

I am delighted to share this morning and this beginning of the Centennial Year with you, here in what has become my own home state.

We might, with a little bit of bemusement, listen to the lines of the Prologue and realize that a hundred years ago our ancestors in the feminine gender began to join a man's world. The men opened the doors to what was a man's world, and in opening those doors to the other half of personhood, they may have begun the advance of the Age of the Person. I firmly believe that ours is not an Age of Woman or a Decade of Woman, or a Year of Woman, but it is rather a real century of the person. If the turn of this century is to say anything for the future of humankind it will be that in spite of the faceless crowd, in spite of technological and bureaucratic man, this age will go down in history as the Age of the Human Person.

When we as women were admitted into this University and into society in the 1860's, I ask you to remember that another kind of emancipation was going on. A very important Emancipation Proclamation was made in that decade and was put underground to lie fallow in the earth. Your generation, your century, your decade, are only beginning now to cultivate and to raise that seed. Your generation, with all its tensions, with all its hazards, is a new attempt to integrate a new sub-category, an old sub-category, into the large embodiment of the human family.

Education and higher education in the last century and in all of the early decades of this century in the United States was heavily committed, it seems to me, to two polar kinds of views, to two polar kinds of tasks. One task was, what was mirrored in the early Prologue here, by the learning of Greek, by the finishing school in all of its best aspects, by trying to educate the man of culture. The other aspect, the other pole of education was addressed to the task of providing technicians, of providing professionals, of providing laborers for the

market that was expanding everywhere in this technological society. Education was polarized into the professional training of the professional school and the liberal education of the urbane man.

When women were admitted into education, the early movers of the system became and became known as feminists. They were the women who were trying to get human rights, civil liberties, for one particular group of the human race. They early entered into the fields of the professions. It was no accident that the University of Missouri opened its gates to women for the very pragmatic utilitarian purpose of providing school teachers for the lower schools. As a consequence, one of the most liberalizing, one of the most philosophically moving periods of mankind was opened because all of mankind was honed in on a very pragmatic, very technical, very utilitarian functional task.

In this evolution of a hundred years, the opening of the professions and the job opportunities created increasing new roles for women. Women had token integration everywhere. Token integration in medicine, token integration in law, token integration in social service, token integration even in the highest courts of the land and the highest assemblies of the land. (We watch Margaret Chase Smith with a little flower which proclaims day by day the token integration of the United States Senate.) But all of these opened up through professional drives of women who early on had to make an option, an option between the conventional role of wifehood and motherhood, and the new opening role of the professions.

I share with you a conviction that your generation will not be satisfied with such options. Your generation has received a legacy from the generations that went before me and from my own generation, and I hope in some way from me. I believe that your generation has received the legacy of multiple options. No longer does man believe, no longer is man convinced that he must make polar options between this choice and that. No longer must any woman decide whether

she will be a feminist career woman, or a wife and mother. Rather, the professions have begun to open up, to believe that they want not only physically decorative and childbearing wives, but women of great spirit, women of great strength.

Think a little bit about what makes him fall in love with you. It is the fullness of your person, it is the independence of your person, it is the singularity of your person, it is all the things that you bring to him from your independent life. And day after day, and night after night, as you begin to share your world, and therefore share yourself, you grow in grace in life with one another. The best courtships are always this. But tragically in our society, all too many courtships cease to be courtships in the long, long process of marriage and the family, because many of our institutions have goaded women into giving up themselves for their husbands and their families. And in the name of subjugating themselves, of placing themselves at the service of their husbands and their families, they become parasites on their husbands and families. The husband comes home with his very important, independent, growing life to a woman who has been immersed in dishes and diapers, and who is waiting to be entertained by her tired husband. This is not the girl he fell in love with. This is not the girl with the independent life and the independent joy and the independent vehemence and opposition of the girl he fell in love with.

There are women, and I'm sure there are some in this audience, who managed in their own time to be the singular exceptions to this pattern. Women who found their own way independently to grow and therefore over the years of Silver and Golden Jubilees everyday to confront their husbands and their children anew. My own mother is one of those persons. My own mother, who grew up on a farm in Illinois, and had a formal education ending at the eighth grade, is a woman who simply would not give up, and who had educated herself in very quiet ways, and who now in her seventies can sit down and discuss Teilhard de Chardin and the

evolution of a new world with me, her child. And so, she lives for the man who has lived and loved her, lived with her and loved her in marriage for fifty-three years: and who falls in love with her every day because she refuses to become a vegetable or a parasite. Her world, however, was a world that no longer exists for you and me. It was a world of a rural farm. It was a world in which they ran, if you will, a little joint corporation in which they dreamed their dreams together, in which they lived through depressions together, and remade their world together. But your husbands will live on jet airplanes, and they may take you to Africa, or Antarctica. They may take you to worlds that you have never seen. And you must make your lives in much the same way my unusual mother made hers. By the process of continuing education. Unless the education that you have had here has freed you, has liberalized you to go beyond its confines, to go beyond the confines of the state of Missouri, to go beyond the confines of your own tribal background in Southeastern Missouri, in your family, in your religious body, in your socio-political background, unless your education by all of these factors has freed you, not to reject those things, but to go beyond them, -- you will not be free to be the liberalized and liberalizing free woman that my unusual mother and many others have been for many of us.

Our tradition, our background is the richest part of us. The girl or the fellow who rejects his parents is a fool and an ingrate. Each one of us is the sum product of everything that we have been. We are the sum product of our biological life from our mothers and fathers created in an act of love. We are the sum total of our philosophical and environmental life given to us through their faults and frailties and their joys and their accomplishments. We are the sum total of the little school we went to, or the urban school we went to. We are the sum total of the University or the College that we went to and the people that we knew. Each one of those events, each one of those learnings,

each one of those livings in our past life gave us power, and therefore released us even as they tried to ensnare us within their own limits.

It is delightful to hear you talking about the Year of the Tigeress instead of the Year of the Tiger. Symbols like that are very important. The loyalty that you summon when you sit in the football stand, in spite of all the academic and intellectual snobs, is a very important loyalty. A very important loyalty that I experienced at the World Series on Saturday and Sunday with great joy in the stands in St. Louis, and a very important loyalty that I experienced yesterday in great sadness in the city of St. Louis. Symbols of appropriateness, symbols of devotion to institutions are very important, but those devotions, whether they be to the St. Louis Cardinals, or to the Missouri Tigers, whether they be to our religious denomination or to our family or to our professional background are honest symbols of loyalty only if they let us go beyond them. If instead, loyalty to the Tiger or the Tigeress makes you in substantial ways snobs about the rest of the world -- not on the football field, we can afford it there -- but if instead it makes you snobs about the rest of the world, if the dignity of the Tiger in all it symbolizes has to make you think an indignity of any other group, then the Tiger has not freed you. Then the Tiger has not ennobled you. If your devotion to your family, or your devotion to your church, or your devotion to your institution, or your devotion to your state has not made you a citizen of the world, a citizen of the cosmos, then you are disloyal to your roots. We are most loyal to our fathers and mothers, we are most loyal to our teachers, you are most loyal to the Chancellor and students at Webster College are most loyal to Jacqueline Grennan when they go beyond our limits.

I have said on numerous public platforms that unless many of you in this audience are more powerful at forty than I am, then all of us are complete flops. Unless we have given to you by our lives a new world which you can act on at twenty that I did not have in which to act at twenty, then our lives have been

unfulfilled.

Not only technological industry but the human race must believe in obsolescence. Unless Chancellor Schwada, and Dean Schooling, and Jacqueline Grennan make ourselves obsolescent, we have not been educated. Unless your generation has been made more powerful and can therefore make the next generation more powerful, you are not successful as a generation.

The congressmen who passed the Resolution of this hazardous act of bringing that timid young woman who had to slip her name into the conversation into the University of Missouri in 1867 were courageous congressmen and the young woman that she represents may be more courageous than any of us, even though she looks much more secure. Because she opened the door that began to create a world that would begin to create a world, that would begin to create a world, that would begin to create a world. Eye has not seen nor ear heard, nor has it entered into the minds of woman to conceive what persons are going to be in 2167, in 2267, and 5267, and 15267. We, who biologically and temperamentally and philosophically and psychically stand for motherhood ought to have a vision of posterity. We ought to have a vision of the future that almost lies in our souls and in our hearts and in our wombs. We ought to be committed to the future because woman is a profound symbol of the future. Woman is physically and perhaps psychically the womb of tomorrow. Not only should we be willing to accept the roles which society gives to us, but we must assume as individuals and as partners in a community of higher education the responsibility of opening up the new possibilities for the women who come after us and for all mankind who comes after us. The real question that lies on the agenda of the Twentieth Century, I think, can be framed as "How Big is the Human Family?" Where does the human family end? The good father, the good mother, the good sister, or the good brother will go down to the valley of death for a child or for a brother or for a sister. The most conservative political man I know, to

whom I must go for money to help support Webster College, talks to me about boot straps operations in his concern about an economy which would let the children of ADC mothers be sure of a college education. If we create that kind of economy, the saying goes, we create a society that expects to be given everything. I love to ask these great old men what kinds of annuities or trust funds they have set up for their grandchildren to go to Princeton. It's a dirty question. It's a loaded question because it is a rhetorical question in ninety-nine out of a hundred cases. The politically conservative man is almost always careful to see that his own posterity has the kind of assurance and insurance to be free, has the kind of stability which will allow him to become a thinking, dreaming, conceiving human being. Granted, some such boys, some grandchildren have become polo players, and dilettantes. But the evidence is on the other side. The statistical average is on the other side. And the people who have been loved, the people who have been supported by their parents, not suppressed, but supported; supported in order that they may be free have gone on to build society. I want to suggest to you that society today, the family today, does not stop with an ADC mother in the slums in St. Louis; society today and the family today does not stop in the Bible Belt of the south or in the Irish or Polish Ghetto of the north. The society and the human family embrace all people. The University, perhaps more than any other instrument of our society has been the principle of integration. The public school system on one level has integrated society in a necessarily parochial, provincial level. The University really opens Pandora's box because it introduces to you thinking, learning, speaking persons from all backgrounds, from all geographies, from foreign countries, from different kinds of philosophical and religious backgrounds, all seeking tomorrow with you. If you will take the little farm girl from Illinois in 1944 or the young woman from Jefferson City, Missouri in 1967 and place her in an open society of persons whose views diverge very much from

the views that came from her parents and her background she goes through trauma, and you too go through trauma. You go through the trauma of a drug culture. You go through trauma of a politically dynamic culture that is worried about credibility gaps and worried about universal socialization at the same time. And you have to find out who you are in that society. And I say thank God, and thank the University world, because never again is it going to be easy for women to build a puritan stockade culture of judgment. Never again is it going to be easy for women, in the name of morality and in the name of religion and even blasphemously in the name of God, to gossip over the back fence or over the bridge table or over the editorial columns and to destroy the potentials of the human race by limiting people within narrow fields of judgment. The open world which has let women into the trauma and the dynamism and the frenetic insecurity that is inseparable from an open world has also let women begin to come of age, let women begin to exercise some of the softer, lovelier qualities of their personhood. Women may finally be free to sacramentalize the larger family of technical urban civilization, to soften and to sacramentalize the larger human family, to begin to wonder about the child in Russia or the child in North Vietnam or the child in China just as much as she wonders and worries and cares for the child in Columbia, Missouri or in downtown urban St. Louis. Unless my heart and your heart are as open to the child in North Vietnam, we are not capable of voting in the next election. In no sense do I want to take a political stance of any kind here. I am not even suggesting how one would vote in the next election. If in the name of religion or in the name of God, you think you are going to protect your children by a simplistic notion of anti-communism, then I suggest that we will write tomorrow in very shaking lines.

The woman of tomorrow has a final new task to which she brings great human



experience from her own life.

I attended last week in Washington, a meeting of the American Planners Institute, a meeting devoted to the next fifty years. Men were talking there about the future of education, about the future of social welfare, and about the future of leisure. Men are concerned about a society where men are going to work twenty and thirty hours. If that is so should we not preclude the entry of more women into the labor market rather than going out to glut the labor market more and more? But the deeper question is what the concept of work is going to be for your children's children's children's children's? What concept is going to hold for the future of responsible labor for mankind? Already well over fifty percent of our paid occupations are in the service industries in almost all walks of life. In our urban civilizations some men are saying that ninety percent are in the service industries. Our schools, our continuing education need work roles that have not been conceived.

A brilliant young woman, married to a young Wall Street broker, recently described to me with poignance, concern, and terror the last three months of her pregnancy when she sat curled up on the sofa and felt sorry for herself because she had nothing else to think about. As she talked to me, she was already beginning to try to come to terms with her complete devotion to this little child, and her equal concern, that unless her mind went somewhere else, she would have no mind, no soul, and not even a very interesting body to share with her husband. That is a very important dilemma. I suggested at a meeting of teachers here in Missouri just two weeks ago that it is imperative that the school system begin to create slots for what I would like to call full-time teachers part-time, rather than part-time teachers full-time. How many of you have considered going into the field of education because it is a field in which you can check in at eight-thirty in the morning and out at three-thirty at night and in which you are off on weekends and over the summer? At least it

looks like one way that you can hold a job and raise a family. Not a bad resolution, but not good enough. Wouldn't it be interesting if as you leave the University of Missouri there were possibilities of your teaching an hour or two in a school system by being a full contributing person in that school system? In the fields of science and mathematics in particular the cadre of women who are available to jobs if we can find ways for them to work limited numbers of hours is amazing. The young woman I have been discussing has a degree in mathematics and had worked for IBM until the final weeks of her pregnancy. She was thinking of having an IBM console in her own home and of having the programming sent in to her while she baby sat. If that young woman convinces IBM of that kind of job, or if she sells some poor bureaucratic deadened school system with the notion of how valuable she could be for two to three hours a day, she will create a model which will open up new roles to other persons who will open up new roles for still others.

But finally I want to suggest that if you and I can help to solve this dilemma, rather than increasing the problem for men in a job market that is going to be less and less in its quantitative area, we will help to solve the problem for the human race. And here I want to end where I began.

The old notion of education used to be technical training, professional training, or liberal education as a kind of decoration for the soul of man. But wherever real liberalizing philosophical and political moves took place, they took place by addressing ourselves to a very pragmatic problem. At the University of Missouri they recognized the need for teachers for the lower schools. And so they opened up the system, and in opening up the system they began to transform the system and the transformed system, the evolutionary system began to transform all of society. Women, in order to avoid boredom and parasitic lives must find ways to make themselves liberalizing opening human beings involved to some degree in professions, but creating at the same time

out of their total existence, part of which is their professional life, a functional, vibrant, important leisure culture. If women in our culture go out of the suburbs and help to solve the urban problem, they will transform society. In helping to solve the urban problems you will free your own children from the limiting force of socio-economic and philosophical stratification. This is a terrifying kind of thing. A terrifying kind of thing for a mother to let her daughter go into Vista, into the Peace Corps, into any kind of wide open society. Yet you know that to some degree your mother has already let you do that. Each of you know that the permissive culture is here, that the permissive culture of Missouri University has moved one year ahead of us in allowing all undergraduate women above the freshmen year to live on their own resources, thank God. But only if you take that sense of responsibility, only if we completely give it to them, only if we expose you knowingly and supportingly to the traumas all around you, will we give you the freedom and the power to help invent a new society. The human family cries out for motherhood. But it seeks out for the motherhood not of a possessive puppetry but the motherhood that gives life and nurture and growth to children so that those children may go free and dream dreams and invent social systems that make mothers and fathers and college presidents a little nervous. Go forth, new generation, and may I worry about you as I smile in my rocking chair.

(This material remains the property of the author and may not be reprinted in any form without the author's written permission.)