

ADDRESSES AND PAPERS
BY EVERETT MOORE BAKER

*Address, "Today's Tensions and Tomorrow's Truth,"
before the North Eastern Ohio Teachers
Association, Cleveland, October 29, 1943*

DOWN through all history we can, if we will, observe the development of certain ideas and concepts of human behavior and social organization.

- a. Some are the result of gradual evolution
- b. Some are *born* of political change and some *create* political change
- c. Some *are born of violent revolution* and some *create violent revolution*
- d. Some are *a long time* in incubation—some are *sudden*

Through all the changes and chance of history it is now possible to look back and see certain ideas forming *that had survival value*. They did survive and became dominant in the growing culture of our civilization.

There were certain other ideas that for a period seemed to be permanent, seemed to have the sanction of human if not divine approval (and usually when there is considerable human approval, some power is brought to bear to invoke the divine blessing). *Human slavery is one of these*, an idea, a widespread concept of human relationship which for centuries was generally approved, but did not have survival value. The feudal system was another.

Certain attitudes concerning women and their relations

to men are another example. It was the wise men—the prophets of old—the great teachers who were able to evaluate these concepts and determine in advance which had survival value and which did not.

Men have foreseen the end of a social condition—the gradual or revolutionary disappearance of a relationship—*by the recognition of tensions in their society*. One hasty look at the present American scene is enough to make us certain that we are living in the midst of forces pulling in opposite directions—pressure groups whose ideologies are in violent contradiction—which are vying with each other for the maintenance or the change of the status quo—or even the status quo ante—(for certain sections of the nation I might say *ante-bellum* and still mean the Civil War).

There are deep undercurrents moving which are going to determine our future; and it is our business as parents and teachers to know which currents will merely run out and stop, which will continue in the stream of history, and what the effect of these currents is going to be.

The oceanographer knows all about the deep currents of the oceans. He is not concerned with the surface storms; for deep currents determine the climatic conditions of much of the land surface of the globe which in turn determine to a very large extent what men do and how they do it.

What then are some of the deep currents moving in our country today, causing today's tensions from which will be born tomorrow's truth? We cannot begin to adequately describe more than three. There are many more, and it is our business as parents to discover them for ourselves.

We know our history. We in this community have had advantages and many of us have had the academic experience which can give perceptive power. The recognition of these fundamental currents (tensions) is our business:

First, there is the steady on-flowing current of Racial Equality. This swelling stream can no more be stopped than Atlantic Ocean's Gulf Stream; than the Columbia River. If any of you have ever seen the Grand Coulee—800 feet deep, cut 20 miles long, made when the glacier turned the river from its original bed—you may have a mind picture of the catastrophic violence that will result if some force is set in the way of such a current. It may be dammed—lakes may be formed whereby we may control the flow and stop the floods—but the current moves on and he who stands in the way of the steady flow of the ideal of racial equality will be swept away like a broken, wooden fence rail on the rushing waters of the Mississippi when she breaks her levees.

There are three times as many colored people in the world as white—and the day of white domination through economic or political control is fast coming to its dusk. Many of us don't know it yet, but it is a fact that, while we may think we are fighting the Nazis and the Japs and a set of values and political ideals contrary to our own—and so we are—for most of the people of the world that is not the real issue.

For the yellow and brown-skinned peoples of the Dutch East Indies, for the natives of Burma—of India, too, over 350,000,000—for the Chinese, 400,000,000—and before we are through, for a great many million Japanese,

for the African Negroes and for a great portion of the dark-skinned population of South America, this war is for their freedom. Perhaps we only fooled ourselves, when in the first idealism of this war we talked a lot about Freedom. Churchill had to pull back on India, but *our words* still stand. The time is coming when the world over, there will not be any more *second and third class citizens*. Of that we can be certain. That is one of the great currents.

What does it mean to us here at home? First of all, it means we cannot with very good grace talk about England and India, until we do something about the tensions existing in America because of racial prejudice. Anti-semitism, anti-orientalism, anti-Negro, anti "all-but-me"—these are vicious attitudes, divisive, ruinous to democracy, which by education, *and only by education*, must be sifted out of our American mind.

It is not merely a matter of education for white children whose parentally inspired prejudices must be removed. It is just as much a matter of education for Negroes who must learn how to understand White prejudice; how to live in the same community with Whites; how to work side by side with Whites, whether in factory, school or office. I say it is primarily a job of education. Prejudice is the product of ignorance. It is the business of education to drive out ignorance.

The Negro in America has been legally a free man for several generations. But he has been a second class citizen. He has not had equal opportunities nor equal rights; he has been segregated into slum areas where he has had to pay higher rents; he has not been allowed in hotels,

movies, theaters, trains and schools; he has been limited in the work he may do. Notice it is *may*, not *can*. He now is taking seriously the talk about the Four Freedoms and says, "This means me." And we must agree.

Another great stream of influence that must be measured and understood is *the steadily rising tide of power of organized labor* and the concomitant ebb from the former flood of influence on American life of what we have called industry or capital. Here again we are witnessing a long-flowing, deep-running stream. There is no stopping it. We can control it—we can channel it if we are wise enough—but we cannot stop this tide.

I have had the privilege recently of serving as chairman of several War Labor Board hearing panels. It has been one of the most interesting experiences I have ever had. Out of it came immediate observations: First, both sides seem almost wholly selfish. Not the good of both, but the good of "my side" is the chief concern. The theory is that out of conflict there will come a workable compromise or best solution. Second, both sides lack understanding of the other. The element of human personality here is very important. Third, the average citizen in between is confused by the extremists of the *Daily Worker* or Westbrook Pegler type. Education — understanding — is the only answer.

One of the most important issues before the War Labor Board panels these days has been Maintenance of Membership and the check-off. *The arguments of the Unions are practical and business-like*. So are some of the arguments against Maintenance of Membership by the employers. One of the most frequently mentioned is that

maintenance of membership is a denial of individual liberty—denial of the very thing, the sacred value, for which our sons and brothers are giving up their lives in North Africa and the South Pacific. This is not the time nor the place to discuss the merits of these issues. I mention the arguments merely to indicate how half-truth, incomplete understanding, enthusiastic “slogan” language is being used by some opponents of what seems to me one of the deep-running currents today.

Before the war is over we must find the way to resolve the differences between the principal factors in this realm of tension. And, I believe, we shall only find the solution in some formula which will give to organized labor, rights and *privileges commensurate with its responsibility*. Wherever labor organizers stand in the way of labor’s move toward this greater responsibility—or employers, managers or consumers participate in action gauged to hold back the democratization of labor’s role in industry—the swollen tide will burst its dykes and there will be floods of violence.

What we need to do is:

1. Study and teach the purposes and ideals of organized labor and the National Association of Manufacturers. Many are similar; and these tend to balance the differences between the two groups.
2. Study and teach the conditions and circumstances which prompt the patterns of conduct for these two groups in America in order that neither can fool an uninformed portion of the public standing in between.
3. Recognize that the rise of labor to power is a part

of a total movement—the great river into which have been flowing little brooks and streams of man’s *endeavor for equal opportunity, freedom from oppression*, the liquidation of second class citizenship—and upon the recognition of that fact of history, work for reconciliation of the opposing forces in the present tension.

And there is one other wrecking and construction job ahead for all of us in our democratic community. These two I have mentioned obviously have their minor problems, but in time we’ll solve them, or if we don’t, we’ll be swept away and someone else will. If we don’t do this other, this third job, *it may not be done for another 100 years*. Here the current isn’t so well channelled—in fact by circumstances of world war, the current of history has been diverted and at the moment is flowing in another direction.

The problem is this: For centuries men have been moving toward greater individual responsibility. Education in the democratic method has been making democrats (small “d”). Now suddenly because of the war we are tending toward authoritarianism. Ten million of our best men—our ablest manhood—are being schooled in military life and ways. It is not my purpose to disparage the manners and mores of military life, but I think there is little argument that they are not as conducive to the development of individual responsibility and freedom of judgment and conduct as the traditional ways of America in peacetime. The tendency toward centralization of government, of transfer of local to federal (more remote) authority is only one example of this trend.

The only force in opposition in which I see hope is the local educational system—enhanced, enriched and continuing. We, the people of America, cannot be responsible for the management of our country, for our own destiny, with only a grammar or even a high school education. Our education system must touch and influence every citizen through his entire lifetime, if we are to fulfill our destiny as peace-makers and bring to bear our influence, with other peoples of the world, for the preservation of peace and justice in the world to come.

*Address at the One Hundredth Anniversary of the
Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity, New York City,
December 29, 1947*

At our service of commemoration and rededication held in connection with our centennial celebration in Dwight Chapel at Yale University, Secretary Royal made a statement with which I would disagree. I do this deliberately because I believe difference of opinion in fraternities is good for us. It stimulates our thinking, it helps our understanding of each other, and if we maintain the basic spirit of fraternity in spite of our differences, we are thereby better citizens. Brother Royal, in his memorial address, argued very effectively for maintenance of strong military organization as "the only way" that we can contribute to the preservation of the peace of the world. It is with that phrase, "the only way" that I would take exception. I do not believe it is "the only way." It is the way we have tried for thousands of years, but in *that way*, so far, we have never succeeded.

I deliberately raise this difference of opinion at the occasion of this banquet because I am firmly convinced that any opinion distilled and tested by discussion and debate is likely to be nearer true than an opinion handed down unchallenged. Furthermore, I am firmly convinced that one of the great values of fraternity life is the opportunity that is afforded to all of us, who share and have shared in it, to argue and debate questions of vital concern.

This leads naturally to my conviction that there is another way:—another way so immediate and so simple that many of us have never even thought of it. This other way is merely the extension of the basic values and attitudes of fraternity ideals and methods to world government. These we learn in our own chapter houses out of the experience of life in fraternity, out of the sharing of ideas and ideals, out of the resolving of our differences through the interchange of opinion and the eventual understanding of each other, out of the sacrifices that are essential for cooperative living.

This is one of the most important parts of the education that is essential for the maintenance of the peace and justice of the world. If our fraternities contribute to this education they will remain strong and vital forces in the colleges and universities of our continent. If they don't, they will die.

Education for tomorrow must serve three purposes. It must create in the student a high sense of responsibility, a cooperative spirit and a deep feeling for the ideals of a free democracy. Essential to the fulfillment of these purposes is a sense of belonging:—a student to his college or university, a citizen to his town, state, or nation and to his world. The human being who does not feel that he belongs to something bigger than himself cannot be a participating member of a free and democratic world.

In our fraternity we have a great opportunity for the development of this sense of belonging, without which the ultimate purposes of our education are impossible. This is the first great service that our fraternity can render to education for the free democratic world of tomorrow.

Our fraternity has a future only if it contributes to the development of this sense of belonging and the purposes of education that are rooted in it.

May I illustrate by reference to one of the arguments set forth at one recent meeting of the Interfraternity Council here in New York. The President of the Council defended fraternities against the charge of discrimination on the grounds that of course *fraternities should be discriminating* and to deny them the right of discrimination would be un-American. He argued that if a group of bow-legged students chose to organize themselves together as a fraternity and refused to admit knock-kneed students that was their American right. The fact remains, however, that this argument when published in the papers of the country appeared to put fraternities against the tide of rapidly developing recognition of the essential injustice of American racial prejudice.

Fraternities should be built upon the values that are important. *Of course we should be discriminating*. We should choose for our members men who are honest, cooperative, responsible and intelligent, progressive and idealistic, loyal to the highest ideals of our country and religious in the true meaning of that word. I do not believe that the educational system of America has much room for organizations whose discriminating tastes exclude all who are not bowlegged. I do believe that our educational system *has much room* for fraternities whose discriminating tastes invite to membership men who are aware of and are guided in their daily living by the highest values of our free American tradition.

May I cite another example of what I mean. We have

just experienced a second great World War. War, by its very nature, breeds authoritarianism. It produces systems and organizations that must be efficient and effective, systems in which the masses of the people don't have to think, where most of us have only to obey, systems in which we lose our freedom in our attempt to gain security. In the wake of war now we are witnessing the strong continuing influence of authoritarian ideologies that so many of our young men gave their lives to defeat. Once more I say, there is no better organization on this continent than the fraternities of our colleges and universities to initiate fundamental education for group and community responsibility that is so essential for our democracy. In the democratic concerns of our fraternity we have the stuff to build the walls and roof of the temple of world brotherhood. If the fraternities do not actively contribute to this end, they have no legitimate place in our educational structure.

These are generalities, parts of the basic philosophy of fraternity. I would give you, in addition, certain specific suggestions which would seem to me important for the improvement of our practices in order that we may live more consistently with the truth of this basic philosophy. . . .

I would suggest there is room for the greater development of a sense of social responsibility within our fraternity groups for the communities in which they are located. Much has been done in recent years to indicate that we are moving in the right direction. However, I still hear too frequently comments from normal, good citizens who happen to live near fraternity houses, to the effect

that thoughtless, anti-social, careless and sometimes illegal conduct of fraternity men is "all that anyone can expect." Many times I have heard intelligent people condone bad manners and low morals with the phrase, "Well, that's all you can expect of fraternity men." That's too bad, in fact, that's very bad. The fraternities ought to play their rightful role. The Faculties of our colleges and the citizens of our country should be able to expect and recognize from them a *higher standard* of conduct than the average of the community. In this endeavor, too, I would like to see our fraternity in the future take the lead.

Another suggestion I would make has to do with the relationship between fraternity and college administration and faculties. Fraternities are an essential part of the educational structure. In every way, life in a fraternity house should contribute to the total education of the student. Between the administrators, faculties of our colleges and fraternities there must be complete mutual confidence and trust or the ends which we all seek cannot be reached. Again, I would like to see our chapters take the lead in initiating a much closer relationship between fraternity members and faculties of their colleges in order that the gap of misunderstanding which exists in some colleges can be closed.

My last suggestion is that as we begin the second century of our history we take up again with enthusiasm one of the purposes that was uppermost in our early history. I would like to see every Deke chapter develop within itself informal, after-dinner discussion groups which might be modeled on the Great Issues course that has recently been initiated at Dartmouth. Perhaps, once a

week or once a month, experts from our faculties or from the world of business, finance, government, industry or religion could be invited to lead discussions of the great issues that are the troubling problems of our world. We need practice in good, old-fashioned town meeting methods. We need to know how to express our differences of opinion, we need to practice the fine art of persuasion, we need to learn the fun of discussion of an idea, and the pleasure of stimulating conversation. Where better than in our fraternities can we do this? How better can we learn to develop another way of solving the world's problems than by beginning to discuss them where we live?

These are only a few suggestions that occur to me as worthy of consideration as we now turn into the second century of our history. It would seem to me wise that every chapter should this year evaluate itself and make an appraisal of its assets and liabilities, not only in terms of its house and mortgage, but more especially in terms of its contributions to the end purposes of our education. If out of such an evaluation new life is born, new energy, a new sense of responsibility and a cooperative spirit, then our fraternity will assume its proper place in the educational system of America. I cherish for my fraternity at the beginning of its second century strong leadership in this direction.

*Baccalaureate Address, Dartmouth College,
June 12, 1949*

On the paneled walls of the great museum in Toronto are pictured the periods in our earth's geologic history when its crust was cooling, when great mountain ridges were pushed upward, when gigantic convulsions created new contours, ridges, valleys, oceans, and continents, when volcanoes blasted forth fire, steam and boiling lava. It was a lifeless time which terrifies our imagination.

In the columned pages of the newspapers of our time are pictured many phases of this current period of our world's history when the fires of war are still cooling, when the statesmen of the world are pushing each other for preference in the control of the deposits of the earth's resources and of the earth's people. And the people are confused. It is a time of life, and death, which challenges our imagination.

This is your period in time. In it the prejudices, the inherited and acquired bitteresses, the passions and hatreds, deeply rooted in men's minds, struggle for expression.

The mistakes of men, their misunderstandings, their misinterpretations of history, and their ignorance hang like heavy rusted chains on our arms and shoulders as we strive to build tomorrow's world.

You know, as well as I, the problems that must be solved before we know the answers that tell us of the

future. Berlin, China, the Far East, the Near East and oil, Moscow, and millions of dissatisfied people who thought they saw in the defeat of Hitler's brown-shirts the promise of four freedoms—now bewildered, seem to have to choose between minimum economic security of totalitarianism and unwanted responsibility for the establishment of the freedoms which they believed would somehow be bestowed upon them. They, these millions, like us do not understand the nature of freedom. It cannot come as a gift. It cannot be bestowed. Freedom must be won, dearly purchased, and the price is responsibility.

We are, I believe, making progress—slow progress—you are no longer subject to the kind of influence described by a paragraph in the popular novel of a few years ago called *The White Tower*. In that tale an American bomber pilot lands in a small Swiss village and there he meets among others a French philosopher. In one of their conversations the Frenchman says to the American:

“There was a time when you were something else. An engineer, perhaps; a lawyer, a student, a journalist—it does not matter. You were young, hopeful, ambitious, your energies directed toward the things of the spirit and the mind. Then the war came—another war—the endless war. The world said to you suddenly, ‘No, you are none of these things you imagine yourself to be. You are a bomber pilot.’ You used to be interested in literature and the arts, but no longer. It has taken you and changed you from a thinker into a tiny cog in its monstrous machinery. Oh, a very remarkable cog, I grant you—a very precise, ingenious, effective bit of mechanism. But a cog, none the less. And in the

process what has happened? What has happened is that you are probably no longer a thinking, feeling man in the sense you once were. Your mind, perceptions and sensibilities have grown decadent and in danger of atrophy.”

You have, I believe, made the transition back again. You have grasped the opportunity and completed the circle. You are not *mere doers* but *thinkers*, no longer *agents* of another's will but *forces* of your own, and responsible for your destiny.

The primary need of our society is for responsible citizens. The college that affords its students opportunity only to learn some science and a little history, to read the classics of literature, to taste a small portion of sociology, economics, and anthropology, to appreciate art and music, to examine philosophies and question theologies has only begun its proper function.

The great purpose of education is to help young men and women to become self-reliant, responsible citizens in a cooperative community. I am not at all sure that self-reliance and responsibility can be taught in the same sense that physics and history can be taught. Initiative, imagination, cooperation and responsibility can, however, be learned, given the environment of the academic community. He who spends four years in the presence of such an opportunity and does not learn to carry his citizen responsibilities, to cooperate with his fellow men in the maintenance of the commonweal, and to strive constantly for freedom under law, has failed in his proper educational purpose.

The Dartmouth, commenting recently concerning a

particular issue in the life of the college, said a student who cannot learn to discipline himself "is likely to find himself on his way back home to break the news to mama that while he can behave himself when she is around to tell him what to do, when he must tell himself what to do, he is unable to do anything else but what he shouldn't." One of the chief purposes of education is the development of self-discipline—the substitution of self for mama; the substitution of self for ulterior authority in cooperative community.

This is the great need in American education, especially in our privately endowed colleges where the justification for their existence is dependent upon a higher output of responsible cooperative citizen leaders than might be expected of the great publicly supported state universities.

This need is our special responsibility. This is the opportunity that you have enjoyed.

There are two suggestions I could make to you as you mark the transition from learning to doing—from receiving to giving—from less to greater responsibility.

The first is that in your thoughts and in your actions you shall be radical. By that I mean no more nor less than the true meaning of the word. I once heard a judge of the Superior Court of one of our great mid-western states say that he wanted to be known as a radical—not a liberal, not a conservative, but as a radical—because he wanted always to be recognized as one who sought the roots of all problems—the roots of the issues of his time. He wanted to develop his opinions upon an understanding of basic and fundamental factors. He wanted to cut through the emotional overlayers which so often hide the

truth, he wanted to be able to dig beneath the prejudices and stereotype opinions of other men and discover root causes.

In the midst of a vast surge of opinion concerning academic freedom, before the tides of prejudice concerning the many varying problems of racial relations, or in the confusions of attitudes concerning the choices of roads toward one world, we need men who can see clearly, understand thoroughly and choose wisely because they know the roots.

I suggest, although I know the analogy is not perfect, that it is the oceanographer who knows the long-range future of Europe and its culture, because he knows the deep currents of the oceans that control the climate that in such large measure controls the economic and cultural life of European people. So it is the anthropologist and the sociologist who knows best the long-range answers to some of the racial problems that vex American colleges today. These, like all our problems, will not be solved by men who study them through dark glasses of prejudice and expediency. Only with the microscope that helps us see the roots and the telescope that brings us into focus with the remote relations of justice and right can we know the answers.

That prompts my second suggestion—that you be religious. By that I do not mean that you must belong to any special ecclesiastical organization or that you be committed to any particular creed or dogma. Some of you either by volition or inheritance are—some are not. I do mean, however, that you shall, because of the privilege that you have enjoyed and the responsibility that is yours,

live in accord with a concept of religion which is not particular but, for the commonweal of tomorrow's world, is essential.

Each of us will find his own religion and his own way to celebrate his religion—some in loneliness pondering the great and ultimate mysteries, some in quiet communion with others in clean, white meeting houses, some in great cathedrals where color, music, and incense motivate their aspirations.

All of us shall need a sense of belonging to Something bigger than ourselves—and a pattern and method of relating ourselves to that Something. This pattern and this method can be our religion. For religion is the light by which we see the right and the wrong. Religion is the warmth which makes us feel our kinship with all men everywhere. Religion is the way we think about ourselves and others. Religion is the anchor chain which holds us fast to our ideals, when tides of disappointment would sweep us out upon a fog-covered ocean of despair. Religion is the telescope by which we measure the distances from ourselves to the shining stars of our perfection. Religion is the firm, strong grasp with which we may hold in our two hands the issues of our day, tear off and cast away the shabby crust of evil, and hold aloft for men to follow the elements of good. Religion is the pattern of our lives that gives us a sense of belonging, of participating, an urge to cooperate to better the common welfare of mankind.

To Dartmouth, your college, my college, we know we belong. We are members of the Dartmouth family. We feel the obligations and the privileges of that relationship.

It is to the extension of the ideas and ideals of this relationship to the world of our tomorrows that we commit ourselves this morning.

We are all members of families—many are gathered here with us today. We understand the ideals of families. We know what they are for. Some of you already know what your mothers and fathers know, that families are for learning joy—the joy of young voices in laughter, the joy of first questions and the searching together for answers; the joy of confidence and trust and understanding that bind old and middle-aged and young together in some place called home.

Families are for learning the give and take of sharing not only things like cars and clothes, but chores, responsibilities, duties and feelings. Families are for building attitudes so necessary for living together in community.

Families are for learning how to meet and know sorrow and tragedy. Families are for comfort and consolation, for facing tomorrow when death calls today.

Families are for Thanksgiving and Christmas and summer vacations and for all the long days of the seasons in between; for bearing the loneliness of long separations, the hardships of disappointment and the anxieties and fears that time and distance make so real.

Families are for holidays, birthdays, anniversaries and commencements—families are for every day—so that people growing up may learn what it is to belong to something bigger than just themselves, something from which, if they give themselves, they can take more than they will ever need.

To such a family we belong. Dartmouth has given us

all the opportunity to develop free minds—free minds with which to search—perchance to find new truth, free minds which need never cower before human opinion, free minds which shall guard their empire of integrity as nobler than the empire of the world.

It is from this family—its hearthfires and its brotherhood that we go this day upon our several ways.

May the ideas and the ideals, the ambitions and the loyalties, the courage and the convictions that we have here learned prompt our thinking, prod our planning and guide our living wherever we may be tomorrow and tomorrow and always.

*Address at the Harvard Divinity School,
April 18, 1950*

Some time ago your Program Committee invited me to speak to you on this occasion on the interesting, and as your secretary said in the announcement, illusive subject: the general moral and religious attitude of the modern undergraduate. In a moment of recklessness I accepted, I suppose believing that somehow between that time and this, knowledge based on facts and data and wisdom, born of experience with which to interpret the facts and data, would come to me.

As has frequently been my experience, I now find that I neither have the facts and data nor the wisdom to give to you anything I can consider authoritative in the realm of the subject assigned to me.

I believe I know something about modern college students. It has been my good fortune to have very intimate contacts and to form lasting friendships with many of them. They come from a great variety of backgrounds, they represent every walk of life; they have been brought up on the Park Avenues and the Main Streets of America's great cities and small towns; they have come from the war-torn capitals of Europe, the devastated villages of southeast Asia; they are the products of homes and families bound in security by custom and tradition and parents torn by death, debt or marital tragedy. They are tall, short, fat and lean. Some are brilliant, some are dull.

Some carry deeply rooted concerns for the welfare of mankind. Some think only about the next date and marks merely high enough to stay in college. Most of them are honest, a few are not. Almost all of them have the feelings of rebellion that are normal in the growing-up process. For some, money, like the air they breathe, is of no concern. Others literally go hungry for the lack of it. Some are as self-disciplined and highly responsible citizens as your ideal church deacon. Others are as care-free and irresponsible as the cartoon Hollywood version. (These, however, I believe are the small minority.) In short, I believe that if I am to talk about the moral and religious attitude of the modern undergraduate I must talk about the moral and religious attitudes of a portion and age-range of a cross-section of American people.

The segregation of undergraduates on a college campus does set them apart in particular groups and makes them subject to measurement and evaluation in a way not possible for other young men and women throughout the nation. It is possible to study the students of Harvard University and such studies have been made. We are making some very simple surveys of our students at M.I.T. The realm of our ignorance about them is vast and the modicum of our knowledge in terms of facts and data is so inadequate that authoritative statement as to what their religious attitudes are and what their moral behavior is, is impossible with any degree of certainty.

I know colleges in the midwestern area of the United States where the faculty is concerned with the immorality of some of the students as expressed by the increasing evidence of smoking. Students are not allowed to smoke

and most of them are not particularly bothered by the rule. On the other hand, I am increasingly surprised by the large number of students who come into my office and turn down a proffered cigarette with the simple statement: "I don't smoke." I know several colleges where possession of liquor is considered adequate reason for immediate dismissal. I know of other colleges where drunkenness is so frequent that the administrative authorities are greatly disturbed. And yet I have seen hundreds, yes, thousands of students at junior proms, fraternity balls, class parties in city hotels where liquor is immediately available, and yet where drunkenness is never noticeable.

I know colleges where the honor system controls and prevents cheating in quizzes and examinations but in no way affects the conduct of students in relation to their guests from women's colleges in their own fraternities. I know other colleges which do not have an honor system where cheating is rampant in certain courses under certain faculty members, and absolutely non-existent in other courses under other professors. *There simply is no one pattern which can be called the general moral and religious attitude of the modern undergraduate.*

I suppose it would be possible on a particular campus or theoretically throughout all the campuses of the colleges of America to discover a pattern which would be a fair picture in its great variety of the modern undergraduate. Perhaps Dr. Kinsey could undertake such a survey. By the time he had it completed, however, another generation of college students would have filled the classrooms and lecture halls and the data he had collected would no longer be pertinent. Personally, I believe that

on most college and university campuses today it is possible to find the same kind of honesty and dishonesty, morality and immorality, responsibility and irresponsibility, generosity and selfishness, good and evil in the student body as in the faculty, and in both of these groups as in the community of which the university is a part.

I could make a case for the modern college student which would make him appear to be on a much higher plane of morality than the student of my generation. I could fortify my argument with case after case drawn from my own records and those of my colleagues in other colleges. I could then turn around and (I honestly believe it would be more difficult) make a case to prove that the modern college student is amoral, if not immoral, materialistic, anti-religious, careless in matters of integrity, and out to get all that he can get regardless of others' welfare.

It is a sad commentary on the acquisition and refinement of knowledge which is one of the functions of the university that I can say this. I cannot imagine the physicist, the chemist or mathematician being able to make a case either way for some proposition in the realm of the physical sciences. At this point the lag in the development of our knowledge of how to develop attitudes, how to measure those attitudes when developed, how to know and measure the motivations of people, how to understand the actions and reactions of people to the multitude and variety of pressures that impinge upon them, becomes dramatically apparent.

All this prompts me to suggest that if we are concerned with education for citizenship in a cooperative society, if

we believe that the products of our colleges and universities shall assume positions of leadership in a free and democratic world, if we believe that in order to do so they must themselves be self-reliant, responsible individuals with strong motivations for justice and righteousness, we must know more about them than we do. We cannot know adequately how to create the product we desire from the raw material we have, until we know more about that raw material.

In one of the research laboratories at M.I.T. one of my colleagues can describe the relations of the particles of atoms in a salt crystal as they change under the influences of the rise and fall of temperature. His research has required hundreds—thousands—of mathematical calculations and he has his atomic particles all plotted on sheets which look like topographical maps. The knowledge possessed by our scientists of physical relationships is beyond the comprehension of most of us. The knowledge the world possesses about human relationships is still at the sophomoric level.

Against this background of recognition of inadequate data upon which to build any body of knowledge, I shall, nevertheless, dare to express some opinions. First, as to the moral temper, and second, as to the religious attitudes of the modern undergraduate.

First, I think the modern undergraduate is as honest as you and I. He is honest when it is important to be honest and he is careless in matters of integrity when the question or issue seems to him inconsequential. He is more likely to be honest when he is trusted, and dishonest when he doesn't understand the need or desirability of a rule or

regulation. When challenged by someone who, to him, represents ulterior authority, he is *as* likely to withhold all the facts pertaining to his misdemeanor *as* the average citizen when caught in a traffic violation. When confronted with the same facts by a friend or colleague, he is as straightforward in his admission of guilt as attitudes of absolute integrity require.

I believe there is a vast amount of cheating and cribbing condoned by college students, but I believe it is prompted *as much* by rules and regulations of colleges, the manner in which quizzes and examinations are presented, the attitude of the ever watchful policeman proctor, the misunderstanding of the purpose of quizzes developed very early in our education system, *as* it is by any tendency to dishonesty in the students themselves.

My second criterion for measurement of the morality of college students is social responsibility. Here again there is no available data. The degree of social responsibility demonstrated by our college students should be measured in the light of two factors:

- 1) The average college student is temporarily removed from very easy opportunity for the expression of social responsibility in the community in which he and his parents have lived and in the community to which he will go after graduation. He is, in fact, living in a kind of social isolation. If, therefore, he doesn't demonstrate the quality of social responsibility which is measurable in terms of extra-collegiate communities, it is not surprising.
- 2) As I have already indicated, he is passing through a period of rebellion which is a normal part of his development. Sometimes this rebellion expresses itself in social

idealism and he becomes the campus radical. On the whole, this is good. More thoughtful students fit into this pattern. The less thoughtful find in their years in college an opportunity for easy-going disregard of the serious issues that plague the political and economic stability of our country and our world.

In spite of these factors, however, I believe the modern undergraduate has a higher sense of social responsibility, a more deeply rooted concern for the commonweal than the adults who sometimes criticize his care-free, playboy conduct.

For example, I believe that if the undergraduates in the fraternities of our colleges were allowed to make their own decisions without the controls of their alumni officers they would very soon remove the discriminatory clauses in fraternity charters which limit membership to Caucasian Christians. On many college campuses there is a strong tide of opinion favoring the abolition of these discriminatory clauses. The opposition to the change comes not from the undergraduates but from the older alumni. The arguments of the students are thoughtful and mature. The arguments of the alumni appear to me to be thoroughly sophomoric.

Similarly, in the realm of developing concerns for international peace, our college undergraduates manifest a high degree of enthusiasm and patterns of thought and action indicative of a high sense of social responsibility. Developments in this realm are not limited to the colleges and universities on our eastern seaboard. Our Foreign Student Summer Project at M.I.T. presents one of the best examples of student initiative and responsibility for

management. But there are many others, such as the Harvard Salzburg Project, the Minnesota Project, Washington University (Missouri) Project, and others rooted in the program and activities of the National Student Association. This summer, for instance, there will be almost a thousand American students traveling in Europe in study tours and seminars, specializing in various subjects and cultural, political and economic problems *sponsored and managed by student organizations*.

It has been my experience that where students are given opportunity for responsibility they accept it wholeheartedly. The difficulty in our educational system at the present time is that we who are university administrators are far too hesitant to allow opportunities for student responsibilities. We are unwilling to trust students with decisions of importance. We are unwilling to let them run their own affairs without the constant check and advice of faculty counsellors. We withhold from them the very opportunities which would make it possible for them to become more responsible and more concerned for the management of their own affairs and the general welfare of their colleges.

There was a time, not so many generations ago, when young men no more than 19 or 20 years of age sailed American clipper ships on every ocean and into every port, the world around.

Such men as these piloted and navigated those terrifying instruments of destruction, B-29's—over the oceans and across the continents of the world. *Such men as these* in most of the colleges and universities of the country can seldom make decisions of their own, seldom handle their

own extra-curricular organizational funds, seldom run their own social events and athletic programs, sometimes not even elect their own officers without being subject to the review and check of faculty or administrative authority. I know of one very large university not far from here where the top ranking student officers told me recently it is impossible for them to make any decisions or plans without first asking the advice and consent of one of their Deans.

If there is little evidence of student responsibility, individual or social, under such a system in our American colleges we should not be surprised. On the contrary, I have sometimes been greatly gratified that in spite of the limitations imposed there appears to be a higher sense of responsibility within our college and university student groups than in the community in which our students will live after their graduation.

Another criterion of the moral attitudes of the modern undergraduate is the degree of self-reliance demonstrated. I must admit it does not appear to me to be very high. On the other hand, I am convinced it is as high as that apparent in the community of which the colleges are a part. If our students appear to be lacking in self-reliance, one reason, at least, is that they have little opportunity to develop this essential quality. Too much of their lives is planned for them. There is too much paternalism, too much coddling in our American educational system, to develop this quality in the degree that we should desire.

I am advised by some personnel officers of corporations seeking college graduates that whereas the question asked a few years ago was: what are the opportunities? today

the question is: what security is offered? I do not believe this is an indication of an attitude unique in college students, but rather is an indication that college students are subject to the same influences that play upon the rest of the people of the country. The development in recent years of plans for unemployment insurance, medical insurance, old age pensions all tend to direct our attention toward a desire for security higher in our thought patterns than the one-time *dominant urge* for opportunity. This is bad, but it is not a factor uniquely related to the colleges and universities. It is an important factor in the life and culture of our nation.

Another criterion in the realm of moral attitudes can be found in the mores of undergraduates as they control the relations of young men and women. Here it is very apparent to me that there have been changes toward what you and I would call laxity or a lowering of standards. About this, however, I cannot be certain. It is true that there is less chaperoning of college students in their social life, there is much more freedom for them to do what they want to do without limitation of rule or regulation from either the college authorities or their parents, and there is certainly evidence of the development of a single standard of morality for men and women. Things which were done twenty-five years ago in secret and contrary to the psychological conditioning of the students are now done more openly and honestly and do not produce the emotional conflicts and psychopathic patterns which were once more familiar. We are still in a post-war transitional period. It is difficult to reach any positive judgments. I would merely suggest for your consideration that it is pos-

sible that the present situation may be more moral because it is more healthy and more honest than the situation of years gone by which involved secrecy, deceit, and considerably more psychological conflict.

Whatever the moral attitudes of our students are in this realm, I venture the thought that they differ very slightly, if at all, from the moral attitudes of the majority of people of our nation.

I would like to digress at this point to suggest that it appears to me that our colleges have placed too much emphasis on the imparting and gaining of knowledge and too little on developing opportunities for the acquisition of wisdom and understanding. We have assumed that the study of literature and history, mathematics, physics and philosophy, economics and psychology, anthropology and sociology will create men of good will who can live cooperatively, controlling their own destiny in a free world. The ore of knowledge mined from the curricula of our universities has not been sufficiently refined by the living and learning experience of our students to the end that wisdom enters their hearts, discretion preserves them and understanding keeps them and those they influence in ways of righteousness and equity.

Just as the study of the history of the Bible does not make a minister, so the study of economics and political science does not make an adequate citizen. We must develop the methods, the environment, the opportunities in which the student can learn the techniques, but much more important, develop the attitudes and *practice* the skills of cooperative living. We spend millions and have formulated specific curricula for the education of compe-

tent physicists, historians and economists. We need to spend similar sums and give equal energy in research to discover how best to educate competent citizens. We are moving in this direction but as recent history proves, we have not yet begun to meet the needs of our times.

You have also asked me to comment on the religion of the modern undergraduate. This is equally difficult. There is no one pattern, no type. I cannot say the modern undergraduate does not care about organized religion because many do. I cannot say that he is irreligious because many are very strongly religious. I cannot say the modern undergraduate does not attend church regularly because that would not be true. A recent survey of our M.I.T. students indicates that the average student attends church about once a month. I cannot be sure of the correctness of this statistic, but I think it is fair to assume that it is as valid as many of the statistics about church attendance drawn from the public at large.

Furthermore, there is great variation depending upon the college and university and the religious attitudes of the portion of the country in which it is located. Certainly the marathon prayer meeting in the small mid-western college that received so much publicity recently does not represent the religious attitudes of college students in general. Similarly, the fact that at Brown University last week Billy Graham was invited to speak to the students by the Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, a group of relatively fundamentalist students, does not indicate that the average student at Brown would favor the type and quality of religious thinking that this up-to-date Billy Sunday proclaims.

I do not believe our students at M.I.T. are typical of the modern undergraduate of America. In this realm, however, I have been able to discover no evidence to indicate that they are any more or less concerned with religion than students elsewhere. By counting membership and meeting attendance and number of students participating in organized student groups in churches in Metropolitan Boston, I cannot make the total of students participating in church or religious activities equal 20% of our student enrollment. This doesn't particularly surprise me because if it is true that only a little more than half of our total population count themselves as adherents to churches, certainly not much more than half of the adult church members of our country can be called regularly attending and participating members.

How, then, can we describe religious attitudes of the average student, recognizing that the average is weighted by the majority who are not regularly associated with what we call organized religion? First of all, I believe that he is not at all interested in doctrine or dogma. Sometimes he demonstrates an academic interest in heated argument in his fraternity house or dormitory bull session, but generally speaking he has not the slightest interest in matters which have been of such vital concern to the vast variety of Protestant churches of our country. He doesn't care anything about baptism as a sacrament but he will be very glad to have his children baptized because he sees some sentimental value in the symbolic ceremony.

Marriage is not a sacrament made good by the blessing of the church, but it is a relationship between two individuals made good by the faithful keeping of their love

one to another.

The teachings of the Christian church concerning the divinity of Christ, his miraculous birth and resurrection, ideas about salvation and grace, heaven and hell, make interesting conversation, but the average college student considers them in the same way he considers some of the strange religious concepts of some primitive African tribe about which he knows nothing but has heard some interesting tales.

If by *religious* we mean participation actively in the organized affairs of churches, concern for the doctrines and dogmas of churches, or belief in or faith in the validity of many of the teachings of the churches about God, Christ, sin and its forgiveness, salvation and immortality, then the average college undergraduate is irreligious. If by *religious* we mean a binding to a higher set of values to which he occasionally feels he must aspire and which frequently prompt his conduct, then he is probably more religious than the average member of the community outside the walls of his campus.

One of the difficulties is that he has been taught many things by his church during his childhood which now in the classrooms and lecture halls of his college he can no longer believe. Unless in his college years he takes a substantial course in the History of the Bible or in the Literature of the Bible, he continues to think he is supposed to believe the Sunday School stories that he once was taught are God's truth. This he cannot do. Much of what he has been asked to believe important seems to him to be inconsequential and like what even Christians call superstition when they allow themselves to be critical of

other religions. The result of this shift in his thinking is to force him to look elsewhere for the answers to the perplexing questions that have vexed mankind. And so he is inclined to follow what he believes to be the scientific and materialistic road to the answers to his questions. He has seen the horizon of the known pushed back further and further by the methods and tools of science. Although the realm of the unknown has thereby become more vast, he prefers to try to penetrate it by using the instruments of his laboratories rather than by reliance on revelation.

For example, the average college undergraduate is considerably concerned with problems of race relations, labor-management relations, international peace, juvenile delinquency, slum clearance and new housing, but I do not believe that he would ever *think* of expecting, *through prayer*, any divine guidance for the solution of these problems. He does have faith that man, with the tools he has and the tools he may devise, following methods he calls scientific, will somehow and some day solve these problems.

Those of you who know me know that I am not a theologian and that my religious concerns do not include either knowledge of or enthusiasm for the doctrines and dogmas of religion. Undoubtedly the opinions I have expressed here demonstrate my own bias. I have tried to give you my honest impressions of the religious attitudes of college students today. I know that those of you who have been in close touch with college students in your churches will have different opinions. Remember that I am talking about students who are not in your churches,

the average students who occasionally go to church but who do not participate actively in discussion groups and in the organized program of your churches.

This brings me to my conclusion which is that, by and large, the country over, the colleges and universities present to their students religion in terms of creed and doctrine, rule and regulation and ideas which the religious man is supposed to accept. Frequently the form in which religion is presented is faulty. Although required chapel is not as prevalent as it was a generation ago, the mere fact of compulsion antagonizes many students and strengthens the feeling of rebellion initiated in their mind when they were forced to attend Sunday School.

I believe there is more real religion in a group of students bound together by a program for the raising of funds for the relief of students in some college in Indonesia or in India, or for the collecting of books for some war-devastated university of Europe, or the development of a big brother program for foreign students in this country than in many college chapels. It can be argued that without the chaplain or the chapel these programs would never be initiated. In some cases certainly this is true, but it is also true that the students believe that the really important religious values are to be found in *work* for international brotherhood, the breaking of the barriers that divide the races and in service for their fellow students the world around. This is their religion. Its inspiration is more humanistic than theistic, and its methods in their opinion are scientific. The students are unaware of any elements of divine sanction, inspiration or guidance.

I look forward to the day when the organized forces of religion in our colleges and universities may in much larger measure take the lead in formulating programs whereby students can learn religious attitudes by doing religious deeds. I have little faith in the results of preaching to college students but I have great faith in the potential of college students for the building of a better world if only colleges will give them greater opportunity for this endeavor and provide more and stronger leaders.

If this be not a primary function of the university, with demands upon faculty and administration equal to those for the teaching of the liberal arts and the social and physical sciences, then it should be. The world will be dark, as it is dark, and grim, until a new light is born of attitudes of brotherhood, of self-discipline, of cooperation, of wisdom and understanding, justice, mercy and equity—religious attitudes—born alive in the minds of students not because they have *read* about them or *heard* about them from the visiting preacher, but because, by *practicing* them, their hopes have been informed and their lives have been enthused.

*Address at the Annual Meeting of the Phillips Exeter
Academy Alumni Association, at the School,
May 27, 1950*

The problems that vex our world are as varied as its people. We can describe and group them in as many ways as there are schools and curriculum subjects, or into such ultimate divisions as "Men of Exeter and Others." The basic problem, however, is whether man, because of his nature and the state of the world, must live and work under totalitarian direction, or can co-operatively and democratically control his own destiny.

Or, as I heard Prof. Archibald MacLeish say this week, "the most important problem of our time is the survival of individual freedom." It is upon the background of this problem that I dare make certain comments this morning about education.

Schools like Exeter—and the colleges and universities of our country—have three purposes:

1. To educate at varying levels of maturity young men for the responsibilities of living in the world of their future.
2. To educate these same young men for the responsibilities of making a living in the world of their future.
3. To mold the world of our future by the enthusing of young men with ideas and ideals, and patterns of thought and habits of conduct, measured to

increase individual and group responsibility, strengthen cooperative endeavor, and develop integrity, develop feelings of community, and enlarge the opportunities for freedom.

The third of these purposes obviously is related to the first but not necessarily to the second. The school or college that does not include in its purposes the third will not fulfill its responsibilities for the commonweal of our world of tomorrow.

No school can adequately meet its obligations by merely preparing a student for the academic requirements of college. No college or university can adequately meet its obligations to society by merely training, no matter how well, a young man for vocational or professional competence. If there is any one obvious weakness in American education today, it is in this realm.

We have succeeded fairly well in teaching young men to perform certain tasks, to do certain types of jobs—to earn livings as lawyers, doctors, bankers, farmers, editors, merchants, business managers, professors and ministers. But if they have become honest men, if they have become happy men, feeling a concern for the welfare of their communities, if they have become good parents, it has been more because of what they learned (as Mr. Churchill said he derived his education) by picking up a few things along the way, than by what they have been taught in the ivied halls of their schools and colleges.

There appears to be little evidence that private schooling, or college or university training (I am speaking of American education in general) provides any special guarantee that the graduate will be a responsible citizen.

We like to think this is not true of Exeter. Here we did learn much which has informed our living as well as our working. Here we learned habits of responsibility, cooperation, integrity and kindliness.

I wish I could believe that even at Exeter, which I hold preeminent in this regard—or at any other school or college—there is as much concern for and emphasis given to the development of attitudes of cooperation, mutual helpfulness, honesty, feeling of individual and social responsibility as there is attention to the teaching of chemistry, Latin or history.

It is more difficult to measure and provide opportunity for boys to learn to be responsible citizens than it is to teach the traditional curriculum subjects; but difficult as it may be, if the trend of education continues in our country as it is now, the time will come when some schools and colleges must take the position that a diploma or a degree means that the recipient has not only satisfactorily passed the courses in the curriculum, but is also known to be the kind of person who is self-reliant, honest, cooperative, concerned for the commonweal and ready to assume his share of work for its betterment.

My thesis this morning is simple: we have gained great facility in teaching certain types of knowledge. The curricula of our schools and colleges are crowded with a vast number of subjects all of which we teach and students learn with relative efficiency. This is our business and we do it well.

And we have had a side-line—which in some schools like Exeter and a few colleges is as important as the original purpose—the production of men who, because

of their deep-rooted attitudes, are capable of upholding standards essential for a free, democratic, and peaceful world.

My thesis is that in all schools and in all colleges the emphasis on the development of compelling attitudes suitable for the world we want should be as important as the teaching of vocational skills, professional competence, the understanding of history, or the appreciation of art.

What a strange world is ours! Our scientists know how to burn us all in a man-made hell far more terrible than any level of Dante's inferno; our engineers can build for us cellars in which we can hide in fear; our lawyers can solve the problems of our civil disputes; our doctors can heal the wounds of our highway duels; we can travel almost as fast as sound; we can freeze our orange juice and our oysters to be fresh for our tables when we want them; we can listen to voices of men who died many years ago, and of men whose voices or trumpets we would like to still; we can see across miles of distance and dark a Gorgeous George, elegantly agonizing with a manner that makes memories of Gus Sonnenburg seem a little rough.

These things we can do; and the knowledge that has made them possible for us all comes from our schools and colleges. But we must be fair. We also can feed the poor, clear the slums, build churches as well as movie houses, libraries and more colleges; we can cure disease that twenty years ago was fatal, we can dream dreams and make schemes for the peaceful organization of the nations of the world. And the knowledge, and the inspira-

tion, for these accomplishments and these plans comes largely from our schools and our colleges.

But, at this particular moment in our history, our world is out of balance. We need an increased emphasis on education for citizenship—citizenship for a democratic and free world—to bring our ability to order our social, economic and political institutions up to our competence for understanding and controlling the myriad factors of our physical environment.

The answer is not, and of course it cannot be, to declare a moratorium on scientific research in the physical sciences until our social sciences catch up—until man learns how to use for his good what now he fashions for his degeneration if not for his destruction.

If we are to have a democratic world in which there is room for a maximum of individual freedom, then we must educate for and maintain a degree of self-reliance and individual responsibility, always associated with kindness, far greater than is now demonstrated in our American society. These are the qualities of citizenship that are of primary importance for the survival, and in most of our world, the establishment of democracy and opportunity for freedom.

These are not learned from the curricula of our schools and colleges. We can be justly proud that Exeter, in very large measure, has always afforded her students ways to learn these essential traits. The record of Exeter students and alumni demonstrates that such traits can be developed and strengthened by what happens to a boy in school and college. This is one of our greatest contributions to our nation and our world and one upon which

we can afford to build to even greater effectiveness.

This last week I heard Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, say that men do not have any inherent urge for individual responsibility or for submission to authority. Neither desire is natural. But men do have a natural aptitude or capability for the development of either. They can learn self-reliance and be responsible and therefore free, or they can learn attitudes of submission and be, thereby, subject to increasing control of dictatorial authority.

I can think of no matter of greater concern to those who are responsible for the purposes of schools and colleges (the students, the faculties and the alumni) than to consider with utmost care every influence that informs the minds of young men to determine its effect. Does it tend to produce the kind of man who will make the kind of world we want? Does it prompt self-reliant responsibility for the common good or irresponsible submission to ulterior authority?

There is much in American education that tends to train (a better word here than "educate") men in patterns of submission as a means of gaining easy security. This we must guard against. Our best defense is aggressively to teach the acceptance and fulfillment of responsibility, not by lecture or by textbook, but by providing experience.

In too many schools and colleges young men are constantly guided, guarded and governed by their elders. They have little opportunity to learn to stand on their own feet; to make their own decisions, perhaps by making some that are wrong; to be honest because it is right

rather than because the proctor is watching; to make their own rules, having learned that some are essential for organized society; to change the rules; to judge offenders; evaluate right and wrong in terms of their own experience, inadequate though it may be, in the light of knowledge available to them; in short, to practice the functions of cooperative citizenship.

These opportunities Exeter has given to us—those of us who are alumni are grateful—you who are seniors will be grateful if you are not already. When all schools and colleges give such opportunities in greater measure, then, and only then, will we have in America the quality of education competent to graduate the men who can and will build a free and democratic world.

Papers from The Cleveland Unitarian

To Live and to Dream

President Truman recently set forth a twelve point statement of United States foreign policy. It reminded us of other statements of other times. Those twelve points might have been adequate prior to August, 1945. Now their underlying philosophy of national sovereignty is obsolete.

How long will it take us to learn the lesson of this last most horrible war?

It will be charged that to argue and work for one strong world government—for which the United Nations Organization is only a first very short step—is to reach for the stars, the hope of futile dreams. The practical politics of the world will not permit more than one step at a time. If that is so, then we must start running, for the practical business of saving our own skins demands that we create immediately a world organization with power enough to cure the social, political and economic Black Deaths that are still the causes of war.

America's greatest need on this anniversary of the Armistice of another war is a human motivation for cooperative devotion to the world's commonweal that can hold in harness the furies man has loosed upon his earth.

Mr. Justice Burton, at the dinner given in his honor

in Washington last week, reminded us that in the last analysis there is no higher law of life than that which we call the Golden Rule.

This is the moral equivalent for atomic energy. Application of this age-old law to the problems of our present confusion is our only solution. We think that because we learned the law in Sunday School it is "sissy stuff." It is not! It is the hard, practical, matter-of-fact answer to our children's expectations:—To live and to dream and grow up in tomorrow's world.

November, 1945

Hope for Every Tomorrow

The Old Year dies.

The New Year holds great promise.

For almost a decade the world has been at war. Men's energies have been spent, wasted in vast destruction.

Now begins a new year. We hope a new era—an age of peace and opportunity for all men everywhere.

The Christmas songs of Peace and Good Will still prompt our thoughts and encourage our hopes.

Men will have another chance, but without the spirit of gentle kindness, of generosity, of love and friendliness, there can be no peace.

Yesterday is past as a watch in the night.

Tomorrow is a vision. Today well lived, guided by the spirit of love new-born once more in men's hearts, gives hope for every tomorrow.

December, 1945

Families

Families are for learning joy. The joy of young voices in laughter. The joy of first questions and the searching together for answers. The joy of bedtime stories and the never failing cheer of children that makes dark morning bright. The joy of adventure in the woods in spring when green new life, pushing through the dead leaves, teaches hope.

Families are for learning the give-and-take of sharing, not only things like bikes and ties and party dresses, but chores and feelings. Families are for building attitudes so necessary for living together in community. Families are for learning how to meet and know sorrow and tragedy; and for bearing the loneliness of long separations, the hardships of disappointment, the anxieties and fears that time and distance make so real.

Families are for holidays and holy days, for birthdays and anniversaries and vacation days. But most of all, families are for every day, so that little people growing up learn what it is to belong to something bigger than just themselves; something from which, if they give of themselves, they can take more than they will ever need.

Families are where we live, in castle or cabin, and where we learn about kindness and generosity. Families are love woven into a great shawl that keeps mother and father, sister and brother and me warm when all the world is cold.

June, 1946

Summer

We all have our hours of darkness, our moments of despair, but not so many in the summertime.

In the thick of the world's turmoil, men's confusions, and our worries, we sometimes lose sight of all that is lovely in our world. Then summer comes.

We still have our concerns. There is still evil to be overcome, hatreds and fears to be reconciled, prejudices with which to reason, and hopes to be realized.

But in summertime we gain a new and broader view. Nature speaks to us in a thousand ways and corrects our perspective.

Did you ever lie on your back in an open field on a summer's night and try to count the stars?

Did you ever fall asleep in a bed of deep moss late in the afternoon and waken to the quiet whirring of the forest's myriad insects?

Did you ever then, without moving, open one eye to see a butterfly with azure wings settle on your outstretched hand?

Did you ever paddle hard—the long trip home to camp, rain and wind blowing in your face and then build your fire and settle down to warm food and friendship?

Did you ever stand alone on a mountain top and explore the distant view, range after range, and not wonder at God's grandeur and the pettiness of man's problems?

Summer is the time when our problems and our purposes come to better balance. Our low aims reach up to

our higher values. We dream long dreams and our hopes begin to build the things we dream about.

June, 1946

At Christmas We Think Kindly

At Christmas time we think of people. We think of you. We remember people we haven't seen for a long, long time. That warms our hearts and makes us happy.

We think kindly about all the children on our street. It's good to see their ruddy cheeks and hear their laughing. We think of other children far away, children who haven't learned to laugh, and we are glad that we can help them too.

We think kindly about all the folk we see from day to day; the milkman, the paper boy, the postman, the conductor on the street car, men in markets and girls in stores and offices. We hope they feel our thanks.

We think kindly about old friends far away. Children who have grown up since we last saw them. Friends we shall never see again. It's good to think of them.

We think kindly about all our cousins, playmates of years gone by, aunts and uncles, grandmothers and grandfathers, sisters and brothers, sons and daughters, and mothers and fathers. In our minds there is a drawing together around our hearth fires and a feeling of warmth inside that is good.

We think kindly about people we see every day and especially about those friends we love but because they are far away or we too busy we seldom see. At Christmas time we think kindly, and because we become like little children we know that "friendship is total magnanimity and trust."

December, 1946

To Seek a Newer World

This is the time when we all feel the deep impulses of heart and hand to work in the earth and recreate ourselves and the common life of men and nations after the patterns of righteousness born of the dreams of saints and sages and nurtured by our hopes.

This is a time in our history when, though the people of the world stagger under the terrible burdens war has heaped upon them, they strive on, courage quickened, by the faint gleam of the new day's dawn.

This is the time when nature touches men's hearts and minds with the brave colors of flowers surviving frost and the soft delicate freshness of new green leaves high against the cold grey sky.

In spite of the world's grief and woe this is the time we feel renewed vigor, hope and courage for the tasks ahead. " 'Tis not too late to seek a newer world."

April, 1949

Milestones in the Life of Everett Moore Baker

- 1901 August 28, born in Newtonville, Mass., son of George D. and Mary Hutton Baker
- 1920 Graduated from Phillips Exeter Academy
- 1924 Graduated from Dartmouth College
- 1925-29 Assistant pastor Mt. Vernon Church, Boston, Mass.
- 1928 Married Helen Macdonald
- 1929 Graduated from Harvard Divinity School
- 1929 Ordained to ministry of the Unitarian Church
- 1929-37 Pastor Westminster Church, Providence, R. I.
- 1932 Birth of David Everett Baker
- 1937 Birth of Sidney Macdonald Baker
- 1937-42 Executive Vice President American Unitarian Association
- 1938 Honorary degree Doctor of Divinity, Tufts College
- 1938-44 Trustee Proctor Academy, Andover, N. H.
- 1941 Compiler *Think on These Things*, an anthology of poetry and prose for men and women in military service
- 1942-46 Pastor First Unitarian Church, Cleveland, Ohio
- 1943-45 Public panel member, Region 5, War Labor Board
- 1943-47 Chairman Board of Directors, National Consumers League

- 1944-45* Lecturer in sociology, Cleveland College of Western Reserve University
- 1944-46* President Unitarian Ministerial Union
- 1944-47* Trustee Hawken School, Cleveland, Ohio
- 1945-50* Board of Directors, American Unitarian Association
- 1947-50* Dean of Students, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- 1948-49* President Dartmouth Alumni Association
- 1949* Honorary degree Doctor of Divinity, Dartmouth College
- 1950* Chairman International Student Service
- 1950* August 31, died near Cairo, Egypt