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Sketch For A Family Portrait

PRESIDENT HOWARD FOSTER LOWRY

Any individual here today is, at best, a symbol, a fraction of our main intent. Even The College of Wooster is not our whole concern, for many of our honored guests who know Wooster very imperfectly — and that is their loss — probably are feeling quite at home. What draws and unites us today in common fellowship is the old perennial miracle, the timeless magic of a college. Why, one wonders, is this very idea of a college, among all ideas that we own, so laden with enchantment? What makes a college so compelling that most of us, busy though we be, gladly reserve for it a very special portion of our nature? Not, I think, mere nostalgia — the memory of lovely landscape and seasons changing across ivied walls. Not the recollection of the first clean shock of truth. Not even the exhilaration of returning, somewhat touched by time, to an obstreperous world of under-twenty-one or thereabouts — to radiant beings who make one feel, with Mr. Shaw, that youth is really much too wonderful a thing to be wasted on young people. No, the idea of a college which attracts us here today is something else, and I shall boldly risk this definition: a college is the corner of men’s hearts where hope has not died. Here the prison house has not closed; here no battle is yet quite lost. Here we assert, endow, and defend as final reality the best of our dream as men. The art of a college is the shaping of human life, under benefit of fact, in terms of what we hope. Here lies our sense of community this afternoon.

Thus our own task today is to dream. My commission, I take it, is to state my own hopes for Wooster — not unrealistically, certainly imperfectly, certainly not completely! Wooster’s vision has always been touched with realism. Indeed, when, at the end of the Civil War, local interest was awakening in a new college here, the Wooster Republican of Oct. 12, 1865, said edito-
rially: "It will not only be an honor to the place, but it will so enhance the value of real estate throughout the whole vicinity and county that none will be losers by the investment." And if this be a family talk on family affairs, our guests will not feel slighted or excluded. We shall try to see our problems in their broader setting, and some of our business may well remind you of your own. What I propose, at any rate, is a sketch for a family portrait — a portrait that Wooster stands ready to paint at the beginning of the last quarter of her first century. It will be not so much the portrait of a family as one painted by a family. For we shall do this work together — trustees, faculty, alumni, students, and friends. Today I cannot predict the final picture. But I can propose a sketch — one that you will help me alter as your hearts and minds tell you in the months ahead.

Into our new portrait will pass the forms and colors of older portraits already painted on this Hill by many devoted hands. Wooster's history is a distinguished one — the kind of history that helps fashion and vitalize a living future. That history I have tried to learn by heart; in twenty-five years of it I have personally shared. I pledge you today that it will give direction to anything we now contrive. If I have any right to accept the trust you offer me, it is, I suppose, because Wooster, through the years, has so completely captured my own imagination. Frankly, I did not want to be a college president per se; but I rejoice to be one here. It is the only post for which I would have left Princeton. I may as well tell you the truth: I would rather have worked for and with Harold Dodds than do anything else in the world — save this. Wooster's great men were my teachers and my friends, and, in spite of my own perversities, they have somehow remained in my blood, in whatever has been good and right in me. The measure of such names as Compton, Mateer, Noststein — and there were others, too, both living and dead — is that they need no emendation. About these men was something elemental
— it is the only word for it — something that will, by God’s grace, remain for ever in the fabric of Wooster. Through any new portrait of Wooster their faces will shine. I dare say of them what was said of another great elemental figure in our national history — that, to make them, nature herself threw aside her moulds:

And choosing sweet clay from the breast
Of the unexhausted West

with stuff untainted shaped them what they were. I have known, also, three devoted presidents of Wooster, and I shall not forget it. The one I knew best, to whom I owe so much of my own faith in anything, has already shown a rigorous fatherly determination to stay out of my path and let me make my mistakes in my own way. I am assured, however, that he retains a benevolent interest from afar; and I know how in practical ways, even in these last few weeks, he has, himself, worked for Wooster. All I can say is this: in whatever is best in my own administration there will always be present the best of Charles Frederick Wishart. So do the forms and colors persist even in the sketch of our new portrait.

Now for the work ahead. During the coming year the faculty and trustees of the College will try to write a “credo” for Wooster — with a detailed educational plan for the future. This will involve settling many questions of policy, determining our size, and planning our buildings and grounds so that they are geared in with our educational program. It will involve finding the answer — and there is one — to those who think the four-year college an outmoded housing venture, to be discontinued, I gather, even at the cost of perpetuating a world of sophomores. One year from Wooster Day (that is, by December 11, 1945), this new document, re-worked carefully through next summer, should be ready for publication. With it will be an exact estimate of what it will cost to bring Wooster to whatever ideal it determines
for itself. The total figure will, I hope, be something prodigious. That it may not be unrealistic or depressing, it will be carefully broken down — specific estimate for specific project. With these detailed plans we shall then discover how many people want this College to be a distinguished place in the last quarter of its first century. I do not underestimate the demands of this undertaking; but I face it with hope and faith, because so many of you have already made me feel that it is in your blood, just as it is in mine.

I am sorry that all this planning must come so soon, lest it seem like the vulgar zeal of a new administration. But the post-war period allows no genteel delay. It causes any institution worthy of keeping alive to take stock of ends and means, and decide which way it is going. We face, at any rate, a lively year here on the Hill. We shall call in from the outside a few of the best educators in the country; but chiefly we shall be on our own. We shall see to it that the main issues are discussed by alumni and by students, for this is a family task and belongs to us all. No generation at Wooster ever had more opportunity or more responsibility.

I cannot predict the fate of some of my own preferences once they go up for family discussion; but I can tell you what they are. Personally, as Dr. Wishart said from this same platform twenty-five years ago, I want to see Wooster a liberal arts college limited to a thousand students (a number which we have twice exceeded) — five hundred men and five hundred women, with a waiting list of both. It is my own belief that we can get along very well here with about five or six new and desperately-needed buildings. If pressed, I could tell you what they are. But the major portion of our endowment beyond that — and probably before these buildings are obtained — should go straightway into direct education: into books and laboratory equipment, and, most of all, into men. Wooster must contrive to offer fre-
quent leaves of absence for professors who are doing research and writing; it must give its teachers some margin in their lives for a few of the modest amenities. It must never brag publicly about its being a small college until its classes in beginning subjects are reduced to twenty or, at the most, twenty-five students each. Personally, I want to see here a carefully integrated pattern of education, with some organic life of its own, culminating in independent work during junior and senior years. I favor comprehensive examinations and a senior thesis or research problem; I do not like to see honors work, successful as it often is, restricted to a favored few — and in a moment I shall suggest why. So much for some of the first details in our sketch.

Behind our plan should be, I think, one underlying assumption about our financial development. One of the tests of liberal education will be its contribution to democracy. It creates human beings who have learned to value themselves as persons, and, therefore, value other persons also — men and women who can understand that great remark of Lincoln: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy." There is now every indication of a great increase in state-supported higher education after the war. Out of this will, indeed, come many benefits, both to general education and to research that advances human life. But, as state education expands, all the more need there will be for private institutions as a healthy balance to this tendency — an assertion of the good old "pluralist" principle in society which is the safeguard against excess of government. Very rightly our government plans to aid our veterans — some of whom will be our own boys now scattered over the seven seas, for whose return we are even now preparing. But here the financial transaction is exclusively between the state and the student. Save for this, and save for actual services rendered, as in war-time, I hope that in the com-
ing years — the years of peace — Wooster will make it a principle not to accept one penny of either state or federal aid.

My own hopes for Wooster do not rest, however, on any paper project. Indeed, I trust we may never have a "Wooster Plan" or anything about which the Dean and I shall be asked to read papers at professional meetings. Machinery is still the curse of education. May our venture be so fundamental, so closely based on the deep, quiet things of the human spirit and on whatever has silently civilized men and women through the years, that it will raise no commotion, whatever, in the teachers colleges. My own faith, most of it, will rest in men — in the scholar-teachers already here and in those whom we may induce to come. A college lives or dies by its appointments; they are the chief task of any president. This is, indeed, a sobering thought in a time when many of our graduate schools call trivial tinkering research, pass off mere technicians as teachers, and quite generally drop mediocrity as fast as the Arabian trees their medicinal gums. To be sure, we want teachers of high technical ability in their own field, men whose teaching is warmed and informed by intelligent research and lively curiosity. Certainly the lowliest, honest technician is better than the pious frauds who do not know their trade and, therefore, cannot raise a student’s mind above a whisper. Such men have, it seems, a peculiar affinity for colleges. They like the "atmosphere," which often grows the thicker for their presence. Such men may be kind to animals, belong to all the proper organizations, and be even personally attractive. But if they do not know their trade, if they are living off stale platitudes and minor pieties rather than off the fresh life of new fact and some imaginative synthesis of facts they already know, they are not dedicated to what Wooster was dedicated — humane learning and the glory of God. What we want here are men who know both their trade and something more than that — men of learning who respect knowledge, but who
know that beyond the world of fact lies a world of value, and, beyond that, some eternal loyalties. As scholars, such men respect the critical spirit, the dispassionate mind, and the reflection that should precede commitment. But they know, also, that men were born to hate some things and to love others; that there are causes and affections to which men of good will are bound for ever. They know that education has confused means with ends, and that its modern tragedy is precisely the world’s tragedy — the worship of gadgets and fragmentary specialties, without any leading idea of human values; the creation, as one critic says, of big machines run by little men; the life of the tangent divorced from the life of the center; the uncritical pursuit of things and “self-realization” without benefit of great creative ethical renunciations; the attempt to live off a thin spiritual capital borrowed from a bank we do not believe exists. In this twentieth century we have to decide whether mankind is to live or die — whether we shall master or be mastered by our own devilish ingenuity. As T. S. Eliot puts it, writing out of the “blitz” on London, we shall be consumed by “either fire or fire” — either by the fire of greed and mechanical anarchy, or by the fire of reason, imagination, repentance, and divine love, the fire that consumes the other fire and, Phoenix-like, delivers us, creating us anew. What education must propose to the last half of our century is no less than a new life — a new revolt in the soul of man as, out of his miscellaneous gadgets and his confused desires, he attempts the recovery of himself. Wooster invites educators who, masters of their own craft, will share also in this great enterprise.

Such men will, beyond question, want Wooster to remain what she was born to be — a college of the liberal arts and sciences. I must not expound today what this liberal education is. You are familiar with what it includes: the major disciplines, the learning how to read, write, think (I mean just that); the
discovery of how to find facts, relate them, and draw conclusions from them. It certainly does not mean "completing" one's education by senior year by a mass of courses and thin surveys leading, I suppose, on graduation, to the degree of Q. E. D. It is rather the acquiring of those methods and dispositions that allow all one's later life to be a continuing liberal education.

And you are familiar, too, with the grand thesis of this education — the thrilling doctrine, not of man's clever ordinary self, learning to be bright for one conspicuously narrow end, but of man's best self coming to its full perfection and awareness. We have apologized too long for the alleged "impracticality" of this kind of education. Our better business houses will never concede it is impractical, and they seek those who have its benefits. Yet, even so, the great end of liberal education is the release of the harmonious powers latent in all human life, that they may form a quality in men and women — a quality that ought to pass into the activity of a responsible citizen. To such education the great divisions of learning must contribute, not as jealous rivals, but as partners in a common enterprise. A new sense of the unity of knowledge is breaking down departmental barriers, and high time it is! I am, by training, a teacher of the humanities, and I shall fight for their survival in any liberal education worthy of the name. But I shall fight, with equal ardor, to preserve and strengthen Wooster's great tradition in the natural sciences and to increase the scope of her political and social studies. I find, indeed, that one may try too hard. The other day in Cleveland I was abusing my humanistic brethren for their occasional aesthetic snobbery, for their indifference to science and to a world that does get hungry and cold and does manage its own affairs very badly. Apparently I made my point. For the newspaper account of my address had me saying that, after the war, the main stress in education would of course, fall on the sciences and social studies, but that we should also try to be as "generous"
as we could to the humanities. Let my colleagues in the humanities take that cold comfort and wait in hope for the next stale crumb to fall from the college table.

In liberal education, after the war, one discerns two very interesting tendencies—a disposition to have less of our free-elective system and more of a simplified, integrated, better-ordered course of study. But getting rid of the "grasshopper" curriculum and the attending worship of chaos for its own sake does not mean, on the other hand, narrow authoritarianism and narrow prescription. It probably means an insistence upon some acquaintance with the broad fields of knowledge, a fair variety of courses implementing these fields—their relationships and interconnections implied or noted. One sees, also, on the post-war horizon, a new stress on history and the imaginative knowledge of the past by which a man becomes the heir of mankind. We American people like nothing better than our contemporary life and a Gallup poll to see how it is all going. But we are also a shrewd people, shrewd enough, if given time, to ask ourselves this leading question: "When, in the things that matter to the mind and heart, did the best public opinion occur? When, indeed, did it begin?" Thus, out of our good American habit of wanting the most for our money, we may find, among other things, that we have civilized ourselves with some historical perspective, and made ourselves the true heirs of the past.

And now we come to that point in our sketch which, if you accept it, will greatly affect Wooster's educational method. You will consider this carefully and will certainly debate it in the year ahead. Our faculty and students are already debating it. I can at least state my own faith. Liberal education must, it seems to me, ultimately look at the boy or girl it is trying to liberate. It is the education of human beings. It must not, therefore, be merely descriptive and second-hand, but an education
in which a person is evoked by participating, himself, in his education.

I have laughed as long as anybody at the excesses of what we term "progressive education." And I still marvel at our gay effort to give a higher education to people who haven't had a lower education first. But progressive education, at its best, has something very important to tell us college teachers; and it has required Jacques Maritain, who is most certainly not unmoved by tradition, to say what it is. He makes a distinction, dubious, to some, as metaphysics, but very valuable as a symbol, it seems to me, between the person and the individual. Personality, he reminds us, is one aspect or pole of the human being; the other pole is individuality, whose prime root is matter. The same man who through his spiritual soul, has integrity or wholeness of personality, is also a material individual, part of a species, living by sense and instinct as well as by reason. Education should not mistake the display of individuality — the bright tricks of the irrational ego scattering itself "among cheap desires and overwhelming passions, and finally submitted to the determinism of matter" for the development of personality, with its growth in internal selfhood under the life of reason and the perfection of divine love, requiring discipline and renouncement. On the other hand, education cannot say, as the traditionalist does, "Death to the individual and long live the person!" because when you kill the individual you also kill the person. The art of education is a balance of methods.

And this balance of methods, ladies and gentlemen, suggests an education for juniors and seniors that is the perfect answer to those who would confer the B.A. degree at the end of the sophomore year and despise the four-year liberal arts college. Institutions that want, from now on, to take four years of an undergraduate's time, must offer something more than one hundred and twenty miscellaneous credit hours and a slung-together
major. They can answer their critics by building a program of which the critics themselves have thus far taken imperfect notice — one that has an accumulative program for an undergraduate career. Against a background of liberal studies, the student begins, perhaps in junior year, a program of independent work. He passes comprehensive examinations in his special field of concentrated study and in his broader departmental subject. As the crown of his work — and it is the crown — he offers a senior thesis. Thus he learns that his liberal studies may come to a head and not remain a scattered dilettantism.

This is not a program for honors students alone. It is a challenge to every man and woman to come to his best, according to his capacity. There are no "candidates" for honors. The awards are given in retrospect, at the end of senior year, when the honors man often turns out (and the figures prove this) to be the "average" student of freshman or sophomore year — a man who would never have proposed himself and whom the faculty — particularly a Presbyterian faculty tinged with ideas on predestination — would have certainly rejected. Such education represents not just the mean between "progressive" and traditional methods; it represents an aristocratic education on democratic principles. It does not invite a campus hothouse of "intellectuals" cut off from normal people and the healthy pursuits of normal life. May Wooster be spared that! But to every man and woman it gives an invitation, according to his talents and abilities, to come to his best. It tries, on the one hand, to civilize a man within a matrix of liberal studies, while encouraging, on the other, his growth as a person in terms of what he can do. The student ceases to be the passive recipient of information; he participates in his own education, and develops habits that look forward to his continuing his liberal studies to the end of his life. This is more, I tell you, than "the seven liberal arts," good as they are; this is more than the analysis of a
selected list of the Great Books, that new and partly very wise suggestion for all our mortal ills between the Midway and the Chesapeake. This is a man’s discovery of himself in a humane, integrated program, with a central nerve running through all four years. When its by-products begin to add up, as I have seen them do in the life of more than one man at Princeton, this education becomes more than the forming of a mind. It is the forming of a person. This is what I want to see happen at Wooster.

One thing here we must never change — our central commitment to Him in whom there is no change. The evangelical Christian faith brought this College into being. Should it ever cease to dominate our purpose here, should it cease to produce upon the campus devoted followers of Christ and workers in His cause, we should promptly close our doors. In many ways, I am now sorry I am a layman; but maybe because I am a layman I know how desperately the world needs what Wooster has to say. On the opening Sunday of this college year I had opportunity to state fully some conception of our religious mission. My remarks on that occasion¹ have been made available to our alumni; I hope they may be considered a part of the sketch I propose today.

I tried to show then how religious instruction is a rightful part of any liberal education — how our religious illiteracy is impoverishing our actual culture, our ability to understand the very symbols of art and literature and music. Religious education opens the mind to its own adventure — to the questions worthy to be asked by men. All honor to the scholarship whose ideal is to overtake truth; but honor, also, to the education that puts even the scholar where the truth may have a chance to overtake him. The secular world, scorning divinity, still yearns to see all men as brothers; Wooster would validate the enterprise by pressing the not illogical claim that brothers must somehow have a common father — that the life of reason in a good society.

¹See page 43 for this address, “The Mind’s Adventure.”
tends towards its own completion in the Christian miracle of love, where "law, life, joy, impulse are one thing." Assign men to less an end than this, and the "very universe belies you, and your heart refutes a hundred times the mind's conceit."

All liberal education — and this idea, as some of you know, grows with me daily — is an adventure in humility. To understand the present we first submit our minds to the past. To know freedom, we first bow before the majesty of law. To realize our individual life, we subject ourselves to institutions. The scientist bends low in his midnight laboratory and puts his hand among the stars. And so with the final paradox of education. He who will lose his life shall find it. Surrendering himself to God, he receives from Him the return of infinite love — not, as Turgenev puts it, the peace of "indifferent nature," but the peace that passes all our understanding, the "peace of eternal reconciliation and of life without end."

May I leave with you a symbol? It comes, not from a sketch, but from one of the finest of all portraits — from that superb book on liberal education, The Divine Comedy of Dante. I first saw it, many years ago, through the eyes of a born teacher, one of Wooster's greatest, Waldo H. Dunn. After the long journey through hell and purgatory, Dante, you recall, gains the heights of Paradise. Beyond the Celestial Rose, beyond the circle of the saints and the children, he presses towards the end and reward of all his quest — the hoped-for sight of God Himself. And you remember that all he saw was a perfected point of light, the sum of all our earthly lights, including the light of learning. But within that divine light he thought he could discern the lineaments, at least, of a human face. The World was made flesh and dwelt among us — and the light was the life of men.

To the task you have called me I dedicate whatever powers I have. I ask God's mercy and His help for me and for you as we go forth — together.
The Survival Power of the Liberal Arts College

PRESIDENT HAROLD WILLIS DODDS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Although from the day of its founding, the bonds between Wooster and Princeton have been close, I cannot truthfully say that this afternoon is the happiest moment of my life. My sense of personal loss of a colleague, who is also a friend, is still too strong for me to find joy in this occasion. I am glad that several months have passed since his election as your president, because we in New Jersey can view now his departure with more Christian charity than would have been possible last spring. All of us at Princeton did our best to persuade Mr. Lowry not to return to you. We lost in what soon proved to be an unequal struggle. Neither bribes, nor threats, nor prayers, nor exhortations, moved him. He is here today as your president for one reason, and one reason only. At a time when his exceptional talents are sadly needed on university faculties, he gave up the sweet delights of teacher and scholar to assume the rigors and servitudes of college administration. His reason for acting in such a Presbyterian manner lays a heavy burden of obligation upon all who have anything to do with the future of Wooster. It is to be found, purely and simply, in a sense of duty which stems from his long association with this college and an abiding faith in its function as a church-affiliated institution. When any call pulls a man out of his chosen work, in which he is happy and successful, those who made the call enter into a solemn contract to sustain him with understanding and good works. Unless you, the trustees, faculty, and alumni of Wooster, are prepared to support him over the long pull, years after the honeymoon is over, you don't deserve Howard Lowry.

My words today are not of the nature of an induction address, saturated with good advice and weighty admonition for Mr. Lowry. For me to attempt to advise him in this manner would
indeed be futile. He refused to follow my advice last spring, when I urged him to stay at Princeton. Because I can entertain no expectation that he would heed my counsel now, any more than he did a few months ago, I shall not proffer any. Rather shall I say a word about the profession with which he is casting his lot today.

It is sometimes charged that college presidents are all stuffed shirts, capped with bald heads with voices. This, Mr. Lowry, is not true. Some do not have bald heads; although all have voices.

My personal word to President Lowry is: do not believe the people who tell you how impossible your new post will be. While a fairly thick skin is desirable, on the whole a college community is composed of civilized people with the usual measure of charity and loyalty. Moreover, many college presidents seem to live to a good old age, and while they do not share the protection of tenure which professors possess, they appear to enjoy, among the older institutions at least, as secure a tenure as most occupations. From this observation I derive a considerable degree of comfort which I gladly transmit to you.

Whether they will it or not, college presidents in these days are public characters whose endorsement is sought for all sorts of movements, some good, some spurious, few having to do with education in the strict sense. Granted the public influence of the office, an influence I am at a loss to explain, the proper extent and nature of a president’s extra-mural activities are difficult to determine.

Since no general answer is possible, I prefer to concentrate on his real function as the head of a society of teachers, scholars, and students. For it is a community he heads, not a factory or a regiment. His desk is the point at which the various plans and ambitions for the college converge, there to be sifted and directed
into fruitful channels, but his position is not one of autocratic command. It should be one of leadership; the two are not the same.

In teaching and scholarship, more than in most human activities, the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life. Apathetic, listless teaching is positively harmful to young minds. The spirit of inquiry can be nourished, the atmosphere can be made uplifting rather than depressing, only when the institution is in truth a co-operative responsibility. And it is never to be forgotten that cooperation calls for a higher degree of individual competence and wise leadership than raw individualism ever required.

It is not hard to frame a plausible brief that organized, formal education has failed the world in its hour of need. Indeed some have been saying so for a good many years. Neglect of practical preparation for business, over-emphasis upon athletics or extra-curricular activities, inflated campus social life, low scholastic standards which encourage habits of indolence, teachers who can't or won't teach, exaggerated stress upon pedestrian scholarship, lack of spiritual objectives, these are a few of the indictments of our colleges and universities. Other more negative and destructive critics have not hesitated to charge that the modern college has positively contributed to the undermining of our civilization.

What disturbs me most is not the accusation that the influence of the colleges and universities has been positively bad. I know better than that. What does disturb me is the fear that, if we are realistic about liberal education as practiced in this country, we cannot truthfully assert that it is accomplishing all that is claimed for it in the addresses of college presidents and the press releases of college news agencies.

Does our teaching of science cultivate a scientific attitude towards the world of public or private affairs in which our students will participate? Does our teaching of the humanities direct our
students in any fundamental way towards a broader working grasp of human values and a deeper understanding of human history? Does our instruction in the social sciences, which are neighbors to both the natural sciences and the humanities, give the student a new approach and methodology which really influence his conduct as a citizen? The answer is "yes," but it is not as strong a "yes" as we can make it.

Although methods are important, in my opinion the situation calls for more than changes in the technique of instruction. It is a sharpening of outlook and aim that is needed. If we ask ourselves why it is that four years of college study of the liberal arts, imposed upon eight years of school preparation, seem to play such a small role in the thinking and attitude of the student in after life, must we not answer that, in part, it is because life and education have not been brought together in college?

We assert that a liberal education treats the fundamental, as contrasted with the vocational, aspects of living. But do we train our students how to use the fundamentals? Indeed do we, their teachers, know how to use them ourselves? Or do the fundamentals remain in a non-communicating compartment of the mind, valuable when and if they contribute to one's subjective enjoyment of science, art, literature, philosophy, and history, but not sufficiently drawn upon in the general business of living? And the heart of an education which gets no exercise soon ceases to throb.

My thesis is that it is not enough to teach the narrow content of the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. How the student can use his education, how these subjects throw light upon his own problems and decisions as an individual and as a citizen, must also be taught. This I conceive to be education for use in the highest and non-material sense of the word. "We are not put into this world to sit still and know," said Woodrow Wilson, "we are put here to act."
The ideal of liberal education has always had to contest with the claims of vocational, cash-value education. It will have to do so after the war. But there is no cause to be dismayed. The struggle is one evidence that St. Paul's doctrine of the two selves, one lower and earthy, the other higher and divine, relates to our everyday experience. Each self is valid in its sphere. It is when the order of importance of the two spheres is reversed that trouble begins. A liberal education should lead the student to understand the relation between his two selves and equip him for mastery of both.

It is an education useful in making a living. The mind trained to think, to carry on its own self-education, is a vocational asset. It will help its owner to a successful career; and it is insincere scholastic snobbishness to maintain that no vocational advantages should accrue from a liberal education. The heightened value that a student finds in a subject which has some relation to his future career will usually, and quite properly, raise the quality of his work. But vocational interest must not set the tone of the college, whose prime objective is an educated person, not a skilled person.

Therefore the chief function of the liberal arts college is to educate-for-use that other side of man that is concerned with timeless values, and to which his nature, reaching out in craving for something that is eternal, always aspires. A liberal education should contribute purpose as well as knowledge. The humanities and the social studies in particular are "purposive" disciplines. They should give a sense of direction, as well as means to follow a direction. They should be taught, I repeat, not as neutral knowledge, but as knowledge for use.

But it is not enough to teach only the methodology of use. The inclination to use knowledge must also be cultivated. It is not enough to show the student that the curriculum is relevant to today's problems; although this would be a great step for-
ward in itself. We must go farther. Incentive, the inclination to utilize history, art, literature, philosophy, religion in daily life must also be provided. It is easy to confuse the mere acquiring of knowledge with the life of the mind, and to forget that the quickening of the mind, rather than amassing information, is the true aim of a liberal education. Academic scholarship has too generally coveted knowledge as a means merely to more knowledge rather than as a means of action, and this, writes one keen Englishman, is the great defect in liberal education as a preparation for leadership in a democracy. Because a democracy whose leaders can only talk is doomed; and an educational system that develops facility of expression and refinements of criticism, but does not lead to decisions or modify conduct, is destined to go the way of the monasteries of the Middle Ages.

Few Americans realize how unique our liberal colleges are among the educational systems of all other civilized countries. There is nothing exactly like them in Europe. Only in America do we advise thousands of young persons to devote those valuable years, from eighteen to twenty-two, to a general education in the arts, science, and literature. To justify these years, the colleges make extremely broad claims for what they have to offer. Sometimes these claims are lost sight of in popular attention to the secondary elements of college life, athletics, social contacts, pleasant, care-free years for the formation of friendships and happy memories. But these luxuries will not justify the colleges after the war, in a world of high taxes and severe competition, where non-essentials will be viewed with hostile eyes. Nor will it be enough for the colleges merely to establish that they ought to be allowed to survive. They must show that they are indispensable to an expanding and complex democracy.

Our colonial ancestors related the advantages of a liberal education to the success of democracy, which they knew was a risky business. We must do the same. The founders of our Colonial
colleges, (they were, by the way, Presbyterians) chartered just as we had won our freedom from Great Britain, when the responsibilities of freedom were beginning to strike home, expressed their purpose thus: To set up an educational establishment to instruct in the arts and sciences, the learned languages and literature in order that the blessings of liberty may endure.

We, their children, cannot improve on that objective.

Wooster is a liberal arts college. It is also a Presbyterian college. A liberal education has been defined as a liberating education, releasing the forces of the mind and the spirit that one may use his freedom aright. The Presbyterians have been great people for freedom. Our Scottish and Scotch-Irish ancestors were such ardent patriots in 1776 that one disgruntled Tory wrote that "Presbyterianism is really at the bottom of the whole conspiracy." As a group they have been staunch believers in education as the basis of liberty. Even piety itself has been suspect, when it has succumbed to emotion without the stabilizing governor of intellect.

Mr. Lowry is coming back to a college with a sound Presbyterian tradition. That tradition has always linked learning with piety; it has insisted that its leaders be not only pious but scholars as well. He belongs in that tradition. He believes in it, and he will be at home here. Nothing happened to him while he was away to change that.

There is plenty of trouble ahead for the administrations of privately endowed colleges. Mr. Lowry is coming at a time when it takes courage to grasp the helm of a private college. Every consideration of personal comfort would have dictated that he decline the call. His life is bound to be more lonely than it was before on this campus. See that you match his courage and self-sacrifice with your courage and zeal. Take care that you express your loyalty in deeds as well as words. He knows that troublous and critical days lie ahead, across the path of his ambitions for Wooster. He is also alert to tremendous possibilities. There is no defeatism in his soul.
Education for Freedom

DR. ARTHUR HOLLY COMPTON, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

We come here today to inaugurate the new president of a college that has a notable record for training leaders. Wooster's sons and daughters have carried the torch of Christian service into all corners of the world's busy life. We welcome President Lowry as a worthy standard-bearer to carry on this honorable tradition.

This inauguration comes at a time that portends great changes. The world remains locked in a struggle for life and death. Our young men are gone. We have many fears as we find our nation thrust into the unfamiliar waters of international politics; yet we look with confidence for victory. With reasonable wisdom at the peace table and with vigilant attention to the rise of possible enemies, our men of farthest vision see approaching a prolonged period of peace. It may be that this great war will not be the last. But one can see that the world is rapidly approaching a situation that has not existed since the fall of the Roman Empire in which there is real reason to hope for a long period of peaceful growth.

During the war years it has been necessary for us to devote our full effort to the protection and preservation of the free mode of life we have come to consider our right. With cessation of hostilities there will remain the need for maintaining the strength required for the nation's continued security. Our great task will, however, be that of giving purpose and meaning to our life of peace.

Having won our freedom to shape our government and our lives, how shall we use that freedom? Shortly before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor I was talking with a small group of students at a Western university.

"Why should we concern ourselves with whether our rulers are American or German?" they asked. "It would mean merely the substituting of one master for another."
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“Is there nothing then in our nation’s heritage for which you would fight?” I protested.

“Nothing,” was the reply.

“Not even the freedom for which your fathers fought and died?” I tried to stir their loyalty. “Our country’s soil is red with the blood of those who sought to establish freedom and those who sought to free the slaves.”

“Too bad that their sacrifice was so futile,” was the reply. “Were the slaves indeed freed? What about our economic slaves — those bound by poverty to labor under conditions worse than slavery in order that they may remain alive? Do you want us to fight for freedom? Who wants freedom except him who is bent upon his own pleasure?

“What we need is the courage to build our own internal strength so that all the people can live a life of opportunity. To establish such a just society we would sacrifice our lives; but ‘freedom’ — it is a will-o’-the-wisp.”

Here were young men and women eager to put their lives whole-heartedly into something that they felt worthwhile. The freedom that was their heritage, for which their fathers and mothers had so courageously lived and died, this meant nothing to them. Their thinking was based upon the false idea that freedom is merely the license to follow one’s whims — the search for selfish pleasure.

Yet freedom is what gives life its meaning. Without it we are not really human. Freedom means the choice of the good from that which is not so good. The free man creates the world in which he lives. His soul is his own.

I happen to be a student of cosmic rays. To measure the rays I send high into the stratosphere measuring instruments attached to balloons. The balloons go up in clusters to fifteen miles or more above the earth. It is far too high for us to attach a string and draw them back, so we tie to the apparatus a tag that says,
“Finder please return and receive reward.” It is surprising to see how many come back. Such balloons are popularly called “free” balloons.

But are these balloons really free? When they leave the ground they must go wherever the breezes blow them. They have nothing to say about where they will come down. Are they not rather perfect examples of a mechanism whose motion is completely determined by that which happens to it? They must obey every whim of the winds.

Sometimes we would seek freedom by trying to get away from all responsibilities. “Let me go wherever the mood takes me. I will follow every whim and impulse.” What does this mean other than that we are merely obeying the forces that act upon us? We make ourselves into automats, machines that are pushed hither and yon by the forces that play upon us. Has such a life freedom? Is it not rather a slavery to surrounding forces?

For freedom, therefore, two things are necessary. First, one must have an objective for which one will strive, even though one must force his way against the winds that blow. Second, freedom requires the knowledge and the means for working effectively for these objectives. The will to work for these valued goals — which is the spirit of freedom — is a God-given gift whose cultivation is the highest aspect of education. It is here that education merges into religion.

It is the function of liberal education to open before the student a view of the possibilities that life has to offer with an evaluation of these varied possibilities. Professional education is concerned with giving the student the knowledge and skill needed to achieve the goal he wants to attain. It is the responsibility of a good religion to inspire its follower to lose himself in the search for the pearl of great price so that in that search he may find his soul.

Colleges such as Wooster are dedicated to this education for freedom. St. Paul might have been the president of such a
college talking to his students when he said, "It is my prayer that your love may grow richer in knowledge and perfect insight so that you may have a sense of what is vital." By love he means the desire to work for the common good. This is the vital spark of freedom. But freedom can become effective only as that love grows rich in knowledge. The truths that science teaches, the truths of history and psychology, the truths effectively stated in great literature — these truths bring vision of life's possibilities, knowledge of ways and means, inspiration to high achievement, and thus a greater freedom.

For untold millions of years the Creator held in His own hands the planning and working out of the great scheme of life found on our planet and throughout the universe. At long last, by God's good work, came into existence a being who found that he could affect his surroundings for good or ill. This was the birth of freedom. When that being had learned to care that the result of his actions should be good — that was the dawn of conscience. Here were beings that could properly be called children of God. Men became as gods, knowing good from evil. They were given a growing share of the great task of making this world a fit place for human life.

For perhaps a thousand generations man has been in training for these new responsibilities. These are the generations in which, as H. G. Wells says, an organism has changed from an individualistic animal like a cat to a social animal like a bee or ant. We were taught by the classic philosophers and the religious prophets. The tools of science were put in our hands. The Egyptian, Greek, and Roman worlds broke apart. Now we find society reorganizing itself on a planetary scale. This reorganization is rapidly approaching completion. Such changes have forced social science, philosophy, and religion once more to search diligently for the better way.
The rising generation has before it unquestionably the greatest task that has ever faced mankind. It is that of shaping this planetary new society so that the values of human life can approach their maximum development.

The contribution which a college such as Wooster can make to this great task is distinctive, and of the highest type. Here is where our future leaders must be taught what are the great values of life for which the world can best strive. I know of no other setting where such ideals can so well be developed and made part of people's lives. Giving an understanding of life's true values is the unique function of the Christian college.

At the same time, Wooster's sons and daughters will learn from their Alma Mater the knowledge and skills with which these ideals can be put into effect. Men and women trained to serve with high vision in many fields: religion and science, teaching and trade, industry and home — this is the honorable tradition of which our College is proud.

Thus it is that Wooster educates for freedom. Thus, sir, you will enable the boys and girls in your care to become more fully children of God.

The person educated for freedom is truly, in the words of St. Paul, "alive to all true values." To give such education is the greatest opportunity of Wooster.

Now, in accord with the procedure that has been followed since the inauguration of Wooster's first president, it is my duty, on behalf the Board of Trustees, to ask of the president-elect a pledge of fidelity.

Dr. Lowry:
Do you solemnly promise that you will faithfully and to the best of your ability fulfill the duties and do the work of President of the College of Wooster as you shall answer to God?

(Dr. Lowry: I do.)
This pledge having been given, by the authority of the Board of Trustees I deliver to you the key to Wooster's old Main Building as a symbol of your supreme authority over this College.

(To the Audience)

Howard Foster Lowry is now the Seventh President of the College of Wooster.
Prayer

PRESIDENT EMERITUS CHARLES F. WISHART

Oh God, Who Art the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, with Whom a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years, we wait before Thee for Thy blessing and benediction. We can say or do nothing of worth without it. We subsist under the cover of Thy loving kindness. In this sick and war-weary world, our only hope is in Thee. When we have been tempted to despair, we look back over the years and recall how, again and again, Thou hast delivered us when all human help was futile. Sometimes we have cried out of the depths, “Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Hath He in anger shut up His tender mercies?” And then we have remembered the works of the Lord; we remember the wonders of old; we meditate also on all Thy works, and talk of Thy doings.

We recall the man of God, who, in the glory of the autumn, knelt in prayer on this beautiful hill-top long years ago. We praise Thee for his dream of a college dedicated to sound learning, to the love of God, and to the service of men. Gratefully, we call to mind the pioneers who translated the dream into reality. To Thy name be the glory of those teaching masters who dared to believe truth was one, whether seen in the white light of science or in the warm glow of revelation. In times of crisis came strong leaders like him, who, after the tragic disaster of fire, stood up to proclaim that the dream should not perish. We remember in loving gratitude the devoted men and women — many now gone beyond the veil — who freely gave time, substance, prayer, and sacrificial labor for the College they loved. On this day of rejoicing, we see the fruits of their labor and cry, “What God hath wrought!”

We plead with Thee that Thy presence may go with us as we face the crucial days ahead. Give to Thy servant, our leader,
abundantly of Thy spirit — courage, vision, patience, and guidance in every decision, fortitude in all perplexities, and, through Him, a consummation of the old dream in success beyond our fondest hopes.

Earnestly we pray for those who have gone from this campus to defend the civilization we cherish. Some have given their lives that men all around the world might be free. Comfort and sustain those who sorrow for them in many homes. Bring, we beseech Thee, a speedy end to the world tragedy, and grant that we may not betray our martyr dead but may have vision and courage to build a world buttressed in the brotherhood of men and faith in the God of peace. We intercede, this day, for Wooster men and women around the Seven Seas. Spare their lives if it may be, and, whatever may happen, grant to them the fellowship of the White Comrade in the hour of need. Grant to the land we love the spirit of tolerance and unity, and the vision of an united world of liberty and brotherhood. Help us on this campus to take our part in bringing such a world into being.

Grant Thy blessing, we beseech Thee, to all who serve Thee here, whether as teachers or learners, and help us in the work which Thou hast given us to do. Enable us to labour diligently and faithfully, not with lip-service, but in singleness of heart, remembering that without Thee we can do nothing, and that in Thy fear is the beginning of wisdom. May we set Thy holy will ever before us, and do that which is well-pleasing in Thy sight, that so our work here may count for good to others, both now and in the days to come. Open Thou our eyes to know Thy marvelous works, to search our own spirits, and to understand the wondrous things of Thy law. Of Thy great goodness pour into our hearts the excellent gift of charity, and grant that in meekness and truth and purity we may glorify Thee, the Father of lights, in the spirit of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.
Dusty Answers And Unconquerable Hope

DEAN WILLIAM CLYDE DeVANE, YALE COLLEGE

I have the very great honor to bring greetings and felicitations to Wooster and to President Lowry on this momentous occasion. I bring these greetings from Yale, the mother of colleges, and the foster mother of your new president, to a younger sister in the West. I should like to think that I bear to Wooster all the hopes of New England for her, and that I am now in the act of renewing old ties and reaffirming old bonds between us. For here in Ohio New England finds its second youth. As I came away from the mist-hung hills of New England, where at this season of the year nature seems to pause and the elms and maples seem to stand burning from everlasting to everlasting, I must confess that I traversed a land made dreary by our crude strength and immense energy. No doubt, Pittsburgh was a lovely city before it was built, and the same may be said of a good many towns along my route. But here again in Wooster the maples and elms flame in the soft autumn sun, and here a bell rings like an echo of one heard far away and long ago.

But I perceive here another duty and another pleasure as well. For a dozen years, now, I have seen your brilliant young president rise from height to height. So naturally he rose, so to the manner born, so superbly, that it has not been possible to envy him. One can only wonder at "that affable familiar ghost" that supplies him nightly with intelligence, to borrow an appropriate figure from Shakespeare. I am proud to count myself one of his contemporaries, and to speak in his praise. We have labored in the same vineyard. His grapes, I suspect, were finer than mine; and his wine was certainly clearer. Matthew Arnold is a cool saturene, and Browning is only a muddy port. But tonight when Wooster congratulates herself, and most properly does so, on the fact that she has acquired one of the first men in his pro-
fession, universally so recognized, to shape her destinies in the years ahead, we must not forget that there is mourning in other places. However short-sighted the view, his fellow-scholars mourn. And being what I am, perhaps too pregnant to good pity, I can almost bring myself to be sorry for Princeton, even at this season of the year when normally pity for Princeton is not a part of any Yale plan. But for your new president — I think he merits Wordsworth’s lines —

"Who is the happy Warrior? Who is he
That every man in arms should wish to be?
It is the generous Spirit, who, when brought
Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
Upon the plan that pleased his boyish thought;
Whose high endeavors are an inward light
That makes the path before him always bright;
Who with a natural instinct to discern
What knowledge can perform, is diligent to learn . . ."

My ultimate felicitations must go to Wooster, for she has enlisted the Happy Warrior.

Now I must turn from these pleasant things and address myself to my theme. We stand here at a brave new beginning, and soon, please God, so may our war-torn world. It is a time to take stock, to assess ourselves and our resources, and to move forward in spite of our weariness and disenchantment. In this juncture, it is my purpose to praise the indomitable spirit of man. In the process I may convict him of stupidity, for he fights against insuperable odds, and never knows when he is hopelessly beaten. But those who think him stupid take a short view of things, for we find that after each set-back he has gained an inch, and after centuries of defeats he has gone forward a mile. Why is this true of man alone among all the creatures of
the earth? That grand Anglican poet of the 17th Century, George Herbert, had his answer to this question:

When God at first made man,
Having a glasse of blessings standing by;
Let us (said he) pour on him all we can:
Let the world’s riches, which dispersed lie,
Contract into a span.

So strength first made a way;
Then beautie flow’d, then wisdome, honour, pleasure;
When almost all was out, God made a stay,
Perceiving that alone, of all his treasure,
Rest in the bottome lay.

For if I should (said he)
Bestow this jewell also on my creature,
He would adore my gifts instead of me,
And rest in Nature, not the God of Nature;
So both should losers be.

Yet let him keep the rest
But keep them with repining restlessnesse;
Let him be rich and wearie, that at least,
If goodnesse leade him not, yet wearinesse
May toss him to my breast.

Since Herbert’s day man has suffered a colossal fall in his own estimation, and his comment upon himself and his world has become more secular and profane. Was the sun, indeed, set to light his earth by day, and the moon and the stars by night? Was he made in the very image of his creator, and ranked little lower than the angels? What a shock to his preposterous pride to discover the true state of affairs — that he was a momentary inhabitant upon an insignificant planet that had the appearance of being forgotten by God. Here was a dusty answer indeed. Any less fatuous creature might well have quit the field. But the
wretched creature did not know that he had been irretrievably humbled! And soon he was popping up again with the shrewd remark that of all known creatures and intelligences only his mind was capable of grasping the magnificent design of the universe and life, and only his soul yearned beyond the span of mortality. It is true, and it is just, and here is man again as resourceful as was ever John Falstaff or a college sophomore at getting out of a very tough spot.

And yet, the doubts have left a scar, and when the mind of man turns vicious and his soul turns base, as we have seen it turn in our time, it is a temptation to become disgusted with our species, and to revert to one of Shakespeare's bitter estimates: "hog in sloth, fox in stealth, wolf in greediness, dog in madness, lion in prey" — the pure animal, blood brother to the ape, and a long cut below any angels we care to imagine. Or we might, in our despair, be tempted to adopt for a time the terrifying opinion of the King of Brobdignag after Gulliver has told him about the wars and politics of Europe: "But by what I have gathered from your own relation," says that mighty monarch, "and the answers I have with much pains wringed and extorted from you, I cannot but conclude the bulk of your natives to be the most pernicious race of little odious vermin that nature ever suffered to crawl upon the surface of the earth."

And yet even in our desperate world that view of man is given the lie direct by some incredible deed of heroism or sacrifice, or by some shining example of magnanimity. Man knows his own capacity for meanness, and yet the eternal and undaunted expectancy of mankind is that one day the earth may be fair and all men wise and good. A poet of our own day who sees the mixed skein of our fate can say even now, "Magnificent out of the dust we came, and abject from the stars." For all his lapses into bestiality, there is something in man that his evolution from the dust cannot account for, and that something
marks him off from all the rest of creation, and makes him co-
equal to it.

Our proper study then is the mind and spirit of man, and we
will do well to go to the greatest of our race.

Of all biographies of great men in our Western world, the
biography of John Milton ought to be most heartening. Never
was a great spirit so thwarted, so hopelessly defeated, so caught
with "that one talent which is death to hide, lodged in [him]
useless." And yet blind, old, poor, and proscribed, he wrote
that great poem which neither England nor the world will let die.
That is the indomitableness of man on an heroic scale. Perhaps
the example is too stoic and lofty for most of us. There may be
something repellent about Milton's tremendous and costly
triumph. Perhaps we are more moved and satisfied by that
account of himself that Wordsworth gives us in his *Intimations
of Immortality*. Poor Wordsworth's soul had received many a
dusty answer to his questions before he wrote that poem. All
the wild delights of his youth had failed him, and he had to
fight hard against a cruel and unsympathetic world to maintain
his cheerfulness — perhaps even against reason. And so he
sings his sad Ode in praise of joy; and raises his voice not for
the wild tempestuous joys of youth,

But for those obstinate questionings
Of sense and outward things,
Fallings from us, vanishings;
Blank misgivings of a creature
Moving about in worlds not realized,
High instincts before which our mortal nature
Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised . . . .

It is not surprising that his song of victory over grief should
doi in "thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears." Like
Deor, a thousand years before him, he overcame his grief, and
looked forward with an unconquerable hope.
But I must leave these delectable mountains and come down to the dusty plains. Mr. Lowry doesn't know it yet, but presidents have very little time for poets, and deans usually fire them. The dusty answers which the soul gets are not reserved for the ultimate questions of life, nor indeed is the unconquerable hope. In the dry wasteland of education, too, these human forces are at work. We stand on the brink of a brave new world in education in America, but before we shout too triumphantly, it may be well to remember a recent, and, to me at least, a bitter defeat. Since this celebration is a landmark in education, perhaps you will forgive a few words of shop talk upon liberal studies.

The human spirit is so constituted that it is hot for certainties, and is exceedingly unhappy when things that have seemed certain prove to be unstable. There is in each of us a tendency, and a strong one, to impose stabilities where, often enough, there are none. A prime example of this tendency is the way we think of liberal education. Most people, and there are many educated persons among them, are prone to think that a liberal education consists of certain fixed subjects, and they often think no further than that. There is, indeed, some warrant for this belief, for some subjects or fields are in their natures more inclined to be liberal than others and more persistently come home to men's businesses and bosoms. These are in general those fields that deal with ultimate problems — philosophy, religion, history, and literature — the so-called humane studies.

Yet it is obvious to anyone who thinks about the history of education in the Western world that the studies which have liberated the mind of man from time to time have never been liberal or emancipating because they were made up of certain subjects which have been fixed since the beginning of time. At crucial moments in the history of Europe mathematics has been the most emancipating of all studies; at other times it has been Greek philosophy and literature; and still other times it has been
astronomy, and at yet others the natural sciences. Each of these fields has great potentialities of life, and however seemingly dead at any moment is capable of revival. Like the cat, a good subject has many lives. The liberating principle for a society consists not so much in the content, *per se*, as in the function it serves at the time. For the individual, almost any substantial subject may prove a liberating and therefore a liberal experience. But we know to our cost that even the most timely and emancipating material may be killed deader than a doornail by dull teachers, and we know also that an excellent teacher can make almost any subject an important and liberal one for the pupil.

In a liberal education we must look for those materials, methods, and teachers which will widen the horizons and increase the freedom of the mind. I wish, for a few moments, to direct your attention to one phase of liberal studies as an example of the danger which all studies are subject to.

The failure of the natural sciences to maintain their great places as liberal studies is one of the most distressing phenomena in the education of our day. To the grandfathers of the young men and women of college age today, the natural sciences opened magnificent vistas and showed a world that was new and wonderful. All sorts of traditional misconceptions were to be discarded, and the world’s great age was to begin anew, this time with truth as its guide. Some of that roseate glow which lit up the natural sciences in that new dawn still lingered when the fathers of the present students were in college. But now that vision has faded into the light of common day. The student in college today who does not specialize in a science hates those subjects and takes only those courses that he must take in order to obtain a bachelor of arts degree or to qualify for medical school. Most of them are utterly untouched by the scientific spirit. In college teaching, at least, the sciences have gone the way of the Classics, and, I think, for the same reasons.
Now this will in time prove a terrible loss to the scientists themselves, for one large source of their strength will have been cut off at the root. A great many able men who should go into the sciences will never get over the first hurdle. But even more painful is the loss to the great mass of students who are not scientifically inclined. I think it is obvious that, in this age which is so dominated by scientific ideas, no educated man can form a rational and adequate philosophy of life without a broad knowledge of the main facts and implications of contemporary science. It has always been so. The thinker of any time has had to found his philosophy upon the best views of his time concerning the nature of the universe and the world he lives in—his place in space and time among the atoms and stars, the elements of inanimate nature, the history of the earth, and the history of life on our planet. Only science can provide satisfactory answers to these fundamental questions and provide the framework for the modern man's conception of life. But now, I say it most regretfully, science fails to offer its answers to the non-scientific student, and he is left poor indeed.

Why has science failed in this most fundamental teaching? The chief reason is that in the last half century the sciences have changed themselves from liberating studies to professional training programs. The main aim of the sciences in our time is to train, not to educate, professional chemists, physicists, biologists, etc., and the student is hardly welcomed if he has not this end in view from the beginning. The first course in a science, largely populated by students who will take no more science if they can help it, is almost invariably professional in its intention. It is difficult to blame the individual scientist for this, or even the particular science. So vast have the fields become, and so immense is the new knowledge, that the sciences have had to specialize in sheer self-defense. Yet the result is deplorable, none-the-less. The teacher of science in this system is often
very narrowly educated indeed, and he is so immersed in his speciality that he is notoriously, with some very honorable exceptions, the most traditional and unadventurous member of the college faculty. He is a far cry indeed from those great scientists and teachers of our grandfathers' time. As for the students, the hungry sheep do not even look up any more.

What is the cure? How can the sciences become emancipating subjects? There is no single panacea. We cannot call great teachers into being by asking for them. We will do no good by requiring the student to take more science as long as it is taught so professionally. The student who is not intending to become a professional scientist must at once become intimately acquainted with the major laws and the important problems in several of the sciences. He must get the panoramic view without being superficial. This means that we must increase the total amount of time which we allow in our curricula for courses in science and demand in college of the candidate for the bachelor of arts degree at least two courses of as much as six hours a week including laboratory, one in the inorganic sciences, and another in the sciences which deal with living things. But, in turn, these courses must be designed specifically to meet the needs of the man in the program of the liberal arts, and the courses themselves must be liberal, historical and philosophical. It is now a good many years ago that William James said, "You can give humanistic value to almost anything by teaching it historically. Geology, economics, mechanics are humanities when taught with reference to the successive achievements of the geniuses to which these sciences owe their being. Not taught thus, literature remains grammar, art a catalogue, history a list of dates, and natural science a sheet of formulas and weights and measures." But the word "historical" in relation to the sciences will bear another interpretation as well, and the seeker for a liberal education ought to get from the study of the sciences that vast
sweep of time (as we measure it) in which stars and suns are made and unmade, according to the great forces and principles which govern them and their motions, in which the atoms and elements combine and disintegrate, and life itself begins and evolves under its own timeless laws. It is this large view, with the detail filled in, that I covet for the layman who does not intend to be a scientist.

I say these things, not to blame the scientist, but to illustrate a mortal human trait at work in education in our time. In this, as in so many things, we have received once again a dusty answer, and yet who will say that we have not forged ahead, and shall not continue to do so?

We stand upon the threshold of new beginnings — not only here in this lovely place, but in the nation, and in the world. Like the vast cloudrack of a departing storm our failures loom in the sky, and yet here we are

Still nursing the unconquerable hope,
Still clutching the inviolable shade . . .

(An address delivered at the Inauguration Dinner, October 21, 1944)
true follower of Christ is (1) a desire to change his own life and to better his own practice, and (2) to see such change in the lives of others.

And here may I speak very frankly to those of you who are not, perhaps, yet sure of what you do believe. The fellowship of Wooster certainly includes you — covets you, in fact. And we shall try, I hope, to play fair with you. We want to give you the chance to discover your own ideas and to allow the silent growth of the loyalties within your blood. We shall never, in our classrooms, withhold from you any fact because it is hard or embarrassing or unpleasant. We shall not hurry you to throw about great words like “truth” and “spirit” and “salvation”; for such words should always rise authentically from the convictions of your own mind and heart. We shall not offer you a debased religion that is pure spasm, or set any “spiritual bear-traps” for you, such as the eighteenth-century poet, James Beattie, set for his child when he planted cress in the garden so it would come up to spell the child’s initials, and thus, through the argument from design, persuade him to a proper faith in the divine order.

But, on the other hand, you must not resent it if Wooster wants you to be a Christian and to accept, in your mind and heart, the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. Any place once touched by Christianity has to feel that way — otherwise it’s a complete fake in terms of itself. It is human nature’s own bent to want to share the things that matter to it. One of the deepest forms of human loneliness is the loneliness of seeing great beauty and grandeur by oneself — scenery, music, painting, and famous historical places. There is something acutely miserable about coming on a fine passage in a book without being able to hand it at once to all your best friends. In like manner, a man who has once felt the power of Christ to make all things new in his own life, anyone who, after some failure of his own
to live up to his best, has felt God's mercy and its re-creative force, has an instinct to go at once to his friends, that they may share in it, too. All this has, of course, its own law of good taste — but the passion it represents, the passion of friendship, is one of the first fruits of any Christian living. Properly tempered with humor and self-forgetfulness, it is not a mean but a noble thing.

Nor, in inviting you to an adventure in Christianity, will Wooster assume that Christianity is something that can necessarily be *studied* — any more than one can make a person moral, as it has been said, by spraying him two hours a week with a course in ethics. In a sense, Christianity cannot be *studied* at all. It is a laboratory experiment, and you have to try living it with what power you can summon, if you want to know what it is. John Hunter, the great eighteenth-century physician and scientist, always asked his research students, "Have you performed the experiment?" Weary of dissection and ready to rush to unfounded hypotheses, they always heard Hunter's sharp rebuke, "Gentlemen, do not think; try and be patient." So Wooster summons you not merely to a life of Christian thought, but also to a life of Christian action. It does not ask you, either, to escape the world, but to draw, as you can, from the spiritual world that which floods the physical world and transforms it. It asks of you some of those great creative renunciations that lie at the heart of Christian ethics — not that your lives may be thin and meagre, but that they may be fulfilled. Frankly, we shall invite you to prayer and, as more than one man has learned, for a very simple reason — that Christ, who was the great expert in these matters and whose insight went deeper than any man's of whom the world has record, prayed; and it seems at least a fair proposal to follow His example if we are to know, for ourselves, the things He knew.
Now all this is very shocking to some secular educators. They say they have no dislike for Christianity — though I recall Dr. Flexner’s reminder of the captain in Lord Nelson’s navy who said, “My Lord, I have no prejudices, but God knows I hate a Frenchman.” Liberal education, they say, cannot sully itself with religion and philosophy — with things that lead to commitment. Such things, they say, involve the emotions and a whole array of feelings that are pure dynamite. During the past two years I have listened to more than one institution debate its future policy. They all know that education today stands convicted of one cardinal sin — multiplicity of means and poverty of ends and general purpose. We have multiplied discovery on discovery, fact upon fact, gadget on gadget — with no more general sense of deep satisfaction than the world has today in the face of its own tragedy for having done precisely the same thing. Above all, education, if it is to have any order or meaning, must brood on one great question: “What is man?” A hard question, involving the whole human activity — the intellect, the will, the emotions. Little wonder there is temptation to dodge it and enchant ourselves with things and mere empirical knowledge. Many institutions do dodge it — under one good pretext or another; either that, or they give it a purely intellectual or historical treatment, gingerly holding the eternities at arm’s length between thumb and finger. They permit students to develop unrelated specialities and learn all manner of bright tricks without any over-all purpose or directing belief whatsoever. One of my own students, last term, put it to me straight: “You ask us what we want after this war? We want an education that, by the end of sophomore year, has at least raised for us the questions worthy to be asked by a man. The answers are another matter. But we’ll settle for nothing less than an education concerned with the total implication of things. We are tired of heaped-up fragments. All this is our right as men.” I thought it a fair request.
doxically enough, a university that cuts short the mind’s adventure is really not a university at all. What I love about Wooster (and the cause of my deepest joy at returning here) is that it allows to education the full human adventure — the search for an understanding of what man really is in the light of the full powers of man — the intellect, the emotions, the will, and (if I may add) that deep quietness at the center where we hear the inner voice that comes at last, if we listen carefully, to teach us all, the voice that has spoken to anyone who has ever learned anything very much worth knowing.

There is, of course, a defense of Christian education as liberal education on very practical and secular grounds. Three great cultures — the Greek, the Roman, and the Hebrew — have formed the Western world. Why be ignorant of one of the three? How far can one go in art, in music, in literature, in history, in social thought, without a knowledge of the Bible and the great documents of the Church? One of the poverties of our contemporary mind is our lack of common symbols for expressing our great ideas. Part of this poverty came with the decline of classical learning and with the advent of anthologies of English literature where Zeus and Apollo have to be annotated and painfully described as if they were something wanted by the government, and a simple phrase like “pater noster” has actually to be translated. We experience a similar poverty from our religious illiteracy. Slowly the great secular books which have used these symbols for nineteen hundred years are closing to men who cannot read them with any ease or pleasure. Moreover, there is a matter of common honesty here. Men who would never think of pronouncing upon secular matters without consulting the sources and the prime authorities, easily conclude about Christianity without examining the evidence — the Old and New Testament. There are very few vagaries of college students that one, with a little time and patience, cannot under-
stand. But there is one that has always stumped me completely. Why is it that students who will sit up far into the night talking about the philosophy of religion or the psychology of religion are content to remain in almost abysmal ignorance of the Bible, which is the great original document in these matters. In no other department of learning would such flimsy research procedure be even tolerated.

Such are the secular grounds for including religion in any liberal education. But the real ground is better still — for only through such study does the mind of man complete its human adventure.

This adventure is, among other things, an adventure in profundity — the profundity that consists, not in impressive learning, but in the effort to retain perspective — in the effort to keep a few fundamental ideas constantly checking on the rest of the mind’s activity. These ideas are the pillars of philosophy — or the polar stars, if you will, by which we steer. They cut across red tape, order our confusion, and let fresh air blow through our speculations. Let me illustrate. Alexander Meiklejohn, the distinguished ex-president of Amherst, has written a three-hundred-page book in which he seeks to find a decent principle for all higher education. With more learning than most men can summon, he deplores the fade-out of Christianity. He tells us, however, that some hope is left. The guiding star of all future education will be Humanity (with a capital “H”) — an idea of universal brotherhood that every teacher will serve. Yet nowhere in his learned book does Dr. Meiklejohn raise the one simple fundamental question that any child would want to know: Who fathered all those brothers?

Another example. We probably face no more depressing fact in our philosophy than the awful waste of Nature. How, amid this terrible secundity, can I think of individual man or even man as a class — as marked for any special distinction — let
alone as a creature little lower than the angels and crowned with glory and honor? "Twenty-one civilizations," says Mr. Toynbee, "are recognized by the historian, of which fourteen have already disappeared entirely." The scientist can count over two million species, of which man is one. Depressing data. But wait for the voice of the philosopher cutting through to first principles. And here it comes. "Yes, this is all very discouraging," says MacNeile Dixon. "But we have one important point yet to consider. If man is but one of two million species, he still has this great distinction. He is, as far as we know, the only one of the two million who has ever been depressed by the fact." What would you say, if urged, is the chief intellectual defection of our time? I think I should say it is our general neglect of the idea of the First Cause. Behind our mass of facts and our empirical data there are still the ancient questions — Why? How? By whom? In our busyness, our pride of discovery, our learning, we forget these lodestar questions that, difficult though they may be to answer, do keep our minds straight and deliver us from hopeless superficiality. These questions are the stock in trade of philosophy and religion.

They keep alive in us, also, the great sources of wonder that ought to form — and so rarely form — our estimate of life. To me, one of our real problems arises from the fact that all the really impressive things which happen to us, generally take place in our experience very early and become trite before we ourselves have become reflective beings. By the time we are ready to form our philosophy of life, we are thoroughly accustomed to the miracles of love and pity, the beauty of holiness, the grandeur of sacrifice, the sky, the earth, and sea. All the great and noble parts of man and earth are, by that time, common and often jaded material. But suppose you were Plato's man coming from your dark cave to your full faculties and were then allowed what you and I too seldom have — the fresh, unspoiled view
of elementary things. Suppose it were the first afternoon of the world and the shadows began to form, and darkness began to stride across the land, and the sun go down. What a miracle it would be to you if, in a few hours, that sun should rise — and on the other side of the earth. In fact, if anybody dared prophesy, in that first great twilight, that the sun would rise, you would execute him on the spot as a "wishful" thinker. Yet, having once seen the returning dawn, with the full faculties of the mind, when would you forget it? There is a quiet, elementary way — a great original way of looking at things — that is the basis of all right thinking. The presence in our minds of the leading questions raised by philosophy and religion keeps those full faculties for the discovery of truth alive. "They make us," as one says, "the friends and companions of the images of wonder."

The mind's adventure that is born of religion will never permit us, moreover, to take that jaunty view of the world that is a frequent mark of the modern temper — the view that morality is all relative to time and place, changing with the customs of tribes and peoples. How many a man, when things get a little rough for him, begs to be excused from certain of our culture-conquests on the ground that the Eskimos think otherwise about it — and what's good enough for the Eskimos is good enough for him. Let us grant that there are mores and "conventions" wrongly inflated to the rank of morals; but there is another perverse tendency in us — to write off as "mores" and "conventions" whatever is difficult for us as morals. Samuel Butler, the seventeenth-century satirist, condemned the Presbyterians:

Who condone the sins they are inclined to
By damning others that they have no mind to.

If we look firmly at the matter, we discover that the moral alarm clock is probably better marked and better set than we think; the problem is really the problem of what to do when it rings.
Surely the mind sensitive to religious values knows that there are truths and commitments living in the depths of our being — truths to which, as Pascal said, we have no title, but to which we are bound for ever. Jonathan Edwards — what a hard head he had! — used to say "there are things in this world that are more than intellect and more than feeling. They are pure supernal light!" One of my favorite passages in all literature is that remarkable insight of Bishop Wilson's — "The joy of righteousness is so great that it would be a kind of debauchery — were it not so difficult."

Christianity is not merely an adventure in profound and adequate ideas. It is an adventure in freedom. Free choice is at the heart of the Christian conception — man given the dignity of choosing good and evil that he may have the honor of free commitment, the honor of being not a puppet but a person. "The gift of God is eternal life" one of my old teachers used to remind me out of the New Testament; and what is the very essence of a gift? — the fact that we don't have to accept it. A desperate choice, given to us at the total risk of ourselves. Little wonder that so many of our English liberties go back to those men in the seventeenth century who took political freedom as a simple matter of course, a deeper, original freedom already being theirs at so great a wager. Such freedom creates that automatic respect for personality out of which democracy thrives. We can preach tolerance at home and hold international conferences abroad till the end of time, and all our work will be in vain unless men of good will possess the world — men who value themselves as immortal persons bought at a price, and who, thus valuing themselves, value other persons also. This is the mind's adventure in brotherhood that follows the mind's adventure in true freedom.

All liberal education is, finally, an adventure in humility. And so, in the final adventure of the liberal mind, he learns again the wisdom of the humble. He first loses his life and then he finds
it again. Surrendering himself to God, he receives from Him the return of infinite love — flooding every portion of his life till there is a new light upon the land and on every human face, and in his own heart a peace the world cannot give. This is the final humility, and it is the crown of intellect.

In this final act of liberation man is not alone. With him is the living companionship of Christ who knew, better than anyone else, the secret of the humble and the lonely insights of bitter revelation. During four years in college you will come on many great figures in the books of the world — Oedipus going home to Colonus in the twilight; Lear with the dead Cordelia in his arms; Pasteur quietly triumphant in his laboratory; Faust brooding at midnight the mysteries of mortal satisfaction; the dying Hamlet and the profound soul of Abraham Lincoln. These are our liberal education. But where will you find a man who, dying between two thieves, takes captive the world’s imagination for two thousand years — the Son of God who says: “Come unto me, all ye who are weary and are heavy laden. For I am meek and lowly of heart, and I will give you rest unto your souls.” In Him is the end and the beginning of your liberal education; for the highest value you know is the value of a person. And where is there a person like Him? In Him is the beginning and the end of the mind’s adventure. In Him the thoughts of God do become our thoughts; and His ways our ways. “Higher than Him,” said Carlyle, “human thought simply cannot go.”

To you who are with us for the first time let me finally welcome you with a symbol. When I was a boy, I went, one summer, on a camping trip to the Carter County Caves in Kentucky. One day, far back in the dark of one of the caves, I found myself crawling along on a ledge with a guide and a few companions. The light from our lanterns flashed back from stalactites and stalagmites upon the wall of the cave nearest us. Suddenly, turning a corner, I came upon one wall covered with the initials
of campers who had preceded us. Among these names I discovered, to my complete surprise, the name of my father carved there many years before. I leave to your imagination the impression this made on a fourteen-year-old boy. And this is my symbol for you today. Your education, at the moment, is going forward in a cave. For the world just now does not wholly permit us to live in the full, clear light of the sun. Even so, you may proceed. This College will give you light and put a lantern in your hand. But your journey will hardly be complete unless, at some turning, you, too, may have the joy of discovering your Father's name.

(An address delivered on the first Sunday of the college year 1944-1945.)
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THE NATIONAL ANTHEM
O say, can you see, by the dawn’s early light,
What so proudly we hailed, at the twilight’s last gleaming,
Whose broad stripes and bright stars, through the perilous fight,
O’er the ramparts we watched, were so gallantly streaming?
And the rockets’ red glare, the bombs bursting in air
Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there.
O say, does that Star-spangled Banner yet wave
O’er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

O, thus be it ever when free men shall stand
Between their loved homes and the war’s desolation;
Blessed with victory and peace, may the heaven-rescued land
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation!
Then conquer we must when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto, “In God is our trust!”
And the Star-spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O’er the land of the free and the home of the brave.
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THE HYMN

Our God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.

A thousand ages in Thy sight
Are like an evening gone,
Short as the watch that ends the night
Before the rising sun.

Before the hills in order stood,
Or Earth received her frame,
From everlasting Thou art God,
To endless years the same.

Our God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Be Thou our Guard while life shall last
And our eternal home. Amen.
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  Doctor of Laws
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  General Secretary of the Board of Christian Education
  of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.
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  March in E major.....................Guilmant
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      MRS. OTELIA AUGSPURGER COMPTON

1855  Berea College
      DEAN CHARLES NOBLE SHUTT
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1855  Chicago Theological Seminary
      PROFESSOR FRED EASTMAN

1855  Elmira College
      MRS. IRVING SUMERGRADE

1855  Pennsylvania State College
      MR. DONALD S. BELL
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1856  Saint Lawrence University
      PROFESSOR EDWARD KNEELAND CRATSLEY

1857  Lake Forest College
      PROFESSOR EMERITUS J. MILTON VANCE (Wooster)

1858  Iowa State College
      MR. I. D. HADLEY

1859  Lake Erie College
      PRESIDENT HELEN D. BRAGDON

1860  Augustana College and Theological Seminary
      PROFESSOR VERGILIUS FERM (Wooster)

1860  Simpson College
      PROFESSOR E. KINGMAN EBERHART (Wooster)

1860  Wheaton College
      MRS. CHARLES H. TROUTMAN, JR.

1861  Massachusetts Institute of Technology
      PRESIDENT KARL TAYLOR COMPTON

1861  North Central College
      MR. WILLIAM C. DEVENY (Wooster)

1861  Vassar College
      MRS. SAMUEL M. GLENN

1863  Kansas State College
      DR. JOHN S. HOUSER
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1864  Bates College
      DR. HARRY K. FOSTER (Akron)

1864  University of Denver
      MR. CHARLES B. SIAS

1865  Cornell University
      DR. FREEMAN SMITH HOWLETT
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1865  University of Kansas
      MR. FRANCIS O. KANEHL

1865  University of Kentucky
      MRS. FLORENCE BREWER MARTIN
UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Date of Founding and Delegates

1865  University of Maine
      DR. WESLEY P. JUDKINS
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1865  Worcester Polytechnic Institute
      MR. FRANK W. JACKSON

1866  Carleton College
      PROFESSOR NELSON VANCE RUSSELL

1866  University of New Hampshire
      MR. ALFRED L. RICHMOND

1867  Drew University
      THE REVEREND W. W. DIETERICH

1867  Lewis and Clark College
      DR. FRED W. NEAL (Chicago)

1867  West Virginia University
      PROFESSOR SAMUEL MORRIS

1867  Western Maryland College
      PROFESSOR MARY REBECCA THAYER (Wooster)

1868  University of California
      PROFESSOR VIRGINIA S. SANDERSON (Ohio State)

1868  Wells College
      PRESIDENT WILLIAM ERNEST WELD

1869  University of Nebraska
      PROFESSOR EMERITUS MARTIN REMP (Wooster)

1869  Pennsylvania College for Women
      MISS LAURA GREEN

1869  Purdue University
      DR. I. C. HOFFMAN
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1869  Swarthmore College
      MR. H. V. BRESSLER

1869  Wilson College
      MRS. J. CLARE GEORGE

1870  University of Akron
      PRESIDENT HEZZLETON ERASTUS SIMMONS

1870  Isabelle Thoburn College for Women
      MRS. MARY COMPTON RICE

1870  Ohio State University
      VICE PRESIDENT BLAND L. STRADLEY

1870  Wellesley College
      MRS. ELIZABETH REESE FUNK
UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
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1870  Wilmington College
      DR. J. CLEVE CARROLL
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1871  Elmhurst College
      THE REVEREND PAUL WILLIAM SCHMIDT

1871  Smith College
      PRESIDENT EMERITA ADA COMSTOCK NOTE STEIN
      (Radcliffe)

1872  University of Toledo
      DEAN ANDREW J. TOWNSEND

1872  Vanderbilt University
      MR. THOMAS E. LIPSCOMB

1874  Colorado College
      MR. KINZIE B. NEFF

1875  Park College
      THE REVEREND S. CARLYLE ADAMS

1875  Parsons College
      MRS. VIRGINIA McKENZIE PARKER

1876  Johns Hopkins University
      DR. J. DEAN WILSON
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1878  Ashland College
      PRESIDENT EDWARD G. MASON

1879  Kinnaird Christian College for Women
      MRS. MARY COMPTON RICE

1879  Radcliffe College
      MRS. ELIZABETH JENNEY TAEUSCH

1880  Case School of Applied Science
      DEAN EMERITUS THEODORE M. FOCKE

1881  Coe College
      PROFESSOR HELEN GRAY (Lake Erie College)

1881  Drake University
      MRS. DONALD HAEFELE

1881  Fenn College
      DEAN JOSEPH CLIFFORD NICHOLS

1882  Findlay College
      THE REVEREND MYRL GEPHART

1882  Hastings College
      THE REVEREND ROBERT C. NEWELL

1882  Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station
      DR. JOSEPH H. GOURLEY
UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
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1883  Huron College
      THE REVEREND JOHN R. WILLIAMS

1883  Tarkio College
      THE REVEREND SCOTT WITHROW

1885  Bryn Mawr College
      MRS. KATHERINE KELLEY TAYLOR

1885  Goucher College
      MRS. JULIA KLEY HUTCHISON

1885  Macalester College
      MR. ROY ALFRED GREIG

1886  Forman Christian College
      PRINCIPAL C. HERBERT RICE

1887  Occidental College
      MISS JANE E. HAZLETT

1887  Pomona College
      THE REVEREND PHILIP SMEAD BIRD

1887  Sterling College
      MR. RUSSELL D. BYALL

1887  University of Wyoming
      PROFESSOR ERIC LINDAHL (Ohio State)

1890  George Williams College
      MR. ARTHUR O. BORG

1890  Lincoln Memorial University
      DR. CARL W. SCHEFFER

1891  University of Chicago
      PROFESSOR JOHN W. CHITTUM (Wooster)

1891  Stanford University
      MR. JOHN R. MORRILL

1892  Central Michigan College of Education
      DEAN CHARLES C. BARNES

1892  Illinois Institute of Technology
      MR. DONALD H. FLEIG

1893  Hood College
      MRS. PAUL T. BECHTOL

1893  Montana State University
      DR. JOSEPH A. BATY

1894  Cedarville College
      THE REVEREND WILSON EUGENE SPENCER

1896  Alabama College
      MRS. LUCIE PICKETT KLINGER
UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
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1899  Simmons College
      MISS BERTHA M. EMERSON (Miami)

1900  Bluffton College
      PRESIDENT LLOYD L. RAMSEYER

1902  Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary
      PROFESSOR JAMES ANDERSON, JR. (Wooster)

1902  Carnegie Institute of Technology
      DR. OSCAR J. HORGAN

1908  Presbyterian College of Christian Education
      PROFESSOR VARTAN D. MELCONIAN

1908  Youngstown College
      PRESIDENT HOWARD W. JONES

1910  Bowling Green State University
      PRESIDENT F. J. PROUT

1910  Kent State University
      PROFESSOR ALFRED WILLIAM STEWART

1915  University of British Columbia
      DR. CECIL ALEXANDER LAMB
      (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station)

1915  Connecticut College
      DEAN DOROTHY MATEER

1933  Wayne University
      DR. FRANK HENRY CLARK

LEARNED SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS

1743  American Philosophical Society
      DR. WILLIAM FRANCIS GRAY SWANN

1776  United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa
      PROFESSOR MARY Z. JOHNSTON

1848  American Association for the Advancement of Science
      PROFESSOR RALPH V. BANGHAM

1857  National Education Association
      MR. RALPH HATHAWAY

1867  Ohio College Association
      PRESIDENT GORDON KEITH CHALMERS

1869  American Philological Association
      PROFESSOR EVA MAY NEWMAN

1876  American Library Association
      MISS ELIZABETH BECHTEL
LEARNED SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS
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1880  Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis
      THE REVEREND JOHN R. CHENEY

1883  Modern Language Association of America
      DEAN WILLIAM CLYDE DEVANE

1884  American Historical Association
      PROFESSOR AILEEN DUNHAM

1888  American Mathematical Society
      PROFESSOR CHARLES O. WILLIAMSON

1888  Geological Society of America
      PROFESSOR FRANK JAMES WRIGHT

1889  American Academy of Political and Social Science
      MR. R. P. DINSMORE

1891  Ohio Academy of Science
      PROFESSOR J. ERNEST CARMAN

1892  American Psychological Association
      DR. BERTHA M. LUCKEY

1899  American Physical Society
      MR. JOHN M. DAVIES

1903  American Political Science Association
      PROFESSOR MARY Z. JOHNSON

1905  American Sociological Society
      PROFESSOR ARCHIBALD A. JOHNSTON

1915  American Association of University Professors
      PROFESSOR JAMES ELBERT CUTLER

1915  Mathematical Association of America
      PROFESSOR EMERITUS W. D. CAIRNS

1918  American Council on Education
      PRESIDENT HEZZLETON ERASTUS SIMMONS

1919  American Council of Learned Societies
      PROFESSOR WALLACE NOTESTEIN

1919  Institute of International Education
      DR. EDGAR J. FISHER

1925  John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation
      PROFESSOR ARTHUR H. COMPTON

1939  College English Association
      PROFESSOR LOWELL W. COOLIDGE
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1802  Board of National Missions
       THE REVEREND J. EARL JACKMAN

1819  Board of Christian Education
       THE REVEREND PAUL CALVIN PAYNE

1881  Synod of Ohio
       THE REVEREND D. EARL MCKINNEY

1882  Ohio Synodical
       MRS. F. L. GARY