“The inaugural address delivered to this audience was a straightforward presentation of the situation at Yale and of the plans of the president. It was well received, not only by the immediate audience but in editorial comment all over the country.”

Thus did Morris Hadley describe the inaugural address of his father in his biography of Arthur Twining Hadley. Though he included several sentences from the speech itself, he wrote mainly of the ceremony. The inauguration, in 1899, had started with an academic procession in the afternoon and ended with an undergraduate torchlight parade in the evening, led by a dummy railroad train complete with realistic puffs of smoke pouring out of the locomotive. “Hadley R. R. Transportation Co.” was painted on the train in honor of the President’s academic field, and transparencies bearing the words “A New Train of Thought” and “Yale is on the Right Track” all echoed Hadley’s famous publication *Railroad Transportation, Its History and Its Laws*. The undergraduates wore academic costumes, each class in a different brilliant color. The students cheered as they passed the President’s House, saluting both Hadley and President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, who stood by his side reviewing the parade.

Morris Hadley felt that the inauguration ceremony itself was of great significance as a harbinger of change. “For the first time in two hundred years the emphasis was on Yale in its relation to the outside world rather than on Yale as a world in itself. The large number of distinguished guests was one aspect of this, guests not only from the world of education but from other fields as well. Another aspect, which evoked a surprising degree of comment, was that for the first time Latin orations were omitted.”

It was at the request of President Hadley that the traditional Latin pronouncements were abandoned.

Arthur Twining Hadley had grown up in New Haven, where his father James was Professor of Greek Language and Literature. Hadley was an only child whose early schooling took place at home. He attended Hopkins Grammar School from the age of twelve and entered Yale in 1872 at the age of sixteen. He graduated as valedictorian of his class, remained in New Haven doing postgraduate work in history and political science for a year, then spent two years in Europe including study at the University of Berlin. Returning to New Haven, Hadley was a tutor for four years but found no position at the University in his field of political economy. He did freelance writing and eventually received an appointment under William Graham Sumner in the political science department lecturing on railway management. His first book, *Railroad Transportation, Its History and Its Laws*, was pub-
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lished in 1885. This was also the year in which Hadley was recognized as an expert in the field and was designated Commissioner of Labor Statistics of Connecticut, a post he held for two years. He was then appointed to a newly created professorship of political science; the title was changed to Professor of Political Economy in 1891. Hadley was one of the most popular faculty members, and his breadth of learning and style of teaching became famous across the campus. In addition, he served as the first Dean of the Graduate School from 1892 to 1895; during his term women were admitted to the Graduate School for the first time. He also was chosen president of the American Economic Association and was one of the original editors of the Yale Review. His election at the age of forty-three and as the first layman to hold the presidency was enormously popular with both students and alumni, as evidenced by the celebrations described above.

Hadley was immediately thrust into planning for the bicentennial in 1901, and later faced many problems with the outbreak of World War I when he participated actively in planning and implementing changes on campus which he described in his President’s Report for 1918–1919: “Yale was…engaged in two kinds of military training…at once an officers’ training camp and a military university.” It was Hadley’s administrative style to delegate duties, particularly to Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes, his Secretary, and Treasurer George Parmly Day. Stokes in particular was second in command, in charge of alumni relations, fundraising, general overall administration, and education planning (since there was no Provost at that time). It was also in the later years of Hadley’s presidency that alumni insistence on changes in almost all educational areas resulted in the Reorganization Plan of 1919.

Hadley announced his plan to resign at the age of sixty-five, having served for twenty-two years. He could look back and take pride in the enormous physical expansion—including scientific laboratories on Pierson-Sage Square, the Yale Bowl, Sprague Hall for the School of Music, an Armory during World War I at Yale Field, and Harkness Memorial Quadrangle. Hadley had decisively influenced the transition to a University, and his emphasis on scholarship, innovation, and public service defined his hopes for the institution during his presidency.
Arthur Twining Hadley
INAUGURAL ADDRESS

ARTHUR TWINING HADLEY, OCTOBER 18, 1899

Thirteen years ago my honored predecessor traced in his inaugural address the changes which two centuries had developed in Yale’s educational methods and ideals, and showed with clearness what were the corresponding changes in organization which would best fit her to apply these methods and approach these ideals. What has once been done so well we need not undertake to do again. Let us rather proceed to a detailed consideration of the problems which now confront us in the various departments of college and university life. Let us formulate the questions which press for solution. Let us study the good and evil attendant on various methods of dealing with them. Let us see, as far as we may, what lines of policy in these matters of immediate practical moment will enable us best to meet the demands of the oncoming century.

These problems are for the most part not peculiar to Yale. The questions which present themselves to the authorities here are in large measure the same which arise elsewhere. But the conditions governing their solution are different. We may best understand the work which Yale has to do if we study the problems in their general form, as they come before the whole brotherhood of educators as a body; and then try to solve them in the particular form which is fixed by the special circumstances, past and present, which have made Yale University what it is.

Fifty years ago the duties of college administration were relatively simple. There was at that time a certain curriculum of studies, chiefly in classics and in deductive science, which the public accepted as necessary for the development of an educated man. These studies were taught by traditional methods which compelled the pupil to perform a considerable amount of work whether he liked it or not. The student body was a homogeneous one, meeting in the same recitation rooms day by day. The classes readily acquired a spirit of good fellowship and democracy. Outside conditions favored the maintenance of this spirit. Differences in wealth throughout the community were less conspicuous than they are today. College education was so cheap that it fell within the reach of all. Most of the students were poor. The few who possessed wealth found comparatively little opportunity for spending it in legitimate ways. Rich and poor stood on a common footing as regarded participation in the social ambitions and privileges of college life. The intellectual education which such a college gave to the
majority of its students was but an incidental service as compared with their education in sterling virtue. The institution which could furnish this double training met fully the requirements which public opinion imposed.

The first of the disturbing elements which entered to complicate the problem of college education was found in the development of professional schools. Down to the early part of the present century, professional study was largely done in private, in the office of some successful lawyer or doctor or in the study of some experienced minister. Even when schools of theology, of law, or of medicine were established, they at first occupied themselves largely with teaching the same kind of things that might have been learned in the office by the old method. But about the middle of the present century a new and more enlightened view of technical training arose. It was seen that a professional school did its best work when it taught principles rather than practice. Instead of cramming the students with details which they would otherwise learn afterward, it was found much better to train them in methods of reasoning which otherwise they would not learn at all. This study of principles, to be thoroughly effective, necessarily occupied several years. There was a strong pressure to introduce the elements of these studies into the curriculum; and a demand that when once they were incorporated in the college course they should be taught, not in a perfunctory way, but with the same standard of excellence which was achieved in our best professional schools.

Meantime, apart from these changes in the method of technical training, the sphere of interest of the cultivated man of the country was constantly widening. The course of college study which satisfied an earlier generation was inadequate for a later one. The man who would have breadth of sympathy with the various departments of human knowledge could not content himself with classics, mathematics and psychology. He must be familiar with modern literature as well as ancient, with physical science as well as deductive.

If we had at once widened the college curriculum enough to correspond to the increased range of human interest, and lengthened the period of professional study enough to give each man the fullest recognized training for his specialty—if, to quote the old educational phrase, we had taught each man something of everything and everything of something—the time of university education would have lengthened itself to ten or fifteen years. Its complete fruition would have been a luxury out of reach of all but the favored few. The difficulty could be met only by the adoption of an elective system: a system which ceased to treat the college course as a fixed curriculum for all, and gave an opportunity for the selection of groups of studies adapted to the varying needs of the several students.
The introduction of these methods of university education, necessary as it was, has been nevertheless attended with serious dangers and evils.

In the first place, there is apt to be a change in the mode of instruction which, while good for the best students, runs the risk of proving bad for the ordinary ones. The old method of handling large classes in a fixed course of study under the recitation system required all the students to do a modicum of work, and enabled the teacher to see whether they were doing it or not. The divisions were adjusted and could be constantly readjusted with that end in view. The time of the instructors was so far economized by the narrow range of subjects taught that their attention could be properly concentrated on this one point of keeping the students up to their work by a daily oral examination. But with the increasing number of things to be taught, the variation in the size of classes, and the demands which the best students now make for really advanced teaching, this supervision and concentration is no longer possible. The instructor who is teaching small groups of selected men who have a particular interest in his subject, is forced to content himself with what is little more than a lecture in teaching the larger groups of ordinary men to whom the subject has only a general interest. A lecture system of this kind is beset with perils. It is something of which we have to make use, because there are not enough first-rate men in the country to teach all the subjects of study which this generation demands, in classes of size small enough to adapt themselves to the recitation system. The choice in many lines of study lies between having recitations with fourth-rate men or lectures from first-rate ones. I never met a good teacher who really approved of the lecture system, or who did not prefer small classes to large ones. But these really good teachers are just the men that we wish to bring in contact with as many students as possible. If we refuse to let them lecture, we either confine the benefit of their instructions to a few, or increase their hours beyond the possibility of human endurance.

Another evil connected with the elective system is the loss of esprit de corps. In a college like West Point or Annapolis, where a homogeneous body of men is pursuing a common scheme of studies, with a common end in view, and with rigorous requirements as to the work which must be done by each individual, this spirit is seen at its strongest. The place sets its character stamp upon every one; sometimes perhaps for evil, but in the vast majority of cases for good. An approximation to this state of things was seen in our early American colleges. In many of them it is still maintained to a considerable degree. But the forces which maintain it are far less potent today than they were fifty years ago. The community of interests is less, the community of hard work is very much less. If this college spirit once passes away, the whole group of qualities which we have known by the name of
college democracy is in danger of passing also. For the increase of wealth in
the outside world is a perpetual menace to old-fashioned democratic equal-
ity. If we have within the college life not only differences in things studied,
but differences in enjoyment between rich and poor, we are at once in
danger of witnessing a development of social distinctions and class inter-
ests which shall sweep away the thing which was most characteristic and
most valuable in the earlier education of our colleges. Not the intellectual
life only, nor the social life only, but the whole religious and moral atmo-
sphere suffers deterioration if a place becomes known either as a rich man’s
college; or, worse yet, as a college where rich and poor meet on different
footings. What shall it profit us, if we gain the whole world and lose our
own soul; if we develop the intellectual and material side of our education,
and lose the traditional spirit of democracy and loyalty and Christianity?

That there will be an advance in thoroughness of preparation for the
special lines of work which our students are to undertake, is a thing of
which we may safely rest assured. That there shall be a similar advance in
the general training for citizenship in the United States, is an obligation for
whose fulfillment our universities are responsible. The Yale of the future
must count for even more than the Yale of the past in the work of city, state,
and nation. It must come into closer touch with our political life, and be a
larger part of that life. To this end it is not enough for her to train experts
competent to deal with the financial and legal problems which are before
us. Side by side with this training, she must evoke in the whole body of her
students and alumni that wider sense of their obligation as members of a
free commonwealth which the America of the twentieth century requires.

The central problem, which we all have to face, and about which all
other problems group themselves, is this: How shall we make our educa-
tional system meet the world’s demands for progress on the intellectual
side, without endangering the growth of that which has proved most valu-
able on the moral side? And it is the latter part which demands the most
immediate attention from a college president, not necessarily because it is
more important in itself—for where two things are both absolutely indis-
pensable, a comparison of relative values is meaningless—but because the
individual professors can, and under the keen competition between univer-
sities must, attend in large measure to the excellence of instruction in
their several departments, while the action of the university as a whole, and
the intelligent thought of the university administration, is requisite to pre-
vent the sacrifice of the moral interest of the whole commonwealth.

There are four ways in which we may strive to deal with this difficulty.
1. By relegating the work of character development more and more to the preparatory schools. Our acceptance or non-acceptance of this solution determines our attitude toward the problem of entrance requirements.

2. By striving to limit the occasion for the use of money on the part of the student. The necessity for such limitation constitutes the problem of college expenses.

3. By endeavoring to create a body of common interests and traditions outside of the college course which shall make up for the diversity of interests within it. The most widely discussed, though possibly not the most important, point under this head is furnished by the problem of college athletics.

4. By so arranging the work of the different departments of study that the variety inherent in the elective system shall not be attended with intellectual dissipation; providing the chance for economy of effort on the part of the instructor and the assurance of systematic cooperation on the part of the pupils. This is the problem of university organization.

The plan of relegating the responsibility for character development to the preparatory schools has at first sight much to commend it. It relieves the college officers of the most disagreeable part of their duty, that which pertains to matters of discipline, and enables them to concentrate their attention on their function as teachers. It meets the demands of many progressive men engaged in secondary education, some of whom long for an extension of their professional functions into new fields of activity, while others, justly proud of their success in the formation of character under existing conditions, desire the additional opportunity which is given them if they can keep their oldest boys a year or two longer under their influence. The larger the university the greater becomes the pressure in this direction.

But with conditions as they exist at Yale, I cannot think it wise to yield to this pressure. If we take a year from the beginning of the college course, that year will be spent by most of the boys either in a high school or a large academy. In the former case we approach the German or French system of education; in the latter the English. A compromise between the two, whereby a boy finishes his high school course and then takes the additional year at an academy, is hardly admissible on any ground; the single year is somewhat too short to give the intellectual influences of the new place to which the boy goes, and far too short to give its character influences. I cannot believe that any one who has watched the workings of the French or German system would desire to see it adopted in this country. The passage at an advanced age from the discipline of the lycée or gymnasium to the
freedom of the university, however well it may work in its intellectual results, does not produce the kind of moral ones which we need. The English system has wider possibilities; and for England it does extremely well. But it is essentially a product of English conditions, — that is, of aristocratic ones. It is an education for a privileged class. In America, on the other hand, we wish our higher education to remain democratic. We should not be satisfied with a system which excluded from its benefits the large number of boys who come from institutions, public or private, which are situated near their own homes, and prepare only small groups for college. And even to those who are fortunate enough to come from the best preparatory schools, the loss in college life would often outweigh the gain in school life. A system of influences whose operation terminates at nineteen or twenty fixes a boy’s moral and social place too soon. For the young man who has grown to the full measure of his moral stature at this age it is good; for the one who matures later it is distinctly bad. In our everyday experience at Yale, as we watch the interaction between school estimates and college estimates of character, we can see that whatever postpones a man’s final social rating to as late a day as possible lengthens the period of strenuous moral effort, increases the chance of continued growth, and is of the largest value to the boys and men of the best type.

The abandonment of the responsibility for forming character would have its disadvantages for the university no less than for the students. A boy’s loyalty will remain where his moral character has formed itself. The devotion and sentiment of the Englishman play not about Oxford or Cambridge, but about Eton, Harrow, and Rugby. Universities which derive their prestige and their wealth from the past rather than from the present may perhaps endure this deprivation. Not so the American college or university, which looks for its strongest support to the loyalty of its alumni.

With the desire of secondary school teachers to extend their work I have the strongest sympathy. To the idea of cooperation between universities and schools, whereby each shall arrange its teaching with reference to the other’s needs, I am fully and absolutely committed, and propose to do all that I can to further it. A university fulfills its true function only when it thus seeks and gives aid outside of itself. But I believe that the chance for this extension, this cooperation, and this leadership, is to come through the freer interchange of thought and interchange of men between school teaching and university teaching, rather than through a transference of subjects from one to the other. I believe that with the conditions as they exist, the true policy for our university with regard to entrance requirements is to find out what our secondary schools can do for their pupils, intellectually and morally, and adapt our requirements to these conditions. Detailed
questions as to what specific subjects we shall require must be subordinated to this general principle of requiring those things, and only those things, which the schools can do well. To know whether we can substitute French or German for Greek, we must know whether any considerable number of schools teach French or German in such a way as to make it a real equivalent for Greek in the way of preparation for more advanced studies. Unless we keep our minds on this principle, we shall be in perpetual danger of receiving students who have been crammed for their examinations rather than trained for their work.

The second of our leading problems is the question of college expenses. Though the increase in this respect is less than is popularly supposed, there is no doubt that it is large enough to constitute a serious danger. It is far from easy to see how this danger is to be avoided. It is all very well to talk of returning to the Spartan simplicity of ancient times, but we cannot do it, nor ought we to if we could. We cannot, for the sake of saving the cost of a bathroom, return to the time when people took no baths. Nor can we meet the difficulty by furnishing the comforts of modern civilization and charging no price for them. If the university could afford to do it for every one, it might be well; but to do it for some and not for others works against the spirit of democracy. It may readily become a form of pauperization. This same danger lurks in the whole system of beneficiary aid, as at present given in Yale and in most other colleges. To avoid this danger, and at the same time give the men the help which they fairly ought to have, we need not so much an increase of beneficiary funds as an increase of the opportunities for students to earn their living. Aid in education, if given without exacting a corresponding return, becomes demoralizing. If it is earned by the student as he goes, it has just the opposite effect. This holds good of graduate scholarships and fellowships no less than of undergraduate ones. There is no doubt that in the somewhat indiscriminate competition of different universities anxious to increase the size, real or apparent, of their graduate departments, there has been an abuse of these appliances which, unless promptly corrected, threatens the future of the teaching profession with an over-abundant influx of inferior men.

The true policy in the matter of expenses and beneficiary aid would appear to be as follows:

1st. In building new dormitories and other appliances connected with the daily life of the students, we should strive to use the kind of intelligent economy which any but the richest man would use in building a house for himself. We should construct them on the standard set by our homes rather than by our clubs. In this way we should create a general level of average
expense in the college life which would attract rather than repel the boy who has to make his own way. We should indeed welcome beautiful buildings, given to the university as memorials of affection; but we should strive to have them so designed that their beauty may be a means of enjoyment to the whole community.

2d. Tuition should be remitted with the utmost freedom to those who maintain a respectable standing. Such tuition should be either earned by service or regarded as a loan—a loan without interest, if you please, or at any rate at a purely nominal interest charge, and payable at the option of the holder, but in its essence a loan—a thing to be paid ultimately, unless disease or death intervene. By establishing a system of such repayment we could give aid far more universally than we now do, could perhaps lower the tuition fees in general, and could avoid a system of fraud which is at present practiced somewhat extensively on our colleges.

3d. All scholarship aid beyond the tuition fees, whether for undergraduates or for graduates, should be distinctly in the nature of a prize for really distinguished work, or a payment for services rendered. I am aware that there are great practical obstacles which oppose the carrying out of this view, and I do not feel sure how quickly Yale will be in a position to put it into effect; but that it is a desirable ideal and goal there appears to be no doubt whatever. Remuneration rather than pauperization should be the principle underlying such aid.

4th. Above all things—and this is a matter where we need the cooperation of persons outside as well as inside the university—the utmost study should be bestowed on the possibility of utilizing the powers of the students in such a way that they can be of service to the college community and the world at large, and thus earn the aid which is given them. The problem is a most difficult one; too difficult even to be analyzed in the brief time before us today. But the amount of progress made already, in the few experiments which have been seriously tried, leads me to believe in an almost unbounded opportunity for ultimate development of this idea.

Our third group of problems is connected with the development and preservation of common student interests and student life outside of the immediate work of the class room.

Of all these interests, the most fundamental are those connected with religious observances and religious feeling. Yale is, and has been from the first, a Christian college. All her institutions show this throughout their structure. This was the dominant purpose in Yale’s foundation; and the work and thought of the children have conformed to the wish of the fathers.
What changes time may bring in the outward observances, or how soon it may bring them, I know not. The question of compulsory attendance on religious exercises is one which is seriously discussed by the faculty, the students, and the graduates; nor can we predict the outcome of such discussion. But this I know: that it is approached by all, young and old, in a spirit of wise conservatism and reverence for past usage, and that no change will be made unless it shall surely and clearly appear to those in authority that we are but modifying the letter of a tradition for the sake of preserving its spirit.

Even in matters of far less fundamental importance we may, I think, wisely preserve this same spirit of conservatism. An ancient university has a great advantage in the existence of a body of time-honored usages and traditions. Some of these it inevitably outgrows as time goes on. But a large majority serve a most useful purpose in binding the students together by bonds none the less real because so intangible. Such college customs and traditions we should maintain to the utmost. Even where they seem artificial or meaningless we should be careful how we let them go. It is not inconsistent with the spirit of progress to value them highly. Edmund Burke was one of the most liberal and progressive men of his century; yet Burke was the man who set the truest value on those forms of the English constitution which, as he himself avowed, were rooted in prejudice. The constitution of Yale today, with its strange combination of liberty and privilege, of prescriptive custom and progressive individualism, has not a few points of resemblance to Burke's England. I can avow myself a conservative in the sense that Burke was a conservative; with him, I should hesitate to cast away the coat of prejudice and leave nothing but the naked reason.

Another group of cohesive forces which strengthens the influence of a university upon its members is connected with college athletics. The value of athletic sports when practiced in the right spirit is only equaled by their perniciousness when practiced in the wrong spirit. They deserve cordial and enthusiastic support. The time or thought spent upon them, great as it may seem, is justified by their educational influence. But side by side with this support and part of it, we must have unsparing condemnation of the whole spirit of professionalism. I do not refer to those grosser and more obvious forms of professionalism which college sentiment has already learned to condemn. Nor do I chiefly refer to the betting by which intercollegiate contests are accompanied, though this is a real and great evil, and does much to bring other evils in its train. I refer to something far more widespread, which still remains a menace to American college athletics,—the whole system of regarding athletic achievement as a sort of advertisement of one's prowess, and of valuing success for its own sake rather than
for the sake of the honor which comes in achieving it by honorable methods. I rejoice in Yale’s victories, I mourn in her defeats; but I mourn still more whenever I see a Yale man who regards athletics as a sort of competitive means for pushing the university ahead of some rival. This is professionalism of the most subtle and therefore most dangerous sort. I know that the condition of athletic discipline in a college makes a difference in its attractiveness to a large and desirable class of young men, and rightly so. Whether a victory or a series of victories makes such a difference, and increases the numbers that attend the university, I do not know and I do not care to know. The man who allows his mind to dwell on such a question, if he is not tempted to violate the ethics of amateur sport, is at any rate playing with temptation in a dangerous and reprehensible way. I am glad to believe that our colleges, and our nation as a whole, are becoming better able to understand the love of sport for its own sake. The growth of this spirit through three generations has relieved English universities of some of the problems which today confront us in America. To the growth of this spirit we must trust for their solution here. I am ready heartily to cooperate in any attempts that other colleges may make to lay down clear rules for the practice of intercollegiate athletics, because the absence of such cooperation would be misunderstood and would give cause for suspicion where none ought to exist. But I cannot conceal the fact that the majority of such rules can only touch the surface of the difficulty and so far as they distract attention from the moral element in the case which is beyond all reach of rules, they may prove a positive hindrance to progress. If we can enter into athletics for the love of honor, in the broadest sense of the word, unmixed with the love of gain in any sense, we may now and then lose a few students, but we shall grow better year after year in all that makes for sound university life.

Last in order of discussion, though perhaps first in the imminence with which they press upon us for solution, are some of the problems of university organization, on whose proper treatment depends that economy of effort and utilization of financial resources which is necessary for the efficient working of the institution as it stands and for its growth in the immediate future.

It is hardly necessary to say to this audience that Yale’s organization differs somewhat fundamentally from that of most other American universities. It is a group of colleges, whose property is held in the name of a single corporation, but whose management is, by tradition and in some slight degree by legal authority, located in the hands of separate faculties. In this respect, Yale is not without points of resemblance to Oxford or Cambridge. I shall not try to discuss whether this system is on the whole a good one. It
is here, and we cannot for the present change it. Like all other systems, it has its advantages and its disadvantages. The advantages are those which are possessed by local government everywhere,—an independence of initiative; a loyal spirit among the members of the several faculties which is the natural result of such independence; a sort of natural grouping of the students under which a common set of rules can be made for each department, and the evils of too great freedom may be avoided. The independence of initiative has manifested itself in the development of new methods of instruction, like those of the Sheffield Scientific School in the past, or the Department of Music in the present. The loyalty has been exemplified over and over again in the readiness to work for salaries even more conspicuously inadequate than those which have been paid at other universities, by men who seek their reward in the possibilities of future greatness. This history of disinterested effort for future rather than present reward has repeated itself in each department of instruction. The effect of the grouping of the students in separate departments has shown itself in the preservation of that *esprit de corps* which Yale has succeeded in maintaining, I believe, to a greater degree than any other university of the same magnitude.

On the other hand, the system has the disadvantages which everywhere pertain to a scheme of independent local government. There is sometimes a difficulty in carrying the whole university sharply forward into any definite line of policy, however strongly it may be demanded. There is yet more frequently a lack of coordination in courses; the work of each of the separate parts or schools having been originally devised with reference to the needs of members to that school, rather than to those of the university as a whole. And finally, there is a certain amount of duplication of appliances, which involves some actual loss of economy and makes the impression on the public of causing even more loss than really exists. Especially severe does this loss seem to some of the most zealous members of the professional schools, who believe that by combining the work of their opening years with that of the later years of the Academic Department or Sheffield Scientific School, they can serve the University and the cause of learning with far more fullness and freedom than at present.

Reform under these circumstances can only be the result of unconstrained discussion and intelligent negotiation. The best possibilities lie not in the exercise of authority but of diplomacy. The effort to impose a prearranged policy is likely to prove futile. We cannot insist on an external appearance of harmony without losing more than we gain. To say that the Scientific School ought to have a four years’ course because the Academic Department has one, or to insist that the Academic Department should
withdraw from the teaching of natural science because the Scientific School has made such full provision for it, serves only to retard the movement toward cooperation. The president who would succeed in establishing real harmony must occupy himself first with providing the means to lead men to a mutual understanding, rather than with predicting the results which should follow.

Foremost among the means which we must use is free and unreserved discussion of principles. Even within the departments, such discussion has been by no means so universal as it might have been. In more than one of them there has been a tendency, both in matters of administration and of educational policy, to rest content with a compromise between conflicting interests, rather than a reconciliation of conflicting views. A typical result of this policy is seen in the present course of study in the Academic Department, where the so-called elective system is really not a system at all, but the haphazard result of competition between the advocates of different lines of instruction—a thing which all unite in desiring to reform. With a reasonable degree of diplomacy and patience, the task of reform in cases like this should not prove a hard one.

Still less adequate has been the interchange of ideas between the different departments. Under the old system the several faculties have had no organized means of discussing subjects of common interest, or even of learning one another’s views. The establishment of a university council for such interchange of thought is an imperative necessity. What will ultimately prove the best form and constitution for such a council can only be a matter of conjecture. For the present, at any rate, such a body is likely to be for the most part deliberative in its functions. Whatever else such a body may do or fail to do, it can prevent many of the misunderstandings and cross purposes which arise from imperfect information, and can thus contribute to the successful transaction of all business that is possible by preventing attempts at the impossible.

In the second place, we must so use those funds which are at the disposal of the central administration as to make it an object for men in the different departments to cooperate at those points where the absence of such cooperation does most harm.

As far as elementary teaching is concerned, the waste from having the same subject taught in two or more departments may be more apparent than real. It involves no very great loss to teach elementary chemistry in two independent sets of laboratories if both laboratories are always kept full of students. The waste comes in thus teaching advanced chemistry where there are relatively few students and where there is much need of specialization. Under such circumstances the existence of separate laboratories tends
to prevent proper division of labor. Under such circumstances duplication is a waste and coordination a necessity. If the material appliances for higher education are not the property of any one department, but stand in relation to the university as a whole, the instructors of the different departments tend of their own free will to cooperate with one another in the higher instruction in their several branches. Under proper management, institutions like the Peabody Museum or the Winchester Observatory tend thus to systematize instruction at the point where such an effect is most needed. With a very moderate increase of endowment, properly applied, I believe that the same sort of harmony can be attained in many other lines of instruction. Among the achievements of my predecessor in office, there is none so wide-reaching in its effects as the development of a large university fund which, without threatening the independence of the several departments, can be used to provide means for promoting unity of action where such unity is indispensable.

In the English universities the teaching is in large measure done by the several colleges, while the examinations are, with few exceptions, the affair of the university. It seems probable that the development of Yale in the future may be just the reverse of this; the several colleges taking charge of the examinations and of those more elementary studies whose control naturally connects itself with the control of examinations, while the distinctively teaching appliances come, to a constantly greater extent, into the hands of the university authorities. Under such a system we should have a well-ordered scheme of local government, where each department could make its own rules, prescribe the conditions of entrance and graduation and be subject to the minimum of interference from without; but where at the same time the instruction would be so ordered that students whose course lay under the control of one faculty could yet enjoy to the fullest possible extent the teaching provided by another, and where, as the subject of study became more and more advanced, the distinction of separate faculties or colleges would disappear altogether.

Such are, in brief outline, a few of the problems which we have inherited from the past. It would be indeed a large burden had we not also inherited from that past an inspiration yet larger. Yale’s seal bears the motto, “Light and Truth”; Yale’s history has been worthy of its signet. Never have there been wanting torch-bearers to take the light from the hands that relinquished it. In this place, hallowed by the deeds of our fathers, all words of formal acceptance of the duties which they have left us are meaningless. It is a God-given trust: may God bless the issue!
“At the head of the line and guarded by a score of Seniors came the Piece de resistance of the occasion, the ‘Hadley Transportation Co.’ train. This very clever and original compliment to the new President had been built in the greatest secrecy on the top story of the chemical laboratory, and its existence was known only to a few until the time for its public appearance. The train, which consisted of an engine and three cars, having a total length of about 60 feet and a width of 4 feet, was built of light material covered with cloth and painted in exact imitation of the ordinary railroad coach. The engine was provided with wheels, but the coaches were carried by sweeps, two in each car. In the cab of the engine was the engineer, realistically daubed with oil and blackened with coal dust, smoking a corncob pipe, and behind him the trusty fireman, who kept up a clanging of the bell for crossings. From the smokestack poured a steady volume of smoke, which was rather too light in color for coal, but suggested cotton waste. Nevertheless the effect was everything that could be asked. The conductor and the head and tail brakemen walked alongside and kept a lookout for hot boxes and broken wheels. By a clever sketch in what was made to appear like the open door of the baggage car, Senator Chauncey M. Depew was seen handling a trunk marked ‘A.T.H., Yale’ while in the windows of the cars several of Yale’s well known men were depicted.”
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