the rights of others, even when they represent a small minority. The tyranny of great crowds can be quite as malicious as the tyranny of a few people.31

29Eugene T. Adams et al., op. cit., p. 263.
30Ibid.
31Ibid., p. 264.
Democracy is a system of freedom by which men can change their rulers and their laws when the majority agrees on what is best to be done. All the Democracies now at work in the world are also capitalistic countries. In a country which is both democratic in government and capitalistic in its economic system, a good deal of freedom is allowed to men's business and industrial actions as well as in politics.\textsuperscript{32}

American democracy . . . is in grave peril today. Though the superstructure may appear to be sound, the foundations are far more precarious than the ordinary citizen realizes. Sapping operations have been going on uninterruptedly for such a long period that the collapse of the entire building might possibly occur in the not distant future.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{32}Lyman Bryson, \textit{Which Way America?} pp. 5-6.

\textsuperscript{33}Counts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 77.
CHAPTER III

DEMOCRACY IN THE POLITICAL REALM

It is obvious that democratic principles cannot be confined to any one phase of life, but that true democracy functions at every turn of the way -- in politics, in economics, in social life, in education, and in every other conceivable sphere of human relations. Perhaps, however, there is some justification in the belief that unless the political order of a nation is democratic, no other phase of the public life of that nation can be democratic. The political sphere is regarded more or less as the fundamental one in society, since it is the one which legislates and thus creates the framework for the entire society.

It has been said that the most important political changes in the nation which have occurred since 1900 have been concerned with concepts and interpretations of what we call democracy. They have been, for the most part, the results of a struggle or conflict between democracy and ideas or concepts which are contrary or hostile to democracy.¹

So fundamentally democratic, in theory at least, has America become that Marxian ideas have to disguise themselves in order to win support from the populace of the nation. The ideals of democracy are so deeply imbedded that Americans will tolerate no open threats to their continuance in popular favor. This is a commendable thing; but one weakness of the matter is that Americans are prone to believe that any new ism cloaked in the outer garments of democracy is democratic all the way through. They do not realize that wolves sometimes attire themselves in sheep's clothing, but remain wolves at heart. For this reason it is difficult to determine what is truly democratic and what is only masquerading in the cloak of democracy in order to gain acceptance before disclosing its true nature. In this way the political order has suffered many shocks from anti-democratic forces, and democracy in America has suffered accordingly from hidden encroachments that have seeped into the body politic and then have slowly and subtly changed democratic ideals into anti-democratic practices that at first did not appear at all bad.

In spite of its weaknesses, American democracy has at its command stronger resources for surviving world crisis than has the political setup of any other nation. But even in America there is a growing view that must be challenged --

---

2Eryson, op. cit., p. 106.
a view that "the institutions of political democracy are uniformly moribund and useless throughout the world."

Certainly there is no justification for this attitude of defeatism concerning American democracy. Though it admittedly has many shortcomings, it is worth defending and improving. It is not ready for the scrapheap until something better appears on the horizon to take its place — and nothing of this nature has yet made its appearance. Until it does, we shall continue our allegiance to the ideals of democracy and seek to make democracy more functional in all life relationships. Those who would abandon democratic procedures have to offer as substitutes the very regrettable and questionable occurrences that are only too prevalent today: civil war and dictatorships, rivers of blood, desolation, military "justice," secret police, arbitrary arrests, persecutions, individual and mass terror, intellectual slavery, and "the creation of a heritage of hatred and bitterness to corrupt the relations of men for generations." 3

Although the Convention of 1787 made elaborate provisions for keeping control of the three governmental branches out of the hands of the populace, the whole structure which it set up now lies in ruins, due to the growth of democratic principles along new lines. Meanwhile, national, state,

and local governments have come to accept as their prime responsibility the promotion and safeguarding of the public welfare. There is present an active interest in the promotion of health and education, public utilities, regulation of trade and commerce, improvement of working conditions, scientific inquiry and research, dissemination of useful knowledge, and many other functions which originally were not conceived as falling properly under the jurisdiction of government. Perhaps of greatest importance is the nation's system of public education, which has done much to destroy class monopoly of knowledge, which was in evidence before state-supported schools came into being. Recently federal and state governments have undertaken the relief of unemployment, the establishment of adequate old-age security plans, and the mitigation of many economic hazards. Thus it is seen that government exerts an influence upon all phases of American life, and is coming increasingly to do so -- with the purpose, of course, of promoting the general welfare of the masses.

At the present juncture in world affairs it seems that a considerable proportion of men and women have neither the desire nor the will to govern themselves. They prefer to prostrate both body and soul before a leader to whom they attach divine or quasi-divine attributes and to submerge their persons in a movement which they do not understand but which they hope will prove beneficent. In any country today, if circumstances should become favorable, it

\[4\text{Ibid.}, \ pp. \ 66-67.\]
would be possible to secure wide popular support for the overthrow of popular rule. The extraordinary careers of Huey Long and Father Coughlin, not to mention others, suggest that this could happen even in the greatest and most celebrated of the democracies. 5

American democracy has implied, in the course of its development, that the price of freedom in its true sense is a constant concern on the part of all for the maintenance of favorable policies and conditions for all. Also it has held that, in the long run, "self-government and good government are not opposed realities, but when intelligently conceived, are two aspects of the same reality." 6 Historically the fact has been established that good government is self-government.

Some countries which are not fundamentally democratic may practice many democratic principles in the course of administration and legislation. No country is absolutely autocratic, nor completely democratic. In every government there is an admixture of both principles, and the government is said to be either autocratic or democratic in accordance with which set of principles predominates in governmental functioning. "Democratic processes are present in any community in which the final word on matters of public policy rests with the many." 7

In no other nation has the concept of civil liberty

---

5 Ibid., p. 5. 6 Tead, op. cit., pp. 4-5.
7 Scott Nearing, Democracy Is Not Enough, p. 7.
risen to such high degree of popular acceptance as it has in the United States. In most respects England is as democratic as America, in some respects more so, but there civil liberty is not so arduously championed as in this country, for property and aristocratic qualifications and restrictions still curtail this particular phase of democracy. Supreme Court Justice Murphy has stated: "In my settled conviction the finest contribution which America has made to civilization is our loyalty to the idea of civil liberty."8

Here in America one has a perfect right to say what he wants to say, one has the privilege of expressing his own opinions. Freedom of oral expression, along with the other fundamental freedoms, is one of the guarantees of a liberal democracy.9

If every man can say what he pleases, we have a fair chance of getting at the truth. But where nobody can speak or write or print anything at all unless he agrees with the government, no one can ever know the whole story. You cannot compare the picture you get of the state of affairs in a country where every man can complain and have his say, with that you get of conditions in a country where only the government can declare what is the "truth."10

It is true that in the United States the freedom of individual citizens has inevitably limited itself by the rapid growth of government agencies, particularly during the past decade. A multiplicity of lawmaking bodies, huge

---

8Murphy, op. cit., p. 3. 9Heilman, op. cit., p. 83.

10Bryson, op. cit., p. 7.
numbers of laws and ordinances, and overlapping authority create inefficiency, resulting in poor public service and vast unnecessary public expense. At the same time the citizens come to feel that their liberties are being unnecessarily curtailed and that democratic principles are being ignored. Actually, the practices being questioned had been devised in the belief that, in the long run, they would work out for the welfare of the greatest number of persons, but this was difficult to believe in some instances when the apparently ridiculous regulations of the "alphabet" agencies of the depression and war years were encountered. In attempting to serve the interests of the largest number of people, the government inevitably restricted the liberties of certain individuals and groups, and even brought injury of one kind or another upon large numbers of people. Those who felt themselves unjustly injured or deprived of their "rights" often resorted to "black markets" to nullify the restrictions of the OPA on food, clothing, gasoline, and tires. Thus they lost respect for governmental regulations, failing to realize the necessity for undergoing personal inconvenience for the public good. They were not willing to accept the fact that any program of equalization demands that some should sacrifice in order that the general populace shall benefit.

11Everett, op. cit., p. 165.
Ours must be a people's century. It must involve the leadership not just of America and England, but of a democratic America and England. It must involve democracy now, and not at some future time, in our diplomacy and foreign policy. It must involve a democratic military force and organization of the armament industries. It must involve democracy now in regional agreements with Latin America. And it must involve finally a federation of nations in which, if we are leaders, we are leaders among equals, with their consent, pooling our resources of wealth and intellect and will with theirs.

Unless we can achieve a people's century for all nations, it will not have room in it for the democratic efforts and dreams that make us proud to be Americans.\(^\text{12}\)

It is difficult to understand how men and women can achieve a maximum degree of freedom when dominated by nationalistic ideas and nationalistic policies. In a world contracted by modern methods of communication and transportation there is no room for selfish nationalism. The nation that lives only for itself and seeks isolation from its neighbors is in danger of its own imminent death as a world power. No country today can be great enough not to need its neighbors.

America has developed an industrial system which is world-wide in scope, in which the prosperity and well-being of all -- of Americans as well as of all other peoples -- require a rapid, large-volume interchange of goods, along with world-wide peace and financial stability. In such a world, it is "nothing short of suicidal to perpetuate national isolation and imperialistic policies,\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\text{Lerner, op. cit., p. 57.}\)
with their accompanying retaliatory tariff barriers, impossible government debts, nationalistic monetary manipulation, and huge national armaments."\(^{13}\)

Another serious menace to democratic government is "uncontrolled partisan politics." A fanatical devotion to one's party, right or wrong, is as stupid as an uncompromising policy of nationalistic isolationism. Voters are often divided by grim antagonism to each other -- not for any real reason, except that one happens to belong to one party, while his neighbor is a member of another. Each regards the other as entirely wrong, stupid, and a menace to the social good. Each of the major parties usually makes a sweeping condemnation of everything the other party has done or stands for, not recognizing the stupidity of counting everything bad simply because one's political opponents happened to foster it. Thus in the South one often hears, to this good day, the Republicans blamed for the great depression of the 1920's and 1930's merely because they chanced to be in power then. Such attitudes give rise to intolerance, hatreds, and ignorance. In the heat of political campaigns, one is often amazed at the widespread loss of reason and the degree to which blind party loyalty prevails. It is foolish to believe that everything that one party has done or proposes to do is entirely bad, while what the other has done or proposes to

\(^{13}\)Everett, op. cit., p. 165.
do is wholly good. Certainly no group or party, politicians to the contrary notwithstanding, can have a monopoly on truth or goodness in government or politics.\textsuperscript{14}

No better evidence that political education is the first problem of the schools today could be found than the current discussions relative to the social functions and problems of education and the attempts of various groups in society to control social education through legislation and through various direct pressures on boards of control, administrators, and teachers. For twenty years now a controversy has raged over the problem of indoctrination. Teachers and administrators and the lay public are today preoccupied with the problem of social education. A vast literature on the subject is appearing in books and journals devoted to the consideration of the moral, social, economic, and political problems of the age. Political education, broadly interpreted, is the raison d'être of the public school. And this purpose was never more compelling nor more urgent than at the present time. It is a purpose that needs to be much more widely understood.\textsuperscript{15}

Communism, fascism, Nazism, and the other isms of the day possess more than a political or social theory—they are a definite way of life, and their philosophical influences color all phases of living, in home, society, and work. As compared with these points of view, democracy is somewhat lacking in definiteness of purpose, for it tends to "substitute sentimentalism about freedom and equality and the brotherhood of man for a clear-cut program of action."\textsuperscript{16} Here we revert to early statements in

\textsuperscript{14}Hardin, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 9-11.

\textsuperscript{15}Newlon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 93.

\textsuperscript{16}Bode, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 7-10; quotation from p. 9.
this paper to the effect that in theory and philosophy democracy is strong, whereas in practice it is weak. The isms which contend with democracy today for the loyalty of the people are not half-hearted, anemic philosophies; but they are aggressive concepts of a way of life, planned to dominate every activity of one's life. Until democracy becomes more functional in every area of life, it may continue to lose ground before the onslaught of these other ideologies which demand the whole-hearted allegiance of those who become converts. Democracy must become a vital challenge to man before he will give himself completely to it. And yet if democracy is to be a way of life, coloring all situations, it will become to some extent dictatorial, embodying the dictatorship of ideas. But this will not be objectionable, since the ideas are wholesome ones.

Countries having a dictatorship claim to be more efficient than the democracies, claiming that discipline makes men work harder than is the case in freedom. These nations likewise assert that dictatorships can more adequately organize for the perfection of national "plans." 17 On the surface these claims appear to possess validity, but it should be remembered that during the war years the United States and England did some good planning, too. When the

17Eryson, op. cit., p. 88.
people have the will to do so, there is no reason why democracies cannot do as efficient a job of organizing, administering, and executing public affairs as a country governed by force.

As was pointed out in the first chapter of this study, we tend to blame democracy for its failures and weaknesses; when, as a matter of fact, democracy within itself is not at all to blame. People should be blamed for their failure to apply democratic principles to all the situations of life, not democracy for its inability to meet these situations. Democracy possesses as much power and influence as those persons who comprise the nation are willing to accord it.

... instead of challenging democracy itself, let us challenge the evils which tend to undermine it. The evils which now confront and which threaten our nation do not indicate a failure of the spirit of democracy, but rather a failure of certain systems under which our government has been carried on. The first essential for a successful democracy is that it shall be a living, growing institution. Rigid fixity in a free government is not only undesirable but impossible. "To stand still is to retreat." Like everything else in evolution, government is an unfolding -- a perpetual struggle for right adjustment. The law of change can never be annulled by conservatism. The idea of evolution was a mental emancipation from what had been thought to be an unchangeable world order. We can never save democracy by anchorage. What is needed is the spirit to "sail on, and on, and on."18

18Hardin, op. cit., pp. 5-6.
CHAPTER IV

DEMOCRACY IN THE SOCIAL ORDER

"We must define democracy as that form of government and of society which is inspired above every other with the feeling and consciousness of the dignity of man,"¹ Thomas Mann has written. The dignity of man is a characteristic peculiarity primarily social in nature, for it is principally in his social relationships that man feels either a possession or a lack of dignity; though a consciousness of the dignity of man can become evident in political, economic, educational, and religious phases of life as well as in the social. But unless he is accorded dignity and worth by his associates in social relationships, man cannot possess it in any other sphere.

People tenaciously cling to the democratic and Christian ideal that the rich and the poor should have equal privileges and chances before the law. But in actual practice the courts are partial to the rich.² The favorable decision frequently goes to the one who has an impressive bank account, who is able to exert political

¹Mann, op. cit., p. 19.
²Everett, op. cit., p. 141.
influence, or who has prestige in the community. Though so-
ciety in a democracy is ideally classless, it is still
definitely dominated by the class which possesses power
and wealth.

Another phase of class division in American society
is noted with reference to minority groups in the community
or the nation at large. Though it is the democratic and
the Christian thing to do, most Americans make little ef-
fort to demonstrate tolerance toward and understanding of
such minority groups as Jews, Negroes, foreigners, and
Catholics.\(^3\) We make no concerted effort to assimilate such
groups into our social order, yet we are surprised and
indignant on those occasions when representatives of these
classes demonstrate anti-social behavior.

... no one can honestly claim that either the In-
dians or the Negroes of this country are free.
These are obvious examples of conditions which are
not compatible with the theory of Democracy. We
have poverty which enslaves, and racial prejudice
which does the same. There are other racial and
religious groups among us who labor under certain
discriminations, not quite so difficult as those
we impose on the Negroes and the Indians, but still
sufficient to show we do not completely practice the
Democratic way of life.\(^4\)

Woolf has asserted that one who believes in democracy
must necessarily believe also in equality; for all democrats,
in one sense or another, believe in equality, and this

\(^3\) Bode, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 90.

\(^4\) Eleanor Roosevelt, \textit{The Moral Basis of Democracy},
p. 48.
belief has produced far-reaching social and political changes in recent years.

The democrat does not say that all men are or ought to be equal in every possible way. He says that for certain political and social purposes everyone ought to be treated as equal. For purposes of government and the organization of society, people ought not to be treated as members of particular classes but simply as individuals. If you treat people as members of classes, you must treat them as unequal; if you treat them as individuals, you treat them as all equal.5

Though a new aristocracy of wealth and prestige, in some respects one of the most powerful in history, has emerged in America, we perceive that democracy in ordinary social relationships remains fairly characteristic of the masses. In comparison with other nations, the people of America place little emphasis upon ancestry, family, and social position, still being inclined, as in pioneer days, to judge a person by his own powers and achievements. Yet strong caste feelings are emerging: wealth vs. poverty, employer vs. employee, power vs. impotence, education vs. ignorance, and so on. Yet, at the same time, personal independence is giving way to interdependence, so that the individual is no longer able to supply his own wants and needs, which have continued to grow more complex and varied. Perhaps this knowledge of interdependence will in time soften the barriers that now divide American society into classes

---

and castes. With the growth of industry, the land of opportunity for the poor became a land of security for the rich. Often the poor are held at the mercy of the rich.\(^6\)

The doctrine of democracy is not one of leveling down primarily, but of building up to a minimum level, and of cultivating the possibilities in all ways of life. It discards traditional status and emphasizes creative capacity or dynamic ability. Far from crushing out talent, democracy may place the highest premium upon it and strike at all artificial limitations.\(^7\)

In society as a whole, the present crying need is to develop and put into practice a social theory which is in accord with the cherished American ideals, and in harmony with the conditions of modern industrial life. This would necessitate a general knowledge of the important facts which influence society, sensing the trends, seeing the movements, holding intelligent opinions regarding the desirable directions which these movements should take, and contributing such action as would appear necessary to further these movements for the social good. "The development and practice of a social theory is a most important responsibility of educators. In a measure, it includes all others."\(^8\)

Thus the school is seen as a fundamental factor in the development of a wholesome social attitude in America. Perhaps only through the schools can such an attitude be instilled.


\(^8\)Everett, op. cit., p. 13.
Democracy maintains that the highest development of personality is the result of active membership and participation in a democratic society. Democracy is able to reconcile the obviously conflicting demands between society and the individual by conceiving them as servants of each other. "The fullest expression of the individual is to be found in a society that has been formed for the sole purpose of promoting the best interests of its members considered individually and collectively."^9

When a boy or a girl in school refuses to salute the American flag, much concern is manifest everywhere, and public indignation mounts high. But little concern is expressed in society regarding questionable or frankly evil practices in business, politics, and social life which silently shape the public opinions and the private ideals of boys and girls. These are the things which really matter, but they go virtually unnoticed.

... the only way to create a healthy and constructive public opinion is to provide a moral, ethical and civic education for all the citizens. Such education must come through example as well as precept. It is idle to prevail upon citizens to love their country and work for the public welfare, and at the same time show by example a spirit of human exploitation. A sound and constructive public opinion is incompatible with a spirit of human exploitation in business, and unjust economic conditions.^10

---

^9 Arthur D. Hollingshead, Guidance in Democratic Living, p. 28.

^10 Hardin, op. cit., p. 141.
Most people in America, Woolf has stated, think that they should be permitted to do what they want to do; but they are not so ready to accord to other people the same privilege of doing what they would like to do. This unwillingness to see the other fellow assume the rights and privileges which one demands for himself is "the terrific political question which was raised by democracy and has caused some of the greatest commotions and changes in the last 150 years." People often refer to democracy as though it were a material thing, something which one can pick up and put in his pocket, or something like a telephone service or a broadcasting system which can be installed in a country in a few weeks or a few months if the people decide that they want to have it. But democracy is nothing like that: "It is really a way of looking at things, a political and social ideal, the ideas that people have of the kind of government they want, the kind of country or society or civilization they want to live in."\textsuperscript{11}

Eode has stated that "the primary obligation of a democratic community to its members is to provide for each the opportunity to share in the common life according to interest and capacity."\textsuperscript{12} Thus democracy takes into account the existence of individual differences in ability, temperament, interests, and ideals.

\textsuperscript{11} Woolf, "Liberty," in Mary Adams, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{12} Eode, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 80.
CHAPTER V

DEMOCRACY IN THE ECONOMIC ORDER

The eminent educator, Counts, has stated that "the supreme task facing the American people today is the rebuilding of the economic foundations of their democracy," and that the American nation "cannot remain indefinitely half democratic and half aristocratic: the one principle or the other will eventually triumph."¹ The situation here is well stated -- as a nation America is half democratic and half aristocratic, though it appears that the aristocratic element is steadily growing in power and influence with the continued advancement of industrial progress and the constant accumulation of vast fortunes from business and industrial enterprises.

Perhaps there are more anti-democratic or non-democratic tendencies in the economic order than in any other phase of public life. It is extremely difficult for labor and capital to work harmoniously together on any plan which would assure the mutual interest of both groups and of society at large. Each has become so strong and so selfish that it tends to consider only its own interests, refusing

¹Counts, op. cit., pp. 75, 78.
to go halfway in reaching an impartial settlement of disputes. Concessions are expected from the other side, but one's own group is not to concede anything. The result of this situation is two powerful groups possessing divergent interests, each an aristocracy within itself, and each refusing to sacrifice, except under pressure, any of its own interests for the general welfare of the total society.

Democracy in industry has become a farce, and even collective bargaining no longer accomplishes the purposes for which it was originated. Today in industrial disputes between capital and labor there is little evidence that collective bargaining functions at all except in name, for the actual situation consists of a tilt between two equally strong opponents, both of which growl at each other while waiting to see which will weaken first.

The complicated organization of the economic order in the nation has nullified one of the fundamental concepts of democracy -- that everyone should possess equal opportunities to earn a livelihood and to achieve a certain degree of success in life, and that no one should be in want of the necessities of human existence. "Freedom requires that human needs be satisfied. It requires that an economy of plenty be substituted for an economy of scarcity." Yet one is appalled when one considers the vast numbers of

---

2Everett, op. cit., p. 162.
people in America who are hungry, ill-clad, poorly housed, and lacking in medical care and in the simplest pleasures and luxuries of life. Granted that many of these poverty-stricken citizens are just "no-account" and are in their present condition simply because of indolence, we yet must face the fact that there are untold millions of others who have not had a square deal in life and who have been mercilessly submerged by an economic order with which they were unable to compete in the earning of a satisfactory livelihood.

We in America have long clung to the idea of an economy of scarcity, believing that only in this way can prices be maintained at a level which will make it worth-while for industry to produce. But we are slowly coming to realize that this concept must be transformed into an economy of abundance to provide the essentials of life in adequate quantities to all the people. This will naturally reduce the profit on individual items, but the volume of goods demanded by consumers and produced by industry will be much greater, and will thus compensate for any reduction of profit on individual products. The profit motive must be put aside as of secondary importance, and must be superseded by the idea that the general welfare of the populace as a whole is of supreme importance. Until this change in attitude is prevalent, there can be little democracy in the
economic order, which now defers to the doctrine that goods and services are reserved for those who can pay high prices for them.

Normally, throughout the centuries, except when intermittently class greed went off its head, the difference between demand and supply was unavoidable. . . . the people had relatively little, but they had all there was. Until recently, the common man had been reaching out for the unattainable. Today he is reaching out for the attainable. Until a generation or two ago, he was the victim of natural and unavoidable scarcity. Today, he is the victim of unnatural and avoidable scarcity. He can no longer take comfort from the fact that, whatever his plight may be, at any rate it cannot be bettered. Today, he can go mad in the knowledge that all this want and unemployment of the present century need never have been.3

In comparatively recent times, particularly in the past half-century, there has come about a radical transformation in the processes of production of goods for human consumption. The role of human labor, once all-important, has been reduced to relative insignificance by the development of machines which can produce, under a minimum of human supervision, much better goods in a far greater abundance than was possible before the Industrial Revolution. Though it was regarded in the beginning as a freak, the machine has steadily advanced until it has claimed for its own practically all of industry. It has brought with it not only great blessings but the curse of unemployment with all its accompanying sufferings and

3W. D. Herridge, Which Kind of Revolution? p. 11.
tragedies. The Industrial Revolution created strata in economic society -- those who owned the machines, and those who operated them. Another result of the machine age was the shrinkage of rural population and the vast increase of urban society, resulting in economic interdependence.

Conditions in the industrial communities became deplorable as people flocked in more rapidly than they could be adequately assimilated into the population. Consequently, slums developed, working conditions became unhealthy, and wages were lowered as the numbers became greater than the available jobs. Whereas in the old-time agrarian society there had been at best only a few simple occupations in which the men of the family could engage, while the women made the family clothing, industry gave birth, almost overnight, to thousands of distinct occupations. Eventually the economic and industrial order became so complex that labor and capital began to regard themselves as each other's enemies, and the tyranny of labor bosses and the autocratic dominance of labor unions came to characterize the industrial scene. 4

Some two generations ago scientific progress enabled production to overtake the demands of consumption. Potential supply rose to meet human requirements and desires. But democracy blundered; leaders sought to neutralize the

---

4Counts, op. cit., pp. 43-45.
benefits of increased production by deliberately conceiving and scientifically devising restraints upon production. The aim of this scheme was not to make production work for the maximum public good, but to restrict production to the level of the maximum private gain. Not only in industry was this plan followed, but even in agriculture, where acreages were curtailed, crops were burned to get rid of so-called "surpluses," and "surplus" livestock was slaughtered. All this happened while millions were unemployed, and millions were hungry, even in America, without considering the dire want existing in other countries.

Yet, while we deplore these unfortunate conditions, we recognize that a return to the individualistic economy is now impracticable, just as much as would be a return to "horse-and-buggy" days in transportation. The entire population has come to depend more or less upon the new means of industrial production and distribution. If democracy in the economic order cannot be preserved or revived by a return to the old system, then it follows that

broadly speaking, some form of collective oversight, management, and even ownership of the necessarily large holdings is the only recourse. Otherwise economic power drifts into the hands of a small class, the many become dependent on the few for their livelihood, the dual spirit of arrogance and servility arises, and genuine democracy fades away.  

---

5Herridge, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

6Counts, op. cit., p. 65.
The contemporary human struggles all over the world are rooted in economics. Everywhere political situations seem to grow out of economic situations. Both in domestic and in international relations, men struggle bitterly for economic advantage. Nations engage in continuous warfare, sometimes through diplomacy, again through armed conflict, for markets, raw materials, concessions, spheres of influence, colonies, and outlets for supplies produced by industry as well as for surplus population; while at home economic classes are in perpetual conflict, by negotiation or strike or lockout, over the distribution of the world's goods. "One of the truly terrifying phenomena of the present age is the apparent readiness with which men and women exchange political rights and privileges won through blood and tears for mere promises of economic guarantees."  

Our present situation, our present difficulties arise from the fact that in the development of civilization we have neglected to remember that the rights of all people to some property are inviolate. We have allowed a situation to arise where many people are debased by poverty or the accident of race, in our own country, and therefore have no stake in Democracy; while others appeal to this old rule of the sacredness of property rights to retain in the hands of a limited number the fruits of the labor of many.  

Counts has pointed out that the simple and obvious fact is that the present dangers to free institutions can

---

7 Ibid., p. 79.
8 Roosevelt, op. cit., pp. 42-43.
be traced in large part to developments in the economic order; he is certain that if the industrial system had not become so complex, democracy would have continued to function in the same simple and direct and unimpeded manner in which it was originally conceived by the American fathers. Counts refers to Aristotle's statement, written some two thousand years ago: "When the rich grow numerous or properties increase, the form of government changes into an oligarchy or a government of families."  

American citizens may as well face the fact that real democracy in government is impossible so long as individuals or corporations stand ready to bribe lawmakers, either directly or by means of retaining fees for services performed or about to be performed. Another menace to democratic government is the threat often made by large organizations to recall legislators unless they work for the passage of legislation for the special benefit of the organizations. Thus business, with its wealth and influence, has entered the realm of politics and is able to some extent to shape legislation according to its own interests by bribery or by developing "proper" public opinion.

It is common knowledge that many who are opposed to governmental regulation in business are the ones who have been instrumental, directly or by lobbying, in bringing

---

9Counts, op. cit., p. 77.
about excessive tariffs and other regulations which have brought them large and unjust profits. "A government that becomes the instrument for promoting the economic interests of certain groups of individuals rather than the general welfare of all its citizens is in no sense democratic, and is doomed to failure."\textsuperscript{10}

Under the system of freedom of competition, a premium is offered for efficiency, therefore capital, labor, and the public at large are the ones who should profit from better products. Employer competes with employer to secure and hold workers, who in turn compete with each other to raise their own standards of efficiency. It is believed that competition, regulated and not allowed to become excessive or unscrupulous, guarantees justice and the economic welfare of all.\textsuperscript{11} At the same time, retaliatory high tariffs limit markets and trade. Governmental debts and imperialistic monetary policies destroy confidence and world-wide credit relationships. The existence of huge armaments creates suspicion, destroys confidence, depletes national treasuries, and leads to disastrous wars.\textsuperscript{12}

The belief that success in an economic way is the result of hard work and thrift is giving way to the belief that work and saving do little to protect one against fluctuating monetary values, bank failure, and severe

\textsuperscript{10}\textsuperscript{10}Hardin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{11}\textsuperscript{11}Everett, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{12}\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 165.
economic depressions, which make years of hard work and saving futile.\textsuperscript{13} But the government has recently taken commendable steps to assure that the American people will not again suffer so severely from economic upheavals and reverses. Governmental efforts to prevent excessive inflation following the war, the government's policy of selling defense bonds to the populace, and the legislation safeguarding individual deposits in banks are among the most important economic measures sponsored by the government during the present century to date.

English-speaking Democracy does not deny its people effective freedom. It has failed to give them the full employment of their resources. . . .

Full employment of resources means the careful, equitable and unhampered use of all that we have. It is the utilization of all material wealth right up to the level fixed either by the exhaustion of that wealth or by the satisfaction of the people's needs. It is total use. We cannot use more than we have and we should not use more than we need. But within these limits, no concept, rule or practice should have the right or power to deny the people the full enjoyment of their heritage.

Until there is total use of our material resources, there cannot be total use of our spiritual and intellectual resources.\textsuperscript{14}

The terms democracy and private enterprise do not mean the same thing; but, if we think of private enterprises as being competitive, one cannot exist without the other. . . . Private enterprise is based upon the institution of private property. If the people do not respect private property, a democracy cannot prosper; for without protection people will not stint themselves in order to save the capital necessary to operate

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 176.

\textsuperscript{14}Herridge, op. cit., p. 3.
the enterprises. A democracy, in order to build up private enterprises and maintain itself, must protect private property.\textsuperscript{15}

Yet, while private property must be protected and the operation of industrial enterprises encouraged, it is also necessary to make it possible for the common man to enjoy security: "Unless we can solve the problem of economic security for the common man, we can have no hope for the continuation of democracy in the United States."\textsuperscript{16} If democracy cannot give the masses a feeling of security, they will turn to some other ideology in the hope of finding it there, just as the Germans turned to Nazism, the Italians to fascism, and the Russians to Communism. Democracy must bring security for all, not just for the favored ones in the economic order.

Some startling figures were released by the Brookings Institution concerning the incomes of American families for the prosperous year of 1929. During that peak in economic prosperity, the Brookings survey showed, 11,653,000 families in the nation earned less than $1,500 each and had a total combined income of about ten billion dollars. At the same time, 36,000 families whose individual family income exceeded $75,000 had an aggregate income of 9.8 billions of dollars. Thus, 0.1 per cent of the American families -- those at the top of the economic ladder --


\textsuperscript{16}Newlon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33.
received virtually as much income as forty-two per cent of the families whose income placed them at the bottom of the scale. 17

Unless democracy can restore economic security to the people, unless productive processes can be made to serve the interests of all, democracy is done for. The struggle is no longer primarily for political rights for the individual but for economic security. Wherever the forces of reaction and of economic privilege are victorious, the political rights of the individual are destroyed. 18

It is unfortunate that, in the present attitude toward society and economics, "democracy may be tolerated or welcomed as long as it leaves the domination of industry to a few, but repudiated when it begins a process of social control." 19 Despite strong opposition that is sure to come from those whose interests would be somewhat upset, democracy must be given greater freedom to operate in the economic order in order to assure that all persons may share in the blessings of life that come from modern methods of production and distribution. The selfish interests of certain groups cannot be permitted to keep in want great portions of the population who, under a democracy, should have their share of the economy of abundance which must be ushered in if democracy in America is to survive.

17 Counts, op. cit., p. 50.
18 Newlon, op. cit., p. 35.
CHAPTER VI

DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION

As long as the educational system continues to be the principal means whereby the culture of society is transmitted to the younger generation, and the chief technique for shaping the ideas, ideals, attitudes, and opinions of the young, education will remain one of the most vital factors in the development of a democratic society. In fact, it is questionable whether we can have a democratic society unless our educational system is democratic.

Countless books and articles have been written dealing with democracy in the schools, and we have long prided ourselves on the fact that we plan our educational techniques in such a way that democratic principles are fostered. This is true, and yet even in education there are weaknesses in the approach to democracy, some of which will be mentioned in this discussion. In education, as in other phases of American life, there remains the danger that much talking is done about democracy, but little practical application of democratic principles in life is made.

The school and its program must at all times be in touch with the growth of attitudes among the people, and
with the social, economic, and political progress of society. Needs of the people must be recognized and gauged by the school, which must then shape its curriculum in such a manner as to include materials and experiences whereby the children may find solutions to their needs and satisfactions for their interests. "Educators cannot at any time maintain a neutral attitude toward the needs of society."¹ In former days education remained somewhat aloof from current life of the people, and pupils were taught that which was in the books, not what was in the world about them; nor were they informed as to how the information gleaned from books could be utilized in explaining or modifying their environment. Education in those days was not recognized as life; it was books and rote learning. As a consequence, youth grew into adulthood with book learning but with little mental equipment for meeting the problems of life. Everyone had to learn the same material in the same way, and education was a stereotyped thing.

Now, education has come to mean a vital phase of life for each individual pupil; each child is recognized as being different from every other child in temperament and ability and interests, and the educational system is geared to fit his individuality as far as possible, so that all products of the school will not be stereotyped like machine-made

¹Everett, op. cit., p. 15.
products, but each will retain his individuality, which has been enriched and encouraged by an educational plan adjusted somewhat to his needs and temperament.

"In our own time school curricula have become widely diversified because of the diverse needs of various classes of people." Yet there remains much to be done before our school system will be truly democratic.

In recent years the world has seen what can be done in a single generation in developing anti-democratic attitudes throughout a great nation by means of antagonism to democracy as advocated and emphasized in the schools of Germany and Italy and Japan. It is for the United States to prove to the world what can be done to uphold democracy through a vital democratic experience in the school systems of the land.

In theory the American schools are democratic, as they are in philosophy. But in practice there is still much to be desired in the development of true democracy. The school which fails to provide practice in the activities of democratic citizenship fails in performing its full duty and neglects to emphasize the vital importance of democratic living in all situations, even in the schoolroom. Many schools continue to teach and talk about how a democratic

---

²Eugene T. Adams et al., op. cit., p. 194.

society functions, and what will be the child's responsibilities in such a society when he has achieved adulthood, but at the same time no effort is made to set up a democratic society within the schoolroom or the school to provide the youth with opportunities to learn now, in actual experience, some of the functions of democratic citizenship.

The schools should do more to emphasize what the community and the individual owe to each other, and what individuals owe to each other in society. Early in life children should come to realize that citizenship in a democracy implies the assumption of individual responsibilities and not merely the receiving of benefits from society. In fact, they need to learn that benefits come to them and to others because they themselves have assumed a role in the ongoing program of society. Benefits in a democracy come through participation, not through absorption.

Bode has said that "the school is peculiarly the institution in which democracy becomes conscious of itself." On the other hand, if the schools are indifferent in the presentation of the social challenge of democracy, they can become the institution in which youth are lost forever to a democratic way of life.

Counts has said that in order to prepare men and women to defend their freedom in the present age, the schools

---

4Bode, op. cit., p. 80.  
5Ibid., p. 95.
should provide knowledge under eight headings:

1. The nature and history of man.
2. The story of American democracy.
3. The rise of industrial civilization.
4. The present structure of American society.
5. Contradictions and conflicts in the contemporary world.
6. Social ideas, philosophies, and programs now in competition in the world.
7. Agencies and methods of propaganda now in use.
8. Purposes and potentialities of American democracy.\(^6\)

Counts recognizes, however, that the mere acquisition of these learnings will be wholly inadequate in preparing young people for membership in democratic society. He, too, is an advocate of putting into practice in the school the democratic principles which operate in society. He points out that even the "most ideal school life" is an "entirely inadequate preparation" for effective citizenship and participation in an industrial democracy. Only in community participation can the pupil learn, by experience, what cooperative effort and citizenship in a community mean. The pupil should be encouraged to set up his own community group in the school, but more than that, he should go out into the adult community and learn about its functioning.

---

He should learn about local government through actual visits to government offices and conferences with officials; he should learn about business and industry and the professions through actual experience in contact with these phases of life, even working for awhile in the places of business and under the tutelage of business men, industrialists, and professional men, learning all he can about each line of work, thus enabling him to make an effective and intelligent choice regarding his own life-work. Many schools in recent years have undertaken to get their students out into all the functional institutions of community life in order to acquaint them with the world of which they soon will become a part. Along with this procedure, some portion of the community can be brought into the school by setting up a school government and community patterned after the adult ones. Also, much benefit may be derived by having regular discussions led in the school by officials, business men, and professional men of the community, each of whom attempts to clarify the underlying and fundamental responsibilities of his own field in the community.7

... education must make provision for the application of social theory to conduct if it is to escape from futility and frustration. Teaching democracy in the abstract is on a par with teaching swimming by correspondence.8

Too often, even today, the schools attempt to develop citizens ready for assuming their roles in a democratic

7Ibid., pp. 323-324. 8Bode, op. cit., p. 75.
society merely by exposing them to the theory of democracy and to books describing the work of institutions and of individuals in society, without giving them any practical guidance and experience in functioning, while in school, in a democracy of their own, or in learning early to fill their respective niches in the adult society.

Effective education for democracy involves three essentials: intellectual understanding of the meaning of democracy, emotional devotion to its principles, and practice in its techniques. In the long run none of these can be effective without the other two. And basic to all three is a clarification of the meaning of democracy. For how can teachers develop in their pupils an understanding of and loyalty to the fundamental principles of democracy and provide for their pupils opportunities to practice its techniques unless these teachers are clear in their own minds as to what these fundamental principles and techniques are?

Teachers who have the courage to teach fearlessly are also required for the effective operation of the program. In the past democracy has been presented too much as an abstract concept. If education for democracy is to be successful, the abstract principles must be translated into concrete applications. The implications of the democratic theory must be boldly pointed out, even though this may not always be popular with some members of the community. Does democracy imply economic equality? Does it have implications for equal educational opportunities? Dare the school raise these issues? A forthright study of the practical implications of democracy may prove dangerous to the teacher's place in the good graces of some people, but, as Friggs has often argued, aside from the elements of learning, most of the education that is not dangerous is not really important.  

In the past few years American education has witnessed a remarkable increase in emphasis upon education for democracy. On every hand we see a flood of books, magazine

---

articles, editorials, pamphlets, radio programs, and public forums dealing with democracy in one way or another. Most of these discussions are founded in the belief that the schools should attempt to develop individuals who are prepared to live in a democracy and who have within them a deep-rooted loyalty to the principles and institutions of a democratic society.\textsuperscript{10}

Foundational training and experience in social attitudes, dispositions, and powers should be provided for the youth of the land in the organization and conduct of life within the school. The principles and values of democracy must be made functional in the relations of pupils with one another, of pupils with teachers, of teachers with supervisors and administrators,

through the sharing of decisions in government, the recognition of the worth of the individual, the propagation of a pervasive spirit of equality and brotherhood. The imperatives of industrial society should be expressed in the softening of the more narrow egoistic impulses and the placing of emphasis on group and cooperative activity, ideas, and sentiments.\textsuperscript{11}

One of the outstanding weaknesses of the American educational system is that it puts a "terminal point" to study at the time of graduation, as if education ended or could be made to end with the completion of a formal course of study or with the receiving of a diploma. Actually, at this point, education is just beginning. One has received

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 1. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{11}Counts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 323.
in school some practical information as to how to read and study and learn, and how to evaluate what he learns, so that in adult life he is prepared to continue his education along lines most interesting or useful to him. "If the formulas of education close the chapter with graduation of one sort or another, minds are shut down at the very time when they might be opened out."\(^{12}\) To some extent this condition is being remedied by the development of worth-while and practical programs of adult education sponsored by the schools and by community enterprises. Rural citizens have the advantages of the home demonstration and agricultural programs, while urban dwellers have access in many instances to a diversified adult curriculum as that offered to their children in the regular day school. Unfortunately, this program is now reaching only a small proportion of the adult population. Some of the most effective learning that one can do as an adult, however, does not come through an organized program of adult education, but through one's own volition. After finishing school, he has opportunity to read the books he really wants to read and to learn information that he needs or wants to know; but how often he says, upon graduation, that he will never read another book so long as he lives!

\[\text{\footnotesize \(^{12}\)Merriam, The New Democracy and the New Despotism, p. 96.}\]
curriculum, the adult too often chooses to have no curriculum of learning whatsoever.

In fostering the program of adult education, all economic and social barriers to higher education should be removed, thus causing education to be no longer the badge of aristocracy, which it has long continued to be. Making higher education available to all, regardless of social or economic status, would repudiate a centuries-old tradition to the effect that only those able to pay for it should have a good education. Numerous studies and observations have demonstrated that in the United States the advantages of college and university education are denied to a great percentage of the population because of financial requirements. A large majority of the ablest young men and women are prevented from enrolling in schools of higher learning, while many of mediocre powers, because of their financial resources, are found even in graduate schools.\footnote{Counts, op. cit., pp. 338-340.}

Universal education is a prime requirement if democracy is to work well. When everyone votes, it is important that everyone have enough knowledge to vote as wisely as possible. \ldots Abuses that thrive on ignorance can be dispelled only by knowledge, a knowledge whose sources and guardian is a school system that reaches out to everyone able and willing to learn.\footnote{Eugene T. Adams et al., op. cit., p. 5.}

Education can help to clarify the nature and goals of democracy. It can portray the American dream of a nation with liberty, justice, and opportunity for all in the broad sweep of history from the
time of the nation's founders. It can promote understandings of the civil liberties and the political institutions through which the democratic ideal finds expression. It can focus the searchlight of free and constructive inquiry on those economic and social problems, which, if allowed to remain unsolved, threaten to disintegrate democracy from within. It can confirm that faith in the worth and improbability of each individual which is the basic tenet of democracy. It can provide opportunities to live democracy, in the school and the home, in the work-shop and the market place. Slogans, rituals, and appeals to emotion are not enough. Knowledge, reflection, and the master teacher, experience, are essential to moral defense. 15

At the same time, a democratic social order does not undertake to prescribe beliefs, but it certainly cannot ignore the duty of providing assistance in this matter to its members. It should definitely indicate what beliefs and attitudes are compatible with the true democratic spirit, and which are antagonistic to democracy, so that citizens may make their own choices. If society does not provide such guidance as this, it neither considers the individual development of its citizens nor the maintenance of its own security. 16

Children often become disillusioned and maladjusted in their school experiences because their educational training fails to deal with realities and to give them a basis for intelligent judgment and evaluation of attitudes and behavior. Many, as a result, become unhappy in their social

16 Bode, op. cit., p. 61.
relationships and may become contemptuous of our national ideals.\textsuperscript{17}

Education has the responsibility to demonstrate as well as to teach that the enjoyment of civil liberties places obligations upon the citizen to exercise these liberties under principles of good-will, fairness, and devotion to the common welfare. The man who abuses his liberties for malevolent, unjust, or selfish ends jeopardizes the civil rights of all citizens.\textsuperscript{18}

Unfortunately, American education has not yet devolved a continuous program of education for democracy based upon clearly defined ideals and concepts. Educators have been content to take democracy for granted and apparently to assume that men are born with an inherent understanding of democratic principles, and will put them into practice without having any particular emphasis placed upon them. But the democratic way of life cannot be biologically transmitted -- it must be learned anew by each generation. "If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, continuous reinterpretation and education are the price of successful functioning of the democratic process."\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17}Everett, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{18}Educational Policies Commission, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{19}Beery, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 9.
Education is dependent on democracy, and democracy is dependent on education. The future of democracy and the future of education are inseparable. Democracy is education and education is democracy. If the American schools fail democracy in the great crisis that now confronts it, all will be lost. For the second time in our history education must be redirected and refashioned in order that it may effectively serve democracy in the new social order that is emerging, may become a constructive force in determining the shape of this new society. This is the challenge of our age to the educator. There is no time to lose.\textsuperscript{20}

Counts, in a comprehensive study of boards of education in the United States, discovered that, in the main, they are composed of persons who by association and interest represent the economic aristocracy of the communities in which they serve. With such persons in control of the schools, there is small probability that education will foster a vigorous program in defense of democratic values, for such a program would not be entirely compatible with the selfish interests of board members. A task of immediate urgency therefore is the creation of boards of education truly representative of the people.

\textsuperscript{20}Having no special privileges or vested interests to defend, the ordinary citizen is in a position to welcome and support a curriculum intended to promote the widest possible enlightenment with respect to social institutions and ideas.\textsuperscript{21}

That teachers have a significant role to play in the total progress and program of education for democracy is

\textsuperscript{20}Newlon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 230.

\textsuperscript{21}Counts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 308.
vividly depicted by Counts:

The teachers of the country should have a special interest in the future of democracy. Their derivation from the ranks of the people, their relatively disinterested position in society, their freedom from the ties of large properties, their devotion to the spread of knowledge, their tradition of loyalty to the popular welfare, and their whole outlook on life, tend to identify them overwhelmingly with the fortunes of the democratic process. Moreover, the experiences of the Old World demonstrate conclusively that they are among the first victims of the rule of modern dictators. A totalitarian regime, resting as it does on the propagation of myths and falsehoods, cannot survive under a condition of free inquiry and thought. Consequently, once it has overcome its adversaries by machine gun and radio, it proceeds to a ruthless regimentation of the entire intellectual class, giving particular attention to all who have any responsibility for informing and molding the minds of the young. The teacher, if he would retain his position, is required to be a soldier in the ranks, to surrender his individuality, to make obedience his highest virtue -- to teach doctrines he may not believe, to affirm as true today what was false yesterday, to applaud that which he detests, to make the ugly appear beautiful, to live a life of hypocrisy, to crucify his own soul. He is asked to spy upon his colleagues and pupils, only to be spied upon by them in turn. He is compelled to violate the finest traditions of his calling and to become the slave of a demagogue, a party, or a body of social doctrine.

...............

Teachers must ... be perpetually on the alert to detect, expose, and thwart, in so far as they are able, every attempt by any minority, however powerful and respectable, to dictate the program of the school. ... Teachers must always insist that the educational program be conceived and administered in terms of the general and unfolding interests of the American people. It is perhaps needless to add that whatever the vehicle or instrument, the only genuine danger today comes from concentrated power -- from the aristocracy of wealth and privilege.\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\textit{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 292-293, 310.}\)
On every hand, schools and teachers are now subjected to constant pressures by individuals and groups seeking to control education and to direct it in such a way that it will serve the interests of the persons or groups exerting the pressure. Efforts are often made to use the schools for the dissemination of propaganda in behalf of questionable social and moral reforms. 23

Equal educational opportunity for all citizens is still an unrealized goal, but America has done more than any other nation toward making her educational system universal in scope and democratic in practice. In the course of providing schools which would give equal opportunity to all, we have made many unique contributions to the theory of education. 24

---

23 Newlon, op. cit., p. 5.

24 Eugene T. Adams et al., op. cit., p. 181.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters of this study have been presented discussions of the ideals of democracy and the present status of democracy in the political order, in the economic realm, in the social order, and in education. It is the purpose of the present chapter to point out certain obvious conclusions resulting from the material reviewed in previous pages, and to substantiate these conclusions to some extent by reference to some of the works already cited.

It is obvious that democracy is today on trial in the world; and even in the United States, where it has held sway longer than in any other nation, there have risen various isms and conflicting ideologies to question the concepts of democracy which have long been adhered to by the American people. In America as well as in the world, contending forces of communism, fascism, and democracy are struggling for control of government and of human life; and each one is opposed to the other two. Bryan has vividly pointed out, "If you are an America, you are at the center of a battle. You are one of the prizes being fought for. Nearly all the world is engaged in this fight; every country
has a stake in it.\footnote{Bryson, op. cit., p. 1.} With the rise of an industrial society, the whole structure of life has changed from one of rural simplicity to one of urban complexity; and at the same time the simple democratic relationships of the frontier country became impossible. Society is divided into two vast camps -- the ones who own the tools of production, and those who operate these tools. Each of these groups feels that the other is an enemy, and each attempts to gain advantage of the other at every opportunity. Democracy in its true form cannot exist in such a situation.

However, in the face of recurring conflicts and in spite of the decrease of democracy and the increase of autocratic selfish interests as the predominant force in American society,

During three centuries people have demonstrated their capacity for self government and self improvement. Despite errors and shortcomings, they have won decisive victories over the privileged classes, made notable improvement in the social environment and broadened the outlook and opportunity of successive generations.\footnote{Nearing, op. cit., p. 11.}

The conclusion of the world war which closed in the summer of 1945 proved that the democratic nations engaged in the conflict had gained a significant victory over the autocratic powers. It is now for the democracies of the world to prove themselves worthy of having attained this victory. If the democracies throw away their triumph in
squabbling among themselves, or permit vested interests within their own borders to usurp unmerited powers over the populace, or fail to set up an effective educational system to foster true democracy among their own people and certainly in the nations where democracy has been submerged -- if these things should happen, democracy will have been retarded in the world instead of advanced by the outcome of the war.

... America must assume vastly increased responsibility for the defense of democracy and human freedom. The present generation must rise to the intellectual and moral stature of the men and women who founded the Republic. The age demands nothing less of them.3

The most enthusiastic champions of democracy in America would be the first to admit that the typically American combination of democracy and capitalism has never worked perfectly. They would say, also, that the setup in this country is not necessarily the ideal one -- it has too many recognized evils to be ideal. But so long as the evils and shortcomings are recognized, and so long as some effort is consciously made to remedy them and to produce improvement in the general situation in the interest of greater democracy, there is hope and a healthful indication that America will never entirely abandon the democratic ideal and the practice of democracy in domestic and international relationships. Though the American system is by no means

3Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., p. 4.
perfect, and though it leaves much to be desired in the
practice of true democracy, "it is," as Bryson has pointed
out, "our way of doing things, and before we change we will
look around."4

It is obvious that in these days of conflicting
theories and ideas of life, if we desire to remain a demo-
cratic people we must re-examine and reinterpret the mean-
ings of democracy and the function of democratic principles
within the fabric of human life in society. We must recog-
nize the fact that democracy in this modern, speedy, indus-
trialized, urban, complicated world is no longer the simple
concept that it was in earlier times, nor can it ever be
again the same. As a philosophy it must change and surely
it must adjust itself to meet the altered tempo of life,
but the fact that it must change does not imply that de-
mocracy as a way of living and thinking is outmoded. It
can be made fully as vital in today's industrialized com-
munity and world as it was on the simple, crude frontiers
of the world, where it was imperative that people work to-
gether and consider each other as equals in order to
achieve the necessary work that had to be done to win a
civilization from the wilderness.

... if we desire to remain a democratic people we
must re-examine and reinterpret the meaning of de-
mocracy. We must face the fact that democracy in
this modern world is no longer the simple concept

4Bryson, op. cit., p. 2.
that it was in earlier times, but that it involves the reconstruction of the whole mass of traditional beliefs and attitudes and practices, so as to become the basis for a distinctive way of life.\footnote{Bode, op. cit., pp. vii-viii.}

Thomas Mann, the famous German humanitarian author, who was exiled from his native land because of his opposition to the Nazis, sought refuge in the United States. In 1937-1938 he delivered a lecture entitled "The Coming Victory of Democracy" in many of the cultural centers of the nation, including the Texas State College for Women, in Denton, Texas. In this lecture, later published in booklet form, he stated that Americans need no instruction in the meaning of democracy nor in the things that concern democracy. But he pointed out that instruction is one thing, whereas memory, reflection, and re-examination are parts of quite another thing, far more difficult to master or to put into operation in human life. It is easy to know what democracy is, he said; but when we attempt to live democracy, we run into difficulties and decide the game is hardly worth the effort. No worth-while possession can be neglected, Mann warned Americans, who are prone to look with indifference and neglect upon their priceless heritage of democracy. Even physical things die off, disappear, are lost, if they are not cared for. Certainly it is becoming more difficult to achieve the "recall to consciousness of a spiritual and moral possession of which
it would be dangerous to feel too secure and too confident. . . . Throughout the world it has become precarious to take democracy for granted -- even in America . . ."\textsuperscript{6}

The people of America need to develop within themselves certain social beliefs in order to be able to combine democratic idealism with practical experimentation and large-scale planning for democratic society. Among the fundamental factors which should enter into the establishment of these social beliefs may be named the following basic concepts of democracy:

1. Intelligent guidance of social change is possible.
2. Ours is a revolutionary period in human history.
3. General social principles in a modern industrial civilization should be built in relation to a society dominated by machinery and technology.
4. Social evils should be dealt with in the light of general principles that have regard for the needs of the changing social situation.
5. The economic welfare of the common people is of primary social concern.
6. A republican form of government dominated by democratic ideals is best for modern America.
7. Beauty is of fundamental importance in the life of every individual and should grow out of and permeate American life, through the creation of an indigenous art.
8. We must establish a truly social democracy which is marked by the presence of sympathetic understanding and cordiality toward people living in different traditions.
9. Fundamental faiths emotionalized into dynamic drives to action are necessary, else all our beliefs and allegiances will be futile.\textsuperscript{7}

Society should make all the changes in the economic and political structure which the people are persuaded,

\textsuperscript{6}Mann, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 8-9.

\textsuperscript{7}Everett, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 191-192.
after earnest study of the facts, should be made in the interest of the public good. But if the people destroy or fail to claim their right to make their own changes in their own way, and give up to any leader who may rise to demand obedience, they will be losing more than they can possibly gain. If the citizens foolishly surrender their freedom, some day their children will have to fight to regain it. 8

Democracy does not mean being satisfied with things as they are. A firm believer in the American way of life is always working for progress, in the American, democratic way. Certainly we are not satisfied with things as they are in our own country, any more than we are satisfied with conditions in other areas of the world. In our own country there are probably more complaints than were heard in Russia, Germany, Italy, or Japan — largely because of the American high standard of living which causes citizens of the United States to strive constantly for advancement and a better way of life. Also entering into the picture is the deeply imbedded idea that America is a land of opportunity; and when one fails to find opportunity for himself, he has no hesitation in saying so. In our country, anyone who wants to complain is not afraid to do it. 9

8Bryson, op. cit., pp. 112-113.
9Ibid., pp. 78-80.
Failure and disillusion have . . . made millions in our adult population cynical of our national ideal or, worse, unresponsive to ideals of any kind. Many of those adults who are most concerned over the many maladjustments and contradictions found in American life are now attempting to re-educate themselves in order to see clearly the realities of our socio-economic situation and to determine upon desirable individual and social goals.\textsuperscript{10}

Those persons who assert that democracy cannot organize to meet the insistent demands for social change, for the recognition and adaptation of the new, and who consequently feel that warfare is the only possible solution to the difficult problems that recur in human society, ignore the essential nature of our modern difficulties. The social, economic, technological, and philosophical problems which are everywhere in evidence today cannot be solved by brute force, but require the exercise of the highest intelligence, the highest wisdom, the greatest patience and skill. Autocracy in regard to economic and social affairs is by no means a route of escape from trouble. In fact, autocratic principles bring more difficulties than they can ever solve. "The conclusion is that, under modern conditions in civilized states, it is easier for the Many to maintain efficient administration with responsibility to the community than for the Few to develop an autocracy that is at once socially efficient and a wise judge in its own cause."\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10}Everett, op. cit., p. 15.

\textsuperscript{11}Merriam, The New Democracy and the New Despotism, p. 254.
In the present complex organization of society, freedom must be thought of in terms of the necessity for mandatory individual and social restraints. Freedom does not imply that one can do whatever he chooses, but it does mean that one must choose to do what will be right for society as well as for himself. And what is right for the individual is right for society, and what is right for society is at the same time right for the individual. Increasing restraints must be put upon those people in society who own or control great wealth and consequently exert great power and influence. Furthermore, increasing restraints must be put upon all citizens in order that they may be free from accident, disease, unemployment, and fear. These steps are necessary in order that all people may be free from the limitations, worries, and terrors of an uncontrolled society. Democracy does not mean lack of control -- it means the best possible type of control -- self-discipline. Any wise society limits personal freedom in numerous ways in order to assure that in the major aspects of life there may be freedom. "We are now coming to see that in a highly specialized, interdependent, urban society freedom comes as the result of powerful long-time controls, and is impossible without such controls."\textsuperscript{12}

It is the basic responsibility of the educational

\textsuperscript{12}Everett, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 178-179.
system to transmit the culture of society to the oncoming
generations and at the same time to cultivate any new con-
cepts that seem desirable in the community or the nation or
the world. Thus the school plays a key role in the matter
of maintaining true democratic ways of life among the peo-
ple. Without democracy in education, it is doubtful that
much democracy could be found anywhere in society.

To educate most effectively for society's total or-
ganization around the principles of democracy, the school
must provide opportunities for boys and girls to live and
work in a democratic society. They should be enabled to
get the "feel" of democracy while they are still young, and
this can be accomplished only by their participation in
real-life situations in the school and in the community.
Thus democracy must be more than something read about in
books -- it must become a way of life for every boy and
girl, so that he will be able to take his appropriate
place in society.

The job ahead appears to be quite difficult; indeed,
"it will take the best we have to set our freedom working
right."13

If democracy is to survive in the United States,
the American people, besides desiring it, will have
to become familiar with . . . the crisis which it
faces today. . . . They will have to study all rival
systems of thought and society and discover the

13Herridge, op. cit., p. vii.
secret of their appeal, striving earnestly to under-
stand why men, having experienced political free-
dom, turn to dictatorships and tyranny. They will
have to search out the weaknesses, injustices, and
deficiencies of the contemporary social order and
seek to correct them. Above all, they will have to
banish their complacency, recapture the spirit of an
earlier day, fashion a truly challenging and realis-
tic conception of democracy, and take the offensive
in applying the conception to the reconstruction of
American society. If the masses of the people lack
the energy and the will to make this effort, that
fact alone would presumably mean that the original
democratic impulse, whatever its source, had spent
itself and that the dream of a land of liberty and
equality for the many was after all only a dream.14
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