



# **Freedom, education, and morals in the modern university: a convocation address. 1932**

Frank, Glenn, 1887-1940

[s.l.]: [s.n.], 1932

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/ROTZHEQPETCAO9D>

Based on date of publication, this material is presumed to be in the public domain.

For information on re-use, see

<http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/Copyright>

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

# FREEDOM, EDUCATION, AND MORALS IN THE MODERN UNIVERSITY

## *Convocation Address*

Given by

PRESIDENT GLENN FRANK  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

At the University Convocation  
held in the Field House at Madison on  
May Thirteenth, Nineteen Thirty-Two

---

*Because* the Badger is a publicity organ and current historical record of the University of Wisconsin, we feel it an obligation and a privilege to include with this copy of the Wisconsin Badger a reprint of President Glenn Frank's all-university convocation in defense of liberty and morals at Wisconsin. We believe that it is the clearest definition and most courageous defense of the University's purpose and policy that has been made in recent years. Because the Badger had already gone to press, it was necessary to include this as a supplement, but because it is so clear a statement of administrative policy, we feel that it is an integral part of university history and therefore of this Wisconsin Badger.

---

MADISON, WISCONSIN

1932

# FREEDOM, EDUCATION, AND MORALS IN THE MODERN UNIVERSITY

I have called you together, ladies and gentlemen of the University, not because I have any desire to dignify by direct reply the insincere, unprincipled, and dishonest campaign of deliberate slander to which the University of Wisconsin has been lately subjected by a little handful of ambitious men who seem quite willing to stab the state's greatest institution in the back if they think they might thereby advance their personal or political fortunes. I should prefer to let so shoddy a venture break down under its own weight of malicious misrepresentation. I have called you together in this convocation, and permitted its proceedings to be broadcast, rather for the purpose of clearing the air, if I can, for all those inside or outside the University in whose minds sincere questionings may have been raised by this carnival of demagogic claptrap.

The little band of character assassins actively promoting this particular attack upon the University is seeking, by collecting and dramatizing isolated and unrepresentative persons and incidents that may be found in all universities and throughout society, to project a picture of the University of Wisconsin that any informed intelligence knows bears no recognizable relation to the University as it actually is.

The picture with which they insult the intelligence of this enlightened commonwealth is that of an institution in which the principle of freedom of thought--without which a university becomes but a merchandise mart for the insights of antiquity and a prison house for the minds of the present--has resulted in a riotous orgy of political, social, economic, religious, and moral anarchy. If this sort of thing is said often enough and emphatically enough, either from ignorance or dishonesty, many sincere men and women, who lack first-hand information, will, if not believe it, at least be disturbed in their minds. It is to such sincere men and women, whether inside or outside the University, that I speak this morning. I am under no delusion that anything I shall say will change the tactics of slick tricksters with personal and political axes to grind.

## *Defines Convocation's Purpose*

What I shall say will fall into two broad divisions: (1) I shall speak of "the right of freedom" and what I say respecting this will deal primarily with forces external to the University that seek to delimit this right, and (2) I shall speak of "the responsibilities of freedom" and what I say re-

specting this will deal directly with the obligations resting upon students and faculty as they discharge their trusteeship of this freedom.

But before plunging into a direct discussion of the place of freedom and the problem of morals in the modern university, permit me to give in rapid succession a series of illustrations of the intellectual dishonesty, unless we are to assume ignorance, that underlies this blatant ballyhoo of the University's organized detractors.

*Illustration number one:* I wish it were possible to discuss this problem without bringing myself at all into the picture, but, whether I wish it or not, as president of the University, I cannot avoid standing in some sense as its symbol. I do not, therefore, resent the effort being currently made to relate my own opinions respecting political, social, economic, religious, and moral matters to the spirit and influence of the University. If, in my approach to issues educational or otherwise, I do not measurably reflect the spirit of the modern university, I have no right to be the executive head of this institution.

This leads me directly to consider the amusing attempt of certain hysterical mountebanks to picture me as a propagandist for Communism. As far as I can discover, this attempt to make a Communist of me consists in lifting from their context and by insinuation making them infer the exact opposite of my meaning scattered phrases from my baccalaureate sermon of last June and from an address on "The Crisis of Capitalism" with which I opened a Labor Conference at the University last July. I invite and defy the little band of self-appointed censors of the University to read these two addresses in full before Wisconsin audiences and to follow the reading, if they dare, with the deliberately dishonest interpretations they have been placing upon them.

## *Refutes Charges of Communistic Leanings*

In my baccalaureate sermon of last June, I said, "I am not a Communist. Everything in me cries out against any social scheme that enforces a regimentation of life from above, whether it be by the dictatorship of a class or the dictatorship of a person. But we must be realists enough to realize that the only answer that will really answer Communism is the achievement and guaranty by Western capitalism of a better life for the millions than Communism can achieve . . . We do not want a Stalin or a Mussolini . . . I am convinced that the American system of free capitalism and political liberty can answer Communism, but it

## CONVOCATION ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT GLENN FRANK

---

must do it in deeds, not in words. For men cannot eat words! Men cannot wear words! Men cannot trust their old age to words!" It is from dismembered phrases from this address, ladies and gentlemen, that a little band of agitators, whether misguided or malicious, has sought to picture me directly and the University indirectly as a source of sinister Communistic propaganda.

The address on "The Crisis of Capitalism" with which I opened a Labor Conference at the University last July was reported with unusual adequacy in the press. It brought to my desk many letters from intelligent captains of industry within and without Wisconsin, all of them speaking appreciatively of its analysis of the problem confronting the managerial genius of American industry. And in the mail evoked by this address came an applauding letter from Colonel Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune. I have not heard of Colonel McCormick's being suspected of Red tendencies. On the Sunday following this address, the Chicago Tribune carried a leading editorial of more than a column, under the title of *The New Capitalism*, citing this address as an effective defense of enlightened capitalism. I doubt that any one will suspect the Chicago Tribune of Communistic leanings. I cite these facts, ladies and gentlemen, simply to show either the idiocy or the insincerity of the attempt that has been made to interpret this address as a subtle propaganda for Communism. This address, in fact, does not contain a single contention respecting American capitalism that has not been made by such industrial leaders as Owen D. Young or Gerard Swope of the General Electric Company, Alfred Sloan of the General Motors Corporation, and a score of intelligent captains of industry whom even a Wisconsin witch-burner would have difficulty in listing as Communists.

I make this one reference to the attack that has been directed at me in order to suggest that, if the other assertions aimed more directly at the University rest upon no better foundation, they may safely be taken with a grain of salt by the citizenry of the state.

### *Cites Red Flag Incident*

Illustration number two: On May Day, the world around a day of pranks and propaganda, a lone student, if he was a student, broke into Bascom Hall early in the morning or earlier in the night and, unnoticed by campus watchmen, flew a red banner from the flagpole. It fluttered there until it was discovered and taken down by a campus watchman. Whether it represented sheer prank or the ill-advised zeal of one radical youth, it is incredible that intelligent men would give it more than amused notice. And yet a newspaper will bring out its extra-size type for a screaming headline **RED FLAG FLIES OVER BASCOM HALL**, as if to say by insinuation that this symbolized the spirit of the institution. All this despite the fact

that the news reports revealed the quietest and most innocently prankish May Day for many years. But the flag incident straightway becomes another arrow in the quiver of the flying squadron of snipers.

I suppose if on Hallowe'en a group of students should revive the well known college prank of their grandfathers and drag a good Holstein cow to the belfry, the University would straightway be charged with an insult to the dairy industry of Wisconsin. I do not mean to be flippant, ladies and gentlemen. I am trying only to expose the tragic depths of insincerity and dishonesty to which demagogery can fall even in an enlightened commonwealth.

Illustration number three: The University is further denounced by a little band of special pleaders because certain members of its faculty support the program of the American Civil Liberties Union. Again, either through ignorance or deliberate misrepresentation, the American Civil Liberties Union is painted as an agency of propaganda for Communistic and various anti-American doctrines. The fact is, of course, that the American Civil Liberties Union has no political, social, or economic program or purpose except the single purpose of protecting all Americans, regardless of their class or their convictions, in the right of free speech, free press, and free assembly established at the outset of the Republic by the federal Constitution. It is obvious that any agency sincerely seeking to safeguard this fundamental American right will be called upon oftener to defend this right for men with minority opinions than for men with majority opinions. Men who never differ from the majority never find themselves denied the constitutional right of free speech, free press, and free assembly. But men whose Americanism is real, and not mere campaign rhetoric, do not flinch from the duty of defending the rights even of men whose opinions they despise. In the hysterical days following the war, many states were swept by the sort of epidemic of hate and intolerance which demagogic forces are now seeking to promote in Wisconsin, and five Socialist members of the New York Assembly were ousted from their seats. I remind you that the man who led the protest against their expulsion and fought manfully for their reinstatement was not the radical Debs but the conservative Charles Evans Hughes, candidate for the presidency on the Republican ticket in 1916, and now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The action then taken by Charles Evans Hughes was prompted by the same reasons that lead intelligent men of conservative as well as liberal leanings to believe in the importance of the purpose of such an organization as the American Civil Liberties Union.

### *Open Expression Cures Radicalism*

I believe that, just as a germ dies in the sunlight, but thrives in the fetid air of a dungeon, so radical

ideas are less dangerous when expressed than when repressed. As the lately retired Mr. Justice Holmes once said, "with radical ideas, as with the not yet forgotten champagnes, the best way to let them get flat is to let them get exposed to the air." I believe that the stability and progress of our civilization depend more upon safeguarding the rights of minorities than upon the exercise of the tyranny of the majority. Had effective means for the complete preservation of the status quo existed from the dawn of human history, instead of our to-day living amidst surroundings of culture and safety, we should be chasing one another with clubs through the forest and drinking blood from the scraped skulls of our victims, while the head of some primitive Patrick Henry afforded a delectable dish for some embryo censor. In the words of a great American, I believe that "the cost of liberty is less than the price of repression." That there are risks in freedom of speech, press, and assembly cannot be disputed. But a policy of no risks is even riskier. Russia took no risks, and the Czar fell the pathetic victim of a firing squad, while Russia has had to seek a different order through a tragic, costly, and, in my judgment, an unnecessary upheaval had the Romanoffs permitted the clean and antiseptic air of free discussion to blow through the council chambers of a Russia that obviously needed to adjust its policies to the changed circumstances of a changed time. This is why I disagree with the Wisconsin Romanoffs who would have the University ruthlessly repress every minority opinion that may arise in student body or faculty. I believe that a man can, with entire consistency defend the rights of a minority, although he differs from and heartily despises its views, and, furthermore, that the safety, to say nothing of the progress, of the Republic demands that he do so. It is gratifying to note that American history is not without conspicuous examples of this sort of intelligent tolerance. John Adams defended the British soldiers involved in the Boston massacre, Alexander Hamilton represented the British loyalists, and General Grant favored the release of Jefferson Davis as a political prisoner. It is, of course, a bit discouraging to have to go so far back in our history for these examples, but we are glad they are there.

The constitutional provision for free speech, free press, and free assembly is so obviously a policy of safety rather than a policy of danger that I have been assuming that, among intelligent and responsible men and women, all this had become a truism. Now, in 1932, to hear the defense of this constitutional right denounced as Communism is as if we should be disgraced by a sudden revival of witchcraft.

These three illustrations are sufficient, I think, to indicate the lack either of insight or of sincerity that lies back of much of the current campaign of attack upon the University.

### *Discusses Freedom in University*

I come now to a discussion of the place of freedom in the enterprise of the modern university. I may most quickly come to the point by calling attention to the double charge, made by a little group of campaigners, that the University teaches atheism and is virtually devoid of concern with the religious life of its students.

In the first place, the University does not teach atheism. In at least one course that seeks to list and interpret the varied conceptions of man and nature that have arisen over the centuries the non-theistic conception is stated along with the rest. I am not an atheist. I entered the morning hours of my active career with the settled intention of entering the ministry. Authentic religion has been a sustaining and sweetening factor in my thought and in my life. For a time I saw active service in the pulpits of Missouri villages. As I emerged from college, I left the pulpit, but I have had no sense of having left the ministry. And I am a father. I know quite well that my son will sooner or later hear the claims of atheism pressed. For myself, I should prefer that he hear them carefully and cleanly analyzed alongside other and, to me, more valid points of view in the classroom of a sincere and morally sound teacher than that he should hear them sneeringly and insinuatingly stated in after-college days by some morally irresponsible cynic.

In the second place, the University is deeply concerned with the religious life of its students and takes every step it may legally take in emphasizing the central significance of religion in their lives. The Constitution of the State of Wisconsin specifically prohibits the University of Wisconsin from teaching sectarian theologies. And this, I take it, implies by indirection a specific prohibition against the teaching of anti-religion. If any teacher of the University of Wisconsin should undertake actively to propagandize for atheism in his classroom I should as quickly ask for his resignation from the faculty as I should ask the resignation of a teacher who converted his classroom into a recruiting station for Calvanism or Christian Science. But a careful and responsible analysis of the contentions of atheism no more means that the University is teaching atheism than that the explanation of Catholic doctrines by a professor of medieval history implies that the University is soliciting converts for the Roman Catholic Church. But, while the University may not itself engage in the teaching of sectarian religion, it cooperates whole-heartedly with all the great communions that cluster about its campus.

### *Lists Religious Organizations*

In addition to the numerous city churches that serve its students, the University of Wisconsin has near its campus nine church organizations devoted in part or altogether to work with its stu-

## CONVOCATION ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT GLENN FRANK

dents. These are: (1) St. Paul's Chapel for Roman Catholic students; (2) the Calvary Lutheran Church for Lutheran students; (3) the Lutheran Memorial Cathedral for Lutheran students; (4) the Wesley Foundation for Methodist students; (5) Saint Francis House for Episcopalian students; (6) the Baptist Student House for Baptist students; (7) the Hillel Foundation for Jewish students; (8) the Presbyterian Student House for Presbyterian students; and (9) the Congregational Student House for Congregational students. And the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations enlist the participation of many students not actively affiliated with the churches. Both faculty and students participate in these organizations and so multiply the instances in which faculty and students share in the examination and experience of religion. Without sectarian bias or creedal requirements these two organizations are rendering invaluable service in emphasizing the value of shared religious experience and the cultivation of a sensitive social conscience.

Of the 8,942 students who registered in the early weeks of last September at the University, 5,409 indicated, on a questionnaire card, either a church membership or a church preference. This hardly indicates an epidemic of atheism, for most of the 5,409 students indicating church membership or church preference were upper classmen.

The cry of "atheism" is, I suspect, but a smoke-screen behind which is hidden a desire to see many other minority opinions ruthlessly suppressed in order that the University of Wisconsin may be moulded to the heart's desire of the critic speaking at the moment. I think I can do no better than to repeat, in essence, a statement I made at the opening of an All-University Religious Convocation at the University on February 23, 1930.

The University of Wisconsin is under Constitutional mandate to observe a theological neutrality as it is under a Constitutional mandate to observe a political neutrality. That is to say, neutrality in the fields of sectarian religion and partisan politics. The University may not, without violation of a clear Constitutional provision, become press agent or tool of any particular religious partisanship, whether fundamentalist or modernist, or of any particular political partisanship, whether conservative or liberal.

### *University Belongs to People*

The University of Wisconsin does not belong to the Catholics or to the Protestants, to the Jews or to the Gentiles, to the Stalwarts or to the Progressives, to the Democrats or to the Socialists. It belongs to the people of Wisconsin, to all of the people of Wisconsin, regardless of party or creed or race. The day it sells its soul to any particular party or creed or race it would as well close its doors, for it will die as a seat of learning and linger only as an agency for the propaganda of the half-

truths of partisanship. It was to underscore this fact that the fathers wisely wrote into the Constitution of this commonwealth a prohibition against the teaching of sectarian theology or partisan politics.

But how is this Constitutional provision to be interpreted and administered? By the way it is interpreted and administered it can become either an embargo upon that freedom of scholarship and expression which is of the essence of a University's life or the surest defense of that freedom.

In the hands of cowards or weaklings, this Constitutional provision can become an alibi for an academic timidity that is reluctant to deal honestly with those issues of politics, economics, and religion that are loaded with the dynamite of current interest, not to say current interests.

In the hands of cowards or weaklings, this Constitutional provision can be interpreted to mean that the economists of the University should not prosecute and publish fundamental researches in such living issues as taxation, lest they draw the fire of this or that political group in the state, that the economists should confine their activities to polite lectures on Adam Smith, Ricardo, and other safely dead worthies, lest they be suspected of teaching partisan politics.

### *In the Hands of Cowards . . .*

In the hands of cowards and weaklings, this constitutional provision can be interpreted to mean that the University should never officially sanction such candid considerations of the issues of life and destiny, such honest attempts to face the significance of spiritual values in the life of the individual and in the processes of the social order as have marked the All-University Religious Convocations that have been called each year during my administration and to the platforms of which have been invited such distinguished Roman Catholic priests as Father Ross, such eminent Jewish leaders as Rabbi Wise, and such outstanding representatives of the Protestant world as Bishop McConnell, to mention only three at random.

Each year there have been scattered voices raised in protest that these student assemblies for the consideration of the religious life of the student violate the spirit if not the letter of the Constitutional provision to which I have referred, just as the publication of the results of a vital research on a living issue in our political, social, or economic life is bound to draw the fire of some who think scholars are meddling in affairs that are none of their business.

I think these critics are wrong. And I am sure that the common sense of this commonwealth returns a verdict against them. I cannot concur in any such philosophy that would set the University of Wisconsin apart in ascetic aloofness from the sweat and struggle of the people of this state,

leaving to it nothing more inspiring than the task of raking over the dying embers of the obsolete issues of the past.

The University does not and will not concern itself with the year-to-year strategies of partisan politics or with the creed wars that the sects may see fit to wage, but the University does and will concern itself with the determining facts of those political, social, economic, religious, and moral issues that go deeper than the machinery and methodologies of political and ecclesiastical organizations. To do less is to commit suicide as a university.

There are stray forces in Wisconsin that are frankly afraid of a fearless university. There are some Stalwarts who would like to see every liberal mind eliminated from the faculty and administration of the University of Wisconsin and every expression of student or faculty opinion inconsistent with their conservative views ruthlessly repressed. There are some Progressives who would like to see every conservative mind eliminated from the faculty and the University turned into a propagandist agency for their particular views of politics and economics. I shall not speak with an equal sense of certainty of groups I have not had the privilege of seeing in action.

### *Will Fight for Freedom*

But this much I can say with certainty: As long as I am president of the University of Wisconsin, no limited group in this state will turn the University into its tool without knowing that it has been through a fight. The University is not worth the investment of one dollar of taxpayers' money unless it maintains its freedom from the external control of cliques. And as long as I am its president I shall fight for this freedom to deal objectively with the life of the mind and the life of the state regardless of personal cost to myself or political support for the University itself. For I would rather see the University of Wisconsin suffer the rigors of a lean budget through an unpopularity resulting from courageous, accurate, and objective research in the living issues of the political, social, and economic life of Wisconsin than to see it grow fat in a popularity achieved by sedulous aloofness from such issues. And I will never willingly buy support for the University at the price of turning it into a propagandist agency for any particular group in this state—political or economic.

I have spoken at length upon varied implications of the "right of freedom" and I want now to speak a concluding word on the "responsibilities of freedom."

The institution or the individual enjoying the right of freedom is obligated thereby to carry the responsibilities of freedom. The University, as an institution, is seeking to carry these responsibilities of freedom intelligently and conscientiously.

A year ago it made certain changes in its disciplinary and regulatory personnel and machinery. Certain observers, either misguided or determined to misrepresent, interpreted those changes as a relaxation of discipline and control. The intention behind these changes was rather to strengthen the forces of discipline, control, and guidance.

### *Upholds Disciplinary Change*

The immediate administration of discipline was transferred from the Deans of Men and Women in order that they might be freed to exercise that confidential and sympathetic and intelligent guidance that fathers and mothers seek to give when their sons and daughters run amuck. It was also sought to free the Deans of Men and Women from the reputation of police officers that they might serve as counsellors and friends to students in those normal hours when they are not in trouble. The administration of actual discipline was lodged in the hands of an able faculty committee on student conduct. And I speak responsibly when I say that I doubt that the administration of discipline has been handled more intelligently, more sympathetically, and more effectively in any American university this year than by this faculty committee at the University of Wisconsin. Proved violators of the moral code that commands itself to the decent and the intelligent majority have been summarily dropped from the University. But their names have not been flaunted to make news copy for a yellow press or campaign copy for yellow politicians. They have been dealt with as we think an intelligent parent would deal with them.

The overwhelming majority of the students of the University are clean in mind and decent in morals. In any community of 10,000 there will be a handful of persons at once nasty and noisy. The University cannot maintain a detective force to dog the footsteps of 10,000 students day and night in order to discover this handful of morally deficient students. To do so, were it possible, would be an insult to the decent and responsible 99 per cent. When the derelictions of the morally deficient are discovered they are dealt with promptly and decisively.

The issue of immoralism would never be raised but for the occasional outburst of "sex letters" in the student newspaper. In the nearly seven years I have been the executive head of the University of Wisconsin, there have been two outbursts of bad taste and indefensible indiscretion in the letter column of the student newspaper. I have been reluctant to lay down a list of taboo topics for the student newspaper, for I know how censorships, however intelligent and justified they may be in their specific regulations, lay a clammy hand upon the mind of a student body or a nation. But the experience of the last seven years should, I think, make plain to any student editor that the

## CONVOCATION ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT GLENN FRANK

---

printing of the views of an occasional student on sex relations in terms not accepted for publication by any professional newspaper is not only a violation of elementary good taste but a plain ignoring of the responsibilities of freedom in that it but gives added war materials to blatherskites and demagogues who are seeking to attack the University for other reasons. I have confidence that responsible students charged with the responsibility of the student press can draw the line between good taste and bad taste. If this confidence proves to be misplaced, I can draw this line and draw it without infringement of that authentic freedom of speech in which I believe profoundly.

### *"The Narrow Gate"*

And now let me speak, out of an older experience, to the students of the University of Wisconsin of this much discussed matter of morals. There is an old admonition in the New Testament that says, "Enter by the narrow gate . . . wide is the gate and broad the road that leads to ruin . . . narrow is the gate and constricted the road that leads to life." This may sound somewhat out of key with some current discussions of morals, but let me tell you why I think it is an admonition that might well be pasted over the study table of every modern university student.

I hope you will not think me wholly out of step with the time if I illustrate the contention I am trying to state by harking back to the old Puritans. Some years ago, when I lived in New York, I had many long and luminous talks with Richard Roberts about the Puritans. Each of us was more or less a professional liberal. We were so liberal, in fact, that we spent so much time talking about the importance of being liberal that we had all-too-little time left to talk about things that needed liberalizing. The irony of that finally impressed us. We had done our share of damning the Puritan for his bleak moralisms and his blue laws. And yet, surrounded by liberal colleagues who, in their zeal to be broad-minded, so often succeeded only in being scatter-brained, we went back again and again to the old Puritan, whose mind we did not like, to find, if we could, what made him so much more of a personal and social force than many of our modernist fellows, whose minds we liked so much better. Let me tell you the conclusion we two liberals reached.

Finally, to our surprise, we came to agreement that it was the Puritan's "narrowness" that made him such an invincible personal and social force. It was not his narrowness of mind but his narrowness of living that impressed us as we went in search of the secret springs of his power. The old Puritan faced a stern struggle for survival in the New England he was carving out of the wilderness. He knew that he could not afford to waste vital energies on profitless adventures. He knew that he had to bring his life to focus. And so, in the manner of his living, he cut a channel through which

his energies should flow and, with their channeled power, turn the wheels of the New England enterprise. I do not suggest that we adopt the dogmas and prejudices of the old Puritan, but I do suggest that we can study with profit the technique of living he brought to a difficult time.

### *Advises Self-Discipline*

The old Puritan was at once a man of social defiance and a man of self-discipline. With his social defiance he resisted the political and ecclesiastical authority that seemed to him to be smothering the sanctity of life. With his self-discipline he held himself aloof from the moral degenerations that seemed to him to be sapping the strength of life. That he made mistakes in applying these principles does not invalidate them for us and for our time. His notions of life and of morals may have been extreme. The poison of fanaticism may have diluted and made septic his significance. He started out as the apostle of public liberty and personal discipline, and later destroyed public liberty by turning his personal disciplines into public prohibitions. As if morals are made by force! But we do not have to repeat his mistakes. We cannot afford, however, to ignore the necessity of the self-discipline he practiced.

The youth I see around me from day to day impresses me with its magnificent vitality, but if there is a central weakness at the heart of this vitality it is that contemporary youth is blind to the necessity of conserving its vital energies, of bringing them to focus, of cutting a channel for them to flow through. And the youth of the modern university must ever miss the point if it follows the old Puritan in his social defiance but forsakes his self-discipline.

Post-war youth has been charged with a rather complete scrapping of self-discipline. I think a lot of the looseness of youth since the war has been a superficial mood and manner rather than a deep-seated apostasy. Much that has been hailed as reckless non-conformity has been in reality a reasonless conformity. Non-conformity became fashionable in the unsettled days that followed the war. Youth felt that it had to be non-conformist to stay in the swim. And so, to an extent hardly realized, this non-conformity was more a display of cowardice than of courage. The new freedom became, in cases beyond number, a new slavery. It is interesting to see how this has dawned upon men and women who were college age when the war ended. The rebellion against self discipline, on the part of men and women who were college age a dozen or more years ago, has noticeably cooled.

### *Bohemian Era is Passed*

I remember vividly the days, some fifteen years ago, when the young writers and young artists of New York were going in rather heavily for the

## FREEDOM, EDUCATION, AND MORALS IN THE MODERN UNIVERSITY

---

irregularities of bohemianism. In those days, youths smitten with literary and artistic ambitions, huddled together in little colonies, like Greenwich Village, where they lived, as they like to say, above the ordinary battles of morals and manners. Those were the days of the great emancipation! Young men and young women were looking for what they called release. They could not, they said, be bound in mind or morals by any of the chains of yesterday, if they were to create beautiful and enduring works of art. That mood and that movement are pretty well shot to pieces to-day. It is becoming more and more difficult to locate Bohemia on the literary and artistic maps. To-day you are more likely to find the productive young writer in the country outside New York than in the cafes inside New York. There are still camp-followers of the cult of bohemianism who insist that there is some organic connection between

masterful art and moral anarchy, but they are, in the main, dreaming incompetents who are more gifted in conversation than in creativeness.

What has effected this change? Billy Sunday has not swooped down on Greenwich Village and lured the loose lives of yesterday down the sawdust trail. No! It is simply that all save the dreaming incompetents have learned by experience that creative art demands a decently strict husbanding of the artist's vital energies, which alone make intelligence and intensity of application possible and productive. Whether we choose to invite or to ignore the counsels of the moralist, this much may be seen for the looking: Art, imperious mistress that she is, whips her followers into acknowledgment that self-expression without self-discipline becomes only something for futile bohemians to talk about over coffee and cognac.



Madison, Wisconsin  
1932