

*From Peter Dobkin Hall (ed.). (2003). Documentary History of Philanthropy and Voluntarism in the United States*

### **III: 7 THE EMERGING TRADITION OF ELITE PHILANTHROPY**

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the group wealthy Bostonian families who would, by the 1850s, be known as the "Brahmins," had not yet acquired a distinct identity. The founders of city's great fortunes were still very much engaged in making their fortunes in commerce and building up the capital that would eventually be invested in manufacturing, railroads, real estate, and benevolent institutions. As citizens of means, they naturally maintained an intense interest in public affairs, serving not only in state and federal elective offices, but also on local boards and committees. To the extent that they conceived of themselves as a group at all, they appear to have framed their common purposes in public rather than private terms.

A variety of circumstances forced Boston's wealthy to change their thinking. As their life styles and ambitions began to be more distinctively bounded by their money and their urban situation, their religious inclinations began to diverge from those of the mass of citizens in the state, most of whom still lived under conditions that differed little from those of Puritan times. As the country people fell more under the sway of emotional evangelical religion, the urban wealthy tended increasingly towards more rational religious beliefs. Although the roots of this divergence lay deep and can be traced to the struggles over the Great Awakening half a century earlier, by 1800 it had begun to go beyond pamphlet warfare between clergymen of opposing views and had begun to center on issues of institutional control.

Political differences also played a role. Once again, while there had been tensions between the country and the city dating back to the early eighteenth century, these intensified in the 1780s, as the commercial interests which controlled the state legislature and the courts, tried to discharge the state's revolutionary war debt (much of it owed to

themselves) through taxation. Rural resentment was widespread and in some places took the form of armed resistance -- as when revolutionary veterans under the command of Daniel Shays closed the courts of the western counties in order to prevent foreclosures on farmers unable to meet their tax obligations. But these political struggles were symptomatic of a deeper in rural society: land in the older settlements had begun to run out; where once all sons could expect to inherit land and received portions of "the common and undivided lands" of the townships in which they lived, by the end of the eighteenth century, rural families could generally afford to provide only for the youngest (who in turn was expected to care for his parents during their declining years). Under these circumstances, the bright promises of newly-minted nationalistic rhetoric contrasted grimly with the declining expectations of increasing numbers of rural families, most of whose sons could look forward to earning their way as unskilled day-laborers. Those without resources set out to seek their fortunes in the towns and cities; the more fortunate went West.

In addition to urban-rural tensions, the increasing concentration of wealth in the hands of a few dozen mercantile families after 1790 kindled resentment of the well-to-do among the increasing numbers of artisans and day laborers in the cities and coastal towns. The days when an apprentice could confidently expect to become a journeyman and, eventually, a master craftsman and proprietor of his own workshop were past. The migration of rural youth seeking entry into the crafts, combined with the efforts of artisans to provide for their own sons, overwhelmed the occupational structure. In addition, the promises of opportunity in the New World and the political and economic crises of the Old attracted increasing number of British artisans, who competed with native craftsmen. As competition intensified, success depended increasingly on entrepreneurial skills and technological innovation. In this race, a few men emerged as leaders -- as employers or as brokers of the skills and products of others. The rest went

to swell a growing segment of the urban population which was entirely dependent on wages and seasonal work.

In town and in country, increasing numbers of people were compelled by circumstances to define their political, economic, and religious interests quite differently from those of the "wealthy, learned, and respectable" -- the merchants, ministers, lawyers, and magistrates who had traditionally taken the lead in public affairs. Many joined the ranks of the Jeffersonians. And even those who remained in the Federalist fold -- the evangelically-influenced members of the urban middle classes (like Beecher's Hanover Street congregation) and those still living in the country -- harbored deep resentment of the growing wealth and power of urban wealth.

These tensions broke out in the open in 1803, over control of two key positions at Harvard: the Hollis Professorship of Divinity and the College presidency. The clergy in the countryside, along with some of their older brethren, insisted that the incumbent of the Hollis chair should be, as the deed of gift to the College had stated, a "man of solid learning in Divinity, of sound and orthodox principles" (Morison, 188). To them, this meant a conservative trinitarian Calvinist. When the question of succession to the Hollis professorship was initially raised, the conservative clergy still had considerable influence over the College and their champion, President Joseph Willard, had declared that he "would sooner cut off his hand than lift it up for an Arminian professor" (188). Willard's death in 1804 broadened the dimensions of the struggle.

The conflict was inevitably a political one, since, under the charter of 1780, Harvard's Board of Overseers included the entire membership of the upper house of the state legislature. And the upper house, because of the property qualification, was dominated by Federalist laymen who were sympathetic to the religious liberals. In February of

1805, the Board voted to confirm Henry Ware, a Unitarian, as the Hollis professor. The battle over the presidency was no less heated and, after a protracted struggle, another Unitarian, Samuel Webber, became President of Harvard. The orthodox Calvinists broke with Harvard, establishing their own theological seminary at Andover. Orthodox families abandoned Harvard, sending their sons to Yale or to new institutions -- Williams and Bowdoin -- where trinitarians still held sway.

The struggle for control of Harvard was the beginning of an acrimonious series of struggles that would shake every congregation in the state, as trinitarians and unitarians fought over the doctrinal soundness of their ministers and, when congregations split, over ownership of church properties. These disagreements ultimately ended up in the courts, where the overwhelmingly Federalist and unitarian jurists decided against the trinitarians in case after case. Slowly but inexorably, the urban elite extended its control over the tax-supported churches of the countryside, forcing the trinitarians to establish their own churches, which were supported by voluntary contributions.

#### THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL AND THE ORIGINS OF ELITE PHILANTHROPY

As the elite consolidated its control of Harvard and the established churches, the legislature, the lower house of which remained trinitarian in its sympathies, declined to provide Harvard, hitherto regarded as a public institution, with further financial support. Boston's Federalist Unitarian elite did not hesitate to make up for this deficiency with private contributions -- a willingness that was further fueled by the election in 1810 of John Thornton Kirkland, who had married into the Cabot family, as president of the College. Unlike Yale, which ultimately turned for financial sustenance to its broadly dispersed alumni, Harvard and the constellation of institutions that grew

up around it would be built on the contributions of a small circle of extremely wealthy merchants and manufacturers.

While all of this appears to be a process of privatization -- and, in effect it was, since it placed a hitherto public institution like Harvard under the control of private wealth -- the Bostonians continued to see themselves as acting in the public interest. In 1810, even as the College was engaged in a bruising struggle with the Jefferson legislature over the composition of its governing boards, the city's wealthy continued to come forward with philanthropic proposals, like the initiative for establishing the Massachusetts General Hospital, in which they, quite clearly, still sought to speak for a public which was less and less inclined to extend it electoral legitimacy.

The drafter of the hospital proposal, physicians James Jackson and John Collins Warren, were very much a part of Boston's mercantile elite. Jackson was the son of Jonathan Jackson, president of the Boston Bank and Treasurer of Harvard; one brother, Patrick Tracy Jackson, was already a successful merchant and, within two years, would establish at Waltham, in partnership with his cousin Francis Cabot Lowell the textile mill that would bring the industrial revolution to the United States. While nominally addressed to the health care needs of a growing urban population, the hospital proposal was also part and parcel of the elite's efforts to extend its control over the medical profession by tying clinical training, which had been a very profitable sideline for physicians, to Harvard and its medical college.

JAMES JACKSON AND JOHN COLLINS WARREN, "CIRCULAR LETTER ADDRESSED TO SEVERAL OF OUR WEALTHIEST AND MOST INFLUENTIAL CITIZENS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AWAKENING IN THEIR MINDS AN INTEREST IN THE SUBJECT OF A HOSPITAL" (1810)

Sir, --It has appeared very desirable to a number of respectable gentlemen, that a hospital for the reception of lunatics and other sick persons should be established in this town. By the appointment of a number of these gentlemen, we are directed to adopt such methods as shall appear best calculated to promote such an establishment. We therefore beg leave to submit for your consideration proposals for the institution of a hospital, and to state to you some of the reasons in favour of such an establishment.

It is unnecessary to urge the propriety and even obligation of succouring the poor in sickness. The wealthy inhabitants of the town of Boston have always evinced that they consider themselves as "treasurers of God's bounty;" and in Christian countries where Christianity is practiced, it must always be considered the first of duties to visit and to heal the sick. When in distress, every man becomes our neighbour, not only if he be of the household of faith, but even though his misfortunes have been induced by transgressing the rules of both reason and religion. It is unnecessary to urge the truth and importance of these sentiments to those who are already in the habit of cherishing them, --to those who indulge in the true luxury of wealth, the pleasures of charity. The questions which first suggest themselves on this subject are, whether the relief afforded by hospitals is better than can be given in any other way; and whether there are, in fact, so many poor among us as to require an establishment of this sort.

The relief to be afforded the poor, in a country so rich as ours, should perhaps be measured only by their necessities. We have, then, to enquire into the situation of the poor in sickness, and to learn what are their wants. In this enquiry, we shall be led to answer both the questions above stated.

There are some who are able to acquire a competence in health, and to provide so far against any ordinary sickness as that they shall not then be deprived of a comfortable habitation, nor of food for themselves and their families; while they are not able to defray the expenses of medicine and medical

assistance. Persons of this description never suffer among us. The Dispensary gives relief to hundreds every year; and the individuals who practise medicine gratuitously attend many more of this description. But there are many others among the poor, who have, if we may so express it, the form of necessaries of life, without the substance. A man may have a lodging; but it is deficient in all those advantages which are requisite to the sick. It is a garret or a cellar, without light and due ventilation, or open to the storms of an inclement winter. In this miserable habitation, he may obtain liberty to remain during an illness; but, if honest, he is harassed with the idea of his accumulating rent, which must be paid out of his future labours. In this wretched situation, the sick man is destitute of all those common conveniences, without which most of us would consider it impossible to live, even in health. Wholesome food and sufficient fuel are wanting; and his own sufferings are aggravated by the cries of hungry children. Above all, he suffers from the want of that first requisite in sickness, a kind and skilful nurse.

But it may be said, that instances are rare among us, where a man, who labours, even with moderate industry, when in health, endures such privations in sickness as are here described. They are not, however, rare among those who are not industrious; and who, nevertheless, when labouring under sickness, must be considered as having claims to assistance. In cases of long-protracted disease, instances of this description do occur amongst those of the most industrious class. Such instances are still less rare among those women who are either widowed, or worse than widowed. It happens too frequently that modest and worthy women are united to men who are profligate and intemperate, by whom they are left to endure disease and poverty under the most aggravated forms. Among the children of such families also, instances are not rare of real suffering in sickness. To all such as been described, a hospital would supply every thing which is needful, if not all they could wish. In a well-regulated hospital, they would find a comfortable lodging in a duly tempered atmosphere; would receive the food best suited to their various conditions; and would be attended by kind and discreet nurses, under the directions of a physician. In such a situation, the poor man's chance for relief would be equal perhaps to that of the most affluent, when affected by the same disease.

There are other persons, also, who are of great importance to society, to whom the relief afforded by a hospital is exceedingly appropriate. Such are generally those of good and industrious habits, who are affected with sickness, just as they are entering into active life, and who have not had time to provide for this calamity. Cases of this sort are frequently occurring. Disease is often produced by the very anxiety and exertions which belong to this period of life; and the best are the most liable to suffer. Of such a description, cases are often seen among journeymen mechanics and among servants.

Journeymen mechanics commonly live in small boarding houses, where they have accommodations which are sufficient, but nothing more than sufficient, in health. When sick, they are necessarily placed in small, confined apartments, or in rooms crowded with their fellow-workmen. They must be sheltered from the weather, and have food of some sort; and these must, in many cases, be the extent of their accommodations. Persons of this description would do well to enter a hospital, even if they had to pay the expense of their own maintenance. In most cases, they would suffer less, and recover sooner, by so doing. When, as sometimes happens, they have not the means of payment, they become objects of charity; and the welfare of such persons should be considered among the strong motives in favour of establishing a hospital.

Servants generally undergo great inconveniences, at least when afflicted with sickness, and oftentimes much more than inconveniences. With so much difficulty is the care of them attended in private families, that many gentlemen would pay the board of their servants at a hospital, in preference to having them sick in their own houses. In some cases, however, neither the master nor the servant can afford the expense of proper care in sickness. Not uncommonly, a young girl is taken sick in a large family, where she is the only servant. She lodges in the most remote corner of the house, in a room without a fireplace. The mistress is sufficiently occupied with the unusual labours which are thrown upon her at a time when perhaps she is least fitted to perform them. Under such circumstances, how can the servant receive those attentions which are due to the sick? Of what use is it that the physician leaves a prescription to be put up at the Dispensary? He goes the next day, and finds that

there has not been time even to procure the remedies which he had ordered; meanwhile, the period in which they would have been useful has passed away, and the incipient disease of yesterday has now become confirmed.

Persons of these descriptions would not be disposed to resort to a hospital on every trivial occasion. But, when afflicted with serious indisposition, they would find in such an institution an alleviation of their sufferings, which it must gladden the heart of the most frigid to contemplate.

There is one class of sufferers who peculiarly claim all that benevolence can bestow, and for whom a hospital is most especially required. The virtuous and industrious are liable to become objects of public charity, in consequence of diseases of the mind. When those who are unfortunate in this respect are left without proper care, a calamity, which might have been transient, is prolonged through life. The number of such persons, who are rendered unable to provide for themselves, is probably greater than the public imagine; and, of these, a large proportion claim the assistance of the affluent. The expense which is attached to the care of the insane in private families is extremely great; and such as to ruin a whole family that is possessed of a competence under ordinary circumstances, when called upon to support one of its members in this situation. Even those who can pay the necessary expenses would perhaps find an institution, such as is proposed, the best situation in which they could place their unfortunate friends. It is worthy of the opulent men of this town, and consistent with their general character, to provide an asylum for the insane from every other part of the Commonwealth. But if the funds are raised for the purpose proposed, it is probable that the Legislature will grant some assistance, with a view to such an extension of its benefits.

Of another class, whose necessities would be removed by the establishment of a hospital, are women who are unable to provide for their own welfare and safety in one of nature's most trying hours. Houses for lying-in women have been found extremely useful in the large cities of Europe; and, although abuses

may have arisen in consequence, these are such as are more easily prevented in a small than in a large town.

There are many others who would find great relief in a hospital, and many times have life preserved when otherwise it would be lost. Such especially are the subjects of accidental wounds and fractures among the poorer classes of our citizens; and the subjects of extraordinary diseases, in any part of the Commonwealth, who may require the long and careful attention of either the physician or surgeon.

It is possible that we may be asked whether the almshouse does not answer the purposes for which a hospital is proposed. That it *does not*, is very certain. The town is so much indebted to the liberality of those gentlemen who, without compensation, superintend the care of the poor, that we ought not to make this reply without an explanation. The truth is that the almshouse could not serve the purpose of a hospital, without such an entire change in the arrangements of it as the overseers do not feel themselves authorized to make, and such as the town could not easily be induced to direct or to support.

The almshouse receives all who do not take care of themselves, and who are destitute of property, whether they be old and infirm, and unable to provide means of assistance; or are too vicious and debauched to employ themselves in honest labour; or are prevented from so employing themselves by occasional sickness. This institution, then, is made to comprehend what is more properly meant by an almshouse, a bridewell or house of correction, and a hospital. Now, the economy and mode of government cannot possibly be adapted at once to all these various purposes. It must necessarily happen that in many instances the worst members of the community, the debauched and profligate, obtain admission into this house. Hence it has become, in some measure, disreputable to live in it; and, not infrequently, those who are the most deserving objects of charity cannot be induced to enter it. To some of them, death appears less terrible than a residence in the almshouse.

It is true that the sick in that house are allowed some greater privileges and advantages than those extended to those in health; yet the general arrangements and regulations are, necessarily, so different from those required in a hospital, that the sick -- far from having the advantages afforded by the medical art -- have not the fair chance for recovery which nature alone would give them. Most especially they suffer the want of good nurses. In these officers must be placed trust and confidence of the highest nature. Their duties are laborious and painful. In the almshouse, they are selected from among the more healthy inhabitants; but, unfortunately, those who are best qualified will always prefer more profitable and less laborious occupations elsewhere. It must, then, be obvious that the persons employed as nurses cannot be such as will conscientiously perform the duties of this office.

In addition to what has already been stated, there are a number of collateral advantages that would attend the establishment of a hospital in this place. These are the facilities for acquiring knowledge, which it would give to the students in the medical school established in this town. The means of medical education in New England are at present very limited, and totally inadequate to so important a purpose. Students of medicine cannot qualify themselves properly for their profession, without incurring heavy expenses, such as very few of them are able to defray. The only medical school of eminence in this country is that at Philadelphia, nearly four hundred miles distant from Boston; and the expense of attending that is so great, that students from this quarter rarely remain at it longer than one year. Even this advantage is enjoyed by very few, compared with the whole number. Those who are educated in New England have so few opportunities of attending to the practice of physic, that they find it impossible to learn some of the most important elements of the science of medicine, until after they have undertaken for themselves the care of the health and lives of their fellow citizens. This care they undertake from books; --a source whence it is highly useful and indispensable that they should obtain knowledge, but one from which alone they never can obtain all that is necessary to qualify them for their professional duties. With such deficiencies in medical education, it is needless to show to what evils the community is exposed.

To remedy evils so important and so extensive, it is necessary to have a medical school exist among us. Wealth, abundantly sufficient, can be devoted to the purpose without any individual's feeling the smallest privation of any, even of the luxuries of life. Every one is liable to suffer from the want of such a school; every one may derive, directly or indirectly, the greatest benefits from its establishment.

A hospital is an institution absolutely essential to a medical school, and one which would afford relief and comfort to thousands of the sick and miserable. On what other objects can the superfluities of the rich be so well bestowed?

In February of 1811, the legislature granted a charter to the Massachusetts General Hospital. It provided for a Board of Visitors consisting of public officials -- the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the House, and the Chaplains of both houses -- and a Board of 12 self-perpetuating trustees. The state also provided modest financial support: the corporation was granted a piece of Boston real estate, "with authority to sell the same and use the proceeds at pleasure, provided that within five years an additional sum of one hundred thousand dollars should be obtained by private subscriptions and donations" (Bowditch 1872, 8-9). It also donated the labor of state convicts for preparing the stone that would be used in the erection of its first building. In exchange, the hospital was expected to support "thirty of the sick and lunatic persons chargeable to the Commonwealth" (this provision was subsequently modified, for fear that it would make the institution "merely a pauper establishment)."

One of the first acts of the trustees was to try to meet the \$100,000 challenge grant from the state. "Not ambitious of being the guardians of a charity *merely nominal*," they declared, we

are satisfied that the sum affixed by the Legislature as the condition of its grant, is so small, when compared with the wealth of individuals and the greatness of the State, that no plea arising from "the hardship of the times," and "the general embarrassment of affairs," or "the claims of other charities," can or ought to avail the community. If such a proposal as this fail, it will be, in the judgement of the undersigned, decisive of the fate of the establishment. It will then be apparent that *the will is wanting* in the public to patronize such an undertaking; and that the honor of laying the foundation of a fabric of charity so noble and majestic must be left for times when a higher cast of character predominates, and to a more enlightened and sympathetic race of men." (Bowditch 1872, 19-20)

The trustees proceeded to produce a thousand copies of a pamphlet urging support for the hospital and to divide itself into committees with responsibilities for soliciting particular individuals. In addition, it organized Ward Committees for soliciting door-to-door within the city of Boston, as well as committees to solicit funds in Salem, Beverly, New Bedford, Plymouth, Charlestown, Medford, Cambridge, Roxbury, and Newburyport. Within three days, the committees had collected pledges totalling \$78,802 -- and within another two weeks, these amounted to \$93,969. Eventually, the Hospital succeeded to collecting more than \$140,000 from 1,047 subscribers. Of these 245 gave \$100 or more.

Although the institution was intended to benefit the whole state, almost all the contributions came from Boston and the towns immediately around it. More significantly, the ten largest donors contributed nearly 40% of the total raised. This tendency for giving to be narrowly focusing among a handful of wealthy patrons would become the characteristic pattern in Boston philanthropy -- unlike evangelical philanthropy, which sought to cast a broader net and to emphasize broad participation. Despite the already evident importance of leadership by a benevolently-inclined elite, the rhetoric with which the hospital was inaugurated still celebrated the initiative in communitarian terms of "all classes of . . . citizens combining and concentrating their efforts" (Dalzell 1987, 127). Gradually, however, the elite would begin to come to grips with its isolation from the public. By the time of the hospital's second fund drive in 1844, giving would be even more concentrated --with only 200 donors giving, almost all in amounts of \$500 or more. More importantly, the elite would begin to ascribe its generosity to its worthiness to lead and to point to its philanthropy as a justification for its wealth.

Wealthy Bostonians in 1810 still thought of themselves as leaders of a community of in which they held an unquestioned place, rather than merely being its benefactors. And just as they had yet to clearly conceive of themselves as a class apart, so, in the circular for the hospital, they had not yet clearly distinguished between *charity*, palliative activities directed at the poor and dependent and justified on religious grounds, and *philanthropy*, benevolence directed at educational and cultural institutions run by and to a large extent serving the purpose of extending their influence in society -- and justified on political grounds. Over time, these two strands of benevolence would begin to diverge.

#### BOSTON'S ELITE AND THE CONCENTRATION OF PHILANTHROPIC CAPITAL

Five years after the issuance of its charter, the Hospital was authorized to grant annuities on lives in order to further increase its revenues. This provision led the trustees in 1819 to form a for-profit corporation, the Massachusetts Hospital Life Insurance Company, which was to share its earnings with the hospital. The insurance company, which was also granted the power to manage personal, testamentary, and institutional endowment trusts within a few years became the largest financial enterprise in New England and a major supplier of capital for the textile and railroad industries (White 1957). Naturally, the boards of the Massachusetts General Hospital and the Massachusetts Hospital Life Insurance Company were tightly interlocked -- and the central figures on both boards were the chief figures in the city's financial, commercial, and manufacturing communities.

The tendency to concentrate wealth in trusts controlled by a small groups of trustees and institutions was peculiarly Bostonian. It stemmed from a convergence of concerns, one having to do with a desire to prevent the scattering of fortunes through division as they were passed from one generation to the next, the other having to do with a desire

to increase the power of certain families as a collective group. Traditionally, estates in New England were equally divided between all children, regardless of sex or birth order. By the end of the eighteenth century, the makers of the new post-revolutionary fortunes came to recognize the importance of accumulating capital for investment in the emerging corporate economy, they began to search for legal mechanisms that would enable them to provide for their descendants while also avoiding the necessity of dividing their capital. While aware that English families customary used testamentary trusts, they were also aware that the Massachusetts courts lack the equity powers that would enable them to enforce trusts -- a point that was brought home in 1804, when the Supreme Judicial Court, in a case in which funds had been left in trust for the benefit of certain legatees, were awarded to the trustee as legal owner because the court could not recognize or enforce the equitable claims of those legatees. Equity jurisdiction was not recognized in Massachusetts until 1819.

Once trusts became legally enforceable, a host of other problems arose. Some had to do with the duration for which trusts could run -- a matter that was eventually settled through the application of the Rule Against Perpetuities, which limited the duration of non-charitable trusts. Others had to do with such things as the validity of claims of creditors against the beneficiaries of trusts and the nature of trustees' fiduciary obligations.

The complexity of the issues arising in this uncharted legal territory, as well as the extent of stake in their resolution held by Boston's elite and its elite institutions is suggested by the 1830 case of Harvard College and Massachusetts General Hospital versus Francis Amory. This case was a landmark in American trust law doctrine, setting for the Prudent Man Rule as the guide for fiduciary investment activity. In addition, the case suggests the extent to which the estate planning concerns of elite

families and the financial management concerns of elite institutions had become intertwined by the second decade of the nineteenth century.

HARVARD COLLEGE and MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL *versus* FRANCIS AMORY.

(Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, Suffolk and Nantucket, March Term 1830).

John M'Lean died on October 23d, 1823, and his will and codicil were proved and allowed in the court of probate for the county of Suffolk, on the 3d of November, 1823.

After an absolute gift to the wife of the testator, of a dwelling house, certain specified personal property, and \$35,000, the will proceeds: --"I give and bequeath to Jonathan Amory, &c. and Francis Amory, &c., jointly, the sum of 50,000 dollars, in trust nevertheless to invest the same upon ample and sufficient security, or to invest the same in safe and productive stock, either in the public funds, bank shares, or other stock, according to their best judgement and discretion, hereby enjoining on them particular care and attention in the choice of funds, and in the punctual collection of the dividends, interest and profits thereof, and authorizing them to sell out, reinvest and change the said loans and stocks from time to time, as the safety and interest of the said trust fund may in their judgement require. And this bequest is upon the further trust, that the said sum of 50,000 dollars so invested, shall constitute a separate and distinct fund, the profits and income thereof to be received and collected by the said trustees and paid over to my said wife, Ann M'Lean, in quarterly or semi-annual payments, as shall be most convenient for said trustees, for and during the term of her natural life. And this bequest of 50,000 is upon further trust, that the trustees will, after the decease of my said wife, pay over, transfer and deliver one half, in actual value, of the said entire fund, to the President and Fellows of Harvard College, the income and profits whereof shall be exclusively and forever appropriated to the support of the professor of ancient and modern history, at that college." --The trustees are directed to pay over the other moiety (after the decease of the wife) to the Trustees of the Massachusetts General Hospital, to be by them held and appropriated to the general charitable objects of that institution.

The testator further says, --"And reposing full and entire confidence in the ability, fidelity and diligence of the said Jonathan and Francis Amory, and not doubting that they will faithfully and conscientiously discharge and execute the trusts hereby reposed in them, and being desirous of relieving them from the burden of procuring sureties for large sums, --I do request and direct that they may not be required to give any other than their own bonds respectively, without sureties, conditioned for performance and execution of the said trusts; and I do order and direct, that they shall not be held responsible for the acts, doings and defaults of each for his own acts, doings and defaults, as such trustees.

In addition to the foregoing bequests the testator gave pecuniary legacies, amounting to \$27,500, and by a codicil he gave the residue of his estate to the Massachusetts General Hospital.

Jonathan Amory and Francis Amory were appointed executors.

The testator's estate was inventoried at \$228,120; --of which, \$100,800 consisted of manufacturing stock, --\$48,000 of insurance stock, --and \$24,700 of bank stock.

In the beginning of December 1823, the executors addressed a letter to the trustees of the hospital, suggesting that it would be expedient for them to choose a committee with full power to treat with the executors, and to represent the hospital in all cases concerning the estate; more especially to determine what portion of the property should be selected as a capital to afford interest or income to the widow during her life.

The college and the hospital thereupon proposed to receive the \$50,000, and give security to Mrs. M'Lean to pay her \$3000 annually.

On December 13th, 1823, the executors wrote to the two corporations, that the testator enjoined upon the executors to pay his widow the income and profits of such stock as they might select; that the testator, having within the three preceding years invested nearly half of his property in manufacturing stocks, thereby indicated that he had great confidence in those stocks; that in the opinion of the executors, he intended that his widow should enjoy her fair share of income and profits of his estate; that the present income of the stock selected was far greater than the interest of the money would be; but that as the two corporations had less confidence in manufacturing stock than the testator had, the executors would transfer the property to them, on condition that they would pay the widow annually six per cent on \$25,000, and sums equivalent to the dividends which should be made on nine shares in the Boston Manufacturing Company and nine shares in the Merrimack Manufacturing Company, during her life.

On December 20th, 1823, the trustees of the hospital decline the foregoing proposition, and state that they have full confidence, "that the executors will, in conformity to the testator's injunction, keep the capital entire;" and they add, "that in their opinion, any investment of this capital in trade or manufactories cannot be considered by them as a safe and discreet investment. They are therefore necessitated to disapprove of any such investment. . . ."

At a probate court in October 1828, Francis Amory, the surviving trustee, presented his account as trustee, for allowance, and tendered his resignation of the trust; of which the college and the hospital received due notice. These corporations objected to the settlement of the accounts which should leave the fund upon a loss of capital arising from the investments in trade or manufactories, and at the same time give to the annuit the whole amount of the dividends thereof. They stated that the shares in insurance stock were then worth about \$12,350, the shares in the Boston Manufacturing Company about \$8100, and those in the Merrimack Manufacturing Company about \$9000. . . .

*S. Hubbard*, for the appellants. In investing part of the \$50,000 in manufacturing and insurance stocks, the trustees have not acted in legal conformity to the will. The fact that a large amount of the testator's property consisted of such stocks, did not authorize the trustees to invest in them. He was at liberty to speculate; but they were directed either to lend on sufficient security, or invest in stock which should be safe as well as productive. They were not bound to give the widow more than six per cent per annum, and in their construction of the bequest they erred, to the injury of the residuary legatees. The first direction in the will is to lend the money; which could not be done at greater interest than six per cent. The testator has a particular object in view after the death of his widow, namely, the foundation of a professorship, for which the sum of \$25,000 was considered to be necessary; and for this reason the capital should have been kept entire. It was also an object with him, that the \$50,000 should be a permanent fund for the support of his widow, inasmuch as the property given to her outright might be lost. Insurance and manufacturing stocks are not safe, because the principal is put at hazard. It is otherwise with bank stock, the money being lent on good security; and the fact that the principal is not at risk, is the ground of the prohibition to take more than lawful interest on the money lent. A manufacturing corporation is a trading company, and as the law stood before the statute of 1829, *c. 53*, an individual corporator was responsible for all the debts of the corporation: whether this responsibility, however, would rest on a trust fund or on the trustees personally, admits of question. The discretion to be exercised by the trustees was a sound discretion, and not an arbitrary power. . . .

*Sullivan and Shaw*, for the appellee, said that in England, by a long course of practice, one kind of stock (the three per cents) is considered safe, and other stocks not safe, but that we have no such rule in this country, and the terms of the will must be taken in their natural sense; and that these trustees were authorized to invest in insurance and manufacturing stocks, being answerable for good faith only in the exercise of their discretion. . . .

PUTNAM J. delivered the opinion of the Court. The confidence which the testator reposed in his executors, whom he also constituted his trustees, was unbounded. He directed that they, as trustees,

should not be required to give any other security than their own bond, without sureties, and that each of them should be accountable "simply for his own acts, doings and defaults as such trustee."

The question is, whether the trustees have abused the trust.

The testator made provision for the support of his wife mainly from the proceeds of the trust fund. He speaks of the profits, income, dividends, which were to come from it through their hands. They were to lend the \$50,000 upon ample and sufficient security, or invest the same in safe and productive stock, either in the public funds, bank shares, or other stock, according to their best judgement and discretion.

It is very clear that the testator did not intend to limit the income to the simple interest of the fund; for if he had so intended, he would not have spoken of dividends and profits but would have given an annuity of three thousand dollars a year.

It has been argued that the testator gave the sum of fifty thousand dollars as the trust fund, and that the trustees could only have demanded that sum of the executors. But we think that no important inference can be drawn from that fact. It would not follow from hence, that there should have been a sale of the personal property or stocks of the testator and a reinvestment. The trustees and the executors were the same persons, and instead of going through the useless formality of a sale and reinvestment, it was clearly competent for them to select from the ample funds of the estate, those stocks which should form the capital of the trust fund. And in making that selection, it is very clear to us, that they should have preferred that stock which probably gave her the most profit, and at the same time preserve the value of the capital sum. It would not, for example, have been the exercise of sound discretion, to have appropriated the trust fund in the stock of an incorporated company which gave great dividends for the time being, but which would, according to the terms of the charter, expire as soon as the death of the wife could be calculated to happen. In such a case nothing would be left of the capital for those in the

remainder. On the other hand, if the investment of the trust fund were in stock which made large dividends, and which had acquired its value by the prudent management of its proprietors, and might reasonably be calculated upon as a safe and permanent capital, such an investment would seem to be according to the manifest intent of the testator.

It is somewhat remarkable that the testator did not himself appropriate the stock of which the trust fund should consist, but that he should have left it the selection to his trustees. But as it would have been necessary to empower them to change, sell out and reinvest, perhaps it was wise in the testator to leave the whole matter, the selection as well as the management, to them. Be that as it may, he has given them the authority.

But it happened that the value of the capital stock in which the trust fund was invested, has fallen, and those in remainder call upon the trustees to make up the deficiency.

It was said by Lord *Harwicke* in *Jackson v. Jackson*, 1 Atk. 514, that "to compel trustees to make up a deficiency not owing to their willful default, is the harshest demand that can be made in a court of equity." The statute of *Geo. I.* for the indemnity of guardians and trustees, provides that if there be a diminution of the principal, without the default of the trustees, they shall not be liable. If that were otherwise, who would undertake such a hazardous responsibility?

It is argued for the appellants, that the trustees have not lent the money on good security. The answer is found in the authority which the testator gave to them. They were to lend, or invest the fund in stocks. They preferred the latter.

But it is argued, that they did not invest in the public funds, bank shares or other stock, within the true intent and meaning of the authority, but in trading companies, and so exposed the capital to great loss. And we are referred to *Trafford v. Boehm*, 3 Atk. 444, to prove the position, that such an

investment will not have the support of a court of chancery. The chancellor seems to suppose that *funds or other good securities*, must be such as have the engagement of the government to pay off their capital. Bank stock, as well as South-sea stock, which were in the management of the directors, c. were not considered by that court as good security. But no such rule has ever been recognized here. In point of fact, there has been as great fluctuation in the value of the stock which was secured by the promise and faith of the government, as of the stock of banks. And besides, the testator himself considers that *bank shares* might be a safe object of investment, --"safe and productive stock." And yet bank shares may be subject to losses which sweep away their whole value. Lord *Hardwicke* considers South-sea annuities and bank annuities stand upon different footing, because the directors have nothing to do with the principal, and are only to pay the interest, until the government pay off the capital, and therefore that they only are good securities.

This reasoning has little or no application here; for, in the first place, the stocks depending upon the promise of the government, or, as they are called, the public funds, are exceedingly limited in amount, compared with the amount of trust funds to be invested; and, in the second place, it may well be doubted, if more confidence should be reposed in the engagements of the public, than in the promises and conduct of private corporations which are managed by substantial and prudent directors. There is one consideration much in favor of investing in the stock of private corporations. They are amenable to the law. The holder may pursue his legal remedy and compel them or their officers to do justice. But the government can only be supplicated.

It has been argued, that manufacturing and insurance stocks are not safe, because the principal is at hazard. But this objection applies to bank shares, as well as to shares in incorporated manufacturing and insurance companies. To a certain extent, each may be considered as concerned or interested in trade. The banks deal in bills of exchange and notes, and the value of its capital depends upon the solvency of its debtors. It may, for example, very properly discount upon the responsibility of merchants of good credit at the time, but who, before the maturity of their notes, become bankrupts from unavoidable and

unforeseen mercantile hazards. In this way, a bank becomes indirectly interested in navigation, trade and merchandise, to an extent very little, if any, short of the trade in which manufacturing companies engage. The capital in both cases may be lost by the conduct of those who direct their affairs, notwithstanding the exercise of reasonable prudence and discretion.

In regard to insurance companies or incorporations, the capital seems, at first view, to be exposed to greater risk, but it is believed that there has not been much, if any, more fluctuation of the capital in those investments, than in incorporated companies for banking or manufacturing purposes. If the insurance be so general as to embrace a fair proportion of all the property at risk, it will generally yield a reasonable profit, and preserve the capital entire.

It will not do to reject these stocks as unsafe, which are in the management of directors whose well or ill directed measures may involve a total loss. Do what you will, the capital is at hazard. If the public funds are resorted to, what becomes of the capital when the credit of the government shall be so much impaired as it was the at close of the last war?

Investments on mortgages of real estate, after the most careful investigation, may be involved, and ultimately fail, and so the capital, which was originally supposed to be as firm as the earth itself, will be dissolved.

All that can be required of a trustee to invest, is, that he shall conduct himself faithfully and exercise a sound discretion. He is to observe how men of prudence, discretion and intelligence manage their own affairs, not in regard to speculation, but in regard to the permanent disposition of their funds, considering the probable income, as well as the probable safety of the capital to be invested.

But in the case at bar, the testator referred the management of this trust especially to the judgement and discretion of the trustees whom he appointed; one of whom is the brother, and the other was the

cousin of his wife, for whose support this provision was made. These trustees are not to be made chargeable but for gross neglect and wilful mismanagement. . . .

Trustees are justly and uniformly considered favorably, and it is of great importance to bereaved families and orphans, that they should not be held to make good losses in the depreciation of stocks or the failure of the capital itself, which they held in trust, provided they conduct themselves honestly and discreetly and carefully, according to the existing circumstances, in the discharge of their trusts. If this were held otherwise, no prudent man would run the hazard of losses which might happen without any neglect or breach of good faith.

Without knowing the historical background of the case, it would be easy to suppose that Boston's elite, in quarrelling over the question of whether investments in the stocks of manufacturing companies constituted "prudent" investments for trustees, was at war with itself. In fact, Harvard College and Massachusetts General Hospital *versus* Francis Amory was a test case, in which all parties involved were themselves deeply involved in the development of manufacturing and were looking to the courts for a decision which would permit them, in their capacities as trustees, to invest in such stocks without fear of litigation by disgruntled beneficiaries. In ruling that the only standard for fiduciaries prudent investment was their observation of "how men of prudence, discretion and intelligence" (i.e., men like themselves) would "manage their own affairs, not in regard to speculation, but in regard to the permanent disposition of their funds," the court opened the floodgates of capital accumulating in family trusts and institutional endowments for investment in textile mills, railroads, real estate development, and other initiatives on which the elite was concentrating its entrepreneurial energies.

The 1830s marked the financial take-off point for the family that would eventually constitute the core of Boston's "Brahmin" elite. The textile industry, still rather experimental in the 1820s, grew rapidly in the '30s, thanks to tariff protection, an inexpensive supply of southern cotton, a growing domestic market, and abundant capital. The leading firms, still closely held by a handful of interrelated extended families including, most notably, the Appletons, Cabots, Jacksons, Lawrences, and Lowells -- produced an embarrassment of riches, a flood of wealth which grew faster than it could be spent. Funds were poured into new ventures: railroads, banks, real estate, iron, shipping, and lumber. But these only yielded more profits.

Boston's wealthiest families, despite their growing resources, lived austerely. They did not build great estates or entertain lavishly. Nor did they abandon active

involvement in civic or economic affairs for more "aristocratic pursuits." But the scope and scale of their fortunes, which grew unremittingly, made it increasingly difficult to sustain the fiction that they were merely the better off portion of a still-integral urban community. Not only were they rich, but their wealth -- thanks to such legal devices as trusts, which prevented the break-up of fortunes on the death of its founders -- seemed likely to become a permanent fact with which each succeeding generation would have to cope, both in terms of learning how to use it wisely and in terms of justifying the fact of possession in terms of the dominant egalitarian and democratic values of American society. As their fortunes grew, Boston's wealthy became increasingly preoccupied with the problem of ensuring that their descendants should prove worthy of their wealth.

The Brahmins responded to these challenges by increasing their involvement with and generosity towards private corporations with public purposes. By the 1830s, Harvard had become a central mechanism for socializing the sons of elite families -- as well as for recruiting talented and ambitious young men into commercial and eleemosynary enterprises in which they were interested. As young businessmen and professionals built their careers after graduation, service on corporate and charitable boards began to be regarded as important indicators of leadership ability, as well as testing grounds for advancement to greater responsibilities in both the worlds of commerce and charity. By the 1850s, leadership in the emerging Brahminate had come increasingly to be largely defined not merely by possession of wealth, but by service on an elaborate hierarchy of boards of the city's increasingly well endowed charitable, educational, and eleemosynary institutions. The most strategically important positions were held by individuals who linked the worlds of finance and benevolence and who, through control of their own enterprises and through their power to invest the assets of testamentary trusts and institutional endowments, were able to collectively shape the

city's economic direction, while at the same time assuring the continuing influence of its elite families.

#### ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE INSTITUTIONIZATION OF PHILANTHROPY

Despite what seemed to be irresistible pressures for institutionalizing charitable activity, a number of critics from within the elite itself argued against it. One of the most forceful and thoughtful critiques appeared in the Unitarian periodical, The Christian Examiner in September of 1829, in the form of a review of the annual reports of the American Unitarian Association, the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, and the General Union for Promoting the Observance of the Christian Sabbath.

The way in which the author treats voluntary organizations reminds us powerfully of their relative novelty in the late 1820s. Especially striking as well are the parallels with the language Tocqueville used in discussing the ubiquity of associations a year later, as he was gathering notes on American institutions. This is no coincidence. Tocqueville's notebooks cite a conversation with Harvard President Josiah Quincy in September of 1830 as the primary source for his insights. Quincy was at the time completing an essay on Boston's charities to be delivered in connection with the city's bi-centennial celebration. He had doubtless read the essay in the Christian Examiner and passed along portions of its contents to the young Frenchman. Unlike the author of the following, however, Quincy strongly approved of voluntary associations. Unlike Tocqueville, however, the author of this essay stressed the novelty of associations. In addition, rather than viewing them as an antidote to the tyranny of the majority, as Tocqueville did, he feared them as its instrument.

The anti-institutionalist themes in this essay were not by any means the exclusive property of the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians. (Indeed, the Jacksonians were far from unanimous in their thinking about associations). The critique of institutions is based on the author's perception of the important differences between "natural" associations such as family, neighborhood, and community and the "artificial" ones created by those who would do good to others. In this, as well as in his fear of the threats that associations pose to the capacity for individual moral development and individual action, the author anticipates in many ways the ideas of Emerson and Thoreau. By 1837, Emerson would begin speaking out against a state of society in which "the members have suffered amputation from the trunk, and strut about like so many walking monsters, -- a good finger, a neck, a stomach, an elbow, but never a man (Emerson [1837] 1957, 64)." Thus, he would continue

Man is metamorphosed into a thing, into many things. The planter, who is Man send out into the field to gather food, is seldom cheered by any idea of the true dignity of his ministry. He sees his bushel and his cart, and nothing beyond, and sinks into the farmer, instead of Man on the farm. The tradesman scarcely ever gives an ideal worth to his work, but is ridden by the routine of his craft, and the soul is subject to dollars. The priest becomes a form; the attorney a statute-book; the mechanic a machine; the sailor a rope of his ship (65).

Significantly, these ideas were generated by elite intellectuals -- the individuals who, willingly or unwillingly, were being forced to cede traditional claims both to moral leadership and control of institutions of charity and education to wealthy laymen.

## Associations (1829)

We have prefixed to this article the titles of several reports of Societies, not so much for the purpose of discussing the merits of the several institutions whose labors they celebrate, as with the more general design of offering some remarks on the disposition, which now prevails, to form Associations, and to accomplish all objects by organized masses. A difference of opinion on this point has begun to manifest itself, and murmurs against the countless Societies which modestly solicit, or authoritatively claim our aid, which now assail us with their fair promises of the good they have done, begin to break forth from the judicious and well disposed, as well as from the querulous and selfish. These doubts and complaints, however, are most frequently excited by particular cases of unfair or injurious operations in Societies. As yet, no general principles have been established, by which the value of this mode of action may be determined, or the relative claims of different Associations may be weighed. We will not promise to supply the deficiency, but we hope to furnish some help to a sounder judgment than yet prevails on the subject.

That the subject deserves attention, no man who observes the signs of the times, can doubt. Its importance forces itself on the reflecting. In truth, one of the most remarkable circumstances or features of our age, is the energy with which the principle of combination, or of action by joint forces, by associated numbers, is manifesting itself. It may be said, without much exaggeration, that everything is done now by Societies. Men have learned what wonders can be accomplished in certain cases by union, and seem to think that union is competent to do everything. You can scarcely name an object for which some institution has not been formed. Would men spread one set of opinions, or crush another? They make a Society. Would they improve the penal code, or relieve poor debtors? They form Societies. Would they encourage agriculture, or manufactures, or science? They form Societies. Would one class encourage horse-racing, and other discourage travelling on Sunday? They form Societies. We have immense institutions spreading over the country, combining hosts for particular objects. We have minute ramifications of these Societies, penetrating everywhere except through the poor-house, and conveying resources from the domestic, the laborer, and even the child, to the central treasury. This principle of

association is worthy [of] the attention of the philosopher, who simply aims to understand society, and its most powerful springs. To the philanthropist and the Christian it is exceedingly interesting, for it is a mighty engine, and must act, either for good or for evil, to an extent which no man can foresee or comprehend.

It is very easy, we conceive, to explain this great development of the principle of cooperation. The main cause is, the immense facility given to intercourse by modern improvements, by increased commerce and travelling, by the post-office, by the steam-boat, and especially by the press, by newspapers, periodicals, tracts, and other publication. Through these means, men of one mind, through a whole country, easily understand one another, and easily act together. The grand manoeuvre to which Napoleon owed his victories, we mean the concentration of great numbers on a single point, is now placed within the reach of all parties and sects. It may be said, that, by facilities of intercourse, men are brought within one another's attraction, and become arranged according to their respective affinities. Those who have one great object, find one another out through a vast extent of country, join their forces, settle their mode of operation, and act together with the uniformity of a disciplined army. So extensive have coalitions become, through the facilities now described, and so various and rapid are the means of communication, that when a few leaders have agreed on an object, an impulse may be given in a month to the whole country. Whole States may be deluged with tracts and other publications, and a voice like that of many waters, be called forth from immense and widely separated multitudes. Here is a new power brought to bear on society, and it is a great moral question, how it ought to be viewed, and what duties it imposes.

That this mode of action has advantages and recommendations, is very obvious. The principle arguments in its favor may be stated in a few words. Men, it is justly said, can do jointly, what they cannot do singly. The union of minds and hands, works wonders. Men grow efficient by concentrating their powers. Joint effort conquers nature, hew through mountains, rears pyramids, dikes out the ocean. Man, left to himself, would be one of the weakest of creatures. Associated with his kind, he gains

domination over the strongest animals, over the earth and the sea, and, by his growing knowledge, may be said to obtain a kind of property in the universe.

Nor is this all. Men not only accumulate power by union, but gain warmth, and earnestness. The heart is kindled. An electric communication is established between those who are brought nigh, and bound to each other, in common labors. Man droops in solitude. No sound excites him like the voice of his fellow creature. The mere sight of a human countenance, brightened with strong and generous emotion, gives new strength to act or suffer. Union not only brings to a point forces which before existed, and which were ineffectual through separation, but, by the feeling and interest it rouses, it becomes a creative principle, calls forth new forces, and gives the mind a consciousness of powers, which would otherwise have been unknown.

We have here given the common arguments by which the disposition to association is justified and recommended. They may be summed up in a few words; namely, that our social principles and relations are the great springs of improvement, and of vigorous and efficient exertion. That there is much truth in this representation of the influences of society, we at once feel. That without impulses and excitements from abroad, without sympathies and communication with our fellow creatures, we should gain nothing and accomplish nothing, we mean not to deny. Still we apprehend, that on this subject there is a want of accurate views and just discrimination. We apprehend that the true use of society is not sufficiently understood; that the chief benefit which it is intended to confer, and the chief danger to which it exposes us, are seldom weighed, and that errors or crude opinions on these points, deprive us of many benefits of our social connexions. These topics have an obvious bearing on the subject of this article. It is plain that the better we understand the true use, the chief benefit, and the chief peril of our social principles and relations, the better we shall be prepared to judge of Associations which are offered to our patronage. On these topics, then, we propose first to give our views; and, in so doing, we shall allow ourselves a considerable latitude, because, in our judgment, the influences of society at present tend

strongly to excess, and especially menace that individuality of character, for which they can yield no adequate compensation.

The great principle, from which we start in this preliminary discussion, and in which all our views of the topics above proposed, are involved, may be briefly expressed. It is this; --Society is chiefly important, as it ministers to, and calls forth, intellectual and moral energy and freedom. Its action on the individual is beneficial, in proportion as it awakens in him a power to act on himself, and to control or withstand the social influences to which he is at first subjected. Society served us, by furnishing objects, occasions, materials, excitements, through which the while soul may be brought into a vigorous exercise, may acquire a consciousness of its free and responsible nature, may become a law to itself, and may rise to the happiness and dignity of framing and improving itself without limit or end. Inward, creative energy, is the highest good which accrues to us from our social principles and connexions. . . . According to these views, our social nature and connexions are means. Inward power is the end; a power which is to triumph over, and control the influence of society.

We are told that we owe to society our most valuable knowledge. And true it is, that, were we cast from birth into solitude, we should grow up in brutal ignorance. But it is also true, that the knowledge which we receive is of little value, any farther than it is food and excitement to intellectual action. Its worth is to be measured by the energy with which it is sought and employed. Knowledge is noble, in proportion as it is prolific; in proportion as it quickens the mind to the acquisition of higher truth. Let it be rested in passively, and it profits us nothing. Let the judgment of others be our trust, so that we cease to judge for ourselves, and the intellect is degraded into a worthless machine. The dignity of the mind is to be estimated by the energy of its efforts for its own enlargement. It becomes heroic, when it reverences itself and asserts its freedom in a cowardly and servile age; when it withstands society through a calm, but invincible love of truth, and a consciousness of the dignity and progressiveness of its powers. . . .

What we have said of intellectual, is still more true of moral progress. No human being exists, whose character can be proposed as a faultless model. But could a perfect individual be found, we should only injure ourselves by indiscriminate, servile imitation; for much which is good in another, is good in him alone, belongs in his peculiar experience, is harmonious and beautiful only in combination with his other attributes, and would be unnatural, awkward, and forced in a servile imitator. . . . No man should part with his individuality and aim to become another. No process is so fatal as that which would cast all men into one mould. Every human being is intended to have a character of his own, to be what no other is, to do what no other can do. Our common nature is to be unfolded in unbounded diversities. It is rich enough for infinite manifestation. It is to wear innumerable forms of beauty and glory. Every human being has a work to carry on within, duties to perform abroad, influences to exert, which are peculiarly his, and which no conscience hut his own can teach. Let him not, then, enslave his conscience to others, but act with the freedom, strength, and dignity of one, whose highest law is in his own breast. . . .

The common opinion is, that our danger from society arises wholly from its bad members, and that we cannot easily be too much influenced by the good. But, to our apprehension, there is a peril in the influence both of good and bad. What many of us have chiefly to dread from society, is, not that we shall acquire a positive character of vice, but that it will impose on us a negative character, that we shall live and die passive beings, that the creative and self-forming energy of the soul will not be called forth in the work of our improvement. Our danger is, that we shall substitute the consciences of others for our own, that we shall paralyze our faculties through dependence on foreign guides, that we shall be moulded from abroad instead of determining ourselves. . . . We are in great peril of growing up slaves to this exacting, arbitrary sovereign; of forgetting, or never learning, our true responsibility; of living in unconsciousness of that divine power with which we are invested over ourselves, and in which all the dignity of our nature is centered; of overlooking the sacredness of our minds, and lying them open to impressions from any and all who surround us. Resistance of this foreign pressure is our only safeguard, and is essential to virtue. All virtue lies in individual action, in inward energy, in self-

determination. There is no moral worth in being swept away by a crowd, even towards the best objects. . . . A state of society, in which correct habits prevail, may produce in many, a mechanical regularity and religion, which is anything but virtue. Nothing morally great or good springs from mere sympathy and imitation. These principles will only forge chains for us, and perpetuate our infancy, unless more and more controlled and subdued by that inward lawgiver and judge, whose authority is from God, and whose sway over our whole nature, alone secures its free, glorious, and everlasting expansion.

The truth is, and we need to feel it most deeply, that our connexion with society, as it is our greatest aid, so it is our greatest peril. We are in constant danger of being spoiled of our moral judgment, and of our power over ourselves; and in losing these, we lose the chief prerogatives of spiritual beings. . . .

It is interesting and encouraging to observe, that the enslaving power of society over the mind, is decreasing, through what would seem at first to threaten its enlargement; we mean, through the extension of social intercourse. This is a distinction of our age, and one of its chief means of improvement. men are widening their bounds, exchanging thoughts and feelings with fellow beings far and wide, with inhabitants of other countries, with subjects of other governments, with professors of other modes of faith. Distant nations are brought near, and are acting on each other with a new power; the result is, that these differing and often hostile influences balance or neutralize one another, and almost compel the intellect to act, to compare, to judge, to frame itself. This we deem an immense benefit of the multiplication of books at the present day. The best books contain errors, and deserve a very limited trust. But wherever men of thought and genius publish freely, they will perpetually send forth new views, to keep alive the intellectual action of the world; will give a frequent shock to received opinions; will lead men to contemplate great subjects from new positions, and, by thus awakening individual and independent energy, will work higher good than by the knowledge which they spread. . . .

In the preceding remarks we have stated, at somewhat greater length than we intended, our views of the true and highest benefits of society. These seem to us great, unspeakably great. At the same time, like all other goods, they are accompanied with serious perils. Society too often oppresses the energy which it was meant to quicken and exalt. --We now pass to our principal subject; to the Associations for public purposes, whether benevolent, moral, or religious, which are so multiplied in the present age. And here we must confine ourselves to two remarks; the first intended to assign to such Associations their proper place or rank, and the second, to suggest a principle, by which such Societies may be distinguished from such as are pernicious, and by which we may be aided in distributing among them our favor and patronage.

Our first remark is, that we should beware of confounding together, as of equal importance, those associations which are formed by our Creator, which spring from our very constitution, and are inseparable from our being, and those of which we are now treating, which man invests for particular times and exigencies. Let us never place our weak, shortsighted contrivances on a level with the arrangements of God. We have acknowledged the infinite importance of society to the development of human powers and affections. But when we speak thus of society, we mean chiefly the connexions of family, of neighbourhood, of country, and the great bond of humanity, uniting us with our whole kind, and not Missionary Societies, Peace Societies, or Charitable Societies, which men have contrived. These last have their uses, and some do great good; but they are no more to be compared with the societies in which nature places us, than the torches we kindle on earth in the darkness of night, are to be paralleled with the all-pervading and all-glorifying light of the sun. . . . Artificial associations have their use, but are not to be named with those of nature; and to these last, therefore, we give our chief regard.

We can easily illustrate, by examples, the inferiority of human associations. In Boston, there are two Asylums for children, which deserve, we think, a high place among useful institutions. Not a little time is spend upon them. Hundreds conspire to carry them on, and we have anniversaries to collect

crowds for their support. And what is the amount of good accomplished? Between one or two hundred children are provided for, a number worthy of all the care bestowed on these charities. But compare this number with all the children of this city, with the thousands who throng our streets, and our schools. And how are these fed, clothed, educated? We hear of no subscriptions, no anniversaries for their benefit; yet how they flourish, compared with the subjects of Asylums! These are provided for by that unostentatious and unpraised society, which God has instituted, a family. That shelter, home, which nature rears, protects them, and it is an establishment worth infinitely more than all the institutions, great or small, which man has devised. In truth, just as far as this is improved, as its duties are performed, and its blessings prized, all artificial institutions are superseded. Here then is the sphere for the agency of the wise and good. Improve the family, strengthen and purify the relations of domestic life, and more is done for the happiness and progress of the race, than by the most splendid charities. --Let us take another example, the Hospital in the same metropolis; a noble institutions, worthy of high praise. But where is it that the sick of our city are healed? Must you look for them in the Hospital? You may find them there perhaps, and should rejoice to find there fifty or sixty beds for the poor. The thousands who sicken and die among us, are to be found in their homes, watched over by the nursing care of mothers and sisters, surrounded by that tenderness which grows up only at home. Let us take another example, Missionary Societies. This whole country is thrown into excitement to support missions. The rich are taxed, and the poor burdened. . . . But what is the amount of good effected? A few missionaries, we know not the precise number, are supported, of whom most have hitherto brought little to pass. Who can compare associations for this object, with churches, or those congregations of neighbours for regular worship, which Christianity has instituted, and to which nature has always prompted the professors of the same faith? Through these incalculable aid is given to the support and diffusion of Christianity; and yet, through the propensity of human nature to exaggerate what is forced and artificial, one missionary at a distance is thought of more importance than a hundred ministers near, and the sending of him abroad is extolled as an incomparably greater exploit of piety, than the support of our own places of worship. We mean not to discourage Missionary Societies; but the truth is, that Christianity is to be diffused incomparably more by caring for and promoting it in our natural

relations, in our homes, in our common circles and churches, than by institutions endowed with the revenues of nations for sending it to distant lands. The great obstruction to Christianity among foreign nations, is, its inoperativeness among the nations which profess it. We offer others a religion, which, in their apprehension, has done the givers no great good. The true course is, to rely less on our own machinery of Cent Societies and National Societies, and to rely more on the connexions and arrangements of nature, or of God.

We beg not to be misunderstood. We would on no account discourage the Asylum, the Hospital, the Missionary Society. All receive our cheerful support. We mean only to say, that our great sources of improvement and happiness, are our natural relations and associations, and that to understand these better, and to attach ourselves more faithfully to their duties, are the great social means of carrying forward the world. A striking confirmation of these remarks may be found in the Roman Catholic Church. The probability is, that under Catholic religion in the dark ages, there were larger contributions to the relief of the distressed, in proportion to the wealth of communities, than at present, and contributions by associations which regarded almsgiving as one of their main duties; we mean the monasteries. But the monks, who quitted the relations of nature, the society which God had instituted, in order to form new and artificial bonds, made a sad mistake. Their own characters were injured, and the very charities doled out from convents, increased the beggary which they hoped to relieve. So sacred is nature, that it cannot be trampled with impunity. We fear that something similar to the error just noticed among the Catholics, is spreading among Protestants; the error of exalting societies of human device above our natural relations. . . .

We repeat, let us not be misunderstood. Missionary Societies, established on just principles, do honor to a christian community. . . . We oppose only the preference of those institutions to the natural associations and connexions of life. An individual who thinks he is doing a more religious act in contributing to a Missionary Society, than in doing a needful act of kindness to a relative, friend, or neighbour, is leaving a society of God's institutions, for one of man's making. He shows a perverted

judgment in regard to the duties of religion, and in regard to the best ways of spreading it. All that has been done, or ever will or can be done by Associations for diffusing Christianity, is a mere drop in the bucket, compared with what is done silently, and secretly, by the common daily duties of Christians in their families, neighbourhoods, and business. . . .

We now proceed to our second remark, in which we proposed to suggest a principle, by which the claims of different Associations may be estimated. It is this; --The value of Associations is to be measured by the energy, the freedom, the activity, the moral power, which they encourage and diffuse. In truth, the great object of benevolence, is, to give power, activity, and freedom to others. We cannot, in the strict sense of the word, *make* any being happy. We can give others the *means* of happiness, together with motives to the faithful use of them; but on this faithfulness, on the free and full exercise of their own powers, their happiness depends. There is thus a fixed impassable limit to human benevolence. It can only make men happy through themselves, through their own freedom, and energy. We go further. We believe, that God has set the same limit to his own benevolence. He makes no being happy, in any other sense than in that of giving him means, powers, motives, and a field for exertion. We have here, we think, the great consideration to guide us in judging of Associations. Those are good which communicate power, moral and intellectual action, and the capacity of useful efforts, to the persons who form them, or to the persons on whom they act. On the other hand, Associations which in any degree impair or repress the free and full action of men's powers, are so far hurtful. On this principle, Associations for restoring men to health, strength, the use of their limbs, the use of their senses, especially of sight and hearing, are to be highly approved, for such enlarge men's powers; whilst charitable Associations, which weaken in men the motives to exertion, which offer a bounty to idleness, or make beggary profitable as labor, are great calamities to society, and peculiarly calamitous to those whom they relieve. On the same principle, Associations which are designed to awaken the human mind, to give to men of all classes a consciousness of their intellectual powers, to communicate knowledge of a useful and quickening character, to encourage men in thinking with freedom and vigor, to inspire an ardent love and pursuit of truth, --are most worthy of patronage;

whilst such as are designed or adapted to depress the human intellect, to make it dependent and servile, to keep it where it is, to give a limited amount of knowledge, but not to give impulse and an onward motion to men's thoughts, --all such Associations, however benevolent their professions, should be regarded as among the foes and obstructions to the best interests of society. On the same principle, Associations aiming to purify and ennoble the character of a people, to promote true virtue, a rational piety, a disinterested charity, a wise temperance, and especially aiming to accomplish those ends by the only effectual means, that is, by calling forth men's own exertions for a high knowledge of God and duty, and for a new and growing control of themselves, --such institutions are among the noblest; whilst no encouragement is due to such as aim to make men religious and virtuous by paralyzing their minds through terror, by fastening on them a yoke of opinions or practices, by pouring upon them influences from abroad which virtually annihilate their power over themselves, and make them instruments for others to speak through, and to wield at pleasure. We beg our readers to carry with them the principle now laid down in judging of Associations; to inquire, how far they are fitted to call forth energy, active talent, religious enquiry, a free and manly virtue. We insist on these remarks, because not a few Associations seem to us exceedingly exceptionable on account of their tendency to fetter men, to repress energy, to injure the free action of individuals and society, and because this tendency lurks, and is to be guarded against even in good institutions. On this point we cannot but enlarge; for we deem it of highest importance.

Associations often injure free action by a very plain and obvious operation. They accumulate power in a few hands, and this takes place just in proportion to the surface over which they spread. In a large institution, a few men rule, a few do everything; and if the institution happens to be directed to objects about which conflict and controversy exist, a few are able to excite in the mass strong and bitter passions, and by these to obtain an immense ascendancy. Through such an Association, widely spread, yet closely connected by party feeling, a few leaders can send their voices and spirit far and wide, and, where great funds are accumulated, can league a host of instruments, and by menace and appeals to interest, can silence opposition. Accordingly, we fear that in this country, an influence is growing up

through widely spread Societies, altogether at war with the spirit of our institutions, and which, unless jealously watched, will, will gradually but surely encroach on freedom of thought, of speech, and of the press. It is very striking to observe, how, by such combinations, the very means of encouraging a free action of men's minds, may be turned against it. We all esteem the press as the safeguard of our liberties, as the power which is to quicken intellect by giving to all minds an opportunity to act on all. Now by means of Tract Societies, spread over a whole community, and acting under a central body, a few individuals, perhaps not more than twenty, may determine the chief reading for a great part of the children of the community, and for a majority of the adults, and may deluge our country with worthless sectarian writings, fitted only to pervert its taste, degrade its intellect, and madden it with intolerance. Let Associations devoted to any objects which excite the passions, be everywhere spread and leagued together for mutual support, and nothing is easier than to establish a control over newspapers. We are persuaded that by an artful multiplication of societies, devoted apparently to different objects, but all swayed by the same leaders, and all intended to bear against a hated party, as cruel a persecution may be carried on in a free country as in a despotism. Public opinion may be so combined, and inflamed, and brought to bear on odious individuals or opinions, that it will be as perilous to think and speak with manly freedom, as if an Inquisition were open before us. It is now discovered that the way to rule in this country, is by an array of numbers, which a prudent man will not like to face. Of consequence, all Associations aiming to tending to establish sway by numbers, ought to be opposed. They create tyrants as effectually as standing armies. Let them be withstood from the beginning. No matter whether the opinions which they intend to put down be true or false. Let no opinion be put down by such means. Let not error be suppressed by an instrument, which will be equally powerful against truth, and which must subvert that freedom of thought on which all truth depends. Let the best end fail, if it cannot be accomplished by right and just means. . . . We cannot consent that what we deem error should be crushed by the joint cries and denunciations of vast Societies directed by the tyranny of a few; for truth has more to dread from such weapons than falsehood, and we know no truth against which they may not be successfully turned. In this country, few things are to be more dreaded, than organizations or institutions by which public opinion may be brought to bear

tyrannically against individuals or sects. From the nature of things, public opinion is often unjust; but when it is not embodied and fixed by pledged Societies, it easily relents, it may receive new impulses, it is open to influences from the injured. On the contrary, when shackled and stimulated by vast Associations, it is in danger of becoming a steady, unrelenting tyrant, browbeating the timid, proscribing the resolute, silencing free speech, and virtually denying the dearest religious and civil rights. We say not that all great Associations *must* be thus abused. We know that some are useful. We know, too, that there are cases, in which it is important that public opinion should be condensed, or act in a mass. We feel, however, that the danger of great Associations is increased by the very fact, that they are sometimes useful. They are perilous instruments. They ought to be suspected. They are a kind of irregular government created within our Constitutional government. Let them be watched closely. As soon as we find them resolved or even disposed to bear down on a respectable man or set of men, or to force on the community measures about which wise and good men differ, let us feel that a dangerous engine is at work among us, and oppose to it our steady and stern disapprobation.

We have spoken of the tendency of great institutions to accumulate power in a few hands. These few they make more active; but they tend to produce dependence, and to destroy self-originated action in the vast multitudes who compose them, and this is a serious injury. Few comprehend the extent of this evil. Individual action is the highest good. . . . We mean not to sever man from other in well-doing, for we have said there are a good many objects which can only be accomplished by numbers. But generally speaking, we can do most good by individual action, and our own virtue is incomparably more improved by it. It is vastly better, for example, that we should give our own money without own hands, from our own judgment, and through personal interest in the distresses of others, than that we should send it by a substitute. Second-hand charity is not as good to the giver or receiver as immediate. There are, indeed, urgent cases where we cannot act immediately, or cannot alone do the good required. There let us join with others; but where we can do good secretly, and separately, or only with some dear friend, we shall almost certainly put forth in this way more of intellect and heart, more of sympathy and strenuous purpose, and shall awaken more of virtuous sensibility in those whom we relieve, than if we were to be

parts of a multitude in accomplishing the same end. Individual action is the great point to be secured. . . .  
. In truth, Associations are chiefly used by giving means and opportunities to gifted individuals to act out their own minds. A Missionary Society achieves little good, except when it can send forth an individual who wants no teaching or training from the Society, but who carries his commission and chief power in his own soul. We urge this, for we feel that we are all in danger of sacrificing our individuality and independence to our social connexions. We dread new social trammels. They are too numerous already. From these views we learn, that there is cause to fear and to withstand great Associations, as far as they interfere with, or restrain individual action, personal independence, private judgment, free self-originated effort. We do fear, from not a few Associations which exist, that power is to be accumulated in the hands of a few, and a servile, tame, dependent spirit, to be generated in the many. Such is the danger of our times, and we are bound as Christians and freemen to withstand.  
. . . .

The author of this essay -- the "Pope" of Boston Unitarianism, William Ellery Channing -- posed himself a peculiarly difficult task. On the one hand, he understood the value of associations in morally and politically empowering individuals and in accomplishing great tasks that could not otherwise be accomplished. On the other, he feared them as instruments of political tyranny and moral disenfranchisement when operated by the wrong people. In 1829, when the essay was written, the initiative for using voluntary associations may indeed have seemed to be in the hands of the evangelicals whom the author, as a member of the Unitarian elite, had every reason to fear.

As he and his class confronted the increasingly intractable challenges of urban poverty and slavery, Channing resolved his ambivalence in favor of voluntary associations, as they came to understand how, by strategically deploying their financial resources, they could begin more effectively to use associations to their own purposes. This paralleled the Boston elite's shifting political tactics: initially repelled by the Jacksonian political style, by 1840 the reform-minded Whigs embraced it with the "log cabin and hard cider" presidential campaign of William Henry Harrison, in which an aristocratic plantation owner was successfully represented as a "man of the people" and public enthusiasm whipped up with free drinks, torchlight parades, and an assortment of other devices.

#### THE LOWELL INSTITUTE: EMBRACING THE DILEMMAS OF INEQUALITY

The Brahmins' sense of themselves as a separate class was reinforced by the political struggles of the era. Following the earlier pattern of Jeffersonianism, Jacksonian politics in Massachusetts involved not only electoral and economic challenges from newly

enfranchised "common men," but a continuation of the conflict between Trinitarians and Unitarians. These involved not only on-going attacks on elite influence over Harvard, but also the establishment of rival institutions which sought to shape public opinion.

If, on the one hand, the Brahmins' wealth made it difficult for them to claim to be "of the people," on the other hand it expanded their capacities to influence the people. Nowhere is this more evident than in the founding of the Lowell Institute, a prototype of the modern foundation, established under the will of John Lowell, Jr. (1799-1836), the son of textile industry pioneer Francis Cabot Lowell. A politically active lawyer and a leader of the Unitarian forces, Lowell was keenly aware of the struggle between the two for public influence, as well as the extent to which Trinitarian leaders like Lyman Beecher were using public lecture series -- the lyceums -- as recruiting grounds for their cause.

But Lowell's concerns went well beyond religion and politics. He was no less concerned with the problem of articulating the relationship of wealth to the new kinds of urban life that were transforming his city. In a setting in which thousands of young men and women were flocking to public lectures and other forms of entertainment, it was quite clear that private libraries like the Boston Athenaeum and educational institutions like Harvard could never hope to influence the broader public. To do this, the wealthy would have to be willing "to raise the character of the community" by proactively influencing the form and content of public culture. Naturally, in an open market for public edification, the elite could not force audiences to attend lectures of a more "elevated" sort. Nevertheless, by making attendance at the lectures free of charge to their audiences and by providing funds which could attract "star quality" lecturers, the Lowell Institute enjoyed a considerable competitive advantage over its rivals, which had to depend on admission fees to remunerate speakers. In effect, the Institute

represented an assertion of elite control over public culture (the lecturers, after all, were chosen by the single trustee of the Institute, who was required to be a lineal descendant of the Lowell family) justified in a language of "public improvement."

For all the rivalry between the religious and political factions, the Unitarian elite did benefit significantly from the "moral reform" agitations of the Trinitarians and other evangelicals. The latter had led a crusade in the 1820s against the city's theaters. These were "all constructed after the manner of the English theatres of that period -- with 'refreshment rooms' so called, which were in reality common grog-shops, contiguous to them or within easy access, with an entrance directly from the pit and first row of boxes. Free admission was granted to women to the 'third row'" -- with predictable moral consequences (Smith 1898, 8-9). The theaters were shut down in short order. Some, like the Federal Street Theatre, were taken over by elite organizations like the Boston Academy of Music. Others, like the Tremont Theatre, were purchased by the evangelicals and dedicated to religious purposes and public lectures.

Edward Everett, "A MEMOIR OF MR. JOHN LOWELL, JUN., DELIVERED AT THE INTRODUCTION TO THE LECTURES ON HIS FOUNDATION IN THE ODEON, 31st DECEMBER, 1839. . . ."

The occasion of our meeting, at this time, is of a character not less unusual than interesting. By the munificence of the late Mr. John Lowell, jun., a testamentary provision was made for the establishment of regular courses of public lectures, upon the most important branches of natural and moral science, to be annually delivered in the city of Boston. The sum generously set apart by him for this purpose, and amounting nearly to two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, is, with the exception of the bequest of the late Mr. Girard of Philadelphia, the largest, if I mistake not, which has ever been appropriated in this country, by a private individual, for the endowment of any literary institution. The idea of a foundation of this kind, on which, unconnected with any place of education, provision is made, in the midst of a large commercial population, for annual courses of instruction by public lectures, to be delivered gratuitously to all who choose to attend them, as far as it is practicable within our largest halls, is, I believe, original with Mr. Lowell. I am not aware that, among all the munificent establishments of Europe, there is any thing of this description upon a large scale; and I cannot but regard it as a conception eminently adapted to the character and wants of our community, and promising to be as beneficial as it is original and generous.

The form of instruction by public lectures has greatly prevailed of late years, and obtained a high degree of favor in this and other parts of the United States. It has been ascertained, that twenty-six courses of lectures were delivered in Boston during the last season, not including those which consisted of less than eight lectures; --many of them by lecturers amply qualified to afford instruction and rational entertainment to an intelligent audience. These lectures, it is calculated, were attended, in the aggregate, by about thirteen thousand five hundred persons, at an expense of less than twelve thousand dollars. This is, probably, a greater number of lectures than was ever delivered in any previous year; but the number of courses has been steadily increasing, from the time of their first commencement, on the present footing, about twenty years ago. It is not easy to conceive of a plan, by which provision could be

made for the innocent and profitable employment of a part of the leisure time of so large a portion of the community, at so small an expense.

These facts sufficiently show the vast importance, as well as the popularity, of this form of public instruction, and they naturally lead to the question, whether it does not admit of improvement in respect to the character of the lectures, and the basis on which they are delivered. In answer to this inquiry, it readily suggests itself, that, notwithstanding the great and unquestioned benefit which must accrue to the community, from the delivery of so large a number of lectures on scientific and literary subjects to voluntary audiences of both sexes, there are two points, in which the system is evidently defective. In the first place, the means of the institutions, under whose auspices most of the public lectures are delivered, are inadequate to hold out a liberal and certain reward to men of talent and learning, for the preparation of well-digested and systematic courses. The compensation is necessarily limited to a moderate fee, paid from the proceeds of the subscriptions to the courses. A necessary consequence is, that the greater part of the lectures are miscellaneous essays, delivered by different persons, without reference to each other. These essays are often highly creditable to their authors as literary efforts; and in the aggregate, no doubt, they are the vehicle of a great amount of useful knowledge. But it cannot be denied that the tendency of the lectures, prepared under these circumstances, is to the discussion of popular generalities, for the production of immediate effect; and that the succession of such lectures during a season can never be expected to form a connected series, upon any branch of useful knowledge. . .

In another respect the system obviously admits improvement. Although the length of time for which these lectures have been delivered among us, with increasing public favor, is matter of just surprise, in the absence of all established funds for their support; yet there is just ground for apprehension, that the system may not prove permanent without further provision to sustain it. Whatever relies for its support on retaining the public favor, without a liberal compensation for the performance of labor, and without the means of withstanding the caprices of fashion and the changes of popular taste, is, of

course, in some danger of declining, when the attraction of novelty is over, and the zeal of the first enterprise is exhausted. Even if there were no just ground to fear an entire discontinuance of the public lectures, it is obvious that the present system contains no principle for such a steady improvement in the character of the instruction they furnish, as is necessary to make them a very efficient instrument of raising the literary and scientific character of the community.

For each of these evils an ample remedy is found in the provision of Mr. Lowell's bequest. It holds out the assurance of a liberal reward for the regular delivery of systematic courses of lectures. By the positive regulations of the founder, these courses will extend to some of the most important branches of moral, intellectual, and physical science; while the trustee is enabled, in the exercise of the liberal discretion reposed in him, to make provision for any lectures, which, in his judgement, may be most conducive to the public improvement. The compensation, which is provided by the bequest, is sufficient to reward the lecturers for the elaborate and conscientious preparation of their courses, and consequently to command the highest talent and attainment engaged in the communication of knowledge in this country; and this, not for the present season or the present generation, but as long as it is possible for human wisdom and human laws to give permanence to any of the purposes of man, for all coming time.

We may therefore consider it as certain, that all who are disposed, in this community, (within the limitation, of course, of the capacity of our largest halls to accommodate an audience,) to employ a portion of their leisure time in the improvement of their minds in this way, will henceforward enjoy the fullest advantage of regular courses of public lectures, delivered without expense to those who are to here them, by persons selected for their ability to impart instruction, and amply rewarded for the labor of faithful preparation. While the public are reaping this advantage, the permanent funds provided by the founder's bequest will constitute a very important addition to the other existing inducements to the pursuit of a studious life; and may in that way be expected gradually to exert a sensible influence, in elevating the scientific and literary character of the country.

It may also be observed, that, so far from preventing the delivery of other courses of lectures on the plan hitherto pursued, this foundation may be expected to extend its beneficial influence to them. It is physically impossible, that much more than a tenth part of the whole number of those estimated to have attended the lectures of the last season, should be accommodated in any one hall; and a single repetition is all that can be expected of any lecture on the Lowell foundation. A very great demand for other courses will therefore continue to exist; and the Lowell Institute, by causing the preparation and delivery of a steady succession of lectures, capable of being repeated before other audiences, will facilitate the supply of this demand. It will no doubt become easier than it has heretofore been, for other institutions, with the command of limited means, to procure for their audiences the advantage of systematic courses. . . .

As an introduction to this first course of lectures before the Lowell Institute, I cannot but think it will be deemed reasonable and just, by this respectable audience, to devote a single hour to the commemoration of the munificent founder. As he thought proper to restrict his bequest to objects which he deemed of direct public utility, forbidding the expenditure of any part of the fund in buildings and fixtures, which, in other foundations, that may be compared to this, usually serve as sensible monuments to their founders, and limiting its application to purposes at once the least ostentatious and the best calculated to act immediately on the mind of the community, --it seems doubly reasonable that we should devote at least one evening to a notice of his brief and somewhat eventful life. I have yielded cheerfully to the request of the highly respected trustee of Mr. Lowell's foundation,<sup>298</sup>--the kinsman and friend to whom he confided the sole administration of the largest and most important bequest ever made in this city, --that I would undertake the honorable task of paying this tribute of gratitude to the memory of our deceased fellow-citizen and benefactor. . . .

[Everett here proceeds to give an extended history of the Lowell family, detailing its role in the Revolution and early republic, and devoting particular attention to Francis Cabot Lowell and the development of the textile industry. In his efforts to weave an historical tapestry which joins together the history of the family, of

industry, of the class of which it was part, and eleemosynary institutions, Everett is attempting to articulate a justification for the possession of wealth by the Brahmin class. Interestingly, he does evoke conceptions of stewardship, but instead bases his argument on the conspicuous contributions of the family to the nation and community.]

To . . . the fruit of the intelligence and influence of Mr. [Francis Cabot] Lowell, New England owes that branch of the industry which has made her amends for the diminution of her foreign trade; which has kept her prosperous under the exhausting drain of her population to the West; which has brought a market for his agricultural produce to the farmers door; and which, while it has conferred these blessing on this part of the country, has been productive of good, and nothing but good, to every other portion of it. For these public benefits, --than which none, not directly connected with the establishment of our liberties, are of a higher order, or of a more comprehensive scope, --the people of the United States are indebted to Mr. Francis C. Lowell; and in conferring his name upon the noble city of the arts in our neighborhood, a monument not less appropriate than honorable has been reared to his memory. What memorial of a great public benefactor so becoming as the bestowal of his name on a prosperous community, which has started, as it were, from the soil at the touch of his wand? Pyramids and mausoleums may crumble to the earth, and brass and marble mingle with the dust they cover, but the pure and well-deserved renown, which is thus incorporated with the busy life of an intelligent people, will be remembered, till the long lapse of ages and the vicissitudes of fortune shall reduce all of America to oblivion and decay.

. . .Mr. John Lowell, jun., was born on the 11th of May, 1799, and, after receiving his earliest education at the schools of his native city, was taken by his father to Europe, . . . and placed at the high-school of Edinburgh. . . . He accompanied his father on his return to America, and in 1813 was placed at Harvard College. . . . His health did not permit him to complete his collegiate course, and, after two years residence at Cambridge, he left the university to follow a more active source of life. In 1816 and

1817, he made two voyages to India, --the first to Batavia, returning by Holland and England, the second to Calcutta. . . .

From the time of his return from his second voyage, with invigorated health, Mr. Lowell became a diligent student. He was engaged with success in commercial pursuits, and, of course, gave to them a sufficient degree of attention. His operations, however, were principally connected with the East Indies, and did not engross his time. His leisure was almost exclusively devoted to reading. . . . He rapidly formed one of the best selected and expensive private libraries in the city, and acquired a familiarity with its contents, not always possessed by the owner of many books.

He did not, however, allow his love of reading to divert his thoughts from the political and moral interests of the community. His time and his property were freely given to the calls of public and private benevolence. He engaged with earnestness in the promotion of the various public-spirited undertakings of the day. He took an active part in political concerns. Regarding our institutions of government as better adapted than any others to promote the virtue and happiness of the people, he considered it the duty of every good citizen to bear his part of the burden of sustaining and administering them. Engaged in lucrative pursuits, which made much attention to public business a pecuniary sacrifice, and with a thirst for knowledge which superseded the necessity of political excitement, he yet gave himself, on principle, to public service. He was repeatedly a member of the Common Council of the city, and the legislature of the commonwealth. In both of these bodies he was distinguished for his assiduous attention to his duties, and for the practical and business-like view which he took of every subject of discussion. Indeed it was his characteristic to do *thoroughly* whatever he undertook. His usefulness was, however, more conspicuous in the committee-room than at the caucus; and as he did not depend upon office for bread, he dwelt less than is the fashion of the day in professions of disinterested regard for the people. Leaving others to flatter them, his own conscience was satisfied, when he had served them to the best of his ability

. . . .

In the years 1830 and 1831, he had the misfortune to lose, in the course of a few months, his wife and two daughters, his only children. This calamity broke up, for a season, all his pleasant associations with home, and served to revive the slumbering passion for foreign travel. . . . Desirous of extending his acquaintance with his own country before going abroad, he passed a considerable portion of the summer of 1832 in a tour of the Western States. He made other preparations, of a more serious character, for what might befall him abroad, and, as he event proved, with a spirit of foreboding that early termination of his life which Providence had appointed. Bereaved, by the domestic calamity just alluded to, of all those dependent upon him for their support and establishment in life, he had already conceived and matured the plan of his munificent foundation. By a will made before leaving his native country, he set aside a large portion of his ample property to be expended, forever, in the support of those courses of lectures in the city of Boston, of which the first is now about to commence. . . .

[Here follows a lengthy narrative of Lowell's travels over a period of 4 years, during which he went from France to England and thence through Holland, Belgium, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Armenia, Persia, to Egypt, thence down the Nile to Kartoum, through Ethiopia, and ultimately to India. He died in Bombay on March 4, 1836].

With his first serious illness in Upper Egypt, he turned his thoughts to the land of his birth, and the completion of his testamentary provision for the benefit of his native city. The object of his bequest, as set forth in his will, is "the maintenance and support of public lectures, to be delivered in Boston, upon philosophy, natural history, the arts and sciences, or any of them, as the trustee shall, from time to time, deem expedient for the promotion of the moral, and intellectual, and physical instruction or education of the citizens of Boston." After a partial recovery from a severe attack of disease, from which he suffered for five weeks, --in a codicil to his will written amidst the ruins of Thebes, from a place called Luxor, an Arab village, the whole of which is situated on the remains of an ancient palace,

--Mr. Lowell transmits to his kinsmen and trustee his detailed directions for the administration of his trust. Of these, the most important are expressed as follows: --

"As the most certain and the most important part of true philosophy appears to me to be that, which shows the connection between God's revelations and the knowledge of good and evil implanted by him in our nature, I wish a course of lectures to be given on natural religion, showing its conformity to that of our Saviour.

"For the more perfect demonstration of the truth of those moral and religious precepts, by which alone, as I believe, men can be secure of happiness in this world and that to come, I wish a course of lectures to be delivered on historical and internal evidences in favor of Christianity. I wish all disputed points of faith and ceremony to be avoided, and the attention of the lecturers to be directed to the moral doctrines of the gospel, stating their opinion, if they will, but not engaging in controversy, even on the subject of the penalty for disobedience.

"As the prosperity of my native land, New England, which is sterile and unproductive, must depend hereafter, as it has heretofore depended, first, on the moral qualities, and, second, on the intelligence and information of its inhabitants, I am desirous of trying to contribute towards this second object also; -and I wish courses of lectures to be established on physics and chemistry, with their application to the arts; also, on botany, zoology, geology, and mineralogy, connected with their particular utility to man.

"After the establishment of these courses of lectures, should disposable funds remain, or, in process of time, be accumulated, the trustee may appoint courses of lectures to be delivered on the literature and eloquence of our language, and even on those of foreign nations, if he see fit. He may, also, from time to time, establish lectures on any subject that, in his opinion, the wants and taste of the age may demand.

"As infidel opinions appear to me injurious to society, and easily to insinuate themselves into a man's dissertations on any subject, however remote from religion, no man ought to be appointed a lecturer, who is not willing to declare, and who does not previously declare, his belief in the divine revelation of the Old and New Testaments, leaving the interpretation thereof to his own conscience."

Such were the enlightened provisions of Mr. Lowell for the benefit of his native city. Surrounded by the most enduring monuments of human grandeur, he felt how little can be done to elevate the moral nature of man, by exhausting the quarry and piling its blocks of granite to the clouds. As far as we can judge from the unparalleled number and gigantic dimensions of the temples, palaces, gateways, alleys of sphinxes, and cemeteries, that cover the site, and fill up the environs of Egyptian Thebes, the resources of monarchs, who made it their residence, must have exceeded those of the Roman Caesars, when the world obeyed their sceptre. But when we inquire after the influence of this might monarchy on the welfare of the human race; when we ask for the lights of humanity that adorned its annals, --for the teachers of trust, the discoveries in science, the champions of virtue, the statesmen, the legislators, the friends of man, --it is all a dreary blank. Not one bright name is preserved in their history; not one great or generous deed, if ever performed, has escaped from oblivion; not a word, ever uttered or written by the myriads of rational beings, the lords or the subjects of this mighty empire, has been embalmed in the memory of mankind. A beam of light from the genius of the modern French scholar, cast upon the sculptured sides of obelisks and temples, has redeemed the names and titles of forgotten Pharaohs from ages of oblivion; but no moral Champollion can pour a transforming ray into the essential character of the Egyptian monarchy, and make it aught else than one unbroken record of superstition, ignorance, and slavery.

Our lamented fellow-citizen, well versed in the history of ancient times, musing amidst the ruins of this unconsecrated magnificence, seems, with a yearning heart, . . . to have desired, as far as an individual could effect it, to secure his beloved native land from the blighting influence of those causes, which preyed upon the vitals of this primal seat of empire. These causes were well known to him, --

known from history, --known from their existence at the present hour, in the same wretched region. There was no free cultivation of the intellect in Egypt, --no popular education, --no public liberty. The resources of the monarchy were lavished on the wars and luxury of its princes. The soul-crushing despotism of mystery checked all development of the common mind. In consequence of the slavery of *caste*, religion -- instead of being a source of light, of social improvement, and happiness -- was an additional instrument of subjection. It chiefly employed its energies in the disgusting art of preserving the clay that perishes from returning to its kindred dust. Nor was this the worst. The priesthood made themselves the exclusive depositaries of learning. If we can trust the accounts of the ancient writers, the import of those hieroglyphical characters in which the Egyptian wisdom is recorded, was a mystery known only to the priests, and those to whom, in their secluded cells, they chose to confide it. Well might it have been expected that the knowledge of it would perish. It had no root in the intelligence of the people; it was the secret of a caste, and it died out with the privileged order by which it was engrossed. The pyramids themselves could not crumble, --the sculptured granite, in that mild climate, could not lose its deeply-graven character; --but, instead of handing down an intelligent record of the monarchs who reared their mountain masses, and now slumber in their monumental caverns, they stand out but as eternal mementos how perishable is all glory, how fleeting is all duration, but that of the improved mind.

The few sentences penned, with a tired hand, by our fellow-citizen, on the top of a palace of the Pharaohs, will do more for human improvement, than, for aught that appears, was done by all of that gloomy dynasty that ever reigned. . . . I am persuaded that more useful knowledge, higher views of the works of God, deeper and more searching glimpses into the mysteries of nature, --will be communicated in the course of lectures which will commence next Friday, than lies hidden in the hieroglyphics that cover the Egyptian temples. . . . Let the foundation of Mr. Lowell stand on the principles prescribed by him; let fidelity with which it is now administered continue to direct it; and no language is emphatic enough to do full justice to its importance. It will be, from generation to generation, a perennial source of public good, --a dispensation of sound science, of useful knowledge, of truth in its most important

associations with the destiny of man. These are blessing which cannot die. They will abide, when the sands of the desert shall have covered what they have hitherto spared of the Egyptian temples; and they will render the name of Lowell, in all wise and moral estimation, more truly illustrious, than that of any Pharaoh engraven on their walls. These belong to the empire of the mind, which alone, of all human things, immortal, and they will remain as a memorial of his Christian liberality, when all that is material shall have vanished as a scroll.

In his peroration, Everett touched upon one of the Bostonian's most compelling anxieties: the notion that, having established their fortunes and having, in their view, laid the foundations of an American empire, they would prove unable and unworthy of sustaining it. Everett recognized that the genius of American culture was its linkage to "the common mind" and the commitment of its leaders to elevating the community, rather than celebrating itself in sterile monuments or isolated cultivation and preservation of arcane knowledge. And yet he never fully articulated the concept of stewardship, in which the wealthy held their riches in trust for the good of society.

Everett did not pass up the opportunity to take a swipe at the Trinitarians. His condemnation of knowledge dominated by priests "and confided only to their friends" was a clear reference to the evangelists aggressive institution-building activities and their continuing efforts to recapture Harvard. In line with this concern, it was singularly appropriate that the first individual designated to serve as Lowell Lecturer was Benjamin Silliman, Yale's leading light and one-time protege of Timothy Dwight!

Finally, it is interesting that Everett, in a lecture that dwelt so extensively with the motivations behind the trust and the personal history of its founder, chose not to mention the specific -- and somewhat eccentric -- provisions regarding its management:

I do hereby constitute and appoint the trustees of the Boston Athenaeum for the time being to be visitors of the said trust fund, with power to require accounts of the administration thereof and to compel the appropriation thereof to the use aforesaid, but without any power or authority to prescribe or direct by whom the said lectures shall be given, nor the subjects thereof; considering it best to leave that high personal responsibility upon the trustee or trustees of the fund for the time being.

Each trustee shall appoint his successor, within a week after his accession to the office, in order that no failure of a regular nomination may take place.

In selecting a successor the trustee shall always choose in preference to all others some male descendant of my grandfather, John Lowell, provided there be one who is competent to hold the office of trustee, and of the name of Lowell. [Quoted in Smith 1898, 12-13]

Should the family offer no suitable candidates for the office of trustee, or should the trustee prove derelict in his administration of the Institute, "the Athenaeum board was given the power to displace him and nominate a three-man directory in his place (Weeks 1966, 13). Though the trustee was nominally accountable to the Athenaeum board, its oversight was hardly onerous, given the fact that the Lowells and their relatives dominated it -- and for many years John Amory Lowell, the first trustee of the Lowell Institute, was also president of the Athenaeum (while at the same time serving as a Harvard Fellow and as trustee and director of many other business and philanthropic corporations). The skeins of family and institutions were densely interwoven as the Boston Brahmins defined themselves as a group!

Under its first trustee, the founder's nephew John Amory Lowell, the Institute flourished. Lowell was both a man of extraordinary financial acumen and a man of high intellect. The list of Lowell Lecturers during his tenure was a veritable pantheon of

the most eminent figures in American science, literature, political economy, philosophy, and theology. The lectures were so immensely popular that crowds crushed the windows of the Old Corner Bookstore where the tickets were distributed and certain series had to be repeated by popular demand. By 1860, the Institute had virtually put all other lecture series out of business.

In the meantime, its capital, astutely managed by the well-connected Lowells, grew by leaps and bounds. By the 1960s, the \$250,000 bequest had grown to more than \$8 million. As its resources increased, the Institute broadened its activities. These included underwriting extension courses in a wide variety of subjects through the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; furnishing instruction in science to the teachers of the Boston public schools under the supervision of the Boston Society for Natural History; and lectures for workingmen on practical and scientific subjects through the Wells Memorial Workingmen's Institute. In 1872, working through MIT, the Institute established the Lowell School of Practical Design, which offered tuition-free instruction on techniques relating to the design and production of textiles. The Lowell Institute began its second century by funding the initial development of public radio (WGBH) in the Boston area.

The Lowell Institute set a pattern of elite cultural intervention that would be recur later in the century, when investment banker Henry Lee Higginson established the Boston Symphony Orchestra. This nonprofit entity entered a rich and complex setting of voluntary and proprietary musical organizations which served a broad public. But its substantial financial resources, combined with the prestige of its patrons, enabled within a few years to virtually monopolize the top musical talent in the city, as well as bringing to Boston audiences an array of international stars which fee-dependent organizations could not rival. Nonprofit museums had a similar impact on proprietary exhibitions of art and natural wonders.

## THE CRYSTALLIZATION OF ELITE PHILANTHROPY, 1845-1865

Despite their growing wealth and the continuing elaboration of generously-funded charitable and cultural institutions, Boston's elite remained politically vulnerable. The Trinitarians kept up their attacks on Harvard, while their friends in the legislature and in the press criticized the whole emerging pattern of privately-controlled public institutions. These tensions manifested themselves with particular acuteness within institutions like Harvard, which still retained elements of their old public status, particularly the presence of elected officials on the Board of Overseers. A major challenge for control of the college came in the 1820s, when a group of faculty members led by George Ticknor began pushing for curricular reforms, including the initiation of courses in modern languages, literature, and history. They found allies among the Overseers -- and the battle broadened from the curricular front to the more fundamental issues of governance. The demand was revived for faculty control of the Fellows, the college's most important governing board. This struggle had a number of important outcomes. The college, which had been growing in a patchwork fashion over the years without any clear sense of direction or administration, initiated a series of thoroughgoing and hotly contested reviews of its constitution and resources.

To assist with this effort, figures like Joseph Story, who would eventually become the most important legal thinker on the subject of eleemosynary corporations in the nineteenth century, were retained. Story's effort, Rights of the Fellows of Harvard University. An Argument Delivered before the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, in January 1825, upon the Discussion of the Memorial of the Professors and Tutors of Harvard College, Claiming a Right that None but Resident Instructors in the College Should be Chosen or Deemed "Fellows" of the Corporation, was an extraordinary disquisition, comparable in form and force to his opinions in case like the *Vidal v. Girard's Executors*: it not only thoroughly reviewed the particular facts of

Harvard's governing boards, it placed them in the broader context of English legal history. More importantly, it echoed conceptions of the corporation that had emerged in the Dartmouth College Case. The Overseers were persuaded by the arguments of Story and others to sustain the conception of the Fellows as a lay board composed of non-residents. And in so doing, it ratified the growing influence of wealthy Bostonians over the College. To drive the point home, a committee of Overseers chaired by John Lowell (great-uncle of the founder of the Lowell Institute), prepared a pamphlet, Report of a Committee of the Overseers of Harvard College, January 6, 1825 (Cambridge 1825), which reviewed in detail each and every one of the trusts supporting activities at the College and setting forth the obligations connected with each, as well those supported by general revenues and under the control of "the Executive Government of the College." In the report's financial statements, which showed Harvard's income to be \$44,956 -- over half of which was income from endowments --, not a single mention was made of governmental support, past or present. The effort gave the overwhelming impression -- though the point was never explicitly brought forth -- that Harvard was a public institution dependent on private largesse, particularly that of wealthy Boston Unitarian laymen.

If there was any doubt about this, major changes in the composition of Harvard's governing boards made clear the ascendancy of the elite (Story 1981). Charles Jackson, Joseph Story, Nathaniel Bowditch, and Francis Calley Gray -- all major figures in the city's economic affairs -- became Fellows. In 1827, Ebenezer Francis, "a founder and officer of the Massachusetts Hospital Life Insurance Company and the Suffolk Bank and a director of the Boston Bank, the Massachusetts Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Boston, the Charles River Bank of Cambridge, and of large textile firms in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine" (47) -- and the richest man in the region -- became college treasurer. In 1829, these Fellows turned to one of their own, Boston

real estate magnate and political reformer Josiah Quincy, to replace the Rev. John Thornton Kirkland as president. Quincy was the first non-clergyman to head a major educational institution in the United States.

In the 1840s, the Trinitarians made another attempt to capture the college, this time under the leadership of prominent Jacksonian politician and historian, George Bancroft. Encouraged by the Democratic victory in the 1843 state elections, Bancroft authored a minority report of the Overseers Committee of Visitation, "taunting it with diminished numbers, accusing it of decadence, excessive expense, and sectarianism."

GEORGE BANCROFT, MINORITY REPORT OF THE OVERSEERS' COMMITTEE OF VISITATION (1845)

The undersigned, as one of the Committee of Visitation, attended to the duty assigned him, by repeated visits to the College, by personal observation, and by continued inquiries.

The undersigned dissents totally from the suggestion that higher qualifications should be the requirement of admission. Such additional requirements could easily be made a part of instruction in the excellent public school in Boston, and in some few academies and private schools. They could not be made general in the preparatory schools of the country; and they would, therefore, shut the doors of Harvard College still more effectually against almost all but the sons of residents in Boston, and a few favored places. . . .

The undersigned, acting as one of your Committee, has been more deeply impressed than ever with the disproportion between the magnificent endowments of Cambridge and the comparatively small number who derive benefit from them. The increase of students has not kept pace with the increase of population of the Commonwealth. The resort to the College is also becoming more and more confined to the sons of residents of Boston and its immediate vicinity. Were the whole Commonwealth as well

represented there as this city, the number of students would be at least three-fold greater than at present. It is a serious fact, well worth [of] the most grave consideration of the Board, that eight prosperous and intelligent counties, which elect a majority of the Senate of this Commonwealth, send to Harvard fewer pupils than they return Senators to this Board. The counties of Worcester, Franklin, Hampshire, Hampden, and Berkshire, Norfolk, Bristol, and Barnstable, send this year through the Senate, more Overseers to Harvard College than their constituents send of their sons. This desertion of the College, by half the Commonwealth, is most deeply to be regretted. The excellent apparatus for instruction, the scientific collections, the library, and the merits of the professors, --among whom are men venerable for their ability, learning, and conscientious fidelity as instructors, --conspire to nourish the wish, that the resort to the College may be quickened.

The present year, the students from Massachusetts are but one hundred and eighty-four. Of these, one hundred and four are from Boston and its three suburbs of Roxbury, Cambridge, and Charlestown; and but eighty from the rest of the Commonwealth. Leaving out of the account the three counties of Suffolk, Middlesex, and Essex, and all Massachusetts sends but twenty-nine pupils to Harvard College. Yet the Constitution of this State makes it the duty of the Legislature to cherish the University at Cambridge, in order that knowledge may be diffused generally among the body of the people.

Two causes conspire to diminish the throng to Harvard College. An apprehension exists, that a sectarian character attaches to its government. Harvard College belongs to no sect. It is the child of the Commonwealth. It is the house of learning which the people have erected, and which they have founded upon the Constitution itself. No sect has a right to the possession of it. No part, religious or political, should control it. In the selection of its teachers, a single eye should be had to capacity and fidelity; in the selection of the clerical part of the permanent board of overseers, ascendancy should be given to no one religious denomination. Were every apprehension on this subject dispelled, it would go far towards winning for the College universal confidence.

The second cause of the diminution of public favor is the increasing expense of education at Cambridge. The habits of economy at a place of education are affected by the character of the collective body of the pupils. As expenses increase, the sons of the less affluent begin to remain away, and the absence of their influence aggravates the tendency to expensive gratifications. But the old-fashioned frugality and rustic simplicity are the best allies of discipline. The undersigned, as one of the Board of Visitors, is not prepared to confirm the remark, that, "in point of disposition to good order and assiduity in study, little more is to be hoped for or even wished." There remains great room for desirable improvement, which would be promoted by the greater influx of recruits from the country, and from the families of the less wealthy.

The expenses of tuition have increased at least fifty *per cent.* beyond what they formerly were, and for some of the classes thirty three and a third *per cent.* beyond what they were when the undersigned was a student. Yet the College has all the time been growing more opulent. The charge for tuition is greater at Cambridge than at those institutions where there are no endowments, and where the professors depend for their whole livelihood on their success in attracting pupils. It is preposterous to say that this is necessary.

A diminution of the expense of tuition might bring with it, perhaps, a very small diminution of the number of those engaged in the government and instruction of the College; and perhaps a slight increase of duty to some who are now the least burdened; yet not such an increase as would affect the character of their places as the most agreeable, most desirable, and least onerous in the country. Or it might leave some inconsiderable portion of their salaries contingent on the number of pupils whom they might draw in around them. If so, it would only require them to share, in some little degree, the lot of every lawyer, physician, editor, and private teacher in the community. . . .

To give the Board an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject discussed in this report, the undersigned concludes by offering the following resolutions:

*Resolved,* That this Board do not advise an increase in the requirement for admission to Harvard College.

*Resolved,* That in filling vacancies in the clerical part of the permanent Board, care should be taken to avoid giving a majority to any one religious denomination.

*Resolved,* That the charge for tuition, in Harvard College, where most of the professorships are endowed, ought not to exceed a charge for tuition in those Colleges which are wholly or principally dependent for support on the tuition fees from students. . . .

*Resolved,* That a special committee of three, from the Board, be appointed by the nomination of the chair, to mature and report a plan for the immediate reduction of the expense of tuition in Harvard College, and that the President and Fellows of Harvard College be requested to cooperate with said committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

GEORGE BANCROFT.

Boston, January, 1845.

Bancroft's salvo was a remarkable iteration of ideas about the public accountability of an institution that had come to consider itself accountable only to itself. While carefully avoiding the suggestion that the legislature could alter Harvard's charter without the college's assent (the matter settled in the Dartmouth College Case), he asserted that the Overseers, the majority of whom sat *ex officio* as members of the State Senate, had regulatory powers over Harvard's curricular and financial affairs. While neither articulating the kind of "charitableness" test against which the performance of some tax-exempt institutions are being measured in our own time, nor calling into question the college's tax exemption, Bancroft's message was an unmistakable threat to Harvard's private status and to the hold which Boston's elite had come to exercise over it. Moreover, Bancroft was not only criticizing Harvard's failure to serve the people of the state, he was calling into the question the legitimacy of the Boston elite's claims that it and the institutions supported by its philanthropy served the public in any broad or credible sense.

Understandably, the Bostonians responded forcefully to Bancroft's attack, both in debate within the Board of Overseers (which were subsequently published) and, over the course of the 1840s, with a series of concerted efforts to delineate an overarching rationale for private philanthropy.

SPEECH OF JOSIAH QUINCY, PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY, BEFORE THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS OF THAT INSTITUTION, FEBRUARY 25, 1845, ON THE MINORITY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF VISITATION, PRESENTED TO THAT BOARD BY GEORGE BANCROFT, ESQ., FEBRUARY 6, 1845 (Boston, 1845)

The subjoined Speech was made under circumstances which I deem it proper to briefly explain. It is now published, in order that the views I entertain with regard to the several topics touched upon in it may be known to the public, and particularly to the friends of Harvard College.

In the year 1843, George Bancroft, Esq., a politician well known to the people of this Commonwealth, obtained a seat at the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, through the temporary ascendancy of the political party to which he belongs, with the aid, as was stated at the time, of Calvinistic votes. In that and the succeeding year, three Calvinists, two clergymen and one layman, were elected to the Board, chiefly, as was also then stated, by the union of the same influences.

On the 6th of February last, Mr. Bancroft made an attack upon Harvard College, in the form of a Minority Report from the Committee of Visitation, containing statements which I could not but deem false, and insinuations relative to the condition of the seminary and the labors of its professors, which I knew to be unjust.

In this Report, he animadverted, in terms of reprobation, on *the sectarian character of Harvard College*. The course of his remarks on this subject was forthwith followed and supported by the two Calvinistic members who had obtained their seats on the Board as above mentioned; the one of them giving the weight of his political, and the other the weight of his religious, character to Mr. Bancroft's views. It became apparent, after this concurrence, that, unless openly and authoritatively counteracted, Mr. Bancroft's Minority Report would go forth to the world with the influence of this combined sanction, and be received as truth. Hence the duty of exposing what I considered false and fallacious in it seemed to be devolved upon me, in my then official station, by a necessity which I could not evade. The subjoined speech was the result.

Being at the time President of Harvard University, and being led in the course of my argument to refer to political and religious relations then existing in the Board of Overseers, I was unavoidably restrained and embarrassed by my official position. This state of things is now changed. In accordance with a determination, long since made, to relinquish, after the present academic year, my connection with Harvard College, and my personal arrangements for the removal of my residence to Boston having long ago been completed, I have resigned the office of President of the College, and now retain only temporarily the superintendence of the institution. . . .

I am now, therefore, and intend henceforth to be, a private citizen. I have thought it proper, however, to keep back this publication, until my resignation was accepted, and my real position understood by the public; in order that it should be known by all to be made by me *as a private citizen, on my sole responsibility*, independently of official duties or connections, and prepared without the suggestion, consultation, or knowledge of any member of any body, party, sect, literary, political, or religious. . . .

My sense of duty has compelled me to speak without reserve of Calvinism and its influences, so far as they are brought to bear upon Harvard College, it may possibly be supposed that they have been dictated by hostility to that creed or its professors. Nothing can be farther from my thought or design. Calvinism acts in its natural sphere, and, while defending itself, treats with Christian charity the opinions of those who differ, both that faith and those who maintain it have my honor and respect; and I would say and do nothing to diminish either its power or that of those who profess its doctrines.

It is not Calvinism, when directed to Christian ends and using Christian means, that I deprecate. It is Calvinism when it seeks worldly power by worldly means; --it is Calvinism when it embarrasses my misrepresentations a great literary institution, for the purpose of getting that institution under its control; --it is Calvinism when it strikes hands with politics, willing to take the chance of putting the institution into the hands of the politician, for the sake of the chance of getting it into its own; --it is

Calvinism thus operating and thus aiming, that I deem it my duty to endeavour to make my fellow-citizens understand.

It is the misfortune of Harvard College to have religion and politics combined very intimately with the other influences of its constitution; and all history shows, that, when thus brought together, and party struggles for power commence, the quality of the religious element is *always debased*, and the quality of the political *never improved*.

By the constitution of the College, its religious influences were made to depend upon those, which, from time to time, might prevail in the town of Boston and its vicinity, and in certain specified Congregational churches there situated. In the course of time liberal religious views predominated in these churches and this vicinity, and about the beginning of the present century the Calvinistic clergy of Boston and its environs found that they had lost control of the College.

A few of the more ambitious clergy were naturally deeply affected by this deprivation of power, and immediately set themselves to persuade the Calvinists in other parts of the Commonwealth, that it was a deadly blow aimed at the Calvinistic faith; and for a time succeeded in impressing them with the apprehension that Harvard College was specially directing its influence to the undermining of that faith. Time, observation, and acquaintance with facts have, I have reason to believe, greatly diminished this fear, among Calvinists in general. Honest unambitious Calvinists in other parts of the Commonwealth begin to understand the cause of this excessive zeal for their sect, put forth by a small party of Boston Calvinists. They are satisfied, that, under the influences which now prevail at Harvard College, its concerns are managed with fairness in respect of other denominations, that no efforts are made for the propagation of any peculiar religious views in the College, that all sects are treated equally there, and that it is the intention and the endeavour to conduct the seminary exclusively as a literary institution. . . .

It is the fate of Harvard College, . . .to be cast, by the Constitution of its Board of Overseers, into the very trough of a politico-theologico sea, which has tossed that seminary in successive periods of its history, always to its injury, sometimes nearly to its destruction. In consequence of party spirit in politics and party spirit in religion, sometimes in hostility, sometimes in coalition, contesting for power, or endeavouring to oppress political rivals or religious opponents, the prosperity of the College has been mischievously affected, from the days of Dunster to the present, its literary advancement obstructed, and the peace and happiness of its governors and instructors, at different periods, disturbed or destroyed. . . .

Perceiving, however, by the events of the last session of the Board of Overseers, that those elements are again in action, and by combination have gained an increased power, I have deemed it important for the interest of the College to have their effects on its prosperity historically presented to its friends and the public. To this end, I made preparation to trace the consequences of this constitution, in which the seeds of political and religious controversy are scattered with no sparing hand, through the various stages of the College history, and to connect the result of my enquiries with this publication. But after proceeding some way in my investigation, I found that the subject belonged to a work of a higher and more permanent character than the present. Such a work it is my intention, as soon as leisure permits, to prepare and offer to the public. . . .

In the speech itself, Quincy categorically refuted Bancroft's charges. In answer to the charge that Harvard had priced itself beyond the means of families of moderate means, Quincy brought forward Bancroft's own financial accounts (he had graduated from Harvard in 1817) to show that the average cost of a Harvard education in 1844 was \$2.72 less expensive than it was three decades earlier. Having let loose this barb, Quincy proceeded to set forth a comparative breakdown of costs for students of different means in each period. They supported his conclusion that

the entire aggregate of expenses at Harvard is in fact, less, instead of being greater, at the present day, than at the period when Mr. Bancroft was in College. What becomes, then, of those pathetic lamentations for the desertion of Harvard College, and of those piteous tears shed by Mr. Bancroft over "eight counties" of this Commonwealth, that are deprived of the privilege of sending their sons to Harvard College in consequence of the vast increase of College expenses since Mr. Bancroft's time? [10-11]

Quincy moved on to refute Bancroft's claim that Harvard College was "deserted" and had failed to increase its enrollments in proportion with the increase in the state's population. Once again, Quincy displayed amazing sophistication, pointing out that the college was now surrounded with competitors -- Yale, Brown, Dartmouth, Williams, and Amherst -- and examining the number of students enrolled in each from Massachusetts.

The average number of undergraduates from Massachusetts in these Colleges is 54 and a fraction. Harvard has 184, --that is, more than twice as many as Amherst, more than three times the number in Williams, more than four times that in Yale or Brown, five or six times as many as Dartmouth, and more than two thirds as many as Dartmouth. Considering all the circumstances which operate upon the minds of parents in selecting Colleges for their sons, I think Harvard has its full proportion, and its friends have no cause for complaint or distress.

But "why do so many citizens of Massachusetts send their sons elsewhere?"

I answer, there are four strong, efficient, and natural reasons; and not "College expenses," or "tuition expenses," technically so called. 1. Local preferences. 2. Personal preferences. 3. Religious preferences.

4. Those incidental temptations to expense, which are supposed to be greater at Harvard than in other Colleges.

Every one of these causes operates in favor of each of the other Colleges.

Parents love to have their children near home. Hence the inhabitants of those towns in Massachusetts near Providence send their sons to Brown. The same is the case with every other College. It is this preference which sends so many of the sons of Boston and its vicinity to Harvard College; and this with many parents is quite as strong as their desire to have the advantage of a very high education. Then there are personal preferences, which operate strongly in favor of Brown and Yale. The parents themselves graduated at the one or the other, and men love to have their sons taught where they themselves were educated. Then there are religious preferences. Almost every religious sect also dreads, or affects to dread, what it called Unitarianism, and proclaims to the world that it is the great endeavour at Cambridge to propagate the tents of that sect; a charge, however, altogether false and unfounded. When to these general reasons is added a common opinion that the style of living, of fitting up rooms, and of dress, is somewhat more expensive than at other Colleges, we have enough reasons to account for the proportion of young men who go elsewhere, and to justify the opinion that it is not College expenses which produce this result. From my own experience, and it has been considerable, *I do not believe that a single individual was ever deterred from coming to Harvard on account of College expenses, technically so called, who had taken pains to inform himself what these expenses were, and what those were at other Colleges.* . . . [12-13]

I am not one of those who desire to see all the youth of the Commonwealth concentrated at Harvard for an education. I look upon Amherst and Williams with no envious or jealous eye. Both of them cultivate and support, in their respective vicinities, a high and sound standard of College education. Instead of adopting a policy which should deprive them of their proportion of students, in order to give Harvard a great enlargement, I think they both deserve patronage; and when that noble merchant

(Amos Lawrence), who is at once a blessing to the city in which he resides and an honor to our common nature, gave, as he lately did, ten thousand dollars for the purpose of raising Williams College from its ashes, I felt scarcely less gratification than it had been given to Harvard College. If we could draw off the students both from Williams and Amherst to-morrow, I think it would scarcely be more injurious to those institutions than to the Commonwealth. . . .

But the cry everywhere is, "Numbers, --Numbers." "These," every one exclaims, "are the evidence and element of success." All this is very natural in a republic. Under such a form of government, power and superiority are reckoned by the head. No account is taken of the nature of those heads, or of their material.

But the success of a literary institution is to be tested by a very different measure from "numbers." These, to say the least, are very uncertain criteria of success, and for this plain reason: because there are so many causes leading to the selection of a literary institution, and for thronging to it, apart from its fulfillment of its duties in a high degree. The sole criterion of success in relation to such an institution is the quality of the scholars it sends forth into the world. Is it faithful to its trust? Are all admitted equally to its privileges? Does it reject no one who is diligent and virtuous?

Numbers in a literary institution are by no means an unqualified blessing. In this world good and evil are mixed, or placed side by side. Compensation is the law of Providence. Numbers bring not merely honors, reputation, and equivalent income to a literary institution, but something else. They bring increased care, anxiety, labor in instruction and supervision, greater danger of noisy assemblages, more materials for the engendering of idle, dissipated, rude, ill-regulated habits and manners. . . .

On this subject of numbers, there are, as has been stated, 394 undergraduates in Yale, being 140 more than in Harvard. Of those in Yale, 201 come from the Middle, Southern, and Western States. The young men from those quarters of the Union now in Harvard are, in general, as worthy and well

disposed as any members of the seminary. Some of them are among our highest scholars, and among the most valued for their example and influence, and bid fair to be an honor to the College and to be distinguished in after life. But young men from those quarters of the Union are often educated in a manner at variance with the customs and habits of New England. Placed at a distance from parental influence, too often supplied with unlimited command of funds through a mistaken confidence of their friends or relatives, they are exposed to manifold temptations, which, to some temperaments, are wholly irresistible, and in former times have proved very troublesome inmates of the College. In a few portions of the Union, a dagger or a bowie-knife is said to be deemed an indispensable appendage of a gentleman; and young men who carry such deadly weapons about them are apt to use them on very slight occasions. Hitherto the annals of Harvard have not been sullied by the murder of a professor or tutor

.....

Here Quincy was making reference to the notorious violence of Yale undergraduates in this period. In 1841, students fought a three-day pitched battle with New Haven volunteer firemen which was ultimately quelled by the militia. On September 30, 1843, Yale tutor John B. Dwight, grandson of Timothy Dwight, was stabbed to death by a drunken undergraduate -- the perpetrator was allowed to post bond and fled, unpunished, from Connecticut (Kelley 1974, 216-17).

Having made his case for the virtues of concentrating the institution's energies on a metropolitan rather than a national constituency, Quincy proceeded to refute Bancroft's charge of the college's sectarianism.

The author of that report (Mr. Bancroft), after lamenting that so great a proportion of the students should be from Boston and its vicinity, and a few favored places; after intimating his deep affliction at "the disproportion between the magnificent endowments of Cambridge, and the comparatively small numbers who derive a benefit from them;" after sighing over the towns of the Commonwealth, at a

distance from Boston, that send their sons elsewhere than to Harvard, which he calls "the child of the Commonwealth"; after deprecating all party control, political or religious, --proceeds to animadvert in terms of reprobation on *its character for sectarianism*, meaning thereby unquestionably its *Unitarianism*. Now this, coming from the author of the minority report, is very curious, and, taken in connection with what immediately ensued, is also somewhat symptomatic. The report, having been read by its author to the Board of Overseers, was soon after followed up by a formal order from a lay Calvinistic member of the Board (Mr. Valley), having for its object the separation of the Divinity School from the College, and thus making this latter what he called "a State literary institution, free from all denominational bias"; he, too, like the author of the minority report, being desirous to relieve the College from all suspicion of *sectarianism*. Putting these circumstances together, I could not fail to perceive that there was a harmony and happy coincidence in language and action between those political partisans with whom the author of the minority report is associated, and those religious partisans with whom the author of the order for upsetting the Divinity School is associated. Now, Sir, I should cooperate most cordially in any project of union and brotherly love between what are usually observed to be very antagonistic elements, did I not plainly see that their successful concert, in the present instance, should result, and did I not conscientiously believe that the main design of one of the parties was that it should result, not in getting what they call "sectarianism" out of the College, but *in getting one species of sectarianism out, and another species of sectarianism in*. Accordingly, I deem it my duty here to speak directly and plainly of the *sectarianism of Unitarianism, as it actually exists in Harvard College*, and as it has existed there ever since I was appointed President.

In the first place, I ought to observe that the *Unitarianism* of Harvard College is spoken of and preached against by Calvinistic clergymen and missionaries, in the Middle, Southern, and Western States, and in the interior of Massachusetts, in language very different from that in which it is spoken of and preached against by clergymen of that faith in Boston and its vicinity; and for this plain reason, that no clergymen in the vicinity of Harvard College could use such language as that often adopted

elsewhere, without being justly liable, in the opinion of every auditor knowing the facts, to an epithet which no gentleman ought to bear, and much less a clergymen. . . .

In those States, Harvard College is represented as a society combined and laboring for the propagation of Unitarianism; as an association of infidels, without belief in the awful mystery of Christ's incarnation, placing no reliance on propitiatory death, and deriving no assurance of a future state from his glorious resurrection and ascension; denying his divine mission, not acknowledging him either as Mediator or Redeemer, but resisting all their hopes of a future life and happiness on their own merits; "not mentioning Christ in their prayers," and "openly denying the Lord who bought them." The funds of the seminary are there asserted to be devoted, all its influences directed, to making proselytes to the Unitarian faith; its honors, its beneficiary donations, are said to be distributed on that principle and for that object. Parents, who are found contemplating sending their sons to Harvard, are beset by the Calvinistic preacher or missionary in their neighbourhood, and entreated not to jeopardize their children's hopes, both as respects the present and the future life, by subjecting them to the temptations and dangers to which an education at Harvard College would inevitably expose both their bodies and their souls. . . .

There is no question that systematic calumnies like these, circulated very openly and boldly, as I am informed, in the Middle, Southern, and Western States, have a powerful influence in turning young men from Harvard to other Colleges; and that they are the main cause of the diminished influx of students from those States, and from foreign countries, into Harvard, and of the comparative increase of their numbers in other Colleges. . . . That such are the effects of representations like those above stated, assiduously made, circulated, and believed in those States, is notorious; and that these representations are utterly false is, in this vicinity, equally notorious.

It is now more than sixteen years since I accepted the office of President of Harvard College, and I here unequivocally declare, that, so far from the influence of Harvard College being devoted to the

propagation of Unitarianism, or the labors of its teaching being devoted to this object, this has never, so far as I have seen, known, or believed, been made the chief or any special object of their thoughts or labors at all. For the purpose of avoiding, as much as possible, the communication of any peculiarities of religious opinion to the students, writings free from such an objection by the universal consent of all classes of Christians . . . are selected as text-books. Episcopalian, Baptist, Calvinist, Unitarian, and every other denomination of Christians, have ever stood before the Corporation and Faculty in the same equal light, been treated with the same deference and respect, and have received an equal share of the College honors and beneficiary funds. . . . Every student of full age is permitted to worship on the Sabbath with whatever sect he pleases. Every student under age is permitted to worship on the Sabbath with whatever sect his parent or guardian pleases. So strictly has this principle been carried into effect in relation to students under age, that, when, as in some instances has been the case, applications have been made by them for liberty to worship at the College chapel, they have been systematically denied, unless they produced a written request to that effect from their parent or guardian. . . .

What I have said of the imputations of sectarian influence, as respects the Corporation, the Faculty, or any of the instructors, applies with equal truth, so far as my observation extends, to the Sabbath services of the chapel. Although those who attend these services are for the most part sons of parents who are either inclined to, or have no fear of the influence of, what is called *Unitarian* preaching (those belonging to other denominations in general worshipping elsewhere), yet the officiating clergymen in the chapel very seldom allude, in their discourses, to any of the tenets peculiar to their faith, or to the opinions of those who differ from them. . . . They avoid controversy, and select topics adapted to make the temper meek and the life holy. . . . Yet these are the men whom Calvinistic missionaries represent as preaching "nothing but natural religion," and calumniate in terms which are worthy to be applied only to deists and infidels. I owe this acknowledgement to the clergymen who officiate in the College chapel, although I do not recognize myself as of the Unitarian sect, or of any

sect; believing that I can find more truth, and a more heavenly gospel, in the word of God itself, than in the teachings of any sect man ever devised. . . .

It ought to be the study of every people, who have the management of their own affairs, to control and keep in check the influence of any one species of sectarianism, --to divide, and thus paralyze, its powers, and not permit one sect to obtain a predominating influence in the state over all or a great majority of their seminaries of education. Let the people of Massachusetts understand that the attempt now making by leading Calvinists in Boston and its vicinity is not merely to get Unitarianism out of Harvard College, but to put Calvinism in possession of it; that this has been their purpose and struggle for these forty years past; and unless their projects be counteracted and defeated by the vigilance and spirit of the community, they will ultimately be successful, though it cost a struggle of forty years more. The alliance recently, to all human appearance, entered into on the floor of the Senate-chamber of Massachusetts is a pregnant evidence of their aim and tact. The predominating influence of Calvinism is stamped, in characters not to be concealed or mistaken, on at least seven institutions for education in New England, --Yale, Williams, Amherst, Bowdoin, Dartmouth, Middlebury, and Burlington. There is also another highly endowed institution in Massachusetts, in which every article of the creed of this sect is riveted down forever on the seminary by a subscription of faith required of the professors, to be renewed every five years. Yet with all this power they are not content. All this influence, "availeth them nothing, so long as," Harvard is not also in their possession.

I know it will be said, in reply, "How unjust is this charge! Were not the Calvinists the authors of that nobly liberal scheme by which all sects are at this day eligible to seats at the Board of Overseers? Shall no credit be given to them for this pure and elevated catholic spirit?" Certainly, Calvinists were agents in effecting that great change in the elemental principles of selection of members of this Board. And when the project was submitted to the Corporation for their sanction, I personally opposed its acceptance; not, however, from any illiberal or sectarian feeling, but because I foresaw, what events have already proved, that this apparently liberal scheme would result in constructing, out of the hopes

and expectations of the members of other sects, a bridge, over which Boston Calvinists might pass themselves into possession of Harvard College. Does any man believe that any one of these would give his vote and influence to introduce an Episcopalian, a Baptist, a Methodist, a Universalist, into the office of president, or of instructor in any moral, religious, or intellectual department in Harvard College. I think not. And how has this new principle been acted upon by these very Calvinists? Since the change in the constitution of the Board of Overseers, antecedent to the present session,, how have *four* out of five vacancies which have occurred i this Board, one in the lay and three in the clerical part of it, been filled? Did the Calvinists seize the occasion to carry into speedy effect the generous design of introducing into the Board members of other sects? Far from it. . . .

My argument, then, is this, --that Calvinists have at this day, in Massachusetts, more worldly power and influence than any other sect, and probably than all other sects put together; that they have enough colleges and theological seminaries at their command for the safety and permanence of religious freedom; and therefore, whatever sect it may be deemed advisable to place in possession of Harvard College, let it not be the Calvinistic. . . .

In this connection it may be well for the members of other sects to consider, and that, too, with some earnestness and anxiety, whether, if Calvinism should be substituted for Unitarianism in Harvard College, as is the design, they would be likely to find more liberality, more fair play, less bitterness, and a kinder or more respectful construction and treatment of their peculiar religious views than they experience at this day from those who are now in possession of that institution. . . .

For all of his vehemence, Quincy was also somewhat disingenuous. In fact, the college's real governing board -- the Fellows -- were Unitarian and Federalist/Whig to a man. While faculty appointments were less attentive to religious affiliation, an informal political test ensured that only those with Federalist and Whig sympathies obtain appointments. Not insignificantly, an unusually high proportion of Harvard's faculty

during this period were either members of prominent Boston families (like medical school professor James Jackson, brother of industrial pioneer Patrick Tracy Jackson) or married into Brahmin families (as Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, professor of French and Spanish, married an Appleton heiress and naturalist Louis Agassiz married into the Perkins clan) (Story 1981, 84-88). Moreover, the trend of Harvard's drawing its students overwhelmingly from the Boston area contained more in it than immediately met the eye: after 1825, fully half of the fathers of Harvard graduates were businessmen (as opposed to less than a quarter in earlier periods) and of these, many were wealthy men who left estates of over \$100,000 (92-3). In contrast to the evangelical colleges, Harvard was unquestionably an aristocratic institution -- even if applicants were not excluded by high costs. [And this is in itself a controversial point. While modern economic analysis supports Quincy's assertions as to fees charged to its students by Harvard, they do not account for a wide range of other costs which served to make life in the college minimally tolerable. Contemporary evidence suggests that overall costs were significantly higher at Harvard than elsewhere (Harris 1970, 39-84; Story 1981, 97-101)].

Although Quincy hoped to produce a more detailed work on Harvard's "constitution" and its history -- presumably with a view to further building the case for its privatization, the job in part fell to Samuel Atkins Eliot, a wealthy Boston businessman and Treasurer of the College, who in 1845 produced an article entitled "Harvard College and Its Benefactors." He followed this up three years later with a small volume, A Sketch of the History of Harvard College and of Its Present State. Eliot's original plan had been to write an abridgement of the two volume history of the college completed by Quincy in 1840. But, as he noted, opportunities presented themselves to "make some additions to the history of the College" -- particularly with regard to its financial history. Although the text itself emphasized the services of the

college to the commonwealth, the extensive appendices, which enumerated and compared the relative contributions of government and private donors to Harvard, made clear that Eliot's primary purpose was to justify private control of the college by stressing the extent of private donations to the College. Quincy had actually made this point earlier, in his two volume History of Harvard University, which had been published in 1840. As the anonymous reviewer of the book for the North American Review noted

a fact stated by President Quincy will surprise many, who have been accustomed to regard the pecuniary resources of the University as the gift rather of public than private liberality. It is, that the whole "productive estate" now held by the institution, --that is, the property yielding a revenue towards its maintenance, -- "may with sufficient accuracy be regarded as the result of private munificence, or of the wise management of the Corporation, in successive periods." What the public has given is either now represented by fixtures, as some of the buildings, or else has been applied in such expenditures that, in respect to money investment, (though not in respect to the attainment of proper objects) it has perished in the using. . . .

The public has done very much for the College from first to last. Without doubt one might say, not without fair show of reason, that, looking to its own advantage, it would have done well to abound yet more, and to keep a more even pace with private liberality. . . .(1841, 377, 383)

The reviewer's conclusion was that the state, by failing to support Harvard financially, had defaulted on its claims to authority over it. This was a viewpoint that Eliot would elaborate on in his 1848 Sketch and in his subsequent writings on Boston's charities.

Modern analyses of Harvard's financial history dispute these conclusions and suggest that Quincy and Eliot distorted and exaggerated the scale of private contributions to its support (Harris 1971, 240-43). While it was true that the state ceased making regular grants to the College after the Revolution and that after that point, Harvard was generously supported by private contributions, it appears that public contributions substantially exceeded private gifts during the first century and a half of the college's existence. However, by aggregating all gifts, public and private, between 1636 and 1846, and by undervaluing public contributions (such as contributions to physical plant), Quincy and Eliot were able to obscure this important point. According to the figures in A Sketch, government support had totalled \$215,797 -- versus private gifts amounting to \$1.2 million (Eliot 1848, 157, 184-5). Had he broken his figures down by period, his figures would have shown that for much of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, public contributions generally exceeded private ones.

Quincy and Eliot were reinterpreting the past to justify the leading role that their class had assumed in funding and governing institutions like Harvard that had been generally regarded as public rather than private. In the coming years, Eliot would extend this line of argument to the broader issue of private responsibility to the public good. His first effort along these lines, "Public and Private Charities of Boston," appeared in the North American Review in July of 1845.

SAMUEL ATKINS ELIOT, "PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CHARITIES OF BOSTON" (1845)

In September, 1830, at the celebration which took place, under the direction of city authorities, of the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Boston, President Quincy delivered an address which was replete with interesting comments on the history and character of the city. In a note to the oration, which was published, he inserted a list of societies and institutions for various purposes of charity, education, and religious and moral instruction, to which the benevolence of Bostonians had been directed within the last thirty years. The amount of money shown by this catalogue to have been given away in a town which numbered from twenty-five thousand inhabitants, in 1800, to sixty thousand, in 1830, excited some surprise, and was very gratifying to those who from birth, personal relations, or other circumstances, took an interest in the character and reputation of the city.

In the short term of fifteen years which have elapsed since 1830, the population has nearly doubled its amount at that time; and it has become a question of deep interest to many, how far, and in what particular ways, the character of Boston has been or is to be so affected by such a sudden development of its resources, and such an immense accession to its physical and commercial strength. As a community must, like an individual, be either growing worse or better, it behooves us to look carefully into facts from time to time, and ascertain their bearing upon character; and while we should not be deterred from this scrutiny by the fear or the shame of finding ourselves losing ground, so neither should we shrink from it because it may seem like boastfulness to proclaim our own good deeds. . . . It is in no spirit of boastfulness, then, that the following attempt has been made to enumerate the principal objects of Boston liberality; but with the hope of drawing from the facts collected some useful practical inferences, not inconsistent with a becoming modesty. Nor would we be supposed to imply, that we consider the mere giving of money as a sufficient proof of the existence of the true spirit of charity; but we are desirous that the facts should be known, and that every one should pass his own judgement upon them.

It is an important preliminary enquiry, how the city, in its corporate capacity, has performed the duties of instruction and charity; and although other places may have done as much, or more, in some departments, than Boston has, yet it is satisfactory to observe that the appropriations go on increasing with the growth and means of the city. The sums spent upon the schools by order of the city government have grown from an average of \$68,343.36 *per annum* in the first five years of the city, to an average of \$153,690.55 in the last five years; while the sums devoted to the support or assistance of the poor in the former term of five years averaged \$31,083.58, and in the latter \$47,080.69. In both departments, more is effected with the same amount of money now than formerly, so that the mere comparison of the sums will scarcely give an adequate idea of the degree of improvement.

The average of the last five years in the expenditure for the schools, including salaries, repairs, erection of new houses, supplies and contingencies, makes a ratio of .2574 to the average tax assessed during the same years, or a little more than one quarter of the whole sum levied; while the average expenditure for both objects, namely, the schools and the support of the poor, including the expense of the hospital for insane and idiots, for the same term, forms an average of .3336, or one third of the whole tax. The ratio of the expenditure for both objects, during the whole term of the city charter, to the taxes assessed is .3898, or 5-1/2 *per cent.* more than one third of the taxes. The ratio of the last five years would have been much higher, but for the very remarkable diminution in the cost of the House of Industry, and in the sums distributed in the different wards by the Overseers of the Poor, during the last two years. The expense of the House of Industry fell from over \$30,000 *per annum* to \$14,779.60 in the financial year ending April 30, 1843, and to \$14,082.90 in the year ending April 30, 1844; while the Overseers of the Poor, instead of spending twelve or thirteen thousand dollars *per annum*, distributed by \$8,320.63 in the former year, and \$7,337.46 in the latter. It will immediately occur to all who are familiar with the causes and consequences of pauperism, that the great and memorable reform in the use of intoxicating liquors has produced this among other beneficent results. More than \$20,000 a year, or one half the whole charge, have been saved in appropriations for the support of paupers alone, --by saving men from a self-destroying vice. It must not be forgotten, that the prosperity of the city, and the

abundance of employment, for two or three years past, have contributed to this result. But that they have not produced it unaided is proved by the circumstance, that former periods of prosperity have shown no such striking diminution of the expense of pauperism to this city.

It may, perhaps, be thought inappropriate to introduce the amount derived from taxes among the charities of the city; and it would be so, were nothing more done than barely to comply with the requisitions of the law. The manner in which these labors and duties are performed, however, is to be regarded as an essential part of the performance of them; and if there be any deficiency still existing, let it be pointed out and remedied as speedily as may be. It is believed, however, that the public charities are rather more free than is usual from well grounded charges of insufficiency, and that they are quite as abundant as the danger of imposition and abuse will allow. In all those branches where there is no fear of such abuse, the provision is as liberal as the nature of the case requires; as, for instance, in the arrangements made for the care and even cure of the insane, or idiotic, who have a settlement in the city. A hospital, constructed in the most thorough manner, and on the best principles, is provided for them, and a resident physician is required to give them his daily attention. In the end, this mode of proceeding will perhaps be found more economical than the old way of perpetuating misery, in the cells and cages of the insane-ward of the House of Industry; but it is manifest that the provision for these unhappy persons must have arisen from other motives than a mere desire to save money. The difficulty which is to be met in so many other walks of charity is not here to be encountered; namely, to guard against offering an inducement to take advantage of the provision unnecessarily. No one becomes insane voluntarily, and there is little danger of delusion or deception. Too much, therefore, can hardly be done for the comfort, or the recovery, of those who may stand in need of the charity.

It is not so, however, with simple poverty. Many prefer idleness and public support to industry and independence; and will practise every device they can think of to escape from the labor which is most valuable and suitable for them. In judging what provision ought to be made for the poor, this

consideration should always be kept in view, especially by those whose kind feelings lead them to be active and forward in labors of this sort. It is very easy, by ill-judged liberality, to produce more pauperism than is, or can be, relieved. At the same time, poverty ought not to be confounded, as it sometimes is, with crime, and the poor man treated as severely as the criminal. This is a sort of dislocation of society, which must produce disastrous consequences. But it is extremely difficult to hit upon exactly the right medium in practice; and if, to any one, Boston, in its corporate form, seems to do too little or too much, let him reflect upon all the circumstances which are to be weighed, and perhaps he will be better satisfied with the results which are attained.

It may contribute to this satisfaction, if he will recollect that it does not belong to the character of our government, under any of the forms and dimensions it assumes, from the debating club of the village to the Congress at Washington, from the chairman of a parish committee to the governor of the commonwealth, to undertake everything which may be deemed united to the good of the community. Our institutions are not of the nature of those paternal governments which assume all their subjects to be in a state of pupillage, and will not suffer them to act for fear of their acting amiss, --the object of whose parental care seems to be rather to check than promote the development of the infant energies of their people. Our civil polity partakes more of the character of another family relation, equally delightful to the imagination and the heart, and may be called fraternal government. The true idea of a government of the people is that of an association, the members of which are ready to aid each other not merely in the attainment of those objects in which they have a common interest, but also to reach such as may be particularly desirable to only one or two of the number. They cannot all desire, or all obtain, the same ends; and it is especially important that the wish of one should not be deemed the interest of all, and thus all be compelled alike to pursue an object desirable only to an individual; but while each is left free to look after his own prosperity, they should yield each other so much assistance towards the attainment of the objects of individual ambition, as may be consistent with the common good and their mutual regard. The acquisition of many, if not most, favorite objects should not be a matter of compulsion upon all members of the community equally, but a free-will offering to the

common good, or an affectionate tribute to the wishes of an individual. And this, happily, is the actual state of things, to a great extent, in this commonwealth and this city. Nowhere and at no time in the history of the world have the true principles of government been more fully developed, or produced more favorable results, than in this community; and its actual condition, notwithstanding the many and serious evils which in times past have threatened it, and those which are now lowering over it, is one which may well be contemplated with complacency by the lover of his country and his race. Wealth combined with liberality, comfort extended through the whole community, a desire to improve physically and intellectually, a general disposition to order, industry, and sobriety, and a prevailing reverence for the institutions, means, and objects of religion, unite to render Boston an agreeable subject of contemplation to the philanthropist. . . .

In order to present a complete view of the subject, the note already referred to in President Quincy's address, is here reprinted, and then follows a list of such contributions as have been obtained since 1830, together with some items which were omitted at that time. Many of the institutions now enumerated have sprung into existence since that period; and although so many have been found, it is probable there are others which have not been thought of, or are not known. Indeed, this enumeration must be regarded only in the light of a contribution towards the history of the charities of the city, to be hereafter perfected by some one who may feel interest enough in the subject to undertake a pretty difficult task.

President Quincy's list is as follows:--

"Amounts received from the liberality of the citizens of Boston towards objects of a public nature, of a moral, religious, or literary character, chiefly within the last thirty years.

"I. By the following Societies:--

Boston Athenaeum . . . . .	\$75,000
Humane Society . . . . .	20,791
Boston Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor	19,000
Massachusetts General Hospital . . . . .	354,400
Massachusetts Charitable Society . . . . .	16,714
Boston Penitent Female Refuge Society . . . . .	15,172
Boston Fragment Society . . . . .	15,205
Boston Mechanics Institution . . . . .	6,119
Boston Eye and Ear Infirmary . . . . .	5,500
Boston Female Asylum . . . . .	79,582
Boston Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge .. . . .	1,035
Boston Society for the Religious and Moral Instruction of the Poor . . .	23,500
Charitable Mechanic Association . . . . .	15,000
Boston Asylum for Indigent Boys . . . . .	20,000
Fatherless and Widows Society . . . . .	6,320
Howard Benevolent Society . . . . .	16,900
Charitable Fund, placed under the control of the Overseers of the Poor, and derived from Private Benevolence . . . . .	95,000
Massachusetts Congregational Charitable Society . . . . .	51,000
Seaman's Friend Society . . . . .	3,000
American Education Society . . . . .	32,228
Bible Society . . . . .	40,000
Harvard College and the several Institutions embraced within, or connected with, that Seminary . . . . .	222,696

Theological Institution at Andover . . . . .	21,824	
		\$1,155,986 "

[From the above amounts have been as far as possible excluded all sums not derived from the citizens of Boston. Those amounts, also, must not be understood as expressing *the present amount of funds* of these societies, although in many instances it is the case; the object of this recapitulation being not to represent the actual state of each of those societies at this time, but the amount they have, within the time specified, received from the liberal and public spirit of the citizens of Boston.]

Amount brought up \$1,155,986

"II. Various contributions for the relief of sufferers by fire in Boston . . . . .	\$34,528	
in Newburyport . . . . .	16,500	
in St. Johns . . . . .	8,666	
in Augusta. . . . .	2,264	
in Wiscasset . . . . .	5,504	
	<u>67,462</u>	"[

The above, although excluding many known contributions \$1,223,448

are all of which the amounts could be ascertained with accuracy.]

"III. Moneys raised, within the time specified, by various contribution, or by donations of individuals, either from motives of charity, or for the patronizing distinguished merit, or for the relief of men eminent for their public services, --the evidence of which have been examined for this purpose, (testamentary bequests not being included,) . . . . .

\$8,000	11,000	
24,500	10,000	
1,400	6,000	
2,000	5,000	
5,000		
In sums between \$500 and \$1,500 . . . . .	35,500	
	<u>108,400</u>	

"[Particular names and objects have been omitted, from motives of delicacy or propriety.]

"IV. Amount collected for objects of general charity, or for promotion of literary, moral, or religious purposes, by, or under the influence of, various religious societies in the metropolis (not including the particular annual objects of expenditure of each society), communicated by the several officers of these societies, or by individuals having access to their records, or to papers containing evidence of such collections . . . . 469,425

\$1,801,273

"[The names of the particular societies and objects is it not deemed proper to publish, --

"1. Because it was the express wish of several officers of the societies that it should not be done.

"2. Because several of the societies could not be applied to, and their omission here might imply that they have not made similar collections, which would be unjust.

"3. Because, since the account of the amounts thus collected depends upon the retaining or not retaining (often accidental) of the evidence of such collections, the comparative returns are very different from what there is reason to believe were the comparative amounts collected, as they would have appeared, had the evidence in all cases been equally well retained.

"The object, on this occasion, has not been completeness, which was known to be impracticable, but as near an approximation to it as was possible. How far short the statement in this item is from the real amount collected, may be gathered from this fact, --that information was requested *for the amount collected within the last thirty years*; yet more than half the sum stated in this item arose from collections made *within the last ten years*.

"As a farther illustration, it may not be improper to state, that, within the last twelve years, *five* citizens of Boston have deceased, whose be- quests for objects exclusively of public interest or benevolence, when united, amount to a sum exceeding *three hundred thousand dollars*; and that one of these, during the last twenty years of his life, is known to have given away, towards similar objects, a sum equal to *ten thousand* dollars annually.]"

In the following list, those which were included in the former one are distinguished by Italics, while those which were omitted, though existing in 1830, and those which have since begun their career, are in Roman letter. Where the date of the donation was previous to 1830, it is intended to be indicated, and the correction of any mistakes either in dates or amounts will be gratefully acknowledged. In some cases, nothing was practicable but an estimate of the probable amount. These are mentioned in the catalogue, and the authority is given.

*Donations to Institution for Theological Education and other Objects of a Religious Character*

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, since 1810	\$278,166 89
" <i>Education Society</i>	81,160 00
" Tract Society, since 1830*	25,420 39
" Unitarian Association	22,233 04
Massachusetts Missionary Society,	40,000 00
" Evangelical Missionary Society, since 1820	7,769 57
" Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge	7,900 00
Amount brought up	\$462,649 89

<i>Bible Society</i> . . . . .	11,706 00
Benevolent Fraternity of Churches	46,014 01
<i>Theological Institution at Cambridge</i>	29,500 00
Society for Promoting Christian Knowl- edge, Piety, and Charity . . . . .	1,800 00
Pitts Street Chapel, including Cost of Land . . . . .	16,366 22
Suffolk Street Chapel, exclusive of Land . . . . .	16,052 08
Unitarian Association for Domestic Missions, within the last two years	9,330 76
<i>Boston Society for the Religious and Moral Instruction of the Poor</i>	17,829 82
City Mission, a new organization of the last named society, since 1840	13,573 47
Foreign Evangelical Society . . . . .	8,166 33
Warren Street Chapel	48,000 00
Pine Street Church, to relieve it from debt . . . . .	10,000 00
City Missionary (a private agent)	2,605 64
Protestant Episcopal City Mission, including donation for chapel . . . . .	35,900 00
Theological Institution at Newton	28,333 00
Bangor Theological Seminary	2,000 00
Waterville College, Maine	5,500 00
Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland	2,126 14
Protestant Episcopal Foreign Mission	12,190 69
Protestant Episcopal Domestic Mission	7,770 37
Estimate within twenty years	
Baptist Foreign Mission	60,000
"    Domestic    "	30,000

For erection of churches in various parts of U.S.	20,000	
For education in the ministry, exclusive of Baptist Seminary at Newton	40,000	
	150,000 00	
		\$937,414 42

*Donations to Institutions for Purposes of Instruction*

Lowell Institute . . . . .	245,000 00	
Harvard College . . . . .	. 83,755 67	
Washington College, Hartford, Ct. . . . .	2,350 00	
Amounts brought up	\$331,105 67	\$937,414 42
Amherst College . . . . .	. 36,104 00	
Williams " . . . . .	. 25,183 00	
Yale " since 1825 . . . . .	27,220 00	
Bowdoin " since its foundation . . . . .	64,909 19	
Brown University, Providence . . . . .	4,629 00	
Illinois College. . . . .	. 11,000 00	
Shurtleff " Illinois . . . . .	10,300 00	
Marietta " Ohio (estimate by pres't)	4,000 00	
Oberlin Collegiate Institute, Ohio . . . . .	1,725 14	
Perkins Institution for the Blind . . . . .	82,500 00	
Hartford Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb, in 1816 and 1817 . . . . .	4,950 00	
Boston Society of Natural History . . . . .	36,378 50	
<i>Boston Athenaeum</i> , subscription to new shares \$70,800, of which one third may be considered as a donation . . . . .	23,600 00	
<i>Charitable Mechanic Association</i> . . . . .	40,000 00	
Mercantile Library Association . . . . .	. 3,100 00	

Mechanic Apprentices Library Association	. . .	1,800 00
Massachusetts Agricultural Society		7,239 66
Normal Schools.	. .	10,000 00
Medals for the High School for Boys		2,000 00
Groton Academy	. .	10,000 00
Lane Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio (estimate)	. . .	25,000 00
Latin School Association		2,000 00
	_____	\$775,744 16

*Donations to Institutions for Charitable Purposes*

<i>Massachusetts General Hospital and McLean Asylum</i>		\$286,512 93
" <i>Eye and Ear Infirmary</i>		39,958 48
<i>Massachusetts Congregational Charitable Society</i>	. .	1,783 00
<i>Boston Asylum for Indigent Boys and Farm School</i>	. .	61,090 82
" <i>Female Orphan Asylum</i>		40,439 99
" <i>Seamen's Friend Society (estimate by Treasurer)</i>		42,238 16
" <i>Penitent Female Refuge Society</i>		21,636 23
" <i>Fragment Society</i>		6,690 94
" <i>Dispensary</i>	. .	20,155 00
<i>Howard Benevolent Society</i>		43,000 00
<i>Fatherless and Widow's Society</i>		.19,654 00
<i>Overseers of the Poor (Corporate Fund)</i>		1,000 00
Boston Lying-in Hospital		27,871 00
"    Seamen's Aid Society		15,667 98
"    Port Society	. .	20,729 00
"    Employment Society		1,633 00

" Society for Employment of Female Poor.	6,048 28
" Orthopedic Institution	. 1,400 00
" Episcopal Charitable Society	40,329 53
Charitable Association of Boston Fire Department . . .	16,016 87
Prison Discipline Society	30,494 71
Widow's Society . . .	17,634 77
Society for the Prevention of Pauperism	6,288 35
 Annuities and Donations to Individuals in sums varying from \$500 to \$12,000 . . . . .	 66,130 62
 Quarterly Charity Lecture at the Old South, Amount given by individuals for permanent funds . . . . .	 18,600 00
 Amount collected at the quarterly contributions since 1822	 5,000 00
 <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"/>	
	\$861,003 66

*Miscellaneous.*

Bunker Hill Monument	100,000 00
Temperance Cause (estimate by its friends) . . . . .	100,000 00
Abolition of Slavery . . . . .	57,000 00
Colonization (estimated ) . . . . .	1,300 00
Peace Society, from 1816 to present time	7,371 38
Public Garden . . . . .	20,000 00
 Boston Academy of Music (for alteration of the Odeon) . . . . .	 5,038 00
Society for Diffusing Information among Immigrants (extinct)	919 25



Besides those above enumerated, application has been made to the officers of several other institutions and societies known or believed to have received aid from Boston; but from some cause, the information has not been received in an authentic shape, and all mention of it is therefore omitted. . . .<sup>299</sup> Application was also made to the churches of the city, associations which are well known to be in the constant habit of contributing not only to many of the objects above mentioned, but to others of various descriptions, both permanent and temporary. . . . It is probable that no records are kept of many donations made by these religious societies; but it is not the less certain that such donations are made. . . . It will not be doubted by many persons, that, in the churches which have existed in the city within the last fifteen years, from seventy to eighty in number, an average of not less than \$10,000 a year has been raised for the support of the poor belonging to them respectively. This item alone would make an addition of \$150,000 to the foot of the above account. But there is another branch of benevolence, the great extent of which can neither be doubted, nor precisely ascertained; and that is, the unnumbered acts of love, pity, and sympathy which are and can be known only to the agent, the recipient, and Him who formed them to give and receive. It would be no matter of surprise, if the amount bestowed in this secret way should make a near approach to that given openly; but as such deeds cannot be counted, nor their value be estimated in dollars and cents, the whole must be left to conjecture, till the arrival of that day when the gift even of a cup of cold water shall meet with its fit reward.

One of the first observations which will naturally occur to every one, on looking over the preceding list, is, not merely that there is a large amount of money voluntarily bestowed, but that it is given for a great variety of purposes. There are thirty-one societies or institution having religious objects, twenty-six for purposes of literary education, and twenty-five for the relief of physical and moral wants. Thirty-one other objects of more or less general interest are added, and doubtless many more may be known to individuals. And it is a little singular, that, in a country so often reproached as this with want of gratitude to its benefactors, there should be contained in such a list no less than thirteen subscriptions for monuments to the memory of as many honored individuals, ten of whom were the contemporaries of this present generation; and besides these, there is the comprehensive monument in

honor of the achievement of our fathers at Bunker Hill. . . . The claims of the wise and the brave of our Revolutionary age are not forgotten, nor are the lights of science, religion, and philanthropy in our own time suffered to go out in ungrateful oblivion.

There are two obvious effects arising from this multiplicity and subdivision of institutions of benevolence, one of which is of a favorable, and the other of an unfavorable tendency. The emulation excited among rival societies for the same or similar objects stimulates the activity and industry of all, and much greater results are obtained, than, to the solitary and *unrivalled* institution, would have seemed possible. The surprising effects produced by the development of this principle are everywhere around us, in every sphere of activity, from the raising of a strawberry to the building of a frigate; and it is happy that it is also felt in the department of benevolence, and that one man's example becomes the impulse to another, till the pulsation is quickened throughout the whole community, and deeds that would once have been considered prodigies become familiar as household words. Thus it is that the rivalry even of religious sects, which seems at first view to produce nothing but that apparent hostility which is on the surface, really causes an unseen under-current of kindness and active benevolence, which may be some compensation for the harshness, suspicion, and injustice which they are apt to indulge.

The other effect referred to is that the multiplicity of objects diminishes the resources of each. This is felt and known by every contributor to subscriptions that are constantly circulating. He cannot give so much as he would, did he not expect a call for something else the next week, or the next day, and recollect what had been asked for the previous day, or the previous week. The result is, that nearly all our permanent benevolent institutions are sadly crippled for want of means. They cannot do all that they are called upon, and are designed, to do. There is scarcely one that has as large means as it could well employ upon its specific objects. Those, therefore, who are disposed to deeds of charity, can perhaps do more good by contributing to the funds of an existing institution, than by starting a new project that may divert a portion of their means from establishments that need more. And it must be

recollected that with the growth of the city, which is so rapid that it may be seen in its progress from year to year, there will come a great increase in that portion of society which is destined to receive rather than to give; and the utmost caution should be constantly observed to prevent the waste of those resources which, however abundant, are apt to become scanty, with the progress of events and ideas.

The perusal of the above catalogues may surely be expected to have some tendency to expand the views of those who are engrossed in their own sphere of action, and think nothing can be so important as their own favorite charity. It is by no means an unusual foible; and the best corrective, one would think, would be to look around and see how many other make the same claim, and determine in one's own mind which of the multifarious charities could be spared without injury. The difficulty one will find may dispose him to be charitable in the largest sense, and to have some feeling for the same infirmity in others, of which he is conscious in himself. And if he watches the history of these institutions, and becomes acquainted with their origin, he will often be struck with the fact, that the gap which has been left by one set of associates has been filled by another, and that a vast deal of ambition is felt for the progress of the favorite scheme in all the paths of activity which have been discovered or devised. In this way it is that emulation and vanity are made to produce, in the course of Providence, the best effects which can flow from them; and thus it is that, even on the best soils, the tares and the wheat must grow together until the harvest.

As long as there are differences in the tastes and powers of men, there will be great differences in the modes in which they will dispense, as well as in those by which they acquire, abundance; and while one will encourage only institutions for the relief of physical wants, another will give no support to anything but promoting the progress of Christianity, and a third esteems nothing of so much importance as the cause of education. We should learn to think respectfully of every form in which charity displays itself, and not allow ourselves to say, "How useless is this or that object! what a waste of means upon an unattainable end!" We cannot know enough of the operation of causes to justify the cavil; and there is one branch of utility, in every mode of giving, which is often overlooked; and that is the

utility to him who gives. It is comparatively of little consequence to what a man gives. The choice is merely an exercise of his understanding. But it is of great consequence that he should give to something; and the greater the diversity of objects for which he can feel a sympathizing interest, the greater his sphere of usefulness to himself as well as others, the more he is enlarging both his mind and his heart, and the more does he deserve the appellation of a liberal-minded man. At the same time, it cannot be denied, that the mode in which a man should attempt to benefit other ought to be a matter of careful attention and study. It should not be left to the hazard of impulse and accidental predilection, but should be made the subject of reflection, and investigation into the actual wants of society. It is very easy to give money in such a manner that it shall not only be comparatively useless, but shall be even a burden and a tax; and the greatest sagacity will not prevent such results, if the ambition to leave a long enduring impression on society should exceed the ability to produce it. The best guide to the true course in such cases is undoubtedly experience; and although new provisions must, of course, be made for new circumstances as they arise, yet there can be no great fear of going wrong, when we make arrangements for the occurrence of events which have happened so often already, that the probability of their occurrence in the future amounts almost to certainty.

There is one error so frequently repeated, notwithstanding the perpetually recurring proofs of its being a great mistake, that it will not be superfluous to utter a caution against it. It is limiting and restricting the uses to which funds may be applied, to such a degree, that, when the circumstances of society change even but slightly, the means provided for a previous state of things are no longer applicable to the corresponding wants of the present and succeeding times.

A memorable instance of this is the legacy of Dr. Franklin to trustees for the benefit of young married mechanics in the cities of Boston and Philadelphia. His arrangements were adapted to what he supposed, or perhaps knew, to be the existing state of things at the time he made his will; and although he was remarkably modest in his pretensions, and did not undertake to determine what circumstances would arise longer than for two or three centuries, yet what happened even to his

modesty? What would he have felt, had he known that in thirty years after his death it would have become difficult, and in fifty years almost impossible, to find persons of such a description, and in such situations, as he required; and that his money, instead of circulating among young mechanics, was quietly accumulating by adding to it the yearly interest on the stock in which it was invested? If Franklin's sagacity could not foresee for a score of years what was to occur in a class with whose interests, habits, and character he was entirely familiar, who shall presume to direct future generations? "It is my will," says the testator, "that this shall remain *for ever*." Who would think that it was a human being uttering this magnificent declaration? A little creature, who has occupied a diminutive spot for a minute period, declares his will; and when the small power he ever had is rapidly becoming smaller, and his short duration in the world sinking into nothing, he issues his fiat, that his arrangements shall endure for ever. If it were not so blind, so foolish, and so presumptuous a thing, it would be inconceivably ludicrous; and, indeed, it is difficult to say which quality predominates in the attempt. Yet it is so common, that this very language has become the customary form of expression in legal testaments. But it is scarcely more common than it is futile; and it would be well if men would give over the attempt to make their purposes last for ever, till they can live here for ever to carry them out themselves. They would then only have to take care that they did not change their own minds, and overturn to-day the settled purposes of yesterday.

The only way in which a man can do permanent good with the money which he must leave behind him is to trust something to the discretion of those who would follow him. Let him describe his wish and his design in so general a way, that, while it may be clearly understood, it shall not be confined within such straight lines, that it can incline neither to the right hand nor to the left. Circumstances do no move so; and if a man's will cannot be bent to accommodate to them, it must be broken.

In looking round on the community in which we live, it is difficult to avoid a feeling of exultation, which ought to be accompanied and moderated by sincere thankfulness to Him who alone has produced such a state of things, that we have avoided, and, so far as can be perceived, are likely to avoid

hereafter, the calamities which in times past have overwhelmed nations, and which threaten, even now, some of the greatest and proudest on earth. The tremendous convulsions which have desolated society have arisen from the want of sympathy of man with man. Artificial arrangements have separated the apparent interests of one class from those of another, and have led the one to look down, and the other to look up, through so many generations, that at length men have really, practically, forgotten that they belong to the same race of animals. It is, in general, true that there is as little sympathy between upper and lower classes in Europe, as between men and horses or dogs; --in some cases far less. The labor of a man in Europe will produce as great an effect upon the soil as in America; but the division of the proceeds is very different. There, the serf who tills the ground must be contented with what will keep him alive, without comfort, ambition, or hope of improvement; while the proprietor of the soil takes to himself all the rest. Here, where the proprietor is also the laborer, he procures such assistance as he may need only by tempting offers of compensation, which is sufficient not only to satisfy abundantly his present wants, but to stimulate every faculty and every feeling with the prospect of constantly rising in condition. Industry, economy, uprightness, and intellectual cultivation are all promoted by this state of things, and the result, in the mass, presents a strong contrast with the degraded, down-trodden, ignorant, and unimproving peasant of Europe. The state of things there is rendered permanent by the barriers of classes being made fixed and impassable both by laws and by customs; and there is little hope that the organization of society can be effectually altered, except by convulsions such as have occurred in France, are now going on in Spain, and are perpetually threatened in England. . . .

Now, from all this, our situation, our institutions, and our habits set us perfectly free. The oppression of the mass by the few is rendered impossible by the public institutions, and is driven, by the habits of thinking and feeling generated by those institutions, from the wish and thought of any one as much as it is from his power. In the entire freedom from personal control, which here is universal, the rights of the individual are maintained; and as no one can encroach on those of his neighbour without being promptly and efficiently reminded of it, the rights of all are respected. The growth of sympathy is

unchecked by any artificial distinction of ranks; as none exists except the natural classification of the more or less intelligent, skilful, and successful. The consideration necessarily attached to these personal differences is personal in its nature, and does not attach, as it does in Europe, to an individual merely because he happens to belong to a certain family, or one class. The accidents of birth and character are not to be prevented from operating in every house; and the fickleness of prosperity is not chained down to a certain succession. Distinct orders of society, therefore, do not and cannot exist here. There is nothing so high, that the very lowest, in situation merely, may not aspire to it. There is nothing so low, that the very highest, if not secured by something besides situation, may not fall to it. In Europe, on the contrary, situation alone, without merit or capacity, secures to a man ease, splendor, and power, and situation alone binds him to obscurity, want, and insignificance; while merit without position will do little to render him comfortable, successful, or distinguished. This is the point which makes the essential difference between the social condition of Europe and America; and which order of things is the best for the mass does not admit of a question for a moment in the mind of a reflecting person. And if it is best for the mass to stand as we do here, it is not very easy to see what it is not best for all, the distinguished as well as the undistinguished, the rich as well as the poor. Where shall the line be drawn between the many for whom our state of society is good, and the few for whom it is not good? In truth, there is not such line practicable; and it is one of the great results of the condition of things in New England, that it proves the identity of interests of all the component parts of society. No one can say to any other, --"You are not wanted; we can do without you." There is a mutual dependence far more widely felt, and not only felt, but acknowledged, here than elsewhere; and as the political institutions of the country are adapted to continue this state of things, it may be hoped that it will long endure to produce the fruits which we have been contemplating.

One proof of the existence of this sentiment has already been intimated; namely, that it is not left, as in monarchical or aristocratic forms of government it is usually left, to the political powers to do every thing, whether for weal or woe, which can be done by society. Here, the subject takes much of the matter into his own hands, and does many things far better than any government could possibly do

them; and at the same time he requires his government to do well all that it can do; and it is a fact, that a much larger amount has been distributed by the individual inhabitants of Boston than by the City government, in the same term of time, for the same, or similar purposes. This is done freely, voluntarily, by no compulsion of any sort, from the motive that springs up in the breast of one, and is communicated to many, be it benevolence, vanity, love of influence, ambition, or whatever else may be imagined. It is desirable to believe, that, in general, it is benevolence which produces these effects; but if it be any of the other less worthy motives, still it produces active sympathy, -- sympathy between those who act in concert, and sympathy with those to whose benefit their action is directed. Thus is society knit together by feelings and by interests intertwining in every direction, and scarcely can one bond be broken without its being widely felt and speedily repaired. It is needless to say, that a society in such a condition stands firmer, more consolidated, and less likely to be dissolved by internal convulsion or external violence, than one where a mutual feeling of hostility, opposing interests, and conflicting claims is always, or frequently, uppermost in the minds and hearts of which it is composed.

It should be a subject of common congratulation that such a state of things can be found here. The wise and the good will, of course, rejoice in it; and it would be a reason for greater rejoicing, if there could be produced in the minds of those who call themselves, and are called by others, the laboring classes here, a proper perception of the immense difference between their condition and that of the corresponding classes in Europe. The cultivators and proprietors of the soil are not there, as here, the same persons, but one is the lord, the other the vassal; the one is rich by the labor of those about him, the other is destitute of property, because he cannot appropriate to himself the proceeds of his own labor. Neither party can change his station; the higher cannot fall from his rank, whatever may be his person character, and the lower cannot rise above his original condition, be his person merits what they may. Now is there anything here at all approaching this? Is not every farmer lord of his own manor; can he not appropriate to his own use every dollar of his earnings? Who is there above him, to whom he must bow the knee, and on whom must he feel dependent? . . . And the condition of the mechanic is quite as favorably contrasted with that of the mechanic in Europe. On the one continent, the profession is

esteemed, and even honored; on the other, it is despised, and treated with a contempt which would be as galling as it is unknown to the high-spirited and often highly-cultivated mechanic of New England.

But persons who are farmers or mechanics in this country often use a language and exhibit a tone of feeling which are inconsistent with the state of things here, and are applicable only to what is found in Europe. They talk of oppression of the rich; when there is not a rich man in America that can, and perhaps not one that wishes, to oppress them. They talk of others being held in more respect, and of themselves as being despised; when there are as many mechanics and farmers in town, city, county, and state offices, both legislative and executive, as of all other sorts of persons put together; they take as decided a lead in all measures, public or private, as they are personally qualified to do; and very frequently do they throw others completely in the shade. Now if this be contemptuous treatment, what would be respectful? If this be oppression, who is free? No; such language is entirely erroneous, and they who use it really do not know what they are talking of. They use terms borrowed from Europe, and applicable only there, and apply them to themselves and those about them, when they are in entirely different relations to each other. It produces a bad effect on their imaginations, (for it cannot influence the reality,) to talk of themselves as if they were poor, despised, or oppressed. It generates a habit of complaining, which ill becomes the sturdy, ambitious, independent, manly yeoman, that they really are; and it creates ill feelings, for which there is little foundation, against those who are more successful or wealthy than themselves. It is a good thing to learn, in whatsoever state we are, therewith to be content, and not to think ourselves poor because our neighbour has more than we, and not to think him an oppressor merely because he is rich. Riches alone do not enable a man to be much of an oppressor anywhere, and in this country the rich man can cut no figure at all in that line. There must be position and privilege superadded to wealth to make it possible to oppress, and in New England neither that position nor that privilege can be attained by any body. So far is the rich man from having attained them, that he is, in truth, farther from them than other persons. He is jealously watched, constantly suspected, and is very commonly regarded as a fair subject for that covert system of attack, which, though in a different way to be sure, is as great a favorite with the Yankee as with his

predecessor, the Indian. The language and the conduct of public bodies, especially legislatures, show pretty accurately the tendency of feeling and thought among the mass whom they represent; and if these be carefully observed, it will be found that they indicate the existence of the jealousy of the rich and prosperous, for which the history of the country has given no good cause, but which, originating elsewhere, and kept up here, in a great degree, by the influx of persons bringing deep-rooted feelings with them from Europe, is alike the unjust to the one side and unworthy of the other.

The preceding statements of donations may be confidently appealed to in proof of the unreasonableness of the jealousy. A large portion of the sums stated have, no doubt, arisen from the gathered mites of the generous poor, but another large portion has also been received from the generous rich; and if a man be rich without being generous, he can certainly find many cities which would be more agreeable places of residence than Boston. So far as has hitherto appeared, the influence of the rich has been exerted, in this country, only for beneficent purposes; and it is time that the uncharitable constructions put upon their conduct should be abandoned.

But there is one remark which is applicable to all sorts and denominations of persons, and which may be regarded in the light of an offset to some of the merciless reproofs we have received from many of the most, as well as from some of the least, enlightened of our visitors from abroad. Nearly all of them, from De Tocqueville and Major Hamilton to Dickens and Mrs. Trollope, can laugh at, abuse, ridicule, scold, or lament, according to their several tempers, our devotion to money-getting, our sordid greediness, our sacrifice of honor, character, comfort, and respectability to the pursuit of "the almighty dollar." And what is the result? It cannot be denied, that we are active and enterprising in our attempts to obtain wealth, and that we succeed in the attempt rather oftener than is usual elsewhere, in consequence of this enterprise and activity; but that we have any stronger passion for money than other people may safely be denied, till some nation is discovered who cannot be reproached in the same way. Till then it may serve to compose the nerves affected by the language referred to, if there be any, to reflect upon the use which is made of a portion of the wealth which is accumulated, and at the same

time of the more moderate resources of those who cannot be called wealthy. Look at the lists already presented, and say if money could be expected to be more freely spent for praiseworthy purposes by any body. Here are a great number of objects, upon some of which all sorts of persons, rich and poor, orthodox and heretic, strong and weak, influential and influenced, male and female, young and old, educated and uneducated, unite their efforts, and the result is such a number and combination of charities as has never before been found in any city of its size. So long as money is freely spent in support of the church, the school, the college, the hospital, and the asylum, for memorials of the departed good and great, for the sustenance of the poor, and the comfort of the prisoner, there is little fear of its being greatly misapplied in luxurious extravagance, wanton waste, or vicious indulgence. If we are greedy of gain, it is not to hoard it with the passion of the miser, but to procure to ourselves the advantages which cannot be obtained without it, --the cultivation, the improvement, the luxury of doing good, which are the stimulus, the means, and the reward of virtue.

Eliot's account of the amount of Boston's charitable giving is impressive, especially when compared to the relatively paltry amounts Mathew Carey indicated Philadelphians during this period. But more impressive still are Eliot's efforts to muster these facts to demonstrate the essentially democratic character of American society and to justify of the place of the wealthy in it. First of all, he suggests that philanthropy is broadly-based, reflecting a diversity of interests and circumstances while, at the same time, serving to knit the diverse elements of the community together. Secondly, while conceding the reality of differences in wealth, Eliot argues that the lack of formal legal barriers to social, economic, and political mobility deprive the wealthy of any real power, while assuring all citizens, however humble their circumstances, just rewards for talent and ambition. Thirdly, he attacks the "farmers and mechanics" who accuse the rich of oppressing the masses as being deluded -- led astray by ideas about society which were foreign in origin and which had no bearing on American circumstances. He

concludes by suggesting that the materialism of Americans, so often noted by foreign visitors, was redeemed by the extent to which wealth was devoted to benevolent purposes.

Eliot's denial of the linkage between wealth and influence -- which was the basis for the Jacksonians' criticism of endowed institutions like Harvard -- is quite startling. One is tempted to question his candor. Not only did he fail to acknowledge that well over half of the charitable wealth he enumerated was controlled by a small group of interrelated individuals -- a group of which he was part --, he also completely missed the significance of the changes that industrialism had wrought upon Boston's population. To speak of "the mass" as being made up "sturdy yeomen" and "cultivated mechanics" made little sense, by the 1840s, when almost all except the most skilled artisans had become wage earners, rather than proprietors of their own enterprises, and when increasing numbers were being pushed into the ranks of seasonally employed day laborers (Thernstrom 1964, 9-32; Dawley 1976). It may be that Eliot, like so many wealthy people in the course of the nineteenth century, was simply blind to the reality of poverty and oppression.

Another intriguing anomaly in Eliot's essay is the complete absence of women, immigrants, and people of color from his philanthropic universe. This is a striking contrast to Carey's essay on Philadelphia charities, which is almost entirely devoted to discussing women both as beneficiaries and benefactresses of charitable institutions. And, given the fact that immigrants and Blacks were, by 1845, subjects of major concern to organized charity -- as well as being active in a wide variety of voluntary associations in the city --, this omission is puzzling. One can only suppose that Eliot did not think of himself as addressing a broad public audience -- and that the essay must be read as

having been written as a kind of internal document for the men who sat on the boards of Boston's charitable and commercial institutions.

If so, the essay is striking, in light of the author's evident ambitions, for its failure to articulate a fully satisfactory rationale for the existence of his class. While he points with pride to its generosity, the second half of the piece, which decries the ingratitude of the masses, points to the Brahmins' failure as a class to persuade anyone but themselves of their indispensability. Part of the problem lies, not doubt, in the insufficiency of Eliot's conception of his peers as a coherent group -- as he portrays them they are merely wealthy and meritorious, representing, as Oliver Wendell Holmes would put a few years later, "a permanent fact of wealth with a variable human element" (Holmes 1850, ). Only this distinguishes them from the broader community with which Eliot still repeatedly expresses a sense of strong identification. Not until the Brahmins (as Holmes would dub them in 1859) came to terms with the reality of their wealth and the way in which it really did make them different from everybody else, would Boston's wealthy be able to effectively assert its claims to leadership.

Despite its deficiencies, Eliot's essay is a very remarkable effort, not only because of its ambitious attempt to provide a quantitative portrayal of the extent of charitable giving by Bostonians of all classes, but also because his grasp of some of the public policy issues arising from large-scale benevolence seem strikingly modern in tone. His discussion of the problem of perpetuities and the need to set up charitable trusts so that they would continue to address real needs is still heard today. His concerns about the efficiency of charitable institutions and the hazards of giving flowing in too many directions are no less of concern now than they were a century and a half ago.

In 1860, on the eve of the Civil War, Eliot again surveyed the growth of Boston's charities. The tone of this essay is considerably different from his earlier one: he, as spokesman for the city's patricians, has a far clearer and more confident sense of who they are as a group and the distinctive nature of their role as community leaders. Notably absent is the defensiveness of the 1845 essay: the influx of mostly Catholic immigrants and the rising political challenge they represented, had led the battling protestant factions to finally find common cause and to settle their long-standing differences. (With an understanding of the political threat the immigrants posed, Harvard quietly cut its last ties to the state in 1865, replacing the *ex officio* Overseers with elected alumni representatives).

## CHARITIES OF BOSTON (1860)

FIFTEEN years ago we published a list of the religious, benevolent, and educational societies and institutions that had received large sums of money from the citizens of Boston, and mentioned the monuments of various kinds which had been erected to the memory of distinguished individuals among us during that period. We now recur to the subject, and propose to lay before our readers a similar catalogue of contributions for the public good, and for objects of interest beyond the limits of our own community, by the inhabitants of our city; embracing the larger gifts of the rich, and the gathered contributions of the poor, for a curious and interesting variety of purposes. This, as we think, is a species of statistics which it is important to collect for various reasons. If institutions exist for the relief of the misfortunes and troubles to which all are liable, it is important that they should be known, in order that they may be useful. If experiments are tried, --and every new benevolent association is an experiment, --their results should be made known, that the institution may be imitated, or improved, wherever a similar spirit and a similar want can be found. And it is not likely that any harm will be done by excessive liberality in founding or endowing charitable institutions, either at home or abroad, which can be traced to the influence of our example. We trust, on the contrary, that the influence of such example would be to produce imitators rather than barren approvers, and thus to cherish institutions of beneficence and utility. Neither can it be said that we are fostering a narrow spirit, while we thus justify our love for our own city. We know what is done here, and we do not know what is accomplished elsewhere. It may be that as much or more is effected, in a similar manner, in other places. We know that the liberality and the attachment to home, which lead precisely to such a result, are felt elsewhere, as well as in Boston; and we should like very much to see a similar statement of the channels of benevolence, their direction, width, and depth, from other cities and towns. There is no doubt that we could learn many lessons of wisdom and of kindness from such a record of the foundations of past generations in the great European cities, where enlightened experience has been longer observed than here; and, from the early ages of Christianity, when benevolence had its birth, to the present time, there have been eminent examples, both public and private, of the same spirit which animated our fathers, and which, we rejoice to believe, has not

deserted their descendants. It would not be difficult to show that a wise and refined beneficence produces fruits of direct utility which the most cunning selfishness cannot reach; and therefore that charity, in all its forms, is an agent and a producer of good in a much larger proportion than selfishness. Does not a hospital restore the health and strength of many a poor man, who saves his family from becoming a burden on? Is not many a child rendered a producer, instead of a mere consumer, by the asylums, the Sunday schools, and the day and evening schools, that are supported by public contribution and private charity? If the industrial and productive effect of many of the institutions called charities were capable of being seen and known, would they not be proved to be a remunerative expenditure? --remunerative, we mean, not to the individual founder or benefactor, for in that case there would be no charity, but to the community in which they exist. This view makes every founder and supporter of a useful scheme of benevolence a public as well as a private benefactor; and adds dignity as well as utility to his labors or his gifts. In a country like this, growing every day in wants as well as in means, --all classes of society, the rich, the poor, and every variety of one and the other, increasing every day, --institutions of charity must increase with equal growth, and must multiply with the multiplying employments and wants of the population, or else great numbers will be left without resource in the worst calamities and most distressing circumstances of life. Large proportions of the community are found in a new condition in every succeeding generation; foundations which were well adapted to their times are, at later periods, either inadequate or comparatively useless; and the charitable as well as other institutions must be modified, or new ones must be created, to meet the wants of each successive age. It is with great satisfaction, therefore, that we observe in our present list so many associations, whose names and objects are new; which have, indeed, begun to exist since 1845, and which show, or tend at least to show, that the resources upon which public spirit may draw are neither hoarded nor exhausted. The old institutions are kept up, and new ones formed, very generally by voluntary contribution; in a few instances only, by permanent funds; and thus successive generations meet new occasions, without forgetting the perpetual wants of society. . . .

The following catalogue embraces the donations by inhabitants of Boston only, so far as we have been able to ascertain them, for the benefit of those who would not otherwise have enjoyed the advantages procured for them. Many of the societies have been founded within the fifteen years of which we give the statistics, as will be seen by the dates annexed; and all the occasional expenditures have of course occurred within that period. Some are known to exist from which we have not been able to obtain returns.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM JANUARY 1, 1845, TO JANUARY 1, 1860.

*For Religious Objects*

	Society for Propagating the Gospel among the In-				
	ians and other in North America	.	.	.	\$13,607.07
	Massachusetts Society for Promoting Christian				
	Knowledge	.	.	.	15,698.18
1853	Southern Aid Society	.	.	.	55,842.48
	City Missionary Society	.	.	.	124,212.49
	American Tract Society	.	.	.	55,258.00
	Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions	.	.	.	322,045.15
	American Home Missionary Society	.	.	.	95,084.67
	Baptist Missionary Union	.	.	.	85,000.00
	Foreign and Domestic Missions (Epis. Church)	,			30,381.00
	Episcopal City Mission	.	.	.	14,270.00
	E.B. Society,	.	.	.	31,000.00
	Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Cler-				
	gymen,	.	.	.	1,000.00
	Episcopal Diocesan Missions,	.	.	.	13,500.00
	American Education Society,	.	.	.	28,554.71
	St. Mary's Free Church for Sailors,	.	.	.	16,000.00
	Benevolent Fraternity of Churches,	.	.	.	102,571.80

Methodist Episcopal Church, for foreign missions  
and church building, . . . . . 216,701.16

---

\$ 1,220,726.71

*For Charitable Objects.*

Massachusetts General Hospital and Asylum for  
the Insane, . . . . \$ 357,530.50

" Eye and Ear Infirmary, . . . . 46,518.75

1851. " School for the Idiotic and Feeble-  
Minded Youth . . . . 78,680.00

" Temperance Society . . . . 6,000.00

1857. " Medical Benevolent Society . . . . 1,673.00

Boston Dispensary, . . . . 35,253.75

" Female Asylum, . . . . 30,267.11

" Port Society, . . . . 38,598.00

" Marine Society, . . . . 11,300.00

" Children's Friend Society, . . . . 53,597.72

1849. Association for Relief of Aged and Indigent Females, 117,393.93

1847. Temporary Home for the Destitute, . . . . 35,955.53

Penitent Female Refuge, . . . . 25,638.13

Needlewoman's Friend Society, . . . . 3,031.00

Old South Quarterly Lecture, . . . . 16,887.60

Howard Benevolent Society, . . . . 65,902.05

Widow's Society, . . . . 12,741.35

Fragment Society, . . . . 1,764.75

Seaman's Friend Society, and Sailor's Home, 34,334.96

" Aid Society, . . . . 30,957.00

	Sailor's Snug Harbor, . . . . .	65,000.00
1849.	Society for Relief of Aged and Indigent Ministers, 18,158.00	
	St. Stephen's Mission to the Poor, . . . . .	<u>46,421.00</u>
1849.	St. Stephen's Brotherhood, . . . . .	3,545.00
	Society for the Prevention of Pauperism . . . . .	21,416.65
1847.	German Aid Society, . . . . . 300	2,767.24
1855.	Church Home for Orphan and Destitute Children, . . . . .	21,037.91
	Warren Street Chapel, . . . . .	75,000.00
	" " " for rebuilding, . . . . .	5,000.00
1852.	Provident Institution (Franklin Street), . . . . . 301	71,745.26
	Charitable Association of Boston Fire Department, . . . . .	5,460.17
1858.	Channing Home, . . . . .	3,469.44
1856.	House of the Angel Guardian, . . . . .	28,669.00
	Colonization Society, . . . . .	23,060.99
1849.	Children's Mission to the Children of the Destitute, . . . . .	21,935.00
	Charitable Orthopedic Institution, . . . . .	1,500.00
	Charitable Irish Society, . . . . .	3,353.00
	Methodist Episcopal Church, . . . . .	<u>61,182.64</u>
		\$ 1,482,726.43

*For Purposes of Education.*

1857.	Boston Public Library, cost, . . . . .	363,633.83
	" " " , donations, . . . . .	74,100.00
	" Athenaeum, donations, . . . . .	65,000.00
	" " , subscription to new shares, . . . . .	158,362.07
	Harvard College, . . . . .	706,333.96
1858.	Museum of Natural History, at Cambridge, . . . . .	75,000.00

	Trustees of Donations for Education in Liberia, .	33,781.50
1855.	Massachusetts Institution for Girls, at Lancaster ,	19,875.00
	Perkins Institution for the Blind, . .	66,301.00
	Boston Asylum and Farm School, . .	68,064.79
	American Academy of Arts and Sciences, .	11,500.00
1846.	State Reform School, . . .	73,500.00
1853.	Industrial School for Girls, . . .	18,000.00
1852.	Tufts College, . . . .	100,000.00
	Latin School, . . . .	4,500.00
1851.	School of Design, . . . .	8,000.00
	Massachusetts Historical Society, . . <sup>302</sup>	34,075.00
	Mechanic Apprentice's Library Association, .	2,091.95
	Methodist Episcopal Church, . . .	<u>173,590.36</u>
		\$ 2,055,709.46

*For Monuments*

1852-9.	Washington Memorial, by Mr. Everett, . .	70,000.00
1854-6.	Mrs. Otis, . . .	6,000.00
1856.	Statue of Franklin, . . . .	20,000.00
1853.	" Webster, . . . .	24,550.00
1859.	" Rev. Hosea Ballou, collected in Boston	1,734.00
1850-60.	Statues in Mount Auburn, . . .	21,000.00
1859.	Copley's Picture of Charles I. in the House of Commons . . . .	7,500.00
1851.	Healy's Picture of Webster in the Senate of the United States, . . . .	5,000.00
1858.	Arcadian Boy, by Story, in City Library, . .	1,500.00

1856.	Plymouth Monument by Billings, subscribed	
	in Boston, . . . . .	11,500.00

*Miscellaneous*

1847-8.	Contribution for Ireland, during famine, . . . . .	\$ 52,162.02
1859.	Model Lodging-Houses (by an individual) . . . . .	50,000.00
1858.	Contribution for Fayal, during famine, . . . . .	9,800.00
	Annuities since 1845, . . . . .	64,000.00
1847.	Contribution for Nantucket, after fire, . . . . .	18,124.81
	Prison Discipline Society, in ten years, . . . . .	<u>18,000.00</u>
		\$ 168,784.50

*Recapitulation*

For Religious Objects, . . . . .	\$ 1,220,726.71
" Charitable Purposes, . . . . .	1,482,726.43
" Education, . . . . .	2,055,709.46
" Monuments, . . . . .	168,784.50
" Miscellaneous, . . . . .	<u>212,086.83</u>
	\$ 5,140,033.93

We are almost tempted to leave the above list to speak for itself, without a word of comment from us; but there are some observations drawn rather from our experience than from the mere catalogue we have recited, which we are disposed to add. The multiplicity of objects of interest cannot fail to be observed, and while it is well, certainly, that all those new incidents and phases of life which require aid should be attended to, yet it must not be forgotten that the ancient course of accident, poverty, and disease is not interrupted, that education requires not only new adaptations to constantly new desires, but the replenishing of the older fountains for the necessities of new times, and the enlargement of

means with the extension of social wants. This alone presupposes a great increase of all modes of instruction, and if we mean to show the spirit of our fathers, we must enlarge the old as well as establish the new; we must look forward, as well as we can, to the probable, the certain growth of the country, and adapt our ideas and wants, not only of this, but of the coming age. We must not fritter away our means, which, however great they may be, are not and cannot be greater than our needs, upon a multiplicity of objects, which will be partially attained, but should rather condense our efforts upon those which cannot be of doubtful necessity, and which are the proper foundation on which to build the charitable establishments we require. Religion and education are the fundamental and permanent necessities of human nature, the objects of instincts which ought to be rightly directed and properly fostered, in order that they may attain their just development and produce their appropriate fruits. On the former of these subjects there has always been a great, and in the opinion of many, a sufficient interest in New England, while some will undoubtedly say it has been excessive and absorbing. However, none will deny that the zeal for education has been very fluctuating among us; sometimes prominent, and marked with a good degree of efficiency, then subsiding into comparative torpor, and again reviving to a useful activity. The instinct of ambitious benevolence, however, has been oftener shown in providing for the gratification of new wishes than of old necessities, in making a partial, rather than a liberal provision for acknowledged wants, and in furnishing ornamental culture when substantial advantages were loudly called for. Examples of this tendency mark Harvard College, where, with a great variety of foundations, not one is sufficient for the maintenance of a professor, and where, while some less imperative needs are more or less provided for, no one has yet established a professorship of such primary importance as that of the Latin language.<sup>303</sup> In like manner, the benevolent institutions of the city, though we cannot say that any are superfluous, yet it is manifest that there are several associations with objects so nearly allied, or it may be identical, that they might be combined, with great mutual advantage, if the religious or personal obstacles to a union could be surmounted. It should be remembered that combined action would, in many if not all cases, diminish the expense of management, and thus increase the real amount given to those necessities which the associations were designed to relieve. We do not doubt that this process of assimilation and

combination will take place, at some time, as it is a natural consequence of the abatement of sectarian and party violence, of which we have witnessed much within the period of an average human life; and we would fain do what we can to recommend the amalgamation of many of those societies above named, which do not differ in the objects of their endeavors so much as in the religious views of their several members and patrons. It should be remembered, in many cases, that the charity really has nothing whatever to do with the religious ideas or judgments of the contributors; that a limb may be saved, or an alphabet taught, even though the subscribers to the fund which enables one to save a limb, and another to teach the accident, may not be all of one mind as to the Divine nature, or the total depravity of the human soul. Shall we, unmindful of the rebuke of our Saviour, refuse our aid to a suffering fellow-mortal, because "he followeth not us." "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you?" asks the Apostle. Would he not have occasion to ask a similar question, were he among us today? It is a curious incongruity of human nature, that in our very charities we should find means to be uncharitable; that while we seek to do good, we have not learned to avoid that which is evil; that we do not fully understand the doctrine of the parable of the priest, Levite, and Samaritan. . . .

While we thus suggest a combination of effort, in some cases, here are others in which it seems to us that at least enough has already been done in one direction, and that it would be much better to found a new institution, than to enlarge an old one beyond convenient limits. Thus the Massachusetts General Hospital, for the care and cure of the sick and the insane, seems to us to be as large as can be advantageously managed by one set of directors and officers; and perhaps the suggestion that the time has come for another institution, with a similar purpose, may not be regarded as untimely or impertinent. . . .

Considerable sums have been collected . . . by agents for particular objects elsewhere, such as building a church in a remote settlement in the West, or the Northwest, and by missionaries for particular purposes, who have been attracted by the reputation of the city for dispensing its abundance. The opinion seems to have become pretty common, however, that these applications are of a kind that do

not deserve the favor they seek, as, in general, there can be no sufficient guaranty for the proper application of donations, and the necessities of a particular neighborhood ought to be met by the exertions or the liberality of those who are near enough to have personal knowledge of the merits of each case.

There us a view to be taken of the relative amount of the charities enumerated, and the public objects promoted, in the preceding catalogue, to the property taxed in the city (generally supposed to be well below the amount actually possessed), which is well adapted to diminish any feeling of exultation or self-approbation into which we may be betrayed by the survey of the considerable aggregates we have enumerated. The valuation on which taxes were assessed in 1845 was \$135,948,700. In 1859 it was \$263,429,000. The mean would be about \$200,000,000, the lowest probable income of which is from ten to twelve millions annually. The sum of the amounts expended for the public objects enumerated above is about \$5,140,000; but calling it \$5,300,000, to make full allowance for anything omitted or unknown, the average is \$353,333 per annum, which would leave from \$9,646,000 to \$11,646,000 for expenditure and reinvestment. Whatever allowance may be made for error or miscalculation, in this estimate of the income, enough will remain to show that the donations in charity, or for great and permanent objects, are not of an amount that need cause any alarm for the permanent decrease of our resources from extravagance in this luxury; but that as long as the property of the city doubles in about fifteen years, it charities should also double, in order to maintain the ancient reputation. . . .

In our advance as a people in age, population, and resources, the physical wants and calamities of life are not likely to be neglected among us. They are obvious to the eye, and of a nature adapted to awaken, in every feeling heart, a strong and active sympathy. There is no reason to apprehend that they will ever be forgotten or neglected. We wish it were so with the interest of that vitally important concern of life, education. We have reached that condition of society, in which the value of elementary instruction is universally perceived and acknowledged; and we feel every day the immense advantage which the spread of knowledge so far in our community has given us, in the character, the ambition,

and the success of our population over those of any equal number without similar privileges. But we have not yet attained an adequate sense of the extent to which instruction is a benefit. We are too apt to think that the common school is all we want, --that it is glory enough for us, in the way of education, to have made its elements universal; and it is a matter of boasting that every person in New England can read. But of what use would be the power of reading, if no opportunity were furnished of usefully exercising the power, by the perusal of books containing the last and best results of study and research? We must have among us minds cultivated to the necessary point of furnishing the best books and materials for study, or we must be ingloriously dependent upon other nations for all progress, and even for preventing a retrograde movement. We must be advancing or retreating; and in this country, with such entire security from foreign interference, and such rapid accumulation of material wealth, there is nothing wanting for progress but the perception of what is necessary, and the willingness to devote the appropriate pecuniary resources to its attainment. Of the latter there is obviously an abundant supply. The great difficulty is to persuade them that any particular study of acquisition is necessary; and we do not wonder at the existence of the difficulty, so long as all that was thought important was the knowledge of the past, without much reference to the present and future. But the relative value of particular studies in much changed. The past history and languages of men and nations are not the only attainments which are now to be mastered by the scholar. The laws of minds and of matter which have not heretofore been reached, nor even sought. The planet upon which we live is full of subjects upon which men are profoundly ignorant, and the investigation of which will well employ, for ages to come, the limited number who are able, from their organization and circumstances, to pursue such studies. The young man must be carefully trained, as far as training can carry him, if he is to be expected to advance beyond his predecessors in the career of knowledge. Discoveries in the external world are not made by accident, so much as by the application of mind to the circumstances around us; and mind, in order to be productive, must be cultivated. Nor can its laws be investigated by those who are not versed in all that has yet been ascertained with regard to the intellectual and immortal part of human nature. If, then, either mind or matter is to be intelligently studied, we must have something more than the common school, which simply gives the first means of progress, and of appreciating, perhaps, the greater

advancement of the higher order of minds. The grammar school is indispensable, but so much more are the college, the university, the professional and scientific school. We rejoice to perceive, in the foregoing catalogue, some evidence that this truth is beginning to be acknowledged in our community; and that a larger proportion than heretofore of the wealth distributed both by the public and by private persons, has been devoted to our highest educational institution. The very considerable sums given by the Legislature and by individuals to Harvard College, the greater part of which are for well-considered and most important objects, are valuable evidence of the general progress of ideas upon the subject of education. But they must be still further extended, before the wants of the age, and of all ages, are seen and supplied; and when this is done, there must be one thing more accomplished, and that is a change in the comparative estimation by the public of scientific and political reputation. When it is seen, as one would think it must be seen, sooner or later, that political advancement in this country, does not imply, as it has done in other times and nations, great power over the relations of society, and much less over individual members of society, the exclusive ambition for political distinction, which is a sort of contagious mania among us, must subside; and other objects, such as science, theology, and law, must share, at least to a greater extent than heretofore, the devotion of aspiring minds. Power, we know, will always be the object of ambition; but, we trust, not necessarily nor exclusively political power. In this country, already, the possession of political power means a very different thing from what it means on the Continent of Europe, or even in England. The material rewards are much less dazzling, and much less really important; and it would be by no means surprising, if such a revolution of idea should take place, that men would consider political office an encumbrance and a burden, to be avoided by almost any sacrifice. . . .

But, without contemplating so remote and so vast a change of ideas and feelings, we can imagine the claims of knowledge to be more widely admitted than they are at present. This is nothing more nor less than believing in the progress of civilization; and that depends upon many other things besides political institutions. Nobody can be more free, or less happy, in social relations, than a North American Indian. In the absence of external control, which constitutes what is commonly understood by

freedom, self-control becomes more and more important; and self-control is one of the last and best results of the highest religious, moral, and intellectual cultivation. Upon the extension of personal self-control, as a principle to guide our public and private conduct, depends the success not only of individuals, but of nations, in the career of humanity; and whoever desires to see the institutions and the liberty of the country preserved must desire the progress of education in every department, until all the powers of the human mind shall be so appropriately and adequately cultivated, as to make them subservient to a virtuous will. It is to intellectual culture in all the departments of the mind, therefore, that we desire to call the attention of the philanthropic among us, most particularly in the present state of our institution and our charities. It would seem that all other departments to which liberality may be called to extend its benefactions are now more or less faithfully provided for. Elementary education, physical suffering, poverty, old age, and mental infirmity, are all furnished with the means of supply or relief. . . . [but] the proper and sufficient collegiate education of our own young men, for our own wants, is not adequately provided for. It is on all accounts desirable that our colleges should be better furnished with pecuniary resources in almost every department of learning. . . . It is at once gratifying and humbling to witness the eagerness with which young men crowd to institutions, which, however imperfect, are yet the best that can be found in the country; how fully appreciated and how eagerly used are the means of progress which are supplied; and ample guaranty is thus given that increased advantages would neither be neglected nor misused. We deem no labor lost which shall tend in any degree to arouse the community of our age and nations to a sense of the importance of affording to all who seek it the means of the most thorough and accurate instruction in every branch of human knowledge. By this process we shall not only raise the standard and increase the product of intellectual studies and pursuits, but we shall secure for all future time the great charities, and the religious and literary institutions, which are the protection, the ornament, and the glory of nations.

Eliot's analysis of Boston charity denotes some fundamental shifts both in the Boston elite's view of itself and in its understanding of philanthropy. Most importantly, he sees the elite and its philanthropic activity as having national implications, evoking Boston as an example for other cities and their elites to follow. Secondly, where in his earlier essay he had been unwilling to prioritize philanthropic objectives, suggesting instead a synergy between all benevolent activities, by 1860, Eliot was willing to assert that some institutions were more important -- and hence more worthy of support -- than others. The most important of these were institutions of higher education.

Eliot's arguments about the higher learning are based on his understanding of the relation between knowledge and national economic and political development. First of all, Eliot believed that industrial progress had altered the task of higher education, shifting it from understanding of the past to a focus on the present and future. To stand at the forefront of progress, required not only universal literacy, but "particular studies" in institutions which fostered "recondite pursuits of science, philosophy, religion, and law" and which cultivated "a higher order of minds" -- specialists -- who could apply their minds "to the circumstances around us." In effect, Eliot was urging that philanthropy, rather than pursuing its traditional goals of eliminating or reducing inequality of condition, should both acknowledge the differences in talent and ability and should create institutions which put these differences at the service of society as a whole.

Samuel Atkins Eliot's conception of a society led by a service-minded, educated elite was, in 1860, more a hope than a reality. As his contemporary, Doctor Oliver Wendell Holmes put it, "it is very curious to observe of how small account military folks are held among our Northern people. Our young men must gild their spurs, but they need not win them. The equal division of property keeps the younger sons above the necessity

of military service. Thus the army loses an element of refinement, and the moneyed upper class forgets what it is to count heroism among its virtues. Still I don't believe in any aristocracy without pluck as its backbone. Ours may show when the time comes, if ever it does come" (Holmes 1857, 245).

The came all too soon for the Brahmins to show their "pluck." In the Civil War, Harvard graduates not only served with conspicuous heroism, but in far greater proportion than either the general population or graduates of other colleges. The North's victory was celebrated by wealthy Bostonians as a vindication of their class. As Thomas Wentworth Higginson would write in his introduction to the Harvard Memorial Biographies (1866),

if there is any one inference to be fairly drawn from these memoirs, as a whole, it is this: that there is no class of men in this republic from whom the response of patriotism comes more promptly and surely than from its most highly educated class. . . . The lives here narrated undoubtedly represent on the whole those classes, favored in worldly fortune, which would elsewhere form an aristocracy - - with only an admixture, such as all aristocracies now show, of what are called self-made men. It is surprising to notice how large is the proportion of Puritan and Revolutionary descent. . . . (Higginson 1866, iv)

"And if there is another inference that may be justly deduced from these pages, it is this," Higginson continued,

that our system of collegiate education must be on the whole healthy and sound, when it sends forth a race of young men who are prepared, at the most sudden summons, to transfer their energies to a new and alien sphere, and to prove the worth of training in wholly unexpected applications. So readily have Harvard graduates done this, and with such noble and unquestioned success, that I do not

see how anyone can read these memoirs without being left in fresh confidence in our institutions, in the American people, and in human nature itself. . . . (v)

The extraordinary performance of the young Brahmins in wartime permitted Samuel Atkins Eliot's ideas about the value of elites and the philanthropic support of elite institutions to attain both clearer expression and institutional reality. In 1869, his son, Charles W. Eliot (18\_\_-1926) was elected president of Harvard. In his inaugural address, he set forth an explicit rationale which detailed the way in which philanthropy focused on elite institutions benefitted the rest of society. "As a people," Eliot declared,

we do not apply to mental activities the principle of division of labor; we have but a halting faith in special training for high professional employments. The vulgar conceit that Yankee can turn his hand to anything we insensibly carry into high places where it is preposterous and criminal. We are accustomed to seeing men leap from farm or shop to courtroom or pulpit, and we half believe that common men can safely use the seven-league boots of genius. What amount of knowledge and experience do we habitually demand of our lawgivers? What special training do we ordinarily think necessary for our diplomatists? --although in great emergencies the nation has known where to turn. Only after years of bitter experience did we come to believe the professional training of a soldier to be of value in war. This lack of faith in the prophecy of a natural bent, and in the value of a discipline concentrated upon a single subject amounts to a national danger.

The civilization of a people may be inferred from the variety of its tools. . . . As tools multiply, each is more ingeniously adapted to its own exclusive purpose. So with the men that make the State. For the individual, concentration, and the highest development of his own peculiar faculty, is the only prudence. But for

the State, it is variety, not uniformity, of the intellectual product which is needful (Eliot 1869, 608-9).

In arguing for the support of institutions whose primary purpose was the production of a professional elite, Eliot was by no means suggesting places like Harvard should only serve the rich. He saw learning and talent as a vitally important common meeting ground social classes:

The poorest and richest students are equally welcome here, provided that with their poverty they bring capacity, ambition, and purity. The poverty of scholars is of inestimable value in this money-getting nation. It maintains the true standards of virtue and honor. The poor grooms, not the bishops, saved the church. The poor scholars and preachers of duty defend the modern community against its own material prosperity. Luxury and learning are ill bedfellows. Nevertheless, the College owes much of its distinctive character to those who, bringing hither from refined homes good breeding, gentle tastes, and a manly delicacy, add to them openness and activity of mind, intellectual interests, and a sense of public duty. It is as high a privilege for a rich man's son as for a poor man's to resort to these academic halls, and so take his place among cultivated and intellectual men. To lose altogether the presence of those who early in life have enjoyed the domestic and social advantages of wealth would be as great a blow to the College as to lose the sons of the poor. The interests of the College and the country are identical in this regard. The country suffers when the rich are ignorant and unrefined. Inherited wealth is an unmitigated curse when divorced from culture (614).

And Eliot meant what he said. Within four years of his inauguration, he had begun administering Harvard entrance examinations in major cities throughout the country

(this was the beginning of standardized college entrance examinations) and Harvard scholarship funds grew spectacularly. By the end of the first decade of Eliot's presidency, there were 112 scholarships available, representing nearly 10% of Harvard's annual expenditures (Harris 1970, 85-105). If the Brahmin Harvard graduate of the 1850s looked forward to performing "an expiatory pilgrimage to State Street" to "ask for the fatted calf of his grandfather. . . and a clerkship in the Suffolk Bank (Adams 1918, 22)," the graduate of thirty years later, who was far less likely to be a Brahmin by birth, could frankly confess that his reason for going to college was that "the degree of Harvard College is worth money to me in Chicago" (305-6).

By the 1850s, Harvard already served the elite whose wealth had transformed the provincial public college into the nation's leading private university: it had become, as Henry Adams wrote, the Brahmins "ideal of social self-respect," creating "a type but not a will," an "autobiographical blank on which only a watermark had been stamped" (Adams 1918, 54-55). But it also served a broader public, helping Boston, as Oliver Wendell Holmes would write, to "drain a large watershed of intellect" and helping Boston to attract to it the "promising young author and rising lawyer and large capitalist" -- and "the prettiest girl" (Holmes 1858, 119-20). Eliot's reforms further extended Boston's "suction range," facilitating an expansion of cultural influence that both paralleled and to a significant extent undergirded the scale and scope of the city's economic interests, which would include the financing of major western railroads and such pioneer "high tech" firms as General Electric and the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

But in being transformed to institutions of national significance, Harvard and the constellation of cultural and scientific enterprises to which it was tied (the Athenaeum, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Museum of Natural History, the

Boston Symphony Orchestra, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the Lowell Institute, the Massachusetts General Hospital, the Perkins Institution for the Blind) ultimately transcended the city of their origins. Although Boston would ultimately be eclipsed by New York as the nation's financial center, the pattern it set for elite philanthropy would not only profoundly affect other metropolitan elites, but would lead to the creation of a new kind of elite -- based on educational and professional credentials. This "new middle class" of experts, serving in corporations, in government, and in institutions of culture, health care, and social welfare, would lead the nation into the twentieth century (Weibe 1967; Bledstein 1976).

## Sources:

James Jackson and John Collins Warren, "Circular Letter Addressed to Several of Our Wealthiest and Most Influential Citizens, for the Purpose of Awakening in Their Minds an Interest in the Subject of a Hospital (1810)" in N.I. Bowditch, History of the Massachusetts General Hospital (Boston: Printed by the Trustees from the Bowditch Fund, 1872), 3-9.

Harvard College and Massachusetts General Hospital *versus* Francis Amory. Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, Suffolk and Nantucket, March Term 1830, 26 Massachusetts Reports 446-465.

Unsigned. "Associations," Christian Examiner and General Review VII (New series, vo. II), 105-140.

Edward Everett, "A Memoir of Mr. John Lowell, Jun., Delivered at the Introduction to the Lectures on His Foundation in the Odeon, 31st December, 1839. . . ." (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1840).

George Bancroft, "Minority Report of the Overseers' Committee of Visitation" in Speech of Josiah Quincy, President of Harvard University, before the Board of Overseers of that Institution, February 25, 1845, on the Minority Report of the Committee of Visitation. Presented to that Board by George Bancroft, Esq., February 6, 1845 (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1845).

Josiah Quincy, "Speech," in Ibid.

"Quincy's History of Harvard University," North American Review 52 (1841), 338-384.

Samuel Atkins Eliot, "Public and Private Charities of Boston," North American Review 56 (July 1845), 135-159.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Charities of Boston," North American Review 71 (July 1860), 149-165.

Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Harvard Memorial Biographies (Cambridge: Printed for the University, 1866).

Charles William Eliot, "Inaugural Address as President of Harvard," in Eliot, Educational Reform: Essays and Addresses (New York, 1898), 1-38.

## Additional Readings:

Henry Adams, The Education of Henry Adams (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1918).

Carl Bode, The American Lyceum (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

Robert F. Dalzell, Enterprising Elite: The Boston Associates and the World They Made (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).

Ferris Greenslet, The Lowells and Their Seven Worlds (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946).

Seymour E. Harris, The Economics of Harvard (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).

Hugh Hawkins, Between Harvard and America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Autocrat of the Breakfast Table [1860] (New York: Sagamore Press, 1957).

\_\_\_\_\_, Elsie Venner: A Romance of Destiny [1857] (New York: Signet Books, 1957).

Daniel Walker Howe, The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

Nathan Irvin Huggins, Protestants Against Poverty: Boston's Charities, 1870-1900 (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1971).

Samuel Eliot Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936).

Harriette Knight Smith, The History of the Lowell Institute (Boston: Lamson, Wolfe and Company, 1898).

Ronald Story, The Forging of an Aristocracy: Harvard and Boston's Upper Class (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1980).

Edward Weeks, The Lowells and Their Institute (Boston: Little Brown & Company, 1966).

Gerald T. White, History of the Massachusetts Hospital Life Insurance Company (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955).

---

<sup>298</sup> John Amory Lowell, Esq.

<sup>299</sup> From the Methodist communion and the Catholics no returns have been obtained. Several literary and theological institutions in the West, besides those mentioned in the list, are believed to have received assistance from Boston; but the amount has not been ascertained.

<sup>300</sup> Estimate of receipts of German Aid Society, previous to 1845, \$4,000.

---

301 Twenty per cent may be added for clothing send in by dealers in suitable articles.

302 Previous to 1845, \$5,300.

303 There is a professorship on "the Application of the Sciences to the Useful Arts," . . . and one on "Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity," requiring a variety of knowledge, and a versatility of talent, of which few examples can be found in the history of the human race. While some subjects are thus singularly mixed in one professorship, there are other instances of two professors in one department. It requires all the ingenuity of the Faculty and the Corporation to arrange the duties of the professors without conflict or superfluity.