

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Science and the Other Humanities

By DR. LAURENCE MCKINLEY GOULD

President of Carleton College

I AM AWARE of the fact that as I approach a consideration of science in its relationships to other fields of learning, I do so from the background of the science I know best, namely geology. Geology is the study of the history of the earth and its creatures. While poets are wont to speak of mountains as being "rock-ribbed, ancient and eternal as the sun," to the geologist mountains are among the most transient of earth's features. Even such majestic ranges as the Andes and the Himalayas will be short-lived as the geologist counts time. The one thing which the geological records show as having had continuity is the thread of life itself. The very oldest rocks we know were formed by processes that are still forming rocks today and in these ancient rocks evidences of life are found. Down through the geological ages, though mountains have risen and have been levelled off repeatedly, and though the seas have flooded the continents time after time, this thread of life has never been broken. In reality life has been more like a stream than a thread for its most important characteristic has always been its fluidity. Life has always been in a state of constant flux, but the stream has been a pulsating one rather than a steadily onward moving current. There have been prolonged periods of sluggish motion followed by shorter periods of great activity which we call revolutions. These revolutions have been the great expression points in the development of life. The one universal ever-operating law throughout has been the law of change. Nature never stands still and never dupli-

cates herself. Life is always in the process of becoming something else.

Throughout the two billions of years that this stream has been flowing, it has ever exhibited two complementary but competitive qualities. There has always been the struggle for individual survival or expression on the one hand and an equally constant groping for some kind of plan or order on the other. The interplay of these two elements characterizes the whole stream of life. Complete individual expression or complete diversity would have been chaos; complete order would have been stagnation and death. Without individual expression there could have been no progress in the stream of life. No new species could have developed. On the other hand if there had not been some kind of order, the advances made by the individual could not have been preserved. This eternal, basic biological paradox of individualism *versus* co-operation is inevitably carried over into the realm of man's activities. Unlimited individual expression or unbridled liberty in the affairs of man would be anarchy; complete order would be tyranny, stagnation, and death. I believe democracy is the best compromise man has yet made between these two basic principles of life, the best compromise between the demand for freedom on the one hand and the need for order on the other.

The word *humanities* derives from the older branches of the curriculum in which the aim of education was to make man humane. The concept of the relationship of man and his institutions to his natural world, which I have so briefly pointed out, is the first claim science has to being a humane study. After all, in a broad sense, education is the rational attempt to identify man with his universe.

From its beginning life has always seemed to possess a tendency to drift toward the side of order; the development of individualism has been a constant struggle against this deep tendency which leads to stagnation and medi-

ocriety. The basic quality toward which all creatures as individuals have striven has therefore been freedom. With the emergence and development of man this quest has been more and more definitely identified with the mind. Surely no one will argue the point that the fetterless or emancipated mind is the end of all the studies we call the humanities. What then has science contributed, what does it continue to contribute, toward the emancipation of man's mind?

First of all science does not subscribe to the idea that ultimate truth was given to mankind once and for all. Science is the principal continuing source of revealed truth about our world. Science is knowledge that has been tested and classified; it is a live, growing body of truth; it therefore recognizes no unchanging hypotheses or finalities. It brings to the initiate a sense of adventure not to be found in other fields of learning and surely there is no more fundamental quality of the emancipated mind than a sense of adventure.

Secondly, the free or emancipated mind cannot be intolerant or prejudiced; there is no room for either in the laws of physics or biology. Nor can the emancipated mind be provincial. There is no field of man's activities intellectual or otherwise which is more completely international and unprovincial than science. The sulfa drugs were hardly discovered by a German nor penicillin by an Englishman before their benefactions had spread around the world. Incidentally, we are stupid indeed if we think we can build a wall around the secret of the atom bomb.

Science is quantitative; alone of the humanities it possesses techniques of measurement from which derive the critical faculties of man—the faculties of discrimination between truth and error. While science is completely impersonal and gives no direct light on what is good or what is bad, it does tell us what is true and what is false in the material world. Is not this gift of science an in-

calculable one to the humanities? Is it expecting too much to depend on the philosopher to carry on from there?

The application of the scientific method has done more than any other discipline to free man from the bondages of fear, ignorance, and superstition about his world. In its broadest sense the scientific method can be stated simply in two axioms. The first is that we live in a law-abiding world, not in a chaos of terror as early man believed, and that behind everything that happens there is a natural law of causation. The second axiom is that man's intellect is competent to understand the laws of the universe and thereby to understand the universe itself.

The discipline of science has been aptly summarized in this cryptic statement of A. J. Carlson: "Keep your mouth shut and your pen dry until you know the facts"; its place in education by Conklin when he said: "As an educational discipline there are no other studies that distinguish so sharply truth from error, evidence from opinion, or reason from emotion, none that teach a greater reverence for truth nor inspire more laborious and persistent search for it. Great is philosophy for it is the synthesis of all knowledge but if it is true philosophy, it must be built upon science which is tested knowledge."

The perspective of history as much as anything else places science in its proper position along with the other humanities, for science is not an intellectual discipline which has just emerged in the last one, two, or even three hundred years. The achievements of the human intellect have been cumulative. Knowledge has not grown by revolution but by accretion or evolution. The genealogy of science antedates all written records of man for the classification of knowledge began when old stone age man began picking up rocks and sorting out those which happened to fit his hand. These handy pieces of rock became his first weapons. The testing, observation, and classification have continued ever since—obscured to be sure from time to time by magic which grew up with

science. We should not have television and radar now if stone age man had not begun chipping stones to make tools. There could have been no Einstein without a Euclid; no Comptons or Lawrences without Faraday or Newton. Not all the great names in science are recent. Will Beebe, himself a living zoologist of distinction, has called Aristotle the greatest naturalist who ever lived.

Our democratic society in terms of its commerce and art is surely the child of science. Science has made possible equal opportunities for all. It is not the fault of science that they have not been more fully realized. The application of science to the means of production has eliminated the need for child labor the world over; its application to problems of shelter, clothing, and food is prolonging life by eliminating famine and plagues. It has made possible standards of living undreamed of a generation ago.

And yet sadly enough in spite of all these benefits, there is no evidence at all that man is any happier or any more kindly because of the gifts of science. Man's inventions have not just filled old wants; they have created an abundance of new ones which are more complex and superficial than the old simplicities that gave satisfaction to our fathers and grandfathers. We have yet to see what the ultimate effect of all this will be upon civilization. Whether man has the integrity and spiritual strength to control the machines he has created remains an open question. The necessity of the right answer cannot be postponed. With the discovery of the means of releasing atomic energy, it is no longer extravagant oratory to talk about the future or non-future of civilized man.

The products of scientific research have been terribly destructive for the reason that mankind has been divided into antagonistic groups. The fault lies with our social and political systems which have prevented the easy distribution of the benefits of science. Co-operation is necessary if the fruits of scientific research are to be used for bettering the lot of mankind.

Scientists themselves must accept part of the blame for the widespread failure of scientific achievements to make a better and safer world. Too many of us have been content, indeed we have preferred "to dwell remote, aloof, in some high mansion built on wisdom's hill." Science and ethics cannot be divorced. Scientists and science do have human responsibilities. The responsibility of the scientist involves not only the discovery of the laws that govern the universe but their interpretation and application to the betterment of mankind. It is not fair, however, to expect the scientist to provide the philosophic synthesis that his accumulated knowledge needs if it is not to be misused. Scientists are more apt to be men of action than of contemplation. Philosophy has never faced as great a challenge as now.

Clearly there is no study as vital to an understanding of our modern world as science. I hope I have further demonstrated that few fields of learning have so much to offer toward enriching the cultural life of the student; yet it has been said that science has failed in the educational process. Loath as I am to admit it, I think there is some foundation for this criticism—but it is not due to any inherent limitations in science but to ineffective and often indifferent teaching. To be sure courses in physics, biology, chemistry, and most of the other sciences are given in nearly all schools, but this does not mean the student is taught science. Rather, he is presented with the piled-up or accumulated facts which are but the results of scientific research, and too often by teachers so full of facts that they are "all prickly with knowledge like a thistle and as barren of fruit." We have confused the accumulation of information for its own sake with education; the two are not interchangeable. T. S. Eliot sums it up thus:

"Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge;
Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?"

In most schools science courses have been aimed di-

rectly at the few who expected to specialize rather than toward the large majority who simply want to be liberally educated. Most of us science teachers have been brought up in the tradition of specialization. We are trained specialists and we are therefore primarily qualified simply to train other specialists. Bad teachers have begotten other bad teachers. Too much emphasis has been placed upon results; too little upon methods. Science as a humanity must acquaint the student first of all with the methods by which science has accomplished so much. He must understand that the means whereby knowledge has been achieved may be more important than the knowledge itself—that the search for truth, the effort to discover it, may be of greater value to the student than the truth itself.

And again science as a humanity must be taught against the background of its growth and development. The contributions of science make up one of the noblest threads that run throughout the history of man's struggle from darkness toward light. The student should know something of the uphill climb and the fearful odds which have beset the paths of the seekers after scientific truth.

I suppose I could have summed up all I have said up to this point with the simple observation that the true spirit of liberal or humane studies is not inherent in any special or sacred field. There are quite as great cultural values to be derived from the study of chemistry or geology as from that of Latin and Greek if inspired teaching guides the student. But this would have been too simple and would have confused too many of you, for I was long ago taught in philosophy that if one stated anything too simply his listeners would suspect him of concealing something. I do not wish to conceal anything from you; on the contrary, I am trying to tell you all I know!

May I quote one pertinent statement as follows: "In education it makes all the difference *why* a man does or learns anything; if he studies it for the sake of his own

development or with a view to excellence, it is liberal." Does it surprise you that it was Aristotle who said that twenty centuries ago?

Certainly I have pursued this academic quibble far enough. Science is a part of the same whole as philosophy and the other fields of learning. They are not mutually exclusive disciplines but they are interdependent and overlapping and must be so recognized in the curriculum of a liberal arts college.

The world of learning is like a wheel with many spokes. The spokes represent the separate fields of knowledge which together merge in the rim or circumference. The rim is the field of general education. Here the integration and interrelations of the various specialized areas of knowledge are discovered to be parts of a larger whole.

The student confronts the circumference of the wheel before he can study the rest; but to understand it, he must know how it is supported—what sustains it—what gives it strength. There is not time enough for any man to examine all of the spokes. Fortunately this is not necessary; for as the student follows one spoke from the circumference toward the axis, he discovers the pattern of the whole wheel. He finds that all the special fields converge at a common point which is the axis of the wheel. The methods of learning vary so that no two spokes ever run parallel, but they have a common purpose and a common dedication which bring them all together at the center, from where the universe of learning is at last seen to be one. I think the biologic paradox is not too deeply hidden here; here is the craving for individualism expressed in the pursuit of a specialized field of knowledge, and here is the quest for a plan or order expressed in general education. Even as democracy is a compromise which freedom makes with plan and order in the political institutions of man, the liberal tradition represents man's yearning for a compromise in the field of learning. There is an organic relationship between general and special education. Both are parts of a liberal training.

The radii of the wheel have grown long and the circumference is now too large to be comprehended as a unit though it makes up the central core of truth which we believe is valid for an educated man. Differences of opinion exist among educators as to how this core shall be broken down for study. The late beloved Professor Smiley of this college points out in his book on Horace that "Socrates thought that the world could be improved by reforming the individual, by a rebirth, so to speak, of the mind and heart; Plato laid emphasis on reforming political and economic institutions; Aristotle thought the world could be improved by an accumulation of knowledge and by the classification of knowledge." I believe we can assume that the disciplines here represented are valid and can therefore furnish an immediate basis for the subdivision of the field of general learning. Socrates comprehended what today would be our division of philosophy, literature, and the fine arts; Plato's field would be our history and the social sciences; and Aristotle's, mathematics and the sciences. Knowledge has become a large and complex body and this tripartite scheme can stand some further subdivision; yet it provides the framework on which the curriculum in general education should be developed. The first division is devoted to those studies which seek to help man to understand himself, which seek to help make him a fit person to live with himself. It is concerned with his world of hopes and aspirations and ideals. The second is concerned with man's relation to the social institutions of which he is a part; and the third, that of mathematics and the sciences, seeks to orient man as a child of the earth.

Within the divisions there should be developed a few fundamental, carefully integrated courses which give coherence or unity to the whole. And by integrated courses I do not mean the conventional survey course which is usually a denial of the very coherence we seek. Most survey courses are but abbreviated projections of our sharply defined, specialized departments and end up as a collection

of fragments of knowledge united primarily by their juxtaposition in the same course. The chief stumbling block to the achievement of an integrated coherent program is our departmental system. The arbitrary lines that have so long separated the fields of learning into small tight compartments must be weakened and even disappear in certain areas.

In addition to the required integrated courses in general education the student should be required to develop competence in some particular field of his choice. Over-specialization makes for rigidity, for non-adaptability in a world which is changing more rapidly than at any previous time in history. The areas of specialization should therefore be broadened and in place of the present thirty majors offered by the various departments in this college, perhaps a third that number will suffice.

The curricula of most of our colleges are composed of a hodgepodge of courses that have grown up through overzealous departmental specialization and promotion. They are generally unco-ordinated and overlapping, often to the extent of actual duplication, and all treated as though they were of equal importance. The proposed changes mean a considerable reduction in the number of courses and the elimination of the elective system over large areas of the curriculum. This reform is long overdue. It is patently absurd to expect that the student who is a complete amateur in education is in a better position to decide what constitutes a liberal education than those who have spent their lives in the profession; yet this has been the assumption of the elective system.

The weakening or melting away of departmental lines will mean more and more that educational problems will become the concern of the faculty as a whole. This is a good tendency toward unity where unity must be achieved if the ends of a liberal education are really to be served. It is not too much to hope that we shall one day find ourselves no longer working at cross purposes trying to turn

out specialists in geology, history, or chemistry but rather united in a common and higher goal of really training educated men and women.

The need for redefining the methods and aims of the programs of college and university training in the liberal arts has been apparent for several years. Careful and serious attention has been given to the complex problems involved by various learned bodies and by several of our leading colleges and universities. Reports and books have been coming off the presses at an accelerated rate. Some of the best and most thorough-going studies have come from our older and larger universities. Yet it is difficult to see how a carefully integrated program can be worked out in a university college where faculties and departments are common to both the college and the university. What the university or even the very large college aspires to do, the small liberal arts college can actually achieve. This is its peculiar function; this is its mission; this is its birth-right which it has nearly lost in its attempts to ape the university with its multiplicity of departments and plethora of courses. The liberal arts college has never faced such a great challenge nor yet such an opportunity. If it does not regain its birthright now, it does not deserve to survive.

The ferment of the war years has caused us to question many things that had long been taken for granted. We must profit by our present awareness of our shortcomings, and above all we must not listen to the voices of vested interests reminding us that the war is over and we can return to normalcy. We were betrayed by that stupid slogan after World War I, and it must not happen again. We cannot stand still and we will not go back.

“New occasions teach new duties; Time
Makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still, and onward,
Who would keep abreast of truth;
Lo, before us gleam her campfires! We
Ourselves must pilgrims be,

Launch our Mayflower, and steer boldly
Through the desperate winter sea,
Nor attempt the future's portal with
The Past's blood-rusted key.”

—James Russell Lowell

There is no time this morning to discuss detailed subject matter in the new curriculum, yet there are one or two ideas which seem to me of such transcendent importance that I must mention them at least.

Of all the things that have happened to man in his upward climb, of all the advances he has made, the one which stands out above all the rest is the development of speech. Speech is essential to the exchange of ideas on any topic at all levels and by all means of communication. Language, which here means the English language, must therefore be the chief concern of a liberal education. Indeed the basic characteristic of an educated man is that he be “literate and articulate in verbal discourse.” Here is one of the keys to the major needs of education at all levels and in all departments. Anything the world over that interferes with the free flow of intelligence or information is inimical to the intent of education. Peoples are separated by differences of language, which is a great barrier indeed. But in addition our currencies are different and we put tariffs on books, all of which interferes with the very ends which we wish to achieve.

Nothing so imprisons a man as words. I am afraid science is guilty of adding to the confusion of tongues in our own language. New discoveries have demanded new and exact words. This is necessary and inevitable, of course, but the matter has gotten all out of sensible bounds and grown into a sort of contest. The scientist dares not try to express an idea except in the prescribed exact language of his specialty. Little more than fifty years ago Dutton wrote a geological description of the Grand Canyon which is still a classic; it contains the most vivid description of the canyon I know of in all literature;

it is scientifically accurate yet written in such style that any reasonably intelligent person can read and appreciate it; the same is also true of Gilbert's *The Geology of the Henry Mountains*. These two works are classics of the science of geology and stand on their own as examples of literary merit. If anything has been written in geology within the 20th Century that will be remembered for its literary merit, I haven't seen it. This malady has already gotten well established in other fields, particularly the social sciences. Geography is on the borderline between geology and the social sciences and derives its strength and importance in education from that relationship; yet there is a school of so-called geographers who are trying to persuade themselves and others that geography is a field of learning possessing a considerable body of specialized knowledge peculiar to itself. They are trying to prove it by inventing a lot of unnecessary new words and terms. And the economist and other social scientists too have been building up such a jargon of unnecessary terms in their own fields that they find it increasingly difficult to communicate with each other. These are sad signs of a declining capacity on the part of the scholarly person to use his own language with clarity and intelligence. By abandoning his opportunity to express his ideas in English that others can understand, the modern scholar is losing the audience that he should be helping to educate. It is fantastic of course to suppose that all of the members of a college faculty should be able to teach all of the subjects in the curriculum. It is not too much however to expect that in a college this size each should be able to express his own specialty in terms that educated men in other fields about him can understand. If I could impose my will completely at any one point on what the new curriculum of Carleton should be, I would require four years of English of all students and some extra courses in composition in the senior year for those who think they want to be scientists. If you don't know what

I mean, pick up a copy of the *Journal of Geology* or *The Physical Review* and try to read them, especially if you happen to be neither a geologist nor a physicist.

Changing habits in higher education have placed another heavy burden on our native language and that is the decline in interest in the study of the classical languages. It would not be wise to attempt to require all students to learn Latin and Greek, but this is quite another thing from saying we should abandon our interest in the classics. On the contrary a basic need of the liberally educated man will always be a knowledge of the classics. The wisdom of Socrates and Plato and even the beauty of Homer and Horace can be had in large part through translation—if one knows his own language.

In his fascinating book *Six Thousand Years of Bread*, Jacoby notes that the British historian Hallam rightly observed that the barbarism of the Middle Ages began when men ceased to speak Latin—that is when Latin declined to a professional language of the educated and the mass of the people could no longer share in the treasury of the ancient world of knowledge.

English, then, stands out above all other subjects in the curriculum of general education, but it has a close second.

We have listened to much talk in these war years about freedom; we know about the four freedoms and we agree with them. It is right that man should be free from fear, from want, and the other ills that have so long plagued him. But that is not enough. Freedom for its own sake is not enough. When the mind is freed from fear and all of its other shackles, something must be supplied in their places. Our institutions need a purpose; for the lack of a purpose the demoralizing influence of a shallow cynicism has taken its place. The mind that has become free needs deep convictions to give it motive power and direction.

Remembering that liberal education and a liberal de-

mocracy are parts of the same idea, and remembering too the tragic sacrifices we have made in these war years to defend our concept of a free society, I have no apology for standing here this morning and telling you that my idea of the next basic requirement for a liberal arts education centers around the development of abiding and robust convictions about democracy. A second common denominator for all students should therefore be a knowledge of American civilization, a deep knowledge of American history. I mean history taught realistically, scientifically if you please, and not as a record of stern and pure virtues as it was taught to so many of us. We need to be reminded often that democracy, being a compromise between factors which are ever changing, cannot become a fixed and rigid system. When a so-called free society passes from creative to preservative, it ceases to be a democracy. The last word on democracy was no more spoken by Jefferson, Lincoln, or Wilson than was the last word spoken on physics by Newton or the last word on biology by Darwin.

Constant self-examination and self-criticism are prerequisite to the preservation of living social or political institutions. Certainly a society has a long way to go which is still so unstable that in spite of all its amazing achievements, it is neither able to deal effectively with the shattering problems of unemployment nor to heal the breach between employer and employee which still remains the greatest crisis of our present system.

A society of free men is a goal yet to be achieved. It is a quest and by the very nature of its origins can never be completely successful. Any Utopia is a forever unrealizable dream. The liberally educated man will therefore criticize and understand his own institutions and will do his best to improve them. He will love them; but if he is a real democrat with a small "d," he will not try to wish them off on the rest of the world. Such are the lessons I

believe an intelligent study of the history of our country will teach us.

There is no time for further elaboration of such specific requirements within the field of general education; but I should be betraying the high office into which I have just been inducted if I did not bring all of the foregoing into focus by pointing out that the educated man, the whole man, is also a good man. No one I am sure will suspect me of sermonizing when I suggest that if society is to be saved, it must be by the development of a higher type of human being. The chief end of all of our studies must, therefore, be toward making man more nearly perfect. What I should like to say in this connection has been so well stated in "A Report of the Alumni Committee on Post-war Amherst College," published in February of this year, that I quote as follows: "The colleges should recover the religious sense of mission they had when they were founded. The mission was then to save individual souls. Today it is to save society from the results of its ignorance and selfishness and it is hard to believe that this aim is less important than the other.

"Our lives are spent against a background of tragedy which makes our selfish materialism and even our easy acceptance of conventional social standards stand out as the sins they are. To combat them, we need a new commitment to the highest spiritual values and this we believe the right kind of religious teaching can supply."

It is easy to subscribe to such sentiments; they are noble. It is quite another matter to know how to instrument or activate them. There is little in the historical record to show that human nature or the mind of man has changed greatly with relation to the basic problems of life in the last two thousand years. So slight has been our spiritual advancement that we are just as barbaric in our use of bombs and guns as was stone age man in his use of axes and clubs.

We share with other animals the basic emotions of

fear and anger; the extent to which we yield to them identifies us with the brutes of the forest. On the other hand the power to conserve the past and thereby to develop foresight and judgment is a quality which belongs only to man. The basic animal emotions of anger and fear have not been cumulative, but knowledge and other achievements of the human spirit have; and we stake our faith on the assumption that their fabric is now so strong that not even atom bombs would destroy it. The hope of the world lies in the prospect of man's further spiritual evolution. But how to foster and stimulate all this within the pattern of a liberal arts college like Carleton is not easy. We shall continue formal instruction in religion, of course, but that is not enough. No lesson of history is more clear than that we shall need men and women of character in the post-war world; or as the ancient Greeks expressed it—men of temperance, courage, moderation, prudence, magnanimity, justice. But there is little evidence that students achieve these virtues by being exposed to courses in them. These indefinable, these intangible qualities which give the final atmosphere to education are not qualities that lend themselves to library research or laboratory analysis. If you can tell me how the gift of humor, of laughter, and of a sense of spiritual uplift can be directly imparted to another, I shall be glad.

And now I have talked long, perhaps too long, about the ideas which are interwoven in our ideals of a liberal education. I would not have you think, however, that we always travel in the clouds. Our heads and our hearts are there, but our feet are on the ground, and we do not forget mundane things this morning as we think of the Carleton that is to be. A committee of the Board of Trustees is at work now on plans for an expanding and continuing financial campaign which will secure to us the permanent income to make all of these dreams come true. Announcements concerning these plans will be forthcoming soon.

All of you are familiar with the time-worn and thread-

bare story that the ideal college would be Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a student on the other. I am sure this legend must have risen in a more southerly clime than ours. Much as I personally love the cold, I cannot imagine myself on one end of a log and students on the other and doing a very effective job of teaching geology in the midst of a Minnesota winter. We are actually collecting some Mark Hopkinses in this faculty, but more than logs for classrooms are needed if they are to be fully effective. Our need for more buildings is desperate in certain quarters; most of all we need a new library building. Much of our collection of books must be stored in the basement of this chapel and in other places equally inaccessible. The cramped quarters in the present building make effective use of the volumes that can be displayed difficult indeed. Looking on toward the future, we also need a fine arts building and an auditorium with classrooms in connection. President Cowling cited the need for a women's gymnasium in his inaugural address thirty-six years ago. Naturally the need is greater now than it was then.

We also need a student union and an additional classroom building for the humanities other than science. To be sure, we shall keep Gridley and Willis; they will be renovated and made fire-proof. This is not a terribly ambitious program, for we are not concerned with the development of a college of buildings. We wish to conserve all possible endowments and future gifts for the enrichment of our educational program. These new buildings will provide all the physical plant we shall need for a college a hundred years from now with a continuing top enrollment of 850 students. Naturally, the sooner these buildings are secured, the sooner we can turn all of our attention to the much more vital matters concerned with their use in fostering the ideas and ideals that will be our educational aim.

And these buildings will come—all of them . . . and as we watch them grow, let us remember the story of the

passerby who stopped to watch some men working on a building one day. He asked each of three workmen what he was doing. The first one replied, "Carrying bricks"; the second one, "Earning a dollar and a half an hour"; and the third one, "Building a cathedral." We do not need to wait for the ground to be broken for the new library to start building our cathedral; we are starting this day, for this will be a cathedral, not of bricks and mortar, but of ideas, and with a spire so high, lighted by a beacon so bright that it will be a guide through all the years of their lives to all who study here; and it will be a light that shall shine so clear that others too may see it from afar and know that here at Carleton College is a kind of twentieth century American monastery of sincere, scholarly men and women of all faiths and ideas, united by the common bond of the search for truth that it may be shared with others, realizing that at long last all definitions of colleges and education end in the simple concept that it is the truth and only the truth that will make men free.

THE BENEDICTION

By THE REVEREND W. ERNEST COLLINS, D.D.
*Executive Secretary of the Congregational Conference
of Minnesota*

WE THANK THEE, our God and Father, for the triumph of the best within us. Through the ministry of thy ruth, we have caught a glimpse of higher reaches and have been stirred to nobler aspirations.

Help us to carry the spirit of this hour through this lay and future days, and grant that the vision may not pass nor the impulse die until they have found fulfillment in our lives and in the lives of those about us.

Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

THE INAUGURAL LUNCHEON

Presiding: MR. MERRILL HUTCHINSON
Chairman of the Trustees' Inaugural Committee

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

By MR. HUTCHINSON

WE HAVE CALLED this event an inauguration, and yet I believe that we might with equal accuracy and propriety deem it a commencement. It is, however, the smallest commencement class at Carleton in thirty-six years and it took the "class" thirteen years to matriculate. Within these thirteen years were included some of Carleton's most critical years so the "class" had an opportunity to observe Carleton functioning under these adverse periods. I feel the College is indeed fortunate in being able to call to its highest administrative office a man of unusual intellect, impressive academic achievement, and broad and successful teaching experience combined with a veritable apprenticeship of thirteen years in training for the presidency of Carleton College. I want to report to this gathering that the Board of Trustees studied carefully the relative qualifications of a number of outstanding educators from all parts of the nation and after such extended study selected Dr. Laurence McKinley Gould. He was chosen not because there was none other available, but rather because in the judgment of the trustees' committee there was none better available for the presidency.

I am certain that it is a source of pride and joy to every member of the faculty to have had our president