CITIZENSHIP IN A MODERN WORLD.

BY PROF. MC KENDRICK

The portals of this university receive, during the course of each generation, a goodly company of men and women who would devote a part of their lives to the pursuit of learning and to the search for an understanding of the world in which they live. It is not given to all of them to play a role in the heroic adventure of extending the bounds of our knowledge. Experience in that adventure must be a test of the strength of any civilization, and a universality will hardly deserve its name if in each generation it does not induct new elements and survivals which are wholly unrelated to any immediately of its members into a sharing of that experience. But the number of trained scholars and artists will doubtless always be limited, and perhaps a university must be content if it can impart to the larger group of its members some sense of the whole vision of our public questions. To each opinion, an advertising of its adherents and supporters which are wholly unrelated to any interest of learning, some desire for increased understanding, and some vision of the good life. If every member of this university cannot become a scholar or an artist, he can be equipped here to take his place in society with more satisfaction to himself and with a capacity for more service to others.

It is a common premise today that education is going to solve the social and political problems which confront our generation. The thought of many people seems to be that university training necessarily equips men and women to meet the issues which they will encounter as citizens; a popularizer such as Mr. H. G. Wells would cast it in the alternative, "Education or catastrophe". But this formula seems to be based upon a fallacy in councils concerning our public affairs, or indeed that they ought to be born out of that source. Education and catastrophe may march hand in hand as public servants or as voters or as citizens; a popularizer such as Mr. H. G. Wells would cast it in the alternative, "Education or catastrophe". But this formula seems to be based upon two assumptions which may well be open to question; first, that the informed
opinion of educated men is bound to prevail over the un-informed opinion of their untutored fellows; and second, that education alone will produce a capacity to understand and to govern. The first of these assumptions is defied by the situation which prevails in America today, where it seems far easier to get a hearing for a rampant prejudiced view of any problem than for the calmer statement of its essentials. Much of our public opinion, much of the opinion that determines governmental action, is based on pre-judices and fears and survivals which are wholly unrelated to any intelli-
gent view of our public questions. To such opinion, an advertising slogan is frequently more persuasive than a profound analysis. More than one observer from other lands has remarked in recent mouths on the gulf that seems to divide us in America; on some of the matters which I shall discuss today, one opinion is found quite generally in our universities, while a wholly different opinion is heeded by our public officials. Nor can it be assumed that the educated men are always best equipped to handle the is-
ues which arise. Unless it is grounded on conceptions which fit a sit-
uation, education may prove to be futile when action is demanded. In the unhappy situation which prevailed in Ireland a few years ago, it was not the men with the greatest knowledge of Ireland and its affairs who made the larger contribution; one might have had even so much exact information about that situation and have lacked the imagination, the willingness to experi-
ment, and the faith in certain leaders which enabled the Irish Free State to be born out of that chaos. Education and catastrophe may march hand in hand. We must guard against assuming either that educated men will always prevail in councils concerning our public affairs, or indeed that they ought which could not be equaled in their revolutionary effects by those of any
to prevail in all cases. We cannot be too critical of the premises which underlie our education, nor too inquiring as to their usefulness to the world in which we live. But with these caveats, I think we need entertain no doubt that education is essential to citizenship in a modern world, and that many of our problems cannot be met without it.

Recent changes in our society have greatly complicated the situation in which the ordinary man finds himself today. Even in the relatively short period since the founding of this university, hardly three generations of the area within which we have to live have lived. Our efforts now confront social and political problems of which the first graduates of this university did not even dream. We must adjust ourselves to a world which seems wholly different from that of our grandfathers, and perhaps even they were not fully alive to the significance of the changes which were under way in their own time. The first half of the last century saw improvements made in transportation and communication, which were destined to revolutionize the life of the ordinary man. The launching of steamships and the building of railroads led him to reach far outside the orbit in which he had previously moved. In many parts of the world he ceased to confine his efforts to the satisfaction of the wants of people in his own locality, and he began to acquire wants for which the resources of the world were accessible. The world seemed to shrink with the achievement that locality could not satisfy. The change was aggrivated by the introduction of the telegraph, less than a century ago, and it was pushed further by the invention of the telephone almost within our own half-century. Small wonder it is that a generation ago, people thought themselves to be living in the most favored of all times, and to be the beneficiaries of inventions which could not be equaled in their revolutionary effects by those of any previous generation.
We live and we propose to continue to live in a world which conditions in which we now move, and a due respect for their wisdom demands that we should not overtax their prescience. Strange it would be, indeed, if the forms of political organization and the methods of political action which prevailed in the days of the oxcart and the wheelbarrow should suffice in these days of the automobile and the aeroplane. The geographical frontiers of our society have ceased to correspond with the political boundaries of our counties, our states and our nations.

Whether we like it or not, whether we recognize it or not, we have been forced upon us a congeries of problems which involve peoples outside our local circles, and even outside the borders of the largest country. Some of us may think that it would have been more comfortable to live in the days when all public questions could be threshed out in a local town meeting; some of us may sigh for a return to the time when a national economy provided the sustenance of our lives; some of us may wish that our politics could stop at the water's edge; but none of us is quite willing to confine his wants to the limits which any of these reversions would entail. We do not propose to give up our coffee for breakfast, and hence our dependence on the farmers of Brazil or Java or Yemen; we do not propose to quit wearing silk stockings, and hence our dependence on the industries of China or India or Japan; we do not propose to abandon the automobiles which are taking the world off its feet, and hence our dependence on the tin mines and the rubber plantations of the Malay peninsula. Not even the most extreme protectionist manufacturer would suggest that the richest country in the world should confine its consumption to what it can produce for itself, and no labor leader fails to realize that some part of the product of our workers must be sold in markets which our continental free trade
cannot open. We live and we propose to continue to live in a world which embraces other peoples, other nations and other continents, and as citizens of one country we have to know what that world is in order that we may handle its current problems as they affect our daily lives.

When these modern changes began, it was inevitable that men should begin a search for new political conceptions and new forms of political organization with which to solve the problems of this world community. The system by which the world has been divided into states, each in large degree a master unto itself, was not evolved to provide for the cooperation of peoples who live in different parts of the world, and it was not easily adapted to that purpose. But by the middle of the last century it became apparent to understanding observers that such cooperation was necessitated by the new conditions, and that methods for facilitating it had to be developed. Obviously, some form of inter-state or international organization had become essential, and as early as 1865 the first league of nations was organized in the form of the International Telegraphic Union. That was followed very quickly by the organization of a second league of nations called the Universal Postal Union. The existence of each of these institutions was due to the technological advances which had then been made. Each of them had its raison d'être in the changes produced by the inventions of the last century. Each of them continues to exist in the world of today, as an indispensable governing agency for the smooth working of our modern communications. The Universal Postal Union has become universal in scope as in name, and though it is obvious that each state cannot always have its own way in that organization, it is a league of nations from which no state can now think of withdrawing. None of us would dream of
returning to the postal systems which existed in the days of our great-grandfathers, and for this reason we have given up any thought of complete national independence in postal matters. These agencies were founded, not on any altruistic impulse, not on any ideal of human solidarity, but on the very pressing needs of a workaday world. We employ them not because of any feeling of unity with our fellow-men, not for any purpose of serving others than ourselves, but because their successful functioning is essential to our daily routine. Nor did they long remain in isolation; before the end of the last century, numerous other leagues of nations sprang into existence, each designed to meet some need of our daily life. The best known of them, perhaps, is the International Union of Weights and Measures, organized in 1875, a league of nations which has given us in a short half-century a common world language of weight and measure. The word gram means the same thing today in Columbus and in Calcutta; a meter has the same length in Tokio as in Toledo. Gradually, though at times haltingly, the world in which we live has found ways for directing common effort to meet the needs which all peoples have in common. Our state system has not been destroyed; it has merely been supplemented without any loss of its vitality.

In the more clearly political field, a shocking experience seems to have been a necessary prelude to organization for common action. For a generation before 1914, efforts were under way to effect a permanent union of states which might deal with new problems as they should arise, and which might attempt safeguarding of the common interest of all peoples in the maintenance of the world's peace. Those efforts were frustrated
chiefly because of a current belief in their futility, and only the
tragedies of the war revealed to various peoples the extent to which
their interdependence made such organization necessary. If the War had
ended without that revelation, its sacrifices might all have been in
vain. It must always remain to the credit of the American people that
we insisted that it should not end so, for it was in no small part our own
insistence and our own contribution which made it possible for the con-
ference that ended the War to be the Conference which created the League
of Nations. Various prototypes existed, various methods of international
action had been proved, various ideas had become current, all of which were
availed of, and on a scale which had seemed quite impossible in 1914, an
effort was launched to protect the world's peace, to facilitate inter-
national cooperation, and to provide to a world society the instruments
for attaining its future security. Ten years have passed since the experi-
ment of the League of Nations was begun, and the close of the decade finds
the world organized as never before for the continuance of cooperative ef-
fort to meet the problems which all nations have and will have in common.

Perhaps each generation is subject to a temptation to exaggerate
the importance of its own contributions; but so much has been accomplished
by our generation in the course of these last ten years that we may be
justified in priding ourselves on the estimate which future generations
will place on our work. No one can say that we have secured release from
the scourge of war, but we can say that the beginning of a war by any state
has become a more perilous undertaking than it ever was in the past. We
have created a habit of thinking of the League of Nations when any menace
to peace arises; we have at least made a beginning toward establishing the
principle expressed in Article II of the Covenant, the most significant
innovation in the political thought of our time, that any war or any
threat of war is a matter of concern to all the peoples of the world;
we have carried cooperation into many new fields of international life,
vindicating and strengthening a growing belief in the efficacy of effort
to replace the sense of futility which previously prevailed. The con-
ference method of handling international affairs has been greatly extended;
a method of summoning conferences has become established; a technique for
conducting them has been developed, and an element of continuity has been
introduced in their work. Today there is scarcely a week in the year
when some international conference is not meeting under the auspices of
the League of Nations.

Possibly our greatest contribution to the future will be the insti-
tutions which our generation is building. The Assembly of the League of
Nations, an annual gathering of the representatives of more than fifty
peoples, has become a fixture on the calendars of Foreign Offices through-
out the world. The Council of the League of Nations, a smaller body which
is continually at the service of the various states for dealing with cur-
rent matters, will meet in a few weeks for its sixtieth session. One
has only to recall the difficulties of the two Hague Conferences of 1899
and 1907 to measure the gain which these institutions signify. A tribunal
of international justice, which a whole generation of effort failed to
establish before the League of Nations was created, has become a reality
in the World Court, which will meet next week for its eighteenth session;
in eight years the Permanent Court of International Justice has won the
confidence of the legal profession in every land, and its jurisprudence
has already begun the cumulation of a new international law. These are
national problems have ceased to be merely national. As citizens, whose principal interest is in our own communities, we may have to consider the aspirations, the interests, the prejudices, of people who do not live in our city, who do not vote in our state, and who do not owe allegiance to our flag. It is not the simple role into which our grandfathers were inducted two generations ago. With the greater complexity of our world lives, it has become correspondingly more difficult for one to be a good citizen, and the task is not simplified because he is a citizen of a Great Power. We seem to be expected to have opinions about a whole legion of issues, and even those which are purely local are baffling enough. How much more difficult it is to be intelligent when other peoples and other nations are involved! We are especially fortunate in America in the literature which our organizations are producing on international affairs. Experts are at hand to guide us in many things, but many are the questions which cannot be left to their judgment. It is still a wise counsel that experts should be on tap but not on top. With all the aids we may secure, we shall frequently find ourselves puzzled, and only the art of suspended judgment will save us from the dangers of dogmatism.

The thought which I would place before you is not a vague ideal of world citizenship. It is not a doctrinaire internationalism. It is not even a plea for world peace. I am not urging any mitigation of the loyalty which each of us feels toward his own community, nor of the patriotism which all of us have for our own country. I am not advocating that the interests of other peoples should be put above our own. I am suggesting a world outlook for a citizen of America because it seems to me to be necessitated by America's own interest, by our interests as Americans. I am suggesting that
we cannot play our role as citizens in this age unless we see our own country as a part of a larger world, and unless we see that world as a whole society. Nor is it an abstract attitude that I would commend. Upon the citizen's conception of his world will depend his attitude toward such strictly national questions as agricultural relief and the tariff; upon it, quite clearly, will depend, also, our country's attitude toward the organization of the world for cooperation and peace. If we would prefer to be ruled by the past, if we would listen to the sneers of a yellow press, if we would insist on the tenets of an exaggerated nationalism, we shall neither prove to be useful to America nor shall we be sure of serving the interests of our own local communities.

A knowledge of our world, and a desire to keep America playing a worthy role in it, will of course affect our consideration of such problems as those of our relations to the League of Nations. It will affect what we may decide to do with the proposal, made by a President and Secretary of State seven years ago and supported by two Presidents and two Secretaries of State since, that America should give her support to the maintenance of the World Court. It will determine whether meaning will be given to the solemn covenant renouncing war as an instrument of national policy which almost the whole world has signed on our invitation. It will influence our decision as to whether the world shall return to a policy of maintaining back-breaking armaments in time of peace which may be an ever powerful pro-vocative of war. And what is quite as important, it will produce the measure of the respect in which America will be held throughout the world. Let us hope that it may prevent our riches and our power from drawing down on our heads the envy and the scorn of the rest of mankind.