

WILLIAMS COLLEGE



Commencement Addresses

and

Citations for
Honorary Degrees

June, 1939

Hidden Reserves of Power

Baccalaureate Address

By President James P. Baxter, 3rd

Thompson Memorial Chapel, June 18, 1939

DURING the past year the world in which we live, and the United States in particular, has had a bad case of the jitters. The continuance of economic maladjustment has been accompanied by increasing signs of sectional discord, class antagonism and racial intolerance, which has been especially marked among the unemployed. Insecurity at home has been increased by the growing insecurity abroad. The balance of power, which long since disappeared in Eastern Asia, was destroyed last fall in Europe as well. Alarmed at these portents, some writers have viewed the scene through very dark glasses. My friend and colleague Professor Schuman recently prefixed to his somber narrative, *Europe on the Eve*, T. S. Eliot's poem, *The Hollow Men*, which, though written in 1925, well represents the mood of the pessimists of today:

“This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but a whimper.”

It is as easy, I suppose, for a generation to regard itself as peculiarly afflicted as it is for an individual to convince himself that his personal ill fortune has not been matched, if at all, since the days of Job. Self-pity is the commonest of vices and exaggeration, a national if not a universal trait. No historian, however, could seriously argue that this generation faces problems graver than those faced by Washington or Lincoln, or that, even in the international sphere, Europe is worse off than it was during the Thirty Years' War or the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon.

There will always be crises, and pessimists to hail them as the worst of all; but there will also be men who carry on uncomplain-

ingly with the optimism of youth or of those men who refuse to grow old. There is no note of pessimism in the baccalaureate sermons of Mark Hopkins during the American Civil War. He knew that it was the lot of man in all times and places to confront adversity, and he had the courage to face it boldly.

It is this response of the soul buffeted by fate which has furnished the chief interest of drama and of biography. Everyone at some time, perhaps many times, is faced with a problem so grave that, to solve it, he must do something harder than anything he has done before.

All of us who attend track meets are familiar with this phenomenon. If men always ran true to form, meets could be figured out correctly in advance, and would lose their interest. As it is, the predictions of the best informed often go astray, since some men fail to live up to their expectations and others far exceed their best previous performance. It is this last phenomenon to which I wish to draw your attention. How is it that a man under intense strain can suddenly outdo all expectation? How can a team, like the Williams basketball team in a memorable game this year, come from behind to victory by a sudden lifting of itself to heights not before achieved?

There are three factors which to my mind explain this phenomenon and give us clues to man's mysterious reserve power. The first of these is preparedness. No man who has not kept training, who has not schooled his mind and body to intense effort, is ever going to startle the world with a record-breaking performance. When Daniel Webster bested the devil in Stephen Benet's charming fantasy he owed his forensic triumph not to the improvisation of the moment but to long years of argument before juries, which prepared him to face even a jury summoned from hell. "Fortune," said Pasteur, "favors the mind that is prepared." If we are each of us to be able to meet severe tests we must train our minds and bodies and keep them in training. The man who stops his education on Commencement Day will soon be as pathetic a figure as a fat man, out of condition, running to a fire.

Indispensable as training is it will not of itself ensure victory. A spark is needed to kindle our hidden reserves. For countless

numbers of mankind tradition serves as the spark and keeps the flame burning brightly. In my school days the boys of Phillips Academy were told of a hammer thrower who saved a meet which had been deemed lost by bettering his best previous performance by twelve feet on his last try. The coaches knew full well the value of a tradition like that in inspiring other boys to "come through in a pinch." The armies and navies of the world know it, too. Regimental colors bear the insignia of famous victories of the past. New ships are commissioned bearing the names of famous ships of old. Every Victoria Cross that has been awarded has inspired some other British soldiers and sailors to extraordinary heroism beyond the line of duty. Our own Navy cherishes many traditions, and first of all the memory of John Paul Jones, whose mortal remains are enshrined in the Chapel at Annapolis. When the *Bonhomme Richard* seemed already sinking under the guns of the *Serapis* he answered the demand for his surrender with the derisive words: "We have not yet begun to fight." To that proud spirit it meant little if his own ship sank provided he had first succeeded in boarding and capturing his opponent. Who can estimate the value to the service of the Jones tradition, or of the memory of those other captains who said "after you, pilot," "damn the torpedoes," or "we have met the enemy and they are ours."

Schools and colleges cherish their traditions to the same end. Every Williams president to the end of time will do his job better because of the memory of Ebenezer Dorr Griffin, who when the faint-hearted wished to abandon this lovely valley, anchored the college here by raising funds for the beautiful building which bears his name, and which he designed and helped to build. Not merely the whole South but the nation is enriched by the memory of Robert E. Lee, not of the soldier only, but of the man of peace. It is the crowning glory of Freeman's great biography that the reader feels no letdown in the long account, in the fourth volume, of Lee's career after Appomattox as president of a small impoverished college. Nothing in that well-nigh perfect life is more moving or significant than those closing years.

If training and tradition are two factors requisite for performance heroic beyond the line of duty, faith is even more essential. You

know as well as I that the doubter is licked before he starts. Faith in one's own powers is indispensable. But there is another sort of faith which can release hidden reserve powers that are far more powerful. It is the consciousness of support from Christ's example and from the goodly fellowship of all Christian people. Self-confidence, however necessary for success, is a weak reed compared with this. When the king of Syria, at war with Israel, compassed about the city of Dothan with a great host, bent on the capture of Elisha, the servant of the prophet was sore afraid. Elisha said to him, "Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them." To the servant this reply seemed at first incomprehensible, for the Syrians apparently possessed overwhelmingly superior forces. Then Elisha prayed to the Lord to open his servant's eyes, that he might see. And all at once the young man saw, and took heart, beholding the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha. Men of that faith were more than a match for the Syrians.

It is easy for us in moments of discouragement to doubt, like Elisha's servant, the eventual triumph of right. Once our eyes are opened by faith, however, we see a host of supporters of whom hitherto we were ignorant. The consciousness of aid from fellow Christians lends strength to our arms and to our will. Lighted by the greatest of traditions our kindled spirit now flames bright and strong. We are close to the mystery of man's hidden reserves of power.

No one who reads, as many of us have been reading, the volumes of collected biography published by college classes on their important reunions, can fail to be struck by the multiplicity of careers chosen by college graduates. Equally striking is the high degree of success attained by so many of them in their chosen field. To an extraordinary degree, as you all know, the leaders of America are drawn from the ranks of college men.

The reason, to my mind, is that they, more than others, are able to draw on their hidden reserves of power. They have had long years of preparation for service, though not all of them have kept in the pink of condition for it. They have been steeped in traditions well qualified to inspire men to do their best, and in-

deed to better it. They have faith in themselves, and, many of them, that deeper faith of which I spoke. If more of them had it, if more Americans were drawing daily not on their own powers, but from the deep well of Christian strength, we could solve more and harder problems.

It is well that college men have these inner resources, for the temptations which beset them are many. No historian would be likely to argue that the sins of his generation are new sins. They are but old sins in new garments. The garb is often so attractive that the unwary fail to see that what tempts them is simply an age-old sin in a new disguise. What is new, too, in each generation, are the latest rationalizations for inadequate performance, the most fashionable excuses of the day for not letting Christianity work.

To meet these challenges, in their protean forms we have to draw on our reserves. The man who has never learned self-control or self-denial will do no better in the pinch than the fat man trying to run against competitors who have really trained. The man uninspired by the traditions of his profession will add one more to the list of failures.

Members of the Class of 1939: You have recently passed through the valuable experience of mobilizing your intellectual reserves to pass a comprehensive examination on your major field of interest. Do not think that your examinations are over. Life is a long series of "comprehensives," interspersed with "hour-tests" on narrower sectors of mind and character.

In the two years that you and I have worked together in this beautiful valley I have been much impressed with your spirit. The curriculum of today, as a result of cautious development over the years, is better designed than the curriculum of my day to draw out the best that is in every man. You are better prepared than we of the Class of 1914 were. You are equally steeped in the traditions of our beloved college. You have faith in yourselves.

With the generosity, friendliness and sense of responsibility which characterize Williams undergraduates you have given me abundant cause for my affectionate interest in your future careers. You will make much of them, I am sure. You will only make the most of them, if, through that faith deeper than faith in yourselves, you,

like Elisha's servant after his eyes were opened, can see the forces of the Lord, and behold the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire. If a man stands up to his convictions in the hour of trial, and cries out with the intensity of Christian belief, "I can do no other," he will find a response from men he has never before seen or heard, rising to support him against the powers of darkness. He will feel a thrill of strength come to him from his sense of community with that larger company. He will realize in truth, in the words of the prophet: "They that be with us are more than they that be with them."

The Curriculum and the Individual

By Hamilton Barksdale Brown of the Class of 1939

FOUR years ago, we thought we were pretty lucky. Here we were, entering Williams College without a Latin requirement. It had taken some hundred odd years for that change to be made, and we felt pretty safe. But instead of the nice, easy-going college we had expected, we found ourselves suddenly immersed in a dynamo of activity. Books were flying out from under the pens of the professors. Buildings were springing up on every street corner. And suddenly the old Williams to which we had come, expecting four blissful years of dreamy relaxation, was gone in a fury of activity. Divisional requirements were reduced; the comprehensives had sprung into being; and a fully designed system of honors work was put into operation.

We've been doing a lot of reminiscing during this last week, wondering what has been most significant to us in our four years here, and strangely enough it has been this dynamic activity, which, stirring this little New England college from educational lassitude, has been the keynote of our undergraduate experience. When I think it over now, it is not surprising that we, as the guinea pigs upon which these experiments have been tried, should have become imbued with the interest in educational theory which has inspired these developments.

These changes which I have mentioned — the comprehensives, honors work, greater opportunity for specialization — led to a new conception of the liberal arts college and its aims. In the past, the curriculum at Williams was planned for the average student. The man who was unwilling to devote the large majority of his time to intellectual pursuits was given, through the wide selection of courses forced upon him, opportunity to absorb speaking acquaintance with a cross section of learning. Parrotlike, he might be able, for a short time after graduation, to repeat a few facts about science or literature, the classics or labor economics. But in my opinion, the student with real intellectual ambition, with mature purpose behind his work, was sacrificed in favor of

his lesser brother. Specialization in any field was limited to the point of stifling interest.

Then came the change. The emphasis was removed from the "gentleman C" to the degree with honors. Purpose and energy became the *sine qua non* for the successful student. The bonds restricting him were removed, and a free rein given the honors man. By making the degree with honors more desirable, by enhancing its value, by opening it to a larger group, specialization was encouraged. The goal was no longer a vague acquaintance with all branches of knowledge, but a base of learning upon which a central scheme might be built.

Dangers became apparent. Under as loose a system as has now been developed, it is possible to wander from course to course, from sideshow to spectacle, with no particular aim. Under the older system, the curriculum was rigid enough to prevent irresponsibility on the part of the student. Now this rigidity applies only to the major field. The student may become a victim of dilettantism, or he may become so desirous of knowledge for its own sake that his perspective will be lost. The college has built up a curriculum based on the individual and individual accomplishment. As such, it is justifiable only when the individual will accept the responsibility thrust upon him.

As I see it, the solution of these problems rests in part with the faculty. Those in command of the situation must have the ability to direct the individual along the right course, a direction formerly guided by the stricter curriculum. By their own knowledge of the situation, they must prevent undergraduates from enrolling in courses which, because of loosened prerequisites, are beyond their abilities. Then they must guard against presenting their students with honors problems which are either too difficult or too easy. The honors thesis should not be expected to cover Ph.D. material, but if the student is capable of such work, his energy should not be restricted. If these precautions are not taken, the whole system of honors work will fall by the wayside.

The main solution, I think, lies with the undergraduate himself. A college undergraduate body may be divided into three distinct groups. There are first those who manage to squeeze under

the line and graduate by sheer grinding effort. This group is the lowest level in scholastic ability, and for them the type of curriculum is unimportant. What they gain from their college experience is the satisfaction of having conquered a problem under which a lesser man would have faltered. And this accomplishment is for them of the highest value. The second class is the naturally intelligent but mentally lazy group which wanders from course to course, exerting as little energy as possible, their goal the minimum requirement for graduation. It is for this group that the older curriculum was built, with the purpose of forcing down the throat of the unwilling student as much education as he could absorb without effort. Finally there is the top group, and for it the new curriculum was designed. As I have said before, the emphasis is now on the individual. But the old story about leading the horse to water still holds good. No matter how able the faculty is in mapping out a curriculum which should bring out the best advantages in a college education, the full cooperation of the student himself is absolutely essential. Williams can now offer to the receptive undergraduate more in the way of intellectual advantages than ever before. I feel certain that there is an atmosphere of intellectual curiosity springing up in the social groups on campus, embryonic but encouraging. It is, then, the student's primary duty to take advantage of what is now being offered him as he has never done before. No longer is it sufficient merely to absorb the material passed out in the class room, handing it back to the professor verbatim on tests and papers. Thought, originality, initiative are required. It is absolutely essential that some vitality, some dynamic energy, some intellectual curiosity and ambition drive the undergraduate toward the satisfaction of his own ideals. If the Williams apathy, about which so much has been said in recent years, gains so much sway in the class room that the entire student body loses its sense of responsibility, if it desires nothing more than to derive from four years here a few stock phrases and pretty quotations picked up accidentally in the class room, then it is high time to return to the old method, once again forcing education down the throats of the "gentleman C's."

The problem of college education, I say, revolves around the

attitude of both the students and the faculty toward education itself. If the faculty has no respect for undergraduate responsibility, then the old, restricted curriculum will return. If the undergraduate has no ambition other than to hang a diploma on the wall of his office, then this same curriculum will be the only possible answer. But if one undergraduate has a spark of energy in his system, if education to him means the solving of problems, the concentration of his interests and abilities into an effective scheme, the development of the last five years at Williams has been in the right direction.

The Menace of Defeatism in These Times

By John Edward Sawyer of the Class of 1939

I FIND myself this morning in a somewhat strange position. The tradition of undergraduate commencement orations was well described last year by Louis Hector when, in his valedictory address, he compared the speakers to prize cows at a country fair, whom the faculty leads from their pasture in the stacks of the library to parade solemnly before the trustees and assembled guests. They are presumably among those who have best survived the succession of academic milkings. In accordance with this tradition they are expected to moo contentedly upon subjects of their college years.

To the difficulties of this tradition is added another, namely, that, by a misguided vote of my classmates, I was forced last Friday afternoon to deliver the pipe oration — an occasion of extreme informality — which, I fear, has earmarked me as a cross between a prosecuting attorney and that snapper-up of unconsidered trifles, Walter Winchell.

This morning, however, I should like to leave behind both the spirit of the pipe oration and the tradition of the prize cows mooing about the past. In their place I should like to consider the question of an attitude for the future. Of all the influences upon an unfolding life none is more lasting or more penetrating than the attitude an individual adopts toward the world in which he lives. There seems to me, therefore, to be particular danger in the philosophy of “defeatism” that lurks over our present-day world.

The essence of this philosophy is the belief that western civilization, as we know it, is doomed, and that the actions and reason of men can do nothing to halt or divert the catastrophe. It ignores the unpredictable energies of men and nations stirred by a great idea, and simply asserts that further struggle, on however small a scale, is useless; we should but bow before the forces of disintegration.

This philosophy is a product of insecurity and defeat, recurring in history as often as these conditions have existed. In the present era it arose from the cultural and spiritual breakdown that followed

the Great War. It found its nineteenth century roots in the irrational pessimism of Schopenhauer but waited for its chief prophets until the twentieth century. In 1918 the German philosopher-historian, Oswald Spengler, published his great work, *The Decline of the West*, which might be called the *Mein Kampf* of defeatists. It was not until the prolonged stress of the present decade, however, that this philosophy threatened to become dangerously prevalent. World-wide economic crisis has struck at a larger number than ever before, and, not unnaturally, brought in its wake discouragement and lost faith in the working of old systems. The tragedies and fears arising from this distress have been capped by the crescendo of war scares that have torn the world. As a result both the economic order and the system of nation-states appear to many to be on the verge of collapse; and the great movements of rising standards and liberal humanism that were the glory of the nineteenth century have lost their multitudes of believers. The vast majority of Americans today are confused or discouraged, having lost their old faiths and being unable to find new allegiances.

Into this confused majority falls most of my generation, growing up in an age when all that had been deemed permanent and secure now seems impermanent and uncertain. It is, therefore, our age in particular that is in danger of falling under the philosophy of defeatism, which in the present decade of stress has become progressively more in vogue and progressively more dangerous.

My plea for its rejection is based on three major considerations.

First, because of its reaction upon the individual who accepts it. You have seen people in the world about you bow before it, some because of a succession of defeats and uncertainties, others merely because of fear. It seems to settle upon them and, like a great fog, muffles thought and action. They cease to find much purpose or satisfaction in living; they lose all power of constructive effort; their horizon becomes limited by the wall which they have built about themselves. Worse than this, defeatism is unlike fatalism or indifference in that it sabotages the efforts of others, with or without conscious intent spreading its doctrine of gloom and stifling the energies that might be devoted to straightening out one small snag in the tangle of the present.

And this brings us to a second reason for rejecting the attitude of defeatism, namely, its reaction upon a whole society or civilization. The acceptance of this philosophy in a time of stress is like throwing tar into a machine already but limping along. The resulting let-down in social morale invites the catastrophe that it fears. History abounds with illustrations of the disastrous effects of such a let-down upon a developed civilization. For example, in the period following the death of Alexander the Great there was a "failure of nerve" that hastened the decay of a great culture. Even more is this apparent in the decline of Roman civilization. It is my point that a high social morale is itself a bulwark against decay, and as such, that we should strive to preserve it.

Yesterday in his baccalaureate sermon Mr. Baxter analyzed wherein lay the sources of strength upon which men call when a supreme effort is needed. All of these sources — tradition, training, and faith — depend upon the rejection of the defeatist's attitude. Particularly is this incumbent upon the youth of the world, not because of the annual June panaceas of graduating classes going out to build a pure white world, but because with youth is associated the energy and the vitality of courage necessary to keep alive ideals whose value we recognize. And of the youth of the world the responsibility lies clearly on those of us who live on this continent, who are spared the more direct impact of the anxieties boiling in Europe. Harold Laski concluded the ingratiating address which he delivered here a few weeks ago with words that proved to be the keynote of that conference, namely, that the great contribution which this country can make to the world is to work out its economic problems and build here a citadel of democratic culture that will point the way to the future. To my mind the starting point toward this very lofty goal is to reject the lurking philosophy of defeatism that would paralyze all thought and effort in this direction.

Finally, I urge the rejection of defeatism on the ground that it is based upon and itself exalts all that is irrational and blind. It finds its roots in the one outstanding irrational philosopher of the nineteenth century, Schopenhauer, and in the present era has grown along with what has been called the "dethronement of

reason.”* It is associated with the “cult of force,” with emotionalism, with Fascism; in short, with all the irrational forces of man’s nature.

If it is believed that the great advance in terms of higher standards and the enhancement of human values which has marked the last 150 years is a product of reason, I think you will agree with me that that philosophy which stalls the operation of reason should be rejected.

I am not urging a flight from realism, for realism must be a starting point in facing any given problem. I am not urging blind faith or blind optimism. I am not even quarrelling primarily with the attitude of fatalism or indifference as represented in the old story of the sale of a blind horse, in which the owner was following the David Harum technique of “keeping it a secret” that the horse was blind. The prospective buyer, however, was a little skeptical and asked to see the horse run. With a slap from the owner it galloped across the field, only to crash head-on into an apple tree. The buyer exclaimed, “Why, man, that horse is blind!” After a minute’s pause the owner replied, “He’s not blind; he just doesn’t give a damn.”

It’s not about this attitude of indifference that I am most distressed, for in that it is simply the one individual that crashes into the apple tree; rather am I most concerned with the attitude of the defeatist who says not only that nobody *should* “give a damn,” but that it would make no difference if everybody *did* “give a damn.” This attitude is contagious and aggressive, and if adopted will effectively paralyze all constructive effort, thus removing the real hope of checking the very debacle that it fears.

Therefore, because of their disastrous effect upon the individual, upon the larger society, and upon the rule of reason, I urge the challenging of the defeatist’s very sweeping assumptions, and the rejection of his philosophy; and replacement by the courage, the determination, the resolution not to give up trying until the last light has flickered out.

*The phrase is used by Hans Kohn, *Force or Reason*, (Cambridge, 1937).

The Valedictory The Individual in the Modern World

By Murray Salisbury Stedman, Jr., of the Class of 1939

BEFORE I accepted the invitation to speak on this platform, I was warned by a respected English professor that three groups of people would be listening to me — alumni, parents, and graduating seniors. No matter what you talk about, the professor told me, the alumni will claim to have heard it before; the parents will have gleaned the whole idea from the Sunday letters their sons send home; and as for the graduating class, so long as your talk is short, they won’t give a damn what you say!

That is the challenge that I am about to take up; for I am going to talk about the principal enemies of individualism in our present society. We had better start by defining what I mean by the term “individualism.” In my jargon, it means, essentially, a faith in oneself. It implies the acceptance of personal and social responsibilities, and with those responsibilities, the practice of self-discipline and self-criticism. It also includes a strong conviction that the aim of each of us ought to be the maximum development of our personality, so long as that development does not interfere with the development of others.

Now let me point out clearly what I am not saying. I am not in the least implying that a collectivistic economy, like ours today, or such as might prevail under socialism, is wrong: it is in the cards, and we must face a collectivistic economy with confidence in our ability to control it. I am not asserting that majority rule is bad: we have never really tried it in America. Nor am I declaring that selfishness is desirable. Croesus and Zarathustra were equally despicable. What I do assert is this: the greatest crime in history, and the greatest crime today, is selflessness. That is the enemy we as educated men must combat in ourselves and in others.

Today three strong forces are attacking individualism, as I have defined it. The first of these is the pattern-forming and the stereotyping of human lives brought about by a machine civiliza-

tion. This tendency was to have been expected. Thus far it has not been controlled; but we must, if we are to have a society of free persons, a society of creative individuals, control this technological process for the social good, and keep the machines from stamping us, as well as the commodities, into standardized patterns. The second great negative force roaming about the country is determinism — determinism whether dressed up in psychological, theological, or materialistic trimmings. The effect of each of these is the same — to liquidate the individual by sublimating him to some greater cause. This is the story the determinists tell us: “To find yourself, you must first lose yourself.” This formula, I submit, is immoral. It is immoral because it treats the individual as a tool, and not as an end in himself. The third enemy of individualism is skepticism. This is the collegiate religion of our day: this is the so-called “new nihilism” of the post-war generations. This skepticism denies value to the individual, perhaps to life itself. You can apply your own label to this tendency; but the point I wish to emphasize is this: that “new nihilism” destroys individualism.

Now that we recognize the enemies who would wipe out egoism, what can we do about them? I have a few suggestions to throw out. We must begin in our educational system — overhaul it so as to produce individuals, instead of types. In his recent book, Professor Max Lerner has termed such education “vertical humanism.” We need more vertical humanism in the schools and colleges of America. Again, each of us must accustom himself to live in a society which is daily becoming and will continue to become more collectivistic. This means we will have to accept more and more discipline upon our actions, imposed impersonally from the outside. But we must be careful that the acceptance of such discipline does not dull our own critical sense. Then, lastly, we must try to establish an economic and a political framework founded upon respect for the individual. Technologically, this could be done tomorrow, if “we planned it that way.” Psychologically, there are many obstacles which can only be overcome by hard thinking and mental discipline.

Probably the objection has already arisen in your mind: But

we do not all have the same political aspirations and opinions. What about that? Yes, I reply, that is true. But political differences do not matter. The essential factor is that we retain our personality, no matter for which side or sides we shall some day be slinging words, or, perhaps, bullets. And there is this corollary: that we encourage and tolerate differences of opinion, based upon sound social thinking, in others.

My plea, then, is that the Class of 1939 possess the courage to become responsible, creative individuals. My hope is that this class will share in the attempt to create the objective social and economic conditions under which the masses of our people may likewise become worthy of respect as thinking persons. This is the meaning of freedom: self-control under the law.

Fellow classmates:

Individualism and freedom have today become trite words. But if democracy is to last, these words must live: they must be re-interpreted and given a positive meaning. Williams stands for freedom. Williams stands for self-discipline and self-criticism to define freedom. As inheritors of the great Williams tradition, we shall be expected to bear our share in the fight to preserve, and further to develop, this meaning of freedom. It will be a hard fight. But it will be a worth-while one: for democracy and the human conscience are at stake in the struggle.

Citations for Honorary Degrees

By virtue of authority delegated to him, President Baxter conferred the following honorary degrees, and declared the recipients entitled to all the rights, honors and privileges appertaining thereto:

Master of Arts:

ARTHUR BLISS PERRY of the Class of 1920. Reared in the best Williams tradition, he could not but follow in his father's footsteps and gladly teach. Principal of the boys' school at Milton Academy, he has already won high rank in the goodly company of New England schoolmasters.

Master of Arts:

GEORGE FRANCIS BOOTH, publisher of the *Worcester Gazette* and *Worcester Telegram* which well maintain the full flavor of New England journalism. A tireless and generous public servant, active in many good causes but especially in behalf of the youth of Massachusetts.

Doctor of Science:

LOUIS FREDERICK FIESER of the Class of 1920, Professor of Chemistry at Harvard University. A brilliant organic chemist, gifted alike in teaching and research, whose studies have thrown light on many fields, especially on the chemistry of cancer-producing compounds.

Doctor of Humane Letters:

CARLTON JOSEPH HUNTLEY HAYES, Seth Low Professor of History at Columbia University. A former president of the American Catholic Historical Association, he is now serving as co-chairman of the Institute of Human Relations which will meet next August on this campus. Known to countless students of European History as the author of some of the best of our textbooks, and to scholars the world over for his studies in nationalism.

Doctor of Humane Letters:

HENRY WOLCOTT TOLL, a member of the Class of 1909, which voted him its most popular, most versatile, most energetic, and best natured member, as well as the one most likely to succeed. A lawyer and teacher who has served his state in the upper branch of its legislature and the nation as a pioneer in the important field of interstate cooperation.

Doctor of Laws:

ALBERT RATHBONE of the Class of 1888, a distinguished member of the New York Bar, who has served the nation under former administrations as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Financial Adviser at the Peace Conference at Paris, and unofficial representative on the Reparation Commission.

Doctor of Laws:

FRED TARBELL FIELD, a graduate of Brown University on whose governing boards he has served with distinction for nearly twenty years. A learned scholar and wise administrator of the law, he "deals with Trojan and Tyrian alike" as Chief Justice of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Doctor of Laws:

CLARK WILLIAMS of the Class of 1892, banker, philanthropist, for twenty-six years a trustee of Williams College, which he has served with love and devotion worthy of the first Colonel Williams. He served his state as Superintendent of Banks and Comptroller in the great administrations of Governor Hughes, and the nation at war on the staff of the First Division. His genius for friendship and affection for the members of this Faculty are embodied in Faculty House.