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TWENTY FIVE YEARS

I have wondered what emotion is uppermost in the minds of those of us who return to Harvard after graduation a quarter of a century ago.

Physically the changes are great: with our wives and children in a series of great dormitories dedicated to the use of our Freshman sons; we look across the River to the series of beautiful buildings of the Business School; we see new structures in and around the Yard.

Personally we rejoice that so many of the faces of the Harvard of 1900 are still here. Because the years have borne so lightly on their shoulders, because we ourselves renew our youth in these anniversaries
we find the realization difficult that the inspiration of President Eliot, of William James, of Charles Eliot Norton, of Dean Shuler, of Major Higginson is with us no longer, though their spiritual mantle remains.

But apart from the gradual appearance of new faces in the ranks, apart from the renewal of the architecture of the campus, apart from that fine generosity of sons and friends of Harvard which makes possible the physical growth, many of us graduates take pride in a deeper, more abiding progress.

A university, I take it, in order to fulfill its highest purpose to the nation and the world, should seek two great aims: First, the provision of education in the best sense of the word, and, equally important, leadership in liberal thought. The University is a composite whole judged by its faculties, its students
its graduate body - judged by the contribution it makes to, and the influence it exerts upon, the life of humanity.

That is where my thoughts lie on a day when Harvard has given me an honor more enduring, more personally and deeply appreciated than any which could come to me at other hands in all the rest of my life.

The liberal thought of which I speak comes properly from the oldest institution of learning in our land. Some young, new giant of the West, exceeding us perhaps in numbers, can pride itself on the modernism of its outlook; it is a rightful attribute of youth; but there is a
difference when that young spirit is backed by the traditions of nearly three centuries. We need not fear the future when the great advances of the present day are led by the older institutions, when laying aside rivalry of a quarter of a century ago which aimed at mere size, they are wiser vying with each other in turning out a better, and not merely a greater product.

Three generations ago Harvard assumed the leadership of the American colleges by striking out boldly in the direction of the university idea, and with the purpose of giving greater responsibility to the individual. We were pioneers in the field; we called it, perhaps, the great experiment, but during the course of the years we proved the rightness of our vision.
Today Harvard leads again, making an experiment in the logical development of modern education. We have become in a true sense a university, teaching adequately and progressively almost every element that enters into the broad field of the human knowledge of the twentieth century. Harvard has been recognized in the field of civic life and in the field of scholastic life that the trend may not go too far to the production of a mere type of a new generation universally cast in a common mold.

Under the leadership of President Lowell, of the men within and without the university associated with him, Harvard sees the danger and bravely steps out to meet it. We believe, and rightly, that in the
final analysis progress will come educational in the industrial, in the scientific and in the political world through the stimulation and strengthening of the will and the power of the individual to act as an individual.

We have passed through an era necessary in our progress when the teaching has been directed to cooperative and mass effort. The purpose, the teaching of this past quarter century has been learned.

Today we face the next great step. Happy in its background, and because of its maturity wholly secure, Harvard can well afford to place a renewed emphasis on the individual within her gates, I am very certain that we, the graduate body of Harvard, did not wish and did not expect that the mere methods of Harvard
shall remain unchanged. My father's day was his day; my day was my own; my son's day is his and just as surely the Harvard of his son will differ greatly from this year of Grace of 1929.

That our university belongs to the nation is today a fact; that its relative influence throughout as high the nation is as at anytime during its history is, I believe, equally established. Not, merely shall we keep pace as a part of the procession, with the growth of national ideals, of world knowledge; we have a higher responsibility, one which far more vitally stirs the imagination - the exploration and the colonization of the new fields and new methods
of tomorrow. Harvard has in her soul the spirit of high adventure. We are seekers, never satisfied with that which we have found.

It is in that spirit which we who have been out in the world for many years come back. We return to renew the inspiration which here we obtained, but in a larger sense we return to pledge ourselves anew to the support of the Harvard of new things, the Harvard of courageous vision - the Harvard of the days to come.
Good Morning!

Here is the copy I will read from so be sure to have it for me on the steps of Memorial at 11.35!

F.N.R.

Better get William will call for it about 10 - I do have to go quickly to Brookline.

Will you give Win. address to some of Priny backer...
Phi Beta Kappa.
Harvard University - Cambridge
June 17, 1929
Franklin D. Roosevelt

The Social Age.

During the war, Mr. Lloyd-George said to me, "I will gain a handwater prize to any imaginative American who will invent for me a new word to take the place of that overworked and unsatisfactory expression "co-operation." His search has borne no fruit, and our language is still unable to express the thought of co-ordination of effort, the work of millions of human beings.

In like manner it is impossible adequately to characterize in few words the life in which we live. Every era of human history is characterized, even though our historical terminology is based too largely on the names of men and of places, rather than on great trends of civilization.

To ask ourselves what is the trend of today is fraught with disagreement and discomfiture, but it is
May seem to bring out new thought and perhaps enrich the English language at least we may agree that the last fifty years have brought such vast unusual and far-reaching changes in the condition of life and the mental outlook of the world popula-#tion that future generations will recognize this period as worthy of a name.

May I take as a premise in a brief review that the line of progress in the graph of the evolution of civilization is soon approaching? Not perhaps the little lines which represent the advancement of any one particular art or science or social effort, but within the broad mark which represents the sum of human endeavor and knowledge.

We are too inclined to think of well recorded history in terms of ups and downs, of success and failure of empires, of glories and disasters.

For example, Greece. It brings to mind a flash of a fleeting century; we see the age of Pericles, glories of creation art and creative thought. Then what?
In the days of political confusion — an unsatisfying gap in history — Rome stands on its ever-corn. On the surface we fast deform the past, and assume that the time on the chart has differed or at least stood still. We are wrong, for we forget that Alexander was at work disseminating the art and the learning of our small peninsula over vast terrestrials of the Eastern Mediterranean and the nearer Asia. Whole populations and nations, representing a diversity of races were brought under the influence of the gifts of Greece, and regarded the process as what we call today progress.

Out of that very progress, men foresaw the source of it in past forgotten, arose another im- pressive beacon, the glory of the Rome of Caesars. We are so much involved with the tale of the decline and fall of the Roman city and of the surpassing wrongly named Dark Ages that we miss wholly the continuance of Roman progress. Rome in the days of her glory was a vast, constructed time and orderly governed.
government and a great advance in material things, but the greatest
distribution of her civilization occurred after her own death. This
was of course true in Northern Africa, in the Balkan Peninsula and
especially in the Empire of Constantine.

The same thought holds true
I think in the field of Europe. If
we should think of Athens the
Euth and Rome as savage,
destroying an old civilization by
fire and sword, great but the
France and Germany and Spain
of Caesar were essentially vast
primal unsettled areas. The races
in invasions brought population to
these areas, and although Rome
herself fell, her gifts to mankind
penetrated the newly settled regions
and made possible the modern
Europe.

If these centuries had been so
wholly dark & Chalermagar would
ever have been possible. He did not
rise from a wholly barbaric
barbaric state of society, rather for
the the product of the distinctive
evolution of a newly opened territory
which had successfully solved the
incoming races. Again progress. There followed the centuries which saw the establishment of the feudal system, the formation of communities, the Crusades, and continuing war and decay. There is the importance of the religious influence in civic and social affairs. Again because there is no focal point built around a contemporary group of immortal writers, artists, and teachers or a predominant city. The tendency is to minimize human advancement during the five centuries preceding the revival of learning. Yet this is the period of the growth of Western civilization, the day of the founding of cathedrals, of unification, of dynasties, the final settling of the land, the establishing of property rights, and the birth of modern law. From and because of this careful process of learning and fertilizing came the Renaissance, a mere continuation of the progress.
not the unexpected birth of a
parasitic new day. It witnessed
the new emphasis on science and
art and literature, and, more
important, the beginnings of a
public consciousness which confined
at first to the field of religion
and the foundation for the later
extension to the realm of government.
In other words, I like to
think of these events as
centuries between the death of the
three Kings, Charles V, Francis I, and
Henry VIII, as another innovating era, vital as the soil of
modern political structure.

For while during this time
concentration of power that resulted
the far wider distribution under the
feudal organization, the very
destruction of the old feudal
structure that for the at least
per cent of the population a new
relationship to government and
was evolved. The result was the
definite acceptance of representative
or constitutional government by the
major part of the Western world.
We are drawn to modern times, to the speeding up of events and trends, because primarily of the strides of invention, especially in the field of communication. The
nineteenth century, which saw the old handicaps of distance and own
way in finishing the task. We took on
a world picture, not a gallery of
national representations. The civilization
triad covered all continents, not inside
alone.

One of the most important
This was the contribution of the
nineteenth century, and the other was
the founding of general education.
It is not broadly realized that up to
fifty years ago education was confined to a small fraction of the
inhabitants of what we recognize as
the more highly civilized nations.
The great masses of men and women
were outside the pale, that
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During the war, Mr. Lloyd-George said to me "I will give a handsome prize to any imaginative American who will invent for me a new word to take the place of that overworked and unsatisfactory expression "co-operation". His search has borne no fruit, and our language is still unable simply to express the thought of coordination of effort on the part of millions of human beings.

In like manner it is impossible adequately and in few words to give name to the age in which we live. Every era of human history is worthy of characterization, even though our historical terminology is based too largely on the names of men and of places, rather than on great trends of civilization.

To ourselves what is the trend of today may provoke disagreement and discussion, but it may serve to bring out new thoughts and perhaps enrich the English language. At least we may agree that the past 50 years have brought such unusual and far-reaching changes in the conditions of life and the mental outlook of the world population that future generations will recognize this period as worthy at least of a name.

May I take as a premise in a brief review that the line of progress in the graph of the evolution of civilization is ever upward? Not, perhaps, the little curves which show the advancement of any one particular art, or science, or social effort, but rather the broad mark which represents the sum of human endeavor and knowledge. We are too inclined to think of well recorded history in terms of ups and downs, of rises and falls of empires, of glories and disasters.
For example, Greece. It brings to mind a flash of a fleeting century; we see the age of Pericles, the renaissance of creative art and creative thought. Then, what? Three or four hundred years of political confusion—an unsatisfactory gap in history until Rome swims into our view. On the surface we classify this period as retrogression, and assume that the line on the chart has dipped or at least stood still. We are wrong: for we forget that Alexanders were at work disseminating the art and the learning of one small peninsula over the Eastern Mediterranean and the nearer Asia. Whole populations and nations, representing a diversity of races were absorbing during these centuries the gifts of Greece, and rightly regarded this process as what we call today progress.

Out of that very influence, the source of it in part forgotten, arose another impressive beacon, the glory of the Rome of the Caesars. We are insculpted with the tale of the decline and fall of the Roman City and of the ensuing wrongly-named Dark Ages, that we miss wholly the continuance of general upward drift. Rome in the days of her glory evolved law and orderly government and a great advance in material things, but the largest distribution of her civilization occurred after her own decline. This was of course true in Northern Africa, in the Balkan Peninsula and especially in the Empire of Charlemagne.

The same thought holds true, I think, in the field of Europe. It is dramatic to think of the Goth and the Hun as savages destroying an old civilization by fire and sword, but the France and Germany and Spain of Caesar were essentially vast primeval unsettled areas with little in them to destroy except a few scattered tribes. The successive invasions brought population to these areas and though Rome herself fell, her gifts to mankind permeated the newly settled regions and made possible the modern Europe.

If these centuries had been so wholly dark, a Charlemagne would have been impossible. He did not rise from a wholly barbaric state...
of society, rather was he the product of the definite evolution of a newly opened territory which had successfully solved the problem of the melting pot of incoming races. Again progress.

There followed the centuries which saw the establishment of the feudal organization with its definite class system, the formation of communities, the Crusades, the importance of the influence of the Church in Civic and social affairs.

Again, because there is no focal point built around a contemporaneous group of immortal writers, artists and teachers or a predominant city the tendency is to minimize human advancement during the five centuries preceding the so-called revival of learning, yet this is the period of the youth of Western civilization, the day of the founding of Cathedrals, of universities, of dynasties, the final settling of the land, the establishing of property rights, and the birth of modern law.

From and because of this careful process of harrowing and fertilizing, came the Renaissance, a mere continuance of the progress, not the unexpected birth of a parentless new day. It witnessed a new emphasis in science and art and literature, and, more important, the beginnings of a public consciousness which, confined at first to the field of religion, laid the foundation for the later extension to the realm of government.

In other words, I like to think of those two centuries between the death of the three kings, Charles V, Francis I and Henry VIII, and the beginning of the revolutions in America and France, as another disseminating era, vital as the seed bed of modern political structure.

For while during this time concentration of power succeeded the far wider distribution under the feudal organization, the very destruction of feudalism meant that for at least ninety percent. of the population a new relationship to government had to be evolved. The result was the definite acceptance of representative or constitutional government by
the greater part of the western world.

We are down to modern times, to the speeding up of events and trends, primarily the strides of invention, especially in the field of communication. The nineteenth century began to destroy the old handicaps of distance and our day is finishing the task. We look on a world picture, not a gallery of national representations. The civilization covers trend/roughly all continents, not Europe alone.

This was one of two important contributions of the nineteenth century, and the other was the founding of general education. It is not broadly realized that up to fifty years ago education was confined to a small fraction of the inhabitants of what we recognized as the more highly civilized nations. The great masses of men and women were outside the pale, swayed by emotions and physical needs rather than by reason springing from knowledge. A century ago illiteracy was the lot of the majority, not as it is today of the comparative few. The first step, within the memory of our own fathers, was the acceptance of the new principle of compulsory education in the elementary steps towards learning. If we analyze further the contributions toward human progress during the 19th century, we gain further proof that we cannot single out individual high spots through the passing of the centuries and give them dogmatic labels. The metamorphosis is constant and always in the same direction - a comparison to a pendulum is fallacious. As a result of invention and education, the two great impulses of the 19th century, the ground was prepared for the days in which we now live. For example, the development of machinery driven by other than man or animal power, laid the foundation for industrial life and greatly stimulated the growth of urban communities. The evolution of the railway and the telegraph were succeeded in the latter years by the motor driven vehicle, the airplane and the radio. The entrance of science into the field of agriculture has meant that in spite of the doubling of the world population during the past hundred years, that a population which has remained
almost without increase has been able to provide the necessary food for the vast urban accession. During the latter years also, the earlier recognition of elementary education has logically been followed by the second step - the maximum extension of college and post-graduate training which goes on space today. This is not a mere recognition of the fact that there is so much more to learn today than 50 years' ago; it is due in at least equal measure to breaking down of the class or caste system of the past. Where, half a century ago, the education of the children of the farmer, of the mechanic or of the mass worker, ended, with good luck, in the grade school, the high school is today the rule and the college more and more becoming the rule.

When, however, we ask ourselves, what is the outstanding trend of this year of grace, and its immediate predecessors and successors, we cannot take as our criteria merely physical aspects of change; we cannot call this the age of universal education any more than we can call it the age of industrialism or the age of science or the age of communication. These are facts, definite milestones, markers on the chart, but not the line of the course itself.

We must look more deeply, and in the final analysis it is to the social structure itself that we must turn. In other words, we must attach importance to physical and material changes in the lives of the world population, only in so far as the sum of these changes affect existing conditions.

Fifty years ago, we humans were still divided by an undoubtedly existant class consciousness. Popular government had come to greater or less degree to most nations, but the influences of the old regime were still potent in every nation. It is not so long ago that our own Harvard catalogues listed the young gentlemen in our halls as those above or those below, the salt; as those with "Esquire" after their names, and those with a mere prefix "Mister." At an even later period the results to a young man
who married out of his class were permanently serious. As for the lot of our grandmothers it was in comparison with that of our daughters, the same type, but more respectability, did not amount to artificial seclusion and artificial barriers. When, for instance, did bathtubs and running water first enter the homes of the class then called upper? How long ago was it considered a mark of what they then called "respectability," to own a horse and carriage. Our own fathers and mothers can remember the day!

It is difficult as I have before suggested, to find a phrase to describe the fundamentals of the present trend. We cannot call this a socialistic age, or a communistic age, for the terms are preempted by special groups; we cannot call it the democratic age, for that connotes affairs of government - and in any event, the Republicans have held the center of the stage for 10 years.

While I must use it as a temporary expedient (as the word cooperation was used during the world war) I incline to the phrase "the age of social consciousness" as most fitting the trend of our own day. It best describes the change in the social relationships.

The broad current falls into two channels. First, the very definite breaking down of the remnants of hereditary caste, and the placing of men and women on a closer comparable and competitive basis. The Kansas farmer and the New York mechanic send their sons and their daughters to college; there is a motor car for one out of every four of the inhabitants of the United States; proper sanitation, excellent transportation, electrical light, music, art, books by the million, the news of the day, good clothing, ready made food - all these are literally at the command of the majority of our citizens. The luxuries of the past generation have become the necessities of the present; in creature comforts, the making easy of daily household tasks, we have gained more in 50 years than in the previous five centuries.
In the vocations of life also, the conditions surrounding work, clerical and manual, have shown a steady rise to shorter hours and more healthful surroundings, and in the field of avocations the most noteworthy change has been the discovery of recreational sports and outdoor play for the benefit of the city dwelling man, woman and child. The point to emphasise is that in all of this used to be the privilege of the few has come to be the accepted heritage of the many.

A century and a half ago our forefathers spoke in theoretical terms of equality, meaning thereby more particularly the equality of opportunity, and it has only in these latter years that we have seen, at least in part, the realization of that wider and more essential equality of opportunity. In this aspect, the social consciousness of this age makes constant strides. In all material particulars the changes and improvements are weighed in their relationship to the good of the community; and even though there be glaring instances of individual or group selfishness, dishonesty in high places, and, of late, a tendency towards the concentration of material power in the hands of the few, yet, nevertheless, the term "My Neighbor" is made to apply far more to fellow men and women, rich and poor, Jew and Gentile, than it did in the days gone by when "My Neighbor" meant one's personal friends and associates and the membership of one's own sect.

In the other stream, modern social consciousness has entered a wholly new phase. We have evolved community obligations undreamt of a hundred years' ago. The State, the Church, and associations of private citizens have undertaken the definite care of the sick, the crippled and the mentally deficient. We are reaching further into more difficult problems such as the effect of the intermingling of races and the necessity for increasing populations in given areas of the world surface, and of limiting the increase in other areas. We are investigating and stamping out the causes of disease and we are eliminating duplication and waste in production.
this same caution falls upon the strides made in the past decade towards the ultimate avoidance of armed conflict. It is based just as much on the better understood economics of mankind as it is on the spiritual vision of the race of man.

The goal of social consciousness of our day is a worthy goal. It conforms, I think, more truly to the teachings of religion than any objective of previous centuries. That has its pitfalls and dangers is undeniable; that it may lead to a complexity of life which will drive mankind to a revolt in favor of a simpler existence, is possible; that the same complexities may fall on organization, enormously increased power over human beings, with be wrested into the hands of a new type of oligarchy, is a danger of the future. That the strain of our daily doings may so weaken our mental and physical fibre that so-called less civilized races may replace the present dominant nations is also a potentiality for our grandchildren's day. Nevertheless, this age of social consciousness is with us now. We are married to it for better or for worse; we are a part of it, and whatever may be our doubts or fears we can do no good to our fellow men by sitting idly by or by seeking to dam the current with a brick. Rather is it our privilege to help direct the ultimate course. In so doing we can be guided by two lessons of the past; first, the recorded history of the human race showing the causes and effects of the influence behind that upward curve of civilization; Secondly, simpler moralities which have been true of all the centuries, for the pencil is in our hands today and it is worth the time and trouble to study the old masters; and last, the simple moralities, true in the day of Moses, true in the day of Christ, are true today.
Through the centuries the divine spirit which is in man has spurred him forward. Greater than material aspirations, that spirit is becoming the dominant influence of the twentieth century. Fortunate are we that we have the high privilege of life today, that we may strive to hand on a better world to our children and our neighbor's children in the days to come.
During the war Mr. Lloyd-George said to me "I will give a handsome prize to any imaginative American who will invent for me a new word to take the place of that overworked and unsatisfactory expression 'cooperation'." His search has borne no fruit and our language is still unable simply to express the thought of coordination of effort on the part of millions of human beings.

In like manner it is impossible adequately in few words to give name to the age in which we live. Every era of human history is worthy of characterization, even though our historical terminology is based too largely on the names of men and of places, rather than on great trends of civilization.

To ask ourselves what is the trend of today may provoke disagreement and discussion, but it may serve to bring out new thoughts and perhaps enrich the English language. At least we may agree that the past fifty years
have brought such unusual and far-reaching changes in the conditions of life and the mental outlook of the world population that future generations will recognize this period as worthy at least of a name.

May I take as a premise in a brief review that the line of progress in the graph of the evolution of civilization is ever upward? Not perhaps the little curves which show the advancement of any one particular art or science or social effort, but rather the broad mark which represents the sum of human endeavor and knowledge.

We are too inclined to think of well recorded history in terms of ups and downs, of rises and falls of empires, of glories and disasters.

For example, Greece. It brings to mind a flash of a fleeting century; we see the age of Pericles, glories of creative art and creative thought. Then what? Three or four hundred years of political confusion — an unsatisfactory gap in history until Rome swells into our view. On the surface we classify this period as retrogression, and assume that the line on the chart has dipped or at least stood still. We are wrong; for we forget that Alexanders
were at work disseminating the art and the learning of one small peninsula over all of the Eastern Mediterranean and the nearer Asia. Whole populations and nations, representing a diversity of races, were absorbing during these centuries the gifts of Greece, and rightly regarded the process as what we call today progress.

Cut of that very influence, the source of it in part forgotten, arose another impressive beacon, the glory of the Rome of the Caesars. We are so inculcated with the tale of the decline and fall of the Roman City and of the ensuing wrongly named Dark Ages that we miss wholly the continuance of general upward drift. Rome in the days of her glory evolved law and orderly government and a great advance in material things, but the largest distribution of her civilization occurred after her own decline. This was, of course, true in Northern Africa, in the Balkan Peninsula and especially in the Empire of Constantine.

The same thought holds true I think in the field of Europe. It is dramatic to think of the Goths and the Huns as savages destroying an old civilization by fire and sword,
but the France and Germany and Spain of Caesar were essentially vast primeval unsettled areas with little in them to destroy except a few scattered tribes. The successive invasions brought population to these areas, and though Rome herself fell, her gifts to mankind permeated the newly settled regions and made possible the modern Europe.

If these centuries had been so wholly dark a Charlemagne would have been impossible. He did not rise from a wholly barbaric state of society, rather was he the product of the definite evolution of a newly opened territory which had successfully solved the problems of the melting pot of incoming races. Again progress.

There followed the centuries which saw the establishment of the feudal organization, with its definite class system, the formation of communities, the Crusades, the importance of the influence of the church in civic and social affairs.

Again, because there is no focal point built around a contemporaneous group of immortal writers, artists and teachers or a predominant city, the tendency is to minimize human advancement during the five centuries preceding the
so-called revival of learning. Yet this is the period of the youth of Western civilization, the day of the founding of cathedrals, of universities, of dynasties, the final settling of the land, the establishing of property rights, and the birth of modern law.

From and because of this careful process of harrowing and fertilizing, came the Renaissance, a mere continuance of the progress, not the unexpected birth of a parentless new day. It witnessed a new emphasis on science and art and literature, and, more important, the beginning of a public consciousness which, confined at first to the field of religion, laid the foundation for the later extension to the realm of government.

In other words, I like to think of those two centuries between the death of the three Kings, Charles V, Francis I and Henry VIII, and the beginning of the Revolution in America and France, as another disseminating era, vital as the seed bed of modern political structure.

For while during this time concentration of power succeeded the far wider distribution under the feudal organi-
sation, the very destruction of feudalism meant that for at
least ninety per cent of the population a new relationship to
government had to be evolved. The result was the definite
acceptance of representative or constitutional government by
the greater part of the Western world.

We are down to modern times, to the speeding up of
events and trends because, primarily, of the strides of inven-
tion, especially in the field of communication. The
nineteenth century began to destroy the old handicaps of
distance and our day is finishing the task. We look on a
world picture, not a gallery of national representations.
The civilization trend covers all continents, not Europe
alone.

This was one of two important contributions of the
nineteenth century, and the other was the founding of general
education. It is not broadly realized that up to fifty years
ago education was confined to a small fraction of the inhabi-
tants of what we recognized as the more highly civilized
nations. The great masses of men and women were outside the
pale, swayed by emotions and physical needs, rather than by
reason springing from knowledge. A century ago illiteracy
was the lot of the majority, not as it is today of the comparative few. The first step, within the memory of our own fathers, was the acceptance of the new principle of comparative education in the ultimate steps toward learning.

If we analyze further the contribution toward human progress during the nineteenth century, we gain further proof that we cannot single out individual highspots through the passing of the centuries and give them democratic labels. The metamorphosis is constant and always in the same direction - a comparison to a pendulum is fallacious. As a result of invention and education, the two great impulses of the nineteenth century, the ground was prepared for the days in which we now live. For example, the development of machinery, driven by other than man or animal power, laid the foundation for industrial life and greatly stimulated the growth of urban communities. The evolution of the railway and the telegraph were succeeded in the latter years by the motor driven vehicle, the airplane and the radio. The entrance of science into the field of agriculture has meant that in spite of the doubling of the world's population during the
past one hundred years, a population which has remained almost without increase, has been able to provide the necessary food for the vast urban accession. During the latter years also the record of elementary education has logically been followed by the second step — the extension of college and postgraduate training which goes on apace today. This is not a mere record of the fact that there is so much more to learn today than fifty years ago; it is due in at least equal measure to the breaking down of the class or caste system of the past. Where half a century ago the education of the children of the farmer, of the mechanic or of the mere worker ended, with good luck in the grade school, the high school is today the rule and the college is more and more becoming the rule.

When, however, we ask ourselves what is the outstanding trend of this year of grace and its immediate predecessors and successors, we can take as our criteria merely physical aspects of change; we can call this the Age of Universal Education even more than we can call it the Age of Industrialism or the Age of Science or the Age of Communication. These are facts, definite milestones, markers on
the chart but not the line of the course itself.

We must look more deeply and, in the final analysis, it is to the social structure itself that we must turn. In other words, we must attach importance to physical and material changes in the lives of the world population only in so far as some of these changes affect existing conditions.

Fifty years ago we humans were still divided by an individually existing class consciousness. Popular government had come to greater or less degree to most nations, but the influences of the old regime were still potent in every nation. It is not so long ago that our own Harvard catalogue listed the young gentlemen in our halls as thus above those below the salt; as those with Esquire after their names and those with a mere prefix of Mister. At an even later period the results of a young men who married out of his class were permanently serious. As for the lot of our grandmothers, it was, in comparison with that of our daughters, the aces of artificial seclusion and artificial barriers. When, for instance, did bathtubs and running water first enter the homes of the classes then called "upper"? How long ago was
it considered a mark of what they then called respectability

to own a horse and carriage? Our own fathers and mothers can
remember the day!

It is difficult, as I have before suggested, to find
a phrase to describe the fundamentals of the present trend.
We cannot call this a socialistic age, or a communistic age,
for the terms are presumed by special groups; we cannot call
it the democratic age for that connotes affairs of government —
and in any event the Republicans have held the center of the
stage for ten years.

While I must use it as a temporary expedient, as the
word "cooperate" was used during the World War, I incline to
the phrase "The Age of Social Consciousness" as most fitting
the trend of our own day. It best describes the change in the
social relationships.

This broad current falls into two main channels.
First, the very definite breaking down of the remnants of
hereditary castes, and the placing of men and women on a
closer comparable and competitive basis. The Kansas farmer
and the New York mechanic send their sons and their daughters
to college; there is a motor car for one out of every four
of the inhabitants of the United States; proper sanitation,
excellent transportation, electric light, music, art, books by the million, the news of the day, the clothing, ready made food — all these are literally at the command of the majority of our citizens. The luxuries of the past generation are become the necessities of the present; in creature comforts, the making easy of daily household, we have gained more in fifty years than in the previous five centuries.

In the vocations of life, also the conditions surrounding work — clerical and manual — are shown a steady rise to shorter hours and more healthful surroundings; and in the field of vocations, the most noteworthy change has been the discovery of recreational sports and outdoor play for the benefit of the city-dwelling man, woman and children.

The point of emphasis is that in all of this what used to be the privileges of the few has come to be the accepted heritage of the many.

A century and a half ago our forefathers spoke in theoretical terms of equality, meaning thereby more particularly the equality of right. Much later came the ideal of the equality of opportunity, and it has been only in these latter years that we have seen, at least in part, its realization.
In this aspect the social consciousness of this age makes constant strides. In all material particulars the changes and importance are weighed in their relationship to the good of the community; and even though there be glaring instances of individual or group selfishness, dishonesty in high places, and, of late, a tendency towards the concentration of material power into the hands of the few, yet, nevertheless, the term "My Neighbor" is made to apply far more to fellow men and women, rich and poor, Jew and Gentile, than it did in the days gone by when "My Neighbor" meant one's personal friends and associates and the members of one's own sect.

In the other stream modern social consciousness has entered a wholly new phase. We have evolved community obligations undreamed of one hundred years ago. The State, the church and associations of private citizens have undertaken the definite care of the sick, the crippled and the mentally deficient. We are reaching far into more difficult problems, such as the effect of the intermingling of races and the necessity for increasing populations in given areas of the world's surface and of limiting the increase in other races.
We are investigating and stamping out the causes of disease and we are eliminating duplication and waste in production. More and more we are proving that modern conditions require the world instead of the merely national point of view.

In this same catalogue falls the strides made in the past decade toward the ultimate avoidance of armed conflict. It is based just as much on the better understood economics of mankind as it is on the spiritual outlook.

The goal of the social consciousness of our today is a worthy goal. It conforms I think more truly to the teachings of religion than any objective of previous centuries. That it has its pitfalls and dangers is undeniable; that it may lead to a complexity of life which will drive mankind to a revolt in favor of a simpler existence is possible; that the same complexities may demand so much over-organization, enormously increased power over human beings will be narrowed into the hands of a new type of oligarchy is a danger of the future; that the strain of our daily doings may so weaken our material and physical fibre that so-called less civilized races may replace the present dominant nations is also a potentiality for our grandchildren's day. Nevertheless, this age of social consciousness is with us now. We are married to it for better or worse;
We are a part of it and whatever may be our doubts or fears, we can do no good to our fellow men by sitting idly by or to seek to dam the current with a brick. Rather is it our privilege to help direct the ultimate course. In so doing we can be guided by two lessons of the past: first, the recorded history of the human race, showing the causes and effects of the influences behind that upward growth of civilization; secondly, simpler moralities which have been true of all the centuries.