



Project
MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

Women and Forgotten Movements in American Philosophy: The Work of Ella Lyman Cabot and Mary Parker Follett

JOHN KAAG¹



Abstract

This paper recovers and investigates the work of two forgotten figures in the history of American philosophy: Ella Lyman Cabot and Mary Parker Follett. It focuses on Cabot's work, developed between 1889 and 1906. During this period, Cabot took several classes given by Josiah Royce at Radcliffe College. Cabot's work creatively extends Royce's early thinking on the issues of growth, unity, and loyalty. This paper claims that Cabot's writing serves as a valuable type of Roycean interpretation—an interpretation that sheds light on Royce's philosophy while redeploying his thinking in ways that explore its ethical and social implications. Cabot is an important figure in the community of classical American thinkers, a figure who deserves greater attention. This analysis concludes with a brief discussion of Cabot's legacy as it is carried on by Mary Parker Follett's progressive and feminist writings published in the early decades of the 1900s. Follett's contribution to the field of organizational management reveals her affinity with Cabot and variety of other American thinkers.

Keywords: Feminism, Pragmatism, Ella Lyman Cabot, Josiah Royce, Mary Parker Follett, Growth, Unity, Loyalty, Progressive Reform.

I. Introduction

We need the past, every bit of it, for the sake of all our future. We cannot afford to forget although there must be many things that we store away till we are capable of assimilating them. We need all we can digest. For some experiences we must wait till our digestion grows stronger.

Ella Lyman Cabot, 1899 Notebook²

In 1952, Joseph Blau writes *Men and Movements in American Philosophy*. As the title indicates, Blau suggests that the work of men—from Ralph Waldo Emerson, to William James, to Josiah Royce, to John Dewey—provided the motivating force in the development of classical American thought. The author claims that his intent is to present “the more formal side of our formal philosophical history, to provide an introduction for the general reader and the beginning student which will enable them to read further in and about American philosophy.”³ Throughout his account, Blau seems occasionally to forget the many movements that women philosophers made in this development of our philosophical history. Since the writing of *Men and Movements*, however, various attempts have been made to counteract the marginalization of women in American philosophy; Charlene Haddock Seigfried’s work in the 1990s set the stage for a counter-movement by scholars who have recently tried to expose the buried roots of the American tradition.⁴ This paper stands as a small contribution in this larger project of recovery by addressing the writings of two women who work amidst Blau’s philosophical “movers and shakers.” The work of Ella Lyman Cabot and Mary Parker Follett invites us to reinterpret the direction and content of American pragmatism as it emerged in the academic circles of New England at the turn of the 20th century. Not only did their thinking influence the philosophical musings of their male counterparts—a fact that is consistently ignored—but it stands in its own right as a unique turn in American thought. Both of these women turn toward philosophical issues of creativity, invention and social unity in ways that remained unexplored by the mainstream.

First, I will discuss the Cabot papers, housed at the Schlesinger Library at Radcliffe College, concentrating on the material written between 1887 and 1902. Cabot writes extensively on the concepts of growth and wholeness. Much of her early work responds to the lectures that Josiah Royce gave in the 1890s. She continually asserts that creativity and spontaneity must be the defining characteristics of the natural and social spheres, and appears to have served as a helpful interlocutor for Royce as his thinking matured during this decade.⁵ This fact is born out by a comparison of Royce’s *The World and the Individual* (1899–1901) and Cabot’s contemporaneous writings and is presented in Royce’s own notebooks that he kept while Cabot was his student.⁶ In the earliest years of the 20th century, Cabot wrote “Wholeness in Relation to Growth.” In this unpublished work and in a variety of earlier notebooks, she extends and complements Royce’s thinking on unity and growth. These early works give us valuable insight into her teacher’s intellectual development, but also provide the necessary context in order to understand *Everyday Ethics*, published by Cabot in 1906 as a manual on pedagogical methods and the ethical upbringing of children. This work reflects Cabot’s willingness to translate metaphysical and theoretical

issues into the language of the “everyday.” In effect, she is willing to make philosophy of pragmatism truly practical.

In 1924, Mary Parker Follett publishes *Creative Experience* and dedicates it to her friend and mentor: Ella Lyman Cabot. In the opening pages, she thanks Cabot for her “faith in the crescent power of the human spirit” that she attempts to give expression in *Creative Experience*. I will address the lineage between Cabot and Follett. Follett inherits her mentor’s abiding interest in the relation between spontaneity, growth and purpose, but more significantly, understands that this interest is vitally important to the revision and flourishing of the social sphere. Writing in the aftermath of World War I, Follett is one of the first pragmatists to suggest that conceptions of social progress and growth must be rethought if we are to avoid international conflict and to encourage the flourishing of viable communities. This suggestion is the product of genuinely feminist thinking; Follett’s treatment of creativity repeatedly points to the political and phenomenological experience of women in the attempt to explain the way in which creative progress—often construed as the project of solitary individuals—might be reframed as the project coordinating communities. I will concentrate on her 1919 “Community as Process” and two sections of *Creative Experience* entitled, “Experience as Creating,” and “Experience in Light of Recent Psychology: The Gestalt Concept, Integrative Behavior, and Circular Response.” Here, Follett reveals herself as an important figure in the formation of first and second wave feminism and in the history of American thought, demonstrating a broad understanding of the work of Royce and James, but more importantly, a willingness to employ pragmatic sensibilities in novel ways in addressing feminist and social-political concerns.

***II. Roycean Interpretations—The Early Notebooks of Ella Lyman Cabot*⁷**

Between the years of 1887 and 1891, Ella Lyman attended Radcliffe College as a special student. Her undergraduate notebooks from this period reflect a vibrant intellectual dialogue with Richard Cabot, a Harvard professor of sociology and medicine, whom Lyman would later marry in 1894, but also a sustained engagement with the principle figures in the American philosophical tradition, most notably Josiah Royce. She attended Royce’s seminar on metaphysics in 1888 and a variety of other courses over the next twelve years. Both of the Cabots participated in the “Philosophical Conference” of 1903 and 1904, which Royce organized at his Irving Street home. Ella Lyman Cabot’s correspondence with Royce would last nearly four decades and Royce repeatedly sought the Cabots’ advice over this extended period.⁸

In the later stages of her career, Cabot published several works on the education of children that continually reversed standard pedagogi-

cal assumptions: instead of discussing how teachers ought to instruct their students, she explores what *educators* might learn from their *students*. In the spirit of this work, I hope to explore the lessons that Cabot's notebooks, written as a student, teach us about the development of American philosophy but also the way in which her notebooks make an original contribution to the canon. This investigation is not to expose the way in which philosophy devours its young, nor the way that the young minds of Cambridge sought to overthrow their teachers. Indeed, what is perhaps most apparent in Cabot's work is a sustained affection for learning, and by extension, for her teachers and their thoughts. Cabot's criticism is always tempered by a remarkable intellectual charity. This charity survives even when she struggles with her professors and, in fact, her struggles often turn on the issue of charity. In 1892, she writes that,

Dewey perhaps understates what Royce dwells on too much—the storm-stress aspects of life. Dewey's attitude is tremendously healthy . . . and he is not without feeling and appreciation as the half-unintentional touches in his books show. But could he possibly have such a wide sympathy as Royce with mystics and romanticists? Could he be as fair to them as Royce is? And if not is his position the best one! A healthy scorn for all things abstract and spiritual is a bracing tonic, but passion and pathos and the tragedy and mystery of life are real and sometimes so life-giving as to be the only world we can see and they must be met with understanding criticism not mere condemnation.⁹

In this passage, we come to understand Cabot's generous approach to her teachers' positions, but also her insistence that philosophy must be charitable to the experiences that seem so real and "life-giving" in our world. These are experiences of "passion, pathos, and tragedy" that the "mystic and romanticist" typify, but more importantly, that many people meaningfully embody in their daily pursuits. This passage gives us an idea of Cabot's philosophical temperament, but also her abiding concerns, namely, her interest in giving philosophic form to pathos and tragedy. In Royce, Cabot finds a teacher who speaks directly to this interest.¹⁰ She writes in 1892, that

We owe Royce a very deep debt of gratitude for the courage and simplicity with which he has told of his own spiritual experiences. It is doubly convincing and inspiring because it is far more real when a man tells you in what a close way his philosophy coincides with his life. It helps me when I feel the faith, confidence and courage that his thought of the Absolute self gives to me. It moves me with grateful trust when he says: "I have often found it deeply comforting in the most bitter moments."¹¹

Cabot, however, is never fawning in her gratitude.¹² While the thought of a unifying Absolute occasionally gave her confidence and courage, she seems to hold reservations in regard to a particular strain of monism that considered the Absolute as an all-encompassing entity or consciousness. Instead, she will be more open to Royce's later suggestion that the Absolute ought to be understood as a well-ordered system or community of interpretation. This being said, Cabot remains somewhat reticent to embrace an ideal of an ordered community on the grounds that order, at least at first glance, seems to impede personal invention and the growth of particular individuals. This reticence seems to stem more from her immediate experience as a woman in the social sphere of 19th century New England than from any esoteric commitment. Struggling with the cohesion and expectations of her own community, Cabot writes in April 1892 that, "The danger in living in a family and state surrounded by customs that seem *unalterable and part of nature* is that that very influence which is such an essential factor in one's development retards our swift advance."¹³

Throughout her life's work, Cabot continues to express concerns about the tension between ordered unity, the belief which allows Royce to weather the tragic storms of his life, and the idea of personal growth and development. As Frank Oppenheim notes, this is a tension that resides at the heart of Royce's thought through the late 1880s and early 1890s. His experience as an outsider—*inside* Harvard—resonates closely with Cabot's own experience as a talented woman in an unwelcoming intellectual sphere. John McDermott has repeatedly underlined this aspect of Royce's writings.¹⁴ In reflections that respond to their existential and political situations, Cabot and Royce, in varying degrees, realize that a philosophy of community can not be a philosophy that stifles newness, possibility, and creativity. In an early notebook entitled "Growth" (1892), Cabot suggests that personal growth and the growth of community are compatible ideals, stating:

*The art of living is becoming other people. We are unfit to deal with the tragic vital world until we can see through others' lives that we may anticipate, grapple, and respond to their need—living lives with absolute understanding so that we can see all their point of view and beyond to what they really stand for. Oh God! Ever this lesson sink in deep!*¹⁵

It seems that the opening line of this passage can cut in two directions. First, the art of living is becoming other people in the sense that each of us discover ourselves in the midst of a process of creation and self-transcendence. I grow. I mature. I become another person. Second, the art of living is becoming other people in the sense that our growth and maturation is always contingent on our ability to find ourselves in

a wider community of interpretation. In effect, the art of living is always a collective and interactive affair that seeks to sympathetically integrate—not arrogantly assimilate—the purposes of others. The “other people” that we become in our creative enterprises seems intentionally ambiguous. It is true that I become other than I am at present, but that I do so only by way of my involvement and empathetic actions with others. It is worth noting that this passage is written in the early 1890s, well before Royce had fully developed his thinking on loyalty and communities of interpretation. It stands to reason that Cabot’s thinking on these issues may have contributed to this development. This point will be developed in the coming sections.

In reading the early Cabot notebooks, it is often difficult to determine the source of the philosophic voice—whether this is the voice of the student, Cabot, or the teacher, Royce. In either case, it is possible to glean particular insights from these papers. On the one hand, we may be reading a genuine contribution to the canon that was appropriated and forgotten. On the other hand, we may be getting a chance to see the message that Royce was expressing in his lectures, if not in his published works, in the early 1890s. At one important point, the latter case seems to obtain. Cabot describes Royce’s lectures on ethics in detail, stating that,

Insight and order Royce said are the elements essential to morality. Moral conduct involves 1) the power of appreciation of interests outside of your own, the recognition of the interests of others as real and 2) the ordering of our world out of chaos into self-possession. These are the two factors that cause all problems and all advance. We grow by newly acquired insight into moral truth by so enlarging our private self through love such that it becomes more and more a social self, bound up with the life of others—and by ordering our insight so that it becomes our permanent possession . . . *Royce’s ethical motto: “Act so as to make more ties and stronger ones . . . that is be LOYAL and loyalty includes sympathy and order.”*¹⁶

This reflection was written in 1892, more than fifteen years before Royce’s writing of the *Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908). Here, thanks to Cabot, we get a snapshot of Royce’s early thinking on the issues of loyalty and the ideal of the community; this is a snapshot that provides additional evidence for the position, expressed by Oppenheim and Anderson, that the Royce’s metaphysics grows increasingly personal, centering on the relations between finite individuals and a personal God. Additionally, her reflections allow us to dispel any lingering suspicions that Royce was an esoteric, “head-in-the clouds” metaphysician. Royce appears to be constantly testing his ideas in the classroom, always interested in the traction that philosophy might have in the ethical affairs of daily life. It is also worth noting that the vignette of Royce that

Cabot renders is itself a type of Roycean interpretation. In her engagement with Royce's work, we get a real sense of Cabot's willingness to engage in the interpersonal relations of a Roycean community.¹⁷ In this case, we hear a genuine *interpretation* of Royce, provided by a devoted student who integrates Royce's interest in the relation between the concept of unity, what Cabot later calls "wholeness," and the concept of creative growth in her own projects and pursuits. Indeed, questions of creativity and integrity, seem to define not only her academic writings, but her most personal thoughts and actions.

III. Cabot's Voice—An Original Composition

Cabot's papers may at points provide us a type of Roycean interpretation, but, like any true interpretation, they do not speak in the voice of repetition but in that of careful originality. Ella Lyman Cabot was what I might call an interpretative thinker, one that reforms, rethinks, and returns the insights of the past in genuinely novel ways. This is also to say that she was a genius of a certain Kantian strain. Creative activity for Cabot was never an isolated affair, but always situated as a moment of inheritance and extension. Her writings have Roycean undertones, but also reflect the poetic qualities of Thoreau and, at moments, the signs of urgent zest that define Peirce's work in the 1890s. Listening to Cabot's voice, therefore, reveals an original contribution to, and an original composition of, American philosophy.

For Cabot, it is clear that the "art of living," like the pursuit of any art, carries with it a type of urgent interest and acute sincerity. In 1893, she writes "Moral sleeplessness may, I think, be a danger for me. To be awake is good. To be sleepless is bad. It does not mark Richard because he is made so that alertness is food and refreshment. But not to have mental rest and quietness may be a strain for me. I can't physically bear very high or very continual mental pressure."¹⁸ Like Thoreau's "Walking" and Royce's "The Problem of Job," Cabot's passage reflects the risk of social detachment that is occasionally experienced by all of us, but that is confronted head-on in the task of philosophizing: "I am sure it is the danger I run, as shown in sharp headaches and in the craving of my whole nature for solitude and the wild woods at times."¹⁹ This is not the sign of a weak disposition, but rather a very strong and honest one. The danger of isolation and solitude implied in the task of American philosophizing is one that Cabot experiences acutely and provides the impetus for her later work on unity and growth. A week later, Cabot continues to face the condition of her moral insomnia: "Poor instincts how you ache as you lay crushed and creased and scarred and bruised as they drag you out of view. Surely it is a strong love of truth which is willing to endure so much tugging and straining after the meaning of my buried life."²⁰ Her frustration and exhaustion repeatedly emerge, manifesting themselves in reflections on the nature of

Truth and human finitude. In a passage that reveals the existential ground of philosophy, she writes, “Oh! Why can it (Truth) not be given out and held forever to enrich the world? Why does God give us glimpses of eternity and let them vanish? Why will it ooze away until only its shadowy name is left. It *cannot* be wholly gone.” Like Royce, however, Cabot has hope that the pursuit of truth and the art of living are not wholly futile endeavors for she continues that, “Somehow, somewhere, it must *live as music* sent up to God.”²¹

More often, Cabot’s hopes are more modest, and turn on the meaning-making involved in a particular type of creative activity. On April 24, 1893, Cabot describes the temporal unity that is achieved in creative events, a unity that is distinctly open-ended:

Live in the past! Live in the present! Live in the future! How impartial and unsatisfactory all of these are. Rather live as one being, for rationality consists precisely in that: in not forgetting, in not ignoring the past, present or future, but bringing all into the unity of a single purpose which is leavened in the past, is created in the present, and is growing toward, looking toward its future.²²

In 1889, Cabot’s summer reading list includes several selections from Ralph Waldo Emerson and perhaps we hear the echoing of “Experience,” in which one finds herself on stairs that stretch two directions without end. To *find* herself on these stairs of time and circumstance, in Cabot’s words, to live as this “one being,” takes purpose and creative insight. She explains that, “to use the past—inherited physique, or brain, culture, joy, agony—so that it disentangles and liberates instead of enthralling, that is creative life. The same net which trips and tangles us may be used to drag the great waters and hoist the shining salmon. That is the relation between past and present that reconciles them.”²³

Meaning-making, however, does not trade merely on the unity that might be established between the past and the present. Cabot insists that this unity must provide space for, indeed enable, the growth of the new. Here she integrates her own philosophic insight with Abraham Lincoln’s comment on the “stormy present”:

[We must] gather in all the significant and relevant past to a focus so that the alchemy of the newly emerging fact shall crystallize it into a unique and unheard of deed. The dogmas of the stormy past are inadequate to the stormy present. If the occasion is new so we must think anew and act anew.²⁴

In *The World and the Individual* (1901), Royce complements this passage nicely in describing temporal unity and novelty to the extent that he suggests that, “What we find must indeed be *new*, and, nevertheless, be capable of being linked to the old. For, after all, even mere

discrimination is an expression of the will, which seeks novelty.”²⁵ Both Royce and Cabot hope to preserve genuine creativity while making it at home in a wider historical and social sphere—in a wider community.

With these comments in mind, it seems clear that the passages that reveal Cabot’s moments of existential crisis have not lead us astray in our discussion of her philosophic treatment of unity and growth. Addressing Cabot’s existential insecurities allows us to place her squarely in the tradition of American philosophy, a tradition that maintains that the live concerns of individuals and communities must be the starting point and touchstone of philosophic inquiry. Exploring the relation between growth and wholeness, therefore, is not a strictly academic exercise for this student, but Cabot’s forthright attempt to understand the relation between individual creativity growth—*her* creative growth—and the collective inheritance that both limited and enabled it.

IV. Cabot on Growth and Wholeness

In a scribbled draft of a letter written in 1889, Cabot thanks Royce for his guidance and encouragement offered in a seminar earlier that year. At this point, Royce had begun to think through *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy* (1892). She writes to Royce that, “It was a great surprise that you thought my work on growth to be worth publishing. I shall hope and work very hard to do it if I can.”²⁶ The fact that Royce considered Cabot’s work publishable is not surprising—it is only surprising and slightly disturbing that her work remains buried in unpublished folders at Radcliffe. It is unfortunate that there is such a dearth of material that reflects Cabot’s work in the late 1880s and early 1890s—only one notebook dated 1892.

At its best, intellectual history involves what C.S. Peirce might have called abduction, that is, a type of educated guesswork which aims at a working explanatory hypothesis by identifying possible relations between objects and ideas. It is with this fact in mind that I will claim that Royce’s interest in Cabot’s work turned on her negotiation of a question he found leading him to the basis he would soon meet in *The World and the Individual*. It is a question with which American pragmatists continue to grapple, namely, what is the relation between the concepts of growth and wholeness. Framed in another way, the question asks how it might be possible to hold on to the fact of unity and the fact of creative newness, two facts that many individuals are reluctant to abandon.

In 1899, Cabot prepared a talk that she entitled “Wholeness in Relation to Growth.” In her notes she writes:

In digging the soil about the roots of my concept of Growth I have several times struck hard against a rock too heavy for me to move.

When one does this repeatedly there are two alternative courses of action, one can move to another country and abandon the rocky soil or one can ask the help of all one's neighbours in hoisting the rock. As I am attached to the concept of Growth and don't want to move, I have adopted the latter course and shall tonight make a small effort to lift the rock with the hope of being aided by everyone present. The rock whose face I am first of all to dig out from the surrounding soil is called Wholeness²⁷

In typical pragmatic fashion, Cabot proceeds to reframe the philosophical tension between growth and wholeness as a tension produced by our adherence to particular conceptions of these terms. She begins by examining our frequent and uncritical usage of the term "Whole" by underscoring several suggestive variations of meaning. First, it is commonplace to believe that to know the whole is to know that beyond which there is nothing. Second, Cabot notes that, "closely related to this usage, is that of completion." She expands on this typical and misleading usage: "To know the Whole is to know that which is total and undiminished, from which nothing has been subtracted. The whole is that which is perfect, finished, forever the same."²⁸ She notes at the outset that these definitions of wholeness stand opposed to the idea of creative growth, describes in detail the logical failure of these two definitions, and finally suggests that these definitions are out of kilter with our experience of unity. At the expense of the detail, I have tried to select an illuminating section of her argument that appeals to the experiences of her listeners. She skeptically writes:

To know the whole is to know all there is? This is very comforting, nothing more could be asked. I remember an organist who at the end of each recital used to announce, "That is all." It was thoroughly reassuring. There was no danger of missing encores. But after all, was it true that we knew the whole of the concert? We had come at the very beginning, and stayed through the middle to its very end. Yes, but might it not have been that just because we had heard every single note we did not know the whole. Who of us has ever really heard the Whole of the Walküre? Is an aggregate, a sum total of an opera, the whole of an opera? Assuredly not.²⁹

In parentheses, beneath this long quotation, Cabot writes, "The whole of that opera is the universe." In this selection, we hear Cabot dismiss the quantitative approach to understanding unity and catch a glimpse of her understanding of the universe—that is Wholeness—as a qualitative and creative integrity.³⁰ It is the whole of the opera, not its discrete notes, that constitute a meaningful unity.

As Cabot's description of the "art of living" indicates, she is well primed to employ the allusion of music that Royce uses effectively in

the 1880s and 1890s. Cabot looks to the making of music as a way of explaining the development of unity, but also the phenomenon of growth. Indeed, she suggests that the ideal of unity, like the unity of a musical harmony, is necessary in order to distinguish between the growth of this harmony and dissonance or “degenerate change.” Here, in an 1899 notebook, she very likely echoes Royce’s thinking for the Gifford Lectures:

In the creation of the work of art we have perhaps clearer growth than anywhere else except in the execution of a well-conceived purpose. In each case we recognize growth as growth and not degenerate change because we made and know the ideal toward which we are working. We correct our failure by an appeal to an ideal. True, the ideal is a great deal more than we know and it also grows clearer when we express our aim but it is essentially ourselves and hence we can judge its progress or loss . . . ethics as well as art appeals to a whole (ideal) without which growth may be degeneration or rather all is chaos.³¹

Whereas growth stood opposed to the uncritical definitions of wholeness described earlier, Cabot and Royce’s description of unity enables the prospect of growth and novelty. This, however, is not to say that there is not a tension between improvisational creativity and the course of an ideal harmony. Indeed, Cabot maintains that, “In the creation of the work of art as in the creation of any purpose there is struggle and a sense of finitude and contrast with the ideal.” She seems to understand that the struggle of individual growth is painfully real, “but when we dwell in the whole we turn from the struggle to the completion involved in that struggle if it is true in itself—to the finished work of art and to religion.”³²

Most of these comments resonate with Royce’s comments in *The World and the Individual* and in earlier works in which he suggests that the dynamic and integrity of music might serve as a helpful analogue to the Absolute.³³ In her 1899 paper, “Wholeness in Relation to Growth,” Cabot continues to jab at the mistaken conception of wholeness and growth as the mere conservation of an aggregate by remarking that

There are people who want to keep everything in an aggregate. It is for them a pity to lose even a fragment, they want the whole. They preserve their pressed flowers, their old shoes, every letter of business or pleasure, every scrap of twine. Nothing indeed is lost, except the wholeness that they sought. That is crowded out by an aggregate of rubbish.³⁴

Cabot refuses to admit that wholeness is realized in conservation, in the mere stockpiling of an aggregate. Instead she states that “we are driven to a conception of wholeness which shall welcome instead of

repel growth." She presents this conception, writing, "A whole is a system of ordered parts and as order involves purpose. Any whole is the expression of a purpose and any purpose implies growth."³⁵ Here many scholars might listen for the echoing of Whitehead or Royce, two of Cabot's teachers. For example, Cabot's comment on unity and purpose coincide with Royce's description of the cohesion of ideas: "By the word Idea . . . I shall mean in the end any state of consciousness, whether simple or complex, which, when present, is then and there viewed as . . . the expression or embodiment of a single conscious purpose."³⁶ Instead of relying on Royce to clarify Cabot, I am more inclined to amplify her own examples in elucidating her claims on unity and growth. She states that there are "several interwoven strands" in her notion of Wholeness. Here are but two strands. First, she states that "the whole in any ordered system is immanent i.e. the process is organic to the end." Second, "the whole is transcendent, or creative in that it rejects the irrelevant and develops the new."³⁷ Faintly implicit in this two-sided remark is the suggestion that wholeness is to be considered a type of organic creativity.

Cabot once again appeals to lived experience in demonstrating the seemingly contradictory statement that wholeness is both immanent-organic and transcendent-creative. As a helpful example, she urges us to consider the way in which a "person of integrity" is "welded to wholeness by linking its changes into a unity, by opening out new reaches of effort, by preventing disintegration, by excluding irrelevancy."³⁸ Her character study of Ulysses S. Grant highlights this point—that the man of integrity, the man of wholeness, is by definition also a man of growth. She writes that

We see him first as a drifter, dissipated and rapidly going to pieces. The swift disintegration of his career is about to wash away all traces of his name. Later, we see him again as the man with a single controlling purpose. He has begun to be the man of integrity. Wholeness and purpose are one . . . Instead of the dissipation of the nightclub or the passive morning at home in an armchair we see him doggedly setting off to his office day after day. He has formed the purpose of earning enough money to be able to marry. It is not attained, but he has, as we say, identified himself with it. It controls him and moulds him. A friend asks him to go hunting. He hesitates, but refuses. "On the whole, I think I had better not." To the whole he refers as his guide—it surrounds him as his most familiar presence.³⁹

Cabot is careful in clarifying her description. It is not the case that Grant would achieve the whole in attaining his goal of marrying. She pointedly says that the end of the process "is not attained." Instead we are continually in the process of making ourselves whole in the genuine engagement with our purposes in the world. Cabot, like Royce, repeatedly insists that our purposes are never wholly our own, but

always situated in wider and more inclusive purposes. It is in this sense that Cabot writes that, “any persistent purpose opens out to infinity.”⁴⁰ The meaning of wholeness is this creative “opening out.”

At the end of her talk, Cabot states that, “the whole is the ongoing process of creation through an ordering and rejecting purpose.” This conclusion must have given Cabot some trouble since beneath the final typed phrase is written, “Wholeness is the process of self-creation through purpose.” It is this sentiment—one that refigures the relationship between growth and wholeness—that guides her social activism but also lays the groundwork for the social-political thought in *Everyday Ethics* (1906).

V. The Purpose of Pragmatism—Everyday Ethics

As mentioned earlier, Ella and Richard Cabot were among the participants of Royce’s “Philosophy Conference,” a fortnightly gathering of friends at Royce’s home on Irving Street in 1903. John Clendenning notes, quite accurately I think, that the “central purpose of the gatherings was to make practical applications of speculative problems.”⁴¹ It is a purpose that seems to have been carried forward in Cabot’s *Everyday Ethics*, a work that sought to reframe the speculative issues of growth and unity in terms of the ethical issue of creative loyalty. This reframing seems to have come naturally to Cabot who repeatedly uses real-world examples in shedding light on more abstract themes.

Before addressing *Everyday Ethics*, let us take a moment to dwell on the description of Ulysses Grant that Cabot gives in 1899. This description was meant to unwind a highly esoteric issue, namely the knotty relationship between unity and growth. It makes a meaningful attempt in this regard, but it also serves as a practical description of loyalty that bears an uncanny resemblance to the version that Royce develops in the *Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908). Remember that Cabot identifies loyalty as being central to Royce’s thinking as early as 1892. Royce later defines loyalty as “the willingness and thoroughgoing devotion to a cause . . . [the person of loyalty] expresses his devotion in some sustained and practical way, by acting in service of this cause.”⁴² To say that Grant remains committed to his unifying purpose is also to say that he remains loyal to his ideal of making a living. Cabot may have realized, earlier than her male contemporaries, the value of negotiating the speculative issues of classroom philosophy by looking to the mundane affairs of contemporary society.

In *Everyday Ethics*, Cabot is explicit in her attempts to foster the personal temperaments and practical attributes that contribute to loyal behavior. Just as Royce intends *The Philosophy of Loyalty* to “win hearts for loyalty,” she intends to outline an educational program that would cultivate loyal sensibilities in schoolchildren. The seeds of this work were sown very early in her career. In 1892, Cabot writes:

The moral life is a carrying out of purposes . . . it is in this insight that knowing your purposes is the one thing for every mother to teach in a myriad of ways and educational influences and for every boy and girl to endeavor to learn. Having purposes, concrete and widely embracing, gives poise, cheer, bearing and eagerness to life. In its deepest meaning, a purpose is a creed.⁴³

Cabot makes sense of this claim in *Everyday Ethics* by explaining the difference between a purpose and a fact by noting that a purpose, as opposed to a fact, has “a kind of hunger or desire.” The fact rests in the present, “settled back comfortably in its chair.” The purpose, in contrast, “leans forward eagerly . . . and stretches forward into the future.” According to Cabot, “the fact is one with itself, the purpose is never at one with itself: it yearns toward what it is not itself.”⁴⁴ This comment reverberates with the suggestion that the “art of living is becoming other people;” this art turns on the acting out of a purpose that always looks beyond itself.

This author suggests that the practice of ethics rests, in large part, on the ability to judge the worth of purposes. An entire chapter is dedicated to this topic, but I will concentrate only on the section entitled “A Good Purpose is Carefully Chosen and Loyal Followed.” Here, Cabot writes that, “the good purpose is perfectly fitted to the man, fully faced and loyally held . . . In order to carry it out he exercises courage, patience, imagination, resolution, industry, unselfish devotion, self-forgetfulness, (and) persistency.” Purposes are necessarily transcendent, directed beyond their current self-definition. This being said, true purposes are not absorbed in the group-think that some communities exhibit. “The good purpose then for each man is his own, and so is different in each case.”⁴⁵ Cabot envisions a type of self-creation without the selfishness that shrouds the modern individual. She cites Royce in her attempt to show how loyal purposes strip away the mask of selfishness, stating that “Prof. Josiah Royce in a stirring chapter in the ‘The Religious Aspects of Philosophy,’ says that all selfishness is due to an illusion.”⁴⁶ She then continues in an original interpretation of Royce:

It is only through sympathy that we reach the truth, or as we accurately say, realize things as they are, see and feel them as real and not as shadows or masks. There are people whose lives are real to us as our own. These we call friends and brothers, for they are realized as human and so akin, but the outer circle of our acquaintance . . . are often far less real than the sparrows at our feet. We think of them as mere means to our ends, or vaguely and dimly as strangers . . .⁴⁷

Indeed, this interpretation written in the years prior to 1906 anticipates many of the themes that Royce will develop in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, especially his emphasis on the sympathetic temperament that is

required in genuinely loyal acts. Cabot is aware not only of her intellectual affinity with Royce, but also her indebtedness to William James's discussion of the self in his *Principles of Psychology*.⁴⁸ There is no doubt that Royce reads Cabot's manuscript of *Everyday Ethics* in 1904. In this year, he writes on behalf of Cabot to a Boston publisher concerning her manuscript that was tentatively entitled *The Secret of Power*. Royce is extremely supportive of the project and only recommends that Cabot change the book title to *Conduct and Power*. Cabot finally decided that *Everyday Ethics* conveyed the pragmatic purpose of this work.

VI. Follett on Self-Creation, Power, and Political Wholeness⁴⁹

It is not wholly accurate to say that the thinking of Mary Parker Follett constitutes a "forgotten movement" in American intellectual life. It is more appropriate to say that it has been forgotten by professional philosophers who seem to have ignored Follett on the ground that her thinking might have some traction in the mundane affairs of politics and business. Scholars of management theory, such as Peter Drucker and Joan Tonn, however, focus on her work for precisely this reason. Drucker's introduction to *Prophet of Management* (1995) outlines the way in which Follett's progressive and feminist sensibilities might be made operational in a workplace setting.⁵⁰ Tonn's *Mary Parker Follett: Creating Democracy, Transforming Management* (2003) provides a sophisticated biographical supplement to this study. Here I try to briefly situate Follett's thinking in the wider context of early American philosophy and draw it into dialogue with Cabot's work on unity, growth and loyalty.

Working during the Progressive movement of the early 1900s, Follett demonstrated an abiding interest in social reform and the development of a more participatory democracy in the United States. In line with this interest, she inherited the belief of Cabot and other Cambridge intellectuals that the truths of philosophy were to be judged by their ability to reform and transform the lives of individuals and their communities. In Follett, therefore, we find a thinker who continually strives to integrate the themes of American pragmatism and German Idealism in order to understand the experience of women, laborers and racial minorities in the Roxbury neighborhoods of Boston beginning in 1901. These themes also serve as the lens through which she interprets the events surrounding the conflict and resolution of World War I. It is this integration of theory and practice that defines Follett's "Community as a Process", published in 1919, and *Creative Experience*, published five years later.⁵¹

In *Creative Experience*, Follett extends Cabot's intuitions concerning growth and unity along social and political lines. The work more directly addresses the creative interactions of individuals through the on-going process of circular relations as it inheres in a community. Fol-

lett claims that an individual should never, in her words, “be seen as a *ding-an-sich*,” as a thing in itself, but rather as emerging in and through the relations of the community.⁵² This is also to say that there is neither an individual prior to the formation of a community, nor is there an individual who autonomously chooses its loyalties and commitments. Follett suggests that individuals, and perhaps most pointedly women, are always already thrown into a social situation and must creatively work their way through the relations that they inherit. Indeed, she takes issue with Royce and her fellow pluralists on the grounds that they suggest that an individual must freely choose its community. Follett states:

This individual is a myth. The problem with pluralism is not its pluralism, but that it is based on a non-existent individual. But Royce, who was not a pluralist would have us choose a cause to be loyal to. Life is knit more closely than that!⁵³

Expanding on this point, Follett states, “The truth is that the self is always weaving itself out of its relations.”⁵⁴ We ought to remember that Cabot’s portrayal of the person of integrity resonates with this remark to the extent that this person achieves unity only through the warp and woof of her purposes and commitments. It will become clear in the forthcoming discussion that this “weaving” is a circular activity that seeks to overcome the historical opposition between the unity of the community and the growth of the individual and lays the groundwork for a type of political pluralism.

Follett’s insight concerning self-creation sets the stage for the discussion of human relations as it is developed in her writings in the early 1920s. She writes that, “community is a creative process. It is creative because it is the process of integrating.” Follett’s understanding of ideal group dynamics stands apart from a standard understanding of consensus formation, compromise, or political unity. She explains that “to integrate is not to absorb, melt, fuse or reconcile in the so-called Hegelian sense. The creative power of the individual appears not when one wish dominates others, but when all wishes unite in a working whole.”⁵⁵ Along these lines, Follett suggests that genuine democratic institutions must seek the novel creation of a general will through the intermingling of individual citizens who continually aim to integrate their distinct purposes.

If the community is a creative process, it seems reasonable to ask what exactly is created in this type of integration. Follett responds with a four-fold answer—the by-products of this creativity are personality, purpose, will and loyalty. To say that community creates personality is not merely to say that individuals always find themselves as persons in a community. Instead, it is also to say that the project of self-creation is bound up with

the process of community formation. "A man expands," Follett writes, "as his will expands. A man's individuality stops where his power of collective willing stops. If he cannot will beyond his trade-union then we must write on his tombstone, 'This was a trade union man.'"⁵⁶ Three important points ought to be underscored in this passage.

First, the growth of individual personality is continually and recursively defined by the collective will with which it identifies. This dynamic process is what Follett terms "circular response" and might be understood in the following way: A person's relationship with her environment creates a change in that person. This alteration affects the purposes that one actively pursues which in turn mediates the response of the environment or the people found therein. It should be noted that circular response is not simply a kind of mechanical feedback, but a process that involves community and individual in a continual evolution. Follett's rendering is a thickening of William James's rather thin claim in the *Principles of Psychology* that, "Not only the people but the places and things I know enlarge my Self in a sort of metaphoric social way."⁵⁷

Second, Follett is attempting to revise the modern conception of the individual will which Robert Frost once described as "the freedom of being bold." She does so by reminding us of our communal relations that quietly underpin our creative powers and so-called bold freedoms. Follett recognizes that this reminder resonates with the works of James and Royce. For example, she notes that "James brought to popular recognition the truth that since man is a complex of experiences there are many selves in each one."⁵⁸ Similarly, for Follett, creative power is found not in singular autonomy (after all, Follett insisted that such autonomy is the stuff of myth) but in the processes of complex relationships. This position is restated by Follett who is the first American thinker to argue that power is, and ought to be conceived as, a "power-with" rather than a "power-over." She anticipates the writing of Simone de Beauvoir, Hannah Arendt and Gloria Anzaldua in suggesting that violence is antithetical to power insofar as violence seeks to destroy relationships.

Third, and most importantly in reference to our earlier discussion of wholeness and growth, is the suggestion that the project of self-creation is ongoing and transcendent in Cabot's sense of the word; it is creative in that it rejects the irrelevant and develops the new. Follett inherits her mentor's sentiment that the "art of living is becoming other people." For Follett the process of community is one that continually seeks deeper and wider integration of various interests. "Power-over" can be achieved in a sort of determinate fashion when one person or group attains total domination over another. "Power-with," however, tends to look beyond itself—discovering and creating relationships that exceed the expectations of its actors. Matthew Shapiro recently elaborated on the transcendent character of circular response, writing that, "Under the right conditions, sustained circular response via dialogue in the pur-

suit of common goals—which may also evolve as the process continues—will tend to produce unforeseen solutions that fulfill and/or transcend the initial goals of the participants.”⁵⁹ In *Creative Experience*, Follett indicates that the truth of circular response is one that women have both understood and embodied. She calls it a “pregnant truth,” one that fosters the *wholeness* of a certain *creative* relationship.⁶⁰ This seems to be a helpful point since it aims to describe a social unity that, in Cabot’s words, welcomes rather than repels the idea of growth.

VII. Conclusion—Power and the Friendship of the Forgotten

In saying that the self is relational, we tend to forget to say what these relations *mean*. In the midst of theorizing about the unity and growth of the social sphere, there is an unfortunate tendency to overlook the persons who enact the processes of community. In short, it is all too easy to neglect the emotional aspect of “power-with” and the personal sentiment of community. In sifting through these forgotten movements of American philosophy, I found this personal sentiment in a folder of letters, the crispness of which belied the time it had remained untouched. On January 23, 1932, Ella Lyman Cabot wrote to a frustrated Mary Parker Follett:

Dearest Mary,

I fully understand the need to have one’s life-work recognized as real—as a needed contribution to one’s time and world. Your writing is so clearly hungered for. You ought not to doubt its virtue for a minute. It is so sound and permanent in its principles and so closely linked to the needs of this age . . . ⁶¹

Thirty-two years earlier, Cabot closed her talk on “Wholeness in its Relation to Growth” with a section on true friendship. In doing so, she suggests that in our search for creative unity, we need look no further than to those cherished friendships that make our lives meaningful. Cabot’s interaction with Royce and her letters to Follett seem to demonstrate this point. The intimate relationship between these individuals is obvious. It is the personal integration to which Cabot and Follett refer in their description of community as a process. This integration, however, does not coalesce in a type of static unity. Instead, intimacy finds its complement in growth, in the willingness to take risks that might give birth to new meaning.

Cabot encourages her younger counterpart to avoid self-doubt, to extend her intellectual pursuit, to persevere in her project of self-growth. It is not mere coincidence that this project of self-growth aims at meaningful participation in a wider intellectual community. The art of living is becoming other people. Today, we stand as this community and may have the opportunity to inherit these women’s purposes concerning unity

and growth. With this in mind, we might return to the quotation that opened this article with new eyes. Cabot states that, "We need the past, every bit of it, for the sake of our future. . . we need all we can digest." The works of Cabot and Follett are integral parts of our intellectual history and may help sustain us in our futures as American philosophers. Today our digestion is undoubtedly strong enough for this form of sustenance.

Harvard University
jkaag@fas.harvard.edu

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Douglas R. *Philosophy Americana: Making Philosophy at Home in American Culture*. American Philosophy Series; no. 18. New York: Fordham University Press, 2006.
- . "Who's a Pragmatist: Royce and Peirce at the Turn of the Century." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41, no. 3 (Summer, 2005): 467–481.
- Cabot, Ella Lyman. *Our Part in the World*. The New Beacon Course of Graded Lessons. Boston: Beacon Press, 1918.
- . *Everyday Ethics*. New York: H. Holt and Co., 1910.
- . *Papers, 1855–1934 (Inclusive)*.
- Clendenning, John. *The Life and Work of Josiah Royce*. Revised and enlarged edition. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1999.
- Follett, Mary Parker. *The Speaker of the House of Representatives*. New York, 1896.
- . *The New State: Group Organization, the Solution of Popular Government*. State College: Penn State University Press, 1998.
- . *Creative Experience*. New York: Longman Green and Co., 1924.
- . *Mary Parker Follett—Prophet of Management*. ed. Pauline Graham. New York: Beard Publishing, 1995.
- James, William. *Principles of Psychology*. vol. 1. New York: Dover Publications, 1950.
- Kegley, Jacquelyn Ann K. *Genuine Individuals and Genuine Communities : A Roycean Public Philosophy*. The Vanderbilt Library of American Philosophy. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 1997.
- Mander, W. J. "Royce's Argument for the Absolute." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 36, no. 3 (07, 1998): 443.
- McDermott, John J. *The Drama of Possibility: Experience as Philosophy of Culture*. ed. Douglas R. Anderson. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007.
- McKenna, Erin. *The Task of Utopia: A Pragmatist and Feminist Perspective*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.
- Oppenheim, Frank M. "Royce's Practice of Genuine Loyalty." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41, no. 1 (Winter, 2005): 47–63.
- . "The Personal Temperaments of William James and Josiah Royce." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (09, 1999): 291.
- . *Royce's Mature Ethics*. [S.l.] : Univ of Notre Dame Pr, 1993.
- . *Royce's Mature Philosophy of Religion*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1987.

- . *Royce's Voyage Down Under: A Journey of the Mind*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1980.
- Orosco, Jose-Antonio. "Cosmopolitan Loyalty and the Great Global Community: Royce's Globalization." *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 17, no. 3 (08, 2003): 204–215.
- Pratt, Scott. *Native Pragmatism: Rethinking the Roots of American Philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Royce, Josiah. *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. The Vanderbilt Library of American Philosophy. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1995.
- . *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy*. New York: Dover, 1983.
- . *The Conception of God*. Norwood: Norwood Press, 1897.
- . *Studies of Good and Evil*. New York: Appleton and Co., 1898.
- . *The World and the Individual*. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1976.
- . *Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems*. Essay Index Reprint Series. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1967.
- Royce, Josiah and John Clendenning, eds. *The Letters of Josiah Royce*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Siegfried, Charlene Haddock. *Pragmatism and Feminism: Reweaving the Social Fabric*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Shapiro, Matthew. "Evolutionary Democracy: The Philosophy of Mary Parker Follett." *World Futures*. 59, 587. 2003.
- Tonn, Joan. *Mary Parker Follett: Creating Democracy, Transforming Management*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Whipp, Judy. "Jane Addams's Social Thought as a Model for a Pragmatist-Feminist Communitarianism." *Hypatia* 19:3. (Summer, 2004).

NOTES

1. I would like to thank the editors of *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* as well as the three individuals who reviewed the working draft of this paper. Frank Oppenheim and Scott Pratt made numerous suggestions that proved invaluable in this article's development. I would also like to thank the American Academy of Arts and Sciences for sponsoring this research.
2. Many of the citations from Ella Lyman Cabot are from the unpublished papers housed at Schlesinger Library at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University. *Collected Papers of Ella Lyman Cabot*. MS A-139. Folder 319. After this point, all citations will be made in call/folder style. Hence, MS A-139/322v.
3. Joseph Blau. *Men and Movements in American Philosophy*. (New York: Prentice Hall. 1952), v.
4. Examples of scholarship that addresses the marginalization of women's contribution to the development of American pragmatism include Judy Whipp's "Jane Addams's Social Thought as a Model for a Pragmatist-Feminist Communitarianism." *Hypatia* 19:3. (Summer, 2004). See also Erin McKenna. *The Task of Utopia: A Pragmatist and Feminist Perspective*. (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001). Scott Pratt. *Native Pragmatism: Rethinking the Roots of American Philosophy*. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002). Charlene Haddock Siegfried.

Pragmatism and Feminism: Reweaving the Social Fabric. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

5. In the "Supplemental Essay" in *The World and the Individual*, Royce pulls back from his willingness to develop the concepts of individual creativity and growth when he suggests that no matter what activity an individual takes, it "come(s) in eternity freely to our home" in the Absolute. Josiah Royce. *The World and the Individual.* (New York: Dover, 1959), 374.

6. In Royce's 1899–1900 seminar in 20th century philosophy, E.L. Cabot wrote extensively on the concepts of unity and purpose, receiving the highest grade in the class. See Harvard Archives UAIII.15.28. *Yearly Returns 1889–1900.* In Royce's class notes, dated 1902, we find repeated references to the work of Ella and Richard Cabot and their abiding interest in the concepts of unity and growth. This is most apparent in Royce's notes taken on a presentation that E. L. Cabot gives in 1902 on growth and purpose of the natural world: "Mrs. Cabot discussed the element of novelty of growth . . . novelty is everywhere in growth, not just at the outset . . . Evolution has not gotten rid of novelty." These comments are found in the Harvard University Archives. HUG 1755.5. Box 2. *Notebooks on Logic.* p. 162.

7. Before addressing the philosophical work of Ella Lyman Cabot, a brief biographical note seems warranted in order to situate the discussion. Ella Lyman Cabot, educator, author and lecturer, was born into a prominent Boston family in 1866, the fourth of the seven children of Ella (Lowell) Lyman (1837–1894) and Arthur Theodore Lyman (1832–1915). The Lymans, a close-knit family, lived at 39 Beacon St. in Boston and at the Lyman estate in Waltham, and as Unitarians attended King's Chapel. Ella Lyman was educated in Boston private schools, attended Radcliffe College as a special student (1889–1891), and took graduate courses at Harvard (1897–1903). ELC began her career as an educator in 1897. Over the next four decades she taught ethics and applied psychology at Boston private schools and at Pine Manor Junior College in Wellesley; she also directed the Sunday school at King's Chapel. She served on the governing boards of Radcliffe College, 1902–1934, and on the Massachusetts Board of Education, 1905–1934. ELC published seven books on ethics and childhood education between 1906 and 1929, a privately-printed 3-volume biography of her parents, and many articles and pamphlets. She died in 1934. See Introduction to the *Collected Papers of Ella Lyman Cabot.*

8. The fact that Royce consults both Ella and Richard Cabot while developing the *Lusitania* address in 1916 attests to the degree to which Royce trusted their opinion. See. *Josiah Royce—Letters.* Ed. John Clendenning. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 649.

9. MS A-139/320v.

10. This aspect of Royce's thought is underscored by numerous individuals. See Frank M. Oppenheim. *Royce's Voyage Down Under: A Journey of the Mind.* Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1980), 17. John J. McDermott. *The Basic Writings of Josiah Royce.* 2 vol. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969). and "Josiah Royce's Philosophy of Community—The Danger of the Lost Individual." In *The Philosophy of Possibility: Experience as Philosophy of Culture.* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2007). Jacquelyn Ann Kegley. *Genuine Individuals and Genuine Communities.* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1997). Douglas Anderson. "Royce, Philosophy and Wandering." *Philosophy Americana: Making Philosophy at Home in American Culture.* (New York: Fordham University Press,

2006), 33–49. Mat Foust. “Tragedy and the Sorrow of Finitude: Reflections on Sin and Death in the Philosophy of Josiah Royce” *The Pluralist*. 2:2, (Sum. 2007), 106–115.

11. Ibid.

12. This fact is reflected in an early note to Royce, drafted June 28, 1889 in which E.L. Cabot praises Royce’s *Religious Aspects of Philosophy* (1885), but comments that “the first half (Book I) could be considerably improved” and that many people did not grasp the significance of Book II which led her “to think that it is not written as clearly as it can be.” MS A-139/319.

13. Ibid.

14. John J. McDermott. *The Basic Writings of Josiah Royce*. 2 vol. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969). and “Josiah Royce’s Philosophy of Community—The Danger of the Lost Individual.” In *The Drama of Possibility: Experience as Philosophy of Culture*. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2007), 106–131.

15. MS A139/324.

16. Ibid. Italics mine.

17. This approach to manuscripts, one that allows the form and tone of the material to teach philosophical lessons of community and loyalty, is exemplified by Oppenheim’s work on the Royce-Mason letters. See Frank M. Oppenheim. “Royce’s Practice of Genuine Loyalty.” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41, no. 1 (Winter, 2005): 47–63.

18. MS A-139/320. The ambivalence and frustration expressed in these passages might reflect the temperament of some forms of American philosophizing, but may also point to the situation of talented and intellectually gifted women philosophers at the turn of the century. It is worth noting that E.L. Cabot observes that her husband, able to express his philosophic views freely and easily as a full professor at Harvard, does not suffer from “moral sleeplessness.”

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. MS A-139/322v.

24. MS A 139/ 322.

25. *Josiah Royce—Basic Writings vol. 1*. ed. John J. McDermott. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 605.

26. MS A 139/ 319.

27. MS A 139/324.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid.

30. Royce observes Cabot’s dismissal of the quantitative approach to unity in his 1902 notebooks. HUG 1755.5. Box 2. *Notebooks on Logic*. p. 162.

31. MS A-139/322v. While this paper cannot address this issue in detail, it is worth noting that Cabot’s rendering of newness may resonate with C.S. Peirce’s desire, expressed in 1906, to revise his doctrine of tychism, the doctrine of Absolute chance. In the “Prolegomena to an Apology of Pragmatism,” Peirce writes: “I intend, as soon as I can command the requisite leisure from pot-boiling, to revise my tychistic hypothesis. I still believe that the universe is constantly receiving excessively minute accessions of variety; but instead of supposing, as I formerly did, that these are causeless (chances), I think there is sufficient ground

for supposing that they are due to psychical action upon matter . . . at present, the psychical researchers have certainly cast serious doubt on our old materialist theory without instituting any progressive method of research into the problem. In this situation, a happy working hypothesis might prove of the utmost service. It would be a pity that the human race should go down to its grave, to which it is visible drawing near, without (addressing) its principle problem.” In line with this sentiment, Cabot suggests that novelty and variation is not the outcome of causeless chance, but is the creation of “psychical” or purposive events that appeal to an ideal. See *Collected Papers of C.S. Peirce*. Harvard University. Houghton Library. MS CSP 292.

32. MS A139/322v.

33. Royce makes several references to music in explaining the dynamic and nature of the Absolute. These references appear in *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy* (1892), 456–457; *Studies of Good and Evil* (1898), 180; and *The World and the Individual* (1901), 34, 80, 472–486. It is unlikely that Cabot is the sole motivating factor in Royce’s use of the metaphor of music, but it does indicate a deep similarity in their respective works.

34. MS A-139/ 324.

35. Ibid.

36. Josiah Royce. *The World and the Individual*. vol. 1 (New York: Dover Press, 1959), 22.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid. It is important to note that Cabot’s rendering of the process of Wholeness implies an aspect of rejection that stands in contrast to the general belief that metaphysical “wholes” are all inclusive. Cabot explains that wholeness rejects only a certain class of ideas, a class that she terms “the irrelevant.”

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

41. John Clendenning. *The Life and Thought of Josiah Royce*. Revised and enlarged edition. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1999), 204–206, 284.

42. Josiah Royce. *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. The Vanderbilt Library of American Philosophy. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1995), 75.

43. MS A 139/320v.

44. Cabot, Ella Lyman. *Everyday Ethics*. (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1907), 33. It is worth noting that Cabot suggests that understanding the transcendent nature of purpose is the first step in understanding the fact that “sympathy is intricately bound up with interest” and purpose. Ibid., 190.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid., 191.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid., 177. Cabot cites James’s *Principles of Psychology* in a section “My Self Consists in all with which I am Identified.”

49. A biographical note may help in framing the forthcoming discussion. Mary Parker Follett was born on 3 September 1868 in Quincy, Massachusetts. She was educated first at Thayer Academy and attended Radcliffe College where she earned her BA with distinction. Her philosophical interests and training were in the tradition of German idealism, but she also was attracted to William James’s pluralism. As Evelyn Burg notes, Follett’s work resonates closely with G.H. Mead’s work in philosophy and sociology. The lineage between Follett and Josiah Royce

can be traced through E.L. Cabot, but also through Anna Boynton Thompson, Follett's teacher in secondary school. Thompson was Royce's student. Follett comments that Thompson first exposed her to philosophy and particularly German Idealism. During her lifetime, Follett worked principally as a social worker consultant and was the author of numerous books on human relations, government, and management. Follett lived in England for the final five years of her life and died on 18 December 1933 in Boston Massachusetts. See Mary Parker Follett: Biographical entry in *Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers, 1860–1960* (Thoemmes Press, pub. 2005).

50. Mary Parker Follett—*Prophet of Management*. Ed. Pauline Graham (New York: Beard Publishing, 1995).

51. Mary Parker Follett. *Creative Experience*. (New York: Longman, Green and Co., 1924).

52. Mary Parker Follett. "Community is a Process." *Philosophical Review*. 28, 1919. 576.

53. Ibid. 580.

54. Ibid. 586.

55. Ibid. 576.

56. Ibid.

57. William James. *Principles of Psychology*. vol. 1. (New York: Dover Publications. 1950), 313.

58. Mary Parker Follett. *The New State: Group Organization, the Solution of Popular Government*. (State College: Penn State University Press, 1998), 3.

59. Matthew Shapiro. "Evolutionary Democracy: The Philosophy of Mary Parker Follett." *World Futures*. 59, 587. 2003.

60. Mary Parker Follett. *Creative Experience*. (New York: Longman Green and Co. 1924), 63.

61. MS A139/117.