

Henry Van der Poyen.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION



AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT THE

ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

JUNE 26, 1890.

By Andrew Dickson White, LL. D.



ANN ARBOR, MICH.:
PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY.

1890.

.....
THE COURIER OFFICE, PRINTERS.
.....

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

Returning to this beautiful spot, so dear to me by its associations with early life, and with old colleagues, students and friends, I might touch a responsive chord in many hearts by recalling the stirring period in which our relations here were formed: taking part in this high festival of this great University, I might perhaps gain approval by an oration upon the triumphs of learning: standing on the threshold of the West, I might try to possibly win applause by declamation on the future glories of the country.

But an occasion like this is too precious for that. I seem to hear the monitions of those whom I once saw leaving these halls to lay down their lives for the Republic, and I see before me the youth who are to-day going forth to make or mar the Republic which so many of their predecessors died to save. I feel what the possibilities are of institutions and occasions like this in suggesting a better future for individuals, states, and the nation at large. I do not then ask your applause, I merely ask your thought upon some very simple considerations.

My subject is EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

It is certain that in this century the theory of an evolutionary method in the universe in some form has taken fast hold upon thinking men. And especially is this the case as to theories regarding the history of man as man upon our planet. I shall not enter into the relation of man's structure and life to the structure and life of other animals, but simply point out the fact, in passing, that in the whole history of humanity, all that great array of sciences which have been brought to bear upon it, show from the earliest prehistoric times in which we can trace man

by his works, evidences of his upward evolution. You need hardly be reminded that from the rudest stone implements of the drift, in California as in India, in Egypt as in England; through the later series of rude stone implements becoming slightly better and better as we rise through the various strata in the caves of England and France; through the still later series of polished stone implements in Scandinavia, in Switzerland, in America;—through the yet more recent series of bronze implements, down to the time when history opens with the general use of iron, we see everywhere the proofs of this evolution from lower to higher. The same process is yet more evident within the historic period.

But while a quiet evolution is easily seen in the long series of ever improving inventions, implements, laws, policies, ideas, a more violent process is no less evident. More and more it becomes clear that the same law of evolution extends even through national catastrophes. The old doctrine of ever recurring closed cycles of national birth, growth, and death;—the doctrine of national catastrophes without any effect save possibly to point a moral or adorn a tale, has virtually disappeared: more and more it is seen, both in historic times, and in prehistoric, that there has been not only an evolution, quiet and gradual, but also an evolution in which not only each national struggle but every national catastrophe is a part.

The working out of this truth has been done by modern historians, but it has been discerned ever since the earliest prophets of our race. Typical is that Miltonic utterance of Martin Luther: "Our Lord God deals with nations as I deal with this old hedge stake—if it displeases me I pull it up, cast it away, and put another in its stead."

Typical examples of this more violent evolutionary process may be seen in the Fall of Rome, in the Crusades, in the French Revolution. The old view was, that the Fall of Rome was simply a catastrophe and nothing more,

—a catastrophe in which the vast conquests of ancient thought and effort were all sunk beneath the waves of unmitigated barbarism. But now the whole thinking world accepts Guizot's teaching, that while the Fall of Rome was indeed a penalty for unreason, corruption, and crime, she left to the world her most precious conquests;—that they were incorporated into European civilization;—that what was thus incorporated by its mixture with Teutonic elements of character and thought aided powerfully in the evolution of a richer and better civilization than the world had known before.

So with the Crusades: the old theory was, that as they were the effort to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the Moslem, and that as the Holy Sepulchre remains in the possession of the Moslem to this day, the whole result was simply and solely a catastrophe. But the modern historical thinker sees that the Crusades were part of the slow upward evolution in society,—a main part in the process of removing the feudal system when the feudal system had accomplished its purpose, and of bringing in centralized power, which was to accomplish *its* purpose.

So too, with the French Revolution at the close of the last century: down to a recent period it has been very generally thought a great calamity caused by human madness, and nothing more; a sort of devil's firework, which flashed, went out with a sulphurous odor which spread over the whole earth, and left in its train anarchy and despotism. But now that the fires of passion are burned out we can look under the clouds, across the ashes and the graves, and see clearly that the French Revolution was but part of the great evolution of modern democracy.

And so with our American Civil War: as it drew on, many of the best men, South and North, thought it the mere flaming up of human madness, sure to end the Republic. Now all, except a small minority of thinking men see it as a freeing of the Republic from the most fearful,

incubus which weighed upon the first century of the national existence, as a transition from a lower condition to a higher.

Thinking then, upon the many examples which might be cited, we distinguish two uses of the word Evolution: first, its larger use, which includes every sort of development, regular or irregular, rapid or slow, revolutionary or of natural growth; secondly, its more restricted use, which confines it to the more regular, natural processes, to growth in the main, quiet, steady, and peaceful. In this latter restricted sense I shall use the word evolution in this address, and I purpose to deal with the distinction between development by natural growth and development by catastrophe;—between progress by evolution and progress by revolution.

Thus far the progress of humanity, as regards political, social, and religious questions, seems to have been largely, if not mainly, by catastrophes. Among the examples of progress by catastrophe let us look more especially at some which come near to us.

Take first, the process by which the British Colonies on this continent were finally separated from the mother country. Two ways were before those entrusted with leadership in Great Britain during the last half of the last century: the first was that chosen by Burke and Pitt; it was large, just, mild, statesmanlike. Both these men labored for the supremacy of right reason in American affairs: Burke's speech on "Conciliation with America" is probably the foremost piece of forensic reasoning in the English language, and possibly the foremost in any language. Could these men of right reason have had their way, the American Colonies would have remained for many years longer attached to the mother country; the sturdy, vigorous English and Scotch emigration, instead of being diverted into other channels, to Canada, the Pacific Islands, India, and South Africa, would have continued to enrich and strengthen the civilization of this Republic;

the separation when it did come, would have been natural and peaceful; the population of these states would thus have had a far greater proportion of that Anglo-Saxon element which would have enabled it to assimilate the masses of less promising elements now flooding us, and which are possibly the new barbarian invasion fated to end this empire, as the old barbarian invasions ended the Roman Empire.

But evolution by right reason was not to be: if Pitt and Burke were apostles of evolution, George III., doggedly conservative, and sundry Americans, fiercely radical, were apostles of revolution, and the revolutionary method prevailed. The result was the immediate loss of much precious Anglo-Saxon blood, for large numbers of the best and truest men and women, who were loyal to the mother country as a matter of conscience, were driven beyond our borders: still worse, the inflow of Anglo-Saxon blood from abroad was stopped almost completely. Though men like Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Adams, and Marshall, built most nobly upon the foundations already laid, and did their best to prevent bitterness between the two nations becoming chronic, every thinking man will now at least suspect that the evolutionary process,—the peaceful development of constitutional liberty in the colonies,—their gradual assumption of state and national dignity, would have saved great suffering to mankind, and probably in the long run would have produced a stronger republic and a sounder democracy.

Take next the French Revolution: in the time of Louis XVI., one of the greatest statesmen, and possibly the most unsuccessful that humanity has ever produced, Turgot, strove to develop free institutions by a natural process, and thus to avert a catastrophe. Turgot saw that the old despotism was doomed, that the new era must come; therefore it was, that he proposed a system for the general education of the people; for the gradual development of political practice; for the gradual assumption of

the duties of free men, first in the provinces, and finally in the nation at large. By vast, comprehensive, political measures he sought to put the people gradually and safely in the possession of their rights, and in the discharge of their duties. He stood at the parting of the ways: could the nation have gone on in the path of peaceful evolution marked out by him, it is, humanly speaking, certain that constitutional liberty would have been reached within a few years, and substantial republicanism not long after. What weary years would have been avoided;—the despotism of the guillotine, of the mob, of the recruiting officer;—twenty years of ferocious war,—millions of violent deaths,—billions of treasure thrown into gulfs of hate or greed!

But on the other side stood against Turgot, the forces which made for progress by catastrophe and revolution;—the ultra conservatives, like poor Marie Antoinette, the leading nobles, the leading churchmen, and hating them, but really their truest allies for evil, the ultra radicals, like Robespierre, Danton, Marat, and their like: both sets of fanatics, conservative and radical, working together for revolution;—conscientiously intriguing, orating, lying, murdering;—creating an atmosphere, first of fanaticism, and finally of hypocrisy, in which all noble thought seemed to perish. In spite of the work of Turgot, and of all those who caught his spirit,—men like Bailly, Lafayette, Mirabeau, who exerted themselves in behalf of progress by evolution, there was progress by catastrophe;—the Paris Massacres, the LaVendee Massacres, the Avignon Massacres, the Red Terror and the White Terror, Revolutionary Wars and Imperial Wars, Jacobin Despotism and Napoleonic Despotism, the First Invasion and the Second Invasion, the First Indemnity and the Second Indemnity, the Bourbon reaction and the Commune, the whole line of sterile revolutions and futile tyrannies each bringing forth new spawn of intriguers, doctrinaires, and declaimers.

Take next our American Civil War. That a contest

between Slavery and Freedom was drawing on many years before 1861, all men see now; various American statesmen saw it then, and they tried to avert it. Only one thought out a great, statesmanlike measure: that man was Henry Clay. He proposed to extinguish slavery gradually, naturally, by a national sacrifice not at all severe: in fact, by a steady evolution of freedom out of servitude. His plan was to begin at a certain year, and to purchase those newly born into slavery, until gradually, through the extinction of the older members of the African race by death and the enfranchisement of the younger members by purchase, slavery should disappear.* It was a great, statesmanlike plan. It might have cost twenty-five millions of dollars. Revolutionists on both sides opposed it: revolutionists in the South would have none of it, for it was contrary to their theory that slavery was a blessing, sanctioned by the Bible, and embedded in the Constitution: revolutionists in the North would have none of it, because it was contrary to their theory that one man ought not to buy another. The result we all know: slavery was indeed abolished, but instead of being abolished by a peaceful process, involving an outlay of twenty-five millions of dollars, it was abolished by the most fearful of modern wars, at a cost, when all the loss is reckoned in, of ten thousand millions of dollars, and of nearly, if not quite, a million of lives. Thus had we political and social progress by catastrophe rather than by growth,—progress, not by evolution, but by revolution.

History is full of such examples: let me give one finally, beginning further from our time, but ending nearer it. In the latter half of the last century the Empire of Germany was the very seat of unreason and injustice. Its political institutions were a farce in which not one great national purpose could be properly served. Its judicial institutions were a jungle in which lurked every

*See Schurz's *Life of Henry Clay*. Boston and New York. 1887. Vol. 11, p. 317.

sort of legal beast of prey. Its social institutions were based on conventionalism; its religious institutions were enveloped in an atmosphere made up of private disbelief and public intolerance. Then arose a true man, Joseph the Second: he attempted to save the Empire by appealing to right reason; by stimulating thought and diminishing despotism; by infusing humanity into the laws, and simplicity into the administration of justice; by the development of education; in fact, by an evolutionary process. All his efforts were rejected, and he died of a broken heart.

But the progress he sought has been accomplished by wars extending through a whole century, by the sacrifice of innumerable lives and untold amounts of treasure, by the humiliation into the dust of those who opposed the evolutionary method; indeed, by the destruction of their rights, of their privileges, of their immunities, nay, of themselves: and finally, by the blotting out of the Old German Empire under Austria, and the establishment of the New German Empire under Prussia. The ruling classes would have none of the kindly reasonableness of Joseph the Second, the apostle of evolution, and they had to bear Napoleon and Bismarck,—apostles of revolution,—men of blood and iron.

And at this moment, we have in one of the greatest nations in the world an example of the same revolutionary process as distinguished from the evolutionary. In the middle years of this century, Russia, having been steadily developed in ways more or less rude by the efforts of Peter the Great, Catherine the Second, and Nicholas the First, found itself under control of a just and kindly Czar,—Alexander the Second. He accepted the spirit of his time, freed the serfs throughout the vast territories of Russia, abolished a mass of absurdities, infused a better spirit into old institutions, improved the laws, increased justice, and prepared the way for a constitution. It was my fortune, as a young man, holding a subordinate diplo-

matic position at St. Petersburg, to see this transition from the stern beneficence of Nicholas to the more kindly beneficence of the Second Alexander. Everything seemed moving in the steady, peaceful evolution of a strong constitutional Empire, when suddenly, between the extreme votaries of despotism on one hand and of nihilism on the other, all was dashed in pieces: the Czar was a mangled corpse in the streets of St. Petersburg: a policy of extreme reaction set in. Occasionally since, those who favor a more peaceful evolution have seemed to gain momentary control, but it is clear that the progress of Russia is to be by revolution,—that the attempt is making to hold back modern thought by great dams and bulwarks, until the flood rises so high that a catastrophe comes, a breaking away of dams and bulwarks under revolutionary pressure, to be followed by successive phases of devastation, reactionary and revolutionary.

The question now arises, is this the necessary law of human progress? Must the future of mankind be no better than the past in this respect? An orator has recently answered this question with a phrase: he tells us “all great reforms must be baptized in blood.” But is this the law of the *future*? There is much, indeed, to support this view: take the simplest principles of our Anglo-Saxon liberty; before they could be secured, blood was shed throughout England and throughout the United States. One king lost his head, another his crown, and another the fairest colonies on which the sun ever shone. Take the simplest thing in religion; the elementary principle of toleration: before it could be established the world had to wade through the religious wars of the Sixteenth Century; the Thirty Years’ War; battles, massacres, and executions innumerable. The possibilities of human unreason are indeed vast, and might lead us to take a sad view of the future, as we are forced to take a sad view of so much in the past, but on the other hand there is much to give us hope. The very law of evolution

itself seems to encourage us. It would seem to show us that not only better results but better *methods* may gradually be evolved. This better side of human progress is seen in every country: an early display of it to our race came in Great Britain in 1688; it came again in the year 1832, and it has been shown by various peaceful reforms during our own history.

The whole question is a question of price: the development of the race is to go on; the one question is, what price shall we pay for it? Must we still secure it, as so often in the past, by these vast sacrifices, or may it be secured in the future by reason and the spirit of justice?

That eminent historian and political thinker, Goldwin Smith, once said, "Let us never glorify revolution." That he was right the recent history of various countries proves abundantly. Early in the present century glorification of the first French Revolution became a French fashion: in this fashion Thiers, Lamartine, and Hugo led. The consequences were the futile French Revolution of 1830, the calamitous French Revolution of 1848, the monarchy of Louis Philippe as the result of the first, the tyranny of Napoleon III., the Prussian Invasion, the surrender of Sedan, and the Commune catastrophe, as the result of the second.

So, too, throughout the first half of the present century on this side the Atlantic, there was a steady glorification of our revolutionary struggle with England. What was best in it—the great constructive part by men like Washington, Franklin, Adams, Hamilton, and Marshall—was comparatively little thought of. What was most orated upon in ten thousand little hamlets was the destructive part—the beauty of resistance to authority, the glory of breaking up an empire, the gain of human liberties and rights: and verily we had our reward. On one side this glorification of revolution helped to promote a Civil War for breaking the Southern States from the Union, and on the other side it helped to pile upon the

thinking people of this country vast masses of illiterate voters, black and white—voters so brought up in this country and in other countries as to be incapable of right thinking, even upon their own material interests, to say nothing of their political interests.

Let us then accept this advice of one who has labored and sacrificed much for human liberty in its best sense; “let us never glorify revolution.”

What, then, shall we glorify? What shall be the ideal of political conduct? The answer is simple: let us glorify the evolution of a strong moral sense in individuals and nations; of well-being and well-doing; of clear and honest thinking; of right reason; of high purpose; of bold living up to one's thought, reason, and purpose; let us glorify these, let these be our ideals.

And what shall be the aim of practical effort? The answer to this question, too, is simple: let us strive to clear the way for a steady, healthful evolution; for the unfolding of a better future.

First, as to the evolution of the individual man: is there not among many of us somewhat too much admiration for a certain spurious self-sacrifice; for a willingness to neglect the highest individual development in order to accomplish a vague something for the community? While every man owes a duty to society, he also owes a duty to himself as a man, and this is not less a duty to society: that duty is the evolution of his own powers, physical, intellectual, moral, religious. The nation, after all, will never be better than the men and women who compose it. Remember Carlyle's great question: “How out of a universe of knaves shall we get a common honesty?” Complaints regarding the low tone of public morality and of corruption in the public service constantly ring in our ears: all sorts of checks and balances are proposed, and these are well; but after all, until there is a preponderating mass of individuals, each detesting oppression and wrong, each loving right reason, each having

in himself a standard of truth and justice, each willing to sacrifice something to maintain this standard, we can hope little for a better evolution, as regards the public at large.

Just at this moment, in this evolution of individuals as bearing upon that of the nation, I would say, that the first thing needed is will power: the great Dr. Arnold gave it as a result of his long and close observation among young men, that the difference between them, which makes them successful or unsuccessful, great men or small men in their after life, is simply a difference in will power. Do we not everywhere see this? Do we not everywhere see men who know better, yielding where they ought to stand firm, giving themselves up to parties, conventions, caucuses, bosses? Addressing this body of young men in a University, I would say, begin here and now your own individual evolution by this cultivation of will power, for it marks the difference between the strong man and the weak man, between the successful and the unsuccessful. Give yourself the physical basis of will power, a strong body; give yourself the intellectual basis, a well trained mind; give yourself the moral basis, standing firm among your fellows here and now for what is decent, right, and just, against the trickster and the boor, standing firm for what is best in yourself against what is worst in yourself; above all, cultivate that will power by deciding what is right for *you* to do, and say, "I will," and on deciding what is wrong for you to do, and say, "I will not,"—stand firm by such decisions,—"firm as a stone wall." That is not so easy as declaiming on what this neighbor of yours ought to have done, or on what that public man ought not to have done, but it is better, better for the country, better for you. If you enforce your will on this little kingdom which God has given you, you will find little trouble in enforcing it throughout far greater dominions.

Take next, material evolution. That a great country like this, comparatively new, must lay out a large part of

its work in developing its own material basis, is certain. All about us we see the evidences of this, some in progress by growth, some in progress by catastrophe.

In American business far too large a part thus far seems played by catastrophes: in the record of demoralizing speculation, of financial crisis, of periods of widespread bankruptcy, we have indeed a material progress on the whole, but a progress which is not normal, which costs the happiness and lives of millions;—which grinds tender-hearted women and children to powder between its upper and nether millstones;—which fills lunatic asylums; which ought to fill prisons;—and which, if we do not develop better methods, is to make the American race a vast body of short-lived, nervous dyspeptics, sure to die out and be succeeded by races of tougher fibre.

Such results of progress by revolution every one can see by looking about him. Can we not labor for progress by evolution? Its simplest elementary conditions are, less idolatry for the mercantile spirit, greater cultivation of literature, science, and art; less worship of millionaires, more respect for thinkers and doers; less deification of phrase-makers, sensation-mongers, and business gladiators, more honor to builders of what is worth building. Let there be in the various professions of active life a steady resistance to encroachments of injustice and avarice, an infusion into our laws of a higher sense of justice and reason, an infusion into our social life of contempt for pettifoggers and hatred for scoundrels, no matter how successful.

The question has lately been asked, whether our Universities produce their share of business men; and a very high authority in business circles has declared that they do not. But he failed to note one or two points of great importance.

First, University graduates, according to the best authority, form only about one-half of one per cent. of the

whole population, while they hold nearly sixty per cent. of the more important positions in the country.

Secondly, he failed to note the fact, that until very recently our Universities trained men almost exclusively for what are known as the "learned professions," and not at all for business in the ordinary sense of the word: whereas, within the last few years, almost all institutions for advanced instruction have been developing courses fitting men for the pursuits in life which lead more directly into great business operations, and therefore, to act far more powerfully upon material development than heretofore.

Thirdly, he missed the fact, that in spite of the prevalence of the old system of training hitherto, every large college class shows a certain number of men engaged successfully in business.

Fourthly, while very few of the colossal millionaires of the country have been educated at our higher institutions of learning, there is one thing of which every University graduate may well be proud, and this is, that among those who have piled up great fortunes by scoundrelism, there is so far as known, not one University graduate: the great plundering schemes of the country have not been conducted by men trained in our Universities: in this field of material progress our higher institutions of learning seem to have helped the better evolution, rather than those schemes and enterprises which are in danger of bringing in revolution.

Take next, political development: what it is now we all know,—the outcome of some good through much evil. Great questions have been settled, great questions are coming on. These may be divided between questions general, sectional, and municipal: glance for a moment at each.

Some are already seeking the solution of these questions by revolution, by catastrophe: thus far with little apparent success. But who shall say what may come

when this nation, thanks to opening its gates freely to the dregs of all other nations, shall have a vast proletary mass who discover that the accredited political teachers are giving them phrases instead of reasonings. What shall be done? I will only say that the evolutionary method would seem fitly begun by a more thorough attention to political and administrative subjects in our Universities;—by the study of the comparative legislation of different countries and of the different states of this Union;—by a careful investigation of methods of reform tried in all parts of the civilized world. And next I would say, by training men to think, speak, and write on such subjects in the light of the best modern thought and experience, thus bringing the results obtained by University research to bear upon the people at large.

Take a few typical examples: and first of all, the popular view of the most serviceable anchor which is left us; our Judiciary System. The Supreme Court of this nation is indeed its greatest jewel; it seems to have been created by our fathers in a moment of Divine inspiration. Its subordinate Courts are also excellent. Our State Courts are most of them good, but after all, there is nothing more necessary in order to keep our Judiciary, and above all, our elective Judiciary, what it ought to be, than an evolution in the people of a higher sense of the judicial function: more and more we should assist the growth in the popular mind of the truth that a cheap Judiciary is the most costly luxury which a people can indulge in;—that it is folly for the people at large to pay starvation stipends to Judges who protect our highest interests, while millionaires and corporations employ lawyers who have proved their right to demand fees equal to a king's ransom.

Thus far, indeed, many men in judicial positions have shown a noble disregard of questions of salary and a supreme reverence for duty. Names there are among these worthy of Greece and Rome; two of them have been long an honor to this University. The name of one of them I

may be allowed to utter with deep respect for his character, with deep love for his endearing qualities, with deep regret for his loss—James V. Campbell. The other you know as well, and the legal profession throughout the country, and the men engaged in vast railway enterprises from the Atlantic to the Pacific, know as well as if it were trumpeted in every market place—a bulwark against corporate greed and popular passion. I need not name him here, yet I will do so, in justice not to him, but to our country—Thomas M. Cooley. Such men give us faith and hope, but in the long run we have no right to expect that men should make such sacrifices; most certainly we have no right to ask men to make them.

Again as regards Crime and Penalty. While the whole subject should command the attention of the best minds in our universities, more and more there should be evolved in the people at large the idea of true mercy as against spurious mercy—the idea of well-considered mercy toward the great mass of hard-working, law-abiding citizens, rather than a contemptible lenity toward the vicious brute who lives by preying upon the law-abiding part of the community, whose profession is crime, whose joy is murder.

An eminent Judge once said, “The taking of life by due process of law, as a penalty for the greatest crimes, seems the only way of taking life to which the average American has any objection.” The Judge was right: there is throughout this republic a widespread legal superstition favoring the protection of criminals. Safeguards which were created in the Middle Ages to protect citizens against kings and feudal lords and robber knights are now used to protect criminals against justice. There should be a quiet evolution out of this superstition, an evolution of better ideas taking form in better laws; laws promoting more prompt, more efficient, more common-sense dealing with criminals, and especially with professional criminals. The enemy of individual liberty to-day is not King John,

or King George, but the ballot-box stuffer; not the feudal lord, but the professional criminal. We have all seen the sickly sympathy with blood stained ruffians; we have all heard the platitudes confounding crime with misfortune; to meet these, there should be developed more healthful modes of thought—the idea that crime is not mere misfortune, that crime is crime; that the criminal is a criminal. There should be developed a healthy, manly, womanly determination to fight criminals, to exterminate them. The passion for fishing and hunting is doubtless a survival of the earliest instincts of the human race: let this survival take better forms. I trust there are many here who will go forth to fish for plunderers, to hunt for scoundrels, —vigorously, mercilessly. I trust that we shall have by and by a prevailing sentiment that the most inglorious thing a man can do is to prostitute his talents in aiding crime and criminals, and that one of the most glorious things he can do is to prove his manliness by fighting on the side of justice and order.

So, too, in regard to Public Office: it is well, indeed, in the recurring political revolutions, to fight wire-pullers and bosses, and to tear them from their thrones: here, too, that survival of the earlier instincts, that passion for fishing and hunting, may find a healthful satisfaction.

But the more quiet evolutionary process should also be borne in mind: more and more should the effort be to evolve out of the present loose indifference to sound political ethics the simple idea that public office is not a reward for mere partisan henchmen, not a personal favor to be dealt out by one individual to another, not a coinage in which tricksters pay their debts at the expense of the public; but, to use a truism which from the mouth of a great public man has become a vitalizing truth, that “public office is a public trust.” Let this idea be developed through the pulpit, through the press, by public meetings. More and more should we seek to evolve in the popular mind the simple idea that

the highest fidelity is not the fidelity of party workers to party leaders, or of the leaders to the workers, or of both to the party; but that the highest fidelity is fidelity to the community, to the commonwealth, to truth and to justice. There should be evolved the spirit of fellow-soldiership with true men, the spirit which honors a man because he respects the truth, the spirit which pardons minor faults in a statesman provided he be clearly true on the greater questions; the spirit which, while it does not expect candidates to be saints, will not permit them to be scoundrels.

Take, next, a great sectional question. We hear much of the negro problem in the South: it is indeed a problem of supreme importance. How shall we meet it? Two ways are before us. On one side we have the revolutionary method, promoted by demagogues in both parties: a method which all history shows leads to servile war, to massacres, to scaffolds. On the other side we have an evolution through the peaceful influences of education in its widest sense. The revolutionary method is by denunciation, leading to murder; the evolutionary method is by national, state, individual devotion to instruction, intellectual, moral and religious, leading to the uplifting of the colored race. Happily a great and noble band of men and women are giving themselves to the latter method.

Take, next, a question which to each of us is a local question: the government of our cities. Here we touch the weakest part of our system. Our cities are the rotten spots in the body politic, from which, if we are not careful, decay is to spread throughout the whole system. For cities make and spread fashions, opinions, ideals.

Simply as a matter of fact, our cities are the worst governed in the civilized world. In them there is the maximum of expenditure with the minimum of good result. The cause is not far to seek: we are making the same mistake which ruined the mediæval city republics: governing them by partisan mobs, with no proper check or balance.

Under our present system periodical revolutions are our only safeguard—revolutions tearing down officials as soon as their plundering becomes unbearable. Far better would it be to evolve truer ideas of municipal government. These ideas seem to me mainly two: first, the idea that cities are not *political* bodies, that the question in electing a mayor or alderman is not what he thinks of national questions, but what he can do as to city questions. Simple as this idea is, it is very scantily developed as yet. The other idea is that as the city is a corporation, as it has to do not at all with political interests, but with corporate interests—paving, sewage, lighting, water supply, repression of crime, care of the public health, public comfort, public instruction—those should have some control who have to pay for all these things. Why may we not evolve out of our present city system, in addition to a Board of Aldermen elected by all the citizens, a Board of Control elected by tax-payers, without whose consent no franchise should be granted and no tax levied?

Take next, progress in Education. Years ago, during my professorial days in this university, I remember hearing a Commencement address on “The Oscillatory Law of Human Progress. Such a law seems to be exemplified in our educational advance. Thirty years ago all was devotion to what was vaguely called discipline or culture. Now there seems a tendency to the opposite extreme, that all shall bend to practical pursuits. The old system culminated in almost entire stagnation at our higher institutions of learning; what this new system may culminate in is not yet certain, but in view of the great number of thinking men and women engaged in educational work, there is reason to hope that the evolutionary method may prevail,—the evolution of a system, in which discipline and culture may be obtained in connection with studies determined by the tastes and aims of students. I would say then, to all engaged in advanced courses of study, do not make such haste as to forget that you are a man or

woman: make a fruitful beginning of your development as man or woman by some good *general* studies in connection with your special studies. And to those engaged in the work of teaching, I would say, bear in mind both the great objects of education, the evolution of true men and true women, as well as the training of specialists.

Take next, evolution in Art. Prophets arise here and there. Among English-speaking peoples in recent years Ruskin is the first and last of these,—the best and worst,—the wisest and the silliest. Who can read his “Seven Lamps” without a quickened sense for what is good and great in art? Who can look over some of his later phrasemaking without seeing in it the revelation of a man made mad by satiated vanity? The lesser prophets, too, have had their way. Here, too, we have gone on by revolutions and catastrophes;—by classic temples and colonnades in painted pine;—by gothic cathedrals in stucco;—by renaissance palaces in putty and varnish;—by the Richardsonesque, the Romanesque, Byzantinesque, Bostonesque architecture, culminating in city residences made like Norman castles twenty feet wide.

And we have had as regards interiors, the Eastlake craze, the Queen Anne craze, the Japanese craze, the craze for bric-a-brac.

On the other hand, the evolutionary method would seem to be a cultivation of the simple sense of beauty, fitness, proportion, by study of what the consensus of mankind recognizes as best and highest in art;—from the Parthenon to the Maison Carrée; from the cathedral of Amiens to Gilbert Scott’s churches; from the Netherlands town halls to Sansovino’s library; from all these to the most tasteful works of modern architecture. And in sculpture, from the works of Phidias and Praxiteles and Michael Angelo to the works of Pradier, Rauch, and Crawford. And in painting, from the works of Raphael and Titian and their compeers, to the best of those which have been recently produced in France, Spain, Germany, Eng-

land, and our own country. Happy am I to bear witness here to the progress of our own country in this latter field of art. The American Fine Arts Section of the Paris Exposition eleven years ago was, as a whole, almost below contempt; the same section in the recent Exposition brought to us very high commendation from all the world. And here let me remind you that one of the two great gold medals of honor, the highest awards which can be made to any artist, was given to a young artist from your own city of Detroit, Mr. Gary Melchers. I wish to testify here, in this place and in this presence, that this young citizen of Michigan has risen far above the ordinary paths of art; far above the painting of landscapes, no matter how charming; far above the painting of *genre* pictures and boudoir pictures, no matter how pleasing. He has risen into the higher realm of the great masters of his art, the great Religious and Historical Painters. May we not hope that some man of wealth will honor himself, the University, and the state, by placing here some worthy historical representation from the hand of a man who has brought to the state and the nation such honor.

I come now to Literature: that the revolutionary method is not unknown in it will be evident to any one who reads some of the masterpieces of modern realism. But the whole field is so large that I will briefly point out one consideration which seems to me fundamental, and it is one regarding which the universities of this land might well exercise a great and beneficent influence.

There has been in the history of the United States a very interesting evolution of Literature: the results to-day are such as give some good people uneasiness, and many good people pleasure. Some lament the fact that there are no great epics now written, and that few great histories have recently appeared. On this point I have in my possession an interesting document: it is a copy of John Stuart Mill's Essays, including the Essay on De Focqueville's America, which once belonged to Henry

Thomas Buckle, the eminent historian of English Civilization and bears many marginal notes in Buckle's own hand. In the text De Tocqueville says, and Mill supports him in the statement, that in the American Republic, as in Democracies generally, we find many writers of History, but few historians,—many writers of verse, but few poets, many speakers, but few great orators; and on this both De Tocqueville and Mill conclude that democratic Republics are unfavorable to the development of the highest order of talent. But I find written in Buckle's own hand in the margin, "So it is in all countries," and this remark is like puncturing a full blown bladder.

On the other hand, some are happy over the fact that we have had a great growth of a very beautiful and wholesome light literature, with ideals not so high as some of our writers could wish, but after all, as a mass, showing a vast deal of talent with sparks of genius here and there. The simple reason why we boast no Washington Irving or Fenimore Cooper to-day, is, that we have a large number of men who are their equals as thinkers and writers, if not their superiors. Irving and Cooper came early and stood alone; these come late, and are many.

Now, as to a further evolution. The point which I select out of this vast field is of capital importance, as it seems to me; it is, the lack of a proper school of critics.

No one need fling at me the remark by which Balzac so angered St. Beuve,—that critics are men who have failed as poets. There is a school of criticism which is not open to any such attack as this; and of this school America has had some noble examples: among them was George Ripley, himself possessing noble literary characteristics, broad scholarship, keen insight, but he was at the same time genial and helpful; he was a type of what may be called the *constructive* critics. The great mass of our critics seem in recent years to differ greatly from him in aim and method, and may well be called *destructive* critics. Of these last we have on the one side the per-

functory critic,—the man who glorifies for some Periodical issued by a publishing house all the main publications of that house; and on the other, we have the vitriolic critic, who, with little knowledge of the subject involved in any given case, often indeed getting all his knowledge of the subject out of the very book which he attacks, simply butchers authors to make an American Holiday. Such are the destructive critics: they give us that vitriolic criticism which destroys all that it touches, and destroys any hope for the evolution of any serious literature as long as such criticism holds sway. A very eminent writer of History, whose success had been acknowledged both in this country and abroad, when I once asked him why he did not write another book, said, “Why should I? The first thing that I shall see after publishing it will be, an essay written by some unsuccessful Professor or smart young journalist, drawing his knowledge from my own book, and proving that I know nothing about the subject, and the public will receive this criticism as gospel.”

I insist, then, to the evolution of a better literature in this country we need, as preliminary, the evolution of a constructive criticism,—criticism based on wide and thorough knowledge, which while it condemns faults in matter or vices in manner, is alert to detect any spark of genius, or reveal any exhibition of talent in any book. When we shall have dominant this sort of criticism, there will be encouragement to writers and thinkers all along the line, and there will come new growth of literature strong and beautiful.

Take next our Constitutional and Legal Evolution. Here the field is vast, but one or two subjects may be taken as typical.

Amid so much that has been gained by catastrophes in the past; so much that is preparing the way for catastrophes in the future, are some things evidently to be accomplished by the evolutionary method. In International Law there has been for several generations, and there is

still going on, a steady evolution of righteousness, justice, and mercy. War has been rendered less and less cruel, less and less far-reaching in its evils; and now in our own times has been evolved in better form than ever before, the principle of International Arbitration. Here, happily, our own country has taken the lead. Not unlikely the future historian will point to the arbitration between our own country and Great Britain as the greatest thing in the great career of Ulysses Grant. Not unlikely there will also be presented to the admiration of the world the still further progress of arbitration at the recent Pan-American Conference. Here has been progress by evolution; the thought of Grotius developing out of the thought of Ayala and Gentilis,—the thought of Vattel out of the thought of Grotius, the thought of a whole line of thinkers in this field since, each evolving something of good out of the thoughts of his predecessors. A splendid growth, slow but strong, bearing the richest fruit of peace and mercy for mankind. I congratulate this University that it has at its head one who has given so strong an impulse in this direction here. I trust that his example may spread to the other universities on our continent.

So much for our exterior policy. Now for a moment as to our interior policy. Among the vast number of considerations which come to me in this field I will single out but one. I trust that our universities and schools are to educate more and more men who can bring the press to bear upon the process of interior evolution. Especially is it to be hoped that one great gap will be filled. Let me call your attention to the simple fact that among all the constitutional nations of the world, ours is the only one which has in its newspapers no real account of the doings of its national legislature. Under every other constitutional government on the face of the earth are newspapers which give to the people, when their legislatures are in session, careful, consecutive accounts of the doings of their representatives. Our own country,

supposed to exist by virtue of the eternal vigilance of its fifty millions of people, has for the masses nothing like any correct, consecutive summary of the doing of those who make its laws. We see now and then an account of this or that great measure, but the great mass of minor measures, what they are, who promote them, all this is mainly unknown. A comparison of the Congressional Record with the reports in our daily papers will at any moment establish the truth of this statement. The beauty of this Senator's curls, the size of that Representative's feet, a joke from this statesman, a sneer from that, these things are telegraphed immediately. The steady progress of our public affairs, wrought out by the earnest efforts of Senators and Representatives, is not telegraphed, not even written.

And when the accounts of public affairs are sent us, what a travesty upon a report to a great people of the doings of its representatives. We have long letters over Mr. Blank's "great fight" in the Senate, the "great fight" being, generally let us say, a theatrical combat over some appointment in a custom-house. We have reports, fulsome or denunciatory, of another Mr. Blank's great speech on the administration, in which it is proved that the present or late President is Antichrist.

What we need, first of all, and what I trust the next generation of statesmen and journalists will give us, are simple, fair summaries of the doings of our representatives in the national councils. Such reports would give us better ideas of political perspective. The country would be finally educated into seeing that some of the "great fights" we hear so much of, some of the "greatest efforts" of men's lives which seem to resound among the spheres, and some of the so-called great men who seem to strike the stars with their lofty heads, are but futile bubbles on the stream of our national life; while other things and other men of real greatness would be revealed. We should then come to see the greatness of such measures as the Morrill bill of

1862, which established in every state of this republic a strong centre for scientific and technical instruction, and so has made a far more lasting mark on the destinies of the nation than all the fights of all the political gladiators. Let me give one more example to illustrate my meaning. Several years since an effort was made to impeach the President of the United States. The current was strong, and most party leaders thought best to go with it. One Senator of the United States refused. William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, believing the impeachment an attempt to introduce Spanish-American politics into this country, resolutely refused to obey the mandate of his party as expressed at its state convention and at its national convention; resisted the entreaties of relatives and friends, stood firmly against the measure, and finally by his example and his vote, defeated it.

It was an example of Spartan fortitude, of Roman heroism, worthy to be chronicled by Plutarch. How was it chronicled?

It happened to me to be traveling in Germany at that time, and naturally I watched earnestly for the result of the impeachment proceedings. One morning I took up the paper containing the news, and read "the impeachment has been defeated; three Senators were bribed." And at the head of the list of the bribed Senators was the name of Fessenden. The time will come when his statue will commemorate his great example; the time will also come, I trust, when we shall have a great body of citizens who demand honest, fair, consecutive reports of the doings of our representatives, and a body of men fitly trained to make such reports,—reports as fair and full as our present chronicles of boating, base ball and lawn tennis.

Take next the general Moral Progress: I will not entangle myself in the reasonings of Buckle as to the impossibility of any progress in morals; I will try simply to draw a truth from a comparison between two concrete examples.

Just at the end of the last century, two great European States were in dire trouble: Austria had rejected the efforts of Joseph the Second, and was once more abject under a stupid despotism: Prussia had fallen away from the theory and practice of Frederick the Great, and was under the second of the only two contemptible Hohenzollerns in history. Owing to the lack of proper moral conditions in its people and government, Austria came under the heel of Napoleon at the Battle of Austerlitz: a year later Prussia came under that same iron heel at the Battle of Jena: both nations lay utterly prostrate.

It is clear to us now that the condition precedent to any uplifting of these nations was a thorough evolution of moral strength in their rulers and their people: Prussia began such an evolution, manfully, nobly, quietly. The moral system of Kant was evolved;—the categorical imperative,—the ethical idea of duty, thou shalt, thou shalt not. It took hold of the foremost men in the land; it was intused into poetry; especially into the drama by Schiller, and into song by Arndt; it was infused into prose, and especially into his addresses to the German Nation by Fichte. From scores of professors' chairs, from hundreds of pulpits, from myriads of newspapers, it was implanted in the thoughts and translated into the actions of millions of men. It gave to old men the patriotic fire of youth;—it gave to young men the steadiness of veterans. The result was the gradual abolition of the serf system in Prussia by Stein, the creation of a nation trained for war by Scharnhorst, the physical hardening and strengthening of the people by Jahn, and, at last, the great uprising, the Freedom War of 1813, the battles of Leipsic and Waterloo, the lifting up of Prussia, the coming of the Emperor William and Bismarck. And so was evolved the new German Empire. Not from mellifluous popular oratory, not from vague declamations about rights, not from hysterical appeals to feeling, but from the stern sense of moral duty extending from king to peasant.

With Austria it was different: that Empire took refuge in substitutes for morality; instead of such thinkers as Kant, developing a moral sense, there came ecclesiastical leaders who thought to save the nation by forcing all teachers, even those in mathematics and the natural sciences, to take oath that they believed in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Instead of such statesmen as Stein, working to apply moral principles to society, there came Metternich, trusting to intrigue: instead of Frederick William the Third, founding the University of Berlin, where competent men were allowed entire freedom to seek and proclaim truth as truth, there came the Austrian Emperor Francis, declaring that the sole aim of university instruction is to make pious and obedient subjects; instead of a system of instruction controlled by large-minded laymen, there came a system of instruction wholly in the hands of priests; and so, instead of the evolution of a moral sense, Austria had an evolution of new dogmas and ceremonials, and instead of the evolution of religion, an evolution of ecclesiasticism. The results are before us. With the hardiest and best soldiers in the world, Hungarians, Tyrolese, Croats, Austria has been humiliated in every campaign since,—beaten steadily in her wars with Napoleon,—beaten in the struggle with her Hungarians, and only saved from them by the humiliating intervention of Russia;—beaten by the French in 1859; beaten by the Prussians in 1866; then, after defeat in war, beaten just as completely in diplomacy, first by Cavour, then by Bismarck: driven out of Italy,—driven out of Germany,—forced to give up her sway over the Old German Empire,—forced to give up all part in the New German Empire,—forced to give up her position in the front rank of Continental States.

To sum up then, as regards the development of a national morality, Prussia has advanced by a steady evolution of the moral sense in her people, a moral sense taking shape in earnest thought, in steady work, in heroism,

in self-sacrifice, so that she has presented one of the most glorious chapters in the history of human progress. On the other hand, Austria has progressed by catastrophes, and she has progressed somewhat: she has at last granted toleration,—the sway of the priesthood over education has been diminished,—her laws have been bettered.

In these contrasting examples, and in many others which might be adduced, are lessons for us: they hint to us the value of the cultivation, the diffusion, the exaltation of the simple, strong principles of ordinary morality,—of righteousness, the righteousness which exalteth a nation. Every other sort of thing is prescribed to us as a nostrum; putting the name of God into the Constitution,—sending the Salvation Army among our people,—Ritualism,—camp-meetings,—sensation preachers, and other sorts of derishes,—Twelfth Century methods,—supposed Twentieth Century methods. But when each of these has had its little day, when all have flickered out, there still shines in the moral heaven this great truth written through all history on the life of every people, on the heart of every true man, “Righteousness exalteth a nation.” Better customs, better laws, and a better future,—to the evolution of these a primal necessity is the cultivation of the simple, strong moral sense in the child, in the youth, in the man, in the family, and in the school,—the cultivation of Righteousness. Not the adoption of this mystical view,—not the acceptance of that metaphysical statement,—but Righteousness, which means *Right-ness*, right doing, right dealing,—the cultivation of this in the individual man and in society. Let the Prophet Micah speak to us: “He hath showed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?”

Take finally, Evolution in Religion. Modern research is making us more and more familiar with the truth that there has been such an evolution from the earliest prehis-

toric beginnings of our race. It has gone through fetichism, shamanism, idolatry, monotheism, through an allegiance to tribal gods, to monotheism under one God who is over all. Not less is this evolution seen in the history of our own great religion,—an evolution through cruelty, persecution, test-oaths, political exclusions, social ostracisms, up to the sway more and more of that mildest, most beautiful form of religion, in the centre of which stands, all radiant, the Blessed Master himself.

But here too, we have in every field of religious effort the contrast between advance by revolution and advance by evolution. The modern attempt at advance by revolution is seen in a thousand horrors; in the terrible Thirty Years' War; in the religious wars of France; in the driving out of the Protestants from Austria, of the Huguenots from France; in the persecution of Catholics and Puritans in England; in the persecution of various sects in America, and to-day in the persecution of the Lutherans in the Baltic Provinces of Russia.

On the other hand, we see the advance in modern history by more steady evolution, through the efforts of Melancthon, Contarini, and Cranmer, of the Wesleys, Edwards, Bishop Butler, and Channing, of Emerson, Theodore Parker and Newman, of Arnold, Maurice, and Robertson;—working indeed apparently at cross purposes, but each leaving something for the enrichment of the world, and all together, no matter what their purpose, enforcing more and more upon the world the idea that dogmas and metaphysics are but the mere husks and rinds enclosing the precious kernel of truth.

Here, too, are practical lessons: in the attempts at religious progress by revolution, we find as in other fields the combination of ultra conservatives and ultra radicals; the former bent on enforcing the idea that with them all truth is at last reached,—that all progress must now stop,—that in them the world has not merely the latest, but the last, growth of religion, and that therefore there

shall be no more growth. And on the other hand, we have their worst enemies, and at the same time their best allies for evil, the wild schemers and dreamers, the scoffers, men treading on all that their fellows hold sacred, all screaming and denouncing, insisting on the immediate establishment or abolition of this or that doctrine as the panacea for all evils, insisting indeed that fruit shall be plucked on the day when the tree is planted. Between the bigotry of extreme conservatism and extreme radicalism, there is generally little or nothing to choose. The efforts of extreme conservatives produce unhealthy reactions: the efforts of extreme radicals too frequently produce, prematurely, a vacuum sure to be filled by some new belief more absurd than the old.

While these ultraists on either hand seem bent on progress by catastrophe, it is encouraging that there are those who are laboring for a more quiet, beautiful, and effective evolution of religious thought and effort;—following the blessed example of the Master, going about doing good: like Him careless of dogmas, promoting devotion to truth as truth, casting aside more and more the mere husks and rinds of religious truth, developing more and more the ethical contents of those forms of religion in which they find themselves, caring little for theories as to the origin of evil, devoting themselves to the evolution of good. If we have on one side a few notorious clerical charlatans and mountebanks, disgusting right thinking people by sensation methods, bringing discredit on Christianity by rank untruth in their representations regarding science, forcing doubts into the minds of thinking young men, who naturally distrust a system which seems to require such defenders,—we have on the other side vast numbers of Christian ministers and laymen under various creeds and confessions, and at times under no creed or confession, leading simple and beautiful lives, preaching, doubtless with many limitations and some errors, great vitalizing truths, devoting themselves more and more to the essentials of religion.

Years ago this was enforced upon me as I read above the door of a mediæval hospital the inscription written there by its founder: "Christo in pauperibus suis," and in these latter days this simple truth has again come home to me as I have seen young men and young women devoting their lives in the same Blessed Name to the service of paupers in the North, and freedmen in the South.

What should be the course of young men going forth from a University like this into this most beautiful of all fields? I would say, let there be neither scoffing on one side, nor the holding of a brief for sectarian dogmas on the other: nothing is so profitless to truth as scoffing, nothing so injurious to Christianity as making special pleas for dogmas in the pulpit,—as a lawyer pleads for his case in court.

As regards the presentation of truth, there should be the effort never to promote revolutions in religion save in the direst extremity; but the effort should be to bring one's work into that line of thoughtful, honest, peaceful evolution which in the long run is infinitely the most effective.

Let then those of you who would work for good on this land and time, under whatever creed, no matter under what ritual, work in that great evolutionary process, which has as its practical rule the great words of Micah, and as its ideal the blessed Sermon on the Mount, the first commandment and the second which is like unto it, and the definition of "pure religion and undefiled" by St. James.

I am aware that there are those who will say that there is danger here of our degenerating into a gospel of sloth, into mere *laissez faire*, into easy-going optimism, to be followed by hopeless pessimism; no mistake could be greater. The steady evolution of humanity in all these vast and various fields demands at times struggles, and even hard fighting; but it also demands, and far more constantly, the development of the great silent forces

which are frequently the most powerful forces. Volcanoes explode, earthquakes come and go, but the steady power of gravitation never ceases. While battles must be fought, at times with great din and suffering, truths must be discovered, developed and spread.

And here, too, let me dwell briefly upon the office of the greater universities, and especially of this University. How vividly, as I stand in this place and in this presence, do there come back to me memories of my early days here as a professor—days when the fearful civil war was drawing on. I saw the noblest of my students at that time lay down their precious opportunities here—opportunities which some of them had sacrificed years of labor to obtain—and go forth to the battle for freedom and for the nation; alas, how many of them “the unreturning brave!” How beautiful come back to me the memories of Frederick Arn, the nature sweet, though strong, thorough in scholarship, refined in thought, noble in purpose; memories of Morse and Nye, less gentle but not less determined, going forth obedient to high purpose, but never to return; memories also of Farnsworth, Jewett and Carpenter, who fell in the mighty struggle at Gettysburg—memories of Walker, Starr, Hurd, Nelson, Bingham, McConnell and many others equally noble and devoted. And then that other splendid list of youth who also gave themselves, risking all, but who came back in triumph. As I recall all these, there comes to me an antidote against any tendency to hopeless pessimism or easy-going optimism. For while I hope that more and more there is to be an evolution of right reason in human affairs, I see that revolution may also lift humanity, may give it devotion, self-sacrifice and heroism, the most precious of national possessions.

Then I recall here, in those same days, forces which made for more peaceful evolution: President Henry Philip Tappan, infusing by his great powers of thought into multitudes of young men an influence in behalf of righteousness, of patriotism, of all that is true and beau-

tiful and good; and I also recall one of the two most lovely souls of men I have ever known, Professor Henry Simmons Frieze; the depth of his culture, the breadth of his view, the height of his aspiration, the strength of his intellect, the genius of his attainments in one of the two greatest arts which have blessed men, that greatness of mind and heart and soul which underlay all, permeated all, overarched all.

And I might recall others of my colleagues—Palmer, Sager, Watson—who labored to make the world better, and succeeded.

Those youth, those heroes who remain to me ever young, were called upon to do their part in a revolution, and they wrought well. Those older men were called upon to work in the progress of a more quiet evolution; they too wrought well. Thousands on thousands of good men throughout our country have in their minds and hearts and souls good growths from germs which these men planted.

Here, then, gentlemen and ladies of the graduating class, in these examples is the enforcement of the doctrine I would lay before you to-day. Some of you are fitted to work in the more quiet and regular evolution of a better future in various fields—fitted to discover truth, to unveil beauty, to develop goodness. Some are to strive in the more stormy fields, by more revolutionary methods, in the open combat against wrong, in the open wrestle with unreason, in the open battle against oppression, in courts, in legislatures, in councils, in the pulpit, in the forum, in the newspaper. My last word to both classes is: Do not prostitute your genius or talents; be true to yourselves, be true to your University, be true to your country, be true to humanity.