

## THE SEVENTY-FIFTH COMMENCEMENT

The graduation Exercises of the seventy-fifth class to receive degrees from the University were held in Hill Auditorium, Thursday morning, June 26. The weather was unusually cool and pleasant and never had this typically academic and dignified occasion appeared more impressive. The various classes formed at their respective stations and the long line of University officials, Faculties, and seniors was underway in good time so that everyone was seated in Hill Auditorium ten minutes before the appointed hour.

Following the invocation by the Reverend John Mason Wells, Dean Frederick Keppel, of Columbia University, now Third Assistant Secretary of War, delivered the Commencement Address. Dean Keppel's address entitled "What Have We Learned?" was as follows:

I am going to try to select three or four general fields in which we Americans have had a chance to learn lessons of permanent value as the result of our war experience. Then I shall try to apply these to what seems to me the most typical cross section of the best in American life, a great American university; and finally, I shall try to apply them to the situation which faces you young men and women of the graduating class as you step out to take your places in the world. And I'm going to look deliberately on the bright side. There are troubles enough in the world to worry and depress us, and we have to face them, but let us face them with the confidence that is justified by the revelations of human endurance, human courage and human accomplishment that it has been our privilege to witness within the lifetime of this academic generation.

What have we learned? In the first place, we have learned that as a nation we possess the power to see a big job through, and we possess it because we have the qualities of youth—enthusiasm, learning capacity, energy, elasticity, initiative—the pioneering spirit. We have the short-comings of youth also—impatience, superficiality, improvidence, cock-sureness—but when the test came we strengthened our virtues and to a large extent overcame our failings.

The various stocks that have come to our shores have come as successive waves of pioneers, of men to whom new and unfamiliar conditions served as an incentive rather than a discouragement.

What single group made the finest impression in the great war? I think we will agree that it was the American dough-boy. As one saw him in France he was absolutely youth incarnate, and he is a cross section of our complex population. If anyone still doubts that all of these stocks have been willing to do their share, even at the risk or cost of life, let him read any of the lists of battle casualties or the lists of honors for heroic conduct and he will have the best kind of proof. Nearly one-fourth of our drafted men couldn't speak and write English when they entered the Army.

In spite of a number of unsightly pieces of slag, which are either floating on the surface or have sunk to the bottom, the great national melting pot has evidently done its work well. The pieces of slag, though considerable numerically and abominable individually, are negligible in proportion to the total.

Our heterogeneous immigration, our enormous national resources, which have tempted us to live on capital rather than on interest, our prosperity, have made us neither fat nor flabby. We now know that as a people we don't really care about money or the money game if we are shown some other game better worth playing; that selfishness and luxury drop away as if by magic when they interfere with the keener satisfactions of giving one's self. Even for us stay-at-homes, the Liberty Loan people, Mr. Hoover, the Red Cross and other welfare workers, were on hand to show us how to play the better game. I don't need to remind you of the details, and in spite of human grumbling and talk of sacrifice, we all know that in the bottom of our hearts we enjoyed the process.

In the second place, we have learned that to see the job through we need all of the nation, men and women, not merely the profession of arms and the mysterious powers of finance—we need all of everyone. We need them not as individuals but as a team, and we have learned that we can develop team play.

Our easiest jobs were the raising of our men and our money; our hardest, the molding of the whole into an organic unity. Just as our young men by the millions took their place in the line when the bugle blew, older men by the tens of thousands left their private affairs to get along as best they might, and regardless of political affiliations or personal convenience, found place for themselves in the administrative army. And they were ably seconded by the women. Hundreds of men in key positions have gladly borne witness to the share which their secretaries and other women associates played in bringing about the needed results.

The first days of the war were days of whirling confusion, colored by glowing forecasts. Then followed months of experimentation, by trial and error, of hope deferred by long delays, of well meant but none the less embarrassing internal rivalries, of sudden spurts. Later came the days of last autumn, when the whole great machine was throbbing rhythmically and steadily, with only a minor "knock" here and there—a sure indication to the watchful enemy, who had had more than a taste of what the machine could produce, that the game was up; and finally the eleventh of November armistice and the order to reverse the engines.

It ought now to be evident that for any great enterprise we need all the young men and the young women, and all the older ones who are still young in heart. We need to know who they are, where they are, what they can do, and we need to touch them at every point; for not only do we need them all, but we need all of each one of them. We should never again face a great national crisis with nearly one-third of our men of military age unfit for hard physical work. We need campaigns of physical education and social hygiene, and we need to apply the lessons in human salvage which the army has learned during the war. But we need more than each individual and all of him. We must remember the fable of the fagots and see to it that the individual star, of whatever magnitude, is subordinated to the team play of the group. And team play means more than energy and "pep." It means a marshalling of the old fashioned and homely virtues of courtesy, deference and consideration.

In the third place, we have learned that to accomplish a great result we need the leadership of those who know and who know vividly and constructively. Our experience has been that in certain fields, finance, science, manufacturing in quantity production, welfare work, we had a supply of those who knew. In other fields, in intimate knowledge of foreign conditions and foreign languages, for example, we had not. At first we didn't know where our leaders were, and in many cases we began by following false prophets.

The vital importance of a thorough knowledge of where the man we need is to be found can be shown by an example: A code message from Germany, directing the dismantling of the German ships which lay in our American ports, was intercepted. If we had known that there was a professor of English in the University of Chicago, who, in the pursuit of his medieval researches had developed the power of reading ciphers almost at sight, that cable from Germany could have been promptly deciphered, the sabotage forestalled, and something like six months in the use of these ships for the transport of troops and munitions could have been gained.

The value of one man with training, brains and persistence can be shown by another example: There was a man who answered these qualifications connected with the Council of National Defence, not in a very exalted position. He was the first in all this country to see that the army program and the shipping program did not fit. It took him a long time to convince the two groups of over-worked, harried officials that neither could play the game alone; that the closest co-operation was necessary. He had no access to the records, but he finally succeeded in building a convincing statement out of the shreds of information which he gathered here and there, and at last he succeeded in getting everyone concerned into the attitude of wanting to face the facts. Everyone would have had to face them sooner or later, but without the devotion and leadership of this one man, it would have been only as the result of a very serious dislocation of function.

One field in which the right leadership has been most brilliantly rewarded is that of medicine. If our army surgeons and sanitarians had been confined to the practical family doctors, who can't be bothered with all this new-fangled stuff, our men would have died like flies from disease, as they did in the Spanish-American war. It was the laboratory man, the theorist, the high-brow if you like, who made our health record a matter of national pride and congratulation.

Just consider what we have done in this field: The success of the anti-typhoid vaccination; the reduction in dysenteric diseases due to chlorination of drinking water; the encouraging fight against cerebro-spinal meningitis and pneumonia; the identification of trench fever and the practical freedom from typhus. As to wounds, a tetanus antitoxin which has made lock-jaw almost a negligible disease; a serum against gas gangrene; the Carrel-Dakin method of chemical sterilization of wounds, the splintering of fractures on the battle field and over-head extension apparatus in the hospital.

To quote Simon Flexner: The entire psychology of the wounded men was altered, the wards made cheerful and happy, pain abolished, infection controlled, and recovery hastened by means of the new or improved surgical and mechanical measures put into common use.

The fourth lesson of which I wish to speak is that a high aim and ideal is what counts and what lifts the individual up from selfishness and sloth. What bound the country together and made the transformation which still seems miraculous, was the noble national aim, the complete dedication to the task before us, the utter absence of any selfish or self-seeking factor in the whole enterprise. The conduct of our soldiers, their submission to a discipline to which most of them were completely unused was, I think, in a large measure due to this recognition, and to the fact that each man supplemented the national impulse with whatever was to him the strongest incentive, religion, love, pride of family, state, regiment, the desire to excel in what all were attempting.

We recognized this aim as a nation and we recognized it in one another. We have all been used to coupling the two words, officer and gentleman, and the assumption that the officer is also the gentleman has had much to do with the high standards of the military profession. For the past two years the War Department has set the nation the example of enlarging this conception and dealing with the soldier and the gentleman. The assumption that an American soldier is also an American gentleman in all the essentials of that much abused term, had much to do, I think, with the fact that the exceptions proved to be so few and far between.

In this country we were able to control the evils of drink and other forms of indulgence by the strong arm of the law, and even more important, by public opinion. But our soldiers soon went to another land, where we could control neither the laws nor the sentiments, and these were very different from those to which our soldiers had been accustomed—not necessarily worse, but confusingly different. The standard of conduct of our soldiers during the days of conflict was unique in military history. Whole divisions went for months without a single court-martial. The reason was, more than anything else, that they felt themselves in training for the big game and no man wanted to miss his chance on the battlefield for the sake of a selfish indulgence.

Some of the experiments in conduct tried in the American Expeditionary Forces were extraordinary in their success. The leave areas, an immense enterprise, the initiative for which, by the way, should be credited to the Y. M. C. A., were run on the basis of absolute freedom to the enlisted man. He lived in the best hotels in Europe and amused himself in casinos where crowned heads had been in the habit of gambling away the money of their subjects. He had no roll calls, no taps, no military machinery whatever. He arose when he pleased, either before or after breakfast; he ate and drank when he pleased, and he stayed out as late as he pleased. The physical and moral effect of this absolute change from the military regime was a very extraordinary phenomenon, but that is not the point I wish to make. Out of the thousands and thousands of men who were sent to these leave areas, there was hardly a single case in which a man abused the trust which was put upon him or failed to turn up on time to go back to the grind of military duty. This could never have been done with soldiers of the old type.

Perhaps the best impersonal check of the result of this assumption that the soldier is a gentleman, is to be found in the court-martial records. Ten years ago the

annual average percentage of convictions by court-martial to enlisted men was seven and one-third. For the fifteen months covered in the last report of the Judge Advocate General, the corresponding figure for the National Army, the drafted men, was one-sixteenth as great, or fourteen one-hundredths of one per cent.

Someone has recently written that fine minds have been finely touched by the war, and base minds basely. He might have added that wise minds have been wisely touched, and foolish minds foolishly. In general, I think it may fairly be said that when the appeal was to the finest in a man's character, the result was correspondingly fine.

These, it seems to me, are the four main things we have learned, or at any rate we have had a chance to learn. First, that we are a real nation, potentially strong with the strength of youth; second, that to fulfill our mission every man and woman and all of every such individual is an object of national concern; that we must be mobilized and we must continue our lessons in team play. We have still plenty to learn in this field. Third, that we must have and must recognize the leadership of those who know, which, after all, is the great test of a democracy. Fourth, that finally, to bring out the best that is in us, we must have an aim, high, clear cut and clearly understood.

If we apply these four lessons which we have had a chance to learn, to educational conditions, and particularly to university conditions, it will be for three reasons:

The first is the general wisdom of confining one's remarks to things he knows something about. The second, that there is no single institution more characteristic of the best in our American life than a great American University. And there is this third reason, that without the supply of young men with the stamp of the American college upon them, we could never have met the call for officers, for a quarter of a million of them. I am told that the Germans were prepared to admit our wealth in money, materials and man power, but they looked forward confidently to a complete failure on our part in training officers to lead our men in battle. Of course, all our officers who made good records were not college men, but it was the college trained citizen that set the pace and made the standard.

It was Pitt who said: The atrocious crime of being a young man I shall attempt neither to palliate nor to deny. A university, it seems to me, should be a place where the primary object is not the repression of youthful exuberance nor the correction of youthful failings (though both may be necessary on occasion), but rather, a place for the encouragement of the great and vital qualities of youth—enthusiasm, energy, power of acquisition, the sensitive retina. It is the place where the older members of the community have the best chance to stay young. The university should be essentially a company of enthusiasts, of pioneers. There is a frontier for every worker to clear—no matter how narrow or how wide his horizon may be. In a university there is no proper place, among faculty or students, for the disillusioned, the cynical, the defeatist.

Now we come to the application of the second lesson, the lesson of mobilization, of team play. In the first place, no university is alive where mobilization is limited to the Recorder's office. In a live institution, regent, professor, student, janitor, each is a part of the game and must feel that he is. He must feel that in its administration the institution has learned the great lesson of direct and human personal contact. Science, among all its triumphs, cannot include any device for conveying a message from mind to mind or from heart to heart half so good as the human voice and the human eye.

Within the faculty, this element of human co-operation should be reflected by the vitality of the organism rather than by the complexity of the organization, which may not be vital at all. Each member must feel that the general repute is safeguarded by honest and intelligent standards, honestly and intelligently administered. The university, like the country at large, must make itself responsible for all of each and every student, his bodily condition, for example, just as directly as his mental.

You may recall that one of my excuses for applying war experiences to university conditions was the share which the college and university men had in building up our supply of officers. If we study why the college men made good officers, and make allowance for the fact that it is the kind of man who goes to college who is likely to make a good officer anyway, and all the other allowances we can think of, we can't dodge the conclusion that there is something outside of the college curriculum which is an important factor in bringing about the results. On the other hand, the curriculum

has had its share, and it is in my judgment a leading share, important as the other factors are. The comfortable theory that once he has settled down to something important the college ne'er-do-well will suddenly blossom forth into a competent leader of men didn't work out in practice. It may have happened here and there, but it didn't happen as a general rule. In the line, it was very generally the man with a sound, academic record, not necessarily the Phi Beta Kappa lad, but the good scholar and active college citizen, the man who had taken the trouble to learn things and learn people, who made the best record. I naturally watched with particular interest the records of my own old students at Columbia, and I know for a fact that this is so.

It is a significant fact for those of us who are interested in the welfare of college boys and girls, that the United States government deliberately built up what was to all intents and purposes an undergraduate college life for the young men of the army, with athletics, dances, dramatics, singing. Even the most hardened of regular officers, who at the first, I fear, regarded this as some of the civilian foolishness with which all soldiers have to contend, came to see that the program was a vital factor in building up such a body of fighting men as they had never seen. And this is only another way of saying that if you want to use the human machine for any purpose, you must concern yourself with the whole of it. Human nature does not come in air tight compartments.

President Wilson coined a phrase which has thoroughly gone the rounds, when he said that the side shows of college life should not over-shadow the entertainment in the main tent. We all agree to this. But I think we are more inclined than when the phrase was coined to urge that the side shows, properly and intelligently subordinated, should be under the same management as the main tent. The army has tried the experiment on a large scale and it has worked well. In February there were six million and a half individual participants in athletic games, ten million attendants on entertainments, nearly a quarter of a million students.

None of the lessons which the Army had learned are more significant than those which have to do with mobilization and classification. The record of the Provost Marshal General of the Committee on Classification and Personnel, in co-operation with the Committee on Education, furnishes the best record of large scale human engineering in the new science of personnel of which we have any record, either in this country or, I think, elsewhere.

A university, like this one, is an Army, and not such a small army either. The United States found that it was worth while, indeed it was absolutely necessary in view of the time factor, to find out everything it could about every man in the Army. What he needed physically to increase his efficiency; what he needed to keep him interested and out of mischief; what he should have in the way of training—based on what he had already had—to make him of the greatest usefulness; whether he had the will to win, and if not, whether anything could be done to get it into him.

In a word, the United States wanted to know just what each man's possibilities were. Was he officer material or non-com material? Should he go into the line or one of the special corps—or to the labor battalion? As a result of this program, the Army succeeded in finding a place that counted for 98 percent of the drafted men.

Now I realize that a university can't do all these things with its army in just the way the Government can. It can't casually transfer a man from engineering to school superintendence, nor a girl from philosophy to cookery—or vice versa—no matter how desirable such a transfer might be for the individual and the community. But it can do a great deal more than it now does in finding about all its members, informing them of their strength and weaknesses, in seeing that every student gets a chance to enjoy in so far as possible the high privileges of youth, and to get a helping hand over the bumps in the road, which also come with youth. Every student ought to have the opportunity to round out his character and his capacities. It ought not to be left to chance that any student gets the best personal contacts for him or her with faculty and fellow-students, the best opportunities for learning team play. Every student ought to leave with some definite aim in life, and if possible an aim high enough to be called an ideal that is worth working for.

A university is not doing its full duty if its athletics and social life are limited to those who need these the least; if its alumni are regarded merely as fillers of the grandstands or recipients of oratory and possible sources of pecuniary support. The alumni

are the best possible sources of keeping the faculty informed as to what the world really wants in the way of trained men and women, and for the students of information, suggestions, and jobs, both temporary and permanent.

I realize that many of these things are now done here and elsewhere, but in the light of what we have learned from the experiences of the university of Uncle Sam, I am sure that our American universities and colleges have hardly scratched the surface of what they might do and what, I think, they will ultimately do in the realm of human engineering. Most educational institutions follow what they find the others are doing. In this field there is an opportunity, I think, for real leadership.

I don't mean that we should leap from one illogical position clear across the field into another. Mental measurements are not yet an exact science, and a man of moderate ability, with a will to succeed, may be a better academic investment than his more brilliant brother who lacks that quality but, by pruning very sparingly at the bottom, one does not have to chop down a tree to prune it, the saving in time and energy will be enormous.

Fundamentally the human relationships are what count, and the qualities leading to team play and co-operation and away from isolation and insulation. This means that if a faculty is to exercise its leadership, it must know the student body, and it must maintain and develop points of human touch. Impersonal tests, impersonal records, all that modern practices and modern science can teach us we must have, but these must be used only as the frame-work for what is after all the fundamental thing, direct human contact between teacher and teacher, teacher and student, and student and student.

Now as to leadership, and in a university we can identify the leaders with the teachers, there is no doubt, I think, that the teachers' profession comes out of the war in a higher place than it went in, and the scholar goes back to his work with a feeling of confidence in himself in view of his record in competition and comparison with men in other callings. One of the questions for the public as well as for the University is whether the expert, the scholar, now that his practical worth has been tested and proved, will be content to slip back into relative obscurity, or will, on the other hand, be tempted too far into the limelight and lose those very qualities which gave him his value. Will he be satisfied with positions of leadership rather than leadership itself, which may be a very different thing.

I venture to say that we shall hear a good deal less frequently in the future the old gibe that the man who could do things did them and the man who couldn't, taught them. The teachers made good, not only because of their scholarship, but because of their personality. I think this experience of the last two years is going to speed up to an extraordinary degree the movement which had already started of turning to the academic world for the man who can do things and do them with other people. The sheer fun of executive work with plenty of money to spend on what you want to get done is pretty strong drink for a man with a heavy teaching schedule and an annual department appropriation of \$75. Both the Regular Army officers who have made conspicuously good, and the scholars of the co-operative type who have made conspicuously good, are being actively bidden for by bankers and manufacturers and all sorts of people. Neither profession can compete on the purely financial side with these tempters and, in order to hold their first-rate men, they will both have to make some greater contribution of the things that money alone can't buy.

Both in the nation and in our republics of letters and science, we must learn to distinguish more clearly between the power that comes with knowledge and the ability to talk about things. It was very interesting to watch in Washington the gradual substitution of the man with the latter quality for the man with the former in positions of responsibility, and I am going to confess that, in the early days, some of the conferences which it was my privilege or my duty to attend, reminded me for all the world of faculty meetings, in which gentlemen without definite knowledge of the matter in hand were discussing at considerable length what they were pleased to call principles, but which were really off-hand impressions.

Our real scholars, and they were most of them from our universities, soon gained the confidence and respect of the military experts.

The physicists and mathematicians alone tackled and solved sixty-eight fundamental problems of direct military importance in a single year.

I think that in their service to the university and to the nation, the scholar may well profit by the demonstration that it was not only the man who knew his subject, but the man who knew how to deal with his fellowmen, who was likely to make his impression. Naturally enough, it was the socially minded scholar rather than the recluse who, in most instances, found his way to Washington, and the freemasonry among the scholars engaged in different tasks proved to be one of the most potent correctives in breaking down the barriers and delays of departmental jealousies and bureaucratic traditions.

In our educational institutions scholarship has three functions: To broaden the field of existing knowledge—and the war has shown us that every field has its valuable practical applications; to train the coming generation of experts; and last but not least, to inspire a recognition of what scholarship is and a respect for it in the minds of the general students, few of whom, by the most generous stretch of the imagination can be regarded as scholars themselves, but whose influence in their generation throughout the country is a very important factor. Our nation needs a respect for expert knowledge and it needs a respect for intelligence, and our college graduates can do perhaps more than any other group along this line.

Any country needs not only a handful of distinguished leaders but a great body of well-trained men and women who, when the emergency arises, stand ready to meet it.

We Americans are proud of being called a nation of inventors; most of us have made or almost made private discoveries which, for some reason, have never come to fruition. The scientific boards in Washington during the war received more than sixty thousand suggestions of a mechanical nature, and I am told by those who ought to know that of all these not more than five of those coming from untrained minds were of any practical value. Even from the trained minds there came no fundamental discovery in science as a direct result of the war conditions. Suggestions of improvements in detail and valuable suggestions, new applications of known principles there were in plenty, but the application of a fundamental new idea, no. That is only to say what we already know, that discovery is not made to order. In each case the idea had already been born in the mind of some intellectual pioneer and worked out by him, and some man who had the idea in the front of his mind was at hand to apply it to the new condition. And that means, I think, that if we met the test we met it with our scholars.

We have taken up three of our four lessons as these affect the university. The emphasis on youth, the need of mobilization and team play, and the need of leadership. There remains a fourth factor, a high, clear-cut aim.

The most serious charge against the American undergraduate in the past has been a lack of a sense of responsibility. We now know from their war record that the sense of responsibility lay latent in thousands of these boys and was only awaiting a sufficient impulse to arouse it.

President Hibben of Princeton, who ought to know the American undergraduate if anybody does, said recently: "Young men are capable of far greater amounts of intensive work day in and day out than we had dreamed of; capable of greater concentration of mind upon their tasks. They respond more quickly than we have conceived to the call of duty. The sense of responsibility is there latent, and we teachers must endeavor to quicken and to appeal to it. We have seen that when the occasion comes these young men rise to meet it."

We can't very well stage a world war for the purpose, and I don't think we need wait for any such crisis to bring it out. There is in every normal, wholesome-minded student some motor nerve that can be touched in such a way as to release that type of co-ordinated energy which we call a sense of responsibility. This all goes back to knowing our men and women and establishing human contacts and human confidences.

In spite of individual disappointments, I am confident that the normal young American either already possesses as a motive force some worth-while aim or that he can be guided toward such an aim if approached in the right way.

As to a general policy, perhaps the thing to do is to build around that vague but very real emotion called college spirit, perhaps to guide our young people to enlist in worthwhile nation-wide or world-wide causes, (we are singularly provincial about

this in America), perhaps to insure better teaching and better co-ordination of work, perhaps a combination of the three. At any rate it is perfectly apparent that we have underestimated both the American undergraduate's capacity for intellectual work and his real pleasure in it when he feels it is worth while.

We have underestimated, up to the present, the power of the straight intellectual appeal. Any doubts as to the instinctive reaction of the normal, healthy young American toward educational opportunities were dispelled by the experiences of the Army in France after the Armistice. The let-down, after the terrific physical and emotional strain, the impatience regarding any delay as to return home, combined to make a pretty serious situation as to the morale of our troops. Some of the older officers tried to correct this in the old fashioned way by heavy drill for long hours, but this didn't work at all. We had a different kind of an Army and the soldiers had had a different kind of experience. What did work was a thorough stimulation of all the welfare activities and a real educational program and it was straight, old-fashioned book-work more than it was the movies or athletics, more even than Miss Elsie Janis, which turned the corner for us. In all, 209,000 men volunteered for the privilege of studying. The military order was often revised and majors sat at the feet of corporals or privates who were selected as teachers. The reports as to the intensity of their work would put many of us professionals to shame.

Just now we are hearing a great deal about the benefits of discipline. I think what the speakers are really talking about, though they don't recognize it themselves, is the benefit of the state of mind which accepts and welcomes discipline. We are not, even as the result of the war, a disciplined people in the sense that Germany is, or was, and we can thank God for it. We shall never want in this country a general subordination of the individual will and initiative to external control. Discipline is a means and not an end. If discipline, as such, externally imposed, were as important a factor as people seem to think to-day, we could look through a list of ex-enlisted men, privates and non-coms in the Army and Navy—I mean the men enlisted during peace time—and find a relatively large number who made conspicuously good records after returning to civil life. As a matter of fact, we find nothing of the kind.

As we all know, many enlisted men who chose the Army as their career have won commissions and made fine records. There were no better general officers in the war than men like Harbord of our Army and Robertson of the British, both of whom rose from the ranks. But isn't it fair to say that the discipline imposed on these men was accepted gladly and accepted in the terms of their fundamental interest in soldiering and that these men are not really exceptions to what I have said.

I venture to predict that there will be a very different record to tell as to the success in civil life of those men now leaving the Army, who, because they believed in the cause and wished to participate to the full in the great enterprise, enlisted for the war and gladly submitted themselves to the discipline for the purpose of increasing their efficiency.

In a month or so you can teach an enthusiastic man, who is fired by a big idea, all the discipline he needs for carrying it out, but you can't reverse the process and incite enthusiasms as a result of the application of discipline.

Don't think that I want to minimize the merits of military discipline for military purposes. Of course, co-ordination and subordination are absolutely necessary in the handling of large bodies of men. Even the men in France who deserted to the front, as many of them did, no matter how much we may sympathize with their desire to get into the game, had to be disciplined. Someone had to stay behind and bring up the supplies. The point we are discussing is the carrying over of this principle intact into civilian life. So far as discipline brings about regularity of life, of exercise, so long as it ministers to alertness, we can use it, but as between discipline and initiative and team play to meet our academic or our national needs, I am for initiative and team play.

Please don't misunderstand me. By reducing the present emphasis on external discipline, after childhood has been passed, I don't mean a lowering of standards. External discipline, it seems to me, is often really imposed as a substitute for high standards; something supposed to be just as good and more easy to keep in stock. The standards of the worth-while organization, and these are the outward expression of its aims, its ideals, ought to be high enough to make sure that the man or woman who



is unable to provide his own discipline, in the general interest should be painlessly but promptly removed from the group.

Let me quote to you a credo for the American people, from the pen of a Regular Army officer. It's a pretty good one for an American University:

"To foster individual talent, imagination and initiative, to couple with this a high degree of co-operation, and to subject these to a not too minute direction; the whole vitalized by a supreme purpose which serves as the magic key to unlock the upper strata of the energies of men."

Finally, let me try to apply these lessons to you young men and women of the graduating class.

Keep in a good physical shape. Over-work is usually a combination of bad air, bad feeding, and lack of exercise and sleep. See that you don't go stale. If you lack the zest of life, find out what the trouble is; whether it is your teeth, or your blood, or your soul. Picture to yourself what Theodore Roosevelt got out of life.

Be honest with yourself. Do your own thinking and do it straight. This, strangely enough, is perhaps the thing which you will find hardest to do after the undergraduate atmosphere. A student body is the most convention ridden group of which I have any knowledge. I am all for conventions, because they save a great deal of time and worry, but only so far as we recognize them as conventions and not principles or philosophical truths. Remember that the public opinion of America is an infinitely more important thing to the world than ever before and that you are each a part of it.

Keep your intellectual interests and your interest in your Alma Mater, not in her athletics and her fraternities alone. Remember that as alumni of the University of Michigan you are citizens of no mean city. Recruit men and women whom Michigan ought to have and who ought to have Michigan, remembering that the danger from the inside of this country, and it is no considerable danger, is mainly due to the misdirected zeal of sincere people who lack knowledge and background. Both the employer who can't see beyond the point of telling his men to take it or leave it, and the men at the other end whose sense of real or fancied injustice has reached what with our children we know as the kicking and biting and screaming stage. It is probably too late to do much with the present generation except by main strength and awkwardness, but a recruit for higher education from either of these groups is a good national investment.

Keep your human contacts. Don't be a glad-hander but do at least your share. It takes two to make a friendship, just as it does a quarrel. There is something worth while in everyone. Give yourself a chance to find what it is. If you keep your enthusiasms and your aims and your self-respect, you need not worry about discipline. You will discipline yourself. Practice following and, as the chance comes to you, practice leading—don't be a trailer,—but above all, practice team play. Keep yourself ready to take the next step, whatever it may be. There is a story of Marshal Joffre, of which I can at least say that it is good enough to be true. After the first battle of the Marne some enthusiast was proclaiming him as a second Napoleon and laying it on pretty thick. The old gentleman stood it as long as he could and then said "No, Napoleon would have known what to do next, and I don't."

Keep your enthusiasms and your ideals. In other words, keep your youth. In choosing your life work, get into something in which the policy and practice are such that you can throw your whole soul into the job. Don't take yourself seriously, but take your opportunities for usefulness seriously. Find out the callings in which America is short. While our war-time contribution in expert knowledge and in the leadership which such knowledge brings has been a very good one, we must not be too well pleased with ourselves. Even in science, where our record is best, it does not compare, I am told by those who know, any too favorably with the record of the French and the English, in spite of the infinitely greater strain under which they worked. In certain fields, as I have already pointed out, it was conspicuous by its absence. Think over whether it isn't possible for you to be one of the men or one of the women, who, from your training and momentum and vision will be selected by acclaim, ten years hence or fifteen years hence, to take part on some important job with the nation as your client, as the one person best qualified to fill it.

We no longer have to prove that it pays to know, to really know almost anything that is worth while. It pays in money, if that is what one wants; it pays in the more

1919]

THE SEVENTY-FIFTH COMMENCEMENT

651

enduring satisfactions of life, in the pleasures that come from exact knowledge and intellectual pioneering, in the almost unique joy of creation without the responsibilities of possession, and in the feeling of individual readiness to be of use in meeting the problems which the years allotted to your generation will surely bring forth.