

Draft of Mr. Jones' Speech
to the Bennington College Community

September 7, 1941

It is a pleasure to welcome you all to the opening of the tenth year of Bennington College. I have already had the opportunity to greet the new students and the freshmen on the faculty. As a freshman president of decidedly amateur standing I have strong bonds of sympathy with all the newcomers who have joined us this week. Tonight I want to welcome back the old students, and all my colleagues of the faculty and staff.

We are especially glad to see several members of the faculty who are rejoining us after a period of absence. Miss Osgood and Mr. Charles Smith have just returned from sabbatical leave. Mr. McCamy has come back to us after two and a half years spent in Washington, as assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture. Our pleasure in welcoming him must be tinged with pride at his recognition of the importance of teaching here, when there were many pressures on him to remain in Washington. I also want to express my personal gratitude, as well as that of the College, to Margaret Patterson, who has returned from a projected sabbatical before it had begun. She has acted in accordance with her habitual unselfishness and public-spirit in postponing her leave, because she is so badly needed here this year.

In order to relieve any anxiety you may have, either about the future of the College or about this speech, I want to assure you at the outset that this is not an inauguration, and I am not going to deliver an inaugural address. The idea of an inauguration is that of a new

beginning, and Bennington College is not in need of a new beginning.

The idea I want to stress is that of continuity.

To the freshmen, the opening of college does of course mean a new beginning. But I want to point out that it is a continuing fellowship into which I am welcoming you, a fellowship of many students and teachers who have left this hilltop, of all who are still working here, and of many yet to come. You will be influenced by the ideas and practices of those who were here before you; you will be called upon to contribute your best to the traditions you will pass on to future members of the Bennington College community.

I hope that someday a really flesh-and-blood history of Bennington College will be written, which will pay adequate tribute to the courage and devotion of the large group of people who founded the College, and who have brought it to its present flourishing condition.

I think of the original group of people whose enthusiasm for education made it possible to start this enterprise in the midst of a severe economic depression: of Dr. Vincent Ravi Booth, of the McCullough and Jennings families, and of many others too numerous to mention. I think with affection of the first few classes of students, who were willing to risk their education in the hands of a new and untried institution, and whose quality has made it easy for us to attract good students ever since. I think also of the able and devoted trustees of the College, and the succession of outstanding chairmen of the Board: Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, Dr. John Coss, Mr. Arthur Page, and our present chairman, Mrs. George S. Franklin.

I think also of that strange but interesting collection of people, the past and present faculty of Bennington College. Seldom has such a vital group of artists, intellectuals and teachers been gathered together in such a small space. The result has been a good deal of hot argument and table-thumping, and the atmosphere has certainly not lacked intellectual stimulation. There must have been times when Mr. Leigh felt as if he were charged with the direction of a group of wild horses, and he may have looked wistfully towards tamer pastures. But it would be hard to find a college faculty which has worked harder, or with more devotion, under his leadership. All these somewhat alarming energies have been spent in the task of building a good college, and establishing a way of life here.

One outstanding characteristic of the Bennington College faculty is that they are not mere job-holders. They came here because they thought this kind of college worthwhile, and they stay here, or come back here, for the same reason. They have shown, individually and collectively, a willingness to stick the neck out, and to take risks. The summer enterprise of the School of the Arts is only one example of this willingness.

I wish I could take time to acknowledge the debts we owe to many past members of the faculty and staff: to Mrs. Barbee-Lee, who selected the first few classes of students; to our two doctors, Wilmoth Osborne and Elizabeth McCullough, whom we shall always remember with deep and grateful affection; to teachers like Genevieve Taggard, Irving Fineman, Harold Gray, Jean Guiton, Polly Ingraham, Stefan Hirsch, Wallace Fowlie, Ted Newcomb, and many others, who have helped to build the college curriculum. I am

tempted to take a sentimental journey into the past, but I must wait until some more appropriate occasion. This is the beginning of the year, and we must devote our attention to the work before us.

I cannot, however, let the opportunity pass of expressing the appreciation of all of us for the excellent work of the people who assumed the responsibility of leading the College in Mr. Leigh's absence last semester. Tom Brockway, the chairman of the executive sub-committee, gave ample opportunity for us to confirm the confidence we all have in his fairness and human understanding. Mrs. Garrett and Mrs. Park shouldered added responsibilities uncomplainingly and bore them with their usual good humor and good judgment. Myra Jones, who is perhaps the unsung hero of Bennington College, took even more than her usual share of financial responsibility. If ever the history of Bennington College is adequately written, at least a full chapter will be devoted to Miss Myra Jones and her work. I have heard one of the trustees flatly declare that this is the best-run institution on the financial side that he has encountered in a wide experience. Those of us who have had occasion to work closely with Miss Jones certainly do not lack appreciation of her quality. The fact that most of the community is relatively oblivious of the financial administration is witness to the way in which Miss Jones has always kept her eye on the main purpose of the College, which is education, and has run the College finances in such a way as to serve this purpose most effectively.

Nor can I let this occasion pass without paying some tribute, however inadequate, to the person to whom the College owes most: the retiring president, Robert Devore Leigh. It would be quite impossible to express the appreciation which all Bennington College people feel for Mr. Leigh's work

of the last fourteen years. We are too close to his administration to be able to evaluate his contribution now. It is certain that Robert Leigh will stand out in the history of American education as one of the great leaders. Not only has he built a college which has put into successful practice many significant educational ideas; he has also built a community. The quality of life on this hill is a result of his insight and imagination, of much careful planning on his part. Under his leadership, progressive education has not crystallized into a set of dogmas. A member of the first graduating class told me this summer that she remembered Bennington College as a most reasonable place. This quality of reasonableness is an outstanding characteristic of Mr. Leigh's administration. Those of us who were here in the early years of the College, when it was struggling to establish itself in a very critical world, remember with admiration the tolerance and patience with which Mr. Leigh watched and encouraged our efforts. He took all criticism of this new and much-discussed college on his own shoulders, and never allowed us to be disturbed or intimidated by it, as long as he knew that we were doing what appeared to be the sensible thing, however unorthodox or shocking it might appear to unsympathetic observers. Speaking personally, I should like to hail him as a great teacher of teachers, and to say that my own education owes more to him than to any other person. The departure of the Leighs will leave a gap in this community which cannot be filled. We shall continue to regard them as members of the College, and hope that they will return often, and give us the benefit of their encouragement and advice. I am sure that the stimulation of new experience will make their future interest in the College doubly valuable to us. It is entirely in accordance with his own theories

of education that Mr. Leigh should be leaving us at this time. He has always said that a well-taught student should be able to take responsibility for her own education, and that a well-run college should be able to run itself without reliance on any one administrator. It is a tribute to his administration that the College is now a going concern, able to carry forward the good tradition he has established.

Thus far I have spoken only of continuity with the immediate past of Bennington College, and the movement out of which we have grown. It would be a mistake, however, to think only of our link with our own brief past. I want to emphasize our continuity with the history of education in America, and with the long tradition of Western Civilization.

The task of education is a twofold one: first, to hand on and preserve traditional knowledge; and second, to invent, create and so enrich the cultural inheritance.

Thinking about education in America has become tremendously confused, and these two complementary tasks of education have been spoken of as if they were opposed to one another. The issue has been stated as one of progressivism versus traditionalism, modernism versus classicism, the liberation of creative energies versus the inculcation of knowledge. These seem to be to be false issues, and it is time we stopped arguing about them. There should be no quarrel about the general aims of education. The issue between progressive education and traditional education then becomes mainly one of emphasis.

It is probably true that extreme adherents of the progressive view have been over-zealous in their emphasis on the value of individual

experience in learning, often to the neglect of traditional knowledge. It is equally true that extreme believers in the value of the classical tradition have often over-estimated the possibilities of its passive absorption, and have been ineffective through neglect of individual experience.

The fact is that each generation has to solve its own problems, and to find meaning in the world in which it lives. Evidently, each generation needs all that it can learn from the wisdom derived from the experiences of the past. But it is true that the greatest periods in education have been the periods when the search for meaning in the contemporary world has been keenest. The mediaeval universities derived their vitality, not from any passive acceptance of classical learning, but from their preoccupation with the important philosophical questions of the day.

It is significant that two of the most vital educational institutions in America at present should be the two small colleges of Bennington and St. John's. The habit of thinking in terms of opposites may make it appear surprising that I should mention these two colleges in the same breath. At St. John's, they are trying to re-experience the development of Western culture through the study of the hundred great books, their purpose being to find some firm basis of effective living in the contemporary world. At Bennington we start with the contemporary world, with the same purpose in mind, but it would be absurd to think that therefore we intend to neglect the achievements of the past. I am myself a partisan of the Bennington approach to education; but I watch the St. John's experiment with sympathy and respect. Both colleges take education very seriously, both have the courage to depart from conventional methods. The ends of both are similar, and I think it would be easy to exaggerate our differences.

Any educational institution, whatever its label, must be conscious of its continuity with the long cultural past of the Western world. But it is important also that we be aware of our roots in American life. We are a peculiarly American institution, and we have only to look at the tragic state of the world to realize that we should have little chance of survival in any other country. We cannot lose sight of the fact that our immediate effectiveness must be in American life. The influence of the United States, for good or bad, is bound to be of immense importance in the next phase of world history. The quality of American leadership depends in no small measure on the work of American colleges.

I should like to make a still more local reference, and say something about our presence in Vermont. When the College was founded, some criticism was expressed about the location of a progressive college on a Vermont hilltop, supposedly isolated and out of touch with the main, predominantly urban, currents of American life. This seems to me to be an essentially provincial view, all too characteristic of New Yorkers, and based moreover on a conception of localism which modern communications have made obsolete. The community of which we are a part, and with which we are in constant touch through the written and spoken word, stretches far beyond the boundaries of Vermont, or indeed of America. But we have increasingly close and mutually beneficial relations with our Vermont neighbors, and I for one have learnt as much from living as a citizen of Bennington as from membership in the Bennington College community. I am very sure that we are lucky to be here, and that it would be hard to find a better environment, both geographical and human, for the job we have to do.

There can be no doubt that American education has a hard and important job to do in the present crisis in civilization. But Bennington College is particularly on the spot. Because we are new, and have enjoyed wide support to try out certain definite educational ideas, a great deal is expected of us. We need therefore to take stock of our nine years' experience, and to re-examine our especial role.

The task of evaluation is already under way. We shall learn much from the findings of the evaluation study, and its publication will make the lessons of our experience available to other institutions. It will help us to chart our future course with reference to that experience. But it will not do our thinking for us.

The movement for Bennington College goes back to the 1920's, when the need was felt to carry the methods of the progressive schools into higher education. The progressive education movement itself was a revolt against the sterility of much of American education, and against practices which had grown stupid and obstructive to its true purposes.

The movement was only partly one of revolt, however. We had important positive aims, and in some respects indeed we were harking back to a much older educational tradition: for example, in the concept of educating the whole person, and in the inclusion of the arts in the curriculum. But even these aims, like many of our methods, seemed like innovations at the time. It is true that we got a good deal of guidance from negative examples: we could clearly see, from the mistakes of others, what not to do. The general tone of the place was one of radical experiment. We seemed intent on discarding, we took nothing for granted, and were

determined not to follow precedent without examining each case on its merits. This period, exhausting as it was to live through, has been extremely valuable. It has liberated us to experiment, vitalized our conceptions of education, and allowed us to re-adapt old and tried methods whenever they suited our purposes.

Because we started without habits, much of our energies have necessarily been devoted to the difficult task of building appropriate habits and customs for this community. Every teacher, as well as every student, has had to learn by experience. My distinguished colleague, Mr. Otto Luening, has said that the main criticism of Bennington College is that it has no group memory; that each year, indeed each semester, we seem to have to begin all over again, repeating our past mistakes in a monotonous pattern. This is a gloomy view, but it must be admitted that Mr. Luening has a point. We have now reached the stage in our development when we ought to be able to use our collective experience to project our program forward.

We have no longer any need to be self-conscious about our newness, or to exhaust much effort in defending and explaining ourselves. We are an established educational institution, no longer as unique as we were, because education has moved along with us. Many battles have been won, and we need expend no energy in fighting them over again. In fact, the accent on youth is no longer appropriate. We have grown up, and we face the awful responsibilities of maturity.

It is not my purpose to outline a program for the next few years. The method of procedure will be what it has always been, the method of discussion and consent. But I would like to re-affirm some of the main principles for which we stand, and to suggest some of the most important tasks before us.

First, we shall continue to base our program on the concept of educating the whole person.

I have never been able to make much sense out of the statement that "It is the sole business of a college to train the mind." I have never met a disembodied mind. I have met people who were extremely intellectual, but not intelligent; and I have met intelligent people who were not adept at verbal and logical expression. What we are after is a kind of functioning intelligence and imagination which is not likely to result only from a training in logical skill. People differ, and the qualities we value can be acquired through many disciplines, through art and literature, through science and social science, and through the experience of a sound community life.

Nor is an extreme pre-occupation with personality development and adjustment any part of our plan. Progressive education has perhaps shown symptoms of a kind of anti-intellectualism, in its reaction against the notion of disembodied minds. There is plenty of evidence that human relations are embittered, human potentialities warped and stifled, by faulty psychological environments. The attention given to healthy psychological adjustment, and individual development, has been of great benefit to education in recent years. We shall continue to take account of

individual differences, to be tolerant of temporary periods of difficulty and confusion, to regard self-knowledge as a necessary aspect of the development towards maturity. We shall also continue to recognize that one useful method of adjustment is hard work, and subjection to some objective discipline; and we shall continue to recognize the fact that individual development is not itself a sufficient guide for an educational program: it remains the responsibility of the College, in its community life and its academic work, to point to desirable directions for growth and development. All change is not progress.

Second, we shall continue to base our curriculum on the individual interests and needs of students.

Interest is obviously the first requisite for effective learning, and Bennington College has been conspicuous for its excellent teaching. We have had success in eliminating the artificial spur of grades as a basis for promotion, and we have shown that a piece of work well done imposes its own discipline, and reinforces the drive for further achievement.

It is also obvious that needs differ, and that diversity is one of the most valuable characteristics of the democratic way of life. But students are of course in no position to decide what they need, and once their main lines of interest are established, it is clearly the responsibility of the faculty to prescribe a course of study for them.

It used to be fashionable for progressive teachers to answer the question: "What subjects do you teach?" by saying: "We don't teach subjects; we teach students." The emphasis was perhaps a necessary one when too much attention was being paid to the working out of organized courses,

too little to effective teaching. But, granted that we must understand how to teach, the question still remains, what knowledge is important.

In the early years of the College, we have necessarily been more concerned, as a group, with questions of method than with content. The curriculum has been individually prescribed for every student. In advanced work, especially, the content has been decided on by the separate divisions of the College, often by one teacher working with one student. Custom-built courses of study will continue to be our distinctive educational offering; but much waste motion might now be eliminated if we pooled our experience, and gave careful consideration to the relation of all these individual activities to the work of the College as a whole. The most urgent task of the next few years seems to me to be the definition of the curriculum.

When the College first opened, with a class of eighty-seven freshmen, the catalogue announced that the unifying principle for the work of the first two years would be a concern with the modern period, meaning of course the period from the Renaissance to the present day. But much of the actual work of that first year was concerned with contemporary materials. The idea was that students were more likely to spend the next three years acquiring "Background" if they were allowed to see its connection with the particular foreground in which they were directly interested. As that first class went through the four years of college, many of them ranged all over human history. The original restriction to the modern period did not find its way out of the catalogue into practice. But people who were shocked to find Bennington students, in their freshman year, studying the bank crisis instead of Adam Smith, or James Joyce

instead of Chaucer, have never lost their conviction that we look no farther back than 1932.

I am sure that some Bennington students will always be found studying contemporary problems, most often as an introduction to some field of study in their freshman year, or as a subject for a senior thesis at the end of four years. But it would be absurd to think that any Bennington student could spend her time here rushing out to observe each rain-drop as it falls, or concentrating on the latest newspaper headline. Current events would be equally current, and probably equally meaningless, after four years of such activity. It is a truism that education is a part of life, and not a mere preparation; but the period spent in college has a very special function. It is the only time in the lives of most of us when we can devote all our attention to the business of learning, reading, thinking, acquiring the technical skill and the understanding which will give us the keys to the rich storehouse of our cultural heritage. The years in college are short, and it is important to make the best possible use of them. Hence the need for each student to use her time here to the greatest advantage; and hence the need for the faculty to give their best thought to the problem of selecting and making available the most significant content.

The question of content is by no means an easy one, and all sorts of answers have been given. The basis of the curriculum ranges all the way from the classics to modern science, from the hundred great books to a completely free elective system. I have heard at one time and another that the world could be saved if everyone understood psychology, or if everyone understood economics, and world-savers could no doubt be found who put their faith in eurhythmics.

I do not think the Bennington faculty, with the sobering experience of nine years face-to-face teaching behind it, will expect to find salvation in any simple, totalitarian curriculum. It is too apparent that students differ, and it is also obvious that an attempt to learn everything will result in a mastery of nothing. Fortunately, our complex civilization, based on the division of labor, has need of a great diversity of skill and knowledge. All sorts of people can find a useful and satisfying place in it. But diversity will not constitute civilization: some unity of purpose, some common loyalties, must hold a society together.

Bennington College is a microcosm, and most of the cross-currents of contemporary opinion are represented here. I do not think we shall find it easy to agree on a curriculum. Placidity is not the outstanding characteristic of this faculty, and each one feels intensely, as all good workers must, the great importance of his own subject, and of his particular philosophy. But in many hot arguments in one another's houses, or on this platform in some of the evening lecture series, we have learned much from each other, and have acquired a healthy respect for one another's specialties. We have undoubtedly set ourselves some difficult problems to solve by our departures from conventional practice, particularly in the inclusion of the arts in the curriculum. But the College cannot exist, any more than a nation can exist, as a collection of individuals, sometimes casually cooperating, sometimes going their separate ways. We must never lose sight of the overall policy for the College as a whole, the unity of purpose which gives meaning to the diverse activities we carry on.

This College was founded to meet the needs of women in the contemporary world. Fortunately, the feminist battle had already been won

for us by the mothers of the first class of students. We felt no compulsion, therefore, to do exactly what was being done at Williams College, in order to prove that women were equal to men. It can now be taken for granted that women are people, and have intellectual and artistic capacities and interests as wide and varied as those of men. (In parenthesis, I am sorry to report a deplorable feminist hangover among some of our graduates who, when asked what they are doing, have been known to reply that "they are not doing anything, they are just married, and have two children.")

But the general abandonment of the austere academic tradition of the feminists has led to some curious results. One college has made a careful survey of the activities of women, in order to discover what they really need to know. The result is a curriculum which includes style clinics, make-up clinics, and classes in baby-care. I do not think a training in the practical techniques of every-day living is the proper function of a progressive college, and Bennington College has certainly not interpreted "the needs of women" in this way.

Because we are a women's college, there will doubtless always be more demand here for such subjects as child development than for physics. Because we believe in the value of practical experience in learning, the handling of children will be part of the study of child psychology. But a pre-occupation with the tricks of a trade is not the business of a college, either for men or for women. In disgust with the cheerful modern reliance on the lore of "how to win friends and influence people," President Hutchins of Chicago has emphasized the importance of metaphysics. Mr. Hutchins' experience in teaching students would doubtless coincide with mind, and

he would agree that most students display only an intermittent interest in metaphysics, and it cannot provide a continuous drive to learning. Philosophical understanding comes slowly, and philosophical questions arise at every stage of learning. Nor would Mr. Hutchins deny that the study of the violin requires that it be played as well as talked about. As George Lundberg has frequently reminded us, technique is like money: you don't like to get it, but you can't do without it. Much of the time in college must necessarily be spent in the humdrum business of mastering the skills essential to effective work in our understanding of every field of study.

But most of us will agree, I think, with the main point that Mr. Hutchins has been making: that the modern enthusiasm for the scientific analysis and technical manipulation of things and people has led to an almost complete lack of interest in those basic questions of man's purpose which should be the peculiar concern of education.

It is the task of artists and intellectuals to interpret the contemporary world, to bring some rational meaning and intelligible direction into the welter of human experience. For a long time now it has been fashionable to avoid questions of value. They have somehow embarrassed us. Words like truth and virtue have been associated with smug and slightly hypocritical Victorian pronouncements. It has been an unintended by-product of our intense interest in the scientific study of man and society that individual morality and traditional values have come to be dismissed as "nothing but culture patterns." This attitude was appropriate, if at all, only at a time when traditional values could be taken for granted, and progress seemed inevitable. But Victorian smugness has crumbled, and

we can no longer support ourselves by pushing against it. I do not think we can afford to be content with a purely visceral explanation of man's highest aspirations. In the world of war and bitter confusion which confronts us, it is becoming increasingly evident that the contempt for traditional values leads, not to progress, but to nihilism.

One of the most alarming tendencies of our times is the perversion of technical knowledge from its proper function of improving the quality of human life as a whole to the cynical purpose of manipulating and getting the better of other men. The art of economics has degenerated into petty techniques of winning or keeping differential advantages for individuals, or the more grandiose schemes for gaining advantages for one nation at the expense of another. The art of politics has degenerated into gangster techniques of crushing opposition, or swaying opinion, with no other aim than the maintenance of power. It is the business of the colleges to develop civilized people, and a good machine-gunner, or a skilful propagandist, is not necessarily civilized. Unless education can counter-act the modern tendency to combine unprecedented technical skill with a basic contempt for the value and dignity of human life, the wave of the future is certain to land us in a mud puddle.

I want therefore to emphasize one of the main principles on which this College operates: that of respect for the individual. This is the most valuable ethical idea in our democratic heritage, and is deeply embedded in the Christian tradition. I cannot see any other possible basis for decent human relations. Self-reliance and individual responsibility are perhaps no longer possible in our complicated economic network. But we are not here concerned with economic enterprise; we are an educational institution

and individual responsibility and mutual respect are essential to education. We are not a political party, and have no need to manipulate anybody. No secret police is breathing down the back of our necks. We can continue to express our disagreements openly and sincerely, and resolve our differences in a civilized manner. I am stressing these things, not because I think you are in any danger of forgetting them, but in order to remind you that respect for the individual is becoming rare in the modern world. It is no small privilege, and no small responsibility, to be able to base our lives and work on it here. Americans may soon have to fight for it, to mobilize all our technical skill and turn them to military uses, but with the purpose of restoring, not destroying, individual human dignity.

The world crisis has assumed such catastrophic proportions that most of us are asking ourselves: what is the significance of a small women's college in a world at war? Bennington College will of course stand behind the policy of the national government, and meet any special demands to which the war situation may give rise. Our flexible program has already adapted itself to include some of the courses which other colleges have announced as "defense" courses. We shall continue to meet such demands, but it would be a mistake to think that special courses in first aid are our most important contribution to national defense. The continuing emphasis on good citizenship will be of far more enduring importance.

The world situation has been deteriorating so rapidly in the last few years that many people have been oppressed and discouraged by

a sense of the futility of their everyday occupations. They have seen the overwhelming importance of large political events, and have reached out desperately in an effort to control them by joining some political movement. This sense of responsibility for distant events has too often led to a neglect of the job in hand, which is the thing for which we are most directly responsible, and in which our main effectiveness will lie. It is essential for each of us to keep his eye on the ball, and not become a bad artist, a sloppy musician, or a distraught social scientist, because he is convinced that general catastrophe is going to engulf him. Catastrophe is much more probable if artists, intellectuals, teachers and students neglect their particular jobs.

The more general function of artists and intellectuals I have already said is that of bringing to bear on the confused issues of the modern world those qualities of insight and informed imagination which can alone make sense out of the current turmoil, and provide some leadership for men of good will. Modern society, not less in America than in Europe, has lost its sense of direction, its consciousness of unity. If the artists and intellectuals abdicate, and flop this way and that with every current of opinion, we cannot be sure of the continuance of civilization as we have known it at its best. Even the great technical skill which has been achieved in the control of the physical environment could conceivably be lost; the ethical values without which human existence would be meaningless to all of us who have been brought up in the traditions of Western civilization could certainly disappear.

The twofold task of education in preserving and carrying forward the cultural heritage can certainly not be neglected now. It would not be far-fetched to compare the role of modern colleges with that of the monasteries during the Dark Ages. Small, isolated groups of people kept alive the classical learning, and made it available for a new flowering in the mediaeval culture. No American college will, I hope, find itself driven into monastic isolation; but we have responsibilities to our own age no less heavy than the monasteries had to theirs. Society has never been in greater need of educated and civilized people, capable of bringing knowledge, good will and courage into the problems of the war and post-war years.

We shall no doubt face many practical difficulties in adapting ourselves to the strained war economy. We shall also face difficult educational problems in planning the work of the college. A great deal of hard work and adaptability will be required of all of us. But if I did not feel confidence in the ability and good will of the Bennington trustees, students and faculty to do a good job, and if I did not moreover feel sure that it is a most important job in the present crisis in civilization, I should not be here tonight.