In this strange period of relapse in the history of the world, when in some lands it has become almost a custom to burn books and to decree national forms of religion, morality and culture, it is more than a mere routine to join with you in happily celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of this University of Pennsylvania and I am honored in becoming an alumnus. The very foundation of this institution was concerned with the ideas of freedom of religious teaching and free learning for the many who could not pay for higher education.

I am told that it was originally thought of as a place where the good and Reverend Doctor Whitehead might preach his religion without certain difficulties which the old conservative respectability of Philadelphia threw in his path; indeed, it was to make it unnecessary for him to preach in the open fields when the doors of the established churches were closed against him. And it was the dream of its founders to make it a source of education to the children of the artisans of the city, the poor who otherwise would go untaught.
The survival and growth of the University through these two centuries are particularly symbolic of the eternal strength of freedom in human thought and action.

Here is living proof of the validity and force of a single-minded service to the cause of truth.

Events in the world are making the great masses of our citizens think more and more clearly about the manner of growth of their liberty and freedom and how hard their people through these two centuries have worked to win and hold the privilege of free government.

When this institution was first laid out by the earliest liberal among American patriots, Benjamin Franklin, there had already developed strong national governments in Europe which had become sufficiently powerful to impose peace and prevent violence among their populace. The earlier system of small independent and warring barons and principalities had given way to strong national governments, with centralized political power.

But even by that time there was a growing feeling that government was too often conducted solely for the benefit of a privileged few at the expense of the overwhelming majority
of the population. With that feeling there had come gradually into being in various nations bodies of representatives of the common people to provide limitations on arbitrary power by popular participation in government. Soon thereafter came the American Revolution itself, which brought about political independence in these Colonies from the rule of force from abroad by monarchical and aristocratic power. With the winning of political freedom came the conflict between the point of view of Alexander Hamilton, sincerely believing in the superiority of government by a small group of public-spirited and usually wealthy citizens, and the point of view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of government by representatives of all the people, an advocate of the universal right of free thought, free personal living, free religion, free expression of opinion and, above all, the right of universal suffrage.

I cannot be denied that Hamilton, by reason of the general recognition of his own personal unselfishness with respect to himself and to his associates in places of high responsibility, had acquired a very large following among the people of his day. His adherents probably constituted even a majority of those who were entitled to vote.
The better elements of the Jeffersonian school were frank to admit the high motives and disinterestedness of Hamilton and his school, and were willing to concede that if government could be guaranteed to be kept always on the high level of unselfish service suggested by the Hamiltonians there would be nothing to fear. For the very basis of the Hamiltonian philosophy was that through a system of elections every four years, limited to the best educated and the richest male citizens, the best of those qualified to govern could always be selected.

It was with rare perspicuity, however, that Jefferson pointed out that, on the doctrine of sheer human frailty, the Hamilton theory was bound to develop into government by selfishness or government for personal gain or government by class, which would ultimately lead to the abolition of free elections. So long as the voters of the nation regardless of higher education or property possessions were free to exercise their choice, without hindrance, in the polling place, the country would have nothing to fear from the abolition of free elections and the substitution of the hand of tyranny.
At all times in our history there have been many Americans who still wished to confine the ballot to a limited group of groups. A quarter of a century ago, President Elliott of Harvard summarized one phase of this when he said to me "Roosevelt, I am convinced, for example, that even though we have multiplied our universities in every state of the Union, even though higher learning seems to have come into its own, that if the ballot were to be confined to the holders of college degrees, the nation would go on the rocks in a very few years". It may seem ungracious in a very new degree holder to say this to this audience of degree holders, but my authority is a great educator, noted for his effort to disseminate college educational facilities throughout the country.

If I own a farm, employing a farmer and his wife and several farm hands, I would rather trust their aggregate judgment on election day than if the right to vote were confined to myself. If with the help of a Board of Directors, a large number of Vice Presidents, and a group of managers and foremen I run a factory or a series of factories, I would rather trust the aggregate judgment of all those who toil with their hands than if the franchise were confined to the top people. If I am the President of a railroad, I would
rather, in matters affecting government, trust the aggregate
opinion of the engineers and brakemen and conductors and
trainmen and telegraphers and porters and all the others than
if the right to vote were confined to myself and the division
superintendents.

And, purely as a matter of history, we know that
efforts on the part of the few at the top to tell the many
lower down how they should vote, using, we regret to say,
even threats or dire prophesies in some cases, have met with
little success.

There are, I regret to say, even today in certain
quarters, demands for a return to a type of government to
the control of those few, who, because of business ability
or economic omniscience, are just a touch above the average
of the present governmental system. As in the days of
Hamilton, let us give them all credit for pure intention and
high ideals. Nevertheless, their type of American could
with ease be succeeded by selfish seekers for power and
riches and glory.
As long as periodic free elections survive, these people cannot permanently control government. As always in our history, there are those who would demagogue their way into places of responsibility. We have had examples in recent days. They obtained large followings among unthinking people and among those who saw therein a short-cut to office. There is much shouting and tumult. They grow greatly and speedily. But the decline and fall of the demagogue is equally swift.

Why? Because of the simple fact that our system of periodic free elections still lives. The untrammeled language of the demagogue is living and vital proof that free elections in the United States are still with us — and should be.

I have said this because it is a prelude by way of contrast to things which have happened in other lands. A decade ago, for example, the German people were dissatisfied with the processes of their own democracy which were based on the free use of the franchise. They leaned to a new cult called "Fasiism" — a minority group which expressed extraordinary patriotism and offered better government through persons believed to have special aptitude for government.
In those days much emphasis was placed on the purity of purpose of this special group. Many people of large business affairs, dissatisfied with the democratic system, formed alliances with the small group and did so, in all probability, with the belief that free elections would not be abolished. It is worth noting that during that period nothing was said about the abolishing of free elections.

You and I know the subsequent history of Germany. And it is, of course, a travesty on fact to claim that there is any free choice of Governors in that nation today.

What Jefferson prophesied might happen in this country, if the philosophy of the restricted vote were adopted, did actually happen in Germany.

Many years ago, in speaking in San Francisco, I pointed out that new conditions imposed new requirements upon government and those who conducted government. As Jefferson wrote "I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind . . . as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance
also, and keep pace with the times.

We can expect that today as readily as then, on the sole condition that any change in institutions or in economic methods shall remain within the continuing framework of a freely elected democratic form of government.

I have pointed out many times that Western migration and the free use of unoccupied lands have ended and that certain controls have become necessary to prevent relatively small groups from harming or cutting the throats of other very large groups.

Furthermore, we have — largely through the processes of education — developed new beliefs in our responsibilities to humanity as a whole. It is a relatively new thing in American life, for example, to consider the duty of government in its relationship to starving people or unemployed people. Twenty years ago people had scarcely given thought to the term "minimum wages" or to the thought of the necessity of the insurance of bank deposits, or to the belief in the need of taking care of elderly people without throwing them into the poorhouse.
Benjamin Franklin himself realized that while basic principles of natural science, of morality, and of the science of society were eternal and immutable, the application of these principles necessarily change with the patterns of living conditions from generation to generation.
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In this strange period of release in the history of the world, when in some lands it has become almost a custom to burn books and to decree national forms of religion, morality and culture, it is more than a mere routine to join with you in the two hundredth anniversary celebration of this University of Pennsylvania. The very foundation of this institution was with the idea of freedom of religious teaching and free learning for the many who could not pay for higher education.

It was to you all know, originally thought of as a place where the good Rev. Dr. Whitehead might preach his religion without the difficulties which the old conservative respectability of Philadelphia threw in his path; indeed, it was to make it unnecessary for him to preach in the open fields when the doors of the established churches were closed against him. And it was the dream of its founders to make it a source of education to the children of the artisans of the city, the poor who otherwise would go untaught.

The survival and growth of the University through
these two centuries are particularly symbolic of the eternal
strength of freedom in human thought and action.

Here is proof of the validity and force of a
single-minded service to the cause of truth.

Events in the world are making the great masses of
our citizens think more and more clearly about the
growth of their liberty and freedom and how hard their
people through these two centuries have worked to win the
privilege of free government.

Then this institution was first laid out by the
earliest liberal among American patriots, Benjamin Franklin,
there had already developed strong national governments in
Europe which had become sufficiently powerful to impose
peace and prevent violence among their populace. The earlier
system of small independent and warring barons and princip-

ilies had given way to strong national governments, with
centralized political power.

But by that time there was a growing feeling that
government was too often conducted solely for the benefit of
a privileged few at the expense of the overwhelming majority
of the population. With that feeling there had come gradually
in various nations bodies of representatives of the common
people to provide limitations on arbitrary power by popular participation in government. Soon thereafter came the American Revolution itself, which brought about political independence in these Colonies from the rule of force from abroad by monarchical and aristocratic power. With the winning of political freedom came the conflict between the point of view of Alexander Hamilton, sincerely believing in the superiority of government by a small group of public-spirited and usually wealthy citizens, and the point of view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of government by representatives of all the people, an advocate of the universal right of free expression of opinion and choice of all the right of universal suffrage.
It cannot be denied that Hamilton, by reason of the universal recognition of his own personal unselfishness with respect to himself and to his associates in places of high responsibility, had acquired a very large following among the people of his day. His adherents probably constituted even a majority of those who were entitled to vote.

The better elements of the Jeffersonian school were frank to admit the high motives and disinterestedness of Hamilton and his school and were willing to concede that if government could be guaranteed to be kept always on the high level of unselfish service suggested by the Hamiltonians there would be nothing to fear. For the very basis of the Hamiltonian philosophy was that through a system of annual elections every four years the best of those qualified to govern could be selected. It was with rare perspicacity, however, that Jefferson pointed out that on the doctrine of sheer human fraility the Hamilton theory was bound to develop into government by selfishness or government by classes, for personal gain which would ultimately lead to the abolition of free elections. So long as the of the Nation of higher education of quality possessions were
free to exercise their choice, without hindrance, in the
polling place the country would have nothing to fear from
the abolition of
hand of tyranny.

Adolph Hitler and
the adherents of "Nazism likewise
preached a doctrine before 1933 which called for government
by people considered for one reason or another to have special
aptitude for government -- people of education, people of
wealth, people of extraordinary patriotism, people who would
reconstitute Germany. In those days before 1933, there was
much emphasis placed upon the purity of purpose of this special
group. Nothing was said about the abolition of free elections.

What Jefferson prophesied might happen in this
country if the Hamiltonian philosophy was adopted did actually
happen in Germany after Hitler came to power and Nazism was
firmly established. They still preached of purity of purpose
but overnight they abolished the entire free election system
of Germany.

There is a moral in all this for our country

There are, in certain quarters, even today, demands for return
to a type of government such as was outlined by the Hamiltonians --
demands to restore government to the control of those few who
because of wealth or business ability or economic omniscience
are a touch above the average of the present elected representa-
tives. The group making these demands assumes that such a
government would always be of pure intention and high ideals,
forgetting what Jefferson feared and what Hitler proved.
As long as periodic free elections survives political democracy
will remain weaker but it is so easy for the favored few to
abolish such a system of free elections that the demands of
those who would go back to this type of government must always
be viewed with suspicion and mistrust.
In this strange period of relapse in the history of the world, when in some lands it has become almost a custom to burn books and to destroy national forms of religion, morality and culture, it is more than ever routine to join with you in exultation on the two hundredth anniversary of this University of Pennsylvania. For the very foundation of this institution was tied up with the ideas of freedom of religious teaching and free learning for the many who could not pay for higher education.

The survival and growth through these two centuries are particularly. It was as you all know, originally thought of as a place where the good old Rev. Dr. Whitehead might preach his religion without the difficulties which the old conservative respectability of Philadelphia threw in his path; indeed it was to make it unnecessary for him to preach in the open fields when the doors of the established churches were closed against him. And it was the dream of its founders to make it a source of education to the children of the artisans of the city, the poor who otherwise would go untaught.
In this strange period of relapse in the history of the world, when in some lands it has become almost a custom to burn books and to destroy national forms of religion, morality and culture, it is more than mere routine to join with you in exultation on the two hundredth anniversary of this University of Pennsylvania. For the very foundation of this institution was tied up with the ideas of freedom of religious teaching and free learning for the many who could not pay for higher education. The survival and growth through these two centuries are particularly symbolic of the eternal strength of freedom in human thought and action.

Here surely is proof of the validity and force of a single-minded service to the cause of truth.

Events in the world are making the great masses of our citizens think more and more clearly about the history of the growth of their liberty and freedom and how hard their people through these two centuries have worked to win the privilege of free government.

When this institution was first laid out by the foremost
liberal of American patriots, Benjamin Franklin, there had already developed the strong national governments in Europe which had become sufficiently powerful to impose peace and prevent violence among their populace. The earlier system of small ruling barons and principalities had given way to strong national governments, with centralized political power.

Even at that time there was a growing feeling that government was too often conducted solely for the benefit of a privileged few at the expense of the overwhelming majority of the population. With that feeling there had come gradually into being bodies of representatives of the common people to provide limitations on arbitrary power by popular participation in government, and soon thereafter came the American Revolution itself, which brought about political independence in these Colonies from the rule of force by monarchical and aristocratic power. With the winning of freedom came the conflict between the beaten point of view of Alexander Hamilton, impatient of slow moving methods, sincerely believing in the superiority of government by a small group of public-spirited and usually wealthy citizens, as opposed to the point of view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of government by representat-
type of government different from the days of industrial plants which have

verging thousands of employees dependent upon the will of one man

for a job. The days when small communities were self-sufficing

and furnished the commodities for their own needs called for a type

of government different from an industrial organization where each

laborer becomes a cog in a machine which makes a product sold in

the market places a thousand miles away.
The men around the founders of this University understood this truism of human affairs. Franklin realized that the basic principles of natural science, and of morality, and of that science of society which he virtually founded, were eternal and immutable. But he also realized that as conditions altered — natural, social, political conditions — so the application of these principles necessarily changed.

Since security and liberty depend upon the just and sensitive application of those rules to the infinitely various and changing patterns of social life, it is the whole duty of the philosopher — and by that Franklin meant any man who pursued truth for its own sake — to discover the proper application of eternal principles of truth and goodness and justice to his own generation in terms of the present and not of the past.

And having discovered them, alone must learn wherein the practice of them consists in the particular situation in which they were placed. For eternal truths are neither true nor eternal unless they have fresh meaning for every new social situation.

Since the conditions of human society are perpetually changing, and at times drastically changing, to proclaim the truths of yesterday in the terms of yesterday and
to insist that they are still true in the old form with the conditions which give rise to that form for another truth is to misunderstand the old truths and distort new thoughts to fit them. Such mis-application of old truths is to misunderstand neither what varies nor what is permanent in the world in which we live.

McDo not believe it is too late, the

thing will not materially alter what has happened in the past will probably mark in the future. It requires better

and original effort to believe and to act on the belief, that the world can be changed by man's endeavor and that this endeavor can lead to something new and unprecedented and better. By welding old truths long embedded in the moral consciousness of mankind to the new era man can create a framework within which progress is possible.

This University was founded, as were our other great universities in America, to train men's minds against the grain, to make them critical of the world and the state and the family, to be receptive and sensitive to the new and the unparalleled, to give them sufficient courage to face new facts, sufficient skill to deal with them. Only insofar as they do this do our universities and their teachers perform their duty to the nation.
In the 1930s we faced another crisis which called for bold action and bold experimentation to meet new conditions. A decade of refusal to face the requirements of changing time and circumstance, had brought again its inevitable aftermath. The national economy was paralyzed; the national existence was at stake. The severity of economic collapse in this country was matched in only one other country, Germany. In that country and at that time, starving and insecure people sacrificed their freedom for the promise of security. Democracy fell before dictatorship. Out of that tragedy for the German people has come the tragedy for all the Franco people of Europe.

In this country we were not found wanting. Democracy, although tested, did not fail. The principles of our national life were not brought into question. The institutions of our national life, long neglected, were swiftly reforged to meet the requirements of our times.
The constructive forces of the Nation were released, and in sequence we are once again experiencing a new birth of freedom.

There are those who think we have not gone far enough, but none can say that we have been untrue to the principles of American democracy. We have not the sin of neglect of the directives which are fathers long ago established. Granted that we have not yet created all the free institutions which circumstances require, none can question that we are in process of creating such institutions. Ours is not the sin of neglect. We are facing the needs of our time without flinching. We are forging the tools which our time requires. We have not only been true to the principles of our national life but have given them richer content and fuller development.

These advances have been made by government, but it has been government functioning through the democratic process as the responsible agent of the people. In a deeper sense, therefore, these advances have been made by the whole people. It was the American people, not their government alone, who were not found wanting in the hour of crisis.

For this we say in part thank our schools and universities.
even in those nations which escape social revolution."

But I question whether there has yet come into the

body of our learning an intuitive awareness of the
drastic changes which modern invention has brought about in
the world. It sometimes seems to me that our social thinking
lags dangerously behind the changes which the industrial
revolution of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has
wrought, in the way men earn their daily bread.

Is it not pertinent to ask whether our scholars

and thinkers have adequately prepared our people to understand
these changes, and understanding, to cope with them?

Is it not pertinent to ask whether our scholars

and thinkers have adequately prepared themselves to understand
the price, the price and the insecurity of fire government
these changes? Are we not all too much concerned that our
quest for peace, liberty, and security be obtained in accordance
with our own preconceived theories? In trying to adhere to
classical economics, do we not at times forget that to the
classical economist idle men and idle factories were as in-
conceivable as perpetual motion is to the modern scientist?

Unmindful that equality of opportunity as we have known it no
longer exists, have we not forgot, as the great liberal, L. T.
Hobhouse once said, "Liberty without equality is a name of
noble sound and equal result."
It seems to me that there is very real danger that this lag in our social
thinking may lead people to associate the new tasks which twentieth century
government must assume with undemocratic forms of government, and cause them
to feel that there is no choice left them but democratic chaos or dictatorial
discipline.

Is it not pertinent to ask whether our scholars and thinkers have
adequately prepared our people to understand the social and economic changes
which have occurred in our national life or to acquire dispassionately the
resources necessary to cope with them?

Is it not pertinent to ask whether our scholars and thinkers have
adequately prepared our people to understand that the defense of democracy
does not necessarily mean the defense of the economic status quo and that
the choice before us is not democratic chaos or dictatorial discipline?

Is it not pertinent to ask whether our scholars and thinkers have
adequately prepared themselves to understand the scope, the power and
versatility of free government? Are we not all too much concerned that
our quest for peace, liberty, and security be obtained in accordance with
our own preconceived theories? In trying to adhere to classical economics, do we not at times forget that to the classical economist idle men and idle factories were as inconceivable as perpetual motion is to the modern scientist? Unmindful that equality of opportunity as we have known it no longer exists, have we not forgotten, as the great liberal, L. T. Hobhouse once said, "Liberty without equality is a name of noble sound and squalid result."

In no country in the world has dictatorship really become supreme by the free choice of a free people. In no country in the world has dictatorship maintained itself without the suppression of freedom of thought and expression. Free men have not turned to dictatorship, but they have not always had the will to fight either its creation or its continuance. Because they found their country weak, divided, in confusion and in shame, and because they could not find a democratic solution which could hope to command the consent of the governed.

It is therefore the task of men of thought even more than men of action, if democracy is to survive, to put aside pride and prejudice and with humility, courage and single-minded devotion to find the truth that shall make men free.
We, in our time are called upon to render our account: to say what we take the sacred words, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to signify in the terms of today, to say, though we fall short of it, that we, too, are prepared to fight and, if need be, die in defending as much of it as we have acquired. This college—a necessity for the so questioning races—we owe in large part...
FROM: JUSTICE FRANKFURTER

Benjamin Franklin recognized no value higher than the truth, no form of life more honorable than one spent in single-minded service to its cause. No man more truly practiced what he preached. And so he founded the Academy from which two hundred years ago grew your great capital University. It cannot be claimed that Franklin was the greatest of scientists or the profoundest of thinkers, but probably no man, unless it be Aristotle, ever possessed a wider range, a more insatiable curiosity, a mind at once so balanced and so flexible. It was no mere curiosity, however, which prompted Franklin's inquiries. He desired to expand the frontiers of knowledge because he knew that without knowledge there could be no freedom and no happiness worthy the name.

Franklin lived in a world not so unlike our own. The tempo of history had risen sharply, and violent forces hitherto latent beneath the surface had begun to shake and transform the world in their struggle. A new world was rapidly coming into being and Franklin, more perhaps than any other man of his age, welcomed it and promoted its fruition. He wished to see men lead their lives in peace and dignity. He believed, and the leading thinkers of his generation believed with him, that such lives could be attained only if knowledge
became more widespread, if truth ceased to be the mystery of
the specialist and became the natural possession of the whole
society and the conscious foundation of its life. He believed
that the basic principles of natural science and of morality
and of that science of society which he virtually founded, were
eternal and immutable. But he equally believed that as con-
ditions altered -- natural, social, political conditions --
so the application of these principles necessarily changed.

Since security and liberty depend upon the just and sensitive
application of those rules to the infinitely various and
changing patterns of social life, it is the whole duty of the
philosopher -- and by that Franklin meant any man who pursued
truth for its own sake -- to discover the proper application
of eternal principles of truth and goodness and justice to
his own generation in terms of the present and not of the
past. And having discovered them, alone must learn wherein
the practice of them consists in the particular situation
in which they were placed.

Franklin differed from other speculative minds
more especially in that no man ever did more to give practical
effect to this thinking. And well might he, as so many later
thinkers, have declared that the times were out of joint,
and taken hereafter in some particular world, wholly occupied
in some theoretical investigation (a dissenting smile and glance (?))
for the tragic turmoil of the world without. He took the
positive course as alone consistent with his principles.
Expert on agriculture and currency and education, politician,
diplomat, legislator, Franklin used his great and varied gifts
in the service of the society to which he belonged. No man
more fervently believed that the principles of thought and
action were truly eternal and discoverable by the patient
effort of human reason. But no man would have been more amazed
and more horrified that men took this effort of it as a reason
for withdrawing from the world into some ivory tower, and pro-
claimed the right to hold themselves aloof from the problems
and the agonies of their society. Such a man would have
seemed to him singularly blind -- blind because they assume
that because science has its independent end they hope to
escape the fate of their society, a fate which their own
irresponsibility may help to render tragic; blind also because
they cannot see that the principles without social content
are empty, just as society content without principles are
meaningless. Franklin teaches us that eternal truths are
neither true nor eternal unless they have fresh meaning for
every new social situation.

Since the conditions of human society are per-
petually changing, and at times drastically changing, to pro-
claim the truths of yesterday in the terms of yesterday and
to insist that they are still true in the old form with the
conditions which give rise to that form for another truth,
is to misunderstand the old truths and distort new thoughts
to fit them. Such mis-application of old truths is to under-
stand neither what varies nor what is permanent in the world
in which we live.

Men do not believe, until it is too late, that
things will not materially alter, that what has happened in
the past will probably recur in the future. It requires
belief and original effort to believe, and to act on the
belief, that the world can be changed by man's endeavor and
that this endeavor can lead to the emergence of something
new and unprecedented and better. Franklin did believe this
and kindled his contemporaries with his faith.
He helped to build the world in which we live as a powerful
and respected people, he did much to formulate the moral founda-
tion on which it rests, and even more the concrete political
form which it received. By wedding old truths long embedded
in the moral consciousness of mankind to the new era he
created a framework within which progress was possible. It
was possible because the framework which he devised in itself incorporated recognition of the principle of change for old truths to avoid the contours of new conditions thereby avoiding enslavement to the forces and the speculations which constitute a deeper base.

Franklin thus asked himself what constituted liberty, happiness, equality of opportunity in American society of the Eighteenth century and conceived the answer in concrete social, political, economic terms. Having found the answer he was prepared to fight, and if need be, die for its realization, since the society which is not free nor happy nor capable of becoming so contains no civilized method which makes life worth preserving.

We, too, in our time are called upon to render our account: to say that we take the sacred words, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to signify in the terms of today, to say, though we fall short of it, that we, too, are prepared to fight and, if need be, die in defending as much of it as we have acquired. This college, a necessity for the so questioning races, we owe in large part to Benjamin Franklin. His precept and even more his example has taught us much which we took for granted as part of our national heritage: that without freedom of inquiry there can be neither learning
nor science; that science and learning are social necessities; that the educated are the leaders and guides in uncertain and dark times or else that they are nothing; that no man can sever the bonds which unite him to his society by simply averting his eyes. I believe I loyally interpret the spirit of Franklin when I say that to pursue truth for its own sake is to apply the eternal principles to new, unfamiliar facts and derive new, unfamiliar conclusions; that it needs courage to perceive and to act upon such conclusions; that liberty and justice can always be defended from their opposites; are always worth fighting for and can be won only by fighting. Franklin revered tradition but helped invent a new form of government in the world and yet in this there is no paradox since the situation in America of his day was peculiar. If the frame work which he had devised had been not wholly moral, evil social pressure would have broken it or else it would have led to misery and social dislocation. Franklin founded this University to train men minds against the grain, to make them critical of the world and the state and the family, to be receptive and sensitive to the new and the unparalleled, to give them sufficient courage to face new facts, sufficient skill to deal with them. Only insofar as they do this do our universities and their teachers perform their duty to the nation.
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It was as you all know, originally thought of as a place where the good old Rev. Dr. Whitehead might preach his religion without the difficulties which the old conservative respectability of Philadelphia threw in his path; indeed it was to make it unnecessary for him to preach in the open fields when the doors of the established churches were closed against him. And it was the dream of its founders to make it a source of education to the children of
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the artisans of the city, the poor who otherwise would go untaught.
It is the function of education to provide continuity for our national life by transmitting to youth our culture and the principles upon which that life has been founded, principles tested in the fire of history, principles which abide. But education has a more critical function, a deeper obligation. This is the obligation to train the minds and the talents of our youth, to develop their capacities to build upon the foundations of the past the institutions which the future requires, to prepare youth for creative citizenship.

This is the deeper obligation, for we cannot build the future for our youth, we can only build our youth for the future. Youth must be given a sense of our past, but it must also be equipped with tools with which to build well upon that past. For though principles are timeless, institutions must change. Growth and change; this is the law of all life. The answers of yesterday are inadequate for the problems of today, as the solutions of today will be inadequate for the needs of tomorrow. Only the principles in terms of which new problems must be met remain unchanged.

Long ago our fathers rejected the principle of autocracy and established the principle of self-government. Long ago they
rejected the principle of master and slave and established the
principle of freedom. Long ago they rejected the principle that
the individual exists for the state and established the principle
that the state is created for the service of men.

Upon the basis of these principles our fathers sought
so to order our national life as to permit the full flowering of
the human spirit, the widest expression of individual freedom con-
sistent with the individual freedom of all and so with the welfare
of the Nation.

It is the function of education to make these principles
live in the minds and attitudes of youth, so that they in their day
may preserve and advance them, as we in our day seek to do; so that
they in their day may be free men, as we are free men today.

But the institutions of self-government, the functions
and duties as well as the rights of individuals within the States
and the Nation, the functions and duties of the States as of the
Federal Government — these must change with the march of time and
circumstance. Failure to effect changes in these functions and
duties can result only in the lesser realization of the principles
of our national life. Indeed such failure results in the mis-
carriage of those principles and bears the threat of their total
negation. Institutions cannot stand still; they must grow or
they decay. They must be a vital expression of the needs of our
times or they poison the springs of our national vitality. We
must build and rebuild our institutions. Our youth, in their
day, must build and rebuild them. It is the function of educa-
tion to prepare youth for this task, to develop their capacity to
discharge it greatly.

In 1933 we faced another crisis which called for bold
action and bold experimentation to meet new conditions. A decade
of refusal to face the requirements of changing time and circum-
stances, had brought again its inevitable aftermath. The national
economy was paralyzed; the national existence was at stake. The
severity of economic collapse in this country was matched in only
one other, Germany. In that country and at that time a starving
and insecure people bartered their freedom for the promise of se-
curity. Democracy fell before dictatorship. Out of that tragedy
for the German people has come the tragedy for all the free peoples
of Europe.

In this country we were not found wanting. Democracy
did not fall. The principles of our national life were not brought
into question. The institutions of our national life, long ne-
glected, were swiftly reformed to meet the requirements of our times.
The constructive forces of the Nation were released, and in consequence we are once again experiencing a new birth of freedom.

There are those who think we have not come far enough, but none can say that we have been untrue to the principles of American democracy. Ours is not the sin of perversion of the directives which are fathers long ago established. Granted that we have not yet created all the free institutions which are circumstances require, none can question that we are in process of creating such institutions. Ours is not the sin of neglect. We are facing the needs of our time without flinching. We are forging the tools which our time requires. We have not only been true to the principles of our national life but have given them richer content and fuller development.

These advances have been made by government, but it has been government functioning through the democratic process as the responsible agent of the people. In a deeper sense, therefore, these advances have been made by the whole people. It was the American people, not their government alone, who were not found wanting in the hour of crisis.

For this we may in part thank our schools and universities.
Such was the faith in the principles of democracy which they transmitted, such was the character they fostered and the intelligence they trained, that we were enabled to meet the challenge of our time. Education in our democracy has measured up to its responsibility.
In this strange period of relapse in the history of the world, when in some lands it has become almost a custom to burn books and to destroy national forms of religion, morality and culture, it is more than mere routine to join with you in exultation on the two hundredth anniversary of this University of Pennsylvania. For the very foundation of this institution was tied up with the ideas of freedom of religious teaching and free learning for the many who could not pay for higher education. Its survival and growth through those two centuries are particularly symbolic of the eternal strength of freedom in human thought and action.

Here surely is proof of the validity and force of a single-minded service to the cause of truth.

Events in the world are making the great masses of our citizens think more and more clearly about the history of the growth of their liberty and freedom and how hard their people through those two centuries have worked to win the privilege of free government.

When this institution was first laid out by the foremost
liberal of American patriots, Benjamin Franklin, there had already developed the strong national governments in Europe which had become sufficiently powerful to impose peace and prevent violence among their populace. The earlier system of small ruling barons and principalities had given way to strong national governments, with centralized political power.

Even at that time with a growing feeling that government was too often conducted solely for the benefit of a privileged few at the expense of the overwhelming majority of the population, and with that feeling there had come gradually into being bodies of representatives of the common people to provide limitations on arbitrary power by popular participation in government, and soon thereafter came the American Revolution itself which brought about political independence in these Colonies from the rule of force by monarchical and aristocratic power. With the winning of freedom came the conflict between the honest point of view of Alexander Hamilton, impatient of slow moving methods, sincerely believing in the superiority of government by a small group of people, public spirited and usually wealthy citizens, as opposed to the point of view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of government by representa-
tives of all the people, an advocate of the equality of all in the
light of free thinking, free personal living, free religion and
free expression of opinion. It was from that conflict and from
the emergence of the Jeffersonian point of view that the formula
of American life for a century was created. It was when it be-
gen in American political life a new day in which individualism
was made the watchword. Everything about the resources of this
continent favored the continuation of that formula. The western
frontier was always open. Vast stretches of land, unlimited re-
sources of minerals, forests and agriculture always provided the
promise of a living, no matter how difficult times would become or
how inexorably depression would follow periods of prosperity.
American resources for livelihood were so unlimited that opportunity
was provided not only to our own citizens but was held out to all of
the distressed and persecuted of the world. Immigrants were not
only admitted; they were welcomed with enthusiastic open arms.

This institution of learning was a hundred years old when
we began to experience the unleashing of a new force - the force of
steam and machinery and industrial plants. Slowly it grew and with
it came dreams of comforts, luxury, of financial and industrial
euphoria never before imagined by man. For the next two genera-
tions during this period of vast expansion, government sought not
only to abstain from interference but actually tried in a hundred
ways to develop and stimulate the growth of industry and finance,
the pushing of railroads into ever new frontiers, the encoura-
gement of the development of our resources above ground and under
ground. Government was called upon to do all kinds of things to
help industry. It was called upon to do so by the fathers and
grandfathers of those who today cry out that government has no
place in any way in the industrial or financial life of the nation.
There was help for industry by protective tariffs; there was help
for railroads by generous subsidies of money and land; there was
help to railroads by giving them valuable oil lands; there was
help to our merchant marine by grants of money and mail subsidy.

The limit was finally reached, and with the turn of the
century came a realization that the vast industrial and financial
combinations had, with the aid of government, seized our national
economic control and that the freedom of economic opportunity for
the great mass of citizens had reached a point of frustration. We
all remember the efforts of President Theodore Roosevelt and President Woodrow Wilson to meet this new threat to the freedom of the individual to lead a decent life.

The World War interrupted the efforts of the statesmen of President Wilson's time to meet this new situation. The false boom prosperity of the post-war period continued the apparent success of concentration of economic power until the collapse of 1929.

The story since that day is familiar to all; it has been written in terms of human misery and degradation and in terms of a rebirth of human hopes and aspirations. I have spoken of this change in the national and economic life of the United States on prior occasions. I mention it again in these surroundings to emphasize the fact that the eternal principles of liberty and freedom and dignity of the human individual call for the use of the forces of government in different ways at different times under different circumstances. Human institutions change even though principles of humanity as we know them may remain unchanged. The art of government is to use the powers of a united people to meet the new conditions, as they arise. The days of unlimited resources, of ever-widening frontiers of development and expansion, call for a
type of government different from the days of industrial plants

hiring thousands of employees dependent upon the will of one man

for a job. The days when small communities were self-sufficing

and furnished the commodities for their own needs call for a type

of government different from an industrial organization where each

laborer becomes a cog in a machine which makes a product sold in

the market places a thousand miles away.
In international affairs, too, we have learned how a democracy can change its institutions to meet threats from abroad as well as threats from within.

By 1937 the threat of war had grown so great that few could any longer mistake it. In the face of the mad ambition of Germany, in the face of the strategy of piecemeal conquest, clearly enunciated and already begun, in the delusion that we were secure from the perils from which no other nation was free, this Nation declared that it had no concern in the war of Europe.

We announced to the world that we would not oppose aggression and conquest. More, we announced that we would be neutral as between the aggressor and the victim of aggression, that we would withhold our material assistance from the one as from the other. Voices were indeed raised, you will recall, to warn of the approaching catastrophe, to urge, that aggression, like a deadly plague, knows no limits, respects no boundaries. But these voices were not heeded, and the opportunity was lost to quarantine aggression and thus to check it before it had gathered momentum. To this extent, we have ourselves been responsible for the peril in which we stand today.

The shock of the war's outbreak cleared our minds.
With the march of dictatorship the threat to our own security became apparent. With the fall of France we awoke to action.

We have rejected the mockery that extends its sympathy to the victims of aggression but withholds its aid. We are providing the full measure of our material assistance to the last remaining democracy of Europe in its fight for freedom.

But more, we have shed our illusion of security and have recognized that it is the British navy and not the Atlantic Ocean that is our first line of defense. We are accordingly providing the fullest measure of our material assistance to the British in their fight to halt the westward march of dictatorship. We shall augment that aid. Month by month and day by day, we shall swell the flow as our strength permits. What our sympathy dictates, our security makes imperative.

We have learned well the lesson of Europe's course of appeasement, a course which in the first small compromise seems reasonable, but which leads inexorably to total surrender. We have determined to defend, not our shores alone, but the whole of the Western Hemisphere. We shall not wait for the invader to reach our shores; we shall fight to prevent his gaining a foothold anywhere in the Americas. We shall not
compromise, we shall not make concessions, we shall not appease.

We have learned well from European experience the
lesson of partial defense, the lesson of half-way measures.
We are determined to confront the threat of total aggression
with a total defense. We are determined to spend whatever
sums, to devote whatever resources, to make whatever sacrifices
this may require. We shall never put a price upon our security
and our freedom.

We are a mighty Nation, awake to the perils that
confront us. We are moving swiftly to marshal our vast
resources, to build and to man vast armaments. We are a united
Nation, resolved to maintain our freedom, come what may. This
Nation, it has been well said, is an awakened giant, slow to
anger, terrible in wrath. Let the aggressor beware.

The magnitude of our defense effort, the unity
of purpose and the swiftness with which we are marshaling our
strength, bear witness to the fact that in the face of the
threat from beyond the seas we have not been and we shall not
be, found wanting. Ours is a faith which holds us in unswerving
allegiance, and ours is the capacity of hand and brain to defend
it well.
In international affairs, too, we have learned how a democracy can change its institutions to meet threats from abroad as well as threats from within.

By 1937 the threat of war had grown so great that few could any longer mistake it. In the face of the mad ambition of Germany, in the face of the strategy of piecemeal conquest, clearly enunciated and already begun, in the delusion that we were secure from the perils from which no other nation was free, this Nation declared that it had no concern in the wars of Europe.

We announced to the world that we would not oppose aggression and conquest. More, we announced that we would be neutral as between the aggressor and the victim of aggression, that we would withhold our material assistance from the one as from the other. Voices were indeed raised, you will recall, to warn of the approaching catastrophe, to urge, that aggression, like a deadly plague, knows no limits, respects no boundaries. But these voices were not heeded, and the opportunity was lost to quarantine aggression and thus to check it before it had gathered momentum. To this extent, we have ourselves been responsible for the peril in which we stand today.

The shock of the war's outbreak cleared our minds.
With the march of dictatorship the threat to our own security became apparent. With the fall of France we awoke to action.

We have rejected the mockery that extends its sympathy to the victims of aggression but withholds its aid.

We are providing the full measure of our material assistance to the last remaining democracy of Europe in its fight for freedom.

But more, we have shed our illusion of security and have recognized that it is the British navy and not the Atlantic Ocean that is our first line of defense. We are accordingly providing the fullest measure of our material assistance to the British in their fight to halt the westward march of dictatorship. We shall augment that aid. Month by month and day by day, we shall swell the flow as our strength permits. What our sympathy dictates, our security makes imperative.

We have learned well the lesson of Europe’s course of appeasement, a course which in the first small compromise seems reasonable, but which leads inexorably to total surrender. We have determined to defend, not our shores alone, but the whole of the Western Hemisphere. We shall not wait for the invader to reach our shores; we shall fight to prevent his gaining a foothold anywhere in the Americas. We shall not
We shall not make concessions; we shall not appease.

We have learned well from European experience the lesson of partial defense, the lesson of half-way measures. We are determined to confront the threat of total aggression with a total defense. We are determined to spend whatever sums, to devote whatever resources, to make whatever sacrifices this may require. We shall never put a price upon our security and our freedom.

We are a mighty Nation, awake to the perils that confront us. We are moving swiftly to marshal our vast resources, to build and to man vast armaments. We are a united Nation, resolved to maintain our freedom, come what may. This Nation, it has been well said, is an awakened giant, slow to anger, terrible in wrath. Let the aggressor beware.

The magnitude of our defense effort, the unity of purpose and the swiftness with which we are marshaling our strength, bear witness to the fact that in the face of the threat from beyond the seas we have not been and we shall not be, found wanting. Ours is a faith which holds us in unswerving allegiance, and ours is the capacity of hand and brain to defend it well.
NOTE:

The reference to Montesquieu on p. 1 comes from Holmes' speech on "Law and the Court" on February 15, 1913 in which he said:

"I have no belief in panaceas and almost none in sudden ruin. I believe with Montesquieu that if the chance of a battle -- I may add, the passage of a law -- has ruined a state, there was a general cause at work that made the state ready to perish by a single battle or a law."
On candidates and on election issues, I would rather
trust the aggregate judgment of all the people in a factory --
the president, all the vice presidents, the board of directors,
the managers, the foremen, plus all the laborers -- rather
than the judgment of the few people in charge. On such
questions the aggregate total judgment of a farm owner,
farm and all the farm hands will be sounder than that of
the farm owner alone. I would rather rely on the aggregate
opinion, on matters affecting government, of a railroad
president, its superintendents, its engineers, foremen,
brakeemen, conductors, trainmen, telegraphers, porters and
all the others, than on the sole opinion of the few in
control of management.
On candidates and on election issues, I would rather trust the aggregate judgment of all the people in a factory — the president, all the vice presidents, the board of directors, the managers, the foremen, plus all the laborers — rather than the judgment of the few people in charge. On such questions the aggregate total judgment of a farm owner, farmer and all the farm hands will be sounder than that of the farm owner alone. I would rather rely on the aggregate opinion, on matters affecting government, of a railroad president, its superintendents, its engineers, foremen, brakemen, conductors, trainmen, telegraphers, porters and all the others, than on the sole opinion of the few in control of management.
These fundamental truths have become commonplace among Americans, except only in a very few places. But it is well constantly to keep them in mind in order to understand what has happened in other lands.
These fundamental truths have become commonplace among Americans, except only in a very few places. But it is well constantly to keep them in mind in order to understand what has happened in other lands.
SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
SEPTEMBER 20, 1830.

In this strange period of relapse in the history of the world, when in some lands it has become a custom to burn books and to fix by government decree the national forms of religion, morality and culture, it is more than a mere routine to join with you in happily celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of this University of Pennsylvania.

I am honored in becoming an alumnus. The very foundation of this institution was concerned with freedom of religious teaching and free learning for the many who could not pay for higher education.

I am told that it was originally thought of as a place where the good and Reverend Doctor Whitehead might preach his religion without certain difficulties which the old conservative respectability of Philadelphia threw in his path; indeed, it was to make it unnecessary for him to preach in the sun and rain of the open fields when the doors of the established churches were closed against him. And it was the dream of its founders to make it a source of
education to the children of the artisans of the city, the poor
who otherwise would go untaught.

The survival and growth of the University through these
two centuries are particularly symbolical of the eternal strength
of freedom in human thought and action.

Here is living proof of the validity and force of a
single-minded service to the cause of truth.

Events in the world are making the great masses of our
citizens think more and more clearly about the manner of growth
of their liberty and freedom, and how hard their people through
these two centuries have worked to win and hold the privilege
of free government.

When this institution was first inspired by the earliest
liberal among American patriots, Benjamin Franklin, there had
already developed strong national governments in Europe which
had become sufficiently powerful to impose peace and prevent
violence among their populace. The earlier system of small
independent and warring barons and principalities had given
way to strong national governments, with centralised political
power.
But even by that time there was a growing feeling that
government was too often conducted solely for the benefit of
a privileged few at the expense of the overwhelming majority
of the population. With that feeling there had come gradually
into being in various nations, bodies of representatives of the
citizen people to provide limitations on arbitrary power through
popular or representative participation in government.

Soon thereafter came the American Revolution itself,
which brought about for those Colonies political independence
from the rule of force by monarchical and aristocratic power
abroad.

With our winning of political freedom came the conflict
between the point of view of Alexander Hamilton, sincerely
believing in the superiority of government by a small group of
public-spirited and usually wealthy citizens, and the point of
view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of government by represen-
tatives of all the people, an advocate of the universal
right of free thought, free personal living, free religion,
free expression of opinion and, above all, the right of
universal suffrage.
It cannot be denied that Hamilton, by reason of the
genial recognition of his own unselfishness as to himself and
as to his associates in places of high responsibility, had
acquired a very large following among the people of his day.
His adherents probably constituted even a majority of those
who were entitled to vote.

The better elements of the Jeffersonian school were
frank to admit the high motives and disinterestedness of
Hamilton and his school, and were willing to concede that if
government could be guaranteed to be kept always on the high
level of unselfish service suggested by the Hamiltonians there
would be nothing to fear. For the very basis of the Hamiltonian
philosophy was that through a system of elections every four
years, limited to the votes of the best educated and the most
successful citizens, the best of those qualified to govern
could always be selected.

It was with rare perspicuity, however, that Jefferson
pointed out that, on the doctrine of sheer human frailty, the
Hamilton theory was bound to develop into government by selfish-
ness or government for personal gain or government by class,
which would ultimately lead to the abolition of free elections.
So long as the voters of the nation regardless of higher education or property possessions were free to exercise their choice, without hindrance, in the polling place, the country would have no cause to fear the abandonment of free elections and the substitution of the hand of tyranny.

At all times in our history since Hamilton, there have been many Americans who still sought to confine the ballot to limited groups of people. A quarter of a century ago, President Eliot of Harvard summarized his views as to one phase of this when he said to me "Roosevelt, I am convinced that even though we have multiplied our universities in every state of the Union, even though higher learning seems to have come into its own, if the ballot were to be confined to the holders of college degrees, the nation would go on the rocks in a very few years". It may seem ungracious in a very new degree holder to say this to this audience of older degree holders, but my authority for this view is a great educator, noted for his effort to disseminate college educational facilities throughout the country.

If a citizen owns a farm, employing a farmer and his wife and several farm hands, their aggregate judgment on election day on matters of government would probably be sounder than if the right to vote were confined to the farm owner himself.
If with the help of a Board of Directors, a large number of Vice Presidents, and a group of managers and foremen, a citizen runs a factory or a series of factories, I would rather trust the aggregate judgment on candidates and on election issues of all those who toil in the plants with their hands, than a judgment confined to the few people at the top. If I were the President of a railroad, I would rather, in matters affecting government, trust the aggregate opinion of the steersmen and firemen and brakemen and conductors and trainmen and telegraphers and porters and all the others, than have the right to the franchise confined to myself and the few division superintendents at the top.

Only too often in our political history, we know that the few at the top have tried to advise or dictate to the many lower down how they should vote, sometimes even using threats and dire prophecies of scanty pay envelopes unless their advice was followed. Fortunately for the preservation of democracy such self-constituted repositories of political wisdom have met with little success.

Even today in certain quarters there are, I regret to say, demands for a return of government to the control of those few, who, because of business ability or economic eminence, are supposed to be just a touch above the average of the present
governmental system. As in the days of Hamilton, we of our own
generation should give them all credit for pure intention and
high ideals. Nevertheless, their type of political thinking could
with ease lead to government by selfish seekers for power and
riches and glory. For the great danger is that once the govern-
ment falls into the hands of a few elite -- a few supermen --
curtailment or even abolition of free elections might be adopted
as the means of keeping them in power.

As long as periodic free elections survive, no set of
people can permanently control government because each election
is a new election and not a recurrence of an old election. Com-
plete and permanent safety of our form of government rests, there-
fore, in maintaining free elections for four years.

Always in our history there have been those who would
demagogue their way into places of responsibility. They usually
are able to obtain large followings among unthinking or dis-
satisfied people and among those who see therein a short-cut
to office for themselves. There is much shouting and tumult;
they rise high and fast. But the decline and fall of the
demagogue is generally equally swift. Why? Because of the
simple fact that our system of periodic free elections still
lives; and the sense of humor and intelligence of the American
voter still persists. The untrammeled language of the demagogue has always furnished living and vital proof that free elections in the United States and freedom of speech at election time are still with us -- and should be.

I have said this because it is so significant by way of contrast to things which have happened in other lands. A decade ago, for example, the German people grew weary of privilege and despaired of the processes of their democracy, which were based on the free use of the franchise. They were willing to lend ear to a new cult called "Nazism" -- a minority group which professed extraordinary patriotism and offered bread and shelter and better government through the rule of a handful of persons boasting of special aptitude of government. In those days the principal emphasis was placed on the purity of purpose of this special group. Nothing was said about abolishing of free elections. Many people of large business affairs, dissatisfied with the democratic system, formed political and economic alliances with this small group.

You and I know the subsequent history of Germany. The right of free elections, the free choice of heads of government, were quickly wiped out. It is a travesty on fact to claim that there is any free choice of governors in that nation today, or
that there ever has been one since 1823.

What Jefferson prophesied might happen in this country,
if the philosophy of the restricted vote and government by
special class were adopted, did actually happen in Germany.

Many years ago, in speaking in San Francisco, I pointed
out that new conditions imposed new requirements upon government
and upon those who conducted government. As Jefferson wrote a
long time ago: "I know also that laws and institutions must go
hand in hand with the progress of the human mind . . . a new
discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and
opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions
must advance also, and keep pace with the times.

We follow that rule today as readily as then, on the
sole condition that any change in institutions or in economic
methods must remain within the continuing framework of a freely
elected democratic form of government.

I have pointed out many times that Western migration
and the free use of unoccupied lands have ended with the advent
of the industrial age and that certain controls have become
necessary to prevent relatively small financial and industrial
groups from harming or cutting the throats of other very large
groups.
It is the function of education to provide continuity for our national life — to transmit to youth the best of our culture which has been tested in the fire of history. It is equally the obligation of education to train the minds and the talents of our youth to improve, through creative citizenship, our American institutions in accord with the requirements of the future.

We cannot build the future for our youth; we can only build our youth for the future.

Growth and change are the law of all life. Yesterday's answers are inadequate for today's problems — just as the solutions of today will not fill the needs of tomorrow.

Principles and ideals are changeless; methods and details are mutable.

It is in great universities like this that the ideas which can assure our national safety and make tomorrow's history are being forged and shaped. Civilization owes most to the men and women, known and unknown, whose free, inquiring minds could not be subdued by power, whose restless intellects could not be bought by the popes and power of the mightiest of tyrants. They may live in catacombs or in exile; their bodies may be mutilated and tortured, but their ideas cannot be blocked out.
The greatest tragedy of this tragic period is that men seek escape from their own failure to adapt their thinking to new facts of civilization by revolting against reason and religion. They seek escape from their own failures by substituting force for morality, by burning books, by exiling scholars, by spurning learning, by degrading art, and by denying God.

Let us not err: this revolt against ideals of civilization laced living and culture symbolizes not physical triumph alone, for it also admits intellectual failure.

If the disciples of that revolt in our own land—and there are already too many of them in places high and places low—should increase their strength, we who take pride in our learning and our peaceful humanities will not escape our share of the shame and blame.

It is the task of men of thought even more than men of action, if democracy is to survive, to put aside pride and prejudice and with courage and single-minded devotion—and above all with humility—find the truth and teach the truth that shall make men free.
More than at any moment in the lives of our generation
do we come with reverence and with determination to the truth
of the poet's words:

"On our own heads, in our own hearts, the sin and the
saving lie".
SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
SEPTEMBER 20, 1940.

This is a strange period of relapse in the history of the
civilization of the world, when in some lands it has become the
custom to burn the books of scholars and to fix by government
decree the national forms of religion, morality and culture.
In such a time it is more than a mere formality to join with
you in celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of this free
and independent institution of scholarship. I am honored in
becoming an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania.

The very foundation of this university was concerned with
freedom of religious teaching and with free learning for the
many who could not pay for higher education. It was originally
proposed as a place where the good and Reverend Doctor George
Whitehead might preach his religion without certain difficulties
which the old conservatives of Philadelphia threw in his path. If
indeed, it was to make it unnecessary for him to preach in the
sun and rain of the open fields, when the doors of the established
churches were closed against him. And it was the dream of the
founders to make it a source of education to the children of
the artisans of the city, the poor who otherwise would go
untaught.
The survival and growth of the University through these two centuries are particularly symbolic of the eternal strength which is inherent in the American concept of the freedom of human thought and action. Here is living proof of the validity and force of single-minded service to the cause of truth.

Events in the world are making the vast majority of our citizens think more and more clearly about the manner of the growth of their liberty and freedom, and how hard their people have fought and worked to win and hold the privilege of free government.

With the winning of our political freedom came the conflict between the point of view of Alexander Hamilton, sincerely believing in the superiority of government by a small group of public-spirited and usually wealthy citizens, and the point of view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of government by representatives of all the people, an advocate of the universal right of free thought, free personal living, free religion, free expression of opinion and, above all, the right of universal suffrage.

Many of the Jeffersonian school were frank to admit the high motives and disinterestedness of Hamilton and his school. Many Americans of those days were willing to concede that if
government could be guaranteed to be kept always on the high level of unselfish service suggested by the Hamiltonians there would be nothing to fear. For the very basis of the Hamiltonian philosophy was that through a system of elections every four years, limited to the votes of the most highly educated and the most successful citizens, the best of those qualified to govern could always be selected.

It was with rare perspicuity, however, that Jefferson pointed out that, on the doctrine of sheer human frailty, the Hamilton theory was bound to develop into government by selfishness or government for personal gain or government by class, which would ultimately lead to the abdication of free elections. For he recognized that it was our system of free unhampered elections which was the surest guaranty of popular government. So long as the voters of the nation, regardless of higher education or property possessions, were free to exercise their choice in the polling place without hindrance, the country would have no cause to fear the hand of tyranny.

At all times in our history since Hamilton, there have been many Americans who have still sought to confine the ballot to limited groups of people. A quarter of a century ago, President Eliot of Harvard summarized his views when he said to me:
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"Roosevelt, I am convinced that even though we have multiplied our universities in every state of the Union, even though higher learning seems to have come into its own, if the ballot were to be confined to the holders of college degrees, the nation would go on the rocks in a very few years". It may seem ungracious for a very new degree-holder to say this to this audience of older degree-holders, but my authority for this view is a great educator, noted for his efforts to disseminate college education throughout the country.

I agree with him thoroughly in his estimate of the superior ability of the whole of the voters to pass upon political and social issues in free and unhampered elections as against the exclusive ability of a smaller group of individuals at the top of the social structure.

If with the help of a Board of Directors, a large number of Vice Presidents, and a group of managers and foremen, a citizen runs a factory or a series of factories, I would rather trust the aggregate judgment on candidates and on election issues of them and of those who toil in the plants with their hands, than a judgment confined to the few people in charge. If a citizen, owning a farm, employs a farmer and his wife and several farm hands, their aggregate or total judgment on election day on matters of government would be sounder than if the
judgment were confined to the farm owner himself. If I were the
President of a railroad, I would rather, in matters affecting
government, trust the aggregate opinion of the management plus
that of the engineers and firemen and brakemen and conductors
and trainmen and telegraphers and porters and all the others,
than have the right to the franchise restricted to myself and
the few division superintendents.

Only too often in our political history, the few at the
top have tried to advise or dictate to the many lower down how
they should vote.

Even today in certain quarters there are, I regret to say,
demands for a return of government to the control of those few,
who, because of business ability or economic omniscience, are
supposed to be just a touch above the average of our citizens.
As in the days of Hamilton, we of our own generation should
give them all credit for pure intention and high ideals.
Nevertheless, their type of political thinking could easily
lead to government by selfish seekers for power and riches and
 glory. For the great danger is that once the government falls
into the hands of a few elite, curtailment or even abolition
of free elections might be adopted as the means of keeping them
in power.
As long as periodic free elections survive, no set of people can permanently control government. Complete and enduring safety of our form of government rests, therefore, in maintaining free elections.

No dictator in history has ever dared to run the gauntlet of a really free election.

I have said this because it is so significant by way of contrast to things which have happened in other lands. A decade ago, for example, the German people despaired of the processes of their democracy, which were based on the free use of the franchise. They were willing to lend ear to a new cult called "Nazism" -- a minority group which professed extraordinary patriotism, and offered bread and shelter and better government through the rule of a handful of persons boasting of special aptitude for government. In those days loudly professed emphasis was placed by this special group on their own purity of purpose. Nothing was said about abolishing free elections. Many people of large business affairs, influenced by several factors, and dissatisfaction with the democratic system, formed political and economic alliances with this small group.
You and I know the subsequent history of Germany. The right of free elections, the free choice of heads of government, were suddenly wiped out by a new regime. It is a travesty on fact to claim that there is any free choice of public officials in that nation today, or that there ever has been once since 1933.

What Jefferson prophesied might happen in this country, if the philosophy of the restricted vote and of government by special class were adopted, did actually happen in Germany.

Many years ago, speaking in San Francisco, I pointed out that new conditions imposed new requirements upon government and upon those who conducted government. As Jefferson wrote a long time ago: "I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind . . . . As new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

We must follow that rule today as readily as then, with the sole condition that any change in institutions or in economic methods must remain within the continuing framework of a freely elected democratic form of government.
I have pointed out many times that Western migration
and the free use of unoccupied lands have ended with the
advent of the industrial age; that with the changes wrought by
new inventions of steam and electricity, new relationships
have arisen between small units of finance and industry on one
side and the great mass of workers and small business men on
the other side; and that certain government controls have
become necessary to prevent the relatively small financial and
industrial groups from harming or cutting the throats of other
very large groups, smaller in size but much greater in numbers.

We have at the same time -- largely through the processes
of education -- developed new beliefs in our responsibilities
to humanity as a whole. It is a relatively new thing in
American life to consider that the duties and relationships
of government are to its starved people or unemployed people,
and to take steps to fulfill its responsibilities to them.
A generation ago people had scarcely given thought to the
terms "social security", "minimum wages" or "maximum hours".

It is only within recent years that government has
given its attention in a serious, effective way to the
insurance of bank deposits, to soil conservation, relief
to farmers and to farm tenants, development of cheap electric
water power, reclamation of fertile soil by proper use of water
and forests; to the prevention of fraud and deceit in the sale
of securities; to the assurance of the principle of collective
bargaining by workers in industry; to government assistance to
the blind and the handicapped; or to the need of taking care
of elderly people without throwing them into the poorhouse.

These are some of the new instruments of social justice
which democracy has forged in America during the last seven
years to meet the new conditions of industry, agriculture,
finance and labor -- conditions which had been neglected too
long and which were beginning to endanger our internal security.

These are the means which our own generation have adopted to
overcome the threats to economic democracy in our land --
threats which in other lands led quickly to political despotism.

Benjamin Franklin, to whom this University owes so much,
realized too that while basic principles of natural science,
of morality, and of the science of society were eternal and
immutable, the application of these principles necessarily
change with the patterns of living conditions from generation
to generation. I am certain that he would insist that it is
the whole duty of the philosopher and the educator to apply
the eternal ideals of truth and goodness and justice in terms
of the present and not of the past. Growth and change are
the law of all life. Yesterday's answers are inadequate for today's problems — just as the solutions of today will not fill the needs of tomorrow.

Eternal truths will be neither true nor eternal unless they have fresh meaning for every new social situation.

It is the function of education to provide continuity for our national life — to transmit to youth the best of our culture which has been tested in the fire of history. It is equally the obligation of education to train the minds and the talents of our youth to improve, through creative citizenship, our American institutions in accord with the requirements of the future.

We cannot always build the future of our youth; we can build our youth for the future.

It is in great universities like this that the ideas which can assure our national safety and make tomorrow's history, are being forged and shaped. Civilization owes most to the men and women, known and unknown, whose free, inquiring minds and restless intellects could not be subdued by the power of tyranny. They may live in exile; their bodies may be mutilated and tortured, but their ideas cannot be blotted.
This is no time for any man to withdraw into some ivory tower and proclaim the right to hold himself aloof from the problems and the agonies of his society. The times call for bold belief that the world can be changed by man's endeavor, and that this endeavor can lead to something new and better. No man can sever the bonds which unite him to his society simply by averting his eyes. He must ever be receptive and sensitive to the new; and have sufficient courage and skill to face novel facts and to deal with them. He must be trained to measure and appraise in a realistic sense the old and the familiar — and to judge whether they fit the contours of new conditions or whether they are merely phrases and formulas suited to a departed past.

If democracy is to survive, it is the task of men of thought, as well as men of action, to put aside pride and prejudice; and with courage and single-minded devotion — and above all with humility — to find the truth and teach the truth that shall keep men free.
Benjamin Franklin recognized no value higher than the truth, no form of life more honorable than one spent in single-minded service to its cause. No man more truly practiced what he preached. And so he founded the Academy from which two hundred years ago grew your great University. It cannot be claimed that Franklin was the greatest of scientists or the profoundest of thinkers, but probably no man, unless it be Aristotle, ever possessed a wider range, a more insatiable curiosity, a mind at once so balanced and so flexible. It was no mere curiosity, however, which prompted Franklin’s inquiries. He desired to expand the frontiers of knowledge because he knew that without knowledge there could be no freedom and no happiness worthy the name.

Franklin lived in a world not so unlike our own. The tempo of history had risen sharply, and violent forces hitherto latent beneath the surface had begun to shake and transform the world in their struggle. A new world was rapidly coming into being and Franklin, more perhaps than of any other man of his age, welcomed it and promoted its fruition. He wished to see men lead their lives in peace and dignity. He believed, and the leading thinkers of his generation believed with him, that such lives could be attained only if knowledge
became more widespread, if truth ceased to be the mystery of
the specialist and became the natural possession of the whole
society and the conscious foundation of its life. He believed
that the basic principles of natural science and of morality
and of that science of society which he virtually founded, were
 eternal and immutable. But he equally believed that as con-
ditions altered — natural, social, political conditions —
so the application of these principles necessarily changed.
Since security and liberty depend upon the just and sensitive
application of those rules to the infinitely various and
changing patterns of social life, it is the whole duty of the
philosopher — and by that Franklin meant any man who pursued
truth for its own sake — to discover the proper application
of eternal principles of truth and goodness and justice to
his own generation in terms of the present and not of the
past. And having discovered them,  man must learn wherein
the practice of them consists in the particular situation
in which they were placed.

Franklin differed from other speculative minds
more especially in that no man ever did more to give practical
effect to this thinking. And well might he, as so many later
thinkers, have declared that the times were out of joint,
and taken hereafter in some particular world, wholly occupied
in some theoretical investigation a discursive note and glance
for the tragic turmoil of the world without. He took the
positive course as alone consistent with his principles.
Expert on agriculture and currency and education, politician,
diplomat, legislator, Franklin used his great and varied gifts
in the service of the society to which he belonged. No man
more fervently believed that the principles of thought and
action were truly eternal and discoverable by the patient
effort of human reason. But no man would have been more amazed
and more horrified that men took this effort of it as a reason
for withdrawing from the world into some ivory tower, and pro-
claimed the right to hold themselves aloof from the problems
and the agonies of their society. Such a man would have
seemed to him singularly blind -- blind because they assume
that because science has its independent end, they hope to
escape the fate of their society, a fate which their own
irresponsibility may help to render tragic; blind also because
they cannot see that the principles without social content
are empty, just as society content without principles are
meaningless. Franklin teaches us that eternal truths are
neither true nor eternal unless they have fresh meaning for
every new social situation.

Since the conditions of human society are per-
petually changing, and at times drastically changing, to proclaim the truths of yesterday in the terms of yesterday and to insist that they are still true in the old form in the conditions which give rise to that form for another truth, as to misunderstand the old truths and distort new facts to fit them. Such mis-application of old truths is to understand neither what varies nor what is permanent in the world in which we live.

Men do not believe, until it is too late, that things will not materially alter, that what has happened in the past will probably recur in the future. It requires bold and original effort to believe, and to act on the belief, that the world can be changed by man's endeavor and that this endeavor can lead to the emergence of something new and unprecedented and better. Franklin did believe this and kindled his contemporaries with his faith.

He helped to build the world in which we live as a powerful and respected people, he did much to formulate the moral foundation on which it rests, and even more the concrete political form which it received. By wedding old truths long embedded in the moral consciousness of mankind to the new era he created a framework within which progress was possible. It
was possible because the framework which he devised in itself
tended to meet the contours of new conditions, thereby avoiding
enlargement to the extent and the speculations which constitute
deterioration, a departure.

Franklin thus asked himself what constituted
the liberty, happiness, equality of opportunity in American society
of the Eighteenth century and conceived the answer in concrete
social, political, economic terms. Having found the answer
he was prepared to fight, and if need be, die for its realiza-
tion, since the society which is not free nor happy nor capable
of becoming so contains no civilized motive which makes life
worth preserving.

We, too, in our time are called upon to render our
account: to say that we take the sacred words, the right to
life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to signify in the
terms of today, to say, though we fall short of it,
we too are prepared to fight and, if need be, die in defending
secured as much of it as we have acquired. This college, a necessity
ourselves, for the questioning reason, we owe in large part to Benjamin
Franklin. His precepts and even more his example has taught us
much which we took for granted as part of our national heritage:
that without freedom of inquiry there can be neither learning
nor science; that science and learning are social necessities; that the educated are the leaders and guides in uncertain days and dark times or else they are nothing; that no man can sever the bonds which unite him to his society by simply averting his eyes. I believe I loyally interpret the spirit of Franklin when I say that to pursue truth for its own sake is to apply the eternal principles to new, unfamiliar facts and derive new, unfamiliar conclusions; that it needs courage to perceive and to act upon such conclusions; that liberty and justice can always be discerned from their opposites; are always worth fighting for and can be won only by fighting. Franklin revered tradition but helped invent a new form of government in the world and yet in this there is no paradox since the situation in America of his day was peculiar. If the frame work which he had devised had been not subtly wrought, evil social pressure would have broken it or else it would have led to misery and social dislocation. Franklin founded this University to train men minds against the grain, to make them critical of the old set and the state and the old familiar, to be receptive and sensitive to the new and the unparalleled, to give them sufficient courage to face new facts, sufficient skill to deal with them. Only insofar as they do this do our universities and their teachers perform their duty to the nation.