

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS TO BE DELIVERED BY CARROLL R. DAUGHERTY
AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF HUNTER COLLEGE AT CARNEGIE HALL,
NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 31, 1940

-----0-----

LABOR IN A CHANGING SOCIAL ORDER

Young ladies of the class to be graduated this morning: When you walk out the academic door today you will face a world which desperately needs your energy and your vision. Perhaps no group which has passed through that door in the decades of Hunter's existence has carried a diploma with such an urgent message from posterity. The college degree of 1940 is no ticket of admission to the Garden of Eden. It is rather a pass for participation in the difficult work of fashioning and molding the channels along which the stream of humanity will move into the land of tomorrow.

But your job will be not only to help shape these channels but to shape them in the right direction. Your energy is needed for the work but your vision is imperative, lest others lead the way which ends only in the bad-lands of dictatorship.

This will be no easy task. There are those who will tell you that dictatorship is no desert but the only land in which man can master the machine. After more than a century of struggling for control of technology, millions have come to believe, been led or been made to believe, that democracy is an unsupportable luxury, unsuited to modern conditions. The only solution for society, they say, is some form of dictatorship. Others paint totalitarianism as a huge steamroller which has gathered such momentum that it is futile to think we can stop its onward rush.

The air is full of glib answers to these critics. But you must examine the problem with great care for yourselves and with your minds as free as possible of the cliches of yesterday. I invite you therefore to consider with me for a moment the meaning of democracy, its development, and how it came to be challenged. With that background we can then turn to a discussion of how to fortify it against the storm.

What is democracy? Probably no two persons would precisely agree on a definition. It is something like the American Dream, indefinable, incompletely attainable, and varying in content from individual to individual, from nation to nation. It seems to me to contain two rather separate concepts. The first is personal - individual liberty. The second is social - a pattern which man has worked out for harmonious group living.

It is difficult to drive home the concept of individual liberty to people who do not have to do without it. In the language of us economists, it, like water, has little value wherever there is an abundance of supply. The most effective way to define liberty is perhaps to paint a picture of its opposite - Galileo on his knees in Rome recanting his theories in the shadow of the Inquisition, a citizen of the modern Reich listening over his radio to a forbidden foreign broadcast with the word "Dachau" drumming an ominous accompaniment in his head.

As a social concept, democracy is a pattern in which the members of the group determine for themselves the conditions under which they will live and work. Basic to that pattern are the mechanisms for safeguarding this self-determination - the civil liberties of free speech, free press, free elections, and free assembly.

Modern democracy is a joint product. The forces which brought it into being sprang from the realms of ideas, religion, and commerce. No one of these can be considered as overshadowing the others. Had the seeds of free inquiry sown during the Renaissance not had the fertile ground of the Reformation in which to grow, perhaps it would have died as easily as so many of the heresies which preceded it. It also happened that the sweeping social changes which were occurring at that time had their manifestations in the field of business and commerce. In their efforts to throw off the yoke of medievalism, the tycoons of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries eagerly appropriated the slogans of the free thinkers and the Protestants and turned them to their own advantage.

The primary task of these early rebels was to break down the existing authority. In its place they set up the individual as one of the final arbiters. In the realm of ideas, the individual was to have free way for the development of science and the arts. In religion, the Protestant insisted not only on the right of the individual to make his own interpretation of the Bible but also on the necessity for his individual "salvation". At the same time the business man was struggling to wrest the control of commerce out of the hands of the State so that he would be free to exploit the resources that were being opened up in both the Old World and the New.

Out of this three-fold onslaught against the pillars of medieval society grew the modern ideas of liberty and democracy. The bourgeoisie of eighteenth-century France, in casting about for allies with which to break the grip of feudalism, took up the equalitarian ideas in Rousseau's Social Contract, helped disseminate them among the discontented peasants and the exploited masses of Paris and used the resulting chaos to tear down the monarchy and set up the Republic with its banner of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Meanwhile, in England the same process had been going on in a somewhat different and less violent fashion. These same ideas came over to this continent as cargo in the ships of the colonists where they were transplanted in virgin and therefore more fertile soil. Here they became part of that powerful legend, the American Dream. As many of the millions who followed these pioneers to our shores came in search of liberty as came in search of gold. This fact alone should prove the tremendous yearning in man's heart for freedom.

The years since then have seen a steady extension of this basic concept. Under its banner the human race has made the greatest strides in history towards the attainment of a rich and full life for all. How then has it come to be challenged? How, in the few short years since the World War, has the complexion of things undergone such a complete change?

In the first place, democracy means democracy not only in living but also in working. To the man who spends most of his time and energy in a factory, democracy is a mere shibboleth if it has no reality during his working hours. Before the rise of large-scale enterprise, this was possibly not so pressing a problem. Shops were so small that the employer knew all his workers and often felt a personal responsibility for their welfare. But the growth of technology in recent years, through the necessity for large-scale enterprise, has tended to break this personal owner-employer-employee relationship down. The relationship between the owners and managers of the modern corporation and its thousands of employees has become an impersonal one of dollars and cents - one of power without responsibility. It is somewhat akin to the difference between the pedestrian and the automobile driver. You put the mildest pedestrian, who wouldn't think of racing some one for a swinging door, behind the wheel of an automobile and he is suddenly transformed into a different person who recognizes no authority other than that of a traffic officer in a faster vehicle. If corporation directors were to live and labor among their workers, it is not unlikely that many of the problems of present-day democratic society would be easier of solution.

The development of modern technology has raised other obstacles to the realization of democratic ideals. The trend away from personal relationships and responsibilities may be seen not only between employer and employee groups but also between the owners of business enterprise and the actual directors of enterprise. And it is an economic commonplace that technology has been a major factor in the development of a tremendously intricate economic system which, because of lack of balance between producing and consuming capacity arising out of unequal distribution of income, experiences periodic breakdowns leading to widespread unemployment of both capital and labor.

These changed relationships in American industry are very important from the point of view of any one interested in the future of democracy. A man among hundreds on a production line who is nothing but a number to the manager behind a mahogany desk, perhaps hundreds of miles away, is likely to draw the conclusion that he is just part of a relentless machine. When he is laid off because of a slackening of work, he may easily feel that he is not even as important to society as the machine he tends, because payments are kept up on the debts created by the purchase of the machine long after he is cast out to drift for himself. "No Help Wanted" signs do not add lustre to the picture statesmen paint of liberty. Individual freedom to starve is not so precious a freedom. Freedom to work for ten cents an hour is not much better. Many men in time become willing to barter this sort of liberty for security or even for the promise of security.

All this helps one to understand why many persons have come to doubt the value of democracy. No society which fails to satisfy the needs and desires of its people will long survive. Democracy is no exception. And if it is discarded because it has been tried and found lacking, the fault will lie, not so much with democracy, as with those who have been entrusted with its safekeeping - with you and with me. Let those of us who believe in it search for ways of making it work. If we succeed in finding the answer to that problem, we need no longer worry about the future of individual liberty.

I do not intend to go into all the ways and means of making democracy work. I will merely take up one aspect of the job to be done - an aspect which I consider to be of the utmost importance - industrial democracy. I believe that, from the standpoint of maintaining a healthy respect for and a favorable attitude toward democracy, industrial or labor democracy must accompany and be an integral part of political democracy if our way of life is to survive. I submit that democracy will mean very little to a man who spends most of his waking hours under conditions

which are closely akin to despotism. You wouldn't expect much of a boost for the institution of marriage from people who are unhappily mated.

What do I mean when I use the term labor democracy? There appear to me to be two main ideals or standards which workers should be able to attain in a society founded on and dedicated to the principles of political democracy. In the first place, workers should be free to participate in the determination of the selling price of their labor - that is, in the determination of their wages, hours, and working conditions. They should be free to deal, if they wish, with their employer through collective rather than individual action. Since ordinarily the modern worker is at a disadvantage when dealing alone with his employer, it has long been recognized that collective action is necessary to afford some balance of bargaining power. Furthermore, if workers wish to organize and deal collectively with their employers, they should be free to select their own representatives for this purpose without any interference, restraint, or coercion from their employers, from existing labor organizations, or from government. In short, there must be democracy in worker-employer dealings, democracy within workers' organizations, and democracy in government relations to worker-employer dealings.

The second main standard or goal of labor democracy is even broader than the first. Workers as producers should not forget their obligations to the buying public, of which they and their families form a major part. They should not act collusively with employers to set up a dual monopoly so that consumers suffer through high prices of goods and services. Certain groups of workers and their employers might benefit from such collusive monopoly, but not for long, and they would be denying what is perhaps the chief aim of industrial democracy - the wide distribution of goods and services produced up to the limits of resources and technology.

How far have we come along the road towards achieving these ideals?

First, let us take the deficit side of the ledger and see how strong are the forces of industrial autocracy and how they operate. The greatest force for autocracy is, of course, the anti-union employer. Perhaps a majority of employers in this country are still anti-union in their basic attitudes. This is a fact which can be verified by any one who cares to lift the curtain of words and look at the actual state of things. It is true despite the fact that labor's right to organize and bargain collectively has been recognized in theory for many decades.

Why have employers exhibited such a strong resistance to outside unions?

The obvious answer is that, being in business to make profits and to avoid losses, they wish to be free of interference in the pursuit of their objectives and they tend to resist unionism as an element of interference. They are often inclined to forget that democracy means more than merely individual liberty, the complete realization of which would lead to anarchistic chaos; they fail to remember that a sense of responsibility and a sincere respect for the rights of others must accompany individual liberty and be the gift which they give in return for freedom to engage in enterprise.

Many employers, it is true, recognize this responsibility and have this respect. But anti-unionism may be forced upon them by the highly competitive conditions in their own industry. Employers of this sort feel unable to deal amicably with outside unions unless their competitors do so at the same time.

It is the attitude of the employer who is anti-union "on principle" that constitutes the real threat to democracy. This sort of employer acts as

if he believes that democracy is all right at election time (particularly if he can control local elections), but that the only way to run industry is on an autocratic basis. He is the man who, even when he is shown evidence that self-organization of his workers will pay returns to him in smaller labor turnover, greater efficiency, and thus lower labor cost per unit of output, gives the familiar answer: "Nobody can tell me how to run my business."

Let us examine for a moment some of the methods used by anti-union employers to combat the spread of labor democracy. First, there are the day-by-day methods, most of which do not get so much public attention as the methods of industrial warfare used during strikes. The oldest and best-known of these methods is the resort by employers to extensive welfare activities such as lunchrooms, company housing, sickness benefit associations, group insurance, and profit-sharing plans. Many workers have thus been brought to believe that a union can give them nothing more than they already have. Especially effective are plans in which the employee gets a financial stake which he will lose if his services are terminated by the company. Naturally, all welfare activities are not carried on for anti-union purposes. There are many notable cases to show the contrary. But there is more than sufficient evidence to show that anti-union employers have often initiated such projects for reasons other than humanitarian.

Welfare activities, no matter how sincerely undertaken by the employer, are not enough if workers are not given a voice in determining their form and content and in operating them. An excellent example of this principle gained newspaper headlines during the NRA days when the employees of a certain large manufacturer struck for recognition of an outside union despite the fact that their employer had established for them what had long been recognized as model living and working conditions. Few employers in the country could boast of more ideal employment conditions from the standpoint of the material things of life. Yet these employees went out on strike. It was a bitter strike in which at least one worker was killed, several sent to the hospital. The employer was a mystified, disappointed man. According to his own lights he had done his best for his employees and this was his reward. He sought solace in the thought that his workers had been misled or coerced by union organizers. But to other observers the answer was simple. To his men self-determination was preferable to paternalism, no matter how benevolent.

The second day-by-day method is the so-called company union. Administration of the National Labor Relations Act has caused many of these unions to disappear. Others have acquired new faces in recent years, but most of them are essentially the same anti-union device. Company unions are important from the point of view of this discussion because they represent a recognition on the part of employers that workers demand some type of voice in their working conditions. The tremendous growth in the number of company unions following passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act, with its guarantee of the right to organize, and later of the Wagner Act, showed that many employers realized that the demand for some form of self-organization was so great that, if left unsatisfied, it would result in the men turning to outside unions. The weight of evidence establishes the conclusion that

these unions have fallen considerably short of the attainable democratic ideal. Nevertheless, company unions have enabled workers in a great many cases to make their first step in the direction of industrial democracy.

Another very effective method of combating the growth of outside unionism has been the use of propaganda methods by employers. Through a favorable press they have been able to play up in the news columns every shortcoming of organized labor and its leaders. Through paid advertisements they have extolled the virtues of rugged individualism and stressed the "rags to riches" theme. Organizations set up to spread anti-union propaganda in one way or another have flourished like the green bay tree in recent years. One group wrote a series of "harmony" advertisements which were run in local newspapers all over the country and signed by innocuous sponsors supposed to be free from any employer connections. When these advertisements were investigated, it was found that the bills were usually paid by large employers or group of employers who used the sponsoring organizations as fronts.

In addition to these mild forms of anti-unionism, employers have used many more repressive tactics, ranging all the way from job discrimination through the use of the labor spy to open industrial warfare with tear gas, armed thugs, and high-powered rifles. There is no need for me to continue listing the effective weapons in the armory of the anti-union employer. Suffice it to say that it is well-stocked and that its use is not conducive to the spread of respect for free institutions. Continuation of these union-fighting tactics constitutes a serious thread to a society founded on democratic principles.

The other two enemies of labor democracy can be summarized briefly. The first is within the ranks of organized labor itself. The extensive development of worker's education by certain progressive labor leaders shows that they have long realized that the loyalty of any union membership is in direct ratio to the

amount of its democratic participation in the decisions which are made. Autocratic labor leaders, who believed, as did paternalistic employers, that they knew better than their members what was good for these members, have found their unions deserting them for believers in self-determination. For effective functioning, unionism, like most other institutions, requires the subordination of individual members' desires to the common welfare, so that, in the end, individual interests may best be served. This subordination to the common good need not be a denial of intra-union democracy, however, if the individual members have full freedom to help in the determination of policy. There is a world of difference between self-imposed discipline and top-imposed discipline.

The last enemy of labor democracy has been government itself. Many of you are perhaps aware of the innate suspicion of organized labor toward government. Past events have provided sufficient grounds for this attitude. For generations, elected city, county, and state officials have used the police and militia to break strikes behind the smoke screen of misleading statements on "law and order." Until recent years most courts were inclined to help employers obtain injunctions against picketing and other union activities. Vigilante groups, weakly disguised as "citizens' committees," have been prodded or aided by local officials into smashing many a picket line with clubs, blackjacks, and more dangerous weapons.

One example will tell the whole story. Year after year, in a certain well-known coal-producing county in this country, the miners, terrorized out of unions by the guns of deputy sheriffs, went to the polls and voted for candidates who were pledged to protect their rights. With almost clock-like regularity, the candidates of the men would, for some reason or another, fail to be elected.

If, by chance, a candidate of the miners did win, the votes would barely be counted before the official-to-be had somehow lost his regard for outside unionism. What effect would that have had on your love of democracy had you been one of those coal miners? Your answer would hold good for all the thousands of union men and women who have been coerced, beaten, thrown in jail, and shot down all in the name of the law, as interpreted by the duly elected representatives of the people. True interest in the future of political democracy dictates a real cleansing of this anti-union policy.

So much for the deficit side. There is considerable, I am happy to say, on the asset side of the ledger. The past few years have been a noteworthy change in the attitude of certain employers toward outside unionism. Many among those whom I have termed "belligerent anti-unionists" have, for one reason or another, radically shifted their positions. They have found of course that, during the first two years or so, things were not all rosy. They have had to reap the results that years of repression had on their workers. They have had to be patient while unionists blew off steam, got grievances out of their systems, and developed senses of responsibility and cooperation. Many of you are familiar with stories about the young hot-heads in the automobile union who, after winning recognition in the 1937 strike, made life miserable for their employers, using almost any little excuse they could find for shutting down the production line. Foremen likewise have had to be educated in an entirely new technique of conciliation, and those who could not adapt themselves have had to be let go. As time has passed, the more conservative of the union members have been elected to office, and these newly recognized unions have begun to settle down and tread the steady, harmonious path long since established in the railroad and clothing industries. It is to be hoped that belligerent anti-unionism is passing from the American scene just as it did in England decades ago.

On the asset side of the ledger also must be noted the significant contributions unionism has made to industrial democracy. Within their own ranks, unions have given many workers their first real opportunity to participate in important decisions affecting group welfare. Thus they have become valuable training grounds for political democracy. In addition, they have often been the only agency to give reality to the principles of political democracy in many communities long dominated by autocratic employers.

Last, we come to the asset side of the government's ledger. On top should be placed the National Labor Relations Act which gave reality to the unenforced theory that workers had the right to self-determination. Through this law the government has helped workers help themselves, and, unless it is later discarded or made ineffective by the believers in industrial autocracy, its proper administration will insure for workers the chance to build a real and lasting structure of labor democracy in this country. The rest will be up to the workers themselves.

To help those who were not in a position to help themselves, particularly in the low-wage, severely competitive industries and those with a high percentage of impermanent and fly-by-night employers, such legislation as the Fair Labor Standards Act has been passed. This law, commonly known as the Wage-Hour Law, contains minimum wage rate and maximum hour provisions which, though modest for the most part, have helped those at the bottom of the economic ladder to climb above poverty and starvation levels to a place where democracy may mean something more to them than utter despair. Through such legislation, government, by assisting workers directly at first, helps put them ultimately in positions where they are able to help themselves and enjoy the fruits of self-determination.

What of the future? I do not pretend to be a prophet. But I will venture this prediction. If the base of political democracy is further broadened through the lessening of employer antagonism, through encouragement by government, and through the extension of self-determination by union leaders, we will witness the building of a bulwark against dictatorship which will be difficult for any demagogue to dislodge, because, in the process, we will have given to the workers of this Nation and their families a vital stake in the future of free institutions.

I hope that during the course of this talk you have been asking yourself, what has all this to do with me, and what can I do about preserving democracy? My disinclination to prophesy is matched only by my desire not to preach. But, in concluding, I can venture to suggest one continuing assignment which may be considered post-graduate or adult education. It is this: practice democracy in all your group relationships, and as the circles of influence of yourselves and other American college graduates widen, continue to do so. Contribute what you can to make democracy an unbreakable, ingrained national habit, and the free men of future generations will rise and call you blessed.

Mrs. Walter S. Mack, Jr.

GREETINGS TO GRADUATING CLASS,
January 31, 1940

Graduating Class of January 1940: Your college years have been the most interesting and turbulent that I have known. You have lived through an almost complete cycle of thought and part of the drama has been played in your very midst. *They have been pushed far at you* You have heard the soft words and sweet calls of totalitarianism. They have appealed at first to your love of peace, then to your baser selves by promising a division of property, more like a multiplication of property; and they have finally appealed to racial jealousies and hatreds, the lowest of all. They have spoken a discredited language urging that the end justify the means. You have been intoxicated by their courtship, but before they could do you real harm, you have come to learn through your own experience that the means which is to assure the end, soon becomes the end in itself. We have all been taught that history repeats itself, but you have had in four brief years, the chance to live history, and you have turned back to democracy.

But democracy in itself is not static. Just two years ago, I told the graduating class that they would have to fight for democracy and ~~that~~ democracy was being taken so for granted that at that time, that was news. Now it seems to me that the mere fact that the whole community is fighting for its democracy proves the battle almost won. A sleeping democracy is a stuffed shirt democracy and is threatened on all sides. A wide awake and aware democracy is not in any real danger.

We feel that you are well equipped to join the struggle for democracy and we trust you will not be merely quiescent. To be effective you must be aware that you are fighting more than a standstill battle, that you should be fighting for our ideal of democracy as well as our achievement of it. We still have a long way to go.

We still have to achieve a perfect liberty. Some of our people are unenfranchised. Lincoln's ^{victory} ~~harkle~~ is incomplete and we must complete it. Others are in ignorance and fear when they vote. Education must point the way to the fearful and ignorant. Education is creative and must still come first.

We still have to achieve a perfect majority rule in our democracy. Majorities must learn to deal tolerantly with minorities. Reforms should be built on intelligent persuasion rather than prosecution and persecution. Restless minorities are always a danger to democracy.

Democracy is also vulnerable to publicity, hysteria, and propaganda. This is particularly true where new inventions, such as the radio, have a sudden growth and have not been completely evaluated. You must help to evaluate these sources of strength and weakness and to set up safeguards.

The pace of life has accelerated many times in the twenty years since I graduated. We had no radio, talkies, passenger air service to thrill and complicate our lives. Action and reaction were slower but more complete. All these new phenomena have thrown the world to some extent off balance. You who have been conditioned to this new world and educated to meet it, must help to restore this balance through your continued effort and intelligent vigilance. You must choose your own means, but you must not confuse them with the end. You must help our democracy to grow, to have a firm and true base and you must ever be on the alert to protect it.

You should enter the world to do your share not in fear but with full confidence that the enemy is on the run and that if you and each one of us do our share, both in living and in being the right kind of citizens, ~~that~~ one of the greatest crises the world has ever known has been met and overcome on these very shores. You can know that this has been a victory, not by arms and their fatal consequences, but of opinion based on sound and free thought, a true basis for the final development of democracy.

M. R. MACK

S E C O N D W I N D

Remarks of Greeting to the Graduating Class
of Hunter College - Winter, 1940

by

Ordway Tead
Chairman, Board of Higher Education, New York City

You do not want, and I have no stomach for, any words of felicitation which ignore the real difficulties which confront you. I do you no service and I would be false to my deepest convictions if I merely said to you today, "This is the best of all possible worlds. God's in his heaven; all's right with the world. Work hard and win through.. Life awaits you with open arms - go out and embrace it eagerly and confidently."

There is no doubt a measure of truth in all such optimistic platitudes. But they are calculated to leave a false complacency. At this hour they insult the hearer; they discredit the speaker.

Rather let me say at once that the world today is in one of those recurrent paroxysms and upheavals of major proportions. A world is dying; a new world is still powerless to be born in the sense that its birth pangs will probably endure through a generation at least. The result is tension, doubt, bewilderment. This starts perhaps in the larger than personal areas with forces and influences that seem to have momentums of their own which operate, if not independently of human decisions, then certainly with some seemingly separable dynamic existence of their own. These are forces of economic method and trend, with ramifications into politics and international relations including wars and rumors of wars.

But these large forces do immediately have their effects on you and me as persons - and on the way of life we may lead. And these effects today on everybody are trying, disturbing, and fraught with almost complete uncertainty as to personal choices to be made for the immediate future. This uncertainty, let me assure you, is not yours alone. The wiser the citizen is today, the more unwilling will he be, I believe, to essay the prophet's role.

But amid this barrage of negative influences, is there nothing positive to be said? I believe there is. But I have time to refer to only one phase of it, - one very personal aspect. My word - not of advice but of reminder - is: remember that in the conduct of your personal life, as in the running of any race, it is your ability to get your second wind which is the necessary condition of finishing among the victors.

In the next ten years - indeed, in the next five years, which will pass all too swiftly - you will be called on to make most of your major life decisions. You will choose a career or a job; you will alter fundamentally your relation to your parents; you will choose a husband; you will or will not become mothers. And your life pattern by 1945 will be pretty well set.

My observation is that not 1940, but 1945 to 1950 will be your test years. Any healthy, vigorous person can face up with some zest to the adventure of leaving college and getting started at something. The very novelty will sustain you for a season. But the novelty of making crucial decisions will wear off. Then will come the years when you will or will not get your second wind. By that I mean - that is the time when some of you will be sorry if you have alienated your parents by thinking you are too smart to associate with them; you may find your career promises less than you had hoped - or at least that a career is a hard, repetitive responsibility; you may find that your husband is not the incarnation of all the superlative qualities of a Clark Gable;

you may find that your children have traits of their father's grandmother which you thoroughly dislike.

Will you then have your second wind? Will you in the meantime have faced life with enough wisdom, serenity, basic conviction of the potential goodness of the human adventure, - to stand the gaff, to take it on the chin, to get over such body blows and start fighting again with buoyancy, faith and good humor?

I hope your college has given you something to build on so that your learning about personal living in the next few years will be a creative and not a discouraged learning. I hope the next few years will find you still able to carry on this learning of life, realistically yet enthusiastically.

An ancient prophet reminds us that this problem is not new to your generation. In his metaphorical way he said, "They shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and faint not."

It is my hope that after the initial soaring like an eagle and the eager running to get on or to keep up with a job or a husband or both, you will find that you then walk and do not faint.

Indeed, this ancient prophet supplied a further clue to the solution of our problem. The fact that he offered this advice some twenty five hundred years ago in no way lessens its eternal timeliness. For his was the kind of truth that is only proved the more as it is put into practice by those with sufficient insight to understand its meaning.

The context from which what I have just quoted is taken is as follows:

"Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting

God, the Lord, the creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?

He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might He increaseth strength.

Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall.

But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength."

My friends of the graduating class, my deepest wish for you is that you start out tomorrow with hope and vigor because you know that it's a tough world; that you get your second wind out of the wisdom you have learned and will acquire in the next few years; and that you find that you can get your second wind because you have come to a profound sense of what it means in our day and age to "wait upon the Lord."

I hail you into an era in which, if we all are to survive at all, we all must learn the secret of ^{how} ~~whereby~~ year by year we can walk and faint not.