Does the Big Bang Prove the Existence of God?
Jean-Claude Pecker
Milton Rothman
Victor Stenger
Adolf Grünbaum

Toward a New Enlightenment
Paul Kurtz

Editorials:
New Directions for America

The Clinton Presidency

Remembering John Dewey
The Dewey Center and
The Collected Works of John Dewey

Jo Ann Boydston

When we started the “Dewey Project”—now the Center for Dewey Studies—in 1961, it was a small research unit in the Graduate School Office of Research and Projects at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale with the modest goal of making a concordance of philosophical terms in the works of John Dewey. Even though the unit was small and its goal modest, Southern Illinois University was in the early 1960s one of the few places in the United States with a climate favoring such a project. There were at the university several philosophers who had continued to promote American philosophy despite a general decline of interest in pragmatism after World War II; the university administration was exceptionally hospitable to new ideas; and the SIU Press was young, with a director who was enthusiastic about unusual projects—and, at that time, the Dewey Project was indeed unusual. Literary scholars had only in the 1950s begun work on collected editions of America’s greatest writers—Whitman, Twain, Emerson, Melville, Hawthorne—but no one had yet contemplated a collected edition of the works of an American philosopher. Nor did the Dewey Project, at the outset, contemplate such an edition. Nevertheless, in 1991—thirty years after it started—the Project culminated in the completion of the critical thirty-seven-volume edition entitled The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882-1953, with a single-volume subject and title index. This is the story of the evolution of that edition during the thirty years from its start in 1961 to the publication of its final volume, the index, in 1991.

In the beginning, the Dewey Project’s formal title was “Co-operative Research on Dewey Publications” (occasionally we still receive mail so addressed). The word cooperative in the project’s official title meant that faculty members were released part-time from teaching or other duties to work cooperatively with the Office of Research and Projects on projects funded by the university, by foundations, or federal agencies. The entire staff was two persons, George E. Axtelle and I, each assigned half-time to the Dewey Project, and a half-time student worker whom I brought with me from another assignment.

In the fall of 1961, we set up the project in a house on the edge of campus. We began by trying to find copies of Dewey’s major works, and we set up procedures to put the concordance terms on computer cards; during the summer of 1962, Joe R. Burnett of the University of Illinois worked with us on the concordance. However, by late 1962, when we talked with Vernon Sternberg, the director of the SIU Press, about publishing such a work, he said that it would be enormously difficult to prepare and nearly impossible to publish without a uniform collected edition of Dewey’s writings. Therefore, with the support of the press, the philosophy department, and the university administration, we abandoned the plan to do a concordance in favor of a plan to prepare a complete edition of Dewey’s previously published writings.

We soon found that the need for such an edition was much more pressing than anyone had realized. After Dewey’s death, interest in his life and work had waned so that, by the early 1960s, few of his major books were in print, and those almost entirely in paperback reprints. Even though his essays had been widely excerpted and anthologized, locating the original publication of those articles was difficult; many, in fact most, of his writings were scattered and hard to locate, and copies of works from the earliest years, 1882 to 1900, were almost impossible to find.

Our first step was to collect copies of all Dewey’s writings, which involved a great deal of bibliographical inquiring and searching, as the only bibliography of Dewey’s works had appeared in 1929, well before his death. Numerous items had appeared in pamphlets, obscure journals, and newspapers (unindexed); and some had appeared only in French, Spanish, Japanese, or Chinese. In that early search we were fortunate to have the help and enlightened cooperation of the staff of Morris Library at SIUC and of Dewey scholars around the world. But, after we started collecting and ordering copies of all Dewey’s published works, the press director told us that the only sensible way to organize an edition and plan for the individual volumes was to make a character count of every item in the corpus. This work turned out to be daunting, as can be seen easily in our estimate after the final volume appeared last year that, as published, the Works text pages (no front or end matter) have approximately 38,300,000 characters.

The body of Dewey’s work is massive: in the seventy-one years from the publication of Dewey’s first essay in 1882, up to the posthumous appearance in 1953 of one of his many Prefaces,
Introductions, and Forewords, Dewey's writings appeared in more than 150 different journals, ranging from the Journal of Philosophy to the Ladies' Home Journal. Those journal articles treated topics as disparate as "The Metaphysical Assumptions of Materialism" (EW 1:3-8) and "Is Co-Education Injurious to Girls?" (MW 6:155-64). His pieces were in all the major, and many minor, newspapers; students in his classes hired stenographers to record his lectures; and he presented public addresses in forums from the local, such as the Teachers Union in New York City, to the August and international, such as the Carus Lectures at Union Theological Seminary (Experience and Nature, 1925); the Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh (The Quest for Certainty, 1929); the first William James Lectures at Harvard (Art as Experience, 1934); and the Terry Lectures at Yale (A Common Faith, 1934).

In organizing the edition, the nature of Dewey's writings turned out to be even more important than their obvious extent. He treated the complete spectrum of topics from aesthetics and architecture to utilitarianism and valuation theory. Moreover, his individual works usually combine various emphases, making it nearly impossible to arrange the volumes by topics or categories. An editorial board formed in 1964 studied and debated for many months the question of arranging the materials into content categories, finally giving it up reluctantly only after deciding to publish when possible a Guide to the Works of John Dewey.4 This volume, which appeared in 1970, reflects Dewey's varied interests; it has twelve chapters and checklists on the major emphases in Dewey's writings: psychology; philosophy and philosophic method; logic and theory of knowledge; ethics; social, political, and legal philosophy; theory of art; theory of valuation; philosophy of religion; social and political commentary; education and schooling; critical and historical studies; lectures and influence in China. Outstanding Dewey scholars wrote the twelve essays; following each essay appears a complete list of works on the named topic. Not only is there a great deal of overlapping in the lists, there is still another group of miscellaneous works that do not fit any of the topics.

Dewey once referred to this interrelatedness of various aspects of his thought, saying, "Democracy and Education was for many years that in which my philosophy, such as it is, was most fully expounded," but he added that philosophers in general, although themselves

"With the resources for Dewey scholarship available, both in the Works and in the collections available and accessible at the Dewey Center, research and publication on Dewey's life and thought have in the last twenty years grown amazingly."

usually teachers, had apparently never believed that "any rational person could actually think it possible that philosophizing should focus about education as the supreme human interest in which, moreover, other problems, cosmological, moral, logical, come to a head." 5

These complexities made it necessary to organize Dewey's works in the chronological order of their publication. This plan has two obvious advantages: it starts with the earliest and least accessible materials, and it provides a full sequential view of the sweep and the development of Dewey's thought. Next, following that plan, we arranged all the raw—that is, unedited—materials in volumes, listed the contents, and numbered the volumes sequentially from 1 to 40. As prospects for funding publication of the volumes were in doubt, the press preferred to divide those originally planned forty volumes into three series: Early, Middle, and Later Works, starting with five volumes from the earliest period. Dewey scholars have from time to time discussed the dates of the Early Works (1882–1898), Middle Works (1899–1924), and Later Works (1925–1953) series, attempting to tie these periods to pivotal works in the Dewey canon; but in fact the division was made for financial rather than philosophical reasons. Dewey's philosophy can, naturally, be divided into the three periods mentioned, but since few scholars would agree about the exact dates for such periods, a simple arbitrary and pragmatic division into three series was probably wise. There was another practical reason for starting with the earliest period: Dewey's widow, Roberta Grant Dewey, was not willing to give us permission to republish his works, which meant that under the copyright law then in effect we had access only to Dewey's writings published between 1882 and 1908.

Throughout the time we were assembling the collection of Dewey's writings, we had discovered variant versions of a large number of items: differing editions of books, multiple printings of many books and monographs, simultaneously published essays with different titles, articles revised and reprinted in collections—in short, exactly the sort of textual proliferation and confusion one might expect in a long career of intense publishing activity. After the basic plan of organization had been set, we had to face the editing questions that these materials in all their variety raised, such as which version(s) to reprint; how to choose among different readings; how far to go in "correcting" apparent errors; and how much to regularize (and by whose standards) the punctuation and spelling. These questions did little more than buzz about "out there" until we decided to commit ourselves to the new version of an old discipline: modern textual criticism, now frequently referred to as "textual" editing.

Complete, collected editions can be put together and "edited" in many different ways. Up to the middle of this century (and continuing today in many editions), the usual approach has been simply to make an exhaustive collection of the materials (as we had done); order and study them to decide on proper organization (as we had done); photocopy the last revised versions of the publications; copyedit them—including regularizing punctuation and spelling—and prepare printer's copy; arrange for introductions and explanatory notes to the volumes; and start publishing. Textual editing, however, requires close comparison of all versions of a text (starting with the author's original manuscript or with a version as close to that manuscript as possible); studying publishers' records and a work's publish-
ing history in an effort to determine what the author's final intention was in every respect (the words as well as the spelling and punctuation); making decisions about which readings most clearly reflect the way the author wanted the text to read; and recording every decision so that all the evidence is available for scholars who want to study it.

The concept of applying the principles of modern textual criticism to the editing of philosophical works was not an immediate success with local advisers, who were concerned that this approach, heretofore used only in editing literary works, might not be well received in the philosophical community. But when the renowned textual scholar Fredson Bowers visited the project in 1965, he quickly convinced all those connected with the project that for an edition of such magnitude—a pioneering edition with great potential for leadership in American philosophy—the only approach worthy of investment of time and money was the full treatment: development of critical texts of every item in the Dewey canon. Bowers, moreover, accepted an invitation to act as consultant to the edition on a continuing basis. Our editorial course was set.

We learned at just the right time, in 1966, that the Modern Language Association had formed a Center for Editions of American Authors (now the Committee on Scholarly Editions), which had established editorial standards to maintain editorial integrity in volumes it approved. These standards were based on the work of Fredson Bowers, our Consulting Textual Editor, so we thought it appropriate to seek the approval of the MLA/CEAA. The only problem was that the CEAA (as an MLA committee) declared that it was concerned only with about a dozen editions of literary works: Hawthorne, Whitman, Emerson, Melville, Twain, and others. We persisted in discussing the matter of having the Dewey volumes "inspected," in the belief that the CEAA standards applied equally well to texts in any discipline. When I first approached the director of the fledgling CEAA, seeking advice, support, and approval for our editing plans, I was received graciously but with frank surprise that a "Center for American Authors" by definition might include nonliterary figures as well as those the MLA had selected. After some negotiations between the SIU Press and the MLA, however, the CEAA agreed to consider whether the Dewey volumes merited that body's emblem as "An Approved Edition."

In 1966, I was appointed Project Director; just over a year later, we published the first volume in The Collected Works of John Dewey, with the MLA/CEAA emblem of approval. We started with Dewey's first full-length book, Psychology (1887), thus beginning with volume 2 rather than volume 1, because Psychology, with its complicated textual and publishing history, seemed a reasonable proving-ground for our editorial approach. In one of the earliest reviews of our critical edition of that book, Harold Dunkel pointed up exactly what we had hoped to accomplish with the editing.

Some who agree to the idea of a "complete" edition may boggle at the idea of a "critical" or "definitive" one. Why not just print up a "good, usable" text and skip all the elaborate machinery of collation, citation of variants, conjectured emendations, and all the rest? Even though this critical apparatus is tucked away at the back of the book, some readers glancing at it will possibly share the sentiments expressed in the opening lines of the little girl's book review, "This book taught me more about termites than I wanted to learn." In this reviewer's opinion, second thoughts will convince the skeptical that a "definitive" text, with all the effort and apparatus it demands, is the only viable solution. For what standards is one to apply in being "fairly critical" or in seeking to arrive at merely a "good" text? While being "partially critical" may not present quite the same problems as being "partially pregnant," it suffers from much the same impossibility. No scholar worth his salt is going to want his decisions made for him by some editorial Big Brother.

The decision to use the techniques and goals of modern textual criticism in editing the works of John Dewey was not only the most difficult and most controversial, but also the most important step we took early in the edition's history, a decision that has been crucial to the success and favorable reception of the edition. As James Collins wrote in a review of the first volume:

The need for at last achieving scholarly control over the text and the developing thought of Dewey has been painfully felt by everyone trying to make a careful analysis, and trying to do as much justice to him as is done in working with the critical editions of Descartes and Berkeley and Kant. Until now, the textual situation in the study of American philosophers can only be described as chaotic. One feels at sea before the various printings of William James and Royce, forcing the student to say that he is using such-and-such a printing but still leaving him dissatisfied on points where textual precision is crucial. In Dewey's case, the variations have been notorious and have necessitated a provisional character to be attached to the research already done on him. Amateur remarks about differences noticed between . . . editions of even such a central work as Experience and Nature have only whetted the appetites of scholars for the SIU edition.

Because we chose this editorial approach and executed it successfully, The Collected Works of John Dewey was the first critical edition of nonliterary writings approved by the Modern Language Association. Soon after the first volume of the Early Works appeared, H. S. Thayer wrote: "This is a major event in the history of American philosophical scholarship. Nothing of the kind has ever before been undertaken for the work of any American philosopher. [It] will be a model for the publication of other American philosophers." And so it has been: MLA/CSE critical editions of the works of three other classical American philosophers—William James, Charles Sanders Peirce, and George Santayana—are following the Dewey edition model.

Although collecting all Dewey's previously published material seemed a difficult task, collecting the manuscript and typescript materials needed for proper editing, including correspondence, was even more difficult. Dewey said in 1939, "I have never kept a journal or diary, and have no ms . . . in fact I've never preserved any ms at any time." Only with the help of Dewey's
correspondents and of archivists at institutions where he gave addresses and where he taught were we able to build an initial collection of photocopied typescript and manuscript material (the Dewey Center has long maintained a "Guide to Dewey Correspondence and Manuscript Collections," periodically brought up to date, which it distributes on request). That collection was substantially increased in 1972 when the John Dewey Foundation gave us the papers in Dewey’s estate when Dewey’s second wife, Roberta Grant Dewey, died. There were eighty-seven warehouse boxes of manuscripts, typescripts, family and professional correspondence, memorabilia, and books, many with Dewey’s annotations and marginalia. The John Dewey Foundation then assigned the literary rights and copyrights to all Dewey's writings to the Dewey Center.

Also in 1972, the Dewey Project became an administrative unit in Library Affairs. Our collections of Dewey materials, both primary and secondary, had become so large that we decided to rename the unit the “Center for Dewey Studies,” which indeed it was. The materials have been organized and made available for scholarly research; many scholars from around the world have taken advantage of these resources both at the Dewey Center and at Special Collections in Morris Library. (The only problem with the Center’s becoming affiliated with the library has been that we have received a number of requests for information about the Dewey Decimal System.)

A real bonus in the gift of the John Dewey Papers was the presence of a number of poems purportedly written by John Dewey. Rumors about a cache of Dewey poems had circulated since 1957 when the French scholar Gérard Deladalle had come across them in the Columbia University Columbiana Collection and made copies. Although the collection had been largely put together by Milton Halsey Thomas, the curator of the Columbiana Collection (who later wrote to me that his “Boswellian” tendencies had led him to retrieve most of these poems from time to time from Dewey’s wastebasket and then from his desk when Dewey retired in 1939), Roberta Dewey reclaimed them from the university as soon as she learned of their existence. A few people had seen copies of the poems made by Deladalle, but otherwise the poems had been inaccessible up to the early 1970s; the directors of the John Dewey Foundation, which inherited the collection from Roberta Dewey, had retained literary rights to the poems because, owing to the poems’ mysterious provenance, they had doubts about Dewey’s authorship. In time, the foundation gave me permission to edit and publish the poems, provided I could authenticate them to the foundation directors’ satisfaction. The evidence I gathered came from painstaking study of the typewriters Dewey used to write many of the poems, from previously unknown biographical material, and from close comparison of the poetic material with Dewey’s prose. In 1977, twenty-five years after Dewey’s death and twenty years after Roberta Dewey had reclaimed them, these ninety-eight previously unknown poems were published separately from The Collected Works in my volume, The Poems of John Dewey, also an MLA “Approved Edition.” The poems, written principally in the 1910–1918 period, provide delightfully revealing insights into Dewey’s personality and emotional life. They also add much to the usual image we have had of Dewey as thoughtful, dignified, even somewhat remote; in the poems we also see him as loving, sensuous, playful, perceptive, and even at times emotionally torn, weary, self-doubting, depressed.

Authenticating and editing these Dewey poems was a highlight of the thirty years I spent editing The Collected Works, but that kind of research and discovery cannot compare with the opportunity to work with the devoted scholars who knew Dewey personally and who were able, because we started in 1961, to contribute wonderfully to the project’s work. Students, colleagues, and protégés of Dewey’s, such as Horace Kallen, Herbert Schneider, Joseph Ratner, Brand Blanshard, Milton Halsey Thomas, Sidney Hook, Gail Kennedy, George Counts, Harold Taylor, George Dykhuizen, George Geiger, and Lawrence Cremin, all seem to have been imbued with Dewey’s own gentle, tenacious dedication to the pursuit of truth and real enthusiasm for the search. When we started a Dewey Newsletter in 1967, many other Dewey scholars from around the world who were not closely involved in the edition spontaneously offered their support and cooperation from the outset and have continued to contribute to the center’s various projects.

Now the Dewey Center has embarked on another project, one that will make much of Dewey’s unpublished writings available for study: organizing, transcribing, and editing Dewey’s correspondence—the remaining, and perhaps richest, resource for Dewey scholarship. In his only published autobiographical statement, Dewey said, “Upon the whole, the forces that have influenced me have come from persons and from situations more than from books.” Starting with his 1885 love letters to Alice Chipman, Dewey reveals the life-long influence of his family and of close personal friends like George Herbert Mead. The correspondence illuminates his continuing interaction with philosophers such as William James, Charles S. Peirce, Sidney Hook, and Bertrand Russell, and his relations with intellectual and political leaders around the world—from Eleanor Roosevelt to Leon Trotsky, from Jane Addams to Albert Einstein. In his letters Dewey also responds to daily events, describes his impressions of other cultures and peoples, reflects on the meaning of national and international developments, providing almost day-by-day biographical insights.

With a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Center staff is preparing a database, verbatim transcriptions, and a detailed chronology of all incoming and outgoing letters. As the Center has been collecting Dewey’s correspondence since the early 1960s, the materials are mostly in hand for this work, and the first stage of “The Letters of John Dewey, 1881–1951” project—preparation of the database and transcriptions of the correspondence of the earliest period, 1881–1905 (through the Chicago years)—is nearing completion. An Advisory Committee of distinguished scholars—Ellen Lagemann, Jay Martin, Steven Rockefeller, Ralph Sleeper, and H. S. Thayer—has
began work on selecting materials for a hardcover edition of Dewey’s letters, which will be published in several volumes by the SIU Press.

Interest in American pragmatism and in the “classical American philosophers”—Dewey, Charles S. Peirce, William James, Josiah Royce, George Herbert Mead, C. I. Lewis, and George Santayana—seems to have been only dormant, certainly not dead, during the immediate post-World War II years; during the 1970s it experienced a stirring rebirth. By 1978, John J. McDermott was able to write in detail about “the resuscitation of classical American philosophy,”15 manifested most concretely in the editions of the works of four classical American philosophers—Dewey, James, Peirce, and Santayana—now either completed or well under way.16

With the resources for Dewey scholarship available, both in the Works and in the collections available and accessible at the Dewey Center, research and publication on Dewey’s life and thought have in the last twenty years grown amazingly. Dewey has been rediscovered by a new generation of scholars, and study of his works has intensified among those who never lost interest. Not only are major works, including several new biographies, in progress, but the variety of areas scholars are studying also echo Dewey’s own varied interests. Contemporary topics like gender questions and feminism, ecological psychology, and the environment are being considered along with the many topics of long-standing interest, often treated in fresh ways: philosophy of religion and moral philosophy, progressive education, politics, psychology, philosophy of education, metaphysics, liberalism, science and scientific method, pragmatism, Marxism, theory of valuation, ethics, democracy, curriculum, and vocational education.17 In 1990, two audiotapes with the title “John Dewey,” written by John Stuhr and narrated by Charlton Heston, were released;18 also in 1990, the Canadian Broadcasting System broadcast two hours on Dewey in its series entitled “Ideas”; recently work has been started on a documentary film of Dewey’s life, work, and influence; and in 1992, Louis Menand published in the New York Review of Books a major essay on Dewey, reviewing Robert Westbrook’s John Dewey and American Democracy in the context of Dewey’s entire career and reputation.19 (This issue of Free Inquiry, which has since its inception taken notice of Dewey and his work, can also be counted an important contribution to Dewey studies.)

“After more than thirty years, I can report that helping Dewey scholars and promoting Dewey scholarship has been an extremely satisfying pursuit. Both as human being and as philosopher, Dewey never pales, his variety is indeed infinite, and his wisdom pervasive; he is, moreover, captivating, charming, inspiring.”

The geometric increase in the number of published studies on Dewey is best illustrated by the Dewey Center’s Checklist of Writings about John Dewey. The first edition of this work was published in 1974, covering the years 1887–1973 (396 pages including index); the second edition, published in 1978, took these writings up to 1977 (478 pages including index); the third edition, now in preparation, will bring the checklist up to date. Although the new Checklist excludes many items included earlier—unpublished studies and dissertations, and even lengthy passim discussions—it will be difficult to publish in one manageable volume of fewer than 800 pages.

The widespread interest in Dewey is fully justified, for, among those identified as the “classical American philosophers,” Dewey was unique. As Sidney Hook wrote to the Times Literary Supplement, “Comparisons of rank among leading philosophers are usually invidious, and serve no useful purpose, . . . but I do not believe that it is an exaggeration to say that John Dewey was far and away the most influential of all American philosophers. William James was better known in Europe than Dewey, but if anyone is entitled to be regarded as America’s national philosopher in virtue of his profound influence on the intellectual and practical life of the nation in education, psychology, law, history, sociology, and politics, it is John Dewey.”20

It is a privilege to have been so closely associated with the work of this complex, gentle, fighting man who saw philosophy not as an academic exercise but rather as the means of solving political and social problems and meeting the needs of people. Even before the turn of the century, Dewey wrote, “As the philosopher has received his problem from the world of action, so he must return his account there for auditing and liquidation.”21 After more than thirty years, I can report that helping Dewey scholars and promoting Dewey scholarship has been an extremely satisfying pursuit. Both as human being and as philosopher, Dewey never pales, his variety is indeed infinite, and his wisdom pervasive; he is, moreover, captivating, charming, inspiring. Now that all his Works are available, readers and scholars everywhere can see the breadth, the extent, the interrelatedness, and complexity of Dewey’s contribution to our intellectual growth and can at last fully appreciate Richard Rorty’s reasons for saying that Dewey’s “work is about as close as I get to sacred text.”22

Notes

1. In the early years, the university provided all funding for the work, including a publication subvention for the five volumes of The Early Works, 1882–1898. Since the 1970s, the project has had outstanding support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the John Dewey Foundation.


John Dewey and A Common Faith

Timothy J. Madigan

Much of John Dewey’s philosophy was devoted to combating what he considered to be unnecessary dualisms: mind and body, appearances and reality, idealism and realism. He was interested in empirically studying the place of human beings in the natural world, and felt that by overcoming such either/or distinctions, one could better understand the dynamic processes that shape our lives. He was particularly critical of philosophies and religions that promoted a supernatural outlook and that sought timeless answers and unquestionable certainties, thereby negating our lived experiences of changing realities, unprecedented opportunities, and baffling challenges.

It is not surprising, then, that Dewey addressed the issue of religious belief and its effect on human thinking. Probably his most famous work on this topic is A Common Faith (1934), in which he calls for a new, naturalistically based religious movement that would unify people by a set of shared ideals revolving around reform of social institutions, renewal of community spirit, and reawakening of a sense of personal meaning and concern. Dewey felt that there was validity to religious inspiration, so long as it could be de-coupled from any supernatural goals such as a longing for eternal life. He writes that: “Any activity pursued in behalf of an ideal and against obstacles and in spite of threats of personal loss because of conviction of its general and enduring value is religious in quality” (A Common Faith, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934, p. 27). Ideals are fully a part of human nature, but they become dangerous when they are completely unrealizable. The danger of religions is that they codify and enforce the quest for ideals and turn them into supernatural constructs. The challenge, then, is to separate the “religious impulse” from the religions that imprison them. “For the moment we have a religion, whether that of the Sioux Indians or of Judaism or of Christianity, that moment the ideal factors in experience that may be called religious take on a load that is not inherent in them, a load of current beliefs and of institutional practices that are


Timothy J. Madigan is Executive Editor of FREE INQUIRY.