

THE SIXTY-EIGHTH COMMENCEMENT

The Sixty-eighth Annual Commencement took place the morning of Thursday, June 27. Following the bugle call at 8:15 and the ceremony of hoisting the flag, the Commencement procession formed in a similar manner to that of the preceding day. Again, just as the buglers sounded the customary reveille before the exercises began, the clock struck ten from the Library tower. Following the invocation by the Right Reverend Bishop E. D. Kelly, the Commencement address was delivered by Professor Jeremiah W. Jenks, '78, LL.D. '03. He spoke on "The Coming Citizenship" as follows:

The exercises of the morning are held primarily for the young men and young women who today first formally commence their tasks as members of the commonwealth.

I am to speak in behalf of our loved Alma Mater, the great State University that holds it her prime duty to fit her sons and her daughters for their responsibilities as citizens. I have therefore thought it fitting to choose as the topic of the hour "The Coming Citizenship."

These days of political turmoil and strife are not only interesting, exciting. They are portentous or hopeful with issues that are vital. As citizens we should, if possible, avoid mistakes. If we would form sound judgments, we must look closely into fundamental principles of society and of life, for politics is an outgrowth of deeper causes.

To look ahead and judge the coming citizenship, we must note the signs of the times in various fields. I am not speaking only, or particularly, of the present political campaign. It would not be fitting on this auspicious day when so many of you are to enter the path of your life's activity, to attempt to stir a momentary enthusiasm for any temporary candidate or any temporary



THE COMMENCEMENT ORATOR JEREMIAH W. JENKS '78, PRESIDENT HUTCHINS, AND DEAN COOLEY, MARSHAL OF THE DAY

cause Rather is it fitting to point out the signs by which we may judge the direction in which our State is moving, and indicate the principles by which we may for a longer time wisely guide our acts as citizens, for an obligation that we must not ignore rests upon each of us to do his part as a member of the community.

Our Country as a political body, the State, is simply all of us—the citizens. Our government is merely our grand committee to formulate and do our bidding in political matters in accordance with the rules laid down for guidance by ourselves and our fathers.

And we as citizens are still men and women with our various interests, our hopes, our fears, our desires, our purposes. But with all this variety each man's nature is one. Each man's life is a unit. Here and there, perchance, may be found a double character, a Mr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: but such a being is abnormal, a fit subject for the alienist. He is not a man. The character of man is the same, and ought to be the same, in all his various activities,—economic, social, religious, political.

If we find, then, the trend of men's views in religion, in morals, in education, in business, we may be sure that we can judge the drift of their political thinking;

and we shall not be misled either by any chance outburst of the day's enthusiasm or by any halting fear of a forward movement.

What are some of these signs of the times?

Some two years ago a group of University seniors asked me to meet them for a Sunday evening talk. The subject was to be of my choosing. Acting on the example of a fellow economist in another university, this suggestion was made as a basis for our talk. Each person present was to assume that he believed in the traditional, old-fashioned doctrine of an immediate formal judgment after death, which should determine the future happiness or despair of human souls. Each was to imagine that he was St. Peter, the Judge. Then he was to consider how those coming before him for judgment could be asked two questions so all-searching, so ethically fundamental that the answers would enable him to decide justly the fate of the soul newly freed from the fetters of the body.

Each student present was given five minutes to formulate and put in writing his two questions. The papers were then gathered and classified. To my great surprise out of some twenty-five students, not goody-goody men, but the leading athletes, editors, managers, the prominent strong men in all fields of activity of the senior class, all but three had in substance asked the same two questions. The three exceptions had apparently been influenced by some religious bias. They asked such questions as, Have you, in your earthly career, followed the teachings of the Bible? or, Did you lead the life of a Christian? But with these exceptions, all framed, in substance, these questions:

(1) Were you in life absolutely square with others and with yourself?

(2) Did you on earth live for yourself or for others, for the community?

These questions, though not technically religious, in reality do sum up in cogent form the fundamental conceptions of Christianity and it is a most hopeful indication of the trend of thought of the coming citizens that a group of young men of the most varied interests and tastes and habits should, without conference, within five minutes have agreed on these fundamental principles: truthfulness, clear-sighted judgment of self, and unselfish regard for others and for the public, as the supreme tests of a good life. The unanimity and promptness of the replies show them to be formulated life principles in the student body of the upper class. You would doubtless find it so among yourselves. It is in the life of the time.

These heart-searching thoughts to these students were religious in character, but are they not equally valuable as tests for citizenship? We too often look upon the act of voting as the primary right and duty of the citizen, but has not citizenship to do with practically all the fundamentals of life? When Miss Stone was captured by Bulgarian brigands in 1901, the government of the United States did not inquire whether Miss Stone was a voter; she was an American citizen entitled to protection. Every child born into American citizenship has its rights and its duties prescribed long before the passing years have given it the right and the duty of exercising a direct influence upon government by voting. A few weeks ago one of America's best known multimillionaires waited calmly, heroically to meet his fate on the sinking Titanic. The following week the papers discussed the legal rights of even his unborn child cared for by the laws of the state and nation.

Citizenship is not a matter of light concern, touching only an act or two a year. Citizenship has that "high seriousness" which Matthew Arnold says forms the substance of all of the best and noblest poetry. Citizenship touches the deep things of life,—religion, morals and business, and finally politics as the reflection or the outgrowth of all these. The statesman is the man who foresees, uses, guides the forces upon which all these ideals and practical activities of life are based, in order to bring about through legislation and administration the welfare of the people; and the people's belief in what really constitutes their welfare,—religious, moral, economic, gives the statesman his power, and that belief is primarily the moving force in guiding the affairs of state. In the vegetable and animal kingdoms the survival of the species seems to be the blind aim which guides the instincts and habits and lives of the individuals, in society, not only the survival of the tribe or of the state, but likewise the welfare of the members of society and of the citizens are in

the long run the goal toward which society and government is striving, and the purpose toward the attainment of which statesmen bend their efforts. In all the great fields of human thought and action, religion, morals, business, politics, the same characteristics of human thought manifest themselves in different countries, and observation of the direction of human thought in these fields shows clearly the direction in which the state is driving. Thus can we judge the coming citizenship.

Religion. In all great religions that have shaped on a large scale the welfare of humanity, the ideas of sincerity and of unselfish service, for the salvation or betterment of humanity, and this through the acts of individuals, have been dominant. When a few weeks ago Yuan Shih-Kai, the President of the new China, sent his greetings to a gathering of Christian missionaries expressing the good-will of his government and of his people toward those who had striven unselfishly for the welfare of humanity and of his people he was expressing the spirit of the great Confucius whose teachings for five and twenty centuries have contributed so much politically as well as religiously to the welfare of the human race. "There were four things," say the Confucian Analects, "which the Master taught: letters, ethics, devotion of soul and truthfulness." "Tsze-Chang having asked how virtue was to be exalted and delusions to be discovered, the Master said: Hold faithfulness and sincerity as first principles and be moving continually to what is right. This is the way to exalt one's virtue."

In Buddhism a like lesson is taught. Sakyamuni, the Buddha, son of the king, left his sleeping wife and babe, abandoned family and friends and wealth and power to become a homeless wanderer, a penniless seeker after truth, in the same spirit of devotion to the welfare of others, in the same belief that only through the self-forgetful act of an individual could the way of rest and peace for suffering humanity be found. And when his search was ended and he believed that he had found the way, the teachings by which his hundreds of millions of followers are led to acquire merit for the peace of their souls, inculcate the same principles of truthfulness and unselfish sacrifice to elevate humanity.

The ancient Hebrew prophets taught in no less certain way the same fundamental principles as regards the spirit which must guide the acts of the true servant of Jehovah.

In Christianity, in addition to the purpose and the aim of religious teaching, Jesus gives us more clearly than any other of the founders of the great world religions the method by which these principles worked out in human character tend to bring about the Kingdom of God on earth, the true Republic of Freedom. The Founder of the Christian religion was a great Personality of marvellous independence of judgment, an iconoclast ready to assume the responsibility of breaking the letter of the law despite the prejudice and opposition of his fellows, in order that the spirit of the law might be upheld. The underlying principles of his life and his teachings, summed up in words of thought and action, seem to be substantially identical with the fundamental principles of popular self-government, thus indicating again that the field of politics and that of religion, though different in their methods of cultivation, may often and ought always to produce like harvests. Last week in Chicago progressives and conservatives in politics wrestled for the prize of leadership. This week a like contest is waging in Baltimore.* Last week I saw a like progressive versus conservative contest in a religious matter, the question of the interpretation of the Scriptures. Such questions, too, rouse passions not easily quieted. In times past they often led to murderous war. In the religious realm, we never find the Founder of Christianity hesitating to assume as an individual the responsibility for his own teachings and his own acts. Must not the citizen in the coming democracy be ready to stand alone, not dictated to by the leader of his faction but himself bearing the responsibility of his acts? In so doing, it is essential that he do his own independent thinking, and reach his own conclusions after due deliberation. Such a citizen will, of course, render obedience to the laws made by himself and his fellows with the purpose of promoting the welfare of his fellow men.

*June 27, 1912, the Democratic nominating convention was in session.

A few weeks ago I was attending a dinner in one of the rooms of a great modern church. A man sitting by my side called my attention to the fact that throughout the winter months that room had been used for the playing of basket ball by the young men and boys of the church in order that their physical welfare might be cared for in suitable surroundings. Everywhere in the Young Men's Christian Association buildings and in their activities, we find emphasized the three-fold nature of man. Building a man's body into health is closely related to developing his mental strength and to giving tone to his moral and religious fibre. Those of us who followed the newspapers during the winter and early spring and noted the activities of those who were guiding the Men and Religion Movement, could not have failed to see that the man's "job" promoted by the leaders of that remarkable movement was nothing less than the development of all round citizenship in the best sense of that word, the building up of men to promote the welfare of their fellow men in the Community and in the State. This is the new activity in religion that points toward the coming citizenship.

Morals. The morals of a people are only their customs fixed in their minds as acts that are right as distinguished from those that are wrong. A comparative study of the morals of different nations shows that the question of the right or wrong of a specific act has ultimately been settled for each tribe or people by their belief in its effect upon the public welfare. In earlier stages of society, property was generally common, so that theft was practically an impossibility. Polygamy was usual and right; under monogamy the tribe would have perished. The methods of preparation and the use of food and drink, the kinds of clothing, of shelter, of manners, of communication, gradually grew up in different nations. Later they were fixed by the ruler, often under taboo or as the commands of the gods; or else in some other way they were given a religious sanction.

As the centuries passed, the customs and the kinds of sanction changed until now the individual does not accept without question the dictum of the ruler or the priest. He seeks his own enjoyment, his own welfare. Now it is not necessarily the ruler who sets the fashion, though in monarchies he often does. Any one in our country is the leader who can make himself heard and can secure the acceptance of his views. Writers on our customs or habits of living or morals, including matters of marriage and divorce, of the treatment of the sick, of the modes of entertainment, as well as those on questions of clothes and manners, say now almost what they please. It may be that if they speak too contrary to custom they may be looked at askance, but, if they seem sincere, they will be listened to. Often their suggestions will be followed. What will be the outcome of the present trend toward individual thinking on morals and of the willingness of the individual to accept the responsibility for his thoughts and acts, is not yet seen. But this is sure. It will be in each nation what most people think is best for all the people. Never before perhaps, even in the days of the noblest civilization of Greece or Rome, have there been so few preconceived views of the right and wrong of specific acts as established by tradition. We cannot forget the pathetic scene of the death of Socrates in the Crito of Plato. It was in the wonderful age of Pericles that the great moral philosopher was forced to drink the hemlock because he dared to think and to speak his thoughts; and we cannot forget that in the days of the Caesars Christians were thrown to the wild beasts for religion's sake.

Rarely if ever before has there been so great tolerance of individual thinking on social questions as now; seldom has each person been so free to seek his own happiness in the way that seems to him best so long as such search for individual happiness seems likewise to promote or even only not to hinder the happiness of all. Indeed so long as the expression of individuality seems to be unselfish or public-spirited, it is easy for it to become fashionable and readily followed by all. To take the extreme example, note the moral attitude today as contrasted with only a score of years ago toward the question of the Social Evil, where the public is rapidly coming to put less blame upon the woman, but rather to note the causes economic and social that have led her away, the emphasis being placed not upon sin or guilt and penitence, but upon possible changes in environment or law that shall improve

conditions. We are coming more and more in matters of morals to permit each to think and act for himself so long as his act is sincere and unselfish. Although we have not yet reached that goal, the trend of modern thought and action is so strong in that direction, that eventually perhaps each may think independently without condemnation so long as he takes the responsibility for his acts; and so long as his motive is good and his acts not contrary to the interest of all he may live his own life whatever it be without public reproach. The bearing of this attitude whether you consider it praiseworthy tolerance or blameworthy laxity, upon the political thought of our time cannot be ignored.

Education. As society is made up of us all and as in the modern democratic state each of us is playing a more important part than heretofore, it is natural that we should lay continually increasing emphasis upon education. We feel that we must train our rulers. But the progress of democracy has brought about a noteworthy change in the methods of education. In the great University of Cairo today where the customs and religion of the Mohammedan despot still lingers, though rapidly vanishing in the field of government, we may still see hundreds of students committing to memory the Koran by rote, with the teacher making little or no attempt to inculcate the meaning of the teachings of his Mohammedan Bible. Under the theory of despotic government in China in the earlier days, the teachers with the profoundest respect and love for learning taught the children in like manner merely to memorize first sounds and afterward the thoughts of their great religious teachers. The commentaries on these teachings were not suggestions as to the way in which they should be applied in new and changed conditions, but rather a scholastic effort to see what those words might in themselves mean. A reverence for the views of the ancients rather than care for the welfare of the moderns was the key-note of interpretation and of teaching. But with us today our philosophers of teaching lay emphasis first upon the development of individual thinking power, and second upon the social purpose of the individual. In consequence, we are creating in our schools a people of thinkers, it may be iconoclasts, persons ready to overthrow the old traditions, but nevertheless people of power, and far more important still, people who in the long run will have an unselfish social aim.

Industry. Many of our magazine writers today seem to assume that the field of industry is quite distinct from the field of morals or that of religion, and that the relation of industry to government is anything but moral or religious. Consider, however, whether these same principles that affect individual action in the fields of religion or morals or education do not play a like part in the realm of business. Since the growth of our great industrial combinations many have feared that the personal initiative of business men will be crushed; that almost all men will be merely hired servants, working under orders; that machines will replace men, and that where men work with machines they will be so controlled by machine conditions that their manhood will be dwarfed. It has seemed also to be common opinion that the aim social betterment is seldom found in the business man, but that economic selfishness alone is the dominant force in business. It is best, however, to probe these beliefs somewhat deeply. In part they are true. So far the evil must be fought relentlessly. Largely they are mistaken. Doubtless in industry as in every field of endeavor, the leaders of first rank are few, but that has always been so. That will always be so. Men of really first quality are extremely rare, whether the test be weakness or ability, wickedness or goodness. We are most of us mediocre. Let us acknowledge it. But what are the chances to rise? How often and how far? That is the prime consideration.

Never has there been such an opportunity for a man of capacity as now. Never has there been so fierce competition among men of genius, and the successful man in business now attains rewards far beyond those ever possible before. The former village patriarch has now become a national character. The former small city merchant is now an international figure. The telephone, telegraph, railroads, the ocean liners have in the field of business annihilated distance so that there is no limit to the range of a person's influence; his attainment is bounded only by his range of conception. Does that not stimulate individuality?

Twenty years ago when we first heard of \$100,000,000 corporations, it was often said that the limitations of the human intellect would set bounds to the growth of corporations; that no one man could well direct the work of so gigantic an enterprise. But the principles of business organization enable a man easily to grasp as a whole the great branches of his business and details are readily delegated to subordinates. Corporations with a capital of \$100,000,000 are already almost numerous; and the head of a 1000 million dollar business has time, after his work is well and efficiently done to be President of an Automobile Association and to preside at functions of Women's Clubs. The range of individual action and influence has enormously increased with the improved methods of communications which are breaking barriers down.

The fact is often overlooked, too, that the giant trusts are the normal outgrowth of the competition of individuals. Almost without exception it is fierceness of competition that has led to combination. Whenever separate companies combine into one, the best leader takes the headship, and his position is higher than any that existed before. But within the great establishment there are many sub-divisions, each division has its head, and the independent judgment of the head of a department counts now for more in many cases than did in former years the judgment of the president of a separate establishment. The largest organizations offer the highest prizes for individual initiative on the part of their employees. Competition among superintendents of different establishments within a combination is both fiercer and more intelligent than that among independent establishments. For the records are kept so accurately that each man knows exactly where he fails and where he succeeds, and moreover each one knows that upon his success depends his advancement. Individuality is not stifled by big business. It is often stimulated. Are the trusts then really undemocratic? Some few of the leaders are doubtless despotic in desire and even at times in intent and act. But the methods of business, the original industry duly controlled as it may be, will give to the enterprising young man and to the people alike, advantages not known before. Moreover, much of the most thoughtful care for workmen, in spite of notable exceptions, is today shown by the largest industries.

At no period in the world's history before has there been so high efficiency in the management of business, and this saving of industrial energy leading to the creation of more wealth, means in the long run shorter hours, better wages, improved standards of living for the working men, progress in society as a whole. Whatever the present evils of the distribution of wealth may be, and they are many, though lessening, nothing can be more certain than that advance in general comfort must be and will be preceded by greater production of wealth; and that will come through organization duly controlled.

Among the working men the conditions, while not the same, are even more encouraging. The great labor organizations are looking, to be sure, for their own welfare as are the wage earning class, but the numbers of the wage earners are so large that this struggle for their class is largely a struggle for others. The spirit is generally not that of individual selfishness but of class self-interest promoted often by individual sacrifice. If Gompers and Mitchell and Morrison spend months in jail, as the Court decrees, no one who knows them will doubt that their sacrifice is an unselfish one, whether or not he approves their judgment regarding methods of action. Not yet have we discovered the means by which the most efficient skill of the individual can become the highest blessing for all; but the struggle for the improvement of the welfare of one's group is distinctly in a nobler spirit than the struggle merely for one's own gain; and the trend is in the right direction. The spirit of co-operation is dominant even though the class struggle remains. When the intelligent knowledge of all business conditions is widely enough extended, the spirit of co-operation will include all of society and we shall have the feeling of individual responsibility, of independent thinking and judgment, of growing skill combined with the sentiment of social service in the industrial field as fully developed as in the field of morals.

Politics. How do all these conditions, industrial, moral, religious, affect politics? What is the coming citizenship to be? The state is society, all of us, organized for the purpose of promoting the welfare of all, through the enforcement of rules made by all in the interest of all. The acts of government differ from the acts of other social organizations, those active in the fields of religion, of business, of education, in that Government, if necessary, employ compulsion, force. The state is all of us active and compelling action for the interests of all. But the individual citizen in the field of government is the same man who is active in religion, in morals, in business. His nature is not changed. Whatever characteristics are found in the other fields will be found in the realm of politics. The coming citizen—and he is already here in large and rapidly growing numbers—will be a personality bearing responsibility readily and willingly, thinking independently, a man unafraid of the new, because, self-reliant, he has thought out the new, basing his judgment on the experiences of the old. The coming citizen will demand the power to choose, and he will readily take the responsibility for his acts. We may count on the growth of the rule of the citizens. They will not be denied. He who stands in the way will be overthrown.

But the coming citizen, also, in the fullness of time will vote and rule not selfishly, because the spirit of the times is becoming more and more unselfish in all ranks of society. He will vote and rule in the interests of all. We may grant that many men are selfish, men in high office still abuse their powers. But this abuse is seen far less often than thirty years ago. The time has already long passed, in any English speaking country at least, where corrupt or self-seeking acts of public officials can be done openly. No one recognizes any right to rule, except that granted by the people in their own interest. And they can give to any man or refuse to any man that privilege at their will.

But clearly the average citizen will not be able to do everything himself. In many fields of endeavor he must choose an expert to do much of his work for him; and he will hold him responsible for results. No sensible man today, untrained in the professions, wishes to be his own lawyer, to act as his own physician, to build his own bridges, to plan his own buildings. It is the untrained, unthinking man who uses patent panaceas to cure his physical ills, or who enters upon important business contracts without consulting a lawyer. But the framing of laws that are to shape the welfare of society, the putting of them into effect, their interpretation, is work demanding a still higher degree of skill, inasmuch as they depend to a still greater extent upon the infinite variety of human motive and the variability of human feeling.

How far can the citizens be trusted to act for themselves? How far should they rely upon experts or representatives to guide their actions? Can this question be answered in a word for all states and circumstances? Must this not depend entirely upon the locality and the conditions existing therein, on the one hand, and on the other upon the nature of the question at issue? Self-government is often not so largely a matter of knowledge as a matter of character. The wise man fit for the modern citizenship, whose interests are bound up with the welfare of society, which in itself is composed of innumerable citizens, various and shifting views, and conflicting interests, must be a man of patience, with self-restraint, with wisdom,—a man ready to compromise with the views of others, so long as those views are honest, one who believes that others have rights equal to his own and who is willing to tolerate opinions divergent from his. Many nations and many peoples have not yet attained this spirit needed for the right self-government. We must aim to get our people trained in all these virtues; they are even more essential than knowledge. Nowhere else in the world, however, have people had so long or so successful experience in self-government as in the United States and Great Britain and her English-speaking colonies. Our people in most parts of our country have attained these qualities to so great an extent that they can be trusted to settle many questions for themselves.

But what type of question may or can the people settle without the aid of experts? Many subjects from their nature are so complicated that the average business man whose time must be chiefly given to his own personal affairs cannot hope to settle

them. He ought not even to venture an independent judgment upon them any more than upon a question of technical law or of surgery. Questions of monetary policy, of methods of taxation, of the regulation of corporations are far more complicated than ordinary questions of business or of science. Such matters should be referred to experts who should recommend and ultimately in effect through the people's representatives make, interpret and administer the laws. The people will judge the results and approve or condemn the lawmaker or administrator. And yet elections are often settled and legislative decrees are issued by men not competent fully to understand the bearing of their acts. The people must take the consequences until they learn to choose aright. And though the consequences may be harmful for a time, they will not be ruinous or irreparable. The citizens in due time will learn. They know now whom they do trust. They will gradually learn who is worthy of trust. If they are willing, it is better for them to choose an agent who knows, than to try to settle such technical questions themselves.

But, on the far more important questions, the really fundamental questions of rights and duties, the people not merely ought themselves to decide; they alone can decide, for their wishes in themselves when deliberate make their decisions right. The course of history, too, shows that as civilization has developed, the voice of the people on such matters has proved to be right. Shall a country be slave or free? Shall a man's domicile be held free from invasion? In what way shall a people select its rulers? What degree of power shall be placed in the ruler's hands? All these fundamental questions of governmental rights and governmental duties can be most wisely settled by the people themselves. Such questions are simple, direct, require no technical knowledge, no technical training. They require only honesty of purpose, toleration for the rights of one's neighbors, readiness when opinions conflict to compromise on what will most nearly meet the wishes of all, willingness to accept the judgment of the majority. On such questions the people's rule should be direct.

This test is a fair one to apply to the great questions of the day. If our constitutions have been properly drawn, they have only with matters fundamental to government. The right of trial by jury, of habeas corpus, of property, of free assemblage, election of senators by the people, or a single term for President, or the appointment of judges, fundamental as they are, touch only simple questions suitable for citizens to vote upon directly. Our forms of government are and should be what the people wish. The way in which the people shall change these forms of government to meet the changing conditions of the times is not a complex matter. These are all simple questions, though of the profoundest significance. The question whether life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness shall be guarded against despotic usurpation is simple. The common man can understand and answer it, though it is the most profound question of government. Regarding such questions what ever the people wish, when they really see the issue, is right.

In all fields of human action, as we have seen, the individual has been growing more independent in his judgment, has become continually more ready to bear responsibility, and fortunately also, in spite of special exceptions, is becoming more willing to recognize the rights of others and to care for the welfare of all. Whether we wish it or not, as now he chooses his religion, the coming citizen will determine for himself what laws he will pass upon directly, what ones he will leave to legislatures to formulate, and to the courts to interpret.

All of our constitutions at the present day provide methods for their own amendment. Such amendments are proposed by legislators, by constitutional conventions, by petition. Whatever the people themselves consider fundamental they put in the constitutions at their will. If they are not discriminating and place in the constitutions matters of temporary, changing interest, such as savings bank laws or forestry laws the progress of society is likely to be blocked by the difficulty of amendment. That they will learn by experience. If, on the other hand, they place in the constitutions only matters really fundamental that have to do only with the form of government or with the rights of citizens, much more can wisely be left to the legislatures and the courts.

As, however, the people grow in intelligent knowledge of social conditions, they may wisely take more into their own hands and leave less to the experts whom they choose. As the people themselves make their constitutions, it is for them to say how and when they shall be amended. If a legislature chosen by the people acting in accord with the will of the people passes a law that the courts declare unconstitutional, the people ultimately will surely decide whether or not they wish the constitution amended so as to carry out their will. The declaration of a court that an act is unconstitutional is not hostile to the people's rights. It merely refers the matter back to the people to decide whether on second thought they wish to insist upon their will as expressed in the law, or whether they will abide by their earlier judgment as expressed in the constitution. If they wish to move with the changing times and insist upon their law, thus amending the constitution, surely they are acting in the spirit of today, and that would be a recall of a judicial decision.

As in the fields of religion and morals and business, so also in the field of politics we must expect more innovations as the people become better trained and more self-reliant. We must expect the progress of the future to be more rapid than that of the past. We must urge changes in legal methods and in legal regulations to come more quickly with the more rapid changes in business methods and with the growing spirit of independence and tolerance in the fields of morals and religion.

What, then, is our duty as citizens? What, then, is your duty, young men and women just entering upon the field of the citizen's active life? The trend of the times *demand*s a greater degree of individuality, of independence, but more and always more it demands an unselfish social aim. You as the coming citizens, should so train yourselves that you will know better when to rely upon the judgment of experts, when to rely upon your own individual judgment. If you see clearly the public welfare, if you are unselfish in your desires you can do your duty. The better you are educated and the more wisely you can think, the more self-reliant you should be, and the more careful in your selection of experts. Above all, on account of the high responsibility that goes with the privilege of the education that has come to you through the provisions made by this great State in this loved University, our ALMA MATER, you should be unselfish and patriotic in your determination to serve, and, if need be, to sacrifice your personal interests and yourself for the public good. Sacrifice is the highest test of good citizenship.

After the exercises, degrees were granted the seniors as follows:

Department of Literature, Science and the Arts.

Bachelor of Science	35
Bachelor of Arts	339
Master of Science (in Forestry)	4
Master of Science	4
Master of Arts	30
Doctor of Philosophy	6

Department of Engineering.

Bachelor of Science (in Architecture)	3
Bachelor of Science (in Engineering)	24
Bachelor of Architectural Engineering	2
Bachelor of Architecture	5
Bachelor of Marine Engineering	6
Bachelor of Chemical Engineering	24
Bachelor of Electrical Engineering	38
Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering	43
Bachelor of Civil Engineering	26
Bachelor of Science (in Electrical Engineering)	1
Bachelor of Science (in Mechanical Engineering)	1