

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

THE INDUCTION OF
HARRY AUGUSTUS GARFIELD, LL.D.
INTO THE OFFICE OF
PRESIDENT
OCTOBER SEVENTH
MDCCCCVIII



EAGLE PRINT
PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

PRESIDENT GARFIELD'S ADDRESS

I shall not undertake to make response to what has been said to me this morning. It would be impossible for me to convey to you an adequate idea of the impression it has made upon me or of the feeling of humility with which, as I stated to the trustees, I undertake this task. I shall leave it to that which is more eloquent than words,—to deeds, in the hope that in the administration of this office the deed may correspond, in some degree at least, with what you have been pleased to address to me here.

The theme I have chosen for this occasion will be found in the answer I would make to the question, "What is the chief end of the American college?"

Similar questions are being asked concerning organizations of every kind. None are too sacred or too long established to escape, and none should desire to be excused. Inquisitions are periodic. They vary in form and character with the times, but all grow out of a laudable desire to be rid of the worn-out and unfit. They are periods of national house-cleaning, as necessary, though quite as disturbing, as their domestic prototype. We have been passing through such a period in recent months. Institutions of higher education having been reached in the process of upheaval, there has been much perturbation of spirit among educators and alumni. In the opinion of some, the time has come for the frank abandonment of the old order of things; we are living in a larger world, on a more extensive scale; what was suitable to our academic needs a few decades ago is no longer so. To others the larger world is sadly in need of the intellectual and moral qualities imparted under the old order.

Though the American college has been the subject of much discussion during the past few years, it has been treated, for the most part, in its relation to secondary

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

schools on the one hand, and to professional schools on the other. But before we undertake to say what its relation ought to be to other educational institutions, we must make sure that its existence in any form is warranted. This depends quite as much upon end and object as upon performance. The mere fact that an institution continues to perform some service is no sufficient reason for its continuance. The service must be adequate; an impossible requirement unless it be actuated by an object that is both definite and necessary.

The charge of vagueness of aim brought against the American college, is, in part at least, well founded, and to this fact is largely due the weakening of intellectual stamina observed among undergraduates. It is rare that men are found idling in the professional schools. One constantly hears it said of a young man who has passed through four years of undergraduate life, with ease if not with dignity, that he is now at the law school working hard, with an eye single to the main issue. Vagueness of aim has given place to clear purpose. But that which is general is not necessarily vague. To train the whole body by vigorous and regular exercise, that one may be stronger and physically more fit for the pursuits of every-day life, is quite as definite as to develop bodily prowess for participation in some particular sport.

What is wanted in our colleges is an object that can appeal to every student, whatever may be the future life-work of each. This object must meet the requirements of the times, without sacrificing the rich heritage of the past. It must quicken and inspire men to new and higher conceptions of life, without rendering them less, but rather more, efficient members of society. Such an object is expressed by the word citizenship. America's greatest need is that the men and women of the United States comprehend all that citizenship imports, and live up to its obligations. Hence, I venture to assert that the chief

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

end of the American college is to train citizens for citizenship.

Many alumni, and most men without experience of academic life, think of college as a place of pleasant comradeship; a place where cultivated ease and boisterous zeal join hands for a season; a charming valley, as it were, where the waters of the stream of life, let through protecting locks, flow gently between banks made glad by a thousand flowers, through groves set with stately and noble trees, a place happily removed from the dust and heat of the weary highway over which the schoolboy has trudged; a place from which one embarks on the main stream of life after a season of preparation, which consists of learning how to paddle one's own canoe without responsibility for consequences. In other words, college seems to them a place of privilege, in which one experiences much that is pleasant and acquires something that is profitable.

Too often men think of citizenship in the same way. It is regarded as a status of which one may be justly proud, but is prized chiefly for the personal advantages and privileges it secures. The consideration which ought to move from the individual to the State in return for these privileges is regarded as a burden to be shifted, land where it will.

It is indeed true that college is a pleasant place and that citizenship is a privilege, but each is vastly more.

If the chief end of the college is what I have stated it to be, it is important to form a clear notion of what citizenship is. Vagueness of aim is to be avoided at all hazards. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the legal meaning of the term, or to discuss the privileges incident to its possession. With its advantages we are sufficiently acquainted. Its duties are service and responsibility to the State, to the end that the highest ideals of the nation may be realized. These ideals differ among different peoples. Their roots are deep down in the subsoil of racial experience long since forgotten. But, inasmuch as present experiences

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

and existing conditions are constantly added to those of the past, it follows that national ideals, which are the fruit of national experiences, will change.

In so far as these experiences are subject to man's control, it lies within the power of every nation to move its ideals upward, absolutely as well as relatively. But this power is exercised by the individuals composing the nation as a whole. There is no such thing as national power, experience, ideals, apart from the individual, and the individual can no more escape making his impress upon the nation's life than he can avoid shaping his own character. Hence it follows that there rests upon each citizen a direct responsibility for the well-being of the nation, and for what this involves, the maintenance of its ideals. This is so whatever the form of government; but especially is it true when, as in the United States, government is based squarely on the proposition that the people rule.

Not all have the gift to perceive the wave of feeling which sweeps through the heart of a people; to interpret it, to formulate it, and to give it power. But all can understand and appreciate that to which the more prescient have given form and expression. All must be able to follow, though some only be trained to command, or have the gift of leadership. A great nation never lacked for leaders, but great leaders have frequently failed because of a supine people. A nation will be great and strong whose citizens, bound together by common traditions, inspired by high ideals, march forward with eager and steady tread toward a goal which is ever advancing.

To attain to that standard requires long and patient effort, for it means that the vast majority must be brought up to the highest level of well-trained, high-minded, efficient manhood. More specifically, it means that citizens must be trained to easy control of their mental faculties as well as of their bodily power:—trained to distinguish between scientifically determined facts and loosely reasoned opinions;

■ ■ INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

to discriminate between things and conditions of varying value; to be zealous in everything that makes for the advancement and welfare of the whole body. It means that the vast majority must be keen to know; constant in service; quick to sacrifice their own for the common good; possessed of a sympathetic understanding of all sorts and conditions of men, and not merely of those of the particular class with which each works and plays. It means that the majority must come at last to realize that a nation's highest welfare is somehow and always inextricably a part of the highest welfare of mankind everywhere; though, because of his finiteness and the limitations of time and space, man's service to mankind can be best rendered through the channels of a particular nationality and under allegiance to a particular government. The nation that would grow from great to greater must bring the vast majority of its citizens to cherish the principles upon which the government is founded; to know the nation's experiences, and to render a service that may be described briefly as consisting in efficient performance, by all, of the duties prescribed for all, and in the assumption, by each, of his full share of the burdens of government. Citizenship of this kind is no mere ideal. It is composite of ideals and action. Ideals unattempted are dead things; they shrivel up as the disused powers of the body atrophy. On the other hand, action, not inspired and regulated by ideals, is motiveless, unhuman, machine-like.

As I have said, to accomplish this result is a vast business,—time and patience are prime requisites to the task. It can be done by no one person or separate group of persons. In a sense it must be everybody's business; but it must be the particular business of some to set in motion and keep going the force that is to actuate the whole body of the people. The thing won't get itself done, and the agency selected must keep the object aimed at constantly in

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

view. The preparatory schools are of necessity preoccupied with mental drill-work,—with, at most, the rudiments of learning. On the other hand, the vocational schools are engaged in preparing their students to earn a living, or to pursue research in some particular direction. As in the preparatory schools, the work of the instructor is with the individual, for the use and benefit of the individual himself; whereas the business of lifting citizenship to a higher level requires work with the individual and a life for the individual of a kind that will fit him to think and act for the State and for the whole body of society. To hope that, while one is chiefly and intensely occupied with learning how to serve self, he will, somehow, in the process, come to know how to serve society and the State, except by relieving them of the burden of his support, is as idle as to hope to regenerate the world by shutting one's self up in a monastery. The problems of government and society are quite as definite as the problems of any business or profession, but they are far more complex and difficult, for they include every other. They are always objective and impersonal, while most others are subjective, and have primarily to do with self's welfare. Under the established order of educational work in the United States, the college is peculiarly adapted to the task of training citizens to this kind of citizenship.

But while I believe it to be the chief end of the American college to devote itself to this task, I do not mean to say that it has no other aim. It has several others, but they are secondary or, more properly, contributory, or complementary, to this chief end. For example, it is certainly an object of the college to prepare students for the vocational schools. When, however, we reflect that some only are to be lawyers, or doctors or clergymen or chemists or engineers, though all are citizens, it is clear that the college ought not to make the preparation of students for the professional schools the chief end of its

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

existence. Again, it is true that institutions, other than the college, are actively engaged in training men and women to the obligations of citizenship. The churches, the primary and secondary schools, and, one may fairly add, the hospitals and prisons, are so engaged; but in none of these instances can we properly say that this is their chief object. Also, there are ways quite individual and non-institutional by which many of the great citizens of every nation have made themselves, or have been made, fit for citizenship. None of these considerations, however, relieves the college of its peculiar responsibility. Hence, we ought, by no means, to give assent to the suggestion that the college has outlived its usefulness, and should either sink into the high school or be merged in the university. Until the ideal of citizenship shall have been realized, the integrity of the college must be preserved, whether it maintains an independent existence, or is part of a university. The American college, like the American state, is a vital part of our system.

It has long been the proud boast of Oxford and Cambridge that they have educated the governors of England. Should it not be the boast of the American colleges that they are performing the same kind of service for the United States? But the governors of England and the governors of America are drawn from different classes, and the methods adopted must differ accordingly. Measured by quantity alone, our problem is vastly more difficult than that of England.

I pass now from the general proposition to its application to the college. How can the college best accomplish this chief end of its existence? No organization becomes effective until it finds itself. The process by which this is accomplished depends upon a few general principles of action, which, in the case of any particular college, may be stated as follows: In the first place, there must be a clear understanding, on the part of all concerned,

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

of the function of the college, that is to say, a common object; otherwise there will be divided counsels among those in authority and friction with those under authority. In the second place, there must be a determined purpose to carry out this object. The atmosphere of an institution, whose members lack the courage of their convictions, is deadly, and will produce weak men and pusillanimous citizens. There must be, in the third place, a broad, vigorous, common life, and it must include the whole body—faculty as well as undergraduates. Anything which separates men into classes, based on objects opposed or unfriendly to the main object of the college, is out of place and, in the end, will inevitably divert the aim of the institution and change its character. There will always, of course, be groups within the whole body. Diversity of taste, of temperament, of previous affiliations, will naturally and properly divide men into groups for different purposes; but each, according to its kind, must contribute its share to the great end for which the whole exists, if it would qualify for a permanent and honorable place. Among the crew of a battleship are many classes and groups, official and otherwise; but all must work together as one well-organized, harmonious whole, if efficiency in action is to be secured.

The value of a common life for the college is appreciated the moment one grasps the supreme object of its existence. The nation demands, and tradition prescribes, a common life for the people of this country, and everything within our colleges, which makes against the spirit of this demand, affects injuriously both the college and the character of our citizenship. Indeed, I would go a step further, and say that, unless the colleges respond to this demand by shaping the life within their walls in accordance with its spirit, they had best be allowed to die. Conversely, the colleges have it in their power to shape the future of government in the United States,

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

if they seize the opportunity that is theirs. The common life of any community is broad and vigorous when each member shares in it to the fullest extent consistent with his powers and qualifications, but subject always to that sound maxim of equity: *Sic utere tuo ut alienas non lædes*. For example, the tradition which separates the faculty and students is wholly inconsistent with this principle of a common life. There is a distinction between the two groups, of course, but it is based on something higher and finer than mere authority. The active body of the college is, in reality, divided into five large groups, of which four are undergraduates. The fifth is composed of graduate students, commonly called the faculty, who, by virtue of their larger experience and longer training, are given places of authority. When, at the end of his school-life, a young man elects to enter college, he voluntarily associates himself with a body of educated, cultivated men. He, so to speak, puts on the intellectual *toga virilis*. He elects to cast aside henceforth the things of boyhood, and to associate with men. He has taken a long step upward,—vaulted from boyhood into manhood, one might say. To demand that he be granted the freedom of manhood and, at the same time, be excused from its responsibilities, is childish. It must be assumed that he is in sympathy with the object of the institution with which he has affiliated himself, even if he sees it but dimly at first, and that he stands ready to coöperate loyally, and to the full extent of his powers, in working toward that object.

That this program involves hard, as well as high, thinking, should occasion no surprise. The student has chosen the companionship of scholars, of men who have learned to see things in right perspective, as well as to discern their finer shades and qualities. In such company, it is to be expected that the sports of the field will be subordinated to intellectual interests, and that the

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

common purpose demands a common life in which all shall share. If our young man objects to this standard, if he seeks a pleasant place of residence in which to while away four happy, careless years, let him not seek entrance to the college whose aim is high and serious. He will be out of place there.

Assuming the soundness of the general proposition, in what way should it affect the actual life of our colleges? The question can be conveniently treated under three heads: the care of the body, the training of the mind, and the development of the moral and religious nature.

(1) As sound bodies conduce to clear thinking, and clear thinking is essential to good citizenship, it follows that careful attention should be given to physical training. Every college man should participate in some sport. Bodily skill and balance furnish not only healthful and enjoyable relaxation from the pursuits of the study, but contribute directly to one's control of the intellectual faculties. The bare statement of these undisputed truths is condemnation enough of one-sided development of athletics in our colleges. "Supporting the team" in the cheering section is an unwarrantable sacrifice just in so far as it takes any man away from his own exercise. Spontaneous cheering is natural and commendable; but organized, it easily degenerates into a purpose to disconcert the opposing team, and in so far forth is unsportsmanlike. The movement toward the further development of intramural athletics is a direct response to the demand that every college man should engage regularly in some form of health-giving sport. Intercollegiate athletics, within reasonable limits, are productive of good results, but the limits are easily exceeded. We Americans are justly charged with overdoing things. Our enthusiastic athlete proves too much for his case. It is true that intercollegiate athletics stir up interest in sport; that to put a winning team in the field inspires a still greater enthusiasm; that it develops

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

admirable nerve; that it keeps men out of mischief and advertises the college. But it is also true that a school for athletes, devoting its whole time and energy to the business, would be far more successful in these respects, and that over-developed athletic activities in a college advertise it in a way to be deplored.

In other words, we should be governed in this matter, as in every other, by constant reference to the object we have in view. It is neither fitting nor necessary that college students should cultivate professional skill in any of their sports, intercollegiate or otherwise. They should "play the game" with as much skill as is consistent with devotion to the chief end of the college, and no more; or, to express it somewhat more specifically, with as much skill as is possible to those who are devoting themselves to the task of training their minds to grasp and deal with the most serious problems of the age,—the problems of citizenship; with as much skill as is consistent with membership in an institution whose chief end is intellectual rather than physical.

But the moment so much is said, it becomes apparent that the burden rests upon the authorities of the college to see to it that the intellectual in the life of the place flows strong and clear. It is narrow and short-sighted to cut off, or even diminish, athletic contests, except for the excellent reason that they interfere with something higher or better. The true basis of any program for re-establishing the proper balance between the curriculum and the campus is positive, not negative. Vitalize and enrich the intellectual life of a college, strengthen its moral fibre, direct its energies toward a definite goal, and the exaggerated value set on secondary things will disappear.

(2) Coming then to the question of the training of the mind,—what shall the college man be taught? Vocational schools find comparatively little difficulty in deciding what to teach, for each vocation has its definite body of

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

requirements, among which accurate and extensive knowledge plays the largest part. But the college cannot avoid the difficulty that inevitably accompanies the training of powers and the cultivation of a way of looking at things, as distinguished from the acquisition of knowledge. To adopt as a plank in our educational platform the statement which I have ventured to formulate concerning the college, does not lessen the difficulty, for citizenship of the kind described is possible only among men whose minds are well trained and broadly cultivated, and whose view of life is generous, as well as clear. It therefore follows that those subjects should be taught which train the several aptitudes and powers of the mind. Extensive knowledge cannot take the place of intensive training. While all subjects lend themselves to this result, some are more suitable than others. Experience has proved the value of language, mathematics, philosophy, and science. The several subjects included in any one of these general groups call out and develop the same kind of powers. Taken together, any one group of such subjects constitutes a field of knowledge, which, for the student, is a training-ground, different in character and discipline from any other. The subjects of each group supplement and complement the subjects of any other group. Thus, though it is impossible to be well informed in all subjects, it is within the reach of every man of average ability to be trained in the intellectual processes and informed concerning the fundamental principles of each field of knowledge. Therefore every college student should be required to take courses in each of these general fields or groups. Breadth of training makes a balanced man, and balance is as essential to intellectual progress as to walking. It is a condition precedent to success to the scholar as well as to the citizen. Viewed from the standpoint of personal inclination and taste, the same program should be followed, for the student can exercise no intelligent choice between the several

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

groups of subjects until he has been made familiar with the extent and general character of each. Within the limits of any one field, however, the case is entirely different. There, great freedom of choice should prevail.

That some subjects produce better results than others in the same general group is due rather to the accident of time and to perfection of method, than to qualities inherent in the subjects. Consider, for example, the teaching of Greek. Both the language and the method of instruction have been standardized, if I may borrow a term from the shops. This result has come about, in part, because the language is "dead," thereby lending itself to fixed methods of analysis and treatment, and in part because it has been studied long enough, since its revival, to enable teachers to agree upon the authors to be read and the order in which their work can most profitably be placed before the student.

These considerations give to Greek, as to Latin, a peculiar claim to consideration as a discipline, wholly aside from the question of literary quality and historic value. A like result, so far as intellectual training is concerned, may be obtained in the teaching of a modern language, but with far greater difficulty. Methods of teaching, the substance and extent of courses, differ so widely, that in reducing the results to a common basis for class-room work, serious loss is inevitable. Furthermore, the outcry that is heard when a modern language is thoroughly taught, raises the suspicion that opposition to classics is due largely to the very thing which commends them to the educator, namely their value as training subjects. If modern languages are to be treated as substitutes for the classics in any real sense, they must be studied with the same degree of attention to grammatical construction and composition that is required of the student of Latin and Greek, subject only to such differences as arise because of the fact that they are still spoken languages.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

To those who advocate the substitution solely on the ground that French and German are useful languages, and that thoroughness is less essential than facility, I have only to repeat that the college is not a vocational school, and that mastery of one's mental processes is more important than fulness of knowledge and ease of expression. "There is love of knowing without the love of learning," said Confucius; "the beclouding here leads to dissipation of mind."

The same reply can be made to those who complain that too little attention is paid to the sciences in our colleges. What is most often meant is, that the instruction has in it too little of practical value. Modern life is set in the midst of a vast laboratory. One must blunder at every point who fails to understand scientific method. The scientific way of looking at things is essential to the student. It is of almost equal importance to the business man and to the man of affairs. It is called into requisition in almost every successful enterprise. It ought to be applied to the consideration of most political questions. The problems of society and government are not to be solved without weighing the scientific facts involved, in a scientific way. In all these relations, however, completeness of knowledge and expert skill can be left to the few who intend to pursue scientific work as a vocation; but familiarity with scientific method is essential to all who pretend to positions of responsibility in any field. It should, therefore, be the aim of the college to train the mind of every student in this method of thinking, and, at the same time, to make him familiar with the common data and the underlying principles of the sciences.

The eagerness of our students to get into the thick of things as quickly as possible is typical of American life. We would be masters without serving an apprenticeship. We would solve age-long problems overnight. The college student finds, for example, the principles of political

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

economy irksome. He would plunge at once into the midst of questions that are taxing the powers of the most experienced. What men are doing and thinking to-day is useful as illustrative matter for undergraduates; but it must be carefully distinguished from that which is finished, or so far finished as to be measurable. The unknown quantity in political and social problems is human nature, and experience is its best measuring-rod. Lack of experience and ignorance of human nature are as fatal to good government as the prejudices of self-interest, and the college student is as ill-equipped in this direction as he may be well informed concerning fundamental principles.

But it must not be supposed that this program for the college leaves no place for the development of ripe scholarship and the refinements of culture. So far as the faculty members are concerned, the necessity of beginning at the beginning with each generation of students, and directing them with patience over familiar paths, does not prevent advanced work. Indeed, one cannot keep alive to the particular subject he is teaching, unless he carries on work in his own field beyond that which is suitable for the undergraduate. This is doubtless far easier to do in a university where one finds opportunity to try out the results of his work in the graduate school and feels the stimulus of the larger group of men occupied with advanced subjects. But the highway of scholarship touches the world at all points, and he who chooses may take the product of his labor to what market he will.

In the case of the undergraduate, the incentive to push beyond the minimum, or even the maximum, requirements of the curriculum, will always exist where the elder members of the community possess the qualities of leadership and are progressive men. When this fortunate condition exists, the lecture plays an important part. Large bodies of students may, with the least waste of time and effort, be shown the broader aspects of a subject,

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

and its relation to the whole field of knowledge. Moreover, the lecture loses nothing of its inspirational value by reason of numbers. But, as a means of training the mind and strengthening the intellectual powers, the lecture is of the least possible value. Nothing can take the place of hard, regular work on the part of the student, under the personal guidance of a competent instructor. For certain subjects, I am convinced that no better method will be found than that which is pursued under the preceptorial system at Princeton, and which is substantially the method of the great teachers a generation and more ago. It makes the largest possible allowance for the personal equation. It accommodates itself to the ambitions of the scholar and to the necessities of the man of average ability or poor preparation. It is an effective means of binding together faculty and students, and makes plain the way to a strong common life.

The requirements of the curriculum should take into account the several kinds of men who come to our colleges. They may be divided into three classes: (1) men of earnest purpose, with native powers of unusual character and promise; (2) men of earnest purpose without unusual native powers; and (3) men who may, or may not, be endowed by nature with special gifts, but whose most striking characteristic is lack of earnest purpose. The men who compose the first class need no urging, they stand ready to seize the opportunities held out to them. They do not rest content with mere pass-work or with minimum requirements. They touch college life on all its sides, but with a due sense of proportion in its several parts. They become not merely well trained, but highly cultivated. They carry away the attainments of the scholar to the enrichment of citizenship, and become leaders among men. But students of this class must not be left to supply their own higher intellectual wants. To require them to continue in the training-field after they

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

have gained control of their mental powers, and are well trained in the use of the intellectual processes and principles of the several fields of knowledge, is a waste, and may easily become a vicious waste by destroying purposefulness. As a reward of merit, men of this class should be permitted to concentrate upon fewer subjects in their last two years, that the fruits of scholarship may be secured to them. The experiments which are now being made to adapt the Oxford and Cambridge systems of honor courses to our use, will be followed with lively interest by all who are impressed by the failure of our colleges to make adequate provision for men of scholarly mind and earnest purpose.

The second class of men to which I have alluded must, however, not be neglected. The danger attendant upon the introduction of honor courses is, that the large body of men of earnest purpose, but apparently of ordinary endowment, will receive less attention and inspiration than at present. Any system which neglects the training of the men of this class is unsuited to our American needs, for to this class belongs the large majority and by it the average of our citizenship is determined. As a class, these men will not become scholars, but, by association with scholars, they may cultivate scholarly tastes and learn how to appreciate the best in everything:—the beautiful things in nature, the refinements of art and literature, the progress of nations, and the achievements of science. Nor will this equipment be to their own advantage only. As citizens, they will aid in making the communities in which they live better, cleaner, and more beautiful places. Furthermore, the man of slow development finds his place in this class. In the end, he may outstrip his fellows and make a larger contribution to the world than the most brilliant of his comrades. To neglect his training is to waste some of our very best material; for, unaided, such men may not find themselves until it is too late.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

But it is of the third class that I wish especially to speak. The young man who enters college and remains there without discovering an earnest purpose to be the best that he can; to do his part to the best of his ability; and to bear his full share of responsibility, ought not to be in college. He is an unprofitable member of the community, and is likely to prove unprofitable as a citizen:— it is of such stuff that our undesirable citizens are made. He may be brilliantly endowed, possessed of a strong personality, and gifted with persuasive powers to an unusual degree, but his influence is bad, if for no other reason than that his brilliant parts cannot be imitated, and his faults will be. Usually, however, such men are not possessed of gifts of a high order. They merely appear to be. Frequently they are *good fellows*, as the phrase goes; but to be merely a good fellow is not sufficient to qualify one for a place in college. In the language of the campus, this kind of a man is a loafer. He is, however, to be distinguished from the man who desires to apply himself but has not yet learned the art, and from the intellectually one-sided man who at least loafs discriminatingly. These two need training and friendly guidance, but they do not lack earnestness of purpose or force of will. The men against whom we should close the doors promptly and effectually are those who loaf because they choose to, and who do not propose to change their occupation. For the college to do otherwise, is to foster and encourage qualities most hurtful to the great object we are seeking to accomplish.

This brings me to the question of the development of the moral and religious nature. It is hardly necessary to say that this means more than mere morality. Our undergraduates should be expected to lead clean and upright lives as a matter of course. Clean living is essential to manliness, and uprightness to good citizenship. The virtues of a good citizen in a republic like ours are not to

INDUCTION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD

be distinguished from the virtues of a good man. Aristotle was convincingly clear upon that point, and experience has demonstrated the soundness of his teaching. But a profounder conception of citizenship will be discovered when we base it, as morality itself is based, upon Christ's interpretation of the law, summed up in the most luminous, the most inspiring words ever spoken: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." Without love of this kind, intellectual endowment, the trained mind, and the most comprehensive knowledge are nothing, or worse than nothing. Upon these two commandments, indeed, hang all the law and the prophets. They are of the essence of the faith of western civilization. They led the pilgrims across the sea and comforted them in the wilderness. They directed and controlled the acts of the founders of our several commonwealths, and guided the framers of the Constitution. Wherever a school-house was opened in the Colonies, there also a place of worship was established. Church and State were wisely separated as organizations, but they were firmly united in the hearts of the people of each community. Upon the preservation of this union depends the future welfare of our country, for through its power alone can the great body of our citizens be lifted up to higher planes of civic life. How essential it is, then, that the young men in our colleges shall be trained to live by the light of these commandments. The underlying principles of the Christian religion should be taught, without limitation of sect or narrowness of construction. Its literature and history should be known to every college man, to at least the same extent that the literature and history of other great world-movements are known.

As if in opposition to this part of the program, one sometimes hears it said that the college is not a theological seminary. True; nor is it a law school, nor a pro-

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

professional or vocational school of any other kind, as already pointed out. Hence, it should not teach theology; but the principles of right living, the foundations of faith, and the place and influence of religion in the world are principal subjects in the field of philosophy. To omit them is to ignore the vital relation existing between God and man, and the part that religion and religious beliefs have played in the development of the race. To fail to give to our young men a sense and appreciation of the dynamic force of religious faith in the progress of human affairs, is to leave them ignorant of the greatest and most profound fact in history.

If, in what I have said, I have seemed to some of you to have omitted the praise due to this, our beloved institution, for past achievement and for peculiar fitness to perform her part of the supreme duty resting upon the American college, it is from no lack of appreciation or affection, but rather that I might emphasize the universal character of the obligation. All that can with propriety be said on this occasion is, that the founder of Williams College was a soldier-citizen, who shortly before his death on the battlefield, in 1755, made provision by will for the establishment of a free school in this place, and that from the beginning of its existence until now, Williams College has taught the obligations of citizenship. The greatest, most honored, and best beloved of all Williams teachers made clear to his students the value of civil liberty and the relation of the spirit of Christianity to the State and to the progress of civilization. He rejoiced that it had become possible to instruct a whole people concerning the end of government and the ground of human rights. "The highest earthly conception," wrote Dr. Mark Hopkins, "is that of a vast Christian commonwealth, instinct with order, and with such triumphs and dominion over nature as modern science is achieving, and promises to achieve."