

Now this is not to say that ~~the~~ pragmatist (and this is what Holmes and even Melville, along with William James, were) may not have a patriot's devotion. It is, however, to say that such devotion to a mere arrangement, a gamble, an experiment, is likely to be caviar to the general. It is not what you tell the sixth-grade civics class or the electorate.

2  
No, I have stated the matter badly. For all the differences between the philosophers and "the general," they sprang from the same seed-bed. Some of the same elements in the American experience that had led ~~to the new philosophy~~ to the new philosophy of speculative men like Adams, Holmes, and William James, had led, even, to the new kind of behavior in men of action. When, after the war, Charles Francis ~~Adams~~ Adams, the father of Henry, got back to America, he remarked <sup>to</sup> the new breed:

X  
"The great operations of war, the handling of large masses of men, the influence of discipline, the lavish expenditures of unprecedented sums of money, the immense financial operations, the possibilities of effective cooperation were lessons not likely to be lost on men quick to receive and to apply new ideas."

The lessons were not lost, and by 1879, William H. Vanderbilt (the son of the old Commodore), testifying before a Congressional Committee, described his contemporaries:

X  
"You can't keep such men down... I don't believe that by any legislative enactment or anything else, through any of the States or all of the States, you can keep such men down. You can't do it."

So here we have the young Henry Adams' theory that "the laws that govern animated beings" are the same--and equally as amoral--as "those which rule inanimate matter." And have, too, an example of Melville's notion that history may spin against the way it drives--may, that is, in the "spin" give

CLOCK TIME

1. Forever 0'clock

A clock is getting ready to strike forever 0'clock