UC History Digital Archive
University Archives, The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

Addresses delivered at the Memorial Service for Bernard Moses

April thirteenth
Nineteen hundred and thirty

University of California
Berkeley, California
Printed under the direction of the University of California Printer
1931

— 1 —

Opening Remarks

William Wallace Campbell

We are assembled with purpose to honor the memory of Bernard Moses, who was a resident of this community and officially connected with the University of California during fifty-four of the sixty-two years of the University's life. This is a remarkable record. He was appointed Professor of History and Political Science in the year 1876. He served actively in this position until 1911, and as Professor Emeritus from 1911 until the time of his death a few weeks ago.

Professor Moses has ever been regarded as one of the University's great men. He was worthy of his colleagueship with Joseph LeConte, E. W. Hilgard, George H. Howison, and others of the University's memorable pioneers. With them he took a leading part in setting our standards and establishing our ideals. He was one of those wise men who contributed both to the foundation and to the superstructure of the University.

— 2 —

Toward all men Professor Moses was gentle and unassuming, yet through his modesty there shone always a kind of majesty, and there was always the evidence of power in reserve.

Professor Moses was not a narrow specialist. He was a man of broad interests, of genuine scholarship in many fields, an extremely successful teacher, and a distinguished public servant.

In the early years of his professorship he was the responsible head of a University department which has been succeeded by four of our largest departments: History, Economics, Political Science, and Jurisprudence.

The three speakers of today have been selected from that small group now with us who were closely associated with Professor Moses.

The Man, Scholar, and Author

Carl C. Plehn

President Campbell

Professor Carl C. Plehn, who joined Professor Moses' department in 1893, and who was associated with him for a time in the Philippines, will tell us something of the man, of the scholar, of the teacher, and of his views on education and politics. Professor Plehn:

Professor Plehn:

WHEN called upon to speak to the memory of a close friend, one's mind goes back, naturally, to the first meeting. In retrospect, the simple, perhaps homely, incidents of that meeting take on a peculiar interest. It was in June, thirty-seven years ago, that a tall, heavily built man inquired for me at my old home in Rhode Island. By chance I met him at the gate. Leaning over the fence he announced, with a quizzical smile, that his name was Bernard Moses and that he had traveled three thousand miles to see a man who did not want to go to California, such a creature being, in his experience, sufficiently rare to justify the trip. The reference was to a call to enter the faculty of the University of California sent to me some months previously by President Martin Kellogg. I had declined that call, partly through ignorance, and partly because I was so comfortably settled in the congenial surroundings of a small New England college. Those who knew Professor Moses will easily understand how readily a young man could be persuaded to enroll under such an inspiring chief. August, 1893, found us together on the train for Berkeley.

On arrival I found myself the one apprentice in the then Department of History and Political Science, of which the staff was Moses, Jones, and

Bacon. It was a glorious apprenticeship. With Moses, quietly guiding, we four taught all that the University then offered of History, Political Science, International Law, and some of the fundamentals of Jurisprudence, together with Economics. Specialization was unknown and to some extent frowned upon. In fact, it was borne in upon me not only by my chief, but in a measure by the whole faculty, that to be an economist **solely** was not sufficient. A professor should endeavor to be a scholar, open-minded to the best thought in every field, and rather widely versed in all subjects related to his teaching. The faculty decided, after due, and sometimes warm, discussion, what was best for the students to study, what courses were needed. Then we went to work and prepared ourselves to teach those courses, dividing the fields among us with great impartiality. Moses had taught, or was still teaching, in all the fields of History, Government, Law, and Economics, and so were the others. Necessarily, under the limitations of time and men, these courses were broad and general. But I am not at all sure that the student did not often get more "education" from them than one of today may get from the extended instruction in all the numerous specialized courses into which the fields covered by the general courses have since been divided. This certainly was true of those taught by Moses.

Let me now speak, as memory prompts, of a few of the outstanding qualities of our friend. What manner of man was this my chief?

Memory pictures him first and foremost as a true gentleman and a staunch friend, kind, helpful and genial in all his associations, a gracious host at his own board, a charming guest on other occasions. His geniality of manner and of speech is well known even to those who met him only in these latter years at the Faculty Club or in his home in the country. Slow to press into a conversation or a faculty debate, he was nevertheless sure to come in at the proper moment with contributions, illustrations, or arguments apt and convincing. Always a wise counsellor, he was particularly good in personal matters. He had also a keen sense of humor. One instance must suffice to illustrate both traits. Before I attended my first faculty meeting, which I confess I was looking forward to as an opportunity to shine and to make an impression, he quietly suggested that perhaps it would be well to wait a couple of years before I rose to speak in faculty meeting. "By that time," he said, "you may possibly, on account of your reticence, have achieved a reputation for great wisdom." To a callow youth who

without the luck of David might easily have come to grief if pitted against such Goliaths in debate as Howison, or Kellogg, or Hilgard, or the fiery

— 6 —

Christy, or the logical Slate, the advice was sound. It took time to learn the fundamentals of the University's policies, as to preparatory schools, admission requirements, curricula, and public duty, which had been fully worked out, but with whose application to the then rapidly changing conditions, resultant from the sudden growth in the student body, the faculty was still busy. Those were days of real faculty discussions, and one needed a background.

Next, Bernard Moses was a scholar, deeply versed in the best literature of the ages, a productive scholar, delving into the records of the past and observing the events of the present, always in search for the truth in the form of principles which might serve as guidance for the political, economic, and social development of the race. The scope of his reading, and the accuracy of his knowledge were at once the admiration and the despair of a neophyte. Of the method of his reading and his careful attention to an author's meaning, I have evidence in a copy of Hobbes' *Leviathan* which he had used and passed on to me when I chanced to take over a class in which that book was used. Its pages are enriched with annotations carefully written in the margins **in ink**, and the more salient passages neatly underlined. His annotations throw a brilliant spotlight on the text, now adding to the thought, now raising

— 7 —

a doubt. The best points to be found are indicated clearly by his notes.

His own writings are marked by a clear grasp of, and profound emphasis on, the broader principles. Illustrative of that characteristic, I have selected a few striking passages, to which I invite your attention. As I read them you will find in them an interest due to their substance as well as to their form. They are almost random selections on the general basis of democracy, but all of them show a rare lucidity in grasping and presenting essentials. They are taken chiefly from his *Democracy and Social Control in America (1898)*.

> The occupation of the American continent by Europeans has part of its significance in the fact that it provided conditions for an unprecedented extension of democracy. In the presence of the wilderness and uncultivated tribes, the conventionalities of an old and complex society were wanting, and a new social growth began, with few of the hampering influences of artificial restrictions and distinctions. Never before, within historic times, had there been offered to man such an ample field of escape from the conventional forms of established society, by which individuals are kept bound in their places of inferiority and superiority. In the unsettled regions of America there was the widest freedom from
>
> — 8 —
>
> the restraints of civilization. There was ample room for millions to take essentially similar places. Under these circumstances, men necessarily and inevitably drifted towards the enjoyment of common rights and privileges, and the law in the course of time recognized and confirmed the fact.
>
> Seeing the state grow up, little by little, as one institution after another was organized to perform some part of the increasing social work, there has been derived the well-founded conclusion that the origin of the state and the source of political authority are not to be looked for in the inscrutable mind of Providence, but in the instincts and intelligence of the nation itself.
>
> In proceeding to take account of the prospects of democracy, we find a reasonable starting-point in the acceptance of the propositions already considered: (1) that a given form of society tends to secure for itself a certain proper form of government; (2) that the circumstances which produce an essential equality of material conditions tend also to produce, among the inhabitants, equality of political rights and power, and thus a democratic form of government. From this point of view light is thrown
>
> — 9 —
>
> on the problem in hand by the facts of normal social growth. If we find in a certain early stage of civilization

> an essential equality of material conditions, we do **not** find either similarity of tastes or equality of mental endowments; and because of the inequality of intellectual power, the diversity of aims, and the desire of the majority of men to improve their circumstances, society, under favorable opportunities, moves away from its condition of democratic equality. With no restrictions placed on the movements of the individual members of such a society, the fittest in the several lines of activity acquire positions of advantage, and the less fit fall behind or are crowded to the wall. Thus every step forward from the simplicity and equality of the early agricultural stage towards the complexity of highly developed society is marked by an increasing inequality of material conditions.....In a word, the natural growth of society under the forces resident in the unlike powers of the individual members is towards various kinds of inequality, and especially towards inequality of material possessions.

Although in a progressive society inequalities in material well-being may arise, "the spirit of our society has not demanded that

— 10 —

the successful shall be overthrown; rather that the accumulated wealth and the accumulated wisdom of the nation shall be so used as to provide opportunities for the advancement of the worthy of whatever origin." The leveling forces, he held, act "not by pulling down, but by lifting up."

Here is a citation from his last book, *Spain Overseas*, published only last year (1929).

> The free states of Spanish America met peculiar difficulties in attempting to establish democratic governments. The idea and recognition of equality were foreign to Spanish colonial society. The New Englanders moved upon the wilderness, and the Indians disappeared before them. The society there established had no place for the Indians, and as the old-world distinctions among the immigrants faded away, the new communities, composed of members of a single race, revealed a large measure of democratic equality. The Spanish colonies presented a very different aspect. They were composed of Spaniards, creoles, mestizos, and Indians, for here the Indians found a place in the new society, although an inferior place. The presence of these distinct classes and members of two different races made democratic equality quite impossible, at least in the beginning. This heritage of the
>
> — 11 —
>
> new estates from their colonial ancestors offers an adequate reason for whatever failure attended the early efforts to establish democratic governments in Spanish America.
>
> When a nation has lived through all republican forms from aristocracy to complete manhood and womanhood suffrage, submitting complicated laws and difficult administrative problems to popular vote, it is not probable that this situation will satisfy the nation permanently, whence long life for a republic hangs on its delay in approaching this democratic finale.
>
> The Spanish American republics have been slow in acquiring stability, and their reluctance to assume the more extreme phases of radical democracy, if continued, will help to insure the continuance of republican institutions in their several territories.

Professor Moses was, moreover, a splendid teacher, for an essential part of his scholarship, as I have illustrated, lay in the lucidity with which he grasped and imparted the essentials. His students never found that they could not see the forest because so many trees stood in the line of vision. No doubt the exceptional clearness of his presentation of truth concealed from some of his hearers the labor and difficulty of the preparation for his lectures. When we watch a

— 12 —

great virtuoso, with grace and apparent ease, bring music from a violin, we may think it easy to do. When Professor Moses, with slow and careful enunciation, pronounced the words of a class lecture to whose latest revision he had given, only the day before, hours in preparation and back of which lay years of study and

meditation, the work behind it was entirely concealed, while the truths stood out like chiseled marble. Never dry, always calm, his lectures may be said to "light the lecture room, but never heat it."

We remember Moses, too, as profoundly wise in matters relating to education, and especially with reference to its connection with, contribution to, and dependence on, politics or government. Again I cite his own words and again choose but a few lines from many.

> To every lover of the liberty of his country,....it is of the first importance that all the forces which tend to enlighten and clarify the mind should be upheld and magnified.
>
> It is particularly important....that under democracy all instruction, the highest as well as the lowest, should be free..... A free University is the best expression of the democratic spirit in an enlightened society.

> In obedience to the demands of true democracy, the highest instruction must not only be free, but must also be equal to the best..... Thus the great and free University stands as the most efficient contribution to equality on the higher planes of existence.

To the ideals of this free university, endeavoring to be "equal to the best" and to let the light shine, Moses contributed much.

And now I come to his later years, after his retirement from active teaching. These years were busy and productive years. The reward they brought to himself was the continuance, to the very last, of a wonderful mental vigor. He was prevented by partial blindness from reading his beloved books, which like Prospero he had prized "above his dukedom." But he could still find on the shelves the volume he wanted and open to the approximate page he desired read to him. His mind was so stored with the knowledge acquired in the past that he had always the where-withal to think and write. With pen and typewriter he recorded words he could not see but others could read. With the skilled and patient help of his wife his last work, *Spain Overseas*, was published in 1929, fifty-five years after his first one, on the *Swedish Invasion of Germany*. It is worthy of mention that when his work on

The Intellectual Background of the Revolution in South America, 1810-1824, came out in 1926, The Hispanic Society of America, which published it, announced, very rashly, that this would be the last contribution from Professor Moses' pen. A little hurt, but more amused, Moses proceeded to show them to be false prophets.

My last recollection of him is as seated in an easy chair at the Faculty Club, ready to engage in conversation with any of the busy passers-by, whom he could not see to recognize, who might have a half-hour of leisure. Yet, withal, quite happy even if none stopped, because he had, within that well stored mind, a wealth of things to think about. And happy he who lingered to sit by his side, because his conversation had all its old-time interest, charm, and humor, and his wisdom threw light on the current events men talk about. He seemed never to feel his affliction, and there came into his nature in greater measure even than his old-time circle of friends had known before, a beautiful mellowness. Finally he passed away happy, we may not doubt, in the deep affection of his many friends.

Teacher and Public Servant

David P. Barrows

President Campbell:

The next speaker, Professor David P. Barrows, as a graduate student in the University of California profited from the guidance and wisdom of Professor Moses. He too was associated with Professor Moses in the Philippines, and in the year 1911 he succeeded Professor Moses as Chairman of the Department of Political Science. He will speak of the powers of Professor Moses as a teacher and of the high merit of his public service. Professor Barrows:

Professor David P. Barrows:

MAY I say something, first, of my gratitude to Professor Moses as a teacher. I first saw him and sat in his classes in 1894. He was then at the climax of his manhood. I thought him then, as I have continued to view him to the end of his life, one of the most nobly endowed men in face and figure, in body and stature, that I have ever seen. His bearing had no trace of pomposity or arrogance. His mind was equally free of pedantry or pretense. But he was essentially commanding in presence, majestic in easy, unaffected dignity, and in the unhurried eloquence of his language.

His classes were large. They were composed almost wholly of men of the Senior classes, who completed the truly liberal college course of that

day with his two courses in Political Theory and Economic Theory. His method was to require **much** reading in the classical literature of both fields—an amount of reading hardly thought practicable today. These works were then discussed in class, the students being called upon to analyze chapter after chapter. His own clarifying remarks accompanied or followed these student recitations and unvaryingly took the form of illuminating estimates and comparisons. In his Political Theory of that fall semester, we read the whole of the following: *The Discourses* of Machiavelli, *The Leviathan* of Thomas Hobbes, *The Patriarcha* of Filmer, the *Two Essays on Government* of Locke, the *Social Contract* of Rousseau, Bentham's *Fragment on Government*, Caird's *Social Philosophy of August Comte*, Austin's *Province of Jurisprudence*, Mill's *Essay on Liberty* and the *Essay on Representative Government*, Bagehot's *Physics and Politics*.

The class bought all these books, possessed and preserved them, that being in the day when Reserve Book Rooms were unknown—and when funds for essential books were an important part of the student's budget.

Other authors covered by his lectures in that term, rather than by the student's own preparation, were Bodin, Montesquieu, and Spinoza.

His fondness was for the writers of powerful mind and broad comprehension. I remember especially

his putting me hard at work on such great books as Hegel's *Philosophy of History*, Bentham's *Principle of Morals and Legislation*, and von Humboldt's *Political Essay on New Spain*. These, with August Comte, were favorites of his among the great philosophical writers, and their influence appeared constantly in his lectures and conversations.

His was a type of teaching which threatens to disappear before the modern tendency for specialization—the practice of confining students too soon to limited domains of investigation. He did not believe in this. He distrusted the technique of modern historical writing, as prone to deal too early with minor phases and episodes, and as trusting too implicitly to documents of a single kind. He realized how faultily an official

minute or even a statute reveals the actual development of an institution.

He believed in **wide reading** and its vital importance to the student, and in the necessity of blocking out the intended portraiture on a large canvas—with true perspective—before taking up the details. I remember his saying once that if he had fifty lectures to give on any course of study, he would in the first lecture cover the entire field, then in the next five cover the field again. The relative place and importance of the remaining forty-four lectures would then be perceived.

— 18 —

His distrust for overspecialization showed itself again in opposition to the tendency to subdivide the fields of History, Politics, Economics, and Jurisprudence. He thought that these divisions of the social sciences exhausted the field of scientific classification; and he disliked further dismemberment. Particularly did he deprecate the rising profession of "sociologists," who, at that time, formed a group of diverse training and interests and who possessed no agreement as to the field or technique of Sociology. He would not admit the validity of this science; I think he perceived in it the dangers of sentimentalism and class prejudice.

In the spring semester of 1895, I attended his "Seminar"—one of the first in the history of this University. There were four of us—Mr. Boke, afterwards a professor of Law in our School of Jurisprudence, whose attendance was interrupted, another gentleman who was to become a well-known legal practitioner, Miss Jessica Peixotto, now Professor of Social Economics, and myself. Our general subject was the political and economic philosophy of the Eighteenth Century in France. We began our study with the reading of Professor Richie's *Natural Rights*. This subject was, of course, a very wide field for students to explore, especially the connection between English revolutionary doctrine and the French *philosophies*.

— 19 —

Moses taught us that the origin of revolutionary ideas was English—a development of the radical theses of Locke, of Hooker, and of other English religious Non-conformists; and that, in the English colonists in America, these ideas passed from the field of speculation to the field of action. The Revolutionary movement, in which we still lived, began in North America, crossed back to Europe, and in France was given the expression which communicated itself to the Continent. This he held one of the services of French thought and language—to take ideas of different origin, left obscure and unpersuasively expressed, and, by means of French aptitude for orderly arrangement and artistic presentation, give them a form which moves the world. He further pointed out that the Revolution, having shaken Europe, came back across the Atlantic to the Caribbean and South America, and produced the downfall of the Spanish American Empire.

He, himself, was, in the best sense, a man of the world. An intensely patriotic American—an American "Imperialist" if you like—he knew and appreciated Europe from years of study and travel there, and by a most unusual knowledge of European literatures, including Scandinavian. His advice to us was to complete our academic training in Europe and preferably in Paris. Miss Peixotto did this, preparing and publishing as her doctoral

— 20 —

thesis a notable study of social doctrines of the eighteenth century, which at once established her position as a scholar. His advice to me was to go to the *École Libre des Sciences Politiques*, and he pointed out the advantages of a faculty formed not only of scholars but of statesmen, eminent in public life. I was not able to do this, but the standards of training which he held up to me, did compel me to the necessary sacrifices to continue my studies under that notable group of American scholars then in the School of Political Science of Columbia University.

I have said this much of Moses, the teacher, because I hope it somewhat indicates how splendid he was in this profession; how he relished it and dignified it. His example was sufficient to form a definite ideal of the Teacher in the minds of his students—which, speaking for one of them, has remained permanent and has

influenced me over thirty years of effort to reproduce something like it again. I hope, also, to have indicated that, despite the enormous expansion of the University of California and its gain in facilities for scholarship, its present **teaching** dose not overshadow that of a generation ago.

The years 1895 to 1898 saw the setting of the stage for the final episode in the great drama of the Modern Age—the Rise and Fall of Spanish Colonial Empire. The ancient antipathy between

Spaniard and Englishman, which began in the time of Philip II and Queen Elizabeth, and the long warfare and contest between them, were to be closed by the final defeat of Spain and the disappearance of the last of her overseas possessions.

Academic opinion in this country was generally not prepared for this swiftly moving catastrophe. It knew little or nothing of the factors at work. It was very ignorant and, with a sort of innocence, surrendered itself to the vigorous anti-imperialist denunciations of Mr. E. L. Godkin, as expressed through the *New York Post* and the *Nation*.

Professor Moses was in a different position. He was prepared by historical and political study to appreciate the conflict. Sometime before, and as a result of his studies in Spain, he had commenced the interpretation of the spirit and achievement of that great historic nation. In this, he was genuinely a pioneer. In an earlier period of our national life, American Scholars had yielded to the irresistible fascination of the Spanish mind and performance. Washington Irving, Prescott, George Ticknor, and Motley are evidence of this inspiration. But later American historical scholarship had turned to other fields. Moses revived the tradition of American interest in Spain.

In 1895, he gave, perhaps, for the first time, his lectures on “The Establishment of Spanish Rule in America,”

almost immediately published as the first of his notable works in this field.

He was thus prepared to judge the Spanish-American War of 1898 both as a historian and a political scientist. As a historian, he saw it as a long-delayed but inevitable culmination. As a political scientist, he saw the inadequacy of Spanish policies; the futility of their efforts to meet conditions which had wholly outstripped them; the necessity of America's ultimatum. He welcomed the achievements of American statesmanship and arms. He favored the paramount position of the United States in the western world and the assumption of its obligations.

In the last months of 1898, as the war ended, the questions of the future became the subject of intense national interest and discussion. Professor Moses prepared an address—and ultimately a series of several addresses—interpretive of the historic and political factors of the situation. These were given before several audiences in the State. I recall nothing of the kind productive of equal interest and appreciation. On one occasion, the audience would not depart nor let him go. They kept him, plying him with questions, until the hour had lengthened into three hours and a half of discussion.

With the opening of this new era of national affairs, Professor Moses' career as a teacher here,

in a sense, terminated. He returned once and again to lecture and instruct, but he had become a public man. The nation claimed his talents and found use for them.

In the spring of 1900, he was appointed by President McKinley to be a member of the Philippine Commission, presided over by Justice William Howard Taft. The other members of this unusual body were Luke E. Wright, former Attorney-General of Tennessee, Henry Clay Ide, of Vermont, American Judge at Samoa under the Tripartite Convention, and Professor Dean C. Worcester, of the University of Michigan. They sailed to the

Philippines in June, 1900.

The authority entrusted by the President to this body was really plenary. It embraced the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. It was their task to create a government for a great archipelago, with over nine million inhabitants, in which the Spanish administration had been destroyed, and to accomplish this task in the midst of civil insurrection. For a year and a half, guerilla warfare was incessant, even in the environs of Manila. Over seventy thousand American troops were constantly in the field, and for eighteen months engagements averaged two every day.

May I cite the fact that, immediately on arrival in Manila, this Commission called to their

assistance Professor Plehn—their first appointment, I think, of an expert Aid—and that he devoted many months of service to an examination of the official statistical data left by the Spanish Government, and to studies for a revised system of taxation for the islands.

On the first of September, 1900, this Commission took over the legislative branch of the Military Government. It divided itself into committees for the study and preparation of legislation. To Mr. Moses fell the duty of presenting and expounding the organic act establishing the Bureau of Education, thus inaugurating a branch of administration judged by the Commission, as well as by their Army associates, to be the most important service that could be rendered to that country.

On July 4, 1901, the Commission relieved the Military Governor, General Arthur McArthur, of the executive responsibility. Mr. Taft became Civil Governor, and Mr. Moses, Secretary of Public Instruction.

The situation had been an extraordinary one. The success of the Commission was most unusual. Such a complicated but momentous effort of the same nature can hardly occur again in the world. The daily life and unintermitting activities of the Commission are revealed in the letters of Mrs. Moses, published in this country under the title

of *Unofficial Letters of an Official's Wife*, and also in the narrative by the private secretary of Mr. Moses, Judge Daniel Williams, entitled *The Odyssey of the Philippine Commission*.

On his return to this country, Professor Moses was further called into the public service, this time in diplomatic missions incident to Pan American Conferences at Buenos Aires and at Santiago de Chile. His visits to those countries are still remembered there, and particularly the delight of those distinguished audiences to find themselves addressed by an American in cultivated and eloquent phrases of their own sonorous and beautiful language. On these visits to South America Professor Moses took occasion to add greatly to his own acquisitions of historical and political collections on South America—materials employed by him, after his retirement as Professor of Political Science in 1911, to enrich our understanding of the intellectual and political history of that continent.

I close by recalling my last visit to Professor Moses. On February sixth, last, in response to their invitation and in the company of two of my students, we spent the afternoon with Mr. and Mrs. Moses at their beautiful country home at Walnut Creek. These last memories of him are very beautiful. He seemed well, vital. There was no evidence in his appearance of the approaching

end. He was serene, happy, humorous in speech and mood, full of recollections of the unusual persons who had formed his acquaintanceships and of the experiences that had made his life so remarkable.

We spoke of his former colleagues of the Philippine Commission. They were gone, except for himself and Mr. Chief Justice Taft, then known to be close to the portals of death. In speaking of the matter, he said, “It

seems that I am to be the last leaf upon the tree.” Alas! that his own end was to come so unexpectedly soon. It preceded that of Mr. Taft by only five days.

A Student's Tribute

Nathan Moran

President Campbell:

Professor Moses won great distinction as a public servant and as a writer of papers and books on the subjects which especially interested him, but I am assured that in reviewing his activities he regarded with special satisfaction his work as a teacher. His acknowledged gift of remembering his relations with individual students is evidence of his deep interest in them. The concluding speaker, Mr. Nathan Moran, a distinguished graduate of the University with the Class of 1901, will speak of Professor Moses from the undergraduate students' point of view. Mr. Moran:

— 27 —

Mr. Nathan Moran:

As to the scholarly attainments and the statesmanly achievements of Bernard Moses I have been a better listener than I could have been a speaker. These aspects of his career have been more fittingly appraised by his distinguished fellows who have just spoken.

It is my province, and my privilege, to recall to you as best I may Professor Moses as the undergraduate student of my day saw him, knew him and regarded him. Our immature vision of course gave us but the haziest idea of the high place he had won among the learned men of the world for his researches in the fields of economics and political science, and we lacked capacity to weigh to high esteem in which he was held by the statesmen of our own and of foreign nations. The span of nearly thirty years that have passed since I received my bachelor's degree would not be overlong to acquire some proper perspective on the place in the world which Professor Moses filled. But to expand upon that, let me say again, is not my place nor my intent. I mention those monumental qualities of the man, not to enlarge upon them, but only that they may serve as a foil to the more intimate and personal relationship which obtained between this teacher of great stature and his adolescent students.

— 28 —

The period to which my personal reminiscences go, might be characterized as the climax of Professor Moses' teaching career. That is to say, these were the years just preceding his departure as a member of the first Philippine Commission—a notable event on the campus when I was an upper classman. This call to sit in council on what was the foremost American and international problem of its day, had its reflexes, first in depriving many of us then undergraduates of the final courses we had hoped to take under Professor Moses, and second, of making him so marked a man in our insular affairs and our Latin-American relations that, unfortunately for later generations of students, he was never again permitted so undividedly to devote his energies to the teaching of youth at California.

Student affairs and relationships, since the times of which I speak, have in so many ways bettered themselves, that I may have to remind you of what unruly young barbarians we were in the nineties at California. In the light of observation and reflection, I think the fact is that we were suffering from an inferiority complex—a term which we did not even know, much less understand. To make ourselves important and to blazon a claim to an independence of which we did not know the meaning, we thought it

necessary to assume an attitude of resistance to restraint and of defiance to discipline, and class rushes were all too important in our eyes as compared with classical learning. However, we were not invulnerable and it was personalities rather than principles which began the process of our rationalization. It was to the eye of the newly arrived freshman that Professor Moses made his first appeal—a man of commanding stature and proportioned to have been an athlete if he would, yet the impression he gave was first and foremost that of the scholar. The seal of learning was on his brow. In the level look of his eyes was written contemplation and sureness of insight. The natural power of his physique became, rather, in the eye of the beholder, an impression of force of intellect.

By intuition, then, we granted Professor Moses a tribute of respect, however we may have been inclined to hide a sentiment so creditable. Nor did the impression stop here. There arose from it the desire better to know what manner of man this was and an ambition in upper class years to attend at least some of his classes, and so, among the elective courses, his lectures were among the most largely attended of that day.

Let me not give the impression that we as students found Professor Moses' aspect forbidding. It was only that his nature was one of innate

reserve and this we found on nearer acquaintance was no barrier. To approach him on a question of the class-room or on a dilemma as to a course of study, or, after greater intimacy, on a personal problem, was to meet with the most gracious of receptions, the kindliest of attitudes, and to receive wise and sympathetic counsel.

As illustrating the general attitude of good feeling without levity or undue familiarity, I recall a small incident. Probably at about the time he had the Philippine mission under consideration, and more weighty concerns on hand than afternoon lectures, there were several occasions not far apart when, on going to the class-room in old North Hall, we would find a notice on the door reading: “Professor Moses will not meet his class today.” One afternoon we assembled and found neither Professor Moses nor a card. After waiting for no unnecessary time past the hour, we tacked up and left for him a small placard reading: “The class will not meet Professor Moses today.” Had there been any lack of respect or understanding, we would probably have dispersed riotously, leaving no card behind. As it was, the next lecture merely opened with an understanding smile. No offense was intended and none taken.

To the student, the best of the retrospect toward a preceptor like Professor Moses is that the vision grows as the years pass. Impressions

gained from a teacher who more and more inspires trust, deepen later on into attitudes of thought and of endeavor. The example of tireless research, of careful analysis and of intensive reconstruction into new patterns of thought, become, in some small and individual way at least, a fixed mental habit. It is my hope that the man who devotes his life to teaching, and whose rewards seem all-too-remote and intangible, may count among these the assurance that the personality which he puts into his work oftentimes counts for as much as, or perhaps more than, the finished product of his learning alone. Most especially do I trust that Professor Moses in his later and less strenuous years may have realized and have found some recompense in the rising tide of appreciation that was his. Of this I can speak with some assurance, for it is no great while ago that he was given at the Faculty Club a dinner by some of his academic associates and former students. That the company on that occasion was a mature one, in years at least, was evidenced by the fact that I was one of the youngest present. To the expressions of long-cherished esteem for him which were spoken, Professor Moses arose and blessed us with a response which showed how much his heart was with the boys, now grown up, whom he had taught.

It is probable that Bernard Moses would not have been so great a teacher had he not also had

the capacity to be a figure in the world affairs of his day and generation, but in the eyes of his students I think that what are generally proclaimed as his greater achievements will remain the lesser. No better service can be rendered to the world and its future than by those teachers of the greater sort who dispense their lives that coming generations may inquire deeply, may think soundly and may live richly in the mind rather than in the flesh.

However inadequate my words, I welcome the privilege of proclaiming before this assemblage of his devoted friends, on behalf of generations of California students, and as a spokesman for the classes of many decades, the love and veneration, the admiration and gratitude that live in our memories of Bernard Moses.

President Campbell:

I think we may say that the civilization we enjoy is the integrated result of contributions to the welfare of mankind made by individual men and women through all the years that have preceded us. The late Bernard Moses exerted a splendid influence upon the students, professors, and others with whom he had relationships, and his contributions to knowledge will continue to be influential upon all persons engaged in the development of the field in which he exerted his best endeavors. In these facts we should find cause for congratulation and satisfaction.