

Trinity College

Trinity College Digital Repository

Trinity College Bulletins and Catalogues (1824 - present) Trinity Publications (Newspapers, Yearbooks, Catalogs, etc.)

1918

Trinity College Bulletin, 1918 (Commencement)

Trinity College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/bulletin>

Recommended Citation

Trinity College, "Trinity College Bulletin, 1918 (Commencement)" (1918). *Trinity College Bulletins and Catalogues (1824 - present)*. 67.

<https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/bulletin/67>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Trinity Publications (Newspapers, Yearbooks, Catalogs, etc.) at Trinity College Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Trinity College Bulletins and Catalogues (1824 - present) by an authorized administrator of Trinity College Digital Repository.

Trinity College
HARTFORD CONNECTICUT

Commencement
at
Trinity College



HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

June 16, 17, 1918



HONORARII (indicated by affixing their degrees), TRUSTEES, and GUESTS OF TRINITY COLLEGE; PHOTOGRAPHED AT THE ENTRANCE TO WILLIAMS MEMORIAL.

Top, Left to right—Flavel S. Luther; Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, Sc.D.; Russell Jordan Coles, Sc.D.; Bishop Paul Matthews, D.D.; George Wharton Pepper, D.C.L.; John Pierpont Morgan, LL.D.
 Second row—George Shiras, III, Sc. D.; Charles Lathrop Pack, LL.D.; Karl Reiland, D.D.; Bishop Granville Hudson Sherwood, D.D.; Edward Schofield Travers, D.D.

Others, in Two Rows, in Order—Charles A. Johnson; W. S. Hubbard; N. H. Batchelder, M.A.; Charles G. Woodward; William B. Davis, Mus. B.; Frank L. Wilcox; Edgar F. Waterman; George D. Howell; William C. Miller; Meigs H. Whipple, M.A.; Admiral William S. Cowles, N.H.S.; George D. Howell.

Commencement
at
Trinity College



HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

June 16, 17, 1918

TRINITY COMMENCEMENT

On the morning of Sunday, June 16, 1918, a memorable event took place on the campus of Trinity College. In front of Northam Towers five thousand people assembled and joined reverently in an open-air religious service conducted by Bishop Acheson, Suffragan of Connecticut. The service was a shortened form of Morning Prayer, interspersed with patriotic hymns. At the conclusion of the service the president of the college presented Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, who addressed the congregation.

Rev. Flavel S. Luther, President. It is with a feeling of great joy that, as President of Trinity College, I welcome to its buildings, its campus, its halls, and everything that it has, our honored guest of this morning. A close relative of his was one of our graduates and died in the military service of his state. I am glad that we have such a beautiful day for him and such an audience. As I wrote him, out of doors is the only room that we have anywhere nearly big enough for those who want to hear Colonel Roosevelt speak.

So, Colonel Roosevelt, I welcome you to this college in the name of faculty, trustees, alumni, students, friends, and in my own name you know, Sir. I present to you this audience of Hartford people, and of visitors connected with the college from outside the city and state; and to you, ladies and gentlemen, I present our first citizen,—statesman, soldier, author, friend of his country, for seven years its President; now, as always, its lover and its stanch defender. Ladies and Gentlemen, Colonel Roosevelt.

Colonel Theodore Roosevelt. President Luther, Bishop Acheson, men and women of Connecticut, my friends and my fellow Americans,—and no man living in the United States whom I cannot call a fellow American is a friend of mine. (Applause)

No one could fail to be moved and touched by such a greeting as you afford me, and by the opportunity under these surroundings to address such an audience; and above all, I am

glad to come here as the special guest of President Luther and to be introduced by him in words which, however ill deserved, I would like my children and grandchildren to think *were* deserved. (Applause) President Luther seems to me, and has long seemed to me, to just about realize in his life what an American citizen should be, along a great many different lines. (Applause) For example, he shows by his life that we can in this country approach the true democratic ideal of an absolute democracy of the soul, coupled with the finest cultivation of the mind and the spirit. (Applause) The true conception of democracy is leveling up, not leveling down, and there isn't anything more necessary in this country than to show that an absolute simplicity of life, an absolute acknowledgment of the essentials of democracy, can go hand in hand with the achievement of culture. (The word has been discredited, but it will outlast Germany!) An achievement of culture undertaken not with a view to any possible money return, but because knowledge and beauty are good things in themselves, and because no nation that fails to appreciate the need of cultivating knowledge and beauty for themselves will permanently win a great part in the tremendous epic of the ages.

President Luther typifies, as it is given but a few men in any generation to typify, entire democracy of soul with lofty achievement of intellect. And there is another thing that is typified by President Luther (and that is why I am here!) President Luther never says anything he does not mean, and his words are always translated into deeds. (Applause)

I have been accused, with a certain semblance of justice, of liking to preach. I do. (Applause) My text for today is to be found in the chapter of Kings which President Luther read, in the eleventh verse, where the King of Israel answers Ben-hadad the boaster and says: "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off."

Now I want to translate that from the days of Ben-hadad to our own. I am here primarily because President Luther when he says a thing means it. I am here to ask that our people act on that theory in their lives. There is a good deal about the system of censorship that we have established which has an unpleasant suggestion of being applicable only to out-patients of an idiot asylum. Much of it has been exceedingly foolish. But there is one line along which I wish the censorship could be extended. I wish it were possible to censor all boasting, (Applause) and devote ourselves to achievement,—not to improper exaggeration of what we have done, and above all not to grandiloquent statements of what we are going to do.

Censor the boasting! Remember that every great speech that has come down through history has obtained and kept its place only because it represented either achievement in the past, or a resolute purpose for achievement in the future. The Gettysburg speech is immortal. Why? Because men by tens of thousands had died at Gettysburg before the speech was made. (Applause) If it had not been for the valor of the men who wore the blue and of the men who wore the gray, both alike, on the field of Gettysburg; if now every man in our country could not look back with pride to the deeds of the Americans who under the two flags fought at Gettysburg, each for the right as it was given him to see the right,—if that were not the case no one today would care to read the Gettysburg speech. It is because what was said represented what had been done and the high purpose to carry the deeds further to fulfilment. That is why that speech was of value. But nobody remembers with pleasure the people who yelled "On to Richmond," in 1861, but who went the other way!

Boasting always has a bad effect upon the people who boast. It may sometimes have a more mischievous effect still. I received a letter the other day from a colonel of engineers in France who had just come back from the trenches, saying that there were no American airplanes to defend the infantry in that sector at that time; that the German airplanes came down and attacked the machine gunners in the trenches, and that enlisted men and officers with their revolvers fired back futilely at those German planes. This colonel went on to say that this condition was due to the fact that last Fall we kept loudly and complacently announcing that we were going to have 20,000 airplanes with Pershing's army this spring. The boast took in our own people, but above all it took in the Germans; and the Germans, unlike our own people, built to meet it. Therefore when in March the great drive began, and when England and France had to make a rampart of the bodies of the best of their young men to shield themselves and to shield us just as much as themselves,—when they had to do this they found that the Germans had built thousands of airplanes to meet the airplanes we were going to build and hadn't built; and therefore the French and English had to meet the added strain of the increased air war made against them, because we had boasted, as Ben-hadad did, before putting our armor on, instead of waiting to boast until after we had taken our armor off.

Let us learn the lesson; let us quit boasting; let us not humiliate our men in the trenches by headlines in the papers, which treat a heavy skirmish by our troops with a German

battalion as equal in importance to a terrible battle with ten German divisions by the French or the English. Let us quit boasting until we have done something to boast of; and a nation of a hundred million people must not sit down complacently merely because a small fraction of its army has done well.

Yet indeed we have every right to lift our heads higher as Americans because of the valor and soldierly efficiency shown by the men under Pershing on the other side of the water. (Applause) I thank Heaven for it. These men have a right to feel the pride that can come only to those who render service through sacrifice. Our boys, our young men, have given and are now giving and in ever-increasing proportion will give their lives for the faith that is in them, and their blood ennoble all of us. If we had not gone into this war; if our sons and brothers were not fighting on the other side; why, after the war was over no self-respecting American would have been able to look a foreigner in the face. (Applause) Thank Heaven that we did our duty; but let us not deceive ourselves as to the duty being done—it has only begun. We have only just begun to harden our giant, but our soft and flabby, strength. We have been able to prepare it only because for their own purposes our allies shielded our soft, unhardened body while we hardened it. Let us accept that fact. For the first six months of the war our navy was utterly impotent and it was a year before we developed any army at all; and during this time we would have been utterly powerless to defend our own homes if we had not been protected by the fleet of England and the armies of France and England. Let us realize our derelictions in the past, and let us face the future in no spirit of empty and complacent selfcongratulation, but with the purpose to show by our deeds that we are worthy of being the spiritual heirs of the men who in the early '60s fought the great Civil War to a conclusion. (Applause)

Now friends, I have peculiar associations with Trinity. One of my dearest and closest friends, my first cousin, Frank Roosevelt, was a graduate of Trinity. He entered the National Guard and died in the performance of duty as a guardsman in New York, died just as much for his country as any man has died over in France recently. I have long known and appreciated the kind of spirit necessary in a crisis like this. Terrible though this war is, dreadful though it is for those whose nearest of blood are going abroad to face if necessary the last ultimate sacrifice of devotion, yet I believe that it means a rebirth of the country. I think it means a new, and glorified American nationalism in this country; I think it means a gain

of perspective on our part, so that we shall no longer confound the essentials and the non-essentials of life, as we have confounded them in the past.

About four years ago, when this war broke out, the antics of many of our people really made one hesitate as to whether we could ever recover from the effects of living in a stew of sordid materialism, flavored with a make-believe sentimentality. There has been a good deal of talk—ninety-five per cent. of it absolutely dishonest talk—about profiteering in this country. There was an immense amount of profiteering in this country before the war. The profiteering in this country took place during the years of our ignoble neutrality. With the breaking out of the war 90 per cent. of the profiteering stopped. It used to make me fairly shudder with horror three years ago, when I would read in the Wall Street news of “war brides,” a sacred name that was used to designate successful money-making by speculation in the blood of others. Such use of the word was a common thing, not only in the newspapers, but in the stories printed for our amusement, in those days. Again, again, and again we came across that *motif* of the “war bride,” of the man who made money out of war brides. The very use of the term was enough to make any decent man cringe with shame.

That is past. When we speak of a war bride now we mean a girl who has sent her lover, her husband, to fight, and if necessary, to die. (Applause) We have finished with the sordidness of the profiteer. As I have said before, there isn't one tenth the profiteering now, since we entered the war, (I am not quite sure when we did (laughter); sixteen months ago Germany went to war with us; fourteen months ago we went to war with Germany; and somewhere in the twilight zone between our people finally opened their eyes.) But since we went to war the profiteering has stopped, compared to what it was before, and now we force those who make profits to pay most heavily for making them, and we exercise some supervision over them. I don't mean that we have stopped it all. In a hundred million people there are dead sure to be some off-oxen! We have immeasurably lessened the number of capitalists who think only in terms of profit. Three years ago those were the terms in which most of our people were thinking; and hand in glove with them went the sentimentalists. Remember that sentimentality and sentiment have nothing to do with one another, save as pathos has to do with bathos—there is just the same difference between sentiment and sentimentality that there is between pathos and bathos. A sentimentalist is the foe of sound morality and of sound sentiment. The sentimentalist

three years ago, two years ago, sixteen months ago was primarily a pacifist, and he worked hand-in-glove with the materialists at home and the militarists in Germany. The pacifists played the game of the German militarist abroad and of the American materialist at home, and he was helped play it by all the decent citizens who in a puzzle-headed way forgot that righteousness is the end and peace only the means to the end.

In 1864 there were any number of people who cried "Peace, peace!" Now understand me. I am half southern. If I had been old enough I should have carried a musket for the Union, but I am extremely proud of the fact that three of my kinsfolk fought in the Confederate Army, and fought as it was in them to fight for the truth as it was in them to see the truth. We can afford now to be equally proud of the men who wore the blue and the men who wore the gray. But there is one set of men of whom we are not proud, and that is the men who did not do any fighting on either side. In 1864 you veterans remember there were any number of men who cried "Peace, peace!" We could have had peace at once by simply quitting the fight, and thereby we would have put a stop to the bloodshed and horror. We could have had peace; and we could have kept the peace for just about two or three years. Then we would have had another war, then another, and then another; and Heaven knows what this country would have ultimately become. It would have been something on the general lines of Central America; but more than that we are not able to say. Thank Heaven that our fathers had iron in their blood; that our fathers were resolute to fight the war through to a decision, so as to secure a permanent peace based upon the foundation of right, before they quit the fight. That is what we have to do now. The pacifist who objected to our preparing for the war, who objected to our going into the war, was the enemy of mankind; and the pacifist who now wishes an indecisive peace, a negotiated peace, is the enemy of this country and of mankind. (Applause)

I wish peace—I wish peace granted by us on our own terms to a Germany beaten to her knees. (Applause) I am willing to negotiate about peace; but I wish to negotiate about it, not with Germany, but with Belgium, Servia, Roumania, Italy, France, and England. The negotiations must be such as to justify those peoples for their sufferings. Let it be such a peace as to guarantee them, so far as it is humanly possible to guarantee anything, against a recurrence of the disasters that have overwhelmed them. To talk about doing justice to Germany as well as to Belgium is like prattling about doing justice alike to

the blackhander and to the mother whose child he has kidnapped.

I refuse to accept the doctrine that there is a gulf between right as we see it displayed in the acts of an honorable man toward his neighbor, and international right as we see it displayed by an honorable nation. I believe on the contrary that every nation should act toward other nations fundamentally as an honorable man acts towards other honorable men. (Applause) As yet, there has to be a different sanction of force in the two cases, simply because international law does not rest on any international sanction of force, and at present cannot rest on any such sanction; so that the method of application must differ from what is the case with municipal or civil law within the nation. But the ethical principle is the same in the two cases. The really great statesman is the statesman who combines strength with a high sense of right dealing. The really great statesman is the man with Bismarck's strength who possesses the scruple which Bismarck lacked. In other words, the really great statesman of the future will be the man who models his conduct on the conduct of Washington and Lincoln in the past. (Applause) One of them fought to a successful conclusion the first great war in our history, and the other directed the fighting of the second great war in our history, and paid with his life for the victory.

This means that you must ask from the nation what you ask of the individual in his private relations. I appeal to all fathers and mothers (I was going to say to my fellow-fathers and mothers, but I have moved into the grandfather class, and have now got eight grandchildren, thank the Lord!) All of you wish your sons as they grow up to show themselves incapable of wronging the weak and incapable of submitting to wrong by the strong. You would abhor seeing your boy a brawler, and you would abhor seeing him a coward; if you don't have both feelings than you are a mighty poor father or mother. If you don't bring up your boy to feel that he is ashamed of himself, that he is a cur, if he bullies the weak, you are a poor creature; and if you don't bring him up to feel that if anyone slaps his sister's face he will fight even if it is against a prize-fighter, you are also a poor creature.

Well, my advice to the nation would be the same as I would give to a son,—don't fight at all if you can help it, but when you fight, *fight*. (Applause) Never hit anyone if you can avoid it, but never hit soft. Nobody is grateful after being hit soft. If you hit a man but only hit him a little, he will hurt you. Don't hit a man at all if you can possibly help it; but if you do hit him, put him to sleep! (Applause) (I am

particularly glad to see the sympathetic appreciation of the technical language I use by the bishop).

This is true of the individual and it is true of the nation. We are in this war—we must put it through with every ounce of strength and energy we have got. We should no longer act as if the war were three thousand miles away. The submarines have brought it up to the three-mile limit in the last two or three weeks. We should act as if the war was next door to us. We should so act because it will be next door to us, unless we win it far off. Every now and then you still meet the honest fool who says: "O, I am perfectly willing to fight on this side if they will come over here, but why should our boys go over there to fight?" The answer is, we send our sons to fight abroad beside our allies because unless they do it they will have to fight here at home without the allies. (Applause) We fight to support France and England and Italy, because if they broke tomorrow we would have to fight beside our own ruined hearthstones without any allies, and while still only half armed here on this side the water. Remember that as yet we are not even half-armed.

Let us proceed; let us do everything as if we knew the war would last seven years, and yet do it as quickly as if we thought we could put an end to it in seven weeks. (Applause) Any man who fails at this time to do all in his power toward the steps that will make us permanently able to hold our own, no matter how long the war lasts, is acting falsely to this country, and any man who in any way advocates or connives at delay is acting falsely to this country. At last, since March, we have been putting across the water hundreds of thousands of men. That means vacancies in our camps here. Last March we should have provided for raising another three million men, so as to reach the five million limit in our army. We ought to do it now. I haven't the slightest interest in bandying words as to whether you say five million or ten million. My concern is with deeds, not with talk. My concern is in passing the law at once to prepare for an army of five million men. Make that the lowest limit—make it ten million, if anyone wishes to make it ten million—make it any amount, but make it now. Make it not less than five million and start doing the work now. (Applause) In other words, make the Gettysburg speech after the battle of Gettysburg—not before. Prepare now, prepare our strength, and prepare it as speedily as possible.

There are some hundreds of thousands of gallant Americans on the other side. Don't leave them any longer than we must without putting a couple of million more men behind them.

(Applause) And, friends, I would be willing to risk the decision of the argument I make for putting the war through, and for preparedness, with the mothers of this country. (Applause)

I think it is one of Anthony Trollope's heroines who says: "My dear, I am not denying that women are foolish; the Lord made them to match the men." The women three years ago were not a bit more foolish than the men—they were just about as foolish. I remember about that time a good woman in the North writing me, evidently a hard-working woman, who had brought up I think six sons, saying she had always admired me, but had separated from me since I was advocating preparedness, because she did not wish her sons to go up against the cannon. Three years have passed, and her sons at this moment are going up against the cannon, and without our cannon to back them. That good woman didn't understand that I wished preparedness, not for the sake of war, but to render war unnecessary, to enable us to achieve the great purposes we ought to have in view without the necessity of fighting for them; and if the necessity came where we had to fight, then to fight at a maximum of advantage instead of at a minimum.

My prime objection to the pacifist is not that he won't fight in the long run. Even the pacifist, if you kick him long enough, will fight. The trouble is that prolonged and pernicious indulgence in pacifism renders a man unfit to accomplish anything when he does fight. The pacifist does not keep the country out of war—he merely keeps the country unfit to do its duty in war by making it prepare after the war has come. I ask all representatives of the higher education if I am not correct in stating that a football team that deferred training until the day of the game wouldn't make a good showing? (Applause) I can see this is a cultural college!

It is too late to prepare when the time for war has come, and somebody then has to pay for the lack of preparation. In our case we had allies who paid. Our allies paid with their bodies. We have been able to prepare behind the fleets and armies of France and England and Italy, and no American who will really think out the matter and who has any self-respect can think without shame of this fact. Never again must Uncle Sam be put in the position of letting others shield him because he hasn't been willing to take thought in advance. After this, let Uncle Sam prepare to defend himself by his own strength. (Applause) It is the only position compatible with self-respect, and it is the only position that will enable him to render help to others.

As for the pacifist, he is not dangerous in war time, but

don't you forget that you will hear his shrill voice raised, very loud, the instant that peace comes and it is reasonably safe for him to raise it. Don't misunderstand me about the pacifists. I don't dislike them—I despise them, but I don't dislike them. (Applause) I have known very amiable pacifists of both sexes, as far as you can predicate sex of a pacifist. (Applause) What I do object to is that they don't pay themselves for their folly—they make others pay for their folly. The sons of the men and women here today, those boys who are over in France, will pay for the folly of the pacifist in the past. The pacifist won't pay; he is safe—he stays at home.

Now one variety of pacifist was the conscientious objector. I am going to repeat what I said at Hartford a good many months ago about him, because I want to keep that drilled into your minds. A year ago you heard much about the conscientious objectors. One of them wrote to me, asking me to respect his conscience. I told him all right, if he would respect mine. I will always respect a man's conscience; but if it makes him act like a fool then I wish he would take it out and look at it to see whether it really functions properly.

Now I want to find out from the conscientious objector, first, what he is conscientious about. If he is only conscientious about killing someone else, all right, put him in the army and send him up to the extreme front to dig trenches. He won't kill anybody. Let him dig the trenches at the risk of his life, and then let the fighting men with rifles go into them. If he prefers a seafaring life put him on a mine-sweeper. A mine-sweeper is a small, slow, unarmed boat that hunts for mines. If it finds them it sometimes blows up. The man on the boat won't hurt anyone else—he may go skyward himself.

Now if the pacifist, if the conscientious objector will do that kind of work I have nothing to say against him, but if he is too conscientious to expose himself to danger, then I would say, all right, I won't bother with you; if your conscience bids you stay at home, you stay at home; but my conscience forbids me to permit you to vote in a country which can only continue to exist by the willingness of its citizens to face death in battle. I hope to see universal military training of all our young men in time of peace on the Swiss system. Let no man vote who has not had that training, and who has not taken an oath that he will bear arms to support the government in the case of malice domestic or foreign levy.

I have spoken of defending the nation. But the first necessity is to have a nation to defend; and there cannot be any such thing as a nation if its citizens are permitted to divide

their allegiance. There is no room in this country for any such thing as a fifty-fifty Americanism. Either a man's an American and nothing else, or he is not an American at all. We used to hear—we haven't heard it so much recently—a good deal of talk about the man who loved America and loved another country too. A gentleman of that expansive patriotism stands parallel with the gentleman of expansive affection in domestic matters—the man is able to love another woman as much as he loves his own wife. We haven't in this country room for but one flag—we have no room for any foreign flag. Neither have we any room for the red or the black flag. These internationals and anarchists are out of place in this country. The internationalist, the man who says he loves other nations as much as he does this, and especially if he is of the parlor or pink tea type of internationalist, should be told that he is altogether too broadly sympathetic to find us congenial; and as he loves all other nations equally he is to get out of this nation and make his choice among the others. The same course should be pursued with the anarchist. We deport alien anarchists. We ought either to deport or intern non-alien anarchists. The anarchist does not stand on a par with any man who advocates any form of government; in other words, he is not willing to work with the rest of us on the theory that we all have a common duty, that we have a common brotherhood, a common object to achieve. His aim is simply to destroy all government. There should be no compromise with him. Let him get out of this country and destroy government somewhere else.

Let us from this time on refuse to allow the flag to be used to cover men who claim all the privileges under it, but who will perform none of the obligations that should go with citizenship.

Friends, this by itself is not enough. I would go to the absolute limit in putting down without any compromise or any hesitation every form of Bolshevism, Anarchism, I. W. W., or German Socialism—I would proceed to the limit against them. I believe it is necessary so to do.

But this is not enough. Remember that in this country, to make our great democratic experiment succeed, we must set our faces like flint just as much against the Romanoffs of reaction in politics and industry as against the Bolshevists. We must face the new era. We must try to reduce our golden ideals to practice. They must not be permitted hereafter to remain only the property of the preacher on Sunday. They must be applied by his congregation on weekdays.

It isn't an easy thing that I am asking, that we as a nation

combine qualities the excess of anyone of which will mean destruction. If we of this country do not in good faith each of us undertake to be our brother's keeper, we will find that we are involved in the end in the destruction that will fall on our brothers. I ask that we remember that this country won't be a comfortable place to live in for the grandchildren of any of us, unless we make it a pretty decent place to live in for the grandchildren of all of us. I ask that we remember that unless all of us go up a little, none of us will permanently go up at all. I ask this on the one hand, and I say that unless we shape our legislation, and what is much more important, our individual social and business action back of the legislation along those lines, we shall face fearful disaster.

Yet I wish also to say, with all the strength that is in me, that this kind of action must be taken having constantly before us the danger of weakening the springs of individual initiative. Help any man up. Every man who will be honest with himself will admit that he either does stumble, or if the opportunity comes may stumble, at some time. Help any man up; help your brother up; put him on the pathway. Make the path as far as you can smooth before him. But don't carry him! If you try to carry him and he submits to it, you will find that you cannot help him and that you impair your own usefulness. The man who will submit to being carried, after a short experience becomes utterly worthless to carry. Do nothing that will impair a man's self-respect. Do what you do, not on the basis of charity from one to another—do it in the spirit of love, which is a spirit entirely compatible with the self-respect of both sides. There is only one way to permanently help any man, and that is to help him to help himself. Therefore treat him with regard to his self-respect just as much as with regard to your own. Work with him for the common good of both of you. Don't work in a spirit of patronage. If you find at any time that you don't think you can be helped by anyone else, then for the Lord's sake don't try to help anyone else!

Let us work with the vivid realization that we have a community object to serve, the common good of all of us; that the welfare of each of us must be the concern of the rest of us; and yet that we must so work as not to shrink or diminish the individual's power of initiative and power of self-government.

So much for the future; so much for after the war. During the war our whole business is to win the war, and therefore to put our solid strength back of the men in Uncle Sam's uniform at the front.

In any great crisis, the men who do the deeds best worth

doing, are the men who run the greatest risks. In any great crisis, those who stay at home have cause for pride in those who go almost exactly in proportion as they also have cause for anxiety. Our pride can be measured by the anxiety we feel. The great sacrifices are to be made by the men at the front. It is they, the young men, the men whose future is open and brilliant before them, the men who are at the crest of life, who run the risk of paying, and so many of whom will pay, the supreme penalty. Of those who do not, many will come back shattered in body, disease-racked, wounded or sick. Theirs is the great task and it is they who alone are worthy of all honor.

Make no mistake about this; don't think for a moment that the work done for the Liberty Loan, for the Red Cross, for the Y. M. C. A., for the thrift savings, for anything else—is in any shape or way a substitute for the work of the fighting men at the front. Every now and then I see posters that really do irritate me; that say "Food will win the war," or "Money will win the war." They won't. There is just one thing that will win the war—the fighting strength of the men at the front. That is what will win the war! (Applause) Don't treat anything else as a substitute for this; treat it as the necessary supplement to it; remember that what we who stay at home have to do is to put every ounce of will, of strength, of energy we have into backing up the men at the front.

Friends, you have come here today to hear me, and I thank you immensely; but it wasn't worth your while to come, and it isn't worth my while to have spoken to you, unless when we separate you and I treat whatever I have said and whatever you have applauded as something to be translated into action from now on. (Applause) No man should feel contented on any week-end now—no man or woman—unless he or she can feel that during that week everything possible has been done to put our strength efficiently back of the men at the front. Our business is to win the war and to win it now.

From the Hartford Times of June 17.

"FLAGS IN THE BACKGROUND"

"When ex-President Roosevelt was speaking before the great arch of Trinity College there were behind him the flags of the five nations now devoting all their energies to the preservation of national freedom and the hard-won civic rights of humanity. To the right was the standard of Italy, once the seat of a great republic, then the religious center of Europe and the home of music and painting; next the "meteor flag of

England," the mistress of the seven seas, the great artificer in iron and builder of ships; then the tricolor of France, the mother of modern civilization and art and philosophy and science; witty, social France, with a soul of heroism and patience beneath an exterior of careless gayety; and the flag of Belgium, the victim nation, to rescue whom every generous impulse impelled the others to united action. Above them all was the flag of the western republic, of a country which was a wilderness when they were already great and powerful, which has now resolved to join them in the full vigor of its manhood because they are in the right, and are in mortal danger from a power that stands for the diametric opposite to the principles to maintain which the great republic was founded, which are precious to it and which it believes are essential to the happiness of mankind.

It required but little imagination to see beneath these five flags of light and liberty the three black flags of the pirate nations—Germany, Austria, and Turkey; the standards of all that is base and material and avaricious in human nature. They were there in the background, and because they were there Mr. Roosevelt's impassioned address carried conviction to his hearers. He did not see them, because he was intent on the duty of the hour for every true man, and on the rank humbug of the boaster and the perverted ethics of the pacifist. They were there because this is a war of principles, and the black flag has been for centuries the standard of the pirates, unfurled when they think themselves strong enough to win. That is what the pirate nations thought in 1914."

Sunday evening the Baccalaureate Sermon was preached in Christ Church by the Reverend Karl Reiland, Rector of St. Georges Church, New York, from the words "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Doctor Reiland's early departure for France, where he is in the service of the Young Men's Christian Association, has made it impossible to present even a synopsis of his eloquent and patriotic sermon.



SUNDAY MORNING.
In Front of Northam Towers.

Monday, June 17, was Commencement Day.

A large audience gathered in Alumni Hall, the class of 1918 seated in front, surrounded by vacant chairs each decorated with the national flag. These chairs marked the places of members of the class now in the military or naval service.

The salutatory was given by Henry Samuel Beers, himself on furlough from the Naval Reserve Corps. Then followed the conferring of the degrees in course, after which Abraham Meyer Silverman delivered the valedictory.

Immediately thereafter Doctor George Wharton Pepper, of Philadelphia, addressed the graduating class and others of the audience as follows.

Doctor Pepper.....

It is great to be graduating at this time. There have been times when it was hard for the college student to realize that he could count for much. There were so many young lawyers clamoring for clients—so many young doctors impatient for patients—so many engineers, architects, and chemists,—so many young men who were financiers from ten to three—and golfers after that. It seemed as if one man more or less would scarcely count. There was no particular place in which he was really needed.

Things are different now. Every man of ordinary capacity finds many avenues of usefulness opening before him. Without conceit he may feel that he is needed in a dozen different places. And the best of it is that the work to which the graduate is called must be done or he will quickly be written down a failure. The situation in general is not such that sub-standard performance will be accepted. So the graduate has the double incentive of many beckoning opportunities and the rigid requirements that the work must be well done if he is to avail himself of any.

This is a healthy condition of things. Each man is made to understand his value. Nobody is left to live according to his own sweet will. The value of the individual is seen to depend upon his readiness to tackle the work that needs him most, rather than the job of his preference.

All this is in sharp contrast with the condition of things to which we had grown accustomed. Not long ago large numbers

of college students were perfectly vague respecting the life work they were to choose and extremely indefinite about the principles which were to govern their choice. The suggestion that a young man should look for the hardest job most useful to his country was a suggestion which even a commencement orator would have hesitated to make. Today such a suggestion is scarcely worth making. Certainly Trinity men do not need it. Your roll of honor shows that you have long ago accepted it as a matter of course. Doubtless each man in the graduating class knows exactly what he is going to do and is eager to set about it; and I suppose that in every instance it is a man-sized task, and one which promises little pecuniary reward.

This rather sudden change in our attitude toward life should make thoughtful people very happy. The young man's assumed right to do as he pleased with his life was rapidly becoming a national menace. The substitution of a sense of accountability to his country will stand as a lasting credit to the war. Scarcely anything is more satisfying than to note on every hand the way in which unselfish service is fast becoming characteristic of American youth.

We recognize now that in time past we carried the optional system in higher education to an absurd extent. One wonders now why it was not clear to everybody that youthful caprice was an unsound foundation for a system of higher education. Higher education tended to degenerate into a kind of intellectual joyride which was likely to land all hands in the ditch. Happily even before the war we began to come to our senses. The sane and wholesome influence of smaller institutions like Trinity was a potent factor in the reform and now it is certain to be a long time before we err again by encouraging youthful development along lines of least resistance.

The evils of our former attitude toward life manifested themselves in many ways.

In time past young men regarded public service from the optional viewpoint. If there seemed to be prospect of rapid advancement with a minimum of effort and a maximum of pull, they were willing to accept a living from their fellow citizens. Otherwise they stood aloof from politics as a dirty business at best and felt no sense of responsibility to clean it up. One may predict with confidence that from this time onward the youth of America will regard public service as having upon them a claim heretofore unrecognized. Young men are having an impressive lesson in the terrible consequences of public indifference to great national responsibilities. They are themselves a part of our creditable though belated efforts to

make up for decades of neglect of the army and navy and for our perverse refusal to believe that we might some day share the common fate. It is of course not profitable merely to bemoan our national failure to heed the warnings of General Wood as England refused to listen to Lord Roberts. But if we ought not now to criticise our public men for what they then omitted to do, we may at least hold them strictly accountable for the use they make of the experiences through which they and we are passing. It is, for example, no longer necessary to treat as debatable the value to education of a reasonable amount of universal military training, conducted under democratic conditions. It is the one sure antidote to the poison of unrestrained individualism—that greatest menace to the permanence of a democratic state. For every one youth of our acquaintance who is harmed by the process, we each of us know ninety-nine whose transformation is little short of miraculous. Under our very eyes the young men of America are being converted into polite, efficient, and law-abiding citizens without the least sacrifice of individuality or initiative. The public man who fails to accord to universal training for the defense of democracy a permanent place in education will deserve to be driven from office into dishonorable seclusion. He will have shown himself incapable of estimating the value of the process which under his very eyes is converting into lion's whelp's many who lately bore an unpleasant resemblance to a litter of mongrel pups.

I am not overlooking the patent fact that military equipment at the disposal of an autocrat may be made a terrible instrument of tyranny. The same thing may be said of wealth, of education, or religion. Self-worshipping autocracy defiles whatever it touches. But it is a sad fallacy to draw from this premise the conclusion that military preparedness is dangerous to a democratic state. We must not be daunted by the bugaboo of names. We must look through them at the things themselves. The qualities which will enable our young men to win this war are not a separate set of qualities—useful only when the Kaiser runs amuck. They are the same qualities needed for good citizenship and the effective prosecution of peaceful callings. Of course war conditions—like peace conditions—give occasion for much that is ignoble. But the war will be won in spite of these excrescences and not because of them. The process of making an American soldier is the process of training an American citizen.

In order that a Commencement address should be characteristically dull it must contain some words of advice to the graduating class.

It is quite unnecessary to advise you in general terms to take seriously the great struggle for the preservation of democracy; but it may not be out of place to suggest a few random thoughts respecting the democracy for which we are fighting.

In the first place, we must see to it that our democracy is refined and purified in the course of the struggle to preserve it. We must enormously improve the product which we are commending to the world. The thing we hold sacred is not the debased and spurious democracy which was ours before the war, but that spirit which will be characteristic of this free people when we shall have passed victorious through the tribulation and washed our robes in blood and made them white.

Young men, even in small ways, can make their contribution to this great result. Every young officer who wins a commission should adopt toward the enlisted man the attitude which military etiquette demands. But he should never think of himself as belonging to a superior caste or regard the men under him otherwise than as brothers. It is an easy thing for a young officer to bring discredit upon the service and arouse bitter resentment among civilians by interpreting his rank in terms of uniform and swagger.

Mercury made the caduceus an honorable symbol. Hercules is known by his club. I seriously doubt whether the swagger stick will live in history as the symbol of anything worth preserving.

In this connection I should like to set before you a young American friend of mine whose spirit and bearing seem to me well worthy of imitation. During my second year at Plattsburg he was Top-Sergeant of the Company of which I was a member. He proved himself to be highly efficient; an indefatigable worker; indifferent to hardships and privations; and of unflinching cheerfulness. He was absolutely simple and unaffected and without the least particle of swagger. The difficulty of his task was increased by the fact that almost all the men in the outfit were older than he, and a few of us were old enough to be his father; but he succeeded in gaining not only the respect but the affection of young and old alike. He is now an officer in the American Expeditionary Force. He has been seriously wounded in action and has been awarded the War Cross for conspicuous gallantry. If it were my good fortune to make my way into the line there is nobody under whom I would serve more gladly than under Archie Roosevelt.

In what I have just said it is implied that democracy is not merely a form of government but a state of mind; and it is idle to prattle about fighting for democracy if we are not ourselves the embodiment of its first principles.

Government officials of the party in power are under tremendous temptation in this respect. It is easy to think of one's self as an apostle of democracy and yet make an arbitrary use of the more than autocratic power which war conditions confer. Two illustrations will make my meaning clear.

There has probably never been a time when the press of the country has been so completely under government control. Just talk privately with newspaper men if you want to understand the situation. Under such circumstances it must be a great temptation to a department head to feed out to the public half-truths in regard to the progress of our war preparations, and thus to create an impression more favorable than the facts warrant. Any official who yields to this temptation is writing himself down as an enemy of true democracy, and, as the witty Frenchman said of Napoleon's murder of the Duke d'Enghien—this sort of thing is worse than a crime; it is a blunder. For if the American people were to find that they had been fed up with silly optimism respecting the most terrifying situation in all history, they would be apt to rise in their wrath and crush the man guilty of such a lack of intellectual seriousness. If we are to fight valiantly for democracy, treat us in accordance with the principles of democracy. Give us the facts and trust us to act upon them like wise men. Or else treat us like children—and stop villifying the Kaiser.

Another fundamental principle of democracy is that ability must be utilized wherever it is found. The justification for the rule of the people is that each man among the people is sure to have his specific genius used in the service of his fellows.

The principle is of general application. It requires that a citizen of conspicuous ability, of commanding personality, and of extraordinary experience should, in a great national emergency, be used in the service of the state. It is not for a handful of government officials to sit in judgment on his qualifications. The people are the judges. If they know him and trust him then he must be used—or else this is but an imperfect democracy.

If, when a democratic state is at war, there is a man possessing in marked degree the qualities that make the soldier, and the experience and training that fit for command; if the people trust him, and he has justified their trust; if the congress has honored him and allies are calling for him; then he must be given responsible command or Washington ceases to be distinguishable from Berlin. If it were to turn out that the command of his division had been denied to such a man because another general doesn't want him around or because a cabinet officer is unable to estimate him at his true worth, then one

of two things will be true—either that the bottom is dropping out of American democracy or else that sooner or later the American people will insist upon having the services of Leonard Wood.

My friends, I have listened to a good many commencement addresses in the course of my pilgrimage—or, rather, I have been present at the delivery of a good many of them. Almost always the principal impression made upon me by the speaker was his failure to realize that the audience would be lenient with him if he stopped talking. In spite of the no doubt insatiable desire of Trinity men to be harangued at great length, you will perhaps permit me here to bring my remarks to a close. I have pointed out to you the greatness of the opportunity which each of you enjoys. I have expressed my confidence that each of you is ready to tackle the hardest job of which your country stands in need. I have exhorted you not merely to talk democracy—not merely to fight for it as so many of your own classmates and other Trinity men are doing—but yourselves to become the embodiment of its principles and to insist that our public men shall do the like. For—

“No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself; for whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we die, we die unto the Lord—whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord’s.”

The Exercises concluded with the conferring of honorary degrees.

BACHELOR OF MUSIC, Honoris Causa

William Butler Davis,
of Middletown, Connecticut

MASTER OF ARTS, Honoris Causa

Nathaniel Horton Batchelder,
of Windsor, Connecticut

Meigs Haywood Whaples,
of Hartford, Connecticut

DOCTOR OF SCIENCE, Honoris Causa

Russell Jordan Coles,
of Danville, Virginia

George Shiras, III,
of Washington, D. C.

Theodore Roosevelt,
of Oyster Bay, N. Y.

DOCTOR OF CANON LAW, Honoris Causa

George Wharton Pepper,
of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

DOCTOR OF LAWS, Honoris Causa

John Pierpont Morgan,
of New York City

Charles Lathrop Pack,
of Lakewood, New Jersey

DOCTOR OF DIVINITY, Honoris Causa

The Rev. Edward Schofield Travers,
of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

The Rev. Karl Reiland,
of New York City

The Rt. Rev. Granville Hudson Sherwood,
of Springfield, Illinois

The Rt. Rev. Paul Matthews,
of Trenton, New Jersey