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MY FIRST words will seem, I fear, somewhat ungracious to you who come to listen to them. For I am planning to speak, not to you who are here but to others who are not here—persons who are far away, in time if not in space. And further (it must be said) this preference of hearers is dictated, in part at least, by the craving of a speaker for an audience which is interested, which will listen eagerly to what he has to say. "But surely," you will protest, "our presence here is proof enough of interest; why do you pass us by in favor of some other men who have not come?" And I must answer for my chosen hearers, "They would have liked to come but could not get away in time." And if you then demand to know who they may be and why, if so much interested, they could not come when others could, I will explain. There are two groups of them. Each would have had to travel a hundred years to be in time today. But even that, I am sure, they would gladly have done had time allowed. The men I have in mind are, first, those who discussed our theme one hundred years ago when Amherst was established and, second, those who, one hundred years from now, will talk upon the theme again when next we have Centennial celebrations. Can you not see them there on either hand, the spokesmen of the founders, the spokesmen of the century after this? Would they not like to come to match their speech with ours? Would we not like to have them here? I wish they might appear in very person that we might really be acquainted with them. But failing that, I try to send my words across the years to them. And you may listen as I speak for you to them. And while we celebrate, on either side these friendly judges of our thought shall stand, two groups two hundred years apart, the spokesmen of the past, the spokesmen of the future.

I have a special personal reason for craving the presence here
of Noah Webster and Aaron Leland and Zephaniah Swift Moore and Messrs. X and Y and Z of 2021. Facing today the task which those have faced one hundred years ago and these must face one hundred years from now, I feel their kinship and I give them mine. The founders had ideals. For the sake of these they even tried to tear old Williams from the rocky hills which held her fast. And when they could not break her bonds they tore a rib from out her side and brought it here—I will not press the figure further. What were the fundamental yearnings of the soul that drove them on to violence such as this? That was the question which Webster, Leland, and Moore were called upon to answer. And Messrs. X, Y, Z must try to state ideals, too. A place without such things is not a college. And they, like us, will tumble out in 2021 the dusty pages of the past, will look to see what words were said two hundred years, one hundred years before. I doubt not we shall have for them the same quaint, far-off quality that Aaron, Noah, and Zephaniah have for us. I doubt not they will smile when names and phrases common to us strike oddly on their modern ears. And yet I know that they will come to us and to our predecessors before they state their modern purposes. They dare not frame a guiding purpose for the College which is not in some fundamental sense our own. Nor may we in these earlier days so form our thought that it shall not be true for them in differing circumstance. We speakers have a common cause to serve, a single truth to follow throughout these centuries. And so we stand together in a fellowship. Alike we shake and tremble before the awful task; with equal pain we know how little of the truth our words can tell; and hence, with friendly smile at one another, we put ourselves aside, and fix our eyes upon the common goal. Here, then, we talk together, Centennial Speakers. And you, who are in present human form the cause for which we speak, shall listen and judge. You shall judge us who try to say in words the truth by which you too are judged as well as we.

Such is the audience. What of the theme? It asks, "What does the College hope to be in this next century?" It is not strange that one should hesitate before a theme like this. I feel inclined to say to those who ask the question, "I'll answer you this if you'll answer another." Will some one kindly tell me just what some other things will be in this next century? What will the world be like, and what
America, and what New England, and what our students, and
what we? Do men say Peace or War, do they say Hope or Fear,
do they say Beauty or Ugliness as they survey the coming years?
What will that world be like for which we give our education? It
makes a difference to our purpose. I cannot tell you what Amherst
hopes to be unless I know what are the greater hopes of which ours
are a little part, to which our purposes must be conformed. One
cannot talk of education unless one knows the human spirit and
its world. To teach young people is to make them ready for the
world in which they are to live. Here is a constant task which runs,
in changing form, through all the centuries—the task of Webster,
Moore, and Leland, the task of X, Y, Z, our task as well. We are
and were and are to be a liberal college. But in what world and for
what spirits? Are they the same as they have been before or do they differ? According as they change so liberal training changes;
as they are constant, so liberal teaching is the same. But will this
coming century differ from the past or will it be the same? Our
theme requires that we should know what things will be, will come
to pass in this next century. It does not tell us where such infor-
mation may be found.

So much for hearers and for theme! What of the speaker's part?
I am to tell you what I can about the world and men, and hence
of education, in this next century— their constant meanings and
their changing forms. Over against the thrilling story of the past
I must attempt to sketch the uncertain future. And as I give this
prophecy I do not hope for your agreement, nor even for my own.
Prophets, men say, are seldom honored near their homes. But may
I ask you to take note that he who makes a prophesy is even nearer
to his home than are his critics. To prophesy is not to know. Our
prophecies are hopes and wills, desires and yearnings for the com-
mon weal in coming days. The prophet says, "Is not this good?"
stating in words the values which we all accept. And when we
answer "Yes," he says, "Then this must follow; this shall the future
be." But round the corner someone else has drawn another vision
from the same accepted truth. "No, no," he says, "the future shall
be that." And while they clash, the sober unprophetic men, who
do find honor near their homes—the nearer the home, the greater
the honor—these shake their dubious heads and go to work again.
That is their prophecy. And so, I say, I do not ask for your agree-
ment. Prophets do not agree. I simply try to see and state my hopes of what a world may be, my pride in what a college might achieve. And you and you and you, out of our common cause, make different hopes and different expectations. By difference such as this we rightly plan together for a common end. But while we plan and differ as we may I still can count in special ways upon my special hearers, on Webster, Moore, and Leland, on X and Y and Z. They cheer me on to play the game. Those say, "We guessed and missed and hit—and so will you." And these, when their turn comes, will read the words and say, "Such was his guess, and theirs;" and then will take their turn and guess again.

But here today, they stand on either hand, my kinsmen. And we who speak for Amherst as she is will face with level eye the men whom Amherst was, the men whom Amherst is to be.

I.

The prophecy which I am about to make falls into two parts, the first telling what the world is to be in the next century, the second deducing from this the future history of education. In each of these fields I have one and only one general observation to make. I shall try to make one prophecy about the world and then to derive from this one prophecy about the college. But under each of these two general principles you will find three minor principles, in each case the remarks on education being derived from the corresponding remarks upon the nature of the world.

You will note at once that in spite of the brave words of my introduction I am not planning to tell you all that will happen in the world in the next century. I am concerned simply with one feature of the world which is of special interest to a college, to this College. We must begin, therefore, by stripping our theme.

And first, since our location is now quite definitely fixed, we find in space a very obvious principle of limitation. We are American. We are not essentially of this Town, or of this State, nor even of New England. And only in rather scattered ways does our immediate influence go to other countries. We are primarily of this country and not of any part of it. This is an American college.

And, second, we are also a liberal college. As such our interest has to do only with central and essential things. We are concerned primarily with what men call, for lack of better terms, a country's
culture. By this we mean that mingling of feeling, belief, purpose, expression, action, in which a nation's spirit finds itself revealed. A liberal college tries to learn and teach that culture.

What, then, in this next century, will be the culture of America? And in its making what part will liberal colleges, this liberal College, play? This is the theme on which today we speakers speak together.

My general prophecy as to America has to do with National Independence. It is this. We, thus far, have been in cultural ways a dependent people. The time has come when we must win our independence. Thus far, I think it may be said, we have been busy giving to an old culture a new home. The home we have been making and we have made it big. The culture we have received from others; we have not made it for ourselves. But now the time has come when we must win our freedom, must be ourselves, must master our spirit—when feelings, beliefs, and actions must be our own as they have never been before. We are, I think, in this next century destined to make a culture and to cease from merely taking one which others made.

May I explain by illustration? We have believed in freedom of individual life. Our fathers took this as a guiding principle. They found it in their blood; they took its formula from France and England. And we have kept it on our books and in our minds. But do we now believe it when time of heavy pressure comes? We are not sure. Our action is uncertain. And why is this? It does not mean that we are fickle stock. When once our will is fixed by clear, deliberate choice, that choice will stand the strain of bitter obstacles. But as to freedom our will is not yet fixed by clear, deliberate choice. The times have changed since first our fathers put the word upon the books. And we have never really questioned whether with changing times freedom itself should change. We have the word which others gave and yet we have not made it ours; we do not know its present meaning. Our home we have made; we have not made our spirit.

If I may change the figure, I should say that in cultural ways we have been playing schoolboy in face of older men, our teachers. And while like schoolboys, we have learned our lessons, we have, like them, been growing up in strength and power of body. What I am saying does not mean that we as individual men are children and schoolboys; it does not mean that leaders among us are not
wise and keen. It does mean that we, a people, have not yet willed what we shall be, have not yet made our spirit by a choice which understands itself. No better illustration could be found than what we did and failed to do in the Great War. We went in mighty strength and grew in strength by using it. We went with courage and resolve, for we had found something to do that seemed worth doing. We put our purpose into words, clear-cut and ringing words that stirred men’s hearts. And now we are not sure just what they were about. The victory is won, and we are puzzled. And Europe smiles; it cannot help but smile. We had such splendid power, such eager spirit to play our part, and yet we do not seem to have brought about just what our spoken words had seemed to mean we were determined should be brought about. And older peoples look at us in envy of our youth and strength, in admiration of our generous courage, and yet in somewhat friendly, somewhat bitter amusement at our futility. We did not understand the part we rushed to play.

But now the time has come for leaving school. The baffled, awkward schoolboy learns by sharp experiences such as we have had; he learns by feeling of his strength at work. “They care what I can do,” he says, “but do they care for my opinion? They like to have me on their side, but do they really care what I may think about the point at issue?” And then the questioning, once begun, goes on. “What do I think; what have I thought; who really has decided all these things that I have done, or tried to do, or thought that I was doing? It seems to me I’d better look around and see just where I am.” That time of questioning has come, I think, for us. In all the arts of peace as well as those of war we must put on the garments of a man. We can no longer merely learn what others have to teach. We must be independent, must be masters of our spirit, must make a culture of our own.

What will this independence mean for us? Many a boy mistakes the meaning of his manhood when it comes. And so may we. What does it mean?

It does not mean that we shall change our point of view, our values, or our standards, that we shall make a culture different from the one we had. Nor does it mean that we shall keep them as they were. It simply means that we shall choose whether or not to keep them as they were. When freedom comes a son may choose
the way his father trod or just as freely he may choose some other way. The son who must discard his father in order to feel himself a man is still a boy; he has another choice to make when he becomes a man. The son who dare not tread a way his father has not smoothed and marked for him had better stay at home and keep his father on the watch for fear some bogey catch him. And both these types of fear are now aroused among us as we approach our manhood. Men fear that we shall leave the old, established ways, shall lose the spirit of Old New England, of Old Virginia, shall cease to think the thoughts our fathers made. And others, just as timid in their braggadocio, fear we may keep the old, established ways, fear we may fail in being different from the past, fear lest the past may have the strength of youth still in its veins. These fears of either type do not express our independence. They are our tremblings at the brink, our first quick timorous shrinkings from the facts which we must face. They must be put aside as we go forward on our way.

And as men fear to be or not to be the past, so do they fear to be or not to be their neighbors. Our independence does not mean that we must take some foreign culture as our own. Nor does it mean that we must hate all foreign cultures, that we must fashion for ourselves some mode of life of which no other race has ever dreamed. But here again already men are raising frightened voices in angry warfare of conflicting views. "Shall foreign tastes and standards come across the seas to scoff at ours?" Or, on the other hand, "Shall we be mere provincials, rude, untutored folk who fail to eat and dress and talk and think as foreign peoples do?" These are the words of children aping at manhood. Freedom does not consist in likeness to other men nor yet in difference from them. Freedom is choice. And choice is Independence.

And so I dare to guess that in this coming century America will choose her way of life, will make a culture of her own. And when she does she will not act from fear or hate or prejudice or spite. Rather, in mere objective ways, her fate will come upon her and she will see and take it gladly. One hundred million people here, linked by a common fate, must find, will find a way of life. And these first years of strong and youthful manhood will flush with glory of the new-found aims and new-found independence. These will be days in which to live. I know that often we shall trip and
stumble. I know that very slowly will the nation as a whole be brought to tread a common way. And yet there is a way that we shall tread, a call that we shall answer. It calls us on from youth to manhood, from tutelage to self-direction, from strength to wisdom in the use of strength. And we will answer to the call. Those who have known our youth have little doubt of that.

But what will be the call? What culture shall we make? There are three phases of our life, our growth, concerning which I dare to guess our choice. The first concerns a racial aristocracy. The second has to do with what we call Idealism. The third deals with our Faith.

1.

And first I wish to speak of Anglo-Saxons and of aristocracy. We are in our beginnings the sons of Britain. Hers are our language, our literature, our law. Hers is the culture from which our culture springs. In all essential things we spring from Britain.

In still another more immediate sense we are of British stock. Her task is ours. Britain has gathered up the peoples of the earth and made them one—one commonwealth or empire. And so have we. To us they come from North and South, from East and West, and we must make them one—one single nation with a single life. And as we face her task again we well may try to learn what Britain has to teach, may look to see what she has tried to do, where she has failed, what ends she has achieved.

If we may separate England abroad from England at home, I think that one may fairly say that England’s way of dealing with this task perforce is one of Aristocracy. She governs other races and yet she keeps herself apart; they are not of her kind, her class. Peoples of many creeds, of many colors, many grades of culture, she holds together for some common ends. And yet so far as foreign races are concerned, it is not fellowship that welds the empire, but common ends, external interests. And through it all, Britain is leader; she stands above, apart.

What I have tried to say just now may be attempted in another way. Britain has shown the modern world how one people may take control of other peoples, may lead them in coöperation. In doing this Britain has faced the facts—and so must we. For certain ends it was and is desirable that races join together in external
ways, that they cooperate. Who should take charge of this co-operation? They who in wisdom and in strength could do it best. And Britain has rightly claimed her place. No other power in modern times has shown such wisdom and such strength for just this task. And yet for Britain it has ever been a task external to herself, an outside thing that needed to be done.

I press this externality because it marks so clearly the difference of the forms in which the common task appears. We, too, have many races, peoples, creeds, who must have government. But Britain's foreign peoples are, for the most part, outside her borders. Her subject races stretch around the globe, far from the little isle that sits so tight just off the coast of Western Europe. Our foreign peoples, on the other hand, are here within our borders; they are our neighbors, soon our fellow-citizens; our friends or not our friends; they are Americans. And so to Britain's son there comes again the task of Britain, but in a very different way.

And we must understand how different is the way. We cannot simply follow Britain's lead as if the situations were the same. Britain has many lands to govern. To each with her experienced eye she measures the closeness of the touch, the tightness of the bond. And so she has learned the lesson of taking charge of those who are not one's associates. That is Aristocracy. Is that the way for us? It cannot be. We have no power to choose how close shall be the touch, how tight the bonds that bind us all together. Here we are, say what we will, a single people in a single land. If Britain's strains should prove too great she might again send off a separate people into independence. And neither of the two would suffer vital hurt. But we are one in many; we cannot, will not let a separate race, a separate part, a separate faction go. We may not separate. How shall we live together?

Here is, it seems to me, the urgent question for our Anglo-Saxon stock. Shall we again attempt an Anglo-Saxon aristocracy in this new world? Already in a sense it is established here without our will. We were the first to come; ours are the greater numbers still; ours are the language, literature, and law; we hold in greater part the places of influence and control; we have the education largely in our hands. We are predominant. And this has come not by our choice but by the mere blind play of fact. But now the time of choosing is at hand. Do we intend to make our dominance secure?
Are we determined to exalt our culture, to make it sovereign over others, to keep them down, to have them in control? Or will we let our culture take its chance on equal terms, without advantage, taking its own in the free play of a great people’s fusing life? Which shall it be—an Anglo-Saxon aristocracy of culture or a Democracy?

It is not easy for a stock like ours to make the latter choice, and yet I think we will. We have two sets of impulses at war within us. We have a love of independence for ourselves; perhaps a habit of ruling others. But there is still another stronger side. I mean the willingness to take a fair and honest chance, to play the game according to the rules and let the end be what it will. And now the question is, which side will have its way with us.

There are some obvious facts which might direct our choice. We have already here one people whom we rule, with whom we do not genuinely associate. How many more such subject races would we like to have? And England at home gives further evidence. Norman and Saxon, Dane and Celt, have made a single people. England did not fight Scotland down, nor did she make much of it when she tried. But they have fused together, and now are one. And who controls their common life, a Scotsman’s modesty forbids my saying. But just across the channel is another people who have not fused, who fear their culture may be lost, who dread and hate the threat of domination. England and Ireland are not so happy as are the other pair.

Which shall it be with us? I hope that we shall ask no special favors for our thoughts, nor take such special favors as our power and influence might win were we to use them. Ours is the creed which says that every creed must take its chance with every other on equal footing. I hope that we shall value its being true more than we value its being ours. But many I know will bitterly object. “What will you have,” they say, “shall we give up our culture; shall we desert beliefs and attitudes and purposes by which we live; shall we set these aside in favor of some sentimental common thing which men may all accept because no one of them accepts it?” “No, no,” they say, “this truth is mine; it shall prevail if I have power to make it.” And other men, whose truths are beaten down, are saying in their turn, “This is not fair; wait till I get my chance; and then we’ll see whose truth shall win.” And victories are won
on fields like these, poor, silly, hollow, lying victories in which both sides are beaten. We do not want, we dare not have such victories in America.

And so I cast my Anglo-Saxon vote for Pure Democracy. We Anglo-Saxons have the upper hand. How shall we use it? According to the principles on which the country's life by us was founded. We dare to say that even those principles must take their chance. He has deserted them who will not let them face the test. Here in America the peoples of the earth are working out a common destiny in which each group must share, share as it may according to the strength and virtue that its spirit has. And we like all the rest shall lose our separate life in this great venture, shall lose it in trying to find, to make a common life more fair, more free, more true than men have ever seen before. It is a dangerous game to play; but yet one dare not miss the chance of playing it.

2.

My second guess as to our forming culture concerns Idealism. The term is not exact but it will do.

To many who watch us from outside, America presents a curious contrast in which again perhaps our sonship to the older Anglo-Saxon country is revealed. To quote a vulgar phrase, one hears men say of us, "You seek the good, and get the goods." They mean that we express ideals and achieve success. And underneath the formula there lurks a query, "Which are you really? If one were seeking for your soul, should he dig down where words crop out or where the actions are? Which are you—devotees of Mammon or of Righteousness?"

It will not do to meet this question with too clear an answer. We are like other men; and other men, like us, are made of strangely mingled and conflicting elements. Men are of general stuff in special mixtures. What is with us the special kind of mixture?

Our fathers came across the sea with mingled motives. They sought a place of freedom and a means of livelihood. They wanted both, but in unusual degree they wanted freedom. And for the sake of this they risked the livelihood, took chances with it. And then the venture turned out well; from risky living fortune came; and then, great wealth. Such is our early history. And for the later immigrants the record is the same. They too have come in search
of freedom and in hope of wealth. And here they have found a fertile continent ready to be their home, to give a lavish livelihood. But they have also found a people ready to risk its home, its wealth, if need be for a cause. And sometimes need has come; and we have taken the risk; and it has turned out well; we have been fortunate. The Lucky Idealists, I think we may be called.

Such is the record of our youth. What will it be when schoolboy days are past? The cynic tells of boys who dream great dreams when they are young, who love their fellows more than they love themselves. And cynics say of such a boy, "His father spoils him, lets him dream nonsense. Wait till his father stands aside, wait till he faces the cares that men must bear; those things will knock the nonsense out of his head." And cynics say the same of us. We have had lavish, easy, wealthy youth. And our Idealism, except in times of special crisis, has not had heavy strain to bear. What will become of it when easy youth is past, when we must face the cares of men? Will it go up like smoke, like idle dream? No, it will not. Youth is not always silly nor cynics always right. In easy youth, free from the pull of special interest, boys learn objective truth, and if they have in them the stuff of which a man is made, they do not turn their backs and run when danger comes. And we, in times of coming strain, will not desert our colors, but seeing the threat against them, will gather round them once again and risk our all for them again, and win again for them—and for ourselves if we are fortunate.

But someone, future, past, or present, will ask, "What is this something which you call Idealism? What does it mean?" It has been put in many forms in many times and countries. With us it means something like this: Each man, each woman, each child shall have a chance at life; they shall not be denied the full and free and rich expression of themselves if we can help them to attain it. Men's lives are thwarted, stunted, twisted, throttled, killed by circumstance of every sort. That is our failure, even more than theirs. We will not have it so. Each life shall be what it might be, what may be made of it, what under favoring circumstances, it may become. Such is our aim. What can we do? We cannot be the life, we cannot live for others in that sense. But we can shape the circumstance. That we will do. Wherever in the world we find men, women, children, weak in life, sickening in spirit because of
circumstance that starves or beats them down, there we will fight the circumstance and break it. Wherever in the world the sun shines on the human spirit, there we will take our friends that they may bask and grow and be themselves. Lives shall be made successful; each one shall have as good a chance at being itself as we can make this hard old world provide. We are responsible. That is, it seems to me, Idealism as we have seen it.

How shall we see it in the coming century as we go out from youth to manhood? Simply with better understanding, as befits a man. Thus far our thoughts are chiefly negative. We have said, "All men are equal in our eyes; all men have equal rights before the laws which limit them; no man shall interfere with others; this is the land of opportunity." That is the creed as boys perceive it. But now we need a version for a man. There is not one among us whose thought and action do not take him far beyond this point. "People must have an equal chance," we say. But, more than that, each one must have some chance of taking the chances which he has. We know that rich men's sons often have little chance of taking what life presents them; they are too dulled by lavish circumstance. And we resent the horror of it. So too with others. If children cannot walk, little is gained by them from public running tracks; if children do not feel what reading is, they are not helped by libraries; if children live in degradation until their souls are stupefied, one does not say much when one talks of opportunity. What does it mean to give to men a chance? Is it to stand aside; is it to say that they are free to roam when all men know that chains have bound them fast? No, it is more than that. It means that men shall not be bound by chains, whether their own or forged by other men. It means that every man shall have a genuine chance at taking the ways of life that lie before him. It means that life shall be; that men shall really live; life shall not be denied. We take responsibility.

And so I think that in the coming century, Idealism will mean, not simply letting others be themselves, but acting that each shall be himself. I am not speaking here for any special scheme of social betterment. I do not know what can be done by way of helping older people. The Puritan believes two doctrines at this point, first that his duty is to help his fellow-men, and second, that to help another man destroys his character—and that is sin. Between two
sins like these, one’s action lags. And I am much a Puritan. But Puritan or not, I know one field in which Idealism may have its way without the fear of sin. Young people may be, must be helped to grow into their strength. Young lives shall not be stunted and deformed. In youth we have the human being in our hands to make it ready for its life, ready in every phase and aspect of its being. This is the time for making sure that lives succeed, by care and nurture as they grow; all children, every child must be so trained and disciplined, so nourished and protected, so strengthened and refined, so guided and informed that richness of life shall open up before it and it shall see and take what life affords. This is the task of Education in the broader sense. In face of it our present schemes of schools and training are petty, trivial things. No other task which men attempt compares with it in grandeur or in scope. Here in the care of youth, in this next century, American Idealism will find its richest play.

3.

My last prophecy as to America’s culture in this next century has to do with Faith. A century ago, when Amherst was established, men spoke much of their faith. Today, men on the whole speak little of it. What they will do one hundred years from now, who knows? And yet the change, whatever it may be, is not essential. Men do not really change in things so deep as this. What is that constant Faith which men have had or failed to have, which they will have or fail to have in this next century?

My friends who study our national life tell me that a century ago America was much as she is now. The world had been at war in long and bitter conflict. And we had our share of it. And there had come upon the people the degradation which follows after struggle. Fibre had slackened; standards were broken down; customs were insecure; men seemed to have lost their grip upon the world and on themselves. Against this degradation leaders of men were lashing out with eager words. Among the cries there rose the words of those who founded Amherst College. They saw and felt the need of strength and virtue in the common life. They called for men to bring them back again. And chiefly in their time they called for ministers to preach. “A Plea for a Miserable World”—that was the sermon delivered by Daniel Clark when the building of the
Charity Institution was begun in August, 1820. It was the call of Noah Webster who, on the same occasion, summoned men out from the "barbarous works of war" into the establishment of the "empire of truth." To these men and to their fellows it seemed that the wisdom of this world had turned to folly and to shame. Over against it they preached another wisdom by which the loss might be regained.

No man among us, I suppose, would use today the words and phrases which were used one hundred years ago. Nor do we think the thoughts in just the forms which then seemed true. And yet the essential cleavage which they knew is with us still. There are two ways of facing life, two kinds of wisdom for mankind. One is the way of dread, the other the way of confidence. One rests on fear and cunning; the other on hope and faith. One is for man, the beast; the other, for man the spirit.

And as between these two, the issue is a very simple one, no matter what the terms in which it may be put. The question is, Do we rely upon the world to be with men as they pursue the good? Is good supported and sustained outside ourselves, or do we fight alone in desperate singlehandedness? That is the ancient modern query that cuts in two our ways of life, that cuts each man in two, that cuts the groups of men apart.

And by men's actions are they judged in this respect. The men who fight for justice, as they say, and yet who fight unjustly, do not believe in justice. They dare not let it have its way, care for itself. They think themselves and their injustice greater in power to serve its ends than justice is. The men who fight for truth with lies strike at the very heart of truth. One sees men fighting, as they think, upon the side of God, who fight as if the world were ruled by devils. They fear, resort to subterfuge, seek favor, give way to hate, and so despair that every breath they draw denies the faith for which they fight. They have not genuine faith; they live in cautious fear.

This lack of faith appears today most clearly in our cleverness. We have become too shrewd in recent years. We trust too much in management, in propaganda, in administration. We moderns threaten to become past-masters in the art of telling truthful lies, of doing deeds of justice by which our pockets shall be filled. We know too well the tricks of using for our ends both men and truth.
We know just what to say and when, to whom and in what form. And every one to whom we speak must ask, "Who pays to have that said; why does he say just that; what is he holding back?" We do not trust our world; and hence we dare not trust each other. But what we need to learn again is what the faithful men have known through all the centuries. The truth suppressed will out; truth cannot be denied. And he whose pockets overflow with money gained by craft is poorer for the having. An end achieved by guile is lost. This world is such that craft and guile are bad; it has no love for folly, and yet it loves an honest fool more than a clever knave. Such faith as this we need again to save us from our trust in cleverness.

Shall we regain our faith in this next century? I hope we shall; I think we will. Just now we are bewildered by the many novel things with which we have to deal. Change after change has come so fast that we have lost our bearings. We have not made a code to fit the changing scheme; we still are lost within a whirl that leaves us dizzy as it rushes past. But we shall find our bearings, shall get our grip anew upon the world. And we will fashion principles which need not be denied when put in practice. The world is such that we have right to faith. And as a hundred years ago, men claimed that right and sought again their faith, so now we will again make good our claim. Without it life is for most of us a hollow mockery. We are too fond of life to let it go like that. America, I think, will live again by faith.

II.

Such is my prophecy about the world, about America, in this next century. If it were true, what would it mean for education, for liberal education, for education here in Amherst?

I have said that in this next century America will pass from youth to manhood, will try to make a culture of its own. And further, out of the mingling of the peoples of the earth, a greater people will be fashioned here. And we will care for individual human beings, will make the individual lives of men the ends we serve. And we will serve these ends without denying them, will keep the faith that they have rightness in themselves. If such should be the process of our country's life, what will it mean for liberal colleges; what will it mean for us? The college is a place
where men and boys are sensitive to human life, are set apart to share by vision and by understanding in the world of men. What will the vision be in this next century? How shall we understand? Let us attempt to answer point by point according to the prophecy.

And first, the major prophecy. If we, the country, go from youth to manhood, so will the college. It too has been thus far a formless place of vagueness and of irresponsibility. America has dallied at the door of manhood, and so have we. Our colleges have failed for lack of conscious purpose in their teaching. And young Americans are hard to teach because neither to them nor to their friends has come the sense of tasks that must be done. Our talk of personal opportunity is far too pale, too negative a thing to claim the generous and adventurous mind. And so those minds are taken, not by us, but by a hundred petty, trivial things, each for its passing moment. But now the time has come when we must claim those minds as ours, to serve our purposes and theirs. I do not mean that we must find sham causes to allure our youth, invent high purposes to tempt them on to lessons, like donkeys straining for a tuft of fragrant grass. But this I mean. If we have purposes to serve, if we have manhood's obligations to fulfill, the college, first of all, must catch the sense of what they are. Here boys and men must feel and know and share their people's life. Here, if our people strive, the sense of striving must be strong and deep. Here, if our people fail, whether in virtue or in skill, the sense of shame must sting and throb until the failure is redeemed. Here, if we win, the joy of winning must explode in riotous delight. Here, as our people seek to find their way, we must be seeking too and help to find the way.

Our people go to find their destiny. What will the college do? It too will go to find its fate with free and honest purpose. There will be many days of doubt and danger, of strain and sad confusion. But through it all we shall go out as boys from their Commencement, from eager youth to eager, sober manhood. This is the time when purpose forms because great things are seen. Life will have zest and power. There are no days in life like those in which the man breaks out into himself. And boys, whose strongest craving is to be like men, will rush to share that zest. Amherst and Williams, Harvard and Yale will live again, as in the earlier days when they were first established, to be the nervous centers of a growing life.
It will be good to try to see and tell the way our people ought to choose to go.

What will the college see in this next century? Out of the nation’s life its purposes will come. What will they be? I have three minor prophecies to make.

1.

First—if we are not to have a racial aristocracy, democracy must have a dwelling place within our colleges. If here where thought is free and men are young, we dare not let our Anglo-Saxon culture take its chance, no other men or institutions will take the risk. We are an Anglo-Saxon college; and so in greater part we must remain. And yet we are American. We may not keep ourselves apart either from persons or from cultures not our own. We dare not shut our gates to fellow-citizens nor to their influence. So we must welcome boys of other stocks. And if they do not come, we must go out and bring them in. Our undergraduate life must represent the country which it serves; students must keep it free from any taint of caste or aristocracy. And teachers, too, must keep our teaching free, open to all the riches which our people have to bring. We shall not lose our Shakespeare by learning Dante’s world; nor is one false to Poe because one follows Dostoievsky. Our mother England gave us much; and yet she has not all that men may have. Peoples who rule tend to know more of ruling life than living it. And we, our mother’s very eager sons, are much excited by the rattle of machinery. We need the wealth of spirit which the other peoples have to give. And they need us. Here in the American college that fusion must be made, our people must be formed and shaped into the rounded wholeness of a single life. This is a splendid college task. We are and must be genuinely American.

2.

And second, if in this coming century our people are to care for individual lives, the college has a heavy part to play. The college is the topmost round of general education. Here taste for what is best must find its best expression. Hence wisdom must be found as nowhere else, wisdom about the ways and means of making lives successful. But more specifically there is an urgent task which colleges have much neglected in the past. We must have conscious
part in general national education. I do not know whether or not within one hundred years the State will take us as her own. I dare not prophesy on matters such as that. But I do know that in all genuine meanings of the term, we are a people's college, and shall continue so to be. And we must share more deeply in the broader work of making younger people ready for their living. The Greeks have said how hard it is for a democracy to keep in touch with excellence. And popular education, popular training of our youth tends ever downwards in a democratic people's life. Shall we have shoddy training for our youth? We have it now in large degree. And out of shoddy training shoddy people come. But as, of old, men called for ministers to preach and lead, so we today must call for ministers and teachers of every sort who shall take charge of education, shall give it excellence from which to draw its strength. To bring the best we have of taste and insight into the making of our youth—that is a splendid task which liberal colleges must face. I do not mean that colleges should be made normal schools for teachers, I do not mean that we should cease from sending graduates to law, to business, to medicine, to all the various arts of human life. But I do mean that in some deeper sense, our colleges which have in charge the best that human life affords must make the best effective in the care of all our youth.

We must send forth more ministers and teachers. And we must make them ready for their work. We cannot cultivate our youth unless their teachers have themselves been cultivated in taste and insight. Here is the essential weakness of our national scheme of teaching. It is not based on genuine education of those who do the teaching. Only an educated people can, in the last resort, give education to its children. And we are vainly trying to pay for education rather than to give it. But we, the colleges, must work for general education for young and old, must set the standard high, must make it gleam before the people's eyes, must lead them into the love of truth, into the search for wisdom in the ways of life. For this was Amherst College founded; by this it is and must be justified.

3.

And lastly, what of faith? Our country seeks to find its bearings, to get a grip again upon some fundamental things in which it
may have confidence. What will the college do to help? It must
keep faith itself. Life is secure. Beneath the strife of men there
are the common things for which both parties, with their partial wis-
dom, partial blindness, strive. The college must keep in closer
touch with these than with the parties which by different ways are
striving toward them. Amidst their doubts and differences men
need today the sense of their agreements lying deep within them-
selves and in their world. Serenity and humor, good will and con-
dience, these are the qualities which colleges must keep in charge
to serve their people. Men lose their poise in days like these, grow
frightened by events which they themselves cannot control, take
desperate means to save the situation by a single stroke; are willing
just this once to put their faith aside, to save it for all future time.
And colleges must tell them, what the ages have to tell, that single
strokes do not save worlds, except for single moments. And if the
faith is sacrificed today, it will cost more to win it back tomorrow.
Here is, it seems to me, the deepest task of liberal colleges—to put
the parties in their proper place and keep them there. We must
have parties, and yet we need to smile at parties—I do not mean to
laugh at them. We need to see each partial good as good in part,
and yet as just a part. We need to smile and keep our faith in men
and in their world. With all its doubts and fears, with all its con-
flict and confusion, the world of men moves onward toward its
goal. And they who doubt the goal are doubting toward it; and
they who find it here will some day learn that there as well it has
been found by other men. It leads us on whether we will or not.
It does not fear our doubts; nor does it value quite as highly as we
sometimes do our approbations. It is the faith of men in Man and
in the world. The colleges must keep, will keep that faith in this
next century.

III.

And now, one closing word! I know that some of you who listen
to our conversation have said, "All this is very general, very re-
 mote, not very helpful for the special tasks which wait the College
in these coming years." You ask, "What is to be the course of
study, what will you teach and how? Is wisdom gained from Greek
or science, art or statistics? Are we to have a junior-senior college
plan? Shall senior majors live or be forgotten?"
And here again, I cannot tell you what will come to pass. Nor do I care to try. These things, important as they are, are not essential. They must be passed upon as current questions according as the spirit leads. Two things I know concerning them. First, we will keep in mind the stipulations made by Zephaniah Moore when he accepted office as president of Amherst College. He required assurance, first, that “the classical education should be thorough,” and second, that “the course of study should not be inferior to that in the colleges of New England.” In both these ways the College pledged itself to him; and it has tried to keep, will try to keep, that pledge. But further I am sure of one thing else. The course of study and the ways of teaching must be determined by the teachers, must be for them expressions of themselves. Nothing is gained by imposition from without. Trustees and president and graduates may make their plans, but they will fail unless they are as well the plans of those who do the teaching. Here is a truth which we must never lose from mind. Nine years ago I said, in an Inaugural Address, and now I say again, “It is, I believe, the function of the teacher to stand before his pupils and before the community at large as the intellectual leader of his time. If he is not able to take that leadership, he is not worthy of his calling. If the leadership is taken from him and given to others, then the very foundations of the scheme of instruction are shaken.” We shall not lose these principles in these next years. A great college with great teachers, that is our dream for Amherst. A great college is great teachers—that is the principle by which our dream comes true.

And so I say to Amherst men of every century, “We have a right today to faith in this old College, faith in the country which the College serves, faith in the work the College has to do, faith in its willingness and power to do that work. And we must keep the faith and do the work with joy and exultation.” Listen, you men of Amherst’s present day, listen and you will hear the cheers that come to urge us on. They come from out the past, one hundred years ago; they ring from out the future, from centuries still to come. They are the cries of those who, after searching, try to speak the spirit of Amherst College. Listen to Webster, Moore and Leland; listen to X and Y and Z. They shout from out the years to us, their fellows, “The College lives, long live the College!”