DARWINISM AT CHAUTAUQUA

JAMES H. McBATH

The platform at the Chautauqua Assembly in New York State provides a unique setting for examining the public encounter between Darwinism and religion in the late nineteenth century. The audiences were a cross section of Protestant, middle-class America, the speeches were reported in the national press, and the platform was open to the discussion of unsettling contemporary issues. No one questioned that "every great message to humanity with the stamp of genuineness upon it gets at some time or other a hearing from the big rostrum."¹ The Assembly leadership, as a matter of policy, sought "to invite to this place the leaders of all forward movements in order that the people may judge of their merits after the case has been presented."² Founded by Methodists in 1874 for the training of Sunday-School teachers, Chautauqua ultimately gained fame as an educational institution and a national forum.³ With the Assembly's antecedents and constituency, it is not surprising that the tensions between evolutionary science and religion found frequent expression on its platform.

The publication of Origin of the Species by Charles Darwin in 1859 initiated a controversy that was to rage for decades in the fields of science, philosophy, and religion. Suggesting that all life developed from pre-existing life, Darwin concluded that animals and plants were gradually evolved in the course of untold centuries. Darwin's readers were quick to grasp the implications of biological evolution for man himself, whose uniqueness was universally interpreted as ontological separateness from the rest of creation.

With the appearance of an American edition of Darwin's book in January, 1860, "an irrepressible conflict of ideas on science and religion began to parallel the struggle over slavery and secession."⁴ Within a matter of months,

²George E. Vincent, Chautauqua Assembly Herald, 14 July 1900, p. 1. Vincent was the son of Chautauqua's co-founder, John Heyl Vincent.
³An account of Chautauqua's early decades can be found in James H. McBath, "The Emergence of Chautauqua as a Religious and Educational Institution, 1874-1900," Methodist History, 20 (October 1981), 3-12.
... heated debates took place at the Boston Society of Natural History and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In the spring and fall of 1860, magazines like the American Journal of Science, the North American Review, the Christian Examiner, the Atlantic Monthly, the Methodist Quarterly Review, and the American Theological Review carried long and lively articles attacking or defending this latest of heresies.\(^5\)

The reception of American scientists to Darwinian ideas was not universally favorable. Zoologist Louis Agassiz, the country's best-known scientist, maintained a resolute opposition to Darwinism throughout his life. But the gathering strength of the evolutionists was not to be denied. Their ranks now included James McCosh, Edward L. Youmans, William B. Rogers, Asa Gray, Charles W. Eliot, James Freeman Clarke—educators, scientists, editors, and ministers. Harvard philosopher Chauncey Wright provided a clear index of their thinking when, in 1865, he declared:

> Progress in science is really a progress in religious truth, not because any new reasons are discovered for the doctrines of religion, but because advancement in knowledge frees us from the errors both of ignorance and of superstition, exposing the mistakes of a false religious philosophy, as well as those of a false science. If the teachings of natural theology are liable to be refuted or corrected by progress in knowledge, it is legitimate to suppose, not that science is irreligious, but that these teachings are superstitious; and whatever evils result from the discoveries of science are attributable to the rashness of the theologian, and not to the supposed irreligious tendencies of science.\(^6\)

The controversy reached its crescendo when, in 1871, Darwin published his Descent of Man. Now, the human species was expressly included in the evolutionary chain. Man, simply the most complex of the primates, was the climax of the evolutionary process. He had been developing from lower forms ever since the beginning of life. Such an hypothesis profoundly shocked religious orthodoxy; few defenders of the faith could remain neutral on the question of evolution.

The growing influence of evolutionary thought was both confirmed and enhanced by speaking tours in the United States of some of Britain's most eminent evolutionists. Thomas Huxley, Alfred Russell Wallace, Richard Anthony Proctor, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, and Henry Drummond were British speakers who lectured to American audiences on the evolutionary hypothesis during the period.

It was into this agitated intellectual environment that speakers at Chautauqua stepped when they rose to address Assembly audiences on the evolutionary question. More than a dozen lecturers discussed the subject at Chautauqua before 1900. The majority of them were ministers; several were college professors or teachers on Chautauqua's summer facul-

---
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6\(^{"Natural Theology as a Positive Science," North American Review, 100, (January 1865), 184.}\)
ty. Although most of the speakers, even in the early years, attempted to reconcile Darwinian doctrines with the Bible, there was a vigorous counteroffensive against science and the evolutionary hypothesis during the first half of the 1880s. After T. DeWitt Talmage's broadside in 1886, Chautauqua audiences heard no formal discussions of the subject for several years. Then, from Henry Drummond's lectures in 1893 until the end of the century, a number of distinguished speakers sought to harmonize evolution and religion, science and theology.

The arguments advanced tended to be straightforward and uncomplicated, as might be expected for messages adapted to a popular audience. Two themes prevailed. One was designed to discredit the evolutionary theory by criticizing aspects of it or by exposing the frailties of science. The other theme sought to demonstrate the compatibility of science and religion. That both themes were advanced, though with varying intensity, throughout the period is understandable. The progress of the evolutionary idea in the whole of America confirms that its acceptance was gradual but that "for most Christians in America, the reconciliation of Darwinism and religion left the old beliefs in all essentials intact."7

Although most of the public lectures at the first National Sunday School Teacher's Assembly in 1874 were devoted to principles and practices of Sunday school work, one lecturer did deal briefly with evolution. In a lecture entitled "The Growth of Moral or Religious Ideas as Traced in the Scriptures," the Reverend Charles H. Fowler, President of Northwestern University, took issue with one aspect of Charles Darwin's theory. Darwin, explained Fowler, has shown that man's brain, in its embryonic development, takes every shape from that of fish to that of man. Superficially, this might seem to favor the Darwinian hypothesis. But, he continued, Louis Agassiz has presented telling refutation to this conclusion: "Agassiz notes that, while we cannot distinguish in its various states of development the brain of the fish from that of the animal, which it resembles, the brain of the fish always remains that of a fish."8

Therefore, concluded Fowler, "we do not change the genealogy to read 'which was the son of the polywog, which was the son of protoplasm, which was the son of nothing,' but we still have 'which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.'" Fowler's argument was much like that of Henry Adams when, after working with Sir Charles Lyell in England, he was forced to admit his skepticism about Darwin's theory. Adams found "he could detect no more evolution in life since the Pteraspis than he could detect it in architecture since the Abbey. All he could prove was change."9

---

During the season of 1875 and 1876 two lecturers advanced the thesis that science simply describes the accomplishments of the Creator. The Reverend Enoch F. Burr, a Congregational minister from Lyme, Connecticut, discussed the "Celestial Magnitudes," concluding that the discoveries in astronomy furnish additional proof of the wonders of God. Defining science as systematized knowledge, theology is the pivotal science for it explains the first causes of the material things that science seeks to describe.10 The Reverend Erastus O. Haven, Chancellor of Syracuse University, also urged that science reveals the genius of the Lord: "God has built the universe . . . God is a spirit, and this material universe is but the clothing, but the instruments, but the machinery of his spirit, and we are but re-thinking the thoughts of God when we study science."11

The Reverend Charles Force Deems, pastor of the interdenominational Church of the Strangers in New York, made the first of several appearances at Chautauqua in 1877. Speaking on "The Bible and Modern Science," he maintained that modern science disproves neither the Bible nor religion.12 Every scientific hypothesis, including evolution, said Deems, assumes there was a beginning. "The very word evolution assumes a primordial creation." Since creation presupposes a Creator, science thus proves the existence of God.

To demonstrate the fundamental harmony between science and religion, Deems pursued a line of argument that Chautauqua audiences were to hear often. Since one Creator authored the Bible, nature, and science, and since He was all-powerful, He must have created these things in harmony and in fundamental agreement. There can be, therefore, no basic conflict between the three. But, continued Deems, when differences do appear between science and the Bible, defenders of the Bible need not attempt to reconcile them. While science is ever-changing, and therefore prone to mistakes, the Bible is a constant and unchanging record of life no matter what the status of current scientific theories. It was Deems's conclusion that "the Bible . . . is probably the greatest example of 'survival of the fittest.'"

The Reverend Charles H. Fowler, who had been somewhat skeptical of Darwin's hypothesis in his first appearance at Chautauqua, spoke at the Assembly again in 1878. Discussing "Science in the Bible," Fowler held that the Bible anticipates science, is the prophet of science, and so, in due

11Ibid., 27 July 1876, p. 2. Delivered in Pavilion, 26 July 1876. Haven at this time also was corresponding secretary of the newly organized Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was elected bishop in 1880.
time, is verified by science. To support this thesis, Fowler marshalled impressive evidence. He sought to demonstrate that many of the conclusions of the physical and natural sciences were discussed in the Bible: races and languages of man, the chemistry of the air, the revolution of the earth, the “order of creation,” botanical classifications, geology, mineralogy and mining, astronomy, etc. This fact, he continued, is not surprising for both Nature and the Bible were authored by God. Any conflict between science and religion, therefore, must be in interpretation rather than in principles. Man should recognize the fundamental harmony between science and religion, and should study both carefully. Why? Because religion taken alone engenders fanaticism, while science taken alone engenders skepticism. “Man needs both science and religion for complete wisdom.”

Less than two weeks after Fowler’s statement, Professor William North Rice of Wesleyan University took issue with a detailed comparison between the finding of science and the disclosures of the Bible such as Fowler had undertaken. “A true reconciliation of science and religion,” pointed out Rice in his lecture on “The Conflict of Science and Religion,” “must not be in letter and in detail, but in spirit and in general.” Past attempts to reconcile science and religion have been unsuccessful because of the method of reconciliation employed. This method has been one of makeshift, provisional adjustment.

Where a discrepancy has been observed between some scientific theory and some particular Scripture text or texts, after the scientific theory has become so well established in general belief that it is vain to deny it, recourse has been had to some device of exegesis, a new interpretation has been put upon the text in question, and by this new interpretation the particular discrepancy has been removed.

But that true reconciliation in principle could be effected, Rice did not doubt. Since science deals with the laws of nature in terms of their order and succession, and since religion deals with the origins and causes of the laws, there is no reason why basic harmony cannot and should not exist. To those in his audience disturbed by the thought of simian ancestry, a picture that evolution conjured in the minds of many, Rice offered a palatable alternative:

Take this terrible bugbear of evolution, this doctrine that one specific form of life is evolved by natural processes out of some other form; and what is that after all but a recognition of the fact that the reign of law is more comprehensive than we had first perceived? It dethrones not God. It does not show us that the universe goes on without a Divine plan. It only shows us that God’s plan is vaster and more comprehensive than our poor thoughts had before been able to recognize.

13 *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, 10 August 1878, p. 2. Delivered in Auditorium, 8 August 1878.
It was not reported whether the Reverend Charles Force Deems heard the Professor’s address. If he did, it would appear that Rice’s remarks had little effect upon him. The next day Deems exposed the “Superstitions of Science.” Science, he asserted, is based upon and perpetuates more superstitions than religion ever has. Most scientific hypotheses are in fact, based upon nothing more substantial than guesswork and speculation. Consider, for instance, the atomic theory. “An atom is not only an unknowable, but an unthinkable thing.” The so-called science of chemistry is based upon atoms which are unknowable and which have no weight, yet when combined are supposed to have weight. Or, continued the lecturer, witness the insubstantial basis for the theories of heat waves or “aether” (through which light allegedly travels).

That there was design in Deems’s debunking of certain hypotheses of science, the audience was soon to learn. One suspects it was more than charity that prompted Deems to grant that, despite their reliance upon superstition, the sciences should not be abandoned just because they are not verifiable. He then presented the heart of his elaborate analogy.

Simply because whether we can prove them or not, we cannot do without them. Without the reception of the unverifiable in logic we cannot reason. Without the reception of the unverifiable in the material world, we can have no physical science. . . . Without the reception of the belief in the unverifiable of the future we could have no practical life in the present. Reject all those superstitions, if you insist on calling them so, and you lie down to die, as starved in intellect as starved in the body. The things verifiable are the useful; the things unverifiable are the indispensable.

And, of course, concluded Deems, this same chain of reasoning applies to religion. The Bible and religion, by the same token, need not be rejected simply because many of their basic concepts are unverifiable. They, too, contribute to the progress and happiness of man.

In 1881, Professor Nathan Sheppard lectured on “Darwin; or Are We Descended from the Monkey.” Pointing to the physiological dissimilarities between man and ape, he concluded that there is much to disprove Darwin’s hypothesis. After this sketchy analysis, Professor Sheppard suggested that the speculation on evolution need not interfere with any man’s faith for several reasons: (1) the concept of evolution is based upon insubstantial evidence; (2) Darwin, himself, presents his conclusion only as an hypothesis; and, (3) Darwin has acknowledged that he believes in God and in the immortality of the soul. These themes subsequently served as the basic organization for Darwinism Stated by Darwin Himself, a book of selections from Darwin’s writings that Sheppard published in 1884.

15 Ibid., October 1878, p. 2. Delivered in Auditorium, 21 August 1878.
16 Ibid., p. 3.
17 Ibid., 4 August 1881, p. 4. Delivered in Hall of Philosophy, 27 July 1881.
Spokesmen for the religious orthodoxy took their final stand at Chautauqua during the next few years. With increasing numbers of the public, as well as the majority of scientists, accepting the doctrine of derivation, anti-evolutionists launched a vigorous counteroffensive. This was, remarked Arthur Schlesinger, "the most critical stage" in the "religious controversy over biological evolution." 18

Four speakers made the rebuttal against evolution and science at Chautauqua. Opening for the negative was Professor James T. Edwards, director of the department of physics and chemistry in Chautauqua's summer educational program. Discussing "The Relation Between Science and Religion," Edwards stated that science inadequately explains phenomena of the universe. 19 But of more serious consequence, he continued, it actually had hindered progress. If diehards in the audience had stirred expectantly at this bold pronouncement, they were to be disappointed with Edwards's proof. Science often hinders progress, he elaborated, by concealing the truth. And science conceals the truth with its almost incomprehensible nomenclature, by "substituting for reality certain expressions like gravity, cohesion, force, energy." The language of science limits our very conception of the cosmos.

Later in the same season, the Reverend Willard F. Mallalieu, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Massachusetts, in an address entitled "Unity of the Human Race," urged that ministers and teachers "openly and manfully adopt the aggressive method of defense." 20 For too long, declared Mallalieu, have we apologized for Christianity and the Bible. We have accepted the "guesses and hypotheses of the so-called scientific men as though they were unquestioned," and then have attempted to "reconcile the teachings of the Word of God with these guesses." But there is no reason for this uncritical respect for science, insisted Bishop Mallalieu. Science often has erred, he said, offering a case in point:

The science, or department of science, known as geology, which is most depended upon by the enemies of the Bible to furnish weapons for their attacks upon the precious Old Book, is, and has been, one of the most uncertain and blundering of all professed sciences, and . . . its record for the last eighty or ninety years ought to make its professors the humblest and meekest of men, instead of being what most of them are, and have been, the proudest and most arrogant and most dogmatic.

If Mallalieu chose to discuss geology because he considered it more vulnerable than the biological sciences one only can surmise. The Reverend Charles Force Deems, however, returning in 1885, did not ignore the evolutionary hypothesis. In a lecture entitled "A Scotch Verdict," Deems claimed

---

19 *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, 10 August 1883, p. 4. Delivered in the Amphitheater, 15 July 1883.
that the supporters of evolution have not proved their case.\textsuperscript{21} Although they can point to similarities between species, they have been unable to demonstrate an evolutionary relationship between them. Why, then, should religion attempt to accommodate the Darwinian doctrine when “its advocates have not, up to this date, established its truth?”

The last of the irreconcilables at Chautauqua was the Reverend T. DeWitt Talmage, the noted Presbyterian minister, who lectured on “The Absurdities of Evolution,” in 1886.\textsuperscript{22} Talmage was a famous preacher and lecturer of the day. Major Pond, who booked his lecture tours, called him “the greatest one-man attraction in America.”\textsuperscript{23} His weekly sermons at the Brooklyn Tabernacle were said to have been carried in as many as 3500 newspapers.

Talmage began by acknowledging that there is no conflict between religion and true science. Most of the great inventors and scientists, he pointed out, have been Christians. Moreover, the best scientific equipment is found at Christian colleges and universities. There is, however, a deep irresoluble conflict between religion and evolution. In fact, cried Talmage, “all the leading scientists who believe in evolution, without exception the world over, are infidel.” Strong words these, but such was the tenor of Talmage’s uncompromising attack upon Darwinism. The evolutionists are infidel, he explained, because they disagree with the biblical account of Creation, and they degrade man by claiming he descended from beasts.

Talmage next launched a rhetorical broadside against the doctrine of natural selection or survival of the fittest.

But do the fittest survive? Garfield dead in September, Guiteau survives until the following June. Survival of the fittest? Ah, no! The Martyrs dying for their principles, their bloody persecutors living to old age. Survival of the fittest? It is the most monstrous doctrine of the centuries. Five hundred thousand brave Northern men march out to meet five hundred thousand brave Southern men, and die on the battlefield for a principle. A hundred thousand of them went down in the trenches. We stayed at home in comfortable quarters. Did they die because they were not as fit to live as we who survived. Ah, no! Not the survival of the fittest. Johnson and Stonewall Jackson on the Southern side, and all the brave generals on the Northern side, did they fall because they were not worthy to live? No, stiffened with frosts of the second death be the tongue that dares to utter it. (Prolonged applause.) It is not survival of the fittest.

Making no effort to accommodate the evolutionary hypothesis with religion, the redoubtable Talmage alternately scoffed and ridiculed this “stenchful and abominable doctrine.” It was the last time that the doctrine of evolution was to be attacked from a Chautauqua platform.

For the next several years, although public interest in Darwinism had not languished, Chautauqua speakers were silent on the subject. Professor

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 20 August 1885, p. 3. Delivered in Amphitheater, 17 August 1885.
\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 3 August 1886, p. 4. Delivered in Amphitheater, 29 July 1886.
Henry Drummond broke the silence dramatically with his lectures on "The Ascent of Man" in July of 1893. The *Nation* regarded these lectures at Chautauqua as "the clearest index yet seen of the silent but sweeping change wrought in the religious world by the teaching of science in regard to the origin of man." This is true because "those who flock to lectures there... are typical representatives of the church people to whom, a generation or less ago, evolution was synonymous with atheism." When, therefore, concluded the *Nation*, "Chautauqua managers provided lectures in defense of evolution, and Chautauqua audiences gather to hear them with such pious edification and strengthening in their faith, it is a sign of the times which no observer can neglect."\(^{24}\)

Another significant sign of the times was the great interest shown in Professor Drummond's lectures by the audiences at Chautauqua, an interest apparently not foreseen by the Chautauqua management.\(^{25}\) Originally scheduled for the Hall of Philosophy, it was necessary to move the lectures to the larger Ampitheater after Drummond's second appearance. Remarked a leading newspaper of the day: "The growing interest in Professor Henry Drummond's lectures on evolution was shown yesterday in the adjournment of an overflowing audience in the Hall of Philosophy to the Ampitheater, and today the body of the Ampitheater was closely filled long before the hour announced for the address."\(^{26}\)

In his lectures Drummond assayed the task of carrying moral and spiritual values into the region of physical processes, and "succeeded in showing the ethical at work in regions of life generally supposed to be given over to purely physical laws."\(^{27}\) Drummond considered this idea as "the missing factor in current theories." There was not only an individual struggle for life, said Drummond, but also a struggle for the life of others. There was a general law of altruism in nature. Such a concept was in marked contrast to the notion that life is but a "survival of the fittest, and that man is governed by inexorable, amoral natural laws which are just and good because they are natural.

The main theme of the *Ascent of Man* is a protest against the interpretation of organic nature which is presented to us by the Darwinian conception of the struggle for life. Against this essentially Hedonistic view the author sets the facts which tend to show that along with the contest for individual success there goes as constant and an even stronger endeavor to help the life of others.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{24}\)"The Week," *Nation*, 57 (13 July 1893), 21.

\(^{25}\)Drummond's evolutionary lectures also had excited great interest at Boston's Lowell Institute in April of 1893. See Howard A. Bridgman, "Henry Drummond," *New England Magazine*, 8 (August 1893), 725f.


\(^{27}\)George Adam Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond* (New York: Doubleday & McClure Company, 1898), p. 462. Drummond wrote his parents: "I do not think I have ever had such meetings in my life as I have had here. Marvellous opportunities have been open on every side, and I never felt so charged with a message." Letter dated 3 August 1893. Quoted in Smith, p. 374.
That there is a basic God-given morality in life, a dominant altruism in man, was Drummond’s central thesis on successive days as he described the “Evolution of the Animal Body of Man,” the “Evolution of the Mind,” the “Evolution of Speech,” the “Evolution of a Mother,” and the “Evolution of a Father.” In all of the lectures the tall, spare Drummond proclaimed that evolution is a demonstrable scientific fact, and that the struggle for life has been accompanied by an equally strong struggle for the lives of others.29

The concluding step in his discussion of human development was determination of the “Relation between Christianity and Evolution.” The question here, said Drummond, is simple to answer: “Evolution is useless without Christianity. Organic nature can carry animals up to man, but no further. There Christianity takes up the work and carries man up to the Divine. . . . Christianity put the finishing touches to the ascent of man.”30

There were a few at Chautauqua who resisted Drummond’s views on evolution. But the Nation thought that “the very protest against the management and the innovative lecturer, drawn up by a handful of those who have not lost their old dread of godless science, only emphasizes the profound nature of the change that has taken place.”31 Jesse L. Hurlbut, who heard the lectures, remarked that Drummond’s ideas were warmly received:

There was still some old-fashioned “kiver to kiver” believers in the verbal inspiration of the Bible who were alarmed to find an eminent Christian leader accept so fully the conclusions of science; but the overwhelming sentiment of Chautauqua was of rejoicing at this harmonizing the most evangelical religion with the most advanced scholarship.32

When John Fiske, philosopher, historian, and popularizer extraordinary, came to address Chautauquans one evening in August, 1895, they were to hear a man who had “made it his business to reconcile not only religion but the whole of philosophy with evolution,” and with spectacular success.33 Fiske did not feel compelled to present any defense of evolutionism—“God’s way of doing things.”34 Rather he described the adjustment and reconciliation that was to take place between science and theology. “The so-called period of antagonism between religion and science is drawing to a close.”35 To Fiske, such a reconciliation was the essence of progress, and was inevitable. “Progress,” he said, “means cessation of antagonism between the theologians and scientists, religion and evolu-

28“Man and Men in Nature,” Atlantic Monthly, 74 (October 1894), 543.
29“Prof. Drummond at Chautauqua,” Critic, 23 (15 July 1893), 41.
tionary science. I believe that the coming century will see the two forces working in harmony.”

The final addresses of the period dealing with the unity of science and religion were presented by educators, William H. P. Faunce, just named President of Brown University, and President G. Stanley Hall, a distinguished psychologist, of Clark University. Faunce, in his lecture on “Contributions of Science to the Christian Faith,” acknowledged that “science is now clearly intimating a spiritual basis of the universe.” A theologian, he hailed the advance of physical science as “the crowning glory of our time.” Hall’s address, “The New Relation Between Science and Religion,” proposed that the probationary period for Darwinism was ending. Applauding the search for understanding between science and religion, he said, “We feel that one of the most hopeful signs of the present day is that this long separation between the heart and the head, between religion and science, which has been so bad for both . . . is beginning to close.”

In his concluding remarks, President Hall prophesied,

Before the first decade of this new century shall have finished, before our eyes are turned to behold it, we may not see the sun shining upon a culture decadent, disabled, belligerent, but rather we may see the standards of the true church of religion, full height, advancing, bearing for their motto no such miserable interrogatory as, “What is science worth?” or those other words of delusion and folly, “Religion first and science afterward”; but rather everywhere, as the ample folds of the Church float over every sea and land on the very wind under the heavens, those other words dear to every soul that is at once devout and intelligent, this motto, “Religion and science, now and forever, one and inseparable.”

If Hall’s prophesy of the oneness of religion and science was but an exultant preoration, he did, nevertheless, suggest the direction of contemporary thought. Discussion at Chautauqua of the relations of science and theology by no means ended with Hall’s pronouncement. But, in the view of Walter Marshall Horton, “the prolonged seismic disturbance in the field of Christian theology caused by the rise of Darwinism” was subsiding. Subsequent rhetoric declared the independence and supremacy of the religious interest while retaining a respect for scientific truth in its own sphere.

---

35Chautauqua Assembly Herald, 10 August 1895, p. 5. Delivered in Hall of Philosophy, 9 August 1895.
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37Ibid., 7 August 1900, p. 3. Delivered in Amphitheater, 3 August 1900.