immediately to the mental part, is yet to train every part. It is doing its full duty only when it causes man to regulate appetite, to crush passion, to guide desires, to quicken affections, to prevent wrong, and to stimulate right choices." While this has been more or less recognized as the aim of undergraduate teaching, it has not been pursued at all effectively as an important objective of adult education. A proper program of instruction beyond the college years will embrace both professional and cultural training, and will be as carefully prepared as undergraduate curricula.

It is direct responsibility for adherence to a broad and sound program of education from the freshman year to the end of life which is at once the distinguishing characteristic and glory of the state university. Its administrators and faculties have serious responsibilities not necessarily shared by members of the staffs of privately endowed schools, which can limit their activities as they may be inclined. In compensation, however, for the greater burden of obligations the staff members of the state institution which lives up to its responsibilities have the satisfaction of being always on the front line of social progress and of being able to realize to the fullest that "*thoroughly* to teach another is the best way to learn for yourself."

The Chairman of the Board of Trustees, the Hon. Frank Harris Hiscock, formally installed President Day in office, saying:

President Day, it is my pleasant duty and conspicuous honor in behalf of the Board of Trustees of Cornell University, with which you are to be so closely associated, to confide to your custody the Charter and the Seal of the University, and formally to declare that you are now inducted as President of Cornell University.

And to these formal words of induction I can not forbear to add in behalf of my associates and myself, the

From: PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES AT THE INAUGURATION OF EDMUND EZRA DAY, FIFTH PRESIDIDENT OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY
8 October 1937

Board of Trustees, with which, as I have said, you will be so closely associated, the earnest hope and the supreme confidence that your administration of this great office will be fruitful of results, successful, and distinguished.

President Day responded:

Judge Hiscock, Governor Lehman, Distinguished Guests, Fellow Teachers, Fellow Cornellians, My Friends, one and all: May I preface my more formal remarks by acknowledging with deepest gratitude the messages which have been conveyed by the three presidents. I have been genuinely touched by what they have said. I thank them from the bottom of my heart, and I would add that for the three institutions which they represent I have an admiration and an affection which I am sure will last as long as I live.

President Day delivered

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

On the occasion of the formal opening of this University on the 7th of October 1868—sixty-nine years and one day ago—the first president, Andrew Dickson White, in whom the University was so rarely blessed, delivered a notable address. For a generation the ideas set forth by President White in this opening statement were Cornell's educational magna charta. Even today the ideas bear so significantly upon the structure and policy of the University that I venture to present them once more. I quote from the recapitulation in President White's Autobiography (I, 341-2):

"They [my ideas] were grouped in four divisions. The first of these related to 'Foundation Ideas,' which were announced as follows: First, the close union of liberal and practical instruction; second, unsectarian control; third,

a living union between the university and the whole school system of the State; fourth, concentration of revenues for advanced education. The second division was that of 'Formulative Ideas'; and under these—First, equality between different courses of study. In this I especially developed ideas which had occurred to me as far back as my observations after graduation at Yale, where the classical students belonging to the 'college proper' were given a sort of supremacy, and scientific students relegated to a separate institution at considerable distance, and therefore deprived of much general, and even special, culture which would have greatly benefited them. Indeed, they seemed not considered as having souls to be saved, since no provision was made for them at the college chapel. Second, increased development of scientific studies. The third main division was that of 'Governmental Ideas'; and under these—First, 'the regular and frequent infusion of new life into the governing board.' Here a system at that time entirely new in the United States was proposed. Instead of the usual life tenure of trustees, their term was made five years and they were to be chosen by ballot. Secondly, it was required that as soon as the graduates of the university numbered fifty they should select one trustee each year, thus giving the alumni one third of the whole number elected. Third, there was to be a system of self-government administered by the students themselves. As to this third point, I must frankly confess that my ideas were vague, unformed, and finally changed by the logic of events. As the fourth and final main division, I presented 'Permeating Ideas'; and of these—First, the development of the individual man in all his nature, in all his powers, as a being intellectual, moral, and religious. Secondly, bringing the powers of the man thus developed to bear usefully upon society.

"In conclusion, I alluded to two groups of 'Eliminated Ideas,' the first of these being the 'Ideas of the Pedants,' and the second the 'Ideas of the Philistines.' As to the former, I took pains to guard the institution from those who, in the higher education, substitute dates for history, gerund-grinding for literature, and formulas for science; as to the latter, I sought to guard it from the men to whom 'Gain is God, and Gunnybags his Prophet.' "

It is hard for us in 1937 to appreciate how revolutionary some of these ideas were in 1868. Cornell for a time was a movement of revolt in American education. Its organization, its curriculum, its general program were a challenge to existing American educational forms and practices. Widespread adoptions have since transformed many of President White's more radical notions into the accepted, and hence conservative, practices of these later days. Some of his other ideas, as yet unfulfilled or thus far effectually thwarted, still carry their original power. Unless I am mistaken, higher education in America would experience a further important lift if President White's ideas of 1868 were to prevail even more fully than they have. Let me in due course be more explicit.

In exposing my own thinking on this occasion it is not my purpose to announce policies. The design of inaugural addresses has never, as far as I know, been formally determined. I can imagine an address given over to a bold formulation of projected undertakings. But this would imply that the policies of the university may appropriately be to a large extent of the president's own contriving. Such is not my conception of the relationship of the head of the institution to policy-making. Thorough inquiry, full and free discussion, cooperative formulation, all seem to me to be necessary preliminaries to formal action. Until the new administration has had opportunity to

consult and confer with faculty, students, alumni, trustees and experienced and friendly advisers outside, its disposition will be to hold new policies in abeyance. That does not mean that the new president does not have ideas here and now about policies he would like to see the University adopt. It does mean that he is prepared to subject such ideas as he has to the give-and-take of thorough examination and full discussion by all parties in interest.

Despite the force of these observations, it is reasonable to expect an incoming university or college president to bring into the open at the outset some of his more firmly set attitudes and ideas—not to mention attachments and prejudices. Certainly this is in order if the president is hoping that others will follow that course. At the risk of dealing too summarily with important topics, I propose, therefore, to comment upon certain phases of current higher education in America with the idea that the views I express may facilitate the later development of sound and constructive university program.

It would be interesting, and, I think, fruitful, in this connection to entertain in turn each one of the ideas of President White's opening address, and to subject each to critical examination in the light of educational developments during the sixty-nine years that have elapsed since they were voiced. Perhaps some later occasion will afford opportunity for just such a venture. Today limitations of time, as well as the nature of the occasion, preclude so wide a commentary. Instead I shall speak from the text of President White's two "permeating ideas" regarding the functions of the University: "First, the development of the individual man in all his nature, in all his powers, as a being intellectual, moral, and religious; secondly, bringing the powers of the man thus developed to bear usefully upon society."

In some ways it is strange that it should be necessary to reaffirm that the primary function of a university is to promote the intellectual life. Yet so potent are the divisive and distracting forces of contemporary society that universities appear at times to be anything but centers of intellectual activity. Like other social institutions, they get caught in political agitations, in reform movements, in recreational programs, in social and community activities, with the inevitable result that the intellectual drive loses primacy.

A great university should be a place in which there are relatively undisturbed opportunities to live with ideas. Much of life is otherwise engaged. But on campuses such as this thoughtful men and women, of faculty and student body alike, should be led to seek out all sorts of ideas: ideas that are deeply rooted in human experience; ideas that, like constellations in the intellectual firmament, have guided the earlier mariners of human thought; ideas that have more recently opened the doors of new knowledge of nature and of man; ideas that afford the foundation of our systems of law and order, of justice and liberty. Men and women on a campus like this should learn how knowledge is gained and wisdom won. They should through practice improve their command of the difficult art of critical thinking. They should come to know something of the nature of imaginative and creative thinking. They should acquaint themselves with the race's heritage of accumulated wisdom. They should strive for intelligence. They should learn what it means to abide with reason. They should, through sustained effort, achieve accessions of intellectual power. They should, in brief, through their common interests and activities here in this university, come to know what is really meant by the intellectual life.

This is no academic plea. Nor is it an ideal that need not be too seriously taken. The place of intelligence in culture is being currently challenged in ways that may well give us all pause. When men in power conclude that ideas should come from authority and not from thought, men of reason must give battle. The liberal tradition to which the democratic peoples the world over owe allegiance cannot survive in a climate unfavorable to free inquiry. If the liberal tradition is to be sustained there must be an unswerving belief in the capacity of the people for intelligent action; there must be a readiness on the part of the people to follow intelligent leadership; and there must be, wisely protected and adequately supported, centers of higher learning in which intelligence is assiduously cultivated and has free play.

This does not mean that our universities should become cloistered institutions remote from the affairs of the day. They should accept exposure to the whole world of ideas and phenomena, including those of contemporary society. The intellectual life is not a life of quiet ease. Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke to this point in this passage:

"God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take which you please—you can never have both. Between these, as a pendulum, man oscillates. He in whom the love of repose dominates will accept the first creed, the first philosophy, the first political party he meets—most likely his father's. He gets rest, commodity, and reputation; but he shuts the door to truth. He in whom the love of truth predominates will keep himself aloof from all moorings, and afloat. He will abstain from dogmatism, and recognize all the opposite negations, between which, as walls, his being is swung. He submits to the inconvenience of suspense and imperfect opinion, but he is a candidate for truth, as the other is not, and

respects the highest law of his being." "Candidates for truth"—that is what university men and women should be. Why are they not more uniformly so?

Two sets of forces operate to make it difficult for our universities to maintain the primacy of the intellectual function. The forces of the first set are external: they inhere in the nature of the surrounding culture.

Reference has already been made to the current eclipse of the liberal tradition. Force is in the field, armed, aggressive and arrogant. War in some quarters has become so natural a phase of governmental action that it no longer has to be declared. The outlook for peace-loving peoples is in certain respects most ominous. The life of the university is inevitably affected by this world situation.

Another external force of great potency is the love of money. To a dangerous degree we have come to regard the accumulation of wealth as the hallmark of individual success. Perhaps this was an unavoidable consequence of the stress laid in conquering our continent on ideals of free individual enterprise. But the love of money has dominated our social psychology to such an extent as to make the intellectual life appear to many pale and academic. The basic work of the universities becomes increasingly difficult as the intellectual life loses social esteem.

Closely affiliated with the love of money, though by no means identical with it, is the widely prevalent insistence upon vocational results in American education. Not that vocational aims are not to be granted a place in the organization of formal education. As a matter of fact, vocational interests constitute an invaluable aid over a wide range of educational undertaking. At times, and with certain types of students, education apparently cannot be made effective except as it is made primarily vocational.

The essential difficulties arise from the fact that vocational interests are in many instances narrow in outlook and distressingly short-sighted as to the ways and means by which a durable vocational competence is to be developed. The best training for a position may be an enhancement of intelligence and intellectual power without explicit reference to the more technical skills the position requires. It is quite likely that most of these technical skills should be taught on the job, not in the school or college. In so far as the cultivation of the intellectual life in our universities is put under narrow vocational pressures, the primary purposes of the university are in some measure defeated.

This same type of consideration arises in connection with all sorts of practical demands upon our institutions of higher learning. Let me not be misunderstood. It is the duty of a great university to serve the society in which it carries on. But it is equally the duty of the university to apply its resources so as to maintain that service permanently. It is for the long pull that our universities exist. Practical men commonly want quick results. As a people we are afflicted at times with attacks of unwarranted impatience. Even our leaders sometimes succumb. All through our political and economic life are evidences of the virus of immediacy. We forget that the course of civilization has been one long struggle to recognize the greater wisdom and efficiency of doing things in roundabout ways that are ultimately timesaving, but initially time-consuming. Our universities, like our social institutions, suffer at times from too great outside insistence upon quick practical results. Thus another external force is added to those which make it difficult for the university, even when its vision is clear, to adhere strictly to its fundamental purpose.

Additional factors stemming from within the University impede the ample cultivation of intellectual interests.

Perhaps the most obvious of these is the vocationalism to which I have already alluded. Young people are quite naturally interested in getting ready to earn a living. This to them ordinarily means specific training for some designated occupation. It is hard for them to believe that their occupational prospects are not enhanced by specific training in job techniques; it is difficult, if not impossible, for many of them to accept the principle that the best preparation for a given occupation may be general training designed to increase less specialized skills and abilities, and that the largest vocational asset they can possibly acquire is the largest growth of intellectual power they can individually achieve.

Most of the colleges and schools of Cornell are vocational in character. Thus we have the Engineering College, the College of Architecture, the College of Agriculture, the College of Home Economics, the College of Veterinary Medicine, the Law School, the Medical College. That these units are openly vocational implies no inferiority of position: sound training for a worthy vocational career is one of the most valuable services the University can render. But if the University is to engage in vocational education it should do so in ways becoming an institution of higher learning devoted basically to the intellectual life. This involves recognition of at least three governing principles: (1) an emphasis upon fundamental disciplines as distinguished from immediately applicable, narrowly conceived, practical techniques; (2) a sustained pursuit, through scholarly and scientific research, of new knowledge within the field of the vocational art; and (3) a steadfast recognition of the broader implications and social obligations of the vocation for which training is being provided. This is all tantamount to saying that vocational education at the university level should be essentially professional in

character. It should, moreover, have a substantial cultural content. Soundly conducted professional education, rightly conceived, need involve no conflict with the primacy of the university's intellectual function.

What of the colleges and schools in our various universities that disclaim any direct vocational or professional aim, as, for example, the college of arts and sciences? It is in these institutions and in our independent liberal arts colleges that we may reasonably look for evidences of the intellectual life at its undergraduate best. What, in fact, do we find?

The situation varies considerably from institution to institution, from subject to subject, from student to student, and notably from professor to professor. However, it is safe to say that upon the whole the situation is far from satisfactory. Even in these colleges, in which the invading forces of vocationalism have been most effectively checked, the intellectual life is not generally promoted with clear success. Certain defects persistently characterize the scholarly work of these institutions.

The chief of these defects I venture to enumerate as follows: (1) the work of the student as organized in a series of formal courses tends to be disjointed and atomistic and lacking in cumulative or additive effect; (2) the instructional outcomes are too largely informational in character—not enough attention is devoted to the development of skills; (3) the results to a regrettable extent prove to be ephemeral; (4) the quality of student interest and effort is in general unsatisfactory—a cult of campus indifference tends to stifle student enthusiasm for things intellectual; (5) the undergraduate experiences of the student do not sufficiently induce lasting habits of self-education; and (6) the results of liberal arts education are commonly lacking in social consequence.

Lest the citation of these deficiencies be thought to constitute an overwhelming indictment of what we now have in our undergraduate colleges, let me hasten to add two further observations: (1) there are no insuperable obstacles to improvement of the present situation; and (2) in a good many instances steps have already been successfully taken to remedy some of the defects I have noted. Much remains, however, to be done.

This raises questions of ways and means which can hardly be entered upon here. That the whole matter has to be analyzed in terms of broad educational policy is quite evident. That specific instructional objectives need to be identified and newly implemented seems to me equally clear. Improved procedures and better administration may help in the whole undertaking, but the heart of the problem lies, of course, in direct teacher-student contacts. No substitute has yet been found, or is likely to be found, for the able and inspiring teacher, himself exemplifying in the flesh the rewarding experiences of the intellectual life. Here are problems with which this administration hopes to concern itself. It can hope to do so successfully only as it enlists the cooperation of both faculty and students.

As indicated in President White's statement of "permeating ideas," the university must be interested in more than the intellectual life of its students. Their health and physical education, their social activities, their moral standards and practices, their religious life and beliefs are all germane to the university's task. But the nature of the responsibility of the university for these diverse phases of student life varies greatly.

The university cannot fail to safeguard by every available means the physical health of its students while they are on the campus. This is elemental, and has long been

a recognized policy of Cornell, as of practically all other American institutions of higher learning. The same principle should hold for the mental health of the resident student body. But what of measures that bear constructively upon the later health of the students? It is here that improvements are urgently needed. It is important that young people in their late teens and early twenties acquire habits that will make as far as possible for lifelong health. Thus the acquisition of interest and skill in a form of sport that may be wisely continued in later years is good health insurance. The recent rapid expansion of intramural recreational activities among both men and women on the campus of this University is a development by all means to be encouraged. As soon as possible, facilities should be provided to make such activities an all-the-year-round experience of every able-bodied student in the university. Anything short of this program will fail to discharge the University's obligation to the health and physical development of its student body.

In general, the social life of the students should be as largely as possible of their own making. Living together in close association in the campus community should afford to the students experiences preparatory to those they will encounter in the larger and more complex communities to which they will later move. While here at the University they should learn to assume their individual shares of the burden of associated living. They should learn the requisites of effective leadership and good followership. They should learn through experience how to cooperate on common undertakings. They should learn how to be good neighbors; the world is sorely in need of more good will in day-to-day human relations. In all these things the students should have such aid and counsel from the University authorities as they need; no more. They are not likely otherwise to

achieve that social development which should constitute one valuable phase of experience for every undergraduate.

Toward the moral standards and practices of its students the University must, I think, take a somewhat different attitude. In certain respects, the moral life of the students is a student responsibility just as is their social life, but there are certain important differences. The laws and regulations of the larger community in which the University is located must be respected. Moreover the University may properly require unvarying observance of certain standards of personal conduct generally expected by the public of its self-respecting citizens. Students failing to meet these requirements should be prepared to sever their local connections. A university cannot wisely undertake to correct fundamental deficiencies of personal character; certain important character traits should have been firmly established in home and school well before the day of college matriculation.

The University may well, on the other hand, undertake to energize among its students certain impulses that in the long run profoundly affect individual character. Ideals of self-respect, of self-development, of self-directed individual responsibility should be inculcated by all available means. The love of truth and of beauty in all their forms should be fostered at every opportunity. A sense of social obligation should be induced. The time has passed when it can be assumed that social well-being will flow automatically from self-interested individual enterprise. If democratic institutions are to be preserved and individual liberty remain our proud possession, the citizen must recognize his obligation to make his life add to the common weal.

In this connection I cannot forbear quoting from a professor at Prague who was reported recently by Anne

O'Hare McCormick in the columns of *The New York Times* as having said in the course of an interview:

"Our country might conceivably be overwhelmed by superior military force. But our democracy will never be imperiled by outside attacks. Democracy is always weakened from within. Only its own feebleness or complacency destroys it. We in Europe see more clearly than you that democracy dies from lack of discipline, unwillingness to compromise, group pressure, corruption, usurpation of public power because the public is greedy or indifferent. It dies unless it draws life from every citizen. Denouncing dictators gets nowhere. The job of those who believe in the democratic process is to be positive, not negative, to build it up, expose and correct its mistakes, keep it alive. We Czechs had centuries in which to learn that nothing kills an idea that is really believed in."

To this fundamental interest of American society in service by every citizen, colleges and universities should rally every resource they can muster. As President White stated in his second "permeating idea," it is for the university to bring the powers developed in its students "to bear usefully upon society." No other purpose of education in America at this time more definitely challenges our institutions of higher learning.

This University has made provision for religious services for its students from the very beginning. They have always been entirely voluntary. The Sage preachership, endowed shortly after the University opened, has from the start been filled from week to week by leading divines of all denominations. The several churches of Ithaca share effectively in the religious work that is done among the university students. College years are, of course, a period of religous unsettlement for many young men and women. Earlier moorings are often broken as unfamiliar lines of

knowledge are pursued. It is a time when not infrequently religious beliefs have to be reconstructed. To an extraordinary extent, our times have lost any sure sense of direction. Civilization is confused partly because it is no longer sure of its own meaning and significance. It is part of the task of our institutions of higher learning to help students fortify and if necessary rebuild the fundamental faith by which men live and work.

As I have reviewed in my own mind what I have written, I am struck by the fact that I have brought nothing essentially new to this campus. Cornell was conceived in the liberal tradition and born to intellectual adventure. The spirit of free inquiry has never faltered here. Nor has faith in intelligence ever weakened. And the call to social service has not gone unanswered. In countless ways the University has responded to social needs. Its contributions to the State, as in its programs of agricultural instruction, extension and research, are an example to like institutions the world over. Its services to the nation and in foreign lands have been notable. With the great company of Cornellians I rejoice in a record of which all may be proud.

The past is secure; what of the future? May we regard that, too, with satisfaction? I think so, despite the uncertainties and confusion that darken every horizon. For the character and faith and devotion which have built this institution, and others like it, are still ready for enlistment when the call is made. Men dedicated to the ideals for which this University has stood from its start are the indispensable means of its further advance. The new administration seeks a place among them.

The omniscience commonly attributed to university and college presidents is clearly a figment of popular imagination. A university or college president starts human even

if he ends wise. If he remains both human and wise—and it is to be hoped he will—he will not be wise all the time. Mistakes are inevitable if important work is being done. Wise and able men merely make relatively fewer mistakes than other men do, and learn more from those they do make. That university and college presidents are held to be both wise and able doubtless helps in making their responsibilities somehow manageable. At the same time it makes these responsibilities all the more sobering.

The whole effect of exercises such as these is designed to add to the seriousness with which an incoming president assumes the responsibilities of office. The Governor of this great State, the Mayor of this splendid City, as well as other officials of City and State, honor us with their presence. The far-flung company of Cornellians graduate and undergraduate is here in impressive representation. The faculties of the University, in colorful array, bear witness to their allegiance and devotion. The distinguished academic delegates whom I see around me in such numbers evidence the interest and solicitude of the institutions of higher learning, the learned societies, the research councils, the great foundations. The founders and builders of Cornell who have toiled and sacrificed to make this university what it is hover in spirit over this assembly. In such a setting the newly inducted president cannot view his obligations lightly.

At the same time, there is for the incoming president in these proceedings a reinforcement of will and spirit which he acknowledges with deepest gratitude. It is evident enough that he will not labor alone. His friends manifest their confidence and loyalty; the resources of a great university are available in his support; the forces of higher learning the world over lend a hand; the heroic efforts of Cornell's founders and the splendid achievements

of his predecessors in office give encouragement and inspiration. It is with enthusiasm and a sense of rare opportunity that he pledges his unfailing devotion to the high purposes for which Cornell University was founded and has since so nobly achieved.

The formal exercises were concluded with the playing of "Alma Mater" by the Organist while the assembly stood in silence.