



LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

The Experimental College. 1932

Meiklejohn, Alexander, 1872-1964
New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/PJ54PYXI36K6U8Z>

<http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC/1.0/>

Copyright 1932 Harper & Brothers.

For information on re-use, see

<http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/Copyright>

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

The Experimental College

by

ALEXANDER
MEIKLE JOHN

This book is a statement of the aims and principles of the most radical and significant educational experiment in America. It is written for every man and woman inside and outside the teaching field who is dissatisfied with the present results and desires a more living and less mechanised method of education.

Here we have the complete picture of a college run without classrooms, lectures, or text books; founded on a theory of education the purpose of which is to find and to teach a new way of life.

THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

by

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

This book is a record of an experiment in the field of education in which every phase of the teaching program was open to investigation. The Advisers, as the teachers were called, were given complete freedom to do as they pleased in developing the course of study, the methods of teaching, and the arrangements of social living of a group of freshmen and sophomores. Never did a group of teachers and students have a better opportunity to establish intellectual as well as personal acquaintance with one another. Besides the general picture of the college there is in the appendix a record of the correspondence between Dr. Glenn Frank and Dr. Meiklejohn which gives the specific story of the foundation of the college. And for those interested in the more detailed educational aspects there is a complete set of freshman and sophomore assignment sheets.

This book is no stereotyped discussion of vague principles, but the story of theories which were put into practice. Teacher, student, and parent come into this picture of a communal attempt to revitalize education.

HARPER & BROTHERS
P u b l i s h e r s

THE
EXPERIMENTAL
COLLEGE



ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

By

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS

New York and London

THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE
Copyright, 1932, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the U. S. A.
First Edition
E-G

To
NEIL SULLIVAN

CONTENTS

I. THE AIM OF THE LIBERAL COLLEGE	
<i>Chapter I</i> INTELLIGENCE AND SCHOLARSHIP	3
<i>Chapter II</i> THE LOWER COLLEGE	20
<i>Chapter III</i> RESPONSIBILITY AND BOOKS	30
II. THE COURSE OF STUDY	
<i>Chapter IV</i> THE PRELIMINARY HYPOTHESIS	39
<i>Chapter V</i> UNDERSTANDING IS INTEGRATION	45
<i>Chapter VI</i> THE ATHENS-AMERICA CURRICULUM	67
<i>Chapter VII</i> COMMENTS AND COUNTER PROPOSALS	89
III. THE METHODS OF TEACHING	
<i>Chapter VIII</i> THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AND HIS FREEDOM	119
<i>Chapter IX</i> THE PRINCIPLE AT WORK	137
<i>Chapter X</i> GAINS AND LOSSES	152
<i>Chapter XI</i> ADVISERS AND PUPILS	172
IV. THE DETERMINING CONDITIONS	
<i>Chapter XII</i> THE HEALTH OF THE COMMUNITY	213
<i>Chapter XIII</i> THE HEALTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT	229
V. A SUGGESTION FOR THE COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE	
<i>Chapter XIV</i> A POSSIBLE ORGANIZATION OF THE LOWER COLLEGE	245
VI. EXPERIMENTING IN A UNIVERSITY	
<i>Chapter XV</i> COÖPERATIONS	271

	<i>Chapter XVI</i> INTERFERENCES	278
	<i>Chapter XVII</i> MISUNDERSTANDINGS	295
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	
	<i>Chapter XVIII</i> RECOMMENDATIONS	313
VIII.	POSTSCRIPT	
	<i>Chapter XIX</i> ACTION BY THE ADVISERS	323
IX.	APPENDICES	327

PREFACE

The American college is experimenting. A recently published Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education lists one hundred and twenty-eight current attempts to improve college teaching. From one end of the country to the other a rising tide of self-criticism is sweeping over our endowed colleges, our state universities, our schools of every type and level. What does it all mean?

It would be easy for a casual onlooker to explain these activities in terms of an American zest for inventing and changing machinery. If one were so disposed, he might find in the situation only a great multiplicity of endeavors to solve the problems of the human spirit by means of mechanical devices. And yet the mind which so interprets American education, or any other characteristic American activity, gives evidence chiefly of the fact that it is itself old and tired and disillusioned. The burst of activity which we call "Americanization" is, it is true, crude and externalized. But nothing could be more dull than to judge it by merely resenting its crudities, its lack of the refinements and sophistications of an older culture. Its activities are those of a young, untried, inex-

perienced people who are, more or less blindly, attempting to create new forms of living in the midst of older forms which have lost, if not their vigor, at least their fitness for the new conditions in which men and their institutions have become so suddenly and rapidly involved.

There are, then, in the experiments of which we have spoken, two dominating attitudes. The more obvious of these is dissatisfaction. It is very clear that our college teaching is not successful. Never before in the history of the world was higher education so eagerly desired, so widely offered and taken, so lavishly endowed. And yet—or rather we should say, “And hence”—it is at present largely futile, frustrated, dissatisfied.

But deeper than the dissatisfaction, and far more significant, is an attitude of resolution, of determination to achieve an end even though we do not know what that end is. The social satirist may give as our guiding principle the words, “We don’t know where we are going, but we are on the way.” And to one who has already neatly charted life’s course, the crowd which straggles along under that banner may well seem to be a barbarian horde. And yet there is always hope that he who seeks may find. It is always possible that he who presses on in search of something which is primarily within himself may, in the

process, discover what it is for which he has been searching. It is in such terms as these that the American teacher is becoming aware that he faces the task of making a new education for a new society.

This closeness of connection between the character of a society and the character of its education cannot be too strongly stressed. Schools and colleges are not something apart from the social order to which they belong. They are that order trying to prepare its youth for participation in its own activities. And a society can teach only the hopes, the knowledge, the values, the beliefs which it has. If knowledge is broken to pieces, if beliefs are shaken, if values become uncertain, then inevitably teaching loses its grip, falls into hesitations and incoherence. Seventy-five years ago the American college had a fairly well-established culture from which to draw its lessons. It had therefore a required curriculum and an assured method of teaching. Then came the impact of modern science and modern industry. In the face of these, religion, morals, beliefs, attitude, institutions all gave way. And with the breaking to pieces of the older life, the older scheme of knowledge, there came, as with the left the right, the breaking of the older scheme of teaching.

It would, in the nature of the case, be very hard to put into intelligible terms, the confusion through

which our education has been passing. The "requirements" of the older system have not been wholly destroyed. Rather they have lost their power, their domination of the field. Side by side with them the "subjects" of an "elective" scheme have claimed and taken a place. And the theory of this newer system, or lack of system, is one which seems to make all subjects equivalent in teaching value and significance. Physics may be substituted for art, literature for engineering, an elementary language for the philosophy of religion. "Any subject properly taught," we are told, "will equally well with any other serve the purposes of a liberal education." It is in beliefs such as this that one sees how the essential incoherence of a social order can bring into confusion and bewilderment the activities of its teachers.

But now the time for the making of a new order is at hand. Our primary task is first to clear away such of the old wreckage as cannot be used, and then to gather together old and new insights into the forming of a scheme of life in terms of which activities may be guided, judgments of fact and value asserted and denied. This task, one need hardly say, will not be done quickly. It is possible that we shall have much more of wrecking, much more of bewilderment and disaster, before the human spirit can again perceive its own intention. But in any case it is the

achieving of that creative insight toward which both social planner and teacher must be striving. We must find and teach a new way of life. It is that demand which, at the bottom, underlies the unrest, the experimenting, of the American teacher.

II

The most noteworthy feature of the experiment at the University of Wisconsin has been its radical character. This has been true in two respects. First, the Experimental College was directed to study, not this or that or the other, feature of collegiate teaching, but rather the whole body of influences which play upon the undergraduate student. "The content of study," the "methods of teaching," the "determining conditions of undergraduate liberal instruction"—all these were to be examined, and the Advisers were set free to do with each of them, with all of them in combination, whatever they might think best. And second, from this complete freedom of action there followed the radical responsibility for trying to understand in some unitary fashion all the elements in a teaching situation. When nothing is fixed, when no procedures can be taken for granted, then everything must be judged and justified, not on the basis of principles previously established, but in terms of ideas growing out of the process itself. More than anything else the

Advisers have faced the necessity of discovering their own purpose. In the midst of devices, they have been seeking for an idea. And in this search they have been constantly driven back, and farther back, into a study of American life. What teaching does America need from its colleges of liberal understanding?

The results which the Advisers have reached in five years are of course tentative and fragmentary. In the field of "devices" they have formulated one teaching program and have suggested a number of others. It is recommended that these programs be further developed and that they be tested by comparative study under actual working conditions. In the field of "ideas" two conclusions have seemed important.

On the face of it, the first conclusion looks more like a device than like an idea. It is the conviction that educational planning and teaching should be done not by large faculties, but by small and relatively independent groups of teachers. The principle here involved is that the greatest need of education just now is coherence, unity of interest and intention. On the one hand, it is imperative that in any group which plans for liberal teaching the different fields of knowledge shall be represented. The diverse elements in the human, the intellectual situation, must all be present. But, on the other hand, the essential task is that of bringing these elements into order, into

meaning. And for the accomplishing of that purpose the Advisers are persuaded that the smallness of the planning group is a prime requisite. It must be possible, it must be arranged, that all the members of the teaching force shall have genuine and intimate intellectual acquaintance with one another. This is another way of saying that the teachers, as they attempt to educate their pupils, must themselves be gaining education from one another, and from their common enterprise. They must be trying to create the wisdom which they wish to impart. This notion will be found further developed in Chapters Sixteen and Twenty of this book. It will there be seen that the only definite proposal which the Advisers have to offer to the University of Wisconsin is that small faculty groups be established for the further study of their problem.

The second conclusion relates to the attempt to define the fundamental idea in terms of which both our new society and our new education may be created. What is to be the dominating principle of the new liberal education? Two negative answers to this question seem to be clearly valid. The idea will not be found among those special activities which are the trades, crafts, vocations, professions, of human society. Nor will it be discovered in the midst of those special investigations, those limited and partial studies,

which we sum up under the term "scholarship." The separate callings of men are items in the human enterprise, but, taken by themselves, they are, and must remain, an unmeaning collection of miscellaneous activities. And, in the same way, the investigations of scholars give us items in the understanding of our world; and yet, if they are allowed to stand as so many separate discoveries, so many independent additions to the sum-total of human knowledge, they may be destructive rather than helpful in the creation of human understanding. Liberal education is not training in technical skill; nor is it instruction in knowledge. Training and instruction are the servants of education. But they must not be confused with it. They serve their proper purpose only when they are kept in proper subordination.

The positive term which this book uses in the attempt to fix the aim of education is "intelligence." Over against the training by which pupils are fitted for vocations, over against the instruction by which students are equipped with knowledge, is the liberal teaching, which attempts to create and to cultivate insight or intelligence. The term is not an easy one to define. It would hardly serve the purposes of this Preface to offer an abstract definition of it here. It is clear that into the meaning of the term there enter moral and æsthetic elements as well as intellectual.

It is evident, too, that the idea implies unity of understanding as against the unrelatedness of scattered bits of knowledge. In view of what has already been said it may be assumed that the function of intelligence is to serve men in the creation and maintenance of a social order, a scheme of individual and group living, which will meet the human demands for beauty, strength, justice, generosity, and the like. But with these general remarks made, it will be best to let the term take on meaning as the deliberations of the Advisers are described. These teachers have been trying to find out how young Americans can be made more intelligent. In so far as they have succeeded their success will appear in their clearer understanding of the three main factors in the problem—first, what young men are and may be; second, what America is and may become; third, what is the human purpose which is seeking to find expression both in individual Americans and in the social order which, for good or for ill, they are now creating.

III

This book presents the full text of the Report which the Advisers of the Experimental College, in February, 1932, presented to the Faculty of Letters and Science of the University of Wisconsin. It does not, however, give a number of academic documents

which were appended to that Report. And further, there is a slight change in order of presentation. In the Wisconsin statement a Prefatory Note and two introductory chapters were used to lead the mind of the academic community into the line of the discussion. This material does not seem well suited to serve the same purpose for the general reader. It has therefore been transferred to an appendix where it will be available for anyone who wishes to follow the argument in its original form.¹ But for readers of less specialized interest this Preface has been substituted.

The attempt to enlist the interest of general readers in such an academic study may seem, in any form, a rather desperate one. And yet it must be made. Probably the greatest single obstacle to the work of the American teacher at present is the lack of understanding of his venture by the public which he serves, even by the parents whose sons and daughters are given into his hands. Neither parents nor a community can get education for young people simply by paying for it. They must share in the process. They inevitably do share in the process, whether they intend it or not.

This book tells the story of an adventure in American education which has proved for those engaged

¹ Appendix I.

in it both exciting and exasperating, both difficult and satisfying. It may be that the teachers in the enterprise have learned more than their pupils. But, in any case, they are true to their calling in being eager to share what they have learned.

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

I

*THE AIM OF
THE LIBERAL COLLEGE*

Chapter One

INTELLIGENCE AND SCHOLARSHIP

IF ONE is directed to make suggestions for the improvement of a piece of work the first question which he should ask is, What is the purpose of the work; what is it intended to accomplish? If, then, Advisers are commissioned by a university to make suggestions for the improvement of liberal teaching in the first two years of the college course, their primary query must be, What does the university wish to get done by means of these two years of its instruction?

It is clear that to answer this question is to fix the place and the function of the two years in the larger scheme of education. Before entering the freshman class students have already had some twelve years of formal teaching. After the close of the sophomore year there are still awaiting them two later years of the liberal college course. And if these are finished, there are yet to come, for a few students at least, the

technical or professional or "graduate" studies of the university. In a word, the freshman and sophomore years—which we may call the "lower college"—are not a closed and separate experience. They grow out of experiences which have gone before; they grow into experiences which are coming after. They are an episode within a continuous process of education. They can be understood only when they are seen as making their special contribution to that process as a whole.

If now, in the interest of simplicity of statement, we assume the "lower college" period to be in general that between eighteen and twenty years of age, the question at issue can be stated, externally at least, in numerical terms. What, in the course of their general development, should students learn between eighteen and twenty? What should they have learned before they are eighteen; what, between twenty and twenty-two; what, after they are twenty-two? To answer these questions would be, in a schematic way, to see, first, the primary and secondary schools, then the lower college, next the upper college, and finally the graduate school, each playing its part in a developing scheme of instruction. It would give us an ordered view of the educational ladder, from its bottom to its top. And with this accomplished we might then hope to see the "lower

college" on its proper rung, in its proper relations to the teaching which has gone before and to that which is coming after.

But the attempt to make a complete survey of the educational ladder would be far too ambitious an undertaking for the present discussion. The intellectual task there involved is exceedingly important, but it is quite as difficult and baffling as it is important. Many students of American education are dealing with it. Now and then outlines appear which give promise of bringing the vast collocation of schools and colleges into some sort of orderly arrangement. And yet it must be frankly recognized that our American plan of education is still in the making. It has few, if any, fixed points of reference. It is very slowly coming to concrete and specific awareness of its own aims and principles. We can hardly hope, therefore, in this preliminary chapter, to present a definite outline within which the "lower college" might find its assigned place. All that we can attempt at present is the making of a very abstract statement. It is to be hoped that in the later chapters of this report that statement will take on the specific colors, the detailed interpretation which it needs.

The liberal college is usually defined in relation to the term "intelligence." It intends to build up in

a student the power of self-direction in the affairs of life. It rests upon the assumption, or the assertion, that over against the specialized teaching of men for banking, for scholarship, for industry, for art, for medicine, for law, and the like, there is the general liberal teaching of men for intelligence in the conduct of their own lives as human individuals. If, now, it be asked, "What is this 'intelligence' of which you speak?" we cannot do better than to borrow a phrase and a story from Abraham Flexner's recent stirring discussion of universities. "Long ago," Mr. Flexner tells us, "Germany learned that industry needs universities not merely because universities train chemists and physicists for research laboratories, but because universities train intelligence, capable of being applied in any field whatever. That lesson the American university has yet to learn."¹ It will be noted that Mr. Flexner here claims the teaching of intelligence as an activity of the "university," while we are using it for the defining of the college. And the difference is a very serious one. But for the moment we are seeking merely to define a term and not to give it allocation.

What, then, is intelligence as the term is used in defining the aim of a teacher? Mr. Flexner hits it

¹ Abraham Flexner, *Universities, American, English, German*, p. 177. Oxford University Press, 1930.

off in many keen and telling phrases. The words just quoted, "*intelligence, capable of being applied in any field whatever,*" give the essential meaning. One of its most delightful expressions is found in the telling of a story taken from George Herbert Palmer's *Life of Alice Freeman Palmer*.¹ It recounts the difficulties and failure of Bridget, the cook, in the attempt to bake good bread. It then relates how Mrs. Palmer, untrained in cooking, came into the kitchen and created the loaf which, in that kitchen, had seemed unattainable. Whereupon Mr. Flexner quotes with great admiration Bridget's definition of education. "That's what education means," she said, "to be able to do what you've never done before." Bridget, it seems, saw at a glance and expressed in a word the peculiar quality of the educated, intelligent mind. But the delightful aptness of the story for our purposes is that, by her own test, Bridget placed herself at once with her mistress as in the same sense "educated." She, too, having never before, it is presumed, engaged in the difficult business of creating definitions of education, produced at the first stroke a masterpiece. So far as the story tells, Bridget, whose only connection with a university is that of cooking for a professor's table, is at least even with her mistress in the common effort at intelligence. She is

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

not, evidently, supreme as a cook; she would not, one supposes, be highly rated as a scholar; but as a venturer into untried fields she is a startling success. And for that reason she may well serve as a reminder to those who engage in the teaching of intelligence that teaching is not the only means by which that quality is secured. But however that may be, the primary fact is that in the story we find the meaning of the term "intelligence" as applied to teaching. Intelligence, it seems, is readiness for any human situation; it is the power, wherever one goes, of being able to see, in any set of circumstances, the best response which a human being can make to those circumstances. And the two constituents of that power would seem to be, first, a sense of human values, and second, a capacity for judging situations as furnishing possibilities for the realizing of those values. It is very near to "wisdom."

If now we seek to relate the college, as so defined, to the teaching institutions below and above it, there are two preliminary observations which must be made. The first has to do with numbers of students and the second with the difference between general and special teaching.

One of the most striking features of the climbing procession of youth which makes its way up the educational ladder from primary school to university is

that it is a dwindling one. The teaching enterprise which, at its final stage in the graduate school, deals with only thousands of pupils, began at the bottom of the ladder, in the primary school, with millions. At every step in the ascent, after the age of compulsory attendance is passed, multitudes of pupils disappear from the classroom, until at the end only a chosen and favored few remain. And, this being true, it is very dangerous to interpret the ladder only as it is seen from either of its ends. If this be done one may be sure that the activities at the other end will lose all their own proper quality and meaning. For the great majority who, at various stages in the process, leave the school to go into "practical" activities, the scholarly pursuits of the graduate school, which they will never reach, nor even approach, must be vague and meaningless. And on the other hand, if one's chief interest is centered in the higher ranges of scholarship, there is great danger that the lower schools will have meaning only as "preparatory," as leading the way toward forms of teaching with which, as a matter of fact, the education of the great mass of students in those schools has not the slightest concern. We must remember that, in the main, young people climb the first stages of the educational ladder, not with the purpose of making their way to the top, but in the expectation of find-

ing beside the ladder here and there landing-places from which they may climb by other ladders in other directions and toward quite different goals. And if these other goals and directions are not clearly seen in their relations to those of the school, then the whole scheme of teaching becomes unintelligible, a chaos of diverging and irrelevant activities.

The second observation is a classification of teaching activities into two radically different groups. In interest, in choice of material for study, some of our schools and colleges are "general," while others are "special." On the one side we find the teaching of the individual in the liberal, general sense. At many different levels this enterprise is carried on. Its goal is the building up of the power of individual self-direction. It is trying to create or to cultivate "intelligence, capable of being applied in any field whatever." Each liberal institution, from the primary school to the college, takes charge, in turn, of this common task. Each, measuring the previous progress and capacities of the student, leads him as far as possible along the road which all are traveling. But on the other hand we have also a vast multitude of technical, vocational, professional, research schools which are dominated by quite different sets of interests. They are concerned, not with the teaching of the individual in the general sense, but with the devel-

oping of his skill in some limited field of activity. If, for example, necessity compels a boy of fourteen or fifteen to leave his general education, a business school may teach him commercial arithmetic, typewriting, and stenography. If a young person of any age shows taste and talent for music, he may be given over to teachers whose purpose it will be to cultivate his talent, to make him, so far as may be, a master in the craft which he loves. And in the same way, schools of home economics, of agriculture, of engineering, of law, of medicine, of theology, of research in various forms, devote themselves, not to general education in personal power and understanding, except as these may serve the purposes of a special interest, but to the training of ability to ply a trade, to practice a profession, to master any one of the special enterprises in which human beings engage. Such schools are as multifarious as are the different occupations and activities into which human beings may enter.

It is important to note, in passing, that the two groups of schools thus separated differ widely as to the relations of their separate members to each other. The liberal schools, from the bottom to the top of the ladder, are continuous in purpose. Taken together they form a single enterprise. Each builds upon what its predecessors have done; each teaches

in anticipation of further learning to follow. They have a common goal which lies far beyond the achievement of any one of them. They all alike follow the line which that goal dictates. But the special schools have no such continuity of purpose, no such identity of aim. Each, at its own point of departure from the liberal ladder, embarks upon its own separate venture. As a series, they are quite disconnected. Each goes its own way, each prepares its students for its own special interest or vocation. And this being true, these schools can be arranged as higher and lower than each other only by relating them to the continuous line of liberal teaching from which at some point each has taken its departure. The business school, which draws boys out of their general education while still in their teens, cannot be expected to give them teaching so fundamental, so far-reaching, so scholarly as that which is provided for the graduates of a college who enroll in a "graduate school" of business. The latter institution serves the same purpose as the former, but the better general preparation of its students enables it to give instruction which may properly be called higher in quality. And in this secondary sense we can rate the special schools in a series ranging from the most rudimentary and mechanical of trade schools up to the graduate schools of the university,

in which young people of mature years and intelligence are established in the scholarly pursuits of the learned professions. By this indirect method we place the special schools in a series, which advances in quality even though it is discontinuous.

If now within this classification of schools and colleges we wish to determine the place of the liberal college, there are two sets of institutions with which especially our question must deal. These are, first, those lower schools which are engaged in liberal teaching, and second, the graduate schools of the university which will accept as students only the graduates of colleges. We must see the teaching of the college in relation to that of the schools from which its students come and to that of the higher schools to which a few of its graduates go.

The relation of the college to the general teaching of the secondary and primary grades can be very briefly stated. It is that between the culmination, the completion, of a process and its earlier stages. The liberal college is our highest institution of general training. In it, in some very real sense, the formal attempt to train our youth in general intelligence reaches its consummation. It is the top of the ladder of explicit general education. And this being true, it is essential that the process of teaching which runs from the primary school to the college shall be seen

and planned as a single piece of work. It cannot be successfully done in fragments. It cannot be planned in separate sections each of which is determined without reference to the others. It is not sufficient that each school, higher in the scale, should impose upon those lower down a set of mechanical and external admission requirements. The program and practice of every stage in the teaching of general intelligence must be determined in reference to the activities of every other part and of the whole. Unless our liberal teachers at these different levels can learn to plan together in effective coöperation there is no hope whatever that we can have a system of schools capable of realizing its essential purposes. We need, in schools and colleges, thinking together, active and generous study of a common undertaking.

The relation of the college to the graduate schools cannot be so easily stated. The former is, as we have said, at the top of our schools of liberal teaching; its work brings to an end our formal attempt at the developing of intelligence. The latter are, likewise, at the top of the series of special schools. They branch off from the ladder of general education only when its top has been reached. From that point, each separate graduate school, selecting its own special interest, its own limited activity, carries to the highest possible level formal instruction in law, in medi-

cine, in theology, in business, or in those many varied forms of learned investigation which we sum up under the name "scholarship." We can speak with accuracy, then, not of "the graduate school," but rather of many graduate schools which vary as widely from one another as do the varied intellectual enterprises in which a cultivated and intelligent mind may engage.

Now it is evident that to a certain degree the college may be regarded as "preparatory" to the scholarly work of the graduate schools. But it is equally evident that if this aspect of the work of the college is made primary, or even important, the resulting view of it is woefully inadequate. And this inadequacy appears in two forms. First, we must remember that not one student in ten who enters a liberal college as a freshman will continue his studies to the graduate level. If, then, we proceed to make our pupils ready for pursuits in which, in the large, they will never engage, our whole procedure falls into futility and misunderstanding. To put the matter quite bluntly, the college is as much and as little interested in the making of scholars as it is in the making of bankers, legislators, grocers, or the followers of any other specialized occupation or profession. And second, since there are many graduate schools into which the graduates of a college may

go, and since each of these is devoted to a separate interest, to make the teaching of the college merely instrumental to these higher studies would utterly destroy its unity of aim and purpose. Nothing can be further from the primary function of a college than the "tool" courses which are now so commonly imposed upon it. The college, it is true, does lay a foundation, does give a training which will be of value to a man, whatever the trade or profession he may follow. But that value is to be defined, not in terms of many different preparations for many different callings, however learned, but rather in terms of qualities of understanding and insight which, in common, are desirable for the men of all callings. The college, as a place of general teaching, has one aim and that aim is intelligence.

Now it certainly will be argued that the separation here established which puts the teaching of intelligence on the one side and the teaching of scholarship on the other is quite indefensible. By what right, it will be asked, does one refuse to scholarship a place within the liberal tradition? And in support of this contention, of this protest, it is often urged that scholarly pursuits are not practical, are not concerned with consequences, that they are motivated by the "love of learning for its own sake." But to say this is to miss, or to deny, the essential point of

the position which we have taken. And for this there are two reasons. In the first place, scholarship does not gain affiliation with intelligence by refusing to be "practical." It would rather lose than gain connection by so doing. No institution in our whole scheme of education is more deliberately, more persistently practical than is the liberal college. In exactly the same sense as the trade school, the business school, the law school, and the school of agriculture prepare men for active life, the college attempts to make its students more efficient, more successful in the activities of human living. So true is this that to many of us it seems that upon the achievement of liberal teaching more than upon any other agency in our social scheme depends the welfare of that scheme, the possibility of saving it from disaster, the hope of making it a fitting expression of the human spirit. To say that any given form of teaching does not equip its students for practical activities is not to say that the institution is liberal, but only to say that it is socially unimportant and negligible.

But, secondly, the objection here presented rests upon a mistaken interpretation of what we have been saying. We have asserted the separation of the liberal, the general, not from the practical, but from the special. The general teaching of the college is liberal because it deals with the individual, in all

phases of his experience, as a single, a unitary thing. The trades, the professions, the varied branches of learned investigation, are "special" because they concern themselves with limited fields, with limited ranges of investigation, with limited departments of knowledge and of experience. And to make this distinction is not to use terms of eulogy or disparagement. It is simply to try to keep clear an essential dualism of function which runs through the educational system from bottom to top. It is to differentiate between two great types of teaching. And when this is done the liberal college can be seen in two relations to the graduate schools of the university. First, it is preparatory. The graduate schools will not accept students into their special pursuits until their general education is completed. The graduate school presupposes that a student's general intelligence has been so far developed that he can be trusted to take charge of his own living. It does not teach intelligence; it assumes it. And second, the liberal college and the graduate school are, in another sense, coordinate. Each is at the top of its own type of instruction. The one gives our highest formal training in intelligence. The other gives our most advanced instruction in scholarly pursuits. To see clearly the deeper relations between the two institutions is, then, to see clearly the relations between intelligence and

scholarship. In all the field of educational theory and practice, no intellectual achievement is more fundamental, more imperative than that. The struggle for that insight will be found running through all the chapters of this report.

Chapter Two

THE LOWER COLLEGE

THE previous chapter has defined abstractly the purpose of the liberal college. That college, we have said, intends, by using scholarship—its fruits or processes or both of these—to so cultivate and strengthen the intelligence of a pupil that he may be ready to take responsibility for the guidance of his own behavior. We must now see how, in actual administration, the college falls into two parts, the “lower” and the “upper” colleges. It will appear that the concrete situation is somewhat more complicated than our abstract statement has made it. We shall find the first two years dealing directly with the task defined, while the last two years seem to lead the way toward the new forms of activity which await a person whose capacity for taking responsibility has been established.

The function of the lower college is suggested, if not determined, by the fact that, for most of the

students, it marks the time of their first "leaving home." In these two years, then, the pupil must learn, as his primary lesson, that of taking care of himself. In these years he comes to the end of formal lessons, given by teachers, in the understanding of himself and of his world of human facts and values. The time has come for his taking upon himself the responsibilities of maturity. Never again, unless he is taken over by a prison or a mental hospital, will any institution devote itself explicitly to the forming of his character, the general training of his mind, the enriching and directing of his personality. In the years before his coming to college, home and school have labored at this task. They have chosen his food, selected his underwear, arranged for his friendships, cultivated his tastes, guided his reading, formed his habits. In a word, they have taken responsibility for his making as a person. And through it all, if they have built wisely, they have been getting him more and more ready to take upon himself the responsibilities which, in the earlier years, they have perforce assumed. They have regarded him as a person who is being prepared to do for himself what, in ever-decreasing measure, his parents and teachers have done since his earliest childhood. And now, somewhere about the eighteen to twenty period, as the student goes from home to college, the time has come

for an explicit and avowed change of regime. If this be true, then all questions about instruction during this period, all questions as to the course of study, the methods of teaching, the determining conditions of life, should be answered with reference to the successful accomplishment of that change of regime. The purpose of these studies is to help a young man in taking upon himself the responsibilities of being a man. Here, if our position is valid, is the principle for which we seek—a principle which might be used in the organization of the freshman and sophomore years. As such it defines the lower college.

We shall not understand this statement, nor use it with discrimination, unless we keep in mind the fact that other young people, who do not go to college, are, at about the same time, learning the same lesson. They too, at about the age of twenty, are expected to become free and responsible human beings, to put away the attitudes and thoughts of children, to become women and men. If we can remember this fact we shall not make the mistake of thinking that the fundamental lesson to be learned in a college is identical with the "studies" which we teach. Those studies are instruments peculiar to the college. But the lesson is common to all young people who are approaching maturity. It is being learned all about us by multitudes of young people—the Bridgets of Pro-

fessor Palmer's story—who know nothing whatever either of colleges or of their studies. It is a general process of human learning of which our education by books and teachers is only a special limited phase.

It would help us greatly in remembering this fact if we could free ourselves from the mechanical ideas in terms of which much of our thinking about education is done—if we could substitute for these, figures of thought taken from the field of organic growth and development. We seem to think of "studies" as if they were things to be taken into a student's system and kept there, unchanged, as permanent parts of his mental make-up. In this way we are accustomed to examine pupils to see whether or not what we have given them as mental food is still there, and especially whether it is still in the same form. One has only to carry over this procedure to the process of taking physical food into the system to see how inept and mistaken it is. The effect of healthily received food upon the body is measured, not by unchanging possession, but by the health and vigor and fineness of essential bodily activities. And the same is true of mental nourishment and care. Studies are not stuff to be acquired and kept. They are mental food to be used by an organism which, when they are not available, uses, under the normal conditions of life, quite different foods for essentially

the same purposes. This statement has all the dangers and limitations of a figure of speech. The analogy between mental and physical foods is not wholly exact. And yet it may illustrate our principle that, in the years between eighteen and twenty, the fundamental lesson to be learned cannot be fully expressed as the mastering of certain studies. Those studies are justified only as they serve the deeper purpose of fitting a young man or woman to face and to meet intelligently responsibilities which at that time inevitably come upon him.

The principle just stated may be seen in another form in which again it may serve to prevent misunderstanding. When one says that the lower college marks the culmination of formal and explicit teaching in intelligence, that after the sophomore year a young man is no longer to receive direct instruction in matters of "wisdom," one does not mean to say that the college sophomore has already acquired all the insight which a human being needs. It is sometimes suggested that this interpretation of his achievement is characteristic of the sophomoric mind. And for him the mistake is a rather natural one. But, on the other hand, no one who has reflected upon the teaching of sophomores and has followed its consequences can long harbor such a misapprehension. What the principle means is, not that growth in intelligence is to

stop, but that now it is to go on under the student's own direction. And the hope and presumption is that the process, having now reached the level of spontaneous self-expression, will proceed with greater speed and with greater certainty. Education in intelligence does not cease when it becomes self-education.

And now upon the basis of this statement we may perhaps determine with somewhat greater accuracy the relations of the lower college to the upper college and to the graduate school which, in many cases, follows it.

If we assume that in the lower college a young man has learned, as it were, to stand on his own feet in the face of life, what shall the upper college, the junior and senior years, offer him for purposes of further education? First, it may give him opportunity to further cultivate his mind by letting it search more deeply, in more scholarly fashion, into the processes of knowledge out of which the "wisdom" of the more general course has been derived. In these last two years the student may well explore how philosophy or science or literature is made; he may try to get nearer to the minds of the masters in some one of these fields, to see how their creative work is done. He will not in this way, nor in so short a time, be-

come a scholar, in the graduate sense, but he will achieve some fairly adequate view of what scholarship is, and so may come to better apprehension of the human spirit in its creative moods. And second, the young man who has now won his freedom may well use that freedom for the making of a first, significant decision. He must select, even though tentatively, his field of special interest and activity. He may, of course, if taste dictates or necessity requires, leave college and go at once to a shop, a farm, a studio, a railroad, an office. In this case he will find that the college has given him no special training for the work he is to do. He will take with him only such measure as he has won of "intelligence, capable of being applied in any field whatever." What little he has acquired of fact and of technique he will probably need to unlearn, or at least to learn differently, as quickly as possible. But, on the other hand, the student of twenty may, if conditions are favorable, choose to go into the upper college. And if we speak in human, rather than in financial, terms, his motive in so doing is fundamentally the same as that of his fellows who have gone into "practical" activities. He is choosing a line of special work or interest and training himself to do it well. He may, for example, be planning for a career in law. He will then study

for two years, in the fields of history, politics, economics, social science, philosophy, the principles and situations in which the law is established. If he wishes to study and practice medicine, he must acquire the knowledge and the methods of the fundamental sciences of which medical science and practice are applications and derivatives. If he has a craving to write, he may well spend his time in winning wider and deeper acquaintance with literature and in studies of human experience which will disclose what, if anything, he has to write about. Or it may be that, not being as yet ready to make a decision, he will wander about in various fields of learning, seeing many things that scholars and cultivated men are doing, looking, in the midst of these, for his fate, his preoccupation. But in any case, the upper college will offer him, at the beginning of his career in the "new freedom," two relatively sheltered and transitional years in which to find his direction and to lay foundations for the special activity to which, in a certain sense, his life is to be devoted.

The same principles apply, though in more remote degree, as a student goes on into the graduate schools of a university. Here, on the side of scholarship, the student is now plunged into the technical and limited procedures of his specialty. He is no longer, as in

the upper college, a pre-medic, learning the fundamental sciences, but a medical student with all the definiteness and limitation of interest which that implies. He is not now ranging through history, politics, economics, philosophy, but learning the structure and functioning of an actual legal procedure. He is, so far as commitment goes, fully established in his special field. On the side of general intelligence, he is still presumably building up his own mind and will. It is of course essential that the graduate student develop in general understanding, in insight and wisdom. And yet, the responsibility for this growth belongs primarily to him and not to his teachers. He is admitted to their classes only on the presumption that this is true. So far, then, as formal instruction is concerned, growth in intelligence is not an end directly aimed at by the graduate school. It is rather a by-product, a process taken for granted. Earlier teachers, it is assumed, have so equipped the student that his later studies, whatever they may be, will be used by him, not only for their special purpose, but for his own general cultivation and understanding. The graduate school may then, as Mr. Flexner suggests, put aside at this point all direct responsibility. It will teach the student medicine or business or law or science or philosophy. He, being liberally educated,

will himself take charge of his own development as a human personality.

And now, with these interpretations and limitations in mind, we may attempt to so formulate what has been said that it may serve as the basis of a working program in dealing with the lower college.

Chapter Three

RESPONSIBILITY AND BOOKS

FOR eighteen years a youth has been in process of liberal education. For twelve of these years he has been under the explicit guidance and direction of teachers who have sought to strengthen his grip on life, to fit him for the responsibilities which are now at hand. In this situation one might well expect that there would be running through the mind of every young man who is studying in a lower college some such words as these:

“I hope that I may be judged ready to take my place as a free and responsible member of the American community. I do not see at all clearly what I ought to be and do. Nor do I find it easy to form opinions on matters of public policy. In the modern world of value and of belief problems of the greatest difficulty and of the greatest urgency wait for decisions which I cannot foresee. If, however, I am promoted by my elders to the level of intelligent self-

direction and social participation, I will do my best to understand, to use my mind in the cause of understanding. And I pledge myself that in action, in attitude, and in enjoyment I will follow unflinchingly such insight as I may be able to achieve. I ask, therefore, to be taught and then examined, so that it may be decided whether or not I am ready for my responsibilities."

These words, if a student were thinking them, would express his sense that we, his teachers, are helping him to prepare himself for the doing of a man's work. He would therefore expect us, at the end of his training, to examine him, or to arrange for his examination, in order to determine whether or not he is fitted for his task, whether or not, therefore, he should be allowed to go on into fields of action where values are so important that no one should be allowed to go until his fitness has been clearly established.

Nothing could be more revealing of the present state of American culture and, therefore, of American education, than the fact that such words, if we actually heard them coming from the lips of a freshman or sophomore, would seem to us fantastic and ridiculous. Any boy found guilty of using them would be regarded by his comrades as a thing apart—a prig, a "queer one," an intellectual. The normal

young American expects, and is led to expect, on his twenty-first birthday, not a new sense of responsibility, but a new automobile, a new set of opportunities for self-gratification. And it is in relation to that young American, and to the society which creates him, that the activities of our teaching go on.

And yet there have been times, and there are now countries, in which such expressions of attitude and purpose would not be held fantastic. In the Athens of the old days, the youth as he came to maturity was expected, and himself hoped, to take the ephebic oath:

“I will never disgrace these sacred arms, nor desert my companion in the ranks. I will fight for gods and home, both alone and with many. I will transmit my fatherland, not only not less, but greater and better, than it was transmitted to me. I will obey the magistrates who may at any time be in power. I will observe both the existing laws and those which the people may by agreement hereafter make, and, if any person seek to annul the laws or to destroy them, I will do my best to prevent him and will defend them, both alone and with many. I will honor the religion of my fathers. And I call to witness of my oath Agraulos, Enyalios, Ares, Zeus, Thallo, Auxo, and Hegemone.”

So too, in the Italy and Russia of today, where the

imagination of great bodies of people has been captured by the attempt at new experiments in living, such pledges can be, and are, given without the slightest suggestion of priggishness or self-conscious virtue. They express the natural attitude of young people who have seen their elders entering upon ventures which seem to them morally and intellectually worthy of their best endeavors.

But, however foreign it may be to our present temporary mood and situation, such a suggestion as that of the ephebic oath has value as pointing a direction, as setting a goal, in relation to which we may judge our present teaching arrangements or may estimate the merits of new ones which are proposed. It is at least illuminating and perhaps startling to see, in this perspective, our usual assignment of studies in the freshman and sophomore years, our usual arrangements for classroom instruction and testing and examining, our usual social groupings of students in dormitories or fraternity houses or boarding-houses, our usual scheme of negative discipline. These are undoubtedly the best devices we have yet been able to construct. But in each of these fields, every teacher, at the least, dreams of something better. And the practical question is, Can we, under actual conditions, make our dreams come true; can we plan for something better and make our plans work? It is that

question which the Advisers faced as they entered upon their study of teaching method, of teaching content, and of determining conditions, for the lower college.

As we attempt to recount the discussions and the decisions of the Advisers on these three specific questions, it is necessary to make our general principle, by one step, more specific. We have said that the "lower college" should prepare a young man for the taking of personal responsibility. But it must do this in its own way and by the use of its own instruments. The college does not build up maturity by the same methods as those employed in a mill or an office. Its chosen material is literature; its chosen instrument is the book. The intention of the college is that, in the case of those favored young people who are allowed to study after the high-school period, minds shall be fed, and trained, and strengthened, and directed by the use of books. The whole procedure points forward to a mode of life in which persons, by the aid of books, are enabled to live in ways which are not open to their non-reading fellows, are trained to practice special forms of intelligence in which the use of books plays an essential part. And if this be true, then we have here the principle which must be used in all planning of the lower college. In the discussion of proposals regarding methods, contents, or

conditions of study we must ask in every case, What effect will this arrangement have upon the eagerness and the capacity of a student to use books in the right way and for the right purposes? At the end of the two years our examination must be an attempt to discover how far the student has developed this attitude and this capacity. To put the matter sharply, we may say that the only really significant question to be asked concerning the graduate of a college as such is, Does he in his living depend upon books and does he use them effectively? Does he know what are the significant values, the significant problems, of his civilization; does he follow these as they are recounted and considered in newspaper, in magazine, in books ranging from fiction to scholarly and technical discussion? Is he an intelligent reader?

As one looks back upon the statement just made, one is uneasily conscious that it is, or seems to be, badly over-intellectualized. Practice in the arts and crafts and games, as well as in the reading of books, can be used as an instrument of liberal education. For example, the activities of dramatics and dancing are at times startling in the richness of their contribution to the development of a student. And it is equally clear that both creative and receptive experiences in music, in painting, in sculpture, in architecture, in games—all these in significant and

valuable ways play their parts in that enriching and strengthening of the human personality which we call liberal education. That the Advisers have accepted these statements will be clearly seen in the later chapters of this report. When then we say that "books" are the chosen instrument of the college, the term must be used to cover, in some sense, the appreciative and active as well as the intellectual activities in the narrow sense. With this explanation we may reassert our principle. The following chapters will be an attempt to recount the experiences of the Advisers as they have attempted to understand that principle and to apply it to the making of decisions upon "the content of study, the methods of teaching, and the determining conditions of undergraduate liberal instruction," as these are found in the lower college.

II

THE COURSE OF STUDY

Chapter Four

THE PRELIMINARY HYPOTHESIS

THE essential question concerning the course of study may be stated in the terms just suggested. If it is presumed that the purpose of two years of teaching is to make a student "at home" in the world of reading, what books should we select from the vast field of human literature as the materials of instruction? What should a young man read in order to learn for himself how to select his own books and to build up the capacity to read them well, to get from them what they have to give as contribution to his intelligence?

It should be said in passing that the asking of the question in this form does not assume that all "lower colleges" will have the same course of study, will make the same selections from the world's literature. It assumes only that some selection will be made by every college and taken as the basis of its instruction. What that selection will be depends, of course, upon the tastes, the beliefs, the interests, of the teaching

group as well as upon the peculiar needs of the student group, and will correspondingly vary from college to college. But the essential point is that the collective intelligence of the faculty shall find expression in a concerted plan of action, which, in his own way, every teacher shall accept and every student follow. In a very real sense, the course of study lays down the conditions of membership in the college community. A college is a group of people, all of whom are reading the same books.

It should be noted¹ that the Advisers, when they faced the task of making a curriculum, were already committed to the testing of a "preliminary hypothesis." It was virtually agreed that the first course of study to be tried should be "integrated." It was practically decided that this integration should take form in the study of two or more civilizations, including an ancient and a modern. In these two suggestions there was contained the outline of a possible course of instruction. Now in dealing with this outline the Advisers faced two distinct problems which, though very different, are easily confused.² The first task, always in the foreground, was that of transforming the general preliminary outline into a work-

¹ See Appendix I, Chapter II, Section 3.

² It is unfortunate that in most of the public discussion of the college the two problems have not been distinguished, and that out of this confusion there has come constant and serious misapprehension.

ing plan. Every teacher knows the difference between general ideas about a course and the actual detailed expression of those ideas in a daily routine of instruction. And from this point of view the question of the Advisers was, Will the hypothesis work at all; can we build a program upon it? Only if that were done could we provide instruction for a hundred or more students for whom we had assumed teaching responsibility. And further, only as the program took definite shape and was applied in practice could its merits and demerits be estimated. Our first task then, whether or not we were inclined to believe in the preliminary hypothesis, was to see what could be made of it as a scheme of practical instruction. Meanwhile, in the background, was a second question, much more important and far-reaching. It was the general investigation within which the "preliminary hypothesis" was only a special incident. Here was the query, How well will the first suggestion, even when made into a working program, serve the purpose which we have in mind? Are there not other hypotheses which will be more fruitful? What is the nature and what are the conditions of the teaching process in the lower college in relation to which the first program must be judged? In a word, the Advisers had on their hands both a specific and a general problem. Their specific task was to construct a pre-

liminary teaching program which would work and which, by its working, might be tested. Their general task was to study the nature of teaching in the freshman and sophomore years and to consider different suggestions with respect to its aims and to the ways of achieving them.

The first of these two questions has already been answered by the Advisers in their report of February, 1931. In that document they informed the faculty that a plan of study was ready for consideration. Whatever its merits or defects, a curriculum has been constructed along the lines originally suggested. And now that this first goal has been reached, it is safe to look back and see how dangerous and uncertain was the road which has been traveled. In the first year of their work the Advisers had, as their stock in trade, two very debatable general principles and one very concrete demand that they day by day provide a course of study in Athenian civilization. Only one of their number had previously taught in the field of Greek learning. And further, they were as a group quite inexperienced in technical studies of educational procedure. It was a hard and terrifying beginning. And the situation in the second year with regard to the American half of the course was at least as desperate. Out of the bewildering confusion of literature bearing upon the history and interpretation of American

life, how shall one make an "integrated" course of study? What books shall be selected and how shall they be fused together? No one who has not shared in the experiences of the venture will ever appreciate its difficulties, nor the severity of its strain upon teachers accustomed to work within the limits of their own "fields" and along the lines of the accepted scheme of instruction. Not until the third year of the attempt did the study of Athens take such form as a teacher would recognize as characterizing an organized course. And the same was true of the study of America. Here also two years of fumbling and relative uncertainty were necessary before the outline of a course emerged. Meanwhile still a third problem, perhaps more difficult than either of those mentioned, was demanding solution—that of welding into one study the two separate courses which were in process of making. When the Advisers say that these three tasks have been accomplished, they do not mean that the work is, in any complete sense, done. They mean only that now a course of study has been so formed and shaped that it might be taken by a group of teachers who were willing to try it and might be by them both worked out and tested as a teaching procedure. We report that a possible course of study is ready for consideration.

The story of the second set of questions, with their

discussion, cannot be so easily summarized. In connection with the making of specific decisions, the Advisers have been constantly facing more general issues, and have attempted to formulate principles on the basis of which these and similar issues might be determined. They have agreed and differed upon matters of educational theory. The centers of this controversy have been, in the nature of the case, the two suggestions underlying the preliminary experiment—first, that of integration, and second, that of studying contrasted civilizations. The story of the work which has been done upon the course of study may then fall into three parts—first, an account of the discussions of “integration,” second, an explanation of the Athens-America curriculum of 1930-31, and, third, a statement of comments on this curriculum and of possible alternatives for it.

Chapter Five

UNDERSTANDING IS INTEGRATION

THE demand for integration is the demand that throughout a scheme of instruction there shall run a single and dominating "scheme of reference." It means that, logically considered, the course of study shall have unity, shall hang together from beginning to end. There shall not be a series of disconnected readings or separate topics whose relations are left undetermined. Fundamentally the course shall be the study of a single topic, and every separate subject within it shall be recognized as a special phase of the central inquiry. The effect of the principle is, it is obvious, the discarding of separate "subjects" as given in the usual college arrangements and the substituting for these of a single enterprise running through the two years of the course. Its psychological influence upon teachers and students appears in the suggestion that there is one definite thing which all of them should do.

This demand for integration, for unification, of the curriculum has immediate regard for that quality which Mr. Flexner calls "intelligence, capable of being applied in any field whatever." The phrase suggests a mind which is able to go about, anywhere in the world of human experience, with sureness of footing, with certainty of touch. And the teaching question is, How does one develop and cultivate that quality in a growing, plastic mind? In answer to this question, the principle of integration, as discussed by the Advisers, is very direct and simple in its teaching theory. It says that the student should go, in terms of ideas, into all the fields in which we wish him to be intelligent, that in each of these fields his mind should be given active work to do, and especially that these separate pieces of work should be such that they will run into one another, have intellectual relations with one another. The underlying purpose is that the student shall in this way develop a "scheme of reference" covering all the fields, within which each field shall find its proper place. And the result of this will be that any new experience within any field may then be seen in its place, in its relations, in the ways which we sum up under the terms, "with understanding" or "intelligently." From this point of view the "intelligent" mind is not one which can go safely into unfamiliar fields. No mind can do that.

In so far as a field is unfamiliar no thinking about it can be secure and certain. An intelligent mind is one to which, in some essential sense, all fields of experience are familiar.

As so defined, the view is radically opposed to a well-known theory which has now fortunately become quite disreputable. This was the view that one could, by cultivating one's powers in a chosen field, develop there an "intelligence" which would guide him in other fields. So formerly it was believed that study in mathematics and the languages would make one keen and accurate and penetrating in any field whatever. So now it is sometimes held by the scientists who have ousted the ancient languages that "science" will make men accurate of mind even about matters to which the application of scientific technique is quite impossible. But the refutation of that theory was very easy and crushing when once the issue had been stated. No one who has seen the uncanny accuracy, not to mention the courage and industry, of a boy at play on a tennis court or a baseball field, and has then encountered his mind and will in a classroom, can long keep his faith in such a notion. And the achievements of metaphysicians in practical affairs are equally disconcerting, not to mention the fumbling, the confusion, the incoherence with which "practical men" mishandle the affairs of the human

spirit. As against this view in all its forms, the view of integration with which we are concerned insists that, in some very real sense, the only way to become intelligent in any field is to go into that field, with your mind, and to use your mind within it *in such a way* that the connections of intelligence are established, that the field is "placed" in your scheme of understanding.

Now it is the phrase "*in such a way*" which, in this statement, quickly becomes the center of educational controversy. If it be admitted that the intellectual purpose is to link together all significant fields in a scheme of intelligible relationships, the question remains, What do you do in each field as you work within it; what kind of mental operation do you and your students carry on? And here the answer of the typical advocate of integration involves him at once in difficulties with his colleagues, if not also with his own other principles. He says, to put it very bluntly, that you will never establish relations either within a field or between fields so long as you are merely seeking specific information. It is only in terms of general problems and general ideas that different situations and different fields are ever understood. What then shall we do with our students as we send them in search of intelligence? By some means or other we must arouse in them an activity in general

ideas, must get them possessed of a store of general questions, must teach them to universalize, to infer, to deduce, to connect. In a word, they must think, in each field, about the things which are logically significant in that field. They must attempt to understand it as a whole and as in relation to a larger whole.

When the demand for unification is stated in this uncompromising way there inevitably breaks out against it a counter demand of great force and significance. It flared up in the first meeting at which the Advisers considered the course of study. It has persisted throughout the four years of their discussions. The advocate of integration has said, The student must approach a situation with general ideas, general questions; he must interpret the situation, reason about it, discuss it, must infer, deduce, connect and separate the meanings which relate to it. And to this his opponent replies, Would it not be well for him to *learn* something about the situation before he begins to understand it? How can he interpret a set of facts about which he knows nothing? Do you mean to suggest that he will bring to the situation, prior to any knowledge of it, a set of general ideas, general questions, general theories which he will use in understanding it? Where will he get those ideas and questions? What assurance is there

that they will have any relevance for this new set of circumstances into which he goes for the first time? If you proceed to teach a young man in that way, will you not make of him a "crank," a person who can solve all universal questions inside his head, but who knows nothing whatever of any actual, specific, objective "facts" or situations?

As one looks back upon discussions of the controversy so stated, the delight of them stirs again in one's veins. One can still feel the rising fury in one's spirit as he sees how ridiculous is the opposing point of view. And it is especially pleasant to recall that, as one's own fury rose, that of his opponent rose with equal intensity. Each, with equal clarity, could see how absurd and objectionable the opposing position was. Which is prior—the asking of questions or the collecting of information by means of which to answer them? One side asserts that it is nonsense to ask questions if you do not know about what you are inquiring. The other retorts that to collect information is quite meaningless unless you have in mind a question for the answering of which the information is needed. Which is right? With which of these general ideas shall we approach the strange and baffling incidents of education? Do chickens depend upon eggs or eggs upon chickens? Shall we teach boys to

“think”? Or shall we “give” them some “facts” to think about?

Now it is evident that only confusion of mind could lead one to make, in *general*, the choice suggested by the questions just stated. If one is asked, in the abstract, to choose between “facts” and “the understanding of facts,” one must, denying the implication of the question, choose both, since each is, without the other, meaningless. But fortunately, no immediate, practical situation calls for such general answers. Our working questions take the form, What, under these special conditions and for this special purpose, will be your choice? Will you, this morning, have chicken or eggs for breakfast? Will you, this evening, have eggs or chicken for dinner? And it is just such a specific question with which the Advisers have been concerned. As a boy seeks liberal education, as he comes out of the American school and the American home, as he enters upon the last formal stages of his training for self-direction, which will you stress more strongly, the gaining of specific information or the building up of a general scheme of reference? Now no single statement could summarize the varied responses of individual Advisers to this question. In their decisions, however, one finds a general drift which may be defined by two statements. First, in the “lower college” years, under pres-

ent teaching conditions, the "integration" demand is of primary importance. In the large, we may say that "information" is secondary; it is valuable, at this time and for these pupils, only as it contributes to the building up of one's "scheme of reference." And second, there is at this point an important, though not a radical, difference between the two years. Information about America is, for our teaching purpose, far more important than information about Athens. As a young man tries to bring into order the world of his values, beliefs, decisions, it makes very little difference, in the last resort, whether he knows what was going on in Athens twenty-four centuries ago. It is, however, essential that he know what is going on in the American world of today. Quite clearly the two years cannot then be simply subsumed under a blank generalization. They have a common aim, but they serve it in different ways. We must now try, by illustration, to make these statements more clear and perhaps more convincing. And to do this we must at least indicate what is meant by a "scheme of reference."

In any organized understanding of contemporary life the distinction between riches and poverty must play an essential part. This cleavage in human societies is a vital element in any intelligent man's scheme of reference. How then shall we use studies in

Athenian civilization of the fifth century B.C. for the teaching of freshmen about it? Now the answer to that question depends upon our judgment as to what the ordinary American boy needs first to have done to his mind with respect to the problem of riches and poverty. And the answer of the "scheme of reference" view is that he needs, to begin with, not primarily more information but a more active response to the information which he already has. If that response can be aroused, then one of its immediate effects will be a strenuous demand for further information which bears upon its question. For example, every boy who comes to college knows in his own immediate circle of acquaintance the tragic separation between the rich and the poor. One pupil comes to the university with a credit in the bank of two or three thousand dollars. Another comes with two or three hundred dollars which he has earned during the summer. One is threatened by the dangers of wastefulness and folly. The other is uncertain whether or not he can "last the semester." Both boys are informed about this situation. Do they understand it? Do they regard it as something to be "understood," or do they simply accept it as matter of fact? If they do the latter they are, in so far, uneducated and failing in the essential process of getting an education. Now at this point we may use the experience of Athens for teaching pur-

poses. Athens had always much to do with the problem of the rich and the poor. It is recorded that in one of the earlier centuries, as a result of changing social and external conditions which no one seemed to understand, the division between the two classes became desperately serious. The ownership of land was drifting into the hands of a few. More and more the many were losing their freeholds, were becoming serfs, were selling their bodies to pay their debts. And as revolution threatened, all classes called upon Solon, who seemed both wise and honest, to take the city into his hands and to do with debts and ownership whatever he might think best. And so there came about the reforms of Solon. How shall this incident be used for teaching purposes?

It is clear that one might ask the student to learn, so far as he can, all that is known about the situation in Athens and about Solon's dealing with it. In very many excellent textbooks this material has been gathered, and so arranged that it can be memorized even by the most inactive of minds. And it would be easy, too, for the teacher, in this case, to tell whether or not the pupil has done his learning faithfully and well. He can be tested and marked on his mastery of facts. But the trouble is that by assigning a task in this form we give to the student a wholly false suggestion as to what his mind should be doing. For a

young American, of eighteen or nineteen, in the present state of American society, to spend his powers in simply learning what was going on in the Athens of Solon would be an egregious waste of time, a sin against himself and against his approaching responsibilities. The Advisers have, therefore, with much misgiving and with many hesitations, contrived a different policy. They have said to the student, "Look into the situation with which Solon was dealing; put yourself into his place; try to imagine what was going on in his mind; write a paper and tell what you would have done had you faced his responsibilities." And at this point there has occurred a curious reversal of teaching relationships. Having said to the students, "You must study Athens in order to understand America," we find ourselves constantly saying to them, "You must bring your knowledge of modern America to help you in interpreting ancient Athens." When the freshmen were reading the Greek dramas we urged them to read also Ibsen and O'Neill; when they were studying Plato's *Republic* we assigned the story of the Russian experiment in Communism in Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*. And the same procedure has been followed in matters of art, religion, politics, philosophy, and science. And the belief underlying this method is very simple. It is that the essential difficulty with which the education

of young Americans has to deal is that they do not think about the information which they already have. We too have an economic and social crisis similar to that of Solon's time. With us, too, as a result of conditions which no one seems able to understand, the great bulk of the property tends to fall into the hands of a few; with us, too, the lower economic class is in terrible fear and distress; in America, as in Athens, unguided forces take from men their independence, make them the slaves of their fellows. And the primary task of liberal education is to make it impossible that boys or men should be in such a situation without attempting to understand and control it. The young man who can blithely and unthinkingly waste a thousand dollars in frivolity and dissipation, while the fellow in the next room is being forced to leave college because he cannot pay for his board, simply cannot be made to understand either Solon or the situation with which Solon dealt. He may learn words and facts and figures, but he will never understand them. The using of Solon is then not an end in itself. It is simply a device for stirring a young man to see that with which he is already acquainted, to think about what he knows. The chief task of the teacher as he deals with American college students is to get their minds active, to give them a sense of the urgency of human need, to establish in them the activity of

seeing and solving problems. It is true that they are sadly in need of information, but it is far more true that they need the desire for information. We must set them to work at a task in relation to which information is the material to be used. If they will attempt to build up a "scheme of reference," then for them every new fact will take on significance, every new situation become an object of active inquiry.

We have cited the division between the rich and the poor as one of the matters about which a lower college student should learn to think. Now, from the point of view of the principle of integration, the problem of devising a course of study is that of listing and ordering all the problems of the class to which that of riches and poverty belongs. To put it quite simply, the task is that of stating in orderly arrangement and interrelation the essential problems with which human intelligence deals. One need hardly say that the Advisers do not think themselves to have accomplished this task. What they can say is that, in their attempt to make and use a course of study, they have worked at the task and have tried to enlist their students in the same endeavor. In so far as the college has been successful, both groups have been engaged in this never-accomplished but never-to-be-

abandoned enterprise of the human spirit—the search for unified understanding.

As one goes through the records and other papers of the Experimental College one finds there an indefinite number of attempts, made by many individuals, to organize the course of study in the terms suggested. No one of these has ever been formally adopted, and each has led to others which developed its tendency or which broke out against it in some other direction. It will perhaps serve the purposes of exposition if we give here an attempt made by the chairman of the college, in its third year, to formulate the principles on which the course of study was operating. A comparison of this statement with the assignments to the freshman and sophomore classes in the year 1930-31 will perhaps serve better than anything else to indicate the line which the thought of the Advisers has been following.

It will be noted that the statement has all the roughness of form of a working document. It reads as follows:

I. PRINCIPLES

(1) The purpose of the course is to lead the student toward acquaintance with Human Intelligence as seen in two typical illustrations of its activity.

(2) The term "Intelligence" is interpreted as meaning all the creative activities, whether or not consciously directed, by which men strive to raise the quality of human experience.

(3) It is assumed that in the two situations selected for study the same creative activities will appear, directed toward essentially the same ends under different conditions.

(4) It is regarded as very important that the two years should be so dealt with as to form a single study—(the attempt to see the human intelligence at work so that the student may be prepared to take his part in that work).

(5) If we regard intelligence as the value response of the human individual to his situation, its activities may for purposes of study be classed into three groups.

(a) Activities immediately valuable in themselves—literature and the other arts, play, recreation, worship, enjoyment in all its forms. With respect to these the student should develop the power of critical appreciation.

(b) The making and administering of social institutions—the arrangements by which groups of people provide for the furthering of common interests and the adjustment of conflicting inter-

ests. Matters to be studied here will present themselves as situations to be dealt with, the question being how under actual conditions of human association desirable ends can be achieved.

(c) Intellectual activities which attempt to describe the world, as found in religion, science, and philosophy. In these activities individuals and groups are trying by the processes of knowledge to determine what is the nature of themselves and of the surrounding "things" with which they have to deal; they seek an accounting of the forces available for the realizing of human purposes. In this field the student will face intellectual questions of fact and principle. For example, religious thinking asks whether human values have any place in the scheme of things at large. Science, assuming a time-space world, asks what things are and how they change. Philosophy asks the critical question, What is human intelligence and what is the world in relation to it?

(6) As the student seeks acquaintance with the activities in these two situations and these three fields, it is essential that he become familiar with the best intelligence as found in a few of the greatest books. These books should be studied until they are known with genuine acquaintance.

II. COURSE OF STUDY

A course of study planned on the basis of these principles would have as its critical question: What do men do as individuals and groups in the attempt to create and to conserve human values? It would naturally fall into three main divisions:

1. Appreciation of human activities in so far as they are immediately of value. In dealing with each civilization we should seek to become familiar with and to appreciate its literature and other arts; in addition to these, its forms of healthy activity, recreation, athletic games, dances, festivals, etc.,—in whatever ways individual or group seeks to express and to heighten the quality of living.

2. Understanding of human institutions as instrumentalities made and remade for the furthering of values. In studying these the student should see (1) the values to be served, (2) the limiting and determining conditions of which decisions must take account, and (3) the human planning, the consideration of ends and conditions which in each case have entered into the shaping of any given institution.

Under this heading a number of social arrangements are to be studied:

(a) The creation and distribution of property

Questions:

- (1) How is property created; how can the methods be improved?
- (2) By what forces or on what principles is property shared? Are better arrangements possible?

Contrast Capitalism, Socialism, and Communism.

Under the general heading, Riches and Poverty, we should study

- (1) Natural resources
- (2) Technology
- (3) Human labor and its reward
- (4) Ownership and industry
- (5) Commercial and financial organization
- (6) Government and property
 - (a) Class conflict
 - (b) Legislation
 - (c) The growth of empire
- (b) Group organization and control

General heading—Rulers and Ruled

- (1) The Individual and the Group

What is the sphere and what the limits of control?
- (2) The location of power

What are the forms and what the best form of control? (Democracy, tyranny, etc.)

(3) Forms of political organization and administration

Comparison of constitutions

(4) Legal principles and procedure

(c) War and Peace—relations between groups

Theory and practice of states in relation to other states. By what forces and on what principles are these determined, should they be determined? (Nationalism, Internationalism, Imperialism)

(d) Status—accepted ratings of individuals and groups, in terms of standing and privilege

Democratic ideal *versus* others

(1) Class division

(2) Race division

(3) Slavery of various kinds

(4) Citizenship and exclusion from it

(5) Sex discrimination

(e) The rearing and training of children

Marriage and sex relations

3. The activities of thinking by which we describe the world of men and things as constituting the values and forces of which men must take account in their planning for the enhancement of value

(a) Religious thinking—the attempt at interpretation of the world at large in terms of values. Are there such values? If so, what are they?

- (1) The origin and growth of religious ideas
 - (2) The conflicts of these ideas
 - (3) Modernism—the criticism of religious beliefs under changing social and intellectual conditions
- (b) The sciences—the description of the world as a time-space process in which “facts” are accurately determined and verified.
- What do men find themselves and their world to be in terms of observation, experiment and inference based upon and verified by these?
- (1) What are the processes and forces of the inorganic world?
 - (2) What are living processes and their relations to the conditions which determine them?
 - (3) What, as seen in the time-space series, are the processes of consciousness, value, and intelligence?
- (c) Philosophy—the attempt at critical examination of intelligence and the world in relation to each other, at understanding of the total human situation so that the various studies may find their significance for each other and for human meaning as a whole.
- (1) What does control by intelligence mean? Is it an illusion? If not, what are its possibilities and its limits?

Freedom and Determinism

- (2) What are the values for the sake of which intelligence plans and directs action?
- (a) What is justice in social situations?
 - (b) What is good, admirable, in individual living?
 - (c) Are these values relative or absolute?
- Folkways *versus* principles
- (3) What is intelligence, especially in the form of conscious self-direction which we call thinking?
- (a) What is the aim of thinking—the difference between good and bad thinking or the absence of thinking?
 - (b) What are the principles, the methods of thinking?
 - (c) What are the different fields of thinking?
 - (d) Is truth relative or absolute or both? How is it related to other values?
- (4) What, in summary and in the best terms we can find, is the world and what man's relation to it, his enterprise in dealing with it? What is the human opportunity? What are human success and failure?

NOTE.—This outline is not intended to suggest the order in which topics should be studied, nor that, if two civilizations are studied, that the same order of topics should be followed in the two cases.

In conclusion, it should be said again that neither this nor any other statement of a "scheme of reference" has been formally adopted or exactly followed by the Advisers. With regard to the problem here involved we have, whatever our differences, two strong convictions in common: first, it cannot be completely solved; second, it cannot be given up. It is the permanent problem of finding a "content" basis for a scheme of liberal education.

Chapter Six

THE ATHENS-AMERICA CURRICULUM

AT THE close of the year 1930-31 it was shrewdly suggested by one of the Advisers that the college had already abandoned its original plan of studying and contrasting two civilizations. "We are now," he said, "studying not civilizations, but problems." The writer of this chapter does not accept that statement just as it stands. And yet it does seem to him to point to an important shift in both the theory and the practice of the college during its four years of experimentation. The shift in theory seems to be chiefly a clarification of an original idea which was at first vague and undetermined. The shift in practice is the seeking of new contents to serve a purpose now more adequately understood. The phrase, "to study a civilization," has both changed and deepened in meaning as the Advisers have used it. But whatever its form, there is no doubt that an important change has, in both parts of the course, taken place.

When the course was first announced, its avowed purpose was a study and contrast of the Athens of Pericles and of America in the nineteenth century. (There was also the possibility that other "episodes" would be taken up.) As the course is now given, its two human situations studied are, first, the Athens of Pericles and Plato and, second, modern, or even contemporary, America. In the freshman study our scope has moved on from the fifth century well into the fourth. In the sophomore year the exclusion of the contemporary situation has been abandoned; we now explore not the nineteenth century exclusively, but modern America as a characteristic expression of human activity and intelligence.

Now it would be quite hopeless, in such a document as this, to attempt to explain in detail the present or any earlier form of the course of study. Anyone who desires that information must seek it by a careful examination of the weekly assignments of work.¹ If, however, we wish to describe the course in general outline and intent, we probably cannot do better than to examine the change in point of view to which reference has just been made.

In the original plan, as crudely conceived, there were apparently three things which we wished the student to do during his two years. First, he was to

¹ See Appendix IV for the assignments in their latest form.

become acquainted with Athens. Second, he was to become likewise acquainted with nineteenth-century America. And third, by comparing and contrasting these he was to make for himself an understanding of what a civilization is. But further, it should be noted, there was implied in these arrangements still another activity which was to come after the completion of the college course—that of taking this newly-won insight into the life of twentieth-century America and using it there as an instrument of intelligent human living. Now the change which has come about in our interpretation of the plan has been that of perceiving more and more clearly that these are not, and should not be, four separate activities, carried on at four different times. One does not “learn” Athens, and then “learn” America, and then “learn” to compare them, and then “learn” how to live in terms of his wisdom. One of the most striking—and to some of our friends the most shocking—illustrations of this point is that in the studies of the second year there have been practically no explicit comparisons made between the Athens of the first year and the America of the second. Apparently we have studied America as if we had never heard of Athens at all. In that statement, perhaps more clearly than in any other way, is revealed the inherent logic

of the decisions which the Advisers have been making.

Of the statement just made, two explanations may be given, each of which is, so far as it goes, true. One of them is negative and perhaps unsympathetic. The other is positive and seems to us to constitute a genuine justification of the procedure followed. The negative explanation is that the first year's study of Athens has not given to the students enough accurate and detailed and remembered information to serve as a useful basis of comparison with America. In large measure this statement is true.¹ But probably more important is the fact that, even if the students had been sufficiently well informed to make the comparison suggested, the teachers in the second year would not have been equipped to help them in the operation. Now these protestations of relative ignorance are not made with the intention of asserting that lack of information about Athens or about any other civilization is a virtue. In itself, such ignorance is undesirable and even deplorable. But the simple fact is—and here we come to the positive and more sympathetic interpretation—that the securing of detailed and remembered information about Athens has seemed to us quite secondary in relation to a more

¹ It is worthy of note, then, that in all the "information" tests which the students of the college have taken in comparison with other student groups they have been surprisingly successful.

important purpose which the study of that civilization can serve. That purpose, it need hardly be said, is the fashioning of a "scheme of reference" which a student may bring to his study of later civilizations.

The statement in this form brings us back to our first query—have we then abandoned the study of Athens as a civilization? And the answer is, "No." We have studied it in the way which our purpose of liberal teaching requires. We have seen it not merely as a set of specific facts, but as typical, as representative, as significant for anyone who is trying to understand human living. And here we find the essential point. The student from the beginning of the first year must be carrying on the "fourth" operation in the list given above. His attempt at "understanding" must not wait until he has learned enough facts to serve as its basis. It must be present at the first and throughout the process, as the motivating purpose of all his studying. We should not send our students into a human situation, as tourists go to a foreign country with a list of important items to see and check. They should go rather as residents for a time, sharing, so far as they can, in the life and experience of the people, getting the feel and the sense of their scheme of living. In the latter case they may have little to tell when they return, but they may perhaps be more

reasonable and intelligent in their attitudes toward "foreign" people.

What, then, is the function of the Athenian year as we have used it in our scheme of study? We have assumed, for the student, that his purpose in studying a foreign civilization is to do with regard to it what any intelligent person living within that civilization would be trying to do—to see it in some such ordered way as that suggested in the last chapter. To understand a civilization is nothing else than to face and to solve, so far as one can, the questions with which its intelligence is dealing. It is chiefly because the literature of Athens is peculiarly well adapted to serve as the basis for an attempt at ordered thinking that we have chosen it as the subject-matter of the first year. Other minds have excelled the Athenian in the breadth and scope of acquired knowledge, but at least so far as the remaining literature reveals, no other mind has equaled it in the liveliness, the determination, the precision of its effort to "make sense" out of the human enterprise, to understand what men are and what they are doing—in a word, to be liberally educated. To many of us it seems clear that for a young man beginning to put into form his "scheme of reference" no other civilization could be so illuminating.

What then, again, is the change which has taken

place in the course of study? In the freshman year we began with Pericles; we then moved on to include Plato. Our first thought had been that the student should see the Great Age as a set of objective achievements. But later it became clear that for us the significance, the meaning, of those achievements is to be found not so much in them as such as in the thinking about them in the minds which they stirred to action. We must read the dramatists who came before and with and after Pericles; we must read Thucydides, who tells the tragic story of the rise of the city under its leader and of its decline in later years; and especially we must read Plato, who, seeing both the glory and the tragedy, tries to think it all through as a scheme of life, to discover its meaning, to plan for its more genuine and permanent success. The shift in the freshman year has come from the perception that what we wish our students to get is not primarily an acquaintance with the Greek situation, but an acquaintance with the Greek mind, a sense of Greek intelligence at work upon its situation.

And the change in the sophomore teaching is another aspect of the same drift. In the original notion the sophomore year was to be, like the freshman, preparatory. The student, having seen one civilization far in time and circumstance from the present, was to study another near to the present, so that by the

comparison and contrast of these two he might then move on to the interpretation of his own present world. But in the sophomore year as now conceived preparation is over; the student is at work upon his final and permanent intellectual task. This is the last year of his formal liberal training. The time has come for him to ask for and to take self-direction in an actual world. He must therefore study now the modern, the American, mind at work upon the situation in the midst of which he is to live. He must share in the thinking which is now being done or, perhaps better, in that which ought to be done. He must show himself ready to assume intellectual responsibilities. Here, too, one finds the explanation of the greater emphasis in the second year on the acquiring and keeping of significant information. In order that a student may understand the problems of his own time and place it is not enough that he formulate those problems in general terms which are applicable to all civilizations. He must see them also as they are set and modified by the peculiarities of value and of circumstance which determine in the present age and country the special issues with which it must deal. Human problems must now become local and contemporary and specific issues. And as he grapples with these the student will face the necessity of knowing what the sciences of the modern world are doing,

what are the current and developing processes of industry and commerce, how the agencies of government operate and change, how the activities of modern men come into being, are built up or torn down, are hindered or enhanced, what is going on in the fields of art, literature, play, religion, philosophy. About all these, as they are actually going on, the student must learn to read intelligently. It is the purpose of the sophomore year to try to get him firmly on his feet in that activity.

As already suggested, it would be quite hopeless to record here the detailed working out of the course of study which has been built upon the basis just described. It may, however, be worth while to bring together the topics assigned for papers to be written by the students. These perhaps better than anything else will indicate the intent of the Advisers as they have tried to direct and influence the minds of their pupils.

For the year 1930-31, the freshman topics, with the dates on which papers were assigned and were due, are as follows:

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENTS

(1) *September 24*

For the first paper, due Saturday noon, October 4, make a careful study of the Funeral Speech of Peri-

cles. Analyze the meaning of the various points and the way in which they are woven together. Give your own reaction to each and to the speech as a whole.

(2) *October 6*

Each student may bring a notebook, and drafts of his map and paper, to conferences with his Adviser. A map should illustrate and accompany the paper. The paper, due October 20, should be on the following subject:

Describe the policy and activities of Athens in her foreign affairs under (1) Themistocles, (2) Pericles, and (3) Alcibiades.

Indicate in your study what you find to admire or criticize in her policy and its execution.

(3) *October 20*

Paper, due October 27:

Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War

Plataean Episode—pp. 146-152, 183-187, 204-

217

Melian Episode—pp. 392-401

Mytilenean Episode—pp. 187-204

The student is requested to take *one* of the above episodes and examine it in the light of the week's reading and discussion. Is there a "right" involved in the situation? If not, give the basis for your judgment. If so, how do you justify your opinion?

(4) *October 27*

Paper: Ways of Earning a Living in Pericles' Athens (Due November 3)

(5) *November 1*

Paper, due November 10:

Describe the conflict about wealth with which Solon had to deal. What did Solon do about this conflict? Did any similar conflict face Pericles? Do you find any similar conflict today? If so, what is your opinion and your attitude toward it?

(6) *November 10*

Paper, due November 17:

What work did the governing bodies of Athens do, and how were they organized under Cleisthenes? Compare the constitution under Pericles. Compare the constitution of Sparta. Discuss the merits and defects of each constitution.

(7) *November 17*

Paper, due December 1:

What do you mean by democracy—social, economic, political? Consider the social, economic, and political life of Athens, with reference to the question whether Athens was democratic in the sense in which you use the term.

(8) *December 1*

The paper for this period should be handed in not later than December 19. The student may choose any topic he wishes bearing on Plato's *Republic*.

(9) *January 6*

Assignment: During this period compare Greek and modern art in detail. It is especially desirable that each student try his hand at some artistic expression. Use a sketchbook, take photographs of architecture and sculpture hereabouts, try modeling in clay. Visit Mr. Topchevsky's studio, work with him, get acquainted with what he is doing and how he is doing it, find out what your own artistic ability is. Examples of your own craftsmanship and a paper on some phase of the function and value of art will be due February 2.

(10) *February 3*

The written assignment for the period will consist of an informal notebook or diary of your reading, in which you may discuss points that interest, please, or puzzle you in whatever you may read; include quotations, and make any comments that may appeal to you. Here are a few suggestions of things that you might conceivably make note of. Which books were your favorites? Which did you dislike, and why? What differences and resemblances did you notice between the various Greeks, between the moderns, between the Greeks and the moderns? How much do you think you lost of the Greeks and the Elizabethans by the fact that their writings are inevitably reflections of a way of life different in many respects from

ours? How much of your interest and pleasure was derived from the characters and ideas presented? How much from the beauty and power of the ordering and writing? How clearly can you distinguish these two kinds of satisfaction? Do they really exist as distinct from each other?

Don't let consideration of these questions cramp your style. They are merely tentative suggestions to get you started. This notebook should be brought to the personal conferences and will be handed in to the Adviser on February 23.

(11) *February 23*

Topic: So far we have been making a phase-by-phase study of the various activities of Athens. But there is an important question, as yet only suggested, which should be squarely faced before the end of the year: To what extent were these different activities interrelated in the experience of the individual and of the community as a whole? We must try to find out what sort of values the Athenians prized most, and how they sought to realize them. In other words, what is the total picture of their community life, and how far did they succeed in creating what may be called a great civilization.

(No paper assigned.)

(12) *March 2*

Paper, due March 18, on the following subject:

What things, in your judgment, does religion do for men and how well did the Greek religion do these things for the Athenians of Pericles' time?

(13) *March 16*

Subject for paper, due March 30, may be chosen from the following:

(1) Describe and criticize from the viewpoint of your own knowledge the answers of the sixth- and fifth-century Greeks to one of the following questions:

What is Being?

What is Becoming?

What is the relation between the One and the Many?

(2) Describe the answers to the above questions given by one of the scientists of the sixth and fifth centuries and criticize it from the point of view of the knowledge which you think he might have possessed.

(3) Describe the conflict between Parmenides and Heraclitus, and criticize their answers to the questions in dispute.

(14) *March 30*

Papers will be due as follows:

Monday, April 6—Plato's Analogy of the Cave, a brief discussion of its meaning and implications.

Monday, April 20—Pleasure as the aim of life:

your own views in the light of Plato's *Protagoras*, *Theaetetus*, *Republic*, books one, two, and nine.

Monday, May 4—State the issue between Plato and the Sophists as to Relativity, giving careful textual references on both sides. Give your own argument on the question.

(15) *April 24*

From May 4 to June 5 each student will work on a special phase of Greek life which especially interests him, and the students working in the same general field will meet as a group to discuss the interrelations between their subjects of research.

On April 27 each student is requested to report at the college office his choice of one of the following groups:

- I Political and Economic Institutions (Mr. Koch)
- II Art (Mr. Agard)
- III Literature (Mr. Beecher)
- IV Religion (Mr. Havighurst)
- V Science (Mr. Havighurst)
- VI Philosophy (Mr. Powell)

The final paper will be due Friday noon, June 5. Final conferences will be held June 6-13, with the Special Adviser and one other Adviser conferring with each student on the results of his research.

At the close of the year, the Regional Study project

was explained and assigned to the students orally. This statement was repeated in the fall in the following memorandum:

MEMORANDUM ON THE SOPHOMORE REGIONAL STUDIES

It may be well to refresh ourselves with a statement of certain requirements outlined last June concerning these studies. They must be handed in to the college office not later than Monday, February 10. Each study must include some account of the physical and historical basis of the society of the region; and in addition either a general survey of the institutions and cultural life of the region, or a more intensive study of some phase of that life in which is revealed as far as possible the character of the region generally. By physical basis is meant (as revealed, for example, in Lobeck) the factor of *place*—the relation of your region to the earth's surface in terms of location, routes (which change with changing technology), natural resources (which also change with man's techniques and utilization of them), climate, etc. To the place come *people* from different places and with different cultural heritages and for different purposes at different times, and from these materials a society—both new and old—emerges and develops. Once you have pictured these indispensable basic aspects of a region, you can continue by attempting a general

sketching (as in *Middletown*) of the institutions and cultural interests that are dominant and the values they represent and shape, or by analyzing in more detail some aspect—literary, architectural, racial, economic, etc.—of peculiar significance in the life of the region or of greatest interest and closest acquaintance to yourself.

Two copies, typed, are to be handed in with whatever maps, illustrations, or charts you may find useful. You should attach a bibliography in which you evaluate critically the materials you have consulted, pointing out those of value and those not of value as a guide to the reader; your footnotes and quotations should be used with a similar view of aiding the reader; and a table of contents should be given. Finally, you are to attach a statement in which you set forth your criticisms and impressions and suggestions concerning the regional study assignment and any record of your attitude toward it as it developed during the progress of your work.

The corresponding assignments for the sophomore year are as follows:

(1) *September 24*

Written paper:

“to Adams the dynamo became a symbol of infinity. As he grew accustomed to the great gallery of machines, he began to feel the forty-foot dynamos as

a moral force, much as the early Christians felt the Cross. . . . In these seven years man had translated himself into a new universe which had no common scale of measurement with the old."

The Education of Henry Adams, Chapter 25.

What is the meaning of this statement?

(2) *October 2*

Paper for the science period:

Students are asked to write a paper, due November 19, on one of the following subjects—

The Method of Science, or

The World-Picture Given by Modern Science.

These papers should be illustrated, where possible, by references to the work you have done in the laboratory.

(3) *November 2*

A paper is due on December 6 at 10:00 A.M. It should be written on the following topic:

Describe the expansion into your home region of the culture of Western Christendom. Why did it come to that region? Through what individuals or groups was it brought? How was it affected by the natural surroundings and resources of the region? Has a new and indigenous culture developed? Or is the culture of your region—technological, religious, agricultural, literary, or whatever other aspects it may possess—an incident of a larger national or world

society? Explain and discuss these questions in concrete terms.

(4) *January 7*

A paper will be due on January 26 at 12:00 noon on the following subject:

You have just been elected President of the United States or Governor of your state. Prepare your inaugural address, dealing with the current industrial depression. This will require, of course, some discussion of your general outlook upon social questions and social institutions, your view concerning the immediate situation, any proposals for dealing with this situation which you think desirable, with some account of their relationship to the existing political and economic system, and some argument designed to carry a sufficient body of popular sentiment with you for securing legislative support of your measures.

From January 26 to February 9 you are free to complete your Regional Studies, which are due on the latter date, and to undertake reading in advance from assignments for February and March which will be made available in a few days.

(5) *February 9*

Each student is to select for special study three Memoirs written by Americans of "unusual experience, sensitivity, or achievement" who have given in this form their appraisals of American society.

(No paper assigned.)

(6) *March 2-April 4* Literature

(The students were divided into six groups, each, under the direction of an Adviser, studying a special literary topic. Each student was expected, with the advice of the group, to select a special phase of the topic and to write a paper upon it. The best of these results were then presented to the whole class.)

(7) *April 6*

The final paper on the *Education of Henry Adams* will be due on May 6 at 4:00 P.M. Papers handed in after that time will not be acceptable as a basis for determining, with the Regional Studies, the final grade of the student.

It will be recalled that these papers are designed to constitute extended reviews of the subject with special emphasis upon two points. Each paper should contain a clear and coherent discussion of the argument of the book, including comments upon the events and situations presented by Adams in the light of the studies of the year in the fields of science, social institutions, history and memoirs, literature, and any other relevant materials. Each paper should also present a thorough and critical study of some phase of Adams' thought, observations, or interests which seems to the writer especially significant or important or which has some special interest for the writer.

This aspect of the task naturally implies the study and discussion of other books related to the special field of interest just as the first relates the preparation of the paper to all the work of the year, since it is a study of the emergence of Modern America in particular and of the Modern World in general.

(8) *May 7*

We may conceive the work of the past two years as a study of the attempts of two widely different groups of people to conduct an ordered and successful social life. Their arrangements for producing goods and sharing in their consumption, their modes of government, their social institutions, art, and science, have all been the subjects of our investigation. The study of fifth-century Athens soon revealed the presence in society of men who criticized existing arrangements and deplored their effects upon the welfare of the group. The most important of these critics of society was Plato, whose reflections upon man and society resulted in a view of human nature and conduct which has influenced thought about these matters ever since.

Likewise, as we have found, modern industrial America has its critics; and the literature devoted to the criticism of existing institutions is increasing in volume. Many of the views expressed, however, leave unexamined the view of human nature, intelligence,

its nature and function, which serves as their basis. It will be our purpose during the remaining weeks of the year to make as careful and critical a study as possible of one view with respect to these matters that has had wide acceptance during the last twenty years. The book that will be used in this study is John Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct*. Every student should arrange to have a copy of the book available for his use.

(No paper assigned.)

These assignments give in outline the course of study as it is presented to the student. If one could see them in relation to (1) the lists of reading on which the papers are to be based, (2) the talks and lectures in which reading and topics are discussed, and (3) the conferences between Adviser and pupil before and after the paper is done, one would appreciate the course of study as it has been in action.¹

¹ Complete assignments given to the class leaving the College in June, 1932, are given in Appendix IV.

Chapter Seven

COMMENTS AND COUNTER PROPOSALS

IN THE two preceding chapters we have described the course of study as directed toward the making and using of a "scheme of reference." It has already been noted that no such scheme has ever been formally adopted by the Advisers. Far more important, however, is the fact that such formulations as we have made have not been presented to the students. Nothing could have been further from our intention than that the students should "learn" such a scheme from us, that they should be told in the abstract what are the essential problems of any civilization, and that they should then go forth, as it were with memory in hand, to look for the problems which have been listed. Success in the initiating of students into the art of thinking does not consist in getting them to learn a list of the questions which intelligent men ask. At this point, progress in the art which makes intelligence is not different from that in any other art.

Rules and precepts should emerge as incidents in the course of practice. What one would expect to find in a well-trained intelligence is not primarily a set of remembered formulas, but a kind of intellectual sensitiveness, an ability to use one's eyes when a situation is presented, to use one's ears when it is described, to use one's mind when its nature or its interests are to be considered, to act sensibly when action is needed. In a word, training in liberal thinking is not the giving of a scheme of reference to be remembered; it is the stimulating of a mind to make a scheme of reference for its own use. The present chapter will describe several specific features of the teaching plan as dominated by this principle and will then go on to state briefly other possible plans in which the same principle might find expression.

(I) THE REGIONAL STUDY

In June of the freshman year, as they come to the end of their study of Athens, the freshmen are asked to select for like study an American community. It is understood that through the summer vacation, so far as possible, and until the end of the first semester of the next year, they will gather all available information about this community and will write an account of it as an episode in human civilization. The task is, or should be, present to their minds over a

period of seven or eight months. In general, a student selects the village or county or town or city in which he has lived. His problem is then, to see with new eyes, and to think with new thoughts, an old and familiar situation. By way of preparation for this work the students are expected to read *Middletown* and to look over other surveys of American and foreign communities. What form the study shall take depends of course very largely upon the size and situation and surroundings of the community. The young man who studies a village with only three or four hundred inhabitants will probably find little literature, scanty statistics, slight historical records dealing with his material. He can, however, study the region as a place of human habitation, can find out why people came there and have remained, what activities were open to them, what use they have made of their opportunities in terms of climate, soil, power, and other determining factors; he can trace the developments of their group life in terms of education, religion, amusement, cultural interests of various sorts. And as he thus tries to understand and appreciate the life of a community he must, of course, seek information and insight wherever he can find it. In the small village he will talk with his parents, with the minister, the keeper of town or county records, the librarian and school principal, the antiquarian,

the leading merchants, the teller of town stories. And he is expected to gather together all this material and to think and write it into a significant account of the life and experience of the place. If a student selects a large city for study his problem is very different. Usually here he is overwhelmed with records but scantily supplied with personal impressions. Very commonly within the larger picture of the life of a city he must select some special region or special phase for study. In several cases two or more students have in this way worked together on the same community. By special arrangement in the year 1931-32 a group of six students are joining forces in a study of Madison, where with immediate access to their material they will be able constantly to check their work by personal observations. But however the work is done, we have found it one of the most valuable of educational devices. When it was given to the first class, a very large number of them shrank from it as something of which they were wholly incapable. Now, however, it has become an accepted part of the routine, and very many of the students pursue it with keen delight. As a part of the program it has the effect of adding to the two situations studied, Athens and America, a third episode which has the liveliness of interest of immediate and concrete experience. These papers, as well as all others handed in by the students, have been

carefully kept. They offer most interesting material for the study of the development of a student's mind during the process of teaching.

(2) EXAMINATIONS

For two reasons examinations have entered into the program of the Experimental College. In the first place, the fact that our graduates must take their places in the junior class as candidates for degrees has made it necessary that we grade them, recommend their promotion or the denial of it, determine the value of their credits in the usual terms of "grade points." But also, quite apart from this necessity, the estimating of the quality of a student's achievement at the end of his course seems in itself important and desirable. As a basis for further planning of his career a student should be told what his teachers think of the work which he has already done. But what form shall the examining take? Nothing is more revealing of the purpose underlying a course of study than the nature of the examinations given at its close. Nothing is more effective in telling the student what we want him to do than the method we take of finding out whether or not, and how well, he has done it. As forms of communication between faculty and students, examinations may do much good, but they are also capable of doing incalculable harm. Their very

common suggestion that a "subject" has now been learned, that the student may now be certified as having "taken" and "passed" a course, is perhaps the most destructive single influence which our educational machinery has produced.

In December, 1928, the Advisers, after long discussion, adopted the following vote upon the grading of students at the end of the two-year course:

That the grading shall be determined entirely upon the basis of the quality of three pieces of work, (a) the regional study, (b) a special study made by a student in the third term upon a topic chosen by him from a list prepared by the Advisers, and (c) a general objective test on material not specifically related to the course of study in the Experimental College.

Notes:

(1) It is understood that this proposal does not preclude arrangement for outside examiners to share in or to take charge of the estimating of the quality of the three pieces of work specified.

(2) It is understood that oral examining may be used in determining the quality of any piece of work.

(3) It is understood that in cases where the estimating of the quality of the student's work is difficult, the examiners may turn for assistance to the

impressions of the student recorded by his Advisers during the course of his two years in the college.

On the negative side this legislation excludes two kinds of grading. It provides that none of the regular work of the college, except the regional study and the long paper written in the last semester, shall be considered in the fixing of the final grade. Throughout the two years teacher and pupil associate together with no sense that one is "marking" the other. And, second, so far as the final mark is concerned, no attempt is made to see how much of the material studied the student remembers. Tests of memory are at times given for teaching purposes, but not for the determining of grades. So much for negations! On the positive side, the arrangement means that the Advisers wish to know what, under normal conditions of work, a student is able to do with the sort of task for which education is preparing him. The question is not, "What has he done in the past?" but, "What can he do now?" In terms of our working principle we may well ask, Can he study an American community and give an intelligent account of its situation and its experience? Can he read a great book in which one of the best of American minds is discussing our external achievements and our inner life? If a student is able to do these things properly

by the use of materials which are available to anyone who normally attempts such a task, then we need not stop to inquire how much he recalls of what he has heard or read. We have been trying to get him ready for a certain kind of intelligent endeavor. Our examination question is therefore, "Can he successfully carry on such an endeavor?" In this, as in many another case, the proof of the pudding may be found not in the examining of the kitchen machinery, but in the eating of the pudding itself.

Two points should be noted in passing. First, in actual operation practically no stress has been laid upon the "objective test" referred to as one of the bases of grading. And second, in the last two years the final paper has dealt with *The Education of Henry Adams* rather than with a special topic chosen by the student himself. Upon the quality of this paper and of the regional study the final marks have been given.

(3) THE TEACHING OF SCIENCE

As one runs through the records and notes of the Advisers' meetings one finds a curious succession of educational discussions. At one meeting men from many different departments are considering how economic problems shall be presented and studied. Soon

after, the same men are dealing with political situations, and then, it may be, with geographical influences; later, perhaps, they must decide upon the selection of literature, the principles of architecture, the conditions of city planning; at some other period, religion, philosophy, or physics demands their attention and decision. Though their special interests and training are in different fields, they must nevertheless think together and decide together upon all the varied aspects of the year's curriculum. In every such discussion one will, of course, find the man in whose field the special topic lies taking the lead, the primary responsibility, and yet it can be fairly said that group thinking has been carried on and that common decisions have been made upon the course of study. At very considerable cost in distraction and strain, the Advisers at least have been going through a lively process of liberal education.

Now it would be hopeless to attempt to give in this report an account of all the problems met and the decisions made in the attempt at teaching the different phases of Greek and American civilization. The teacher who has special interest in these matters will find abundant material in the changing assignments for the successive years and in numerous memoranda prepared by the Advisers. For our present purpose it

must suffice to give as illustration a brief account of arrangements made for the teaching of science.

The contribution of science to human civilization must be a major, a dominating element in any study of modern civilization. What science means in terms of human insight into the world, in terms of human mastery over fate, no one as yet knows. It may turn out to be the way of divine wisdom for which hitherto the human spirit has yearned in vain. It may, on the other hand, prove to have been a passing form of intellectual aberration under the influence of which fixed and uncriticized ideas have been leading the spirit of man astray. Most of us would probably place it somewhere between these two extremes. But whatever the ultimate judgment upon it, there can be no doubt that the scientific attitude and method is now, more than any other single influence, in command of the modern world. It is essential, therefore, that students who are being trained for human responsibility should know, so far as they can, what it is and what it does.

The first plan of the Advisers was made along lines of physiology. One of our number was a worker in that field, and he devised for us a combination of laboratory work and reading which seemed very promising. The plan was, however, given up because

of difficulties and expense involved in securing proper equipment and assistance. The second attempt has been made chiefly, though not wholly, in the direction of the physical sciences. The following selection from a memorandum prepared by Mr. Havighurst will indicate its general direction.

SECOND-YEAR SCIENCE IN THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

Purpose of the Science Study

When we attempted to organize our study of modern science so that it might contribute to our general aim of helping the student to understand himself and his world, we set up the following three goals:

(1) The student should become acquainted with the modern scientific world-picture, and he should learn the difference between it and other world-pictures, present and past, scientific and non-scientific.

(2) The student should be helped toward an understanding of modern science which includes a critical understanding of the validity of its world-picture and an appreciation of the possibilities and limitations of its methods.

(3) The student should learn enough of modern science to see that it has created the material basis of modern civilization.

To reach these goals our study must depend upon *interpretation* of the facts of science as well as upon a knowledge of the facts themselves. We must somehow effect a compromise between the learning of facts and the interpretation of these facts. No matter how limited the time (and our time for the study of modern science is limited to a little less than one-fourth of the sophomore year), it must be shared between facts and interpretation.

We are not attempting to prepare our students for technical work in science. Most of them will never study science again in a formal way. They will have no practical use for the scientific facts which they learn. A knowledge of scientific facts is necessary to them only as an aid to their understanding of the meaning of science in modern life. Hence we have tried to make our factual study of science keep step with our attempts at interpretation of science.

Undoubtedly our students cannot pass a fact test in science as well as college students who have had the usual one-year elementary course in physics or chemistry or biology. On the other hand, our students are far superior to these others in their understanding of the meaning of science.

If we have leaned too far in one direction, it has probably been in the direction of interpretation. I

think that in 1928-29, our first year of sophomore work, when our students spent no time in the laboratory, we did pay too little attention to the facts of science. Since that time I believe that we have struck a better working balance between facts and interpretation.

Plan of Study

During the last three years we have devoted the first eight weeks of the sophomore year to the study of physics and biology. We use these terms in a broad sense—physics including some astronomy and chemistry—while biology includes some physiology and psychology. The time we devote to science in the second year is the equivalent of about seven semester hours as calculated on the ordinary basis of fifteen semester hours to a full semester's work.

Laboratory Work

The work in physical science includes laboratory work in physics. This is the only laboratory work that we do, and it is done in physics rather than biology mainly for the reason that such an arrangement was the most practicable one in our situation. Each of our students is given the opportunity to spend five two-hour periods a week for one month in the physics laboratory.

Work in Physics

In addition to the laboratory work, we have four or five lecture or discussion periods a week. Some of these periods are devoted to demonstration of experiments which the students cannot perform. But most of these meetings are given to discussion of the work in the laboratory or of the reading assignments.

Instead of a textbook of the usual sort we use a text which has been prepared especially for this work. This text contains an outline of the material to be covered, directions for the experimental work, and some discussion of the interpretation of the facts of physical science. Students are expected to go to regular elementary physics textbooks (which we provide) for detailed explanation of the particular subjects on which they work in the laboratory. Students are also expected to do some general reading on the world-picture of physical science, and the Advisers suggest to them books which are adapted to individual preparations and abilities. The better students are advised to read Jeans' *Universe Around Us*, while those who are not so well prepared are sent to more elementary books like W. H. Bragg's *Concerning the Nature of Things*.

As the close of the work in physical science one or two weeks have been given to reading and discussion

in biological science, concentrating on the idea of evolution. In 1931-32 all the students read G. H. Parker, *What Evolution Is*, while the majority read sections of Baitzell, *Evolution of Earth and Man*, and other books on evolution.

No one who has had touch with this venture in the teaching of science can hold the opinion that the venture has been carried through to a successful ending. There is still a long road to travel before that can be said. We are not certain about the use of the laboratory or of mathematics, and in a field which grows by leaps and bounds the choice of books cannot possibly be fixed. On the other hand, we are all convinced that there is, at this point, one of the most vital problems of modern education for which the regular teaching of science and related subjects does not make adequate provision. For example, the students who come to us after many years of study in mathematics have, on the whole, no conception of mathematics as an instrument of scientific investigation, no facility in its use in relation to its primary purpose. Mathematics has been "done," but it has been neither understood nor used. We need from the schools a quite different training from that which they have given. And the same seems to us largely true of the usual

separate courses in science given in the separate departments. They do not adequately serve the purposes of non-scientists who need, for the sake of general intelligence, to "read" science just as they read political or philosophical or literary discussions.

(4) TIME VALUES

Mr. Havighurst speaks of the sophomore science as running through eight weeks of study. When this is compared with the "times" of the regular courses it should be remembered that, with certain limitations to be noted, the student in the Experimental College has only one assignment of work as against the four or five assignments in the usual curriculum. If, then, comparisons in time value are to be made, eight weeks under our conditions is equal to twenty-four weeks in a five-credit course "on the Hill" or to forty weeks in a three-credit course. In other words, it is approximately equal to a four-credit course running through the year.

It may be worth while, in this connection, to list the comparative times given to the studies of the various phases of Greek and American civilization. For this purpose we may assume seventy weeks of instruction during the two years. These have been divided approximately as follows,—

General and introductory..	3½ weeks	
Economics, politics, and other social studies.....	18	“
Literature and the arts.....	14½	“
Philosophy and religion....	12	“
Science	10	“
Special papers (including examinations)	12	“
	<hr/>	
	70	“

Again, it should be remembered that if these figures are to be compared with the times of courses “on the Hill,” for example with the usual three-credit courses, each should be multiplied by five. If this is done, then the values, in terms of such courses, will read,—

General and introductory..	17½ weeks	
Economics, politics, and other social studies.....	90	“
Literature and the arts.....	72½	“
Philosophy and religion....	60	“
Science	50	“
Special papers (including examinations)	60	“
	<hr/>	
	350	“

Or again, if time-values are measured with a three-

credit course for one semester as the unit, approximately the following measurements will be found,—

General and introductory	1	semester	course
Economics, politics, and other social studies	5	semester	courses
Literature and the arts	4½	“	“
Philosophy and religion	3½	“	“
Science	3	“	“
Special papers (including examinations)	3	“	“
	<hr/>		
	20	“	“

In the interpreting of these figures three limiting factors should be noted. First, during the first semester of the sophomore year the students are working on their regional studies as well as on their assignments. Second, a number of students are taking extra courses “on the Hill”; these, however, give no additional credit, it being assumed that the work of the college is a full assignment. Third, the times given do not cover a considerable amount of work on the regional studies which the students are expected to do during the summer holiday.

(5) GREAT BOOKS

When the dominating idea and purpose of a course of study has once been accepted, the problem becomes largely that of finding books which will express the idea and serve the purpose. And from the very beginning it has been taken for granted by the Advisers that, just so far as possible, the books selected should be "great," should represent the work of the human mind in its highest quality as well as in relation to its most significant themes. We are certain that one of the greatest educational influences is found in this closeness of contact with the leaders in human intelligence. Teaching rests largely in the hope that greatness of mind may be contagious.

In the development of the curriculum toward its present form, two "great books" have come to take a primary place, one in relation to each civilization. The Greek studies have been largely centered round the *Republic* of Plato, together with a number of the related Dialogues. In the American assignments the *Education of Henry Adams* has, in some measure, taken a corresponding place. In the first of these two cases, it is clear that by other groups of teachers other choices might have been made. It would have been quite possible to take Thucydides as the basis with his keen and accurate historical studies. The four great

dramatists have often been used, and might well be used again, as giving approach to Greek life and thought. It is quite possible that the architecture, sculpture, and related arts and crafts might be used for the purpose with telling effect. Each of these has been used in its own field. On the whole, however, Plato has seemed to us best suited to give center and focus to the scheme of teaching. We have hoped that by constant and recurring contacts the freshmen might catch something of his "scheme of reference," something of his far-reaching insight, his deep and passionate human spirit.

The choice of the *Education of Henry Adams* for the second year has been made with less assurance. It is a very difficult book for sophomores as well as a very significant one. Some of the Advisers question whether its influence contributes strongly toward the building up of intellectual and moral power in relation to the problems of American life. They fear that students may be baffled and defeated by it. But on the other side is the conviction that in the book one finds a very powerful and sophisticated mind, thoroughly at home in the processes of American civilization, finding itself thwarted and defeated only because it goes out to meet every actual shock and to face every real problem. It is possible that if another

book of like "greatness" could be found to challenge the *Education*, a substitution might be made. But thus far the Advisers have been unsuccessful in their search. There can be no doubt that if a student does succeed in mastering the book he has made a long step forward in the process of his education.

(6) TRAINING IN WRITING

It is worthy of note that throughout the two years the course of study provides that students have practice and criticism in writing. Every week during the two years papers are submitted in rough draft or in final form to an Adviser, and out of his own non-technical experience the Adviser gives such assistance as he can. The influence toward ready and good writing is informal, but it is steady and apparently powerful.

(7) INDEPENDENT READING

It may be noted also that an effect of the course of study, as devised and used, is to stimulate free reading in important books. Many of the students have built up relatively large private libraries. A very large proportion of them have developed the taste and the habit of free, independent enjoyment of significant reading.

(8) FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Instruction in foreign languages has been given chiefly in extra courses taken "on the Hill." When the college opened it was hoped that this work might be woven into the teaching of the two civilizations. However, administrative difficulties and lack of time have prevented thus far the realization of this hope. It is worthy of note in passing that a voluntary class in Greek, in which usually from ten to fifteen students were enrolled, has been extraordinarily successful.

COUNTER PROPOSALS

As the Advisers have worked at the problem of constructing and organizing the Athens-America curriculum, there have been suggested many variations from it of a more or less radical sort. Some of these are in the form of carefully prepared memoranda. Others are less explicitly formulated but have often reappeared as possible ways of overcoming or avoiding difficulties inherent in the "preliminary hypothesis." This Report can give little more than a listing of these suggestions. They are presented, it should be understood, merely as undeveloped notions. They fall into three groups.

(1) There are two suggestions, often mentioned

COMMENTS AND COUNTER PROPOSALS III

in the first years of the college, which have now practically disappeared from our discussion. The first of these was that the order of the two civilizations studied should be reversed, that America should be taken up in the first year and Athens in the second. The suggestion was grounded in the fear that the life of Greece would seem to a freshman dead and strange and unmeaning. But the suggestion has lost force as the meaning of the words "studying Athens" has been transformed. It rested on the supposition that our purpose in the first year was to "learn" an ancient civilization. One might well reject it if that supposition were true. But as explained in the previous chapter, our plan has been far from that. The study of Athens has become a first step in the attempt to understand contemporary America. In that form there seems to most of us no lack of vividness or vitality of interest.

The second passing suggestion was that the curriculum should be organized about a number of "Great Books" rather than about two civilizations. In the midst of the confusion and blocking of the second year, when the Advisers were unable to select and to relate books of first-rate quality bearing upon America, this suggestion had for them a strong appeal. "Let a student read," they said, "Shakespeare, Kant, Marx, Newton, Spinoza, Darwin; let him see

their thoughts in their own words; he will then discover modern intelligence at work in the minds of the men who have created it." But, for two reasons, the plan lost its interest. First, it seems practically impossible to make an organized scheme of teaching out of the writings of unrelated "great men." And, second, the difficulties out of which the suggestion grew have largely disappeared. The Athens-America course has taken working form. The "preliminary hypothesis" has, at least, become a practical curriculum. The tension of perplexity has therefore been slackened.

(2) The suggestions in the second group accept the two-civilization plan of study. Their attack is, however, focused upon the selection of Athens as the subject for the first year. Each of them proposes for this the substitution of another episode in human civilization. Europe in the mediæval times and Europe in the Renaissance have both been suggested, with the understanding that in each case either the total situation or some community or episode within it might be studied. Other proposals are Europe in the Industrial Revolution, Europe in the eighteenth century, and England in the nineteenth century. There can be no doubt that in the hands of a group of teachers who see it in its significance for contemporary human living any one of these "situations" might be used to

give the first step in the "lower college" program. In each case the teaching problem will be found to be that of combining two factors—(1) the literature of the period and (2) the making of a "scheme of reference" for the interpreting of human living. It is not enough that the period or the civilization be significant. That significance must be well stated for the student in the writings of the situation itself. In the cases of eighteenth-century Europe and nineteenth-century England very promising beginnings have been made toward the organizing of the literature for that purpose. Whether or not any one of these suggestions would prove preferable to the Athens plan could be determined only by actual experimentation. It seems to us exceedingly important that some of these experiments be worked out and tried.

(3) A very interesting variation from the Athens-America plan was the suggestion that the study of contemporary America should run throughout the two years, but that in each phase of the study reference should be made to some other European or American episode which seemed of peculiar significance. Thus, while studying modern art, one might turn back to Athens or to the Italy of the Renaissance; when discussing industry one would go back to the Industrial Revolution; when exploring Amer-

ican politics, one would turn with interest to Machiavelli or to Aristotle. It was provided also that each student should carry on two regional studies, each running through the two years, one dealing with Athens and the other with an American community. This plan was carefully developed by three of the Advisers and made a strong appeal both to them and to their colleagues. Had we not been committed to the giving of the "preliminary hypothesis" a thorough testing, it is possible that the substitution suggested might have been made.

Two other plans suggest much wider departures from the principle or practice of the Athens-America curriculum. The first of these proposes that instead of taking the different phases of a civilization in succession, one at a time, there should be three different courses running simultaneously. The freshman course as now given devotes approximately the first third of the year to social studies, the second third to literature and the arts, and the last third to religion, science, and philosophy. The proposal is that each of these studies should run through the year, that they be given simultaneously. While it does not change the content of the course of study, the suggestion involves obviously very radical changes in teaching method.

Still another suggestion brings its attack to bear

upon the required curriculum. It objects to the demand that every student, no matter what his special interest or capacity, should follow the same course of study. It proposes, therefore, that each student be allowed at least to start with his own interest, and that the attempt be made to find for each person, from his own starting-point, his own way to liberal and general understanding. The plan is strongly favored by at least a small minority of the Advisers and is undoubtedly worthy of very careful consideration. It, too, takes us over into serious problems of teaching arrangement and procedure. If a group of teachers should take it as a basis of experimentation, it would furnish very fruitful contrasts with other courses of study.¹

SUMMARY

As one looks back over this account of the deliberations of the Advisers, two generalizations seem to emerge. First, with practical unanimity the Advisers accept the principle of integration as applied to the course of study of the lower college. They are convinced that the teaching and learning of the two years should conform to a unified and coherent plan. And second, the Athens-America curriculum is one

¹ Still another course outline, suggested by Professor John M. Gaus, has aroused much interest among the Advisers. It will be found in Appendix III.

of many possible ways in which unity may be sought. Further experimentation along this line would concern itself (1) with making these suggestions into working plans, and (2) with attempting to determine their relative values.

III

THE METHODS OF TEACHING

Chapter Eight

THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AND HIS FREEDOM

WE HAVE seen our working principle express itself, in the course of study, in the demand for a *required* curriculum. A college, we have said, is a group of teachers and pupils, all of whom are reading the same books, trying to solve the same problems. No one who is not reading those books, working on those problems, is a member of that college. In the very nature of the case, the purpose and the materials of a liberal college define a common curriculum.

Now it is a curious fact that this same working principle, when applied to methods of teaching, expresses itself not in requirement, but in freedom of action. When a young man comes to that stage in his education in which it is to be determined whether or not he is capable of free and responsible self-direction, the use of any other methods than those of freedom is a contradiction in terms. It would be ar-

rant nonsense to graduate a student from the lower college with the statement, "This fellow is capable of directing his own life if some one else will direct him how to do it." Before we can guarantee him as ready for mature living we must have evidence of his own capacity and fitness, his own maturity of judgment and attitude. And from this it follows that our relationship with him, during these two decisive years, must be one in which, to the utmost possible limit, he is given his freedom of action, is allowed to choose his own way of life. As we try to develop the meaning of this statement two preliminary remarks must be made.

First, the argument here presented is not merely dialectical. It springs from hard experience which comes to every teacher of college students. It is an observation based on bitterly-won common sense. We wish our students to reach a certain level of intelligent self-direction. How shall that end be achieved? What can we do to bring it about? Shall we force the student into a sense of responsibility? Shall we drive him into freedom? We would gladly use these methods if they were effective. In fact, we would go even farther than that. So valuable are freedom and self-direction that if only some physician would invent a serum which, upon injection, would produce in a student those qualities, we would willingly substi-

tute for the classroom the operating-table, would joyfully assume the rôles of nurse and orderly in place of that of pedagogue. But the plain fact is that no such specific has yet been discovered. And it is equally clear that the methods of inducement and compulsion do not give us the desired result. You can train a student for freedom only by building up more and more his freedom in all your relationships with him.

And second, the suggestion that a student should be made free by his teachers does not mean, as it is often assumed to mean, that the teacher has nothing to do for the pupil. It is a caricature of the suggestion to say, "The teacher presents the course of study; the student accepts or rejects it according to his own sweet will; and that is the sum of the whole matter." Giving people freedom is not so simple, so negative a program as that. Throughout the history of mankind the experience of every democratic enterprise reveals the fact that the attempt to deal with men and women, not by compulsion, but by regarding them as free and equal with their fellows, is an amazingly difficult and complicated undertaking. Far from saying that during the two years of the lower college the teacher has nothing to do for his pupil, this suggestion implies that at no other point in the educational scheme is the influence of the teacher so

vitally important, so tragically decisive of the future character and destiny of the student. Teachers in the lower college are commissioned by society to convey a message to young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty. They are not saying, "Do as you please." Rather they are saying, "The time has come for your freedom; no one else can give it to you; you must, therefore, make it for yourself." And the question of teaching method is, How can that message be delivered effectively?

Now this situation, as one meets it in the lower college, is in outline a very simple one. A young American comes to us for instruction. We wish him to adopt a certain mode of living—that of seeking intelligence by means of books. But the suggestion does not apparently attract him. He has been formed and shaped by a society which does not regard living in the companionship of books as constituting great success or high achievement. How, then, shall we counteract the effects of other training; how shall we influence the pupil to go in the right direction? It is obvious that the question here involved is one of motives—that is, of forces available within the personality of the pupil which may be used for the accomplishing of a desired end. What, then, are the "motives" on which a teacher may depend as he plans his scheme of education? First, of course, is the direct

appeal of approaching responsibilities. The teacher may say, "There are things to be done in American life, in your life; you must be ready to do them. And further, in the doing of those things some men at least must be users of books. Are you ready to be one of them? Will you make yourself ready? Can we count on you to become an intellectually equipped member of American society?" There can be no doubt that this is the primary appeal which every teacher uses; it is, and must be, the basis of the scheme of teaching. But it is at least possible that this direct approach may not be effective. It may ring in the ears of the students and still leave them sitting idly on the benches. Are there not, then, other auxiliary, secondary motives which may be used? Anyone who is acquainted with students knows that there are. They fall into three groups. First, if a student has not the zest for learning, we may still prod him into the use of books by appeal to his other desires and to the fears which grow out of these. For example, we may say to the young man who sits idly on the bench, "If you do not do your lessons, you will not be allowed to join a fraternity, you will be forbidden to play on the football team, you will be 'dropped' from college and sent home in disgrace, you will be required to attend classes when better students are allowed to be absent." Just as we lure a

child into the taking of bitter medicine by the promise of sugar candy to follow, so we may entice the young man of eighteen into the doing of the hated task by the prospect of joys or the fear of miseries to come. And second, in the case of abler students at least, there is the very effective appeal to vanity. Students may be stirred to special activity and industry by the arrangement that if their achievement in the classroom is superior to those of their fellows, this fact will be publicly announced. They will be recognized, by means of prizes and honors, as more clever, more successful, than other students. They will be given opportunity to find satisfaction in their own superiority. And third, much wider in the range of its application is the desire for social approval, the instinct of social conformity. We may convince students that, whatever the merits or lack of merit of the educational enterprise, sober and respectable people think well of those who achieve formal success in it, and think badly of those who fail. And this being true, we can, by the establishing of a general scheme of "grading," bring upon the whole body of students a social pressure of very great weight. The desire to "make good" is a factor that can be counted on in the management of any American enterprise.

And now, with this array of motive forces at his disposal, what shall the procedure of the teacher be?

The answer of the Advisers, so far as it is revealed in their practice, can be stated in very simple terms. It is that, to the utmost possible limit, the secondary forces should be eliminated from the teaching process, that, just so far as it can be done, the stress of emphasis should be placed upon the direct appeal of the work itself which the student ought to be doing. We should give to students a free and unhindered opportunity to decide whether or not they wish to be educated men. And nothing else should be allowed to confuse, or to distract attention from, that decision.

That the secondary methods do confuse the issue seems beyond question. This can be shown in each of the cases mentioned. We can, by the use of external rewards and penalties, induce unwilling students to use books, but what, in the process, do books become for the student? What is, for him, the meaning of education? The effect is to make of learning a disagreeable task which, so long as one is under the control of teachers, must be performed for the sake of other values. And from this it follows that, after the pressure is removed, all motive force for the using of books disappears with it. It is well for us to remember that the graduates of American colleges are not peculiarly marked by their ardent devotion to good reading. And in the same way, the appeal to vanity defeats its own intention. In so far as a scheme of

education leads a person to rejoice in his own cleverness, his own superiority, it is bad education. In so far as it tends to substitute for the genuine appeal of objective interest this form of self-seeking it is positively disastrous. No one can measure the extent to which this form of disaster has come into the field of scholarship so called, as men have confused the pursuit of learning for human ends with their own desire for priority of discovery, for the recognition of special achievement. Between these two motives a chasm is fixed as between heaven and hell, and the obscuring of that chasm is a making of direct provision for human failure. And the same is true of the appeal to social conformity. This is a motive which has no place in the education of a young man whose present task it is to criticize, to appraise, to challenge conventional standards and valuations. At the time when he is learning to stand on his own feet we must not ask him to find strength and support in the general, uncriticized judgments of his fellows. To do so is to defeat both him and ourselves. There is nothing for it but to keep his mind, so far as we can, on the thing which he is doing as worthy of doing for its own sake.

In this connection it may be worth while to note two classes of students whom one finds peculiarly difficult to deal with for purposes of liberal education. The first is the boy who has developed a special inter-

est and has discovered in himself special aptitude for it. He can "write" or "act" or "do mathematics." And because he can do this thing well he wishes to devote himself to it. And then, out of the desire and perhaps out of the encouragement given him by others, there springs the conviction that for him proper education lies along the line of this study in which he is successful. He becomes a victim of the "bias of happy exercise." To such boys it is often practically impossible to present the values of being intelligent. If one speaks in those terms he is classed as a "social reformer," a "goody-goody" who knows nothing of the meaning of "learning for its own sake." The men who have cried that slogan, leaving the term "learning" undefined, whatever they may have accomplished by it, have a huge debt of damages to pay to the cause of education. They have made almost impossible the liberal teaching of many of our ablest students. They have confused scholarship and intelligence. The second class of difficult cases is found among the conventionally "good students." These are boys who have learned their lessons well because they are pliable in disposition, are willing and eager to do whatever their parents, their teachers, the general social scheme, may ask of them. As one faces such students, the feeling of futility sometimes rises to sheer desperation. They are so willing to do what

you ask because you ask it. And what you wish as a teacher is that they should see for themselves the human necessity which underlies all lessons, should feel its drive and compulsion, should undertake their own education. Here again the motive force is wholly self-denying and self-defeating. One cannot be dependent in being independent. There is a certain sense in which every good student must become a bad one before his goodness can become his own.

On the basis of what has been said it is now possible to state the basic working principle of the Advisers with regard to method of teaching. We shall find it appearing in both negative and positive forms.

Negatively, the principle rests in the conviction that the failure of the enterprise of learning to catch the imagination, to move the will of young America, is largely due to confusion caused by the use of the secondary motives to which we have referred. Young men are not excited about learning because they have been made, by compulsions and inducements of various sorts, to think of it as something quite different from what it is. On the negative side, therefore, the Advisers have gone to the limit in excluding such devices from their procedure. Except at two points at which obligations to the university regime rendered special arrangements necessary, no regulations have been made, attendance has not been

taken, penalties have not been inflicted, inducements have not been offered, grades have not been given. We have assumed that the most effective way of presenting to students the opportunities and the obligations of self-direction is to give them in their own student experience those obligations and opportunities. We have persistently refused to take upon ourselves responsibilities which, if they are fulfilling the intent of the college, are theirs. We have tried to keep the issue of intelligence in action as clear and direct as possible.

But now, with the field thus negatively cleared, what is the positive program? How shall book-intelligence be so presented that it shall be effective upon the habits and minds of our pupils? It is clear that, in the teaching situation, there are two forms of personal influence on which we can rely—that of the teacher and that of the college community within which the student lives. First then, we may so arrange relations between teacher and pupil that the personal attitude of the former shall have a chance to communicate itself to the latter. And second, we may so construct our community life that books and the use of them shall be at home in it, shall be the natural focus of its enthusiasms and purposes. Teaching arrangements and community living—these two must be established on the supposition that they are

the friendly activities of a group of older and younger students. The elaboration of this statement, so far as it refers to the making of the community, must be left for a later section of this report. For the present our interest is in its significance for the forming of teaching relationships.

In the field of teaching method it has seemed to us that, in order to present effectively to the student the enterprise of intelligence, we must deal with him primarily as an individual. We must substitute for the scheme of instruction which is based upon the classroom a scheme which rests primarily upon personal conference. As American students now come to the college, it seems evident that the most effective way to enlist their activity in the cause of the college is to deal with each student separately, to get acquainted with him as he is with all his peculiarities of power and of limitation, to bring him into informal contact with an older person who, having gone through the undergraduate stage, is now engaged in the activities which we wish the student to follow, to let these two talk together in relations of free and untrammelled conversation. We have, therefore, taken the "personal conference," not, it is true, as a total teaching scheme, but as the basis of a scheme, as expressing more adequately than anything

else the purpose which we have in mind and the method which we intend to follow.

The next two chapters will try to give in some detail the working out of a teaching program on the basis just stated. Before that is done, however, it seems desirable that several explanatory remarks should be made.

First, the adoption of the principle of freedom in dealing with students, the abolition of external compulsions and rewards, does not mean that the work of the student is not to be judged and criticized, approved and condemned. Quite the contrary is the case. It is true that we have taken it as a primary principle that in the personal conference no marks shall be given, no grades shall be reported to some one else. It has seemed to us essential that the meeting of teacher and pupil be wholly freed from that external influence. But, nevertheless, the essential quality of the relationship is one of criticism. The student, as such, is engaged in doing a piece of work; special phases of that work have been from time to time assigned; he brings to his Adviser his results. And the primary purpose is that the Adviser should help him to see the merits and the defects of what he has done. The teacher is attempting to introduce his apprentice into the mysteries of the craft of learning. He must, therefore, make him aware of the quality

of what he has already done, must give him a growing appreciation of the skill and mastery which are still to be achieved. Teaching by personal conference is a peculiar combination of personal friendliness and savage, impersonal criticism.

And second, the method of freedom does not mean that appeal is made, solely or even primarily, to the interest of the student. The teacher's question to the student is not, "Do you find this interesting?" but rather, "Do you not see that this is important and significant?" And if a matter is important, then it makes no difference whether or not the student has a taste, a liking, for it. If there is some human situation which needs to be understood in order that a young man may live intelligently, then he should go vigorously about it, just as a would-be football-player spends weary and painful hours in tackling a dummy or building up the muscles in his legs and back. There is, of course, a principle of limitation at this point. Not all young men can be made good football-players; and the severity of training toward the end of the season is quite different from that which is given when the new recruits make their first appearance on the field. But in spite of the limitation, the fact remains that the primary appeal of all liberal teaching is not to a student's interests taken as separate things,

but to a judgment of value and worthfulness made by him as a responsible human being.

The statement just made needs, if not correction, at least supplementation by another which appears to be in conflict with it. This is the assertion that the teacher must have constant regard for the interests and peculiar capacities of his pupils. Those interests are the active forces in the pupil's make-up. As such they are himself; they are the materials which the teacher must use. If he cannot make his desired quality of life out of these, then he will never make it at all. Just as one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, so one cannot make a student except as activities already stirring within him can be taken and transformed into the ways of learning. Each student then presents a different teaching problem. Each must be treated differently. Each must go a different way toward the common goal. Each must start at the task where he is, and must work where and how his nature requires. And the teacher must accept these differences and deal with his varying students accordingly. There can be no doubt that, as a description of teaching method, these assertions are true. And yet they do not mean that the teacher accepts the interests of his students as determining the aim of his teaching. They are not the aim, the goal, of teaching; they are the materials to be used in reach-

ing a goal which is set by nothing less than all the interests for which a human being should have regard, whether he has them now or not. In a word, each student must, in the nature of the case, go his own way. If he does not walk on his own legs, he will not walk at all. But if he goes rightly, he goes toward the meeting of an obligation which is common to every human being, teacher and pupil, non-teacher and non-pupil alike. To teach him is to get him to assume freely his responsibilities.

It is sometimes asked at this point, Why, if your students have a common and imperative obligation to meet, do you not force its acceptance? Why do you not build up a scheme of rigid discipline, such as that used in the traditional German Gymnasium or in an army? The answer to this question is to be found in a counter question: What "forces" will you use to establish and maintain your discipline? What forces are available? Everyone knows that when a common cause arouses group enthusiasm, it at once assumes authority over the separate individuals of a group. So for example, in the training of a football team, discipline is strict and is exceedingly effective. Why is this so? Because the purpose voluntarily accepted by the group has in itself authority over the desires and inclinations, the activities and wearinesses of the separate individuals. But what becomes of the "dis-

cipline" when the season is ended, the games won or lost? It disappears. Now the essential error of the discipline notion as commonly used in relation to teaching is that it thinks of discipline as a force to be used when other motive forces are lacking. But the truth is that the strength of discipline when it is effective for teaching lies in the fact that it is the expression of other forces which are powerful in the community and are recognized as such by the individual who is disciplined. In a very real sense one can say that in the field of education discipline is effective only when it is unnecessary. When it is needed, when other forces fail, it fails, too. It is, as teaching method, a form of self-deception, an attempt to create educational influence out of nothing. The point might be argued indefinitely, but there is neither time nor space for it here. Let it merely be said that the suggested comparisons with the army and the German Gymnasium are not accurate. As to the first, one need only note that the purposes of an army and of a college are radically different. There is no reason to believe, therefore, that their methods should be the same. With respect to the other, more serious suggestion, it is essential to recognize that the present conditions of American life do not furnish the social forces out of which the discipline of the Gymnasium could be, or should be, made. And this means that a

complete study of the motivation of the teaching process would involve analysis, not only of pupil and school, but also of the social scheme from which they come, to which they belong.

In the next chapter we will try to describe how, upon the basis of the personal conference, a scheme of free relationships between teacher and pupil has been partially built up.

Chapter Nine

THE PRINCIPLE AT WORK

WE HAVE two years in which to train young men in the art of reading for intelligence: How shall it be done? It is evident that the plan of teaching must be devised with two ends in view. First, we must develop the student's intention, his purpose, to read; and second, we must build up his capacity, his ability to read well. The teaching aim has to do both with the will and with the mind. There are, therefore, two measures of success in teaching, and, correspondingly, two measures of failure. If a student leaves us with capacity for learning but with no active interest in the using of that capacity, we have in the latter respect failed. If he goes out eager for knowledge, but dull, inaccurate, and ill-equipped in mental technique, we have again fallen short of our proper achievement. The two aims, the two characters at which we aim, are of course interdependent. Out of the eager pursuit of learning comes improvement in the quality

of learning. And one of the strongest incentives to learning, as to any other activity, is the sense of doing it well. And yet the two are not identical. Any practical teaching scheme must have regard for these as separate ends and, according to the peculiarities of varying student nature, must adjust its emphasis to the needs of the pupil concerned.

Now, in dealing with the general run of students who enter an American college, it is important to remember that the active forces within and around them are not driving them on into the eager pursuit of liberal learning. The American home, the American school, the American social order, do not, at present, create acceptance of the values of liberal understanding. They implant many other desirable and attractive qualities, but not that. And from this it follows that, in the great majority of cases, our primary task as teachers is not the cultivation of excellence, but the arousing of activity. We are trying to get an enterprise started rather than to carry it on to its highest levels. Our first aim is not to get liberal thinking done excellently, but to get it done at all. In a word, we must recognize that the drift of American life is against those forms of liberal teaching which seem to us most essential to its welfare.

The point just stated becomes more clear if we observe that the teaching process has two sides—the

special, in which we as a people are abundantly successful, and the general which, with all our enthusiasm for it, we constantly misconstrue and defeat. We can train ordinary young people for special tasks and occupations in which they quickly "make good." And on this side, too, we can train leaders, can develop "experts" and "scholars" of the highest technical efficiency. But on the other side, that of liberal learning, our mind has not yet roused itself to activity. We do not feel the need, nor sense the beauty, of general understanding. And from this it follows that, in dealing with the deeper issues of life, its values, its beliefs, its fundamental institutions, we have neither intelligent living nor intelligent leading. It is here that the primary, the urgent task of the liberal college lies. Our first question is, Can Americans, old and young, ordinary and extraordinary, be roused to undertake the task of understanding and evaluating American living? This does not mean that we are to ignore the other work, that of cultivating excellence, of training the best thinkers. It does mean that a democracy such as ours, by confusing the special and the general, has an infinite capacity for defeating its own deeper purposes. It means that the teachers of a democracy must be its critics, that in the training of its youth they must fight an unending battle against the blindly hostile forces of its popular

drift. Their task is not so much to teach lessons whose value is recognized as to create the recognition of value for insights which are essential to individual and social well-being. Under present conditions, the primary aim of college teaching is a kind of spiritual remaking, a reshaping of fundamental attitude and interest.

If what has just been said is true, it follows not only that teaching is in large measure volitional, but also that it is very difficult. It does not admit of rough-and-ready, casual, or mechanical handling. It will not serve our purpose simply to offer fragmentary courses and then, if a student does not take them satisfactorily, to "flunk him out" of college. Under present social conditions, the general effect of such methods is to create in the student mind attitudes of unwilling and relatively dishonest conformity, devices for "getting by" the tests rather than for meeting them. In the face of this situation the "preliminary hypothesis" of the Advisers is that teaching should be personal, individual. We should bring to bear upon each student, according to his special needs, the influence of the individual teacher. And the statement here made applies to students whom we call "good" as well as to those who are "bad." Suppose, for example, we invite a college group to read Plato's *Republic*. The effect is at once to divide sharply be-

tween the goats, who are many, and the sheep, who are few. Now it is fairly evident that in dealing with a "goat" it will be well to bring him into close and intimate contact with an older American who has read the *Republic* and has found it significant for present-day living. Such a teacher may take it as his first task to "establish connections" with a boy who does not "get" the *Republic*. He will find that the book is not read in the goat family, that it seems queer and idealistic and full of meaningless playing with words. And the task is to establish lines of conversation and of reading which will lead from the region in which the pupil's thinking has been formed over to that in which Plato and his pupils reflect upon human nature and human arrangements. But the same necessity for personal conference appears in dealing with the sheep of a class as well. One might almost say that if an American boy of eighteen or nineteen does at once find Plato interesting and significant, he needs, in special degree, individual attention. How was such an attitude developed? There must have been something queer and unusual in his environment or in his inner life. He may be, for example, the son of a country minister, a lover of books, living in a community where not many books are read and where the minister is felt to be "out of touch with real life." If so, the boy needs special care

and advising as he works out his own adjustment. If to his father's "queerness" there is added the sense of his own, the educational consequences may be quite disastrous. He must, if possible, be brought into touch with men who are friendly to his father and to himself and who can help him in thinking his way and in making connections with the world to which his studies apply. In a word, whether they are goats or sheep, whatever the depths of their conventionality or the wildness of their variations from it, young Americans seem to us, at the present time, to need personal guidance in their attempt at the comprehension of good living. It is upon the basis of this belief that we have worked out our scheme of teaching arrangements.

The outline of the teaching plan can be briefly stated. First, the Advisers, in accordance with their "scheme of reference," present the course of study in the form of assigned readings to be done and papers to be written upon the reading. As a help to the student in his reading and his writing three different kinds of meetings are arranged—(1) meetings attended by the class as a whole and by the Advisers, (2) personal conferences of an Adviser and a student, and (3) meetings of groups of about twelve students, under the direction of an Adviser. Each of these has a distinct and important part to play in the

teaching process. The first and second have been developed into fairly satisfactory form. The third is still very uncertain both in idea and in technique.

(1) Class meetings are held usually four or five times a week. Their number has tended to increase as the years have gone by. They are arranged, and usually conducted, by the Adviser within whose special field the reading of the period falls. The primary intention of the meeting is that the Adviser shall comment upon the reading, discussing it in such a way as to help the student in mastering it for himself. The peculiar nature of the purpose has sometimes been expressed in the statement that we wish the leader to give, not a "lecture," but a "talk." This means for us that he should always regard the reading as primary. He should not himself try to cover the same ground as the reading, giving his own systematic account of the material. He should not give to the students an organized interpretation of the reading, telling them, as it were, what the authors are saying and what their sayings mean. His function is rather to suggest points, to make comparisons, to raise questions, to talk with the students as if he and they were together reading the same books and were conversing about them. At practically all such meetings there is, of course, abundant opportunity for the asking of questions and for the informal discussion

of difficult or disputed points. When, then, we say that the leader should not lecture, we mean that he should not take the primary responsibility for the interpretation of the reading, but should leave that to the individual student. It was said a moment ago that the technique of this meeting is now fairly well worked out. To say that is to say that the Advisers have in large measure overcome tendencies which were strong within them when the work began. Inevitably at first as we faced a group ranging from fifty to a hundred students and eight or ten of our colleagues, the impulse was strong within us to make a good presentation of the whole matter with which the reading had to do. Our tendency was to give the students the results of our own investigations and reflections rather than to help them in considering the subject-matter presented by the books under discussion. The distinction here is a subtle one, but it is very real and, with much effort, the Advisers have transformed their teaching method in such a way as to keep for the student the sense of his primary responsibility for the making of his own education.

It should be noted at this point that we have had valuable help from outside lecturers who have come for a week or for shorter periods to present significant points of view. Usually these men have "lectured"; that is, they have given us additional material taken

from their own books already written or in process of writing. And further, we have had most friendly and valuable help from members of the university faculty, who have talked or lectured on matters within their special fields. Some of our best meetings have been conducted under their guidance. One cannot let pass this opportunity of expressing appreciation of their generous interest.

(2) Individual conferences have been scheduled once a week for each student. Ordinarily they have been a half-hour in length, but in some cases this has been increased to three-quarters of an hour or an hour. Each full-time¹ Adviser has by lot been assigned twelve or thirteen students whom he has kept for six weeks or more under his special direction. At the end of the period new assignments have been again drawn, with arrangement for avoiding reassignment to the same Adviser during the year.

The technique of the individual conference is at once more easy than that of the general class meeting, and more difficult. Here there is no strongly established habit, such as that of lecturing, to break down. There is, however, the task of selecting from an indefinite number of possibilities the essential

¹ A full-time assignment at the Experimental College has been regarded as two-thirds of the regular university teaching assignment. A few of the Advisers have been on half-time schedule with us, taking six advisees instead of twelve. In both cases the remaining time has been given to teaching "on the Hill" or to graduate study.

things that can be done within a limited period. One must establish personal contact with the student, become acquainted with him; one must criticize the writing of the paper; one must discuss the investigation and interpretation which the paper expresses; one must lead the discussion on into the lines toward which it is implicitly directed; one must keep the different papers and their problems in mind in relation to the total enterprise in which the student is engaged; in a word, adviser and advisee must talk together as two students who have a common interest in a common undertaking. In such a relationship there are, on both sides, the emotional difficulties of shyness, reserve, hesitation, and the like. On the other hand, the contact is so immediate and so personal that it must be at every point genuine and direct. It has been very interesting to see how completely, in such meetings, evasions and concealments tend to disappear. There is no need of pretending on either side. There is no reason why the student should pretend to have done what he has not done, and there is no reason why the Adviser should claim mastery over a field in which he too is only finding his way. It may safely be recorded that honesty and informality of personal relationship have been established to a remarkable degree.

And yet, admitting what has been said, it remains

true that teaching by personal conference is a very difficult craft in which those who practice it should have long and careful training. One of its terrors, which is perhaps one of its greatest virtues, is that when time is being wasted, both teacher and pupil are painfully aware of the situation. The dangers which threaten it vary between two extremes. On the one hand, it may become for the student too subjective, may focus his attention too much upon himself, his attitudes, his difficulties, his possibilities. It is essential, as we have said, that the teacher should deal with the student in terms of his peculiarities of circumstance and nature. And when one does this there is always danger that the student will develop too much interest in these, will become interested in himself rather than in the world, the society, the objective situations and problems which it is his present business to study. And at the other extreme is the danger of being, in a bad sense, too objective and impersonal. The young man of eighteen or nineteen is, however he may have been externally smoothed down by the requirements of conformity, a curiously uneven and undeveloped person. And the temptation is strong upon a teacher who has standards of excellence to spend his time in defining and upholding those standards, in demanding conformity to the requirements of excellence without any regard to the

present relation of his pupil to them. Between these two dangers every conference wavers and vacillates. Each of them expresses, in extreme form, a legitimate and essential demand which the conference must meet, and as between the two no simple formula will in general terms express the proper balance. The situation varies with every student, with every change in his development, with every turn in the subject-matter considered. If not an artist, the teacher is at least a craftsman, and he must learn by practice to adjust to each other his present material and his present purpose. So far as the personal conference is concerned, success in it, as we have already said, depends upon a peculiar combination of personal friendliness and impersonal criticism. We are teaching a student, but we are also teaching him in relation to demands made upon him by knowledge and beauty and high-mindedness, as objective factors in the human situation.

(3) The smaller group meeting has from the first been regarded as important, but it has thus far received much less careful attention than the other two parts of the teaching scheme. It is clear that much can be gained in attitude and habit of study if the students can be brought into active and intimate coöperation in dealing with it. The first arrangement

for this purpose, still largely carried on in the freshman year, was that each Adviser should hold a weekly meeting with his twelve advisees. There has been little general planning of these meetings, each Adviser following his own inclinations or inventions as to procedure. And the results have shown the widest variations in success and failure. These have varied with the experience and the inclination of the Adviser toward the leading of group discussion. And further, the outcome has been largely determined by chance as to whether or not the topics under consideration have found the kind of focus which brings different minds into active relationships as they deal with them. It has now, however, become clear that the values of the "small group" meeting are too great to be neglected. In the year 1930-31, during the sophomore literature period, a promising beginning was made toward the shaping of a new program. The class was divided into small groups, each under the direction of an Adviser. Each group assumed responsibility for presenting to the whole class some author or some phase of the literary study. Within the group, each member was by general vote assigned a special topic, and his results were passed upon by his fellows. The contributions of the groups were presented and discussed in general class meetings. Somewhat the

same procedure is now being tried by a group which is carrying on a joint Regional Study of Madison. And further, the Advisers are discussing plans for the extension of the arrangement. Group work of this character seems to us to give a valuable corrective to the subjective danger of the personal conference. But much more important, it contributes to the making of study an active social interest: it creates for the student social responsibility in the doing of his work. During the present year the Advisers hope to make definite progress in the attempt to give it a more important place in the teaching scheme.

In addition to this organized teaching program there have been many other meetings of a more or less informal sort. For example, on Monday morning of each week there has been held a meeting of the whole college which, in a secular way, has tried to accomplish the purpose of the college chapel of older days. Usually the chairman of the college has conducted the meeting, but at times other Advisers have taken it in charge. The most frequent exercise has been that of reading from good literature, with comment on its form or content, but there have also been talks and discussions of questions of general interest and also consideration of immediate matters of faculty or student policy. There have been also a great

number of informal personal conferences, meetings of small groups, sometimes in the form of clubs, and social gatherings in the homes of the Advisers. There will be occasion to speak of some of these when the forming of the community life is discussed.

Chapter Ten

GAINS AND LOSSES

WE HAVE thus far defined a plan of teaching in terms of content and method. And now the primary question is, Does it work; does it give education? But this question is hard to answer because it is very hard to make and to keep clear in meaning. If we mean, Does the plan accomplish what is hoped for when a boy enters college? then we must ask, What is a reasonable expectation as to the book learning of American youth between the ages of eighteen and twenty? If, as we have said, the college is struggling against the drift of popular influence, we must not hope for great or secure victories and we must expect to pay heavily in losses for such gains as are won. If we gain in scholarship, we may lose in character, in insight; if we lose in social regularity, we may perhaps make up for it by gains in sensitiveness and generosity of understanding. And these values are hard to measure. But it is only by measuring them, by measuring them all

in some total evaluation, that a scheme of teaching can be judged. It is very easy to approve in terms of one value gained, to condemn in terms of one value lost. But to do that is to show only that one's own mind is badly educated with respect to values and education. The question, Does it work? is not so simple as it looks.

The present chapter cannot attempt, in any complete form, such an evaluation as is here suggested. Even if the preliminary hypothesis were completely worked out, even if it had been for a number of years in successful operation, there would still be great difficulty in assessing its merits and defects. To do that it would be necessary to have running side by side with it other plans so related that comparative judgments of value could be made. But, as already suggested, the plain fact is that the procedure of the Experimental College is still in the making. During these four years a very large part of the energy and attention of the Advisers has gone not into teaching, but into the devising of a scheme of teaching. We are still uncertain as to the best books to be used, still in doubt as to ways of dealing with students, still baffled by the problems of community life. Our report is not that we have a scheme of teaching whose merits have been demonstrated, but that we have a plan which seems worthy of consideration by an American col-

lege of liberal arts. This chapter will attempt to give, then, not a total evaluation, but only a discussion of some serious questions and difficulties which would occur to anyone who sees the plan in actual operation.

I

First is the question of the time schedule of the student—the arrangement of his day and of his week. At this point the fear is commonly expressed that the plan of the Experimental College involves too sharp a break, too sudden a transformation from the controlled routine of the secondary school. The point of this criticism is felt when one realizes how many or how few appointments a week the student has and how closely or non-closely he is supervised. In general one may say that the student has each week six or seven meetings (four or five class meetings, a personal conference, a group meeting) as against fifteen or sixteen usually scheduled for a college student. And, further, there is no taking of attendance at class and group meetings. It can hardly be avoided at the individual conference. With the exception, then, of some six or seven hours of appointments the student has on his hands the task of arranging his own schedule. He is free to come and go as he chooses. He himself must determine when he will study, when he will play, when he will get up in the morning and go to

bed at night, how his day shall be apportioned. In a word, he must work out for himself a plan of living and must take charge of its enforcement. Is not the burden too heavy? Is not the change too swift? Now again this question brings us face to face with the fundamental issue of the whole teaching process. And that issue may be stated by asking a counter question. Do you wish to graduate a young man as ready to take responsibility for the conduct of his own living, for sharing in responsibility for the common welfare, while it remains true that he cannot be trusted to get up in the morning, to go to bed at night, to assign proper times to his work and his play, to keep his appointments with teachers and fellow students who are engaged in the same enterprise? Surely these are fundamental elements in the educational process. Not only are they more important than any lessons to be learned from books, but also they give color and character and significance to the lessons themselves. The lesson freely learned has a very different quality from the task which is done under compulsion. But if we say this the question will be stated in another form. Granted that the learning of self-direction is necessary, do you actually succeed in teaching it; do not the students take advantage of their freedom; do they not waste time and live in great disorder and confusion? This question deserves

an answer which is honest and, so far as is possible, accurate. In the first place, it must be noted that most of the students, when they enter the college, have the lesson still to learn. And from this it follows that the mastering of it becomes one of the first and most urgent problems of their education. And for some of them it has proved necessary that they plunge themselves into the disorder and futility which come from the wasting of time so that they may discover for themselves how disappointing and unsatisfying shiftlessness is. For the greater number, however, the problem does not take this form. Their task is rather that of well-disposed and sensible people who are given a new opportunity, a new kind of responsibility, and who thereupon proceed to build up the technique which it requires. But again, the question will be asked, Does the giving of freedom pay; do the students, as time goes by, build up ability to manage themselves? And to this we can fairly answer that, as judged by fair standards of college achievement, the arrangement does justify itself. If one asks how the lesson is taught, it must be remembered that, in addition to the response which freedom brings, there are two other sets of forces at work toward the accomplishing of the desired result—the personal contact with a teacher and the influence of the community. The second of these factors will be dis-

cussed in a later chapter. As to the first, the essential fact is that if a boy is shiftless, if he is negligent, if he has difficulty in organizing his time, he is, under our arrangement, in close touch with an older person who knows these facts, who talks with him about them, not as one who is trying to detect him in sin and to devise punishments fitting the crime, but as one who hates shiftlessness and like errors because they destroy essential human values. To the question, then, Does this arrangement work? it seems fair to record the general answer that under the actual conditions of American academic life it works better than any other plan which is available. The lesson of self-direction is one which every self-respecting person must learn sooner or later. Our experience would seem to show that young Americans between the ages of eighteen and twenty are capable of learning it if given the chance. It will cost something, for the time, in other values, but it is worth more than it costs.

It would not be fair to leave this statement without the further remark that the Advisers have often been tempted to modify, to limit, the freedom arrangements. At one point, in fact, it was necessary to abandon them altogether. The university calendar fixes certain times for the beginnings and endings of holidays. And the university enforces conformity to

this requirement on the basis of class attendance which is carefully recorded. Under the conditions at the college this enforcement is impossible, since there is no corresponding "class" scheme and no record of attendance. It was of course essential that the students should not use their freedom for the purpose of lengthening their holidays. They were, therefore, told that they should not leave before a fixed time nor return later than a fixed time. But at this point the scheme of "freedom" failed to work. The recognition of responsibility could not be established. Many of them insisted on leaving early or coming back late. It was necessary, therefore, for the Advisers to take decisive action. They required each student to register attendance before and after holidays, announcing that failure to do so would be regarded as ground for dismissal from the college. One student was dismissed for this reason, but, apart from that, the method has in its own way worked effectively.

But apart from such matters of external discipline, the Advisers have also been tempted to limit the freedom arrangements within the teaching process itself. We have thought of the freedom given, not as a fixed and irrevocable dogma, but rather as defining a direction in which we might go. The practical question has been, How far can we go in that direction? And at one point especially the impulse has often been

very strong to impose requirements—that is, with respect to attendance at the class meetings. At those meetings the reading is interpreted and discussed, the common problems of the group are defined and considered. It is, therefore, very desirable that all the students and Advisers should be present. Should we require attendance and set up a scheme of penalties for failure to meet the requirement? The Advisers have hovered long on the brink of that decision, but they have not made it, and as time goes by it seems less and less desirable. On the whole, it seems to us to give better education to let the student himself, under personal and direct criticism, decide whether or not it is worth while to attend the common meetings. And the developing attitude of the individual students and of the college community seems to justify that decision. The question is not dead, but it is for the present quiescent.

II

A second very serious question has to do with the Advisers. Does not the plan of “personal” teaching make too heavy a demand upon them? Is it not too costly in its expenditure of time and energy and interest? Does it not interfere unduly with the other obligations of a teacher, his scholarly pursuits, and his own cultivation of the power out of which teaching

springs? There can be no doubt that the drain upon the members of the teaching staff has been heavy and at times exhausting. But to say that is not to answer the question in its proper meaning. A very large part of the burden has come not from teaching, but from having to devise the ways and the instruments of teaching while the process is going on. The Advisers have struggled with uncertainties at every point; they have been depressed by the constant awareness of their own mistakes and by seeing the results of these; they have suffered from all the strains which ensue when a university is criticized from within, however generous the original intention of self-criticism may have been; they have been constantly beset by misunderstandings and even hostilities from the expression of which at least teachers are usually protected by a highly developed system of academic courtesy; they have been teaching in two different systems at once. In a word, there has been, incidental to the carrying on of an experiment, an exceedingly heavy burden of work and of strain which does not belong to a developed teaching plan under normal conditions. If, then, the question at issue is to be fairly answered it must be stated in other terms. If such a system of teaching as has been outlined were normally and peacefully established, would it make heavier demands upon the teachers than does the

usual American system, providing that in the two cases the ratio between the number of students and the number of teachers were the same? But unfortunately the question does not, in this form, admit of exact answer; one can as yet only guess and estimate. A fair guess would seem to be that the proposed system, if normally running, would take less actual time in preparation and teaching, but that the time spent with the students would make heavier demands upon interest and energy. The personal scheme of teaching makes of each member of the staff an administrator as well as an instructor; each is, as it were, a dean, an adviser, taking cognizance of everything that enters into the development of his pupil; each becomes responsible not simply for the presentation of a subject, but for the education of the persons under his charge. But now with factors like these in the lists it is hard to add up the columns and to compare the totals. It seems fairly clear, however, that the difference between the two teaching burdens is not decisive. Many, if not all, of the Advisers can record the fact that the creating of an experiment in the midst of a running university is a killing experience. That, however, would be quite consistent with the opinion that, with an integrated curriculum and tutorial teaching, greater teaching results can be gained at less teaching cost than in any other way.

III

A third point at which values conflict and, hence, serious question arises, is that of "non-expert" teaching. Each Adviser in the college has, of course, his own special field of study. But as the college passes from phase to phase of Greek or American civilization, all the Advisers share in the work, and hence each deals in turn with every line of study which is included in the curriculum. In other words, a teacher of art guides his pupils in their studies of politics, economics, philosophy, religion, science. An expert in science likewise leads the way, as well as he can, as his pupils fight for understanding of literature, philosophy, economics, and all the rest. And it is at this point that the question at issue arises. Can a person teach effectively in a field of which he is not in some sense a master? Can the student be held to accuracy and comprehensiveness of treatment by a leader who has neither accurate nor comprehensive knowledge of the material with which the student is dealing? Now in this form the question must be answered, "No." There is a genuine loss in non-expert teaching. Other things being equal, the man who knows a field best should be best able to teach it. But in this case other things are not equal. And there are many gains and losses to be measured before

adequate judgment can be made on the real question at stake. If we wish to see how the losses and gains are balanced it will be well to turn again for a moment to the actual process of teaching. Let us take a case in which the college is dealing with some political phases of American life. In accordance with the regime of the college, books dealing with the field will be assigned. At four or five meetings each week the Advisers who specialize in the field will comment on the reading, will lead the discussions, will help their fellow-advisers and the students to "place," to understand what they are reading. So far, of course, we have what would be called "expert" teaching. And now the "non-expert" process begins. In group meetings, in individual conferences, Advisers and students talk together, considering the merits and demerits, the implications and significance of the work which the student is doing. If we should make the very inexact comparison with a large lecture course accompanied by quiz sections, it might be said that in our arrangement the "lecturing" is equally expert. It is only in the conducting of the quiz sections that the non-expert, the layman, has his chance. Is this a disadvantage? Is "expert" quizzing better than "lay" quizzing as the two schemes are actually conducted? The answer to that question depends finally upon the answer to another question. What kind of knowl-

edge of a subject do we wish freshmen and sophomores to get? Do we wish them to know each field separately from the inside? Or do we wish them to know the various phases of human activity in relation to each other, each being seen from without as well as from within? It is evident that the specialist in art or in science who undertakes to help his pupils in their dealing with politics sees the field as an outsider. He sees it as any intelligent man, who has not devoted his life to its technical investigation, may be expected to see it. But if we are true to our definition of the function of the lower college, this is just the kind of understanding which we wish our students to get. We are well aware that each student may have his eye on some special field into which some day he will go in the pursuit of exact scholarship. But this is only one phase of his education, one limited aspect of his liberal education. What of the other fields? From the point of view which our argument is taking, it must be flatly said that the kind of understanding which we are trying to teach in the lower college is that of the "outsider." Our primary task is to see, and to help students to see, subjects in their relations. We wish our pupils to be intelligent about, to be able to read about, science and philosophy and politics and religion and art and literature and economics rather than to develop a separate technical proficiency in

each. And for this purpose the "lay" quizzing seems clearly superior to that which is available from "experts." A group of Advisers from different fields, working together in intellectual comradeship, with each in turn taking the lead in the presentation of material, seems to us to have, for purposes of liberal teaching, a decided advantage over a group of specialists, each working separately and disconnectedly within his own field. If we wish students to develop a given type of understanding, which we call liberal, we must provide for it in the arrangement of our scheme of teaching. It is idle to ask students to see subjects in their relations if we ourselves deal with them separately and from within.

IV

There is still a fourth difficulty which is very closely related to the one just discussed. It is one which cannot fail to torment and terrify any Adviser who has developed within his own field the habits and standards of scholarly technique. The educational effect of studying, first, Athenian civilization in the large, and then American civilization in the large, is very different from that which follows from specializing in chemistry or language or history or economics over a like period. In the latter case the techniques are more definite and specific, the infor-

mation needed for scholarly purposes is more clearly prescribed, the subject builds up step by step, each so leading to the next that the progress of the student can be accurately seen. But, in contrast with this, the "making of a scheme of reference," the "developing of sensitiveness of understanding in the face of a civilization," seem vague and empty phrases. They express the attitude of the dilettante rather than that of the scholar. One feels them unworthy of a place in the vocabulary of an institution of learning.

Now the issue here involved takes us back to Mr. Flexner's discussion of the university in Chapter I. It arises from a permanent and inescapable tension between the two fundamental elements which we there found tormenting the theory of the teaching process—intelligence and scholarship. In any sound theory scholarship is, of course, the servant of intelligence; its function is to contribute to intelligent, well-guided human living. But, on the one hand, intelligence constantly finds scholarship an unruly servant and, on the other hand, scholarship is sadly dissatisfied with the uses which are made of its services. For the sake of making clear this issue we may perhaps be allowed to use an illustration which in the modern world is now almost as trite as it is dreadful—that of the inventing of poison gases. In the contriving of these efficient devices for the destruction of human

life the chemist uses all the refinements of skill, of precision, of comprehensive information, of which his mind is capable. He does beautiful scholarly work. If, however, we ask, "Should such devices be used, should the nations engage in brutal, mutual self-destruction?" the chemist, as such, replies, "My studies give no answer to that question; it is not in my field." In whose field, then, does the question lie; shall it go by default? Now the plain fact is that no scholar, as such, not even the student of politics or of ethics, will take the responsibility for that decision. In the last resort we are driven back to the makers and enforcers of laws—in a democracy, to the legislators and the citizens of a community. But in that case we face exactly the dilemma which we are trying to illustrate. The mental processes of the ordinary voter, even those of the comic-paper United States Senator, are not highly approved by men of scholarly training. The discussions of a legislature seem to them ill-informed, inaccurate, superficial, unscientific. The decisions of the "average voter" are intellectually quite disreputable. And so there arises the strain between the "expert" and the "common man." The latter must, in the making of practical decisions, have regard for all the results of scholarship. But he cannot possibly know them. He cannot know chemistry as the chemist knows it, and metaphysics as the meta-

physician knows it; he cannot be a master of law and politics and economics and art and religion and all the rest. And especially he must be very inept in the face of the task of bringing together into some sort of intellectual order such fragments of these as he is able to gather and interpret. What a sorry mess his thinking is, when compared with the investigations of the scholars! But why is it so bad? Is it because the mind of the common man is inferior in quality, his purpose less keen, than that of the scholar? The evidence available gives no support for that opinion. So far as one can see, the sufficient explanation is that "practical" questions are much more difficult than are those of the scholars. The latter group limits its field; it deals only with those matters for which its own technique is peculiarly suited; it cannot and will not deal with anything else. But in the world of human affairs, men cannot be so dainty in their choices; they must meet urgent problems as they come; they deal with problems, not because they can, but because they must. The situation, seen from both sides, hardly justifies an attitude sometimes found which may be called "the arrogance of the scholar." If one is tempted by that arrogance, it is well to remember that perhaps the greatest of "common" thinkers, Socrates, was subjected to exactly the same condemnations as are forever brought against

men whose minds grapple with problems outside the field of exact scholarship. No mind of which we have record was more exact than his. And yet he, too, was a maker of phrases, an asker of unanswerable questions; he played with words and arrived at no verifiable conclusions; he gave men doubts and uncertainties in place of precise information. Human experience recognizes him as one of the greatest of its thinkers, and yet he always seemed to himself and to others confused and ill-informed; he was a talker rather than an investigator. But enough has been said to illustrate the point. It is time to state it as briefly and clearly as possible.

The lower college uses scholarship, its methods and its results, for the developing of young Americans in intelligence. But its primary task is not the education of scholars; it is the education of common men. And if we wish to estimate the results of college training, we must, primarily, measure it, not in terms of the kind of thinking which scholars do, but in terms of that thinking which all men are called upon to do in the ordinary relations of life. Can they use books for the guidance and enrichment of those relations? That is the essential question. It does not mean that books are to be used badly; it means only that they are to be used for an end which is not identical with scholarship.

If then a group of Advisers is tormented and dismayed as it views the intellectual achievements of a group of sophomores, it may perhaps balance its judgment, make reasonable its expectations, by the following observations.

First, the results of the liberal training of freshmen and sophomores are to be measured or estimated chiefly, not in the field of accurate and limited scholarship, but in the field of inaccurate and uncertain human experience. As such they must always be, from the technical point of view, meager and disappointing.

Second, under present American conditions of school and social life, the results are far poorer in quality than they need be. Until our social order improves in this respect, every college, whether its methods be good or bad, must be content with a product which, under other social conditions, would condemn the work of the teacher as badly done.

Third, as one stresses the values of common life as over against the claims of the technical scholar, one must be careful not to push the balance too far. After all, our chosen instrument in the college is scholarship; we teach by means of books. And as we use these for our ends we have a right to expect that young men who see the usefulness of books and of scholarly technique will go on to master them, to

train themselves in handling them. And further, every, or nearly every, young man who engages in such study will discover within himself special powers, special forms of thinking, in which he can be peculiarly successful. In these cases it is the secondary purpose of the college to encourage the special interest and to develop it. Into the measurement of the work of any college there must enter the inquiry as to how well this secondary task has been accomplished. But as between the two, the primary and the secondary, it must not be forgotten that while the second is the more accurate, the first is the more important. Intelligence is not a by-product of scholarship. It is the end which scholarship serves.

Chapter Eleven

ADVISERS AND PUPILS

ANYONE who is closely in touch with the teaching process knows how difficult it is to give its inner quality by such external descriptions as the earlier chapters of this Report have attempted. After all, the essential matter is that of the personal relation between the teacher and the pupil and of the mutual influences which pass between them. Such descriptions as have been given might take on life if the reader could spend some time in the midst of the process, so that the words might acquire color and immediacy and sharpness. Failing that, there are, however, two sets of records which have been carefully kept which are available for an "outsider" who wishes to understand and to appreciate the influences of the college and the responses of the students to them. These are, first, the papers written by the students during the two years and, second, the estimates of his pupils which each Adviser, at the end of every

assignment period, has prepared for the next Advisers who were to take the students in charge. More than anything else, except active participation in the teaching and learning, these two sets of papers—student themes and Advisers' reports—would give proper understanding of what the college has tried to do and of its failures and successes in the attempt.

It will not be possible to include within this Report any of the student papers. To make a selection in any measure representative would take far more space than is available. Even to compare the freshman's first interpretation of the Funeral Speech of Pericles with the final book review of *The Education of Henry Adams* would be here quite impossible. One can only note that if an "outsider" should wish for better acquaintance with the educational development of the student, and if he were skilled in the critical reading of themes, he would find here abundant and valuable materials for his study.

The second set of records does, however, seem to be, in some measure, usable. As already stated, each Adviser is accustomed at the end of a six-week period to sum up in writing his impressions of his pupils, and to pass these on as helps and recommendations to the next Advisers to whom the pupils go. And fur-

ther, at the end of each year these reports are summarized in characterizations of the pupils, for the one-year or the two-year period, and these are sent to the parents. There was much fumbling before these arrangements for "student estimates" were worked out, but they seem now to serve their purpose very well. It may be added that an essential feature of the letters to parents is a request that they will question or correct the estimates which the college has made and will in turn tell very frankly what they think has been the influence of the teaching upon their sons. Some of these replies have been exceedingly significant and helpful.

This chapter will now give four sets of Advisers' reports as illustrative of the teaching problems which the Advisers have faced and of the attitudes and methods adopted in dealing with them. The choice must be very arbitrary, and it should be clearly understood that it claims to represent nothing more than some different types of students with the corresponding different reactions of Advisers to them. As one reads the reports, he should keep in mind that they are written as confidential notes among the Advisers; they are often casual, even caustic, in manner, having all the freedom of a very closely knit and intimate community.

I

October

Petroff has worked as steadily and enthusiastically as anyone in my group. He is independent of mind without special keenness; in conference he is very much in earnest, eager to correct his mistakes and break open new paths. No worry that he will not do the required reading. His English in writing is quite bad—jumbled grammatically. I advise that he re-write his papers or parts of them regularly for a time. Also he needs to be drawn out at group conference.

December

Slavic. Good-natured but determined and aggressive in purpose. Has, I judge, no background of cultivation. Has his own world to make and with little sense of content or method. Is delightful in attitude, eager for suggestion and tries to follow it. Writing pedestrian and not good technically—but work shows energy and perseverance.

Probably not very able, but should develop a lot if suggestions are given him as he needs them and he is given the sense of getting on. One has to remember that most of his power toward study is as yet volitional rather than from understanding.

January

Petroff, once he is set firmly on a pathway and directions made clear, is enthusiastic, thorough, and (discounting a certain slowness of perception) competent. But once lost, he's just downright lost—and doesn't even go round in a circle.

He reads the material carefully, doggedly, and has a wide discussion experience—friends and Advisers. His papers are lengthy, thorough—but he doesn't organize his material carefully enough and his writing is usually spotty and awkward. However, he cheerfully rewrote a 3,500 word paper and did a much better job.

The *Republic* was a splendid adventure for him—and not painful. He's too honest and eager to discover satisfaction in the fine arts in three weeks.

March

Good native ability, a great deal of enthusiasm for the work, and an excellent attitude. He is so willing to profit by contact with his Advisers that he is a pleasure. His writing is rather awkward and his speech is full of colloquialisms. This, I presume, is due to home environment, though he tells me that his father is a well-read man. His home is in a small agricultural town in the central part of the state. He

should be encouraged to consciously correct his speaking and writing. Possibly some mechanical exercises would help him.

There are no personal problems so far as I can tell. His mind is normally alert. He is sensitive to social problems, and has few prejudices. He doesn't care for modern novels, though he likes literature. He reads more drama than any of the rest of my group.

His working habits are excellent.

June

An unusually eager and happy student throughout the year; reasonably capable, at least, and humanly well adjusted. His English has been his great deficiency; and he should work hard, as he knows, at improving that.

A particularly thoughtful study of Aristophanes as a social critic and a full and well-organized "regional" study of Athens in 430 seemed to warrant a higher rating than earlier reports would suggest.

November

A very hard-working lad. Always comes to laboratory ten minutes early. Poor mathematical ability, but he struggled manfully with every problem.

December

This boy is a very industrious and responsible student of Slavic immigrant parentage. His father is a skilled worker, and Joe has worked with him. While he is not widely read or verbally at ease, as is natural, I admire his industry and I think that he is developing good critical judgment. He reveals an increasing independent initiative in his work. Future Advisers may well feed his eagerness for using his educational opportunity to best advantage by suggesting general reading and helping to make it available.

March

Joe continued his consistent, hard, extensive work during his whole period with me; I have seen no more earnest student in the college, and few who read more widely.

His papers do not always live up to the promise of the work that goes into them. Although they always are good, they are seldom excellent. He usually glimpses the point—for example, the changes in American economic life reflected in Wilson's program, or the one-industry limitations of his home town—but the glimpse is sometimes foggy. Somehow he lacks the ability to "put over" a clear, precise, unified paper that would deserve to be called excellent.

In part his trouble is imagination and organization; he saw little or no continuity between the chapters of his regional study until I pointed it out to him. In part his difficulty is an inability to exclude irrelevant details. In part it is paucity of background brought from a small-town high school, and here I think the college has helped him and may continue to help him a great deal.

He writes better than most others, with only an occasional slip in idiom which he is pleased to have you point out.

A good, earnest, hard-working, thinking student.

April

Joe worked pretty steadily during this period in spite of an illness which was rather serious. He seemed interested, active, and developing—getting a good deal out of his reading, and writing fairly well.

(He was recommended for promotion to the junior class with a grade of B.)

II

October

Jensen's home is in Denver. He has had a wide prep school and military school experience since he was seven. He has never known a mother until re-

cently when his father married again. The boy has plenty of assurance, has been about, is more or less a natural leader. He has been much rushed by the fraternities, finally going ——, I believe.

He did most of his reading sometimes twice, but made little out of it. Part of the time—during fraternity rushing—he neglected his reading utterly, but continued to promise better. I think he will have to be checked up on closely or he will wander away from the fold. I suspect that he will take the responsibility of being a loyal Wisconsinite, or something of the sort, too seriously.

Jensen's paper was sketchy, disorganized, brief. He certainly needs attention here.

In discussion he was active. He had the nerve to stand up to —— and, so to speak, face him down. But I must confess that his discussion was not noted for its penetration.

December

Jensen comes from a prosperous family and attended a military school. He is an alert, forceful chap with definite qualities of leadership, and he relishes campus political activity. He is proud of his family, his city, his country—and his ability to “get things done.” (Life is a series of neatly parceled, sharply de-

finer duties to be met with promptness and self-discipline. Study is one phase of that life.)

This military-school attitude tells the story of his scholastic life here. He rolls up his sleeves, reads his "assignment," slams the book closed, and writes his paper. The papers are usually short, clearly thought out, but superficial. He wrote one very long paper which reflected a fine job of fact-finding and organization, but little critical thought. He swore he would never do a paper that thoroughly again—but he will if he is challenged—he will do anything on a "dare."

He likes to talk and express opinions—conferences are never dull.

Lately his blithe acceptance of the social order has been undergoing changes; he begins to doubt the divinity of our political mechanism—though the industrial system is beyond reproach.

January

Jensen did some fairly good work in the *Republic*. He was a bit hard for me to reach in a vital way. My impression of him is that he has average abilities and pretty broad interests. He has a tendency to be superficial and careless in his thinking. He is apparently very interested and is liking it very much here. If we can get him to dig into some of the material, he might develop surprisingly well.

May

Jensen came here as the successful son of a successful father. He has always had plenty of money, has gone to conventionally-good prep schools, and has had business experience in the summers.

He admits that he was a narrow-minded young business man until he came here and met the communists, *et al.* He is fond of C——, with whom he argues for hours on end about social injustice and the remedies. Consequently he has a righteous glow of becoming liberal in his outlook. At the same time, his life centers a great deal in his fraternity, where I judge the intellectual light shines a little dimly.

He has been irregular in conferences and with his papers. He is confused in his thinking, with little aptitude for abstract questions. Sleeps late. A sleek horse that needs a constant gadfly. A political campus leader who will sink back into practical consolations unless we keep him stirred up.

June

Classification: C—

General summary: Jensen this year attempted such a varied and active extra-curricular program that his life in the college was casual, concerned only with the mechanical grinding out of his assignments. He

is capable of far better work than he accomplished—but he needs above all else to relax from his activity-complex and fall into the mood of the college. His attendance at college and class meetings was wretched. His outstanding qualities are vigor, pride, and a high sense of duty.

Quality of work: He was rigidly loyal in doing mechanically the assigned reading and papers, though he read almost solely in order to write. His papers were neat, moderately well-written, and superficial. His final conference-exam. indicated that he had grasped the high spots of the Greek study—and that he has a mind superior to the use of it he has made this year.

Remark: He should return next year determined to attend all meetings, give up most of his activity work, and give his intelligence a chance.

October

Came fairly regularly to the lab. for ten days, but did very little work. His tendency was to play around. Was barred from laboratory for the last two weeks. Should have been able to do good work. Needs prodding or should be let out.

December

So far as I know there is nothing subtle or con-

cealed about Pete. He is not bothered by introspection. He is not lazy, but I doubt if he will ever do much academic work. I should imagine he has considerable executive capacity. He is interested more or less in campus activities. He has apparently a good solid bourgeois background, is a go-getter and militantly proud of it, is an uninhibited apologist for the existing order of things and ought to be a success in any enterprise not involving theoretical speculation or diplomatic finesse. What can be done about his work here is a question. He is courteous and, I believe, frank. I guess he has moments of good intentions about study. At all times he wants to be well thought of and successful. But I doubt if he can ever know what it is all about. He missed most of his conferences, for which he always had excuses which he did not profess to regard too adequate. He couldn't get at what Henry Adams was saying, so he wrote nothing. Knowing he had an interest in horses, I proposed that he write a paper on the evolution of the horse for his science period. He did. He made a sort of outline sketch from a technical book on the subject, cataloguing periods and species with labels which I fear he understood no better than I. He is a likable boy and can be got to respond readily and volubly in most any argument on his own terms. On the whole, I think he is wasting his time.

April

Jensen stayed in the poetry group, in spite of his distaste for poetry of whatever sort, because he thought he ought to get acquainted with it and try to get something out of it. I believe that he enjoyed the work pretty well, though his appreciation was very limited. He read a good deal of Robinson and achieved some measure of understanding of him. His paper was unambitious and fair in quality. I like this fellow; he has a long way to go—just fair abilities.

(He was recommended for promotion to the junior class, but on probation.)

III

October

First conference: Absent. Learned later that he was in the infirmary for a week with an injured leg.

First paper: Not handed in. He did the reading, so we decided to let this paper go.

Second conference: Have failed to come to grips with this chap yet. He has done some reading, but his interest is not particularly stimulated. I have not had enough contact to make estimate of his powers. He seems pleasant, willing, and interested a little.

Third conference: A very quiet and reserved

person, difficult for me to draw out. He seems to be working well. Presented an ambitious outline for paper on foreign relations.

Fourth conference: Absent. Largely my fault. Rather an elusive chap. Failed to make any vital contact with him. Again may have talked too much, myself. He is shy and reserved.

November

Buehler was one of my best advisees: earnest, quiet, self-possessed, inquisitive. His comments are always honest and independent, with sometimes canny insight. His papers have been clear, sane, complete. He is interested in probing below the surface to study motives and causes. He writes well, and should be encouraged to keep a record of his intellectual response to his reading. It isn't easy to get to know him; he is reserved and doesn't wear his ability on his sleeve, but he has lots of ability and should show steady progress if properly guided.

January

This boy is of a very worth-while sort, but he needs a great deal of careful handling. He has a serious and, I think, rather brooding mind, but I imagine he is prone to daydreaming rather than accomplishment. Through most of the group discussions he sat looking

out of the window without taking any active part. However, in the last meeting he seemed to have many things to say, but was somewhat retiring about taking the floor. He seems to have a realistic mind that is impatient with anything suggesting absolutes and that is quite penetrating in argument. In short, he has considerable intellectual capacity. What he needs is to be constantly encouraged and led on. He did nothing of moment; but, apparently feeling impelled to do something for me, he wrote off a paper on caste systems that contained some good suggestions, but which did not follow them up and which was in general hardly a serious piece of work. He missed one conference, but was very careful about arranging to make it up.

March

Reads widely, and often carelessly. Capable of care and sometimes uses it. Writes reasonably well; somewhat explosive. Good participation in discussion.

Needs to study more and read less. A good "spirit" and a good mind, in need of some "discipline."

May

Fred Buehler has talent. His year has not been one of the careful scholarship of which he is capable. He

has been groping, introspecting, rationalizing. He is now a vigorous, active futilitarian.

(Probably with his appetites for knowing and his intuition, he was painfully startled, when thrown with the Experimental College group, to discover how highly self-over-evaluated he was when he came here.)

He was regular at all meetings, read the science and philosophy material, but worked out his own program rather than follow the suggested issues. He wants to work on more subtle and difficult problems than the group, so he never really makes a complete, specific, scholarly accomplishment.

He handed in no paper.

June

Classification: B+

General summary: Buehler this year has been very young, very intelligent, very introspective—therefore very confused. The consequence has naturally been a certain aloofness. The topics suggested for the whole class have usually seemed too simple for grand conceptions—so he has often stormed off on expeditions of his own—and usually arrived nowhere. Perhaps some would call this rebellion. He has spent a profitable year—providing he moves along a natural

adolescent development and turns to disciplined scholarship next year.

Quality of work: When he completes a paper it is a splendid one. His final paper was the product of careful scholarship and a noteworthy accomplishment for a college freshman.

Remarks: He has probably hovered this year at times on the dangerous mood. But I do not consider him a problem.

November

Laboratory attendance good. A good student, well fitted for this kind of work. Ten write-ups, good, and some problems.

December

Buehler is a most unusual student. His laboratory report states that his attitude is good and that he is well fitted for his work, which was of high quality. His papers for me were of extraordinary merit and maturity. I found, in the course of conversation, that in his senior year in high school he had something akin to a conversion so far as interest in ideas is concerned, apparently through the work of a history teacher. He has grown up among the Amish communities near Akron; and I suspect in a household of fairly circumscribed outlook in religion and other

matters. I also surmise that he has packed an immense amount of study and reading into the last two years without developing the air of sophistication and arrogance which some other boys acquire. He is somewhat shy and questions his own ability; he really needs more encouragement and self-confidence. I think there are the makings of a quite unusual type of research scholar in him. The chief difficulty is the possibility of his not seeing any tangible interest or activity to which he should direct his energy during the next two or three years; he is likely to fall under too strong a sense of disillusionment in his studies of philosophy and the borders of science, and the Adviser should try to keep him concerned with "human" interests and activities from one point of view.

February

Work this period: His work in the prescribed material is seldom so important as the work he carries on independently, I believe. He is not greatly interested in economic problems of a general nature, though he has a good grasp of the economic situation of his own Amish group in Ohio. His paper on the economic depression was unfinished, though as it stood it was fuller and better than any other paper I received. He complains that he can never finish a

paper because his reading and thinking succeed in making the immensity and the hopelessness of solving each problem evident to him. He is always dissatisfied with his work. He is inclined to want to go into business later, because academic work makes one dissatisfied with everything. And yet he is happier this year than last. I think he is best left to follow his own course, with whatever suggestions an Adviser can find to help him in the work he is pursuing. He says that he has won his way through the glib phase of sophisticated shallowness. And I believe he is right. He is very quiet, never demonstrative of his knowledge. He was impressed with Whitehead's *Science and the Modern World*. He doesn't care for Watson's *Behaviorism*. In the course of a group meeting, he and I became involved in an argument, and he came back a few days later to show me some facts which he had looked up as having a bearing on our argument.

Writing: Very good.

Reading: He reads about two non-prescribed books a week. He has read a good bit on sex.

Social adjustment: He has a few good friends, and very few acquaintances. I think it would be well if he did make more social contacts. He should be having a few dates. While he has a good grip on him-

self, so that his life is reasonably healthy, yet I believe that more social life would benefit him.

March

Regional Study—B+

Buehler delved quite deeply into the geology, geography, and the soils of his region, linking these with early settlement and more recent developments. He showed both perseverance and originality in digging up this background material and in using it to interpret the life of that section. His paper is well written and reveals quite a grasp of the situation, rather belying his modesty. Unfortunately, Buehler was unable to complete certain parts of his paper. Having taken time to do thorough work on earlier portions, he tells less than he could about the Amish, etc.

Buehler seems to lack self-confidence, especially in dealing with people.

June

A very able boy who is very pleasant to deal with. He is unusually reflective and dreamy. He has been reading a great deal on the modern sciences. In conversation he is likely to be rather incoherent, or perhaps fragmentary. He impresses one as understanding much more than he can communicate. His Adams paper was in a rudimentary stage. (An un-

fortunate illness has prevented him from doing his best this year.) But as it was, it showed thought and penetration. I am sorry he could not complete the work, for I should be anxious to see a finished job of his.

He is an intimate of ——, and they are a good pair.

(Buehler was recommended for promotion to the junior class with a grade of B+.)

IV

November

Reading not always accurate. Not always up to date on reading, due mostly to work outside (to earn way through school). Writing all right. Takes part in group discussions—interested, intelligent. Probably hasn't the best of backgrounds. His interests are general; eager for knowledge; likes the college. His social adjustment seems all right; is handicapped in this line by having to work. Likable. He has no outside university activities but is taking a course "on the Hill"—French 1b. Papers are well done except the brief. One of the most interested boys.

February

Schulz was easily one of the best men in my group.

Alert, active and conscientious, persistent and thoughtful. He has a fair background of reading and has worked steadily to enlarge it during this period. His work in art was excellent; he enjoyed sketching and did some interesting work, also tried his hand at clay modeling. His biography of Euripides was a thoughtful piece of work.

His notebook on literature was especially good, with well-thought-out comments on wide reading. Not too keenly critical, but analytical in a good, sound way. He is especially interested in drama.

Whatever is done for him will be appreciated and made good use of.

May

The best man in my last group. Punctual in keeping all appointments. Very good abilities and a hard and conscientious worker. He seems to be keenly interested in the work here and should have a steady development if we can keep him going. His writing is good but needs some attention.

June

A serious-minded, hard-working student, rather puzzled as to what he wants to do. He tried working in a business house for a time before entering the university, but did not like it. He wants intensely to

be "educated." There is no doubt that he is able, though his writing is slightly stilted and does not, I think, wholly do him justice. At present he is thinking of becoming a psychiatrist and has talked to Dr. Lorenz on the subject. He has the problem of supporting himself.

November

Schulz is tackling Wheeling for his regional study. He read *Middletown* early, last summer, and gathered a good deal of material on Wheeling before returning to Madison this fall. His interest is primarily in the industrial aspects of his region; he should do a good study, judging by his early start and his intelligence about what he wants and how to get it.

Though he worked hard at it, Schulz had quite serious trouble with the mathematics involved in the early weeks of the science period. But he kept at it, and came through the first weeks pretty well. He is regular and conscientious about anything he does, I guess. As the science period continued, he became increasingly interested, both in a generous number of laboratory experiments and in his reading on science. His final paper was a good, thoughtful piece of work—on scientific method in atomic research.

An able, serious, diligent, intellectually curious boy.

Likable and apparently well adjusted, and getting a good deal out of his work. Does more than the minimum, though he works in the Refectory several hours a day. One of the best students in my first group.

December

Schulz is one of the most satisfactory men I have found. He is intelligent and ambitious and open-minded. He has done the prescribed reading, together with a great deal of reading about coal and Wheeling for his regional survey. It will be difficult for him to get first-hand information, but he will try hard during the vacation to do so. His next Adviser should help him to organize and delimit his material, for in such work he is a bit weak.

January

Good man—hard, cheerful worker. Attitude very satisfactory; despite handicap of money shortage, etc., immense courage and resiliency. Very rapid development. Weak in accuracy, presentation, and taste, but promising material. No special internal difficulties, but money a problem which should be solved; he deserves every encouragement.

Attendance all right.

April

One of the best men I have met in college work—intelligent, a hard worker, with a really critical and appraising mind, mature, fair-minded. He should go far, but a very serious financial handicap plus a deep feeling of responsibility for helping his parents may prevent further formal college work. His regional was an excellent study of Wheeling, he got much from Saunders, and his study of the Chinese Eastern Railroad was a gem, as is his literary notebook. He is a great credit to the college.

June

Schulz has gained more from the college than almost any student I have seen. In my opinion, he has acquired sufficient intellectual stimulus and technique to last him a lifetime. He has read widely during these two years, and clearly intends to read much more, even though he must leave college for the business world.

He has learned to look at economic and political abuses from a detached and relatively scholarly point of view, and seems clear in his mind as to what values he wants to get in life.

He has been unusually hard-working and intelligent. His steadiness is attractive as combined with his willingness and ability to criticize.

Lack of money is his reason for not going on in college.

(Schulz was recommended for promotion to the junior class with a grade of A.)

These four sets of records illustrate four different groups of students which it may be worth while to characterize in a few words.

The first type is that of the small town or village or country boy, evidently of good stock, often of second-generation American residence. He is at the beginning undeveloped in cultural ways, knows little of the world of men or of letters, has trouble in speech or writing or both, is impressed, and sometimes depressed, by the greater facility and cleverness of more sophisticated companions. He may have had a fairly good record in high school, but he is still the typical, small-town, Middle Western youth. But he is responsive; he knows with more or less clearness that there is another world into which study will take him, and he is willing to work his way toward it. If he is very wise he knows that he need not give up his old world when entering the new. This is, on the whole, our most satisfactory student and the one to whom the methods of the college seem best fitted. It has been one of the tragedies of the college that the hostility

of a surrounding community has kept from us young men of this type. We have had many of them, quite enough for experimental purposes, but not enough to realize our hope that we might have a student body which would be representative of the colleges and universities of the Middle West.

The second group is that of the socially successful student. He is able to make his way in terms of clothes and manners and is interested in doing so. He belongs to what one commonly calls the "fraternity type." He is successful in external ways and is interested in the men who get on in the world. He is very hard to deal with because "success" has already taken on a meaning for him, and the Advisers find established in him a social influence against which they very often struggle in vain. Such young men are usually courteous to their teachers, but they do not take them seriously. In this connection it may be said that between a residential college and a fraternity there is inevitably a serious and harmful rivalry. Each is, in social ways, trying to capture the imagination and will of the student, to lead him into certain ways of living. And in general, if the fraternity succeeds the college fails. Apart from a number of striking exceptions, it is worthy of note that among the students who have failed to respond actively to the teaching

influence of the college an unduly large proportion is found among the members of fraternities.

Still a third group is that of the able, relatively well-trained and serious students who, nevertheless, are inclined to have their freedom during the college years, to go their own way, to engage in "activities," to read according to their own interests and preoccupations rather than according to the fixed schedule which the Advisers may prescribe. Such young men vary much in ability and also in reasonableness of attitude—perhaps in clearness of perception of the kind of rebellion they are carrying on. They always, of course, trouble the minds of their Advisers who have laid down work for them to do, and there is a constant temptation to try to whip them into shape. In dealing with these students, obviously the chief task of the Adviser is to get them to see as clearly as possible the meaning of what they are doing. Undoubtedly they waste much time. But undoubtedly, also, such experiences are often necessary for youth which is shaking itself free from controls and restraints. Perhaps they do not waste as much time as do those who try to prevent them from living their own lives.

The fourth group is that of the able and well-prepared students, who in one way or another have become ready for eager coöperation with teachers and the teaching system. This does not mean that they

accept instruction with docility, but that they are untroubled in mind about teaching and so are ready to coöperate with the men who are teaching them. These are, in every respect, the good students. They appeal to teachers because many of them are already in process of becoming, in their turn, teachers. They are scholarly in interest and are physiologically, emotionally, socially, intellectually adjusted to scholarly living. They are less tantalizing than the third group and more gratifying in technical ways than the first group. Between them and their teachers there quickly develops a friendly comradeship.

It was said a moment ago that, among these four groups, it is the first for which the methods of the Experimental College seem best adapted. And in a sense this is true. Nothing is more gratifying than to see the apparently ill-trained, unpromising fellow find his way, take new courage, lose the sense of being awkward and inferior to his fellows. But in a deeper sense, the method of the college is dominated by the demand that all four of these types shall be equally regarded and cared for. The most important feature of the "personal conference" method is its flexibility, its readiness to deal with each student according to the needs of his own immediate situation. And in a democratic scheme of education this flexibility is essential. It is sometimes said that democratic

education is necessarily mass education, that the demand for equal opportunity for all inevitably leads to uniformity and mechanization of teaching procedure. But nothing could be further from the truth. For the teacher the essential principle of democracy is that of the worth and significance of the individual pupil. And from this it follows that not only each group, but each separate member of each group, shall have his own separate and distinct teaching. The young man who has been driven by family success and by social superficialities into an external and superficial view of life must be dealt with accordingly. He needs "inner" teaching, and the welfare of society demands that he be given it. To dismiss him from college as unfit is to abandon an essential task. We must learn how to teach him. So too, the young fellow who is resisting us because he has, or wants to have, purposes of his own must, in the proper sense, be taught. However far he may wander afield, however foolish he may be in action and in idea, he must be made to realize that fundamentally we accept his decisions, that we approve what he is doing. And the "good" student must also be taught. We must keep him from becoming dependent, must make him critical even of the scholarship which we use and of the ends for which we use it. In a word, we must take students as we find them, and must give to each such

friendship and such assistance as personal acquaintance enables us to devise.

There is one other group of students, the mention of which will throw light upon the teaching problem and teaching methods. Its members are found in all the four groups given above, and some of them cannot be placed in any one of these. They are the young men who, for one reason or another, are under physiological and emotional strains which interfere seriously with healthy living and successful learning. The state may vary from minor forms of laziness, moodiness, and depression down to definite and serious abnormalities of attitude and behavior. What shall be done with these students? It is now recognized that under the present conditions of American life these disturbances are to be expected at all ages and in all periods of growth. And probably the time of late adolescence is especially fruitful in them. It would seem then that any teaching scheme must be ready and equipped to deal with students classifiable in this group. In the very nature of the case the Experimental College has had more than the usual share of disturbed and more or less abnormal students. "Problem" sons have been sent to the college, and also they have wished to come because of its apparent readiness to give them the special consideration which they needed. And as a result of this a great deal of

the energy and time of the Advisers has been given to the attempt to help these students who are so especially in need of help. No layman who undertakes a psychiatric task can be very confident of his ability to do it well, but it can safely be said that the expenditure of time and energy involved seems to the Advisers fully justified both by necessity and by results.

It may perhaps serve to round out the picture which this chapter has tried to suggest if copies are given of letters written to the parents of one of the students at the close of each of the two years, together with the father's reply to the second letter and the chairman's reply to that. The young man referred to falls clearly within the third group given above. He was well trained both in home and in school and apparently had fine ability as well as a likable and well-poised disposition. He was young and very eager to have his freedom. He will probably soon make his way into the fourth group.

DEAR MR. PETERS,

The advisers of the Experimental College have asked me to send to the parents of each of our students a statement of our impressions of his activities and development during the year. We shall be glad to add to these statements or answer questions if you wish us to do so.

Tom is one of the ablest boys in his class, and his in-

tellectual interest is keen and active. His papers have been well written and well thought out, though sometimes rather slight in the amount of material gathered. His regional study of Athens was very well done. He has developed very fast during the year, has taken part in student activities, and has apparently been happy in social ways. As he matures he will do still better work, and he should have a very fruitful year in studying American life. In this he should win poise and the deepening of his interests into purposes.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

DEAR MR. PETERS,

At the close of the two years which your son has spent in the Experimental College the advisers wish me to send you (1) the official report of his credits, as determined by the quality of his Regional Study and his paper on Henry Adams, and (2) our estimate of what he has done in the college. The advisers are also very eager that you should reply to this letter, giving us your impression of the influence which the college has had upon your son. We shall welcome, not only appreciation of progress, but also suggestion and criticism of the most outspoken kind.

Tom completes the two years with a mark of "B" and ninety-five grade points. This mark does not represent his ability as judged now or in my letter of last year. The reason for this is that Tom has this year been going his own way, taking the assigned work easily, giving much

time to so-called activities and, by the way, doing very good service in these. It is of course hard for a teacher to reconcile himself to this use of freedom by a student, and yet I should be inclined to accept Tom's judgment as to the wisdom of his procedure. He is a wholly admirable fellow, and I have the greatest confidence in him.

Hoping that you will contribute to the study which the college is making by telling us what you have observed as to your son's development during these two years, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

MY DEAR DR. MEIKLEJOHN,

Your report of the 14th asks for my impression of the influence of the college on my son. Both Mrs. Peters and I feel that it has been, on the whole, very fortunate.

After the close and rigid supervision of the preparatory school, the independence and responsibility that the college fostered had a happily stimulating effect. If our boy "went his own way" it was partly because he has always been encouraged at home to do so, with due regard to the rights and wishes of others. His choice of pursuits may be criticized, like any youthful endeavors, but he evaluates his misdoings quite accurately and faces them with equanimity. On the whole, he profited much from his freedom and did little harm to himself or others, and we think his education is more complete, more "liberal," than with formalized, systematic methods. To your statement that he carried his assignments easily and did very good service

in outside activities we can add that he enjoyed it all hugely and looks to the future with eagerness.

It is impossible at this stage to estimate the after-value of the assigned and voluntary college subject-matter: Greek philosophy and drama, modern political and economic issues, and the technique of the modern drama. What we chiefly value is the strengthening of his questing spirit and the increased ability to follow methodically a given line of work. He did not lack wit, energy and persistence; what he needed and got from the college was a wider knowledge of source material and some guidance in efficient methods.

Nevertheless, we venture to make two criticisms. The first is so personal as perhaps to appear captious, but it seems justified by the fact that the college professed to give particular attention to individual circumstances. When our boy started with you he had a working knowledge of both French and Italian. Since many of the best reference works on the assigned study, the ancient Greek civilization, are in those two languages, we are sorry that he was not encouraged to maintain and perhaps increase his mastery of the two languages by that means.

The other criticism is hard to express, partly because to some extent it is self-contradictory; in some ways Tom is ahead of the usual position after two years of college, and in others ways he is behind. His attitude towards the subject-matter and his ability to cope with it is almost of graduate quality, but there are large gaps in specific information ordinarily acquired in the first two years of college. In certain important lines, such as science and

modern language, the ground has not been covered, and yet your boys have been working under conditions more nearly approximating graduate work—or at least upper-class work in honors courses—than undergraduate work as ordinarily understood and administered. That is, of course, inherent in your experiment, and in itself would not be serious if your boys were prepared to face the situation realistically and without cavil. But the fact is, Tom is finding it hard to comply with the conditions and restraints imposed by various institutions either for graduation in the regular way or for advanced work in certain subjects. Impatience with things as they are predominates for the moment over the realization that, things being as they are, numerous compliances are necessary to secure certain desirable results. Specifically, antagonism to “courses” and “requirements” is so pronounced at present as to interfere seriously with a sober choice of further college work.

It is possible, of course, that this development is peculiar to our boy, but from his frequent reference to student discussions and from our experience of normal reactions of youth we think it likely that the atmosphere and aims of the college have strongly reinforced a healthy and desirable adolescent attitude without, perhaps, stressing the complementary viewpoint. If the young radical, even the young liberal, finds the problem of personal adjustment to actual conditions so difficult as to interfere with his larger social aims, is there not danger that the serried ranks of conservatism may gain recruits even from the nurseries of light and liberalism?

We recognize these factors as of small importance compared with the eagerness and confidence, due partly to the influence of the college, that we consider essential to later success.

Very sincerely,

(Signed) SAMUEL PETERS

DEAR MR. PETERS,

May I thank you very heartily for your letter of comment on Tom's development in the college? It is, of course, very gratifying to know that in terms of total teaching effect you are pleased with the outcome. As I said in my earlier letter, one cannot help being disturbed when a fellow like Tom devotes himself so much to activities at the cost of studies. And yet I too am pleased with what he has done and with its effect upon him. One of these days he will be ready to give himself up to intellectual work, and I am sure he will find himself ready to do it exceedingly well.

I am very glad also to have your criticisms. We need all we can get of those as we try to work out our procedure.

As to the failure to carry Tom on in his language, I can only express regret. We planned, when the college opened, to do just that kind of work. It is clearly very desirable. But we have not had time or energy for it. In any proper development of our scheme such work must be given a place. On the other hand, I am not sure just how diligently Tom would have done the language work during these past two years. He could have taken language courses "on the Hill" had he chosen.

The other difficulty is, as you say, not so clear and not so easily dealt with. Quite frankly we have so much to do in the two years, and it is so out of joint with usual methods that I expect a good deal of maladjustment when the boys first go out. Our time is short, and we must do the job thoroughly rather than smoothly. On the other hand, I think you will find that Tom's impatience and unwillingness to accept actual conditions does not go very deep. He is making his protest as a young intellectual will, but I shall be much disappointed if you do not find him soon taking a reasonable and sensible attitude in matters of practical arrangements. He seemed fully capable of it as I have seen him this last year.

May I thank you again and say that I hope that we may meet for a talk one of these days? Tom has told me of an old quarrel which we have to settle about vacation rules. I should enjoy that greatly. And, also, I should like to discuss with you our whole project.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

IV

THE DETERMINING CONDITIONS

Chapter Twelve

THE HEALTH OF THE COMMUNITY

IN A famous passage in his *Idea of a University* John Henry Newman gives his judgment of the relative importance, in a teaching scheme, of the “determining conditions” of study. He says, “I protest to you, Gentlemen, that if I had to choose between a so-called university which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendence, and gave its degrees to any person who passed an examination in a wide range of subjects, and a university which had no professors or examinations at all, but merely brought a number of young men together for three or four years, and then sent them away, as the University of Oxford is said to have done some sixty years since, if I were asked which of these two methods was the better discipline of the intellect—mind, I do not say which is *morally* the better, for it is plain that compulsory study must be a good and idleness an intolerable mischief—but if I must determine which of the two

courses was the more successful in training, moulding, enlarging the mind, which sent out men the more fitted for their secular duties, which produced better public men, men of the world, men whose names would descend to posterity, I have no hesitation in giving the preference to that university which did nothing, over that which exacted of its members an acquaintance with every science under the sun." And a little later in the same discourse he adds, "How is this to be explained? I suppose as follows: When a multitude of young men, keen, open-hearted, sympathetic, and observant, as young men are, come together and freely mix with one another, even if there be no one to teach them, the conversation of all is a series of lectures to each, and they gain for themselves new ideas and views, fresh matter of thought, and distinct principles for judging and acting, day by day." And again, a few lines later, he says, "Let it be clearly understood, I repeat it, that I am not taking into account moral or religious considerations: I am but saying that that youthful community will constitute a whole, it will embody a specific idea, it will represent a doctrine, it will administer a code of conduct, and it will furnish principles of thought and action. It will give birth to a living teaching, which in the course of time will take the shape of a self-perpetuating tradition, or a genius loci, as it is some-

times called, which haunts the home where it has been born, and which imbues and forms, more or less, and one by one, every individual who is successively brought under its shadow.”¹

Now if Newman is right—as one can hardly doubt that he is—then this Report has reserved to the last a phase of the educational problem which is at least as important as those already considered. It has dealt with the course of study and the methods of teaching. We must now take up what has happened in the attempt to form such a community, to establish such a set of social influences as Newman finds so important in its effect upon the intellectual development of a group of students. What then shall we say of the “determining conditions” of freshman and sophomore study as illustrated by the experience of the Experimental College?

The “preliminary hypothesis” of the Advisers at this point was that conditions of residence and association should be so arranged that intellectual and social relations would fuse together—that Advisers and students would become a closely-knit intellectual community. It was hoped that the cleavage between “studies” and “activities,” so common in undergraduate life might be broken down so that books and their meanings might be given drive and zest by the

¹ *Idea of a University*, Discourse VI.

liveliness of undergraduate loyalty, while, on the other hand, the "activities" would be deepened and refined and enlightened by active forces of appreciation and intelligence. The intention was that young men should learn to play as if they were intelligent and responsible human beings and should learn to work as if they were free and joyous comrades in a thrilling enterprise.

To this end it was arranged that all the students should live in the same dormitory, rooming side by side and eating in the same refectory. And further, the Advisers were given offices or studies in the same building. At first only a part of the dormitory was reserved for the college but it was hoped that in the second year the whole building might be taken over so that the community might feel that it had a home of its own.

The record of the experience of the college in this field is, on the external side, one of constant and rather bitter disappointment. As noted elsewhere, the hope of taking over the whole building was not realized. The group has not, therefore, been separated off as a complete residential unit. And the building itself, planned before the college had been thought of, has proved sadly unsuited to the making of an intellectual community. Apart from a very restricted use of one of the dining-rooms in the refectory, there has

been no common place in which the college could assemble in social ways. Even for purposes of class and college meetings we have had no room of our own, but only a classroom, or at times two of these, loaned with great kindness by the College of Agriculture, but nevertheless as little suited to the intention of the college as rooms could possibly be. One may fairly say that, so far as building arrangements are concerned, the preliminary hypothesis has hardly been tested at all.

And the situation with regard to the surrounding community has been equally unfortunate. The college was from the beginning involved in strains and conflicts which were destructive of its own healthy and normal social development. During the first two years its presence on the campus was keenly resented by many students, by members of the faculty and by administrative officers. And from this feeling there developed much misguided and destructive controversy. The "freedom" inherent in the teaching method of the college was seen in vivid contrast to various requirements imposed upon other students and was sharply criticized. As will be more fully described in Chapter XVII, the college was felt to be "queer," to be critical of the university which had established it, to be hostile to the loyalties and traditions of the university community; and this supposed

hostility was repaid in kind. Beginning with the second year, there were constant rumors that the experiment would soon be abandoned, the number of students from Wisconsin dropped in two years from forty-five to eleven. More and more the group became outsiders and aliens, and the college itself an invasion to be tolerated only so long as might be necessary. In a word, the external situation was such as to make practically impossible the task of establishing a happy and well-poised group life. These statements are not made in a spirit of faultfinding against the surrounding community. In any such difficult situation mistakes are made on both sides, and it would be idle to attempt here to determine their distribution. The facts are given only because they are essential for an understanding of the conditions under which the "preliminary hypothesis" has been applied or not applied, tested or not tested. They are given as materials significant for an investigation.

But there have been also serious difficulties within the group itself, increased by outside pressures, but yet existent and active quite apart from those pressures. It was quickly, and not surprisingly, evident that the students who came to the college were markedly individualistic, that they would strongly resist influences working toward group solidarity. And again, certain cleavages quickly appeared, cut-

ting across the student body and dividing it into parts which were uninterested in each other and, at times, definitely uncongenial. It may be worth while to explain each of these difficulties briefly. The "cleavage" situation will be considered first.

Along three lines, the college body quickly suffered separation. First there was the break between fraternity and non-fraternity men. The fraternity men went actively into the life of small social groups in the outer university; they found there loyalties of an intimate and compelling sort; in many cases, the fraternity house became their home rather than the college dormitory. But to other students, to join a fraternity seemed to mean a departing from the college or at least a serious dividing of one's loyalty. These men, being invited to join a fraternity, refused the invitation or, not being asked, recognized the fact that they were different from their fellows who had established such connections. A second cleavage was that between "radicals" and "conservatives." In the college group, the greater portion were, as in any assemblage of young Americans, of the conservative type. But the minority of "radicals" was undoubtedly larger than is usual in such groups. Many of the students came from homes and social surroundings where poverty or free discussion or both had aroused active rebellion against existing institutions. For a

time the college had a very active group of communists in its midst. Between these radicals and their fellows there were the customary difficulties of understanding, accentuated perhaps by the constancy and closeness of their association. Still a third division was racial, that between Jews and Gentiles. The percentage of Jews was, quite naturally, unusually large, and it has tended to increase. And further, Jews and their Gentile confrères came to the college life with all the customary prejudices, fears, hostilities which this cleavage brings. It was not to be expected that they would easily fuse together into membership in a common college family.

As between the first of these cleavages and the other two, the experience of the college has been widely different. The separation between fraternity and non-fraternity, slight at first, has rather widened than narrowed with the passing of time. Fewer students with fraternity inclinations have entered the college, and the disposition not to join has apparently also strengthened. The proportion of fraternity membership has diminished until now, at the beginning of the year 1931-32, only eight students out of sixty-six are fraternity members. In the other two cases, however, there has been definite and gratifying success in breaking down separation and establishing acquaintance. Radicals and conservatives have come to

see one another more clearly, and they talk and study and play together untroubled by imagined barriers. One can even see students shifting from one side of the line to the other, and then back again, and accepting the transitions as natural experiences for persons engaged in the business of liberal education. And this being true, the words "radical" and "conservative" have lost their sting; they express important differences of ideas, but they no longer smack of personal and social antagonism. And in like manner, the relations of Jews and Gentiles have slowly but very steadily and very greatly improved. In fact, it is amazing to see how completely the distinction is lost from sight. When people know one another in common terms the difference between Jew and Gentile becomes no different from that between English and Scotch, Italian and German. It is enlightening for Gentile young men to discover, not by being told but by actual contact, that Jews are like other people. They are bright or dull, industrious or lazy, gay or sober, generous or selfish, just as their fellows are. The only difference they seem to have from others is that they are thought to be different and that they suffer the consequences of being so interpreted. We have spoken of this as a gratifying result. And surely, from the point of view of education, the statement is justified. Nothing can be more typical of education

gone mad or gone astray than a teaching which instructs pupils with regard to the races of men, which studies human nature scientifically and yet leaves both teachers and pupils filled with the prejudices and the meannesses of racial antipathies. When ideas and attitudes can be joined together in so external a way as that one need have no hesitation in declaring the ideas dead, the education ineffectual.

The interference of "individualism" with the unification of the college community has taken many amusing as well as serious forms. It made its first appearance a few weeks after the college opened. The students were invited to form an organization of their own to take charge of their common interests and to deal with the Advisers and any other groups with whom they might have relations. For a month or more they debated plans of organization with great inventiveness in devising schemes of action and in suggesting improvements of those already invented. And in the end they decided not to organize at all. They seemed to prefer not to recognize any common business or, if it should be forced upon them, to deal with it only as each specific occasion might call forth its appropriate response. From this beginning slow progress has been made in external organization. A council was finally established to deal, first of all, with the vacation problem. But in spite of valiant

efforts it never succeeded in doing so. Later the council has acquired more influence. It is now fairly active in directing the social life, but its chief activity has been that of bringing in outside lecturers and arranging meetings with them. In times of emergency, however, when library books have been missing or when money was needed for special purposes, it has shown itself capable of vigorous action.

We have spoken so far of the external side of the college community—of its organization and activities. Here, as we have said, the story is one of difficult and slight achievement. On the inner side, however, a different picture can be drawn. Newman, in the passage quoted, speaks of “a living teaching, which in course of time will take the shape of a self-perpetuating tradition, or a *genius loci*, as it is sometimes called, which haunts the home where it has been born, and which imbues and forms, more or less, and one by one, every individual who is brought under its shadow.” Now in this sense there can be no doubt that the Experimental College has had a decided effect upon its pupils. They are very keenly aware of being members of the college; they think of themselves in terms of it. Their education is for them something distinctive which marks them off as a group from others who are having a different education. And the important point is that the difference

which arouses their interest is an intellectual one. They think of the community to which they belong, not in the ordinary social terms of this or that "activity," but in terms of a kind of studying, a content of understanding, an intellectual method of approach. And so far as this is true it means that the attempt to fuse together the intellectual and the social has succeeded. The college has become, in the minds of its students, an intellectual community. This does not mean that all the students devote themselves with full vigor to their studies. It does mean that they measure themselves and their fellows, their successes and their failures, in terms of the values toward which studies are directed.

And with this statement made, it may now be permissible to touch with brighter colors the picture which was so darkly painted in the early part of the chapter. One of the best ways to do this would be to refer the reader to the Year Book which was published by the first class at the end of the college's first year. One will get there the sense of a community which has been actively engaged in the giving of Greek and American plays, in the arranging of lectures and discussions, in the carrying on of discussion and study clubs in law, science, art, philosophy, medicine, politics, in the management of a work-

shop, in painting, modeling, and other forms of expression in writing and criticism. These activities have not been carried on regularly. They have risen up and died down. But two things can fairly be said about them. At many points they have achieved quite remarkable quality. For example, the Greek plays were as student performances surprisingly successful. And further, taken all together, they have expressed in social forms a very lively and creative interest in the values of intelligence and appreciation. With proper facilities, indefinitely more could have been done. But even as conditions have been one may say that, within itself, in relation to its own values, the college has become a genuine community.

A question with regard to "determining conditions" has often been raised among the Advisers. "If we were starting again, under conditions as we now know them, would we again insist upon the requirement of dormitory residence; is the preliminary hypothesis sustained at this point?" And the discussion of the Advisers would seem to indicate that, if another beginning were made in the same external situation, they would prefer to give up the dormitory arrangement. Especially would this be true if they were able to substitute for it central meeting-rooms adequate for their purpose, with offices and

studies and library so related as to serve as proper headquarters for an intellectual community. But if this decision were made, it is certain that it would be made reluctantly. It could be made only on the ground that present dormitory accommodations, not being planned for the purposes of the college, are quite unsuited to it. If, however, it were possible to build a dormitory with the scheme of instruction in mind, if these two sets of educational arrangements could be planned and executed from a common point of view, there can be no doubt as to what the preference of the Advisers would be. One of the most urgent needs of the American college—one might almost say “a desperately urgent need”—is that of fusing together the intellectual and social activities of the students. And to this end no method seems more promising than that of bringing together into a residential unit teachers and students who are engaged in the same intellectual enterprise. It is essential that American students know each other intellectually and that they know their teachers personally. No external educational influence is so powerful in the molding of a young man as membership in a group which, commanding his interest and his admiration, becomes for him a way of living. And to this end, it will not do, as is so commonly ar-

ranged in the newer dormitory schemes which are now being established, to bring together students from different fields and different departments. In the activities of liberal education the different tastes, capacities, trainings, backgrounds, expectations, give quite enough of variety. What is needed is that the community find its life centering about a common course of study, a common set of problems, a common human situation. The effect of this is to give to the casual conversation, the easy association of students, an educational value which is wholly lost if one's dormitory friends or fraternity house mates are studying in different fields. If one member of a group is studying physics and another art and another economics, then it follows almost inevitably that neither physics nor art nor economics will be easily talked about. The group must search for matters of common interest outside the field of studies altogether. The studies become private and socially uninteresting pieces of work. But if the whole group is engaged in the same attempt at learning, then every aspect of the social living becomes steeped in the common purpose. Men breathe it in, eat it in, play it in, smoke it in, study it in, laugh it in, discuss it in, until education becomes what it ought to be—not a set of imposed, demanded, external tasks, but a form of

human living and association, the natural and inevitable growth of a healthy organism in a congenial environment. The possibilities of this kind of educational influence no one of our liberal colleges seems yet to have explored.

Chapter Thirteen

THE HEALTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT

THROUGHOUT this report we have spoken of the purpose of the lower college as that of establishing young men in a special mode of behavior. We have wished to get them so habituated, so disposed toward the use of books that it would become for them the natural and customary form of their thinking. Our chosen and recommended way of life is that of intelligence by reading, by acquaintance with the best human minds as they are recorded in literature. But there is one fundamental fear by which any such program must be beset. It is the fear that, for the individual student, the mode of life which we recommend is not healthful, that it is exceedingly costly in terms of physiological and emotional and volitional well-being. If one might personify Nature, as we sometimes do, the question may be expressed in the words, "Does Nature intend that a young man

between eighteen and twenty should live the life of study; has she made him and equipped him with such an end in view?" We may well believe that the general demands of social welfare require that education shall be carried on whatever the cost to the individual. And yet it is idle and heedless to plunge into the enterprise without surveying our human material, without estimating its fitness for the uses which we intend to make of it, without calculating our effects upon the individual lives which social arrangements are presumed to serve. It is possible—if one may take the risk of seeming to give aid and comfort to the enemy—that the reluctance with which youth responds to the summons of the teacher has its hidden sources in a fundamentally sane protest against the attempt to distort human nature into forms which it is not fitted to assume.

Now this fear, in its extreme form, would lead to two extreme suggestions with regard to our processes of learning and teaching. It might well be maintained that, taking the long biological view, men are going too fast and too far in their language activities. The use of books, of written symbols and the ideas which these make possible, is a relatively recent human invention. And with it there has come an enormous and ever-accelerating transformation of the modes of human living. The little marks which

men make on paper are so rapidly changing the forms and conditions of life that there is serious question whether the physiological organism out of which the making of those marks came can stand the strains which their effects produce. It may well prove true that biologically the use of books is a disease which is fatal in its consequences. Or, if one does not go so far as that, at least it must be said that the thinking process is artificial, a highly sophisticated kind of activity imposed upon a living form which had long been trained and adjusted to other kinds of activity.

If this first suggestion were seriously maintained it might lead one to attempt to escape from the domination of the thinking process, to get back to simpler and less complicated forms of behavior. And if this plan were followed it would of course profoundly modify our systems of teaching. If we were planning for a society in which books should play a smaller part, then we should have little use for them in the training of young people for healthy and successful living. But to most of us the suggestion here made would now seem even more artificial than the mode of life which it criticizes. For better or for worse, we seem committed to the ways of thinking, of verbal and symbolic intelligence, as characteristic forms of human behavior. Having begun to think, we must think our way through. There is no turning back.

We must do our best with it and take the consequences.

The second suggestion, however, expresses the same fear in a milder form. Admitting that men must verbalize their living it asks that the process be, for the individual, delayed, that it be not thrust upon people so early in their youth. Civilization, it is true, cannot be carried on successfully unless men express it in words, unless they understand it, control it by means of ideas. But would it not be possible to give that work over to older men and women? Might we not, with Plato, assign the tasks of intellectual understanding to those who, having been through most of the processes of life, are now equipped both positively and negatively for the coolness and detachment of intellectual abstractions? If this were done, then people while young might go into the experiences of individual and social relations far more heedlessly, with more easy adjustment, with more uncritical and joyous abandon, than they do at present. In their youth they would live normally and happily, and then, when the fires had died down, they would plan living for those who are coming after them. In that case teachers would not be trying to get them, between eighteen and twenty, to build a "scheme of reference" by means of which to interpret a human world of which, practically speak-

ing, they know nothing. But now again, whatever its long-time value for human institutions, this suggestion can have little effect upon immediate teaching arrangements. It depends upon the hope that younger people would be willing, or could be trained, to accept life happily in just the forms which their elders have given it. But in a rapidly changing society such as ours, this hope is idle. If the elders could stop devising and planning, the younger people might stop it too. We little realize how ardently our children are expressing their loyalty to us when they find fault with the provisions which we have made for them by our ingenuities and cleverness. If society were stable, then youth, and with it education, might escape the fever of thinking. But a generation which has spent its effort in clever and ingenious transformation of the human world must expect that its children will, with like cleverness and ingenuity, try to change what it has done. They are too deeply loyal to fail us in that. There is, therefore, no hope that in such a society as ours, young people will find a peaceful, a non-intellectual adjustment in the world which we have made for them. That world drives them on to study, to the use of books, however little it may have equipped them for it. They must go through with the business of understanding, whatever the cost. And we who are their teachers must

guide, must lure them on into those activities of intelligence and appreciation upon which the welfare of the modern world so clearly depends.

And yet, the fears of which we have spoken have a basis in fact. And the teacher, or the scheme of education, which ignores them will do so at the peril of the whole enterprise. One takes a hundred or two hundred lusty, vigorous, young men, lodges them in a dormitory, assigns them books to read and papers to write—and then what does one expect? One may, of course, ignore everything in the situation except the lessons. One may limit one's activity to insisting that the tasks be done. But to do that is not to teach in any proper sense of the term. One might as well try, by means of precept and formula, to teach a mountain brook to flow uphill. The plain fact is that in the life of a young man of eighteen or twenty there are tremendous forces at work; his mind, his spirit, is a battleground of conflicting influences; he is driven here and there by impulses within and forces without. His primary task, on its subjective side, is to learn what those impulses and forces are, so that out of them he may make the pattern of his life. And the chief task of the teacher is to help him in the making of that pattern.

Now in view of what has just been said, the Advisers have been trying for five years to discover what

conditions are needed in a college to make it, so far as possible, a healthful place for young men who are engaged in study. And it must be said that they have little success to report. They are very clear in their acceptance of the principle already stated that each student must be dealt with separately and with a view to the peculiar conditions within and without which are acting upon him. But there is a further question. Are there not general arrangements which can be made in view of common factors in the experience of all the students? Is it not possible to find some suggestions at least as to ways in which the life of a student community might, to the advantage of its members, be enriched and directed?

On November 10, 1930, that is, early in the fourth year of the college, a committee of the Advisers presented a report on the problem just suggested. One of its first paragraphs reads as follows:

“A part of our task, as it was outlined in the original program of the college was to investigate ‘the determining conditions of undergraduate instruction.’ This problem we have hardly touched. Experiment with the conditions of student life is for us made particularly difficult, partly because of our lack of a proper dormitory and headquarters building, and partly because our boys are living under the control of Dormitory Fellows who owe allegiance to the

Dormitory Committee, over which we have no control. Possibly we can do very little to influence conditions because of the difficulties mentioned, but this committee believes we should make a good try."

In the further sections of the report and in the discussions which followed a number of observations and considerations came to view.

It seemed clear to all the Advisers that, in the words of the committee, "One of the determining conditions of undergraduate instruction is the emotional state of the student." And further, there are, in addition to the disturbing conditions of dormitory life, two sets of influences which contribute strongly to emotional instability. These are, first, the strains and stresses of sexual development, and second, the confusions, uncertainties, and readjustments incidental to an intellectual criticism of a social order to which one belongs. In the face of the first of these the Advisers have found themselves largely helpless. Each year they have provided talks and discussions on matters of sex, and individually they have done what they could to make student minds clear and unfrightened with regard to the values and dangers there involved. But their one certain conclusion is that of the need of more expert guidance and assistance in dealing with the situation. The second difficulty is that to which the opening paragraphs of this

chapter have referred. It appears in the statement that, for a young man just reaching maturity, the experiences of liberal education are profoundly disturbing. If one adds to the burden of approaching responsibility the sense of insecurity which comes as a pupil examines the human enterprise, as he questions the customary formulations of its values and beliefs, as he challenges its institutions, as he becomes aware of the physical, physiological, economic, social forces which drive men about in apparent helplessness, as he finds the modes of life, the convictions of his parents and friends, open to question and doubt, the emotional strain upon a sensitive and loyal person may become almost unbearable. And in so tense a situation as this, emotional difficulties of every sort may and do arise. At times it seems as if one could measure the success of the intellectual enterprise by seeing how far the sense of futility and uncertainty in the face of life has forced itself upon the spirit of the pupil. And in the presence of this difficulty the Advisers have had many searchings of heart. Are we not trying to go too fast? Would it not be better to let students learn lessons mechanically without probing too deeply into what they mean? Is not the strain of utter freedom together with the clarification of personal responsibility too great? Would it not be better to limit freedom, to reserve for the teachers

more authority, more discipline? Would it not be safer and more prudent to extol the merits of an established scheme of human behavior and to keep young people back from questioning and studying it too deeply? And as one meets so genuine a question as this it will not do to be too dogmatic. It may be that the prudent way would be better. Certainly very many parents would be tempted by their affection to take this view. And yet, in our actual human situation, the interests, both of the individual and of society, seem to make the other way imperative. Our youth will be quite unfitted for the tasks which they must undertake unless they can fight their way through these strains, can win the power which is evidenced by conquering them. Knowingly or not we have made for our youth a world of which these strains are an inevitable part. Our social scheme simply cannot be made to run unless there is constantly flooding into it a stream of clear-headed, critical, responsibility-taking young people who can see its principles and its problems and so can deal with it intelligently. We have not given them an easy task; perhaps it will be too heavy for them. But they must face the music. And we must find ways of getting them ready, of giving them courage for the work which it is theirs to do.

But now again the immediate teaching problem

presents itself. Granted that the life of study is beset by strains and difficulties, what can be done to so adjust the arrangements of a student community that life in it shall be healthful and successful? Many scattered suggestions have appealed to the Advisers. It is clear that there should be wise and generous provision for recreation and that in this field the two sexes should meet in natural and happy association. It seems clear also that arrangement should be made for many activities outside the field of study in the limited sense. Work in the arts and crafts is especially promising at this point. One of the most successful arrangements which the college has made was the bringing in for several months of a resident artist, Morris Topchevsky, who established a studio in one of the "dens" so that students might go to share with him at any time the activities of drawing, painting, modeling and the like. The plays, too, have been of the greatest social value, quite apart from their narrower educational importance. At times nearly half of the students have been busy in the carrying on of these plays, taking charge of every feature, sometimes from the writing of the play through every detail of costume and production to the actual presentation itself. There have been also many attempts at various kinds of clubs. The Advisers and the students' council have carried on social affairs, some-

times in the "dens," sometimes in faculty homes, sometimes in the halls of the refectory. It has often been suggested that a regular schedule of work with one's hands might be a healthful diversion from the work of study. To this end, laboratory practice might run through the year. It is even possible that every student should be expected to work two or three hours every day at some useful employment. This arrangement would have the double advantage of giving physical and mental change and also of providing acquaintance with important phases of human living. These and many other like devices have been considered, but, as yet, they fall far short of constituting a working program. The plain fact seems to be that thus far our colleges and universities have dealt with "determining conditions" chiefly in a negative way. They have tried to control, but they have done little to direct and build up and inspire the undergraduate community.

The most important action of the Advisers in relation to this problem was, first, to confess their own bewilderment and, second, to ask for expert advice. Over and over again they have been given valuable aid and council by Dr. Lorenz, the university psychiatrist. And in 1931, after considering the report above mentioned, they were able to bring to the college for about two weeks Dr. Frankwood Williams,

a graduate of the university who, as a psychiatrist, has had special interest in the problems of students. Dr. Williams lived in the dormitory among the students during his stay here, entered into the most informal and friendly relations with them, studied the Advisers' reports, held many conferences with separate Advisers and with the whole group.

For comments of Dr. Williams on the questions raised in this chapter see Appendix II.

V

*A SUGGESTION FOR THE COLLEGE OF
LETTERS AND SCIENCE*

Chapter Fourteen

A POSSIBLE ORGANIZATION OF THE LOWER COLLEGE

THIS report has now considered all the matters which were referred by the university to the Advisers. It is time that it give such recommendations as the Advisers have been able to draw from their experience. It must suggest the next step or steps which the university may take if it wishes to go on in the work of experimental inquiry. It must also advise as to whether or not experimentation should be continued.

Before these recommendations are given, however, it seems advisable to speak of two sets of observations and suggestions which have been, as it were, thrust upon the Advisers in the course of their study. These are not matters assigned to the college for investigation, but in the nature of the case they cannot be ignored by anyone who deals with the problems which the college has considered. The first set of observations has to do with a possible form of organ-

ization for the College of Letters and Science, or at least for that freshman-sophomore part of it which we have called the "lower college." The second is concerned with the wisdom or folly of attempting to carry on experimentation in a university, and especially in a state university. The present chapter will deal with the first of these topics. The three chapters of Part VI will then describe situations which inevitably appear if a university undertakes experimentation. And finally, in the last chapter, the report will try to sum up its results and to present its recommendations.

The observations with regard to a possible reorganization of the lower half of the College of Letters and Science are four in number. It will be quickly seen that they are really four different phases of a single point of view.

(1) Student social life and student education might profit greatly if the thirty-six hundred freshmen and sophomores in the College of Letters and Science were divided into fifteen or twenty smaller colleges, each with its own social organization and social interests.

(2) There would be very great gain if the teachers of the lower college could act, not only as one body, but also as fifteen or twenty smaller faculties, each considering the educational problem as a whole, each

working out its own aims and methods in relative independence.

(3) The experience of the Experimental College suggests a way in which college teachers might, much more satisfactorily than at present, be trained for the art of teaching.

(4) It seems clear that the cost of teaching in smaller units, and along lines analogous to those followed by the Experimental College, would not, other things being equal, be greater than that of the present system.

If we explain each of these statements in turn, the outlines of a working plan will begin to appear.

(I) THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COMMUNITY

As one looks, with a teacher's eye, at the undergraduate life of a state university, nothing is more terrifying than its lack of focus. It is not the life of a group or of a community, but rather that of a collection, a conglomerate of individuals. But if that is true, then we are losing, in very large measure, the educational value which, as was seen in an earlier chapter, John Henry Newman regards as basic in all liberal education. The sense of the group to which one belongs, the stirring of its loyalties, the sharing in its creation and support, the enthusiasm of its pur-

poses and its comradeships—these are the stuff out of which the deepest and most vital education is made. But under the social conditions of life in a state university, these values are very largely lost. The students live as scattered individuals, or in accidental and relatively meaningless groups, or in the sorority or fraternity assemblages which are, as such, unrelated or even hostile to the educational purposes of a college. The total effect is—to borrow a phrase from the University Committee of 1924-25—that of a “huge, heterogeneous mass of students and faculty.” Individually, the institution has many eager spirits, young and old, but there is no focus, no unity, no sense of dominating meaning and purpose and fellowship which might give to intellectual endeavors their proper rounding out into a scheme of rich and happy living.

Now the experience of the Experimental College, fragmentary and blocked as it has been at this point, warrants the suggestion that the needed focus for social and intellectual life might be gained by dividing the lower college into a number of smaller colleges, socially manageable in size. The effect of this policy would be to seize upon the undoubted power and influence of fraternity organization, and to use it in direct contribution to the purposes of the teaching

process. If this were done, two results would follow. First, every member of the lower college would be, as it were, a member of a fraternity or sorority. The present brutal separation of "ins" and "outs" would disappear. Second, the fraternity or sorority, the social unit of the university life, would become a college, a group defined along intellectual lines, organized and conducted with reference to the essential aims of an institution of learning. There are many obstacles in the way of carrying out such a program as this. With the present arrangements of boarding-houses, dormitories, fraternity and sorority houses standing in the way, progress toward its realization would of necessity be slow and difficult. And yet it seems clear that some such venture should be under way, that progress should be made in it as rapidly as other commitments allow. Fifteen or twenty groups of students and teachers, living and working side by side in friendly rivalries and coöperations, might give to an American university what it most sorely needs—a social scheme adapted and adjusted to its teaching aims. Intellectual and social activities might so fuse together that, for practical purposes, one would find no difference between them. In so far as we fall short of that state we fail in the proper social organization of a college community.

(2) THE SMALL FACULTY

We have said that for educational purposes it is desirable that student groups be small. It seems even more important for the same purposes that the teaching groups, the faculties, be small. The chief tragedy of the piling up of "huge, heterogeneous masses of students and faculty" lies not in the unmanageableness of the student body, serious as that is, but in the unmanageableness of the faculty, with its hundreds or thousands of teachers. Now at this point the experience of the Advisers in the Experimental College provides a suggestion which seems well worthy of consideration. The Advisers have found themselves in a working group so small that every member has been able to have, in some measure, intellectual as well as personal acquaintance with his colleagues. Each has known what teaching the others were doing and has shared in the planning and doing of it. The teacher of literature has discussed with the teacher of science how science shall be taught, what books shall be read, what talks shall be given. He has attended the lectures of his colleagues, and has discussed them with his students. And the same relationship has held true between every other pair of subjects which might be mentioned. The effect of this has been to make of the teaching program not a collection of separate

activities, but a concerted attempt at definite and unified action. And its effect upon the teacher has been to demand of him that he be not merely a specialized scholar, attending to his own field without regard to what is going on in any other, but a liberally-minded man who is concerned with the making and administering of the total education which the students are receiving. No one can doubt that the achievement of this end is costly in other directions. It is too much to expect of fate that we should get the greatest values without paying for them in the currency of lesser values. But on the other hand, if one really cares for the aims of liberal education, the building up of such a liberal outlook and experience among its teachers is greater than any other interest with which a college may be concerned. We cannot give liberal education unless the scheme of teaching which attempts it is liberally conceived. It need hardly be explained that, in saying this, one is speaking not of the personal qualities of the teachers themselves, but of the influence of the scheme of organization under which they do their work.

The suggestion, then, which arises out of, or is confirmed by, the experience of the Experimental College is that the general faculty should act, not only as a single body, but also in fifteen or twenty separate

faculties. Each of these faculties would, under general limitations, have responsibility for its own group of students. Each would devise its own course of study and its own methods of teaching. The different faculties would be, of course, in relations of conference and comparison of methods and results, and their differences would be of immense value in giving suggestion and correction to all concerned. But the essential gain would be that within each group the scheme of instruction would be unified and coherent. It would be an immediate, living expression of a small group of men sufficiently close together to be one in purpose and understanding in the midst of all their differences. For the accomplishing of this purpose it would be necessary to keep a proper balance between two sets of values. First, the faculty must be large enough to give proper representation to different lines of study and research. Literature must have its devotees, and philosophy and science, and the social studies as well. And within each of these fields also there are separate interests, separate lines of understanding, of which account must be taken in a scheme of liberal education. But on the other hand, the group must not be so large as to exceed the limits of easy and informal intellectual acquaintance throughout its membership. It must be a body so unified that all its parts are dealing intelligently with every phase of its ac-

tivity. For the purposes of this balance, the lower limit of eight members which the Experimental College has reached in the present year is too small. The upper limit of eighteen, reached in the second year, is under our conditions about as high as we should care to go. But in such a matter no one may dare to be too dogmatic. Somewhere between ten and twenty one would probably find the most efficient group for the planning and administering of a scheme of liberal study. One would like to see what would be the educational effect if the "lower college" at Wisconsin were divided into fifteen or twenty colleges. The transformation would not be easily made, and yet, as one dwells upon them, the social and intellectual advantages seem so great as to make the plan worthy of careful consideration.

(3) THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS

The third suggestion is that if small, coherent faculties were established they might serve as training-camps for young men and women who are preparing to do college teaching. Everyone knows that at present there are no arrangements for the training of college teachers. Our future professors are rigorously prepared for the activities of scholarship. We demand and require that they "know their subjects." But we do not demand that they understand or master the

teaching process, that they know what students need and how their needs can be supplied. And it is obvious that, for the purposes of democratic and liberal education, this state of affairs is quite intolerable. The activities of liberal teaching must be brought up to the level of an intelligently directed social activity.

Now again, and this time rather by chance than by planning, the Experimental College has hit upon a way in which young teachers might be prepared for their careers. Chiefly for financial reasons we were forced to take into the faculty a number of young men in their first or second or third years out of college. These men were given the full assignment of individual and group conferences. They had less than the usual share of leading the larger meetings. They found themselves, however, accepted as members of the teaching group in full standing. They shared in all discussions and decisions upon teaching aim, teaching methods, teaching conditions. And the results of the arrangement have been surprisingly satisfactory. On the one side, these young teachers have done the tutorial work exceedingly well. They have been able to establish sympathetic understanding with freshmen and sophomores and have exerted powerful teaching influence over them. And, on the other hand, they have themselves received valuable training. If they are planning to be college teachers, there

lies before them the double career of scholarship and teaching. It is fair to presume that during the last two years of their undergraduate course they were specializing in some major field. And there are still before them two or three or four years of specialized study on the graduate level. Now from every point of view it would seem to be good training for these young scholar-teachers to devote two or three years between the two "study" periods to association with a group of older men from many departments who are carrying on a common enterprise of instruction. The early teaching responsibility seems to be valuable for them; so too is the close association with older men who are trying to make the many fields of knowledge into one; and the getting of a proper sense of the human opportunities and responsibilities inherent in the life of the teacher is of paramount importance. As one makes this statement one is not saying that all these values have been, in full measure, gained by the young men who have taught in the Experimental College. One is only saying that the experience of the college offers a suggestion which might profitably be followed out.

(4) THE COST OF INSTRUCTION

If the question is asked, "Does individual instruction cost more than class instruction?" it never fails

to find a ready answer waiting for it. The answer is, "Of course; to teach one student at a time must be more expensive than to teach twenty or fifty or five hundred at a time; how could it be otherwise?" As one hears this question and this answer constantly repeated, one is reminded of the traditional Aristotelian physics which Galileo is said to have utterly destroyed when he used the Leaning Tower of Pisa for purposes of experimental observation. The question involved on that occasion was, "Do heavier bodies fall more quickly than lighter ones?" And the old answer had been, "Of course; bodies fall because they are heavy; hence, the heavier they are the faster they fall. Q. E. D." Now it has been the delight of the modern followers of Galileo to tell how neatly and how irrevocably, at one stroke, he destroyed the old methods of thinking. Never again, we are told, has it been reputable to settle a question of fact by saying, "Of course." "One must go to the facts themselves, must let them speak for themselves. How could it be otherwise? Of course!"

Now the question of relative costs is one of fact and must be settled as such. But the difficulty is that the facts are very complicated. One can find many schemes of class instruction which are more expensive than many schemes of individual teaching, and the same is true in the other direction. And this brings

us to the observation once made by Immanuel Kant that Galileo allowed the facts to speak to him only after he had spoken to them. He did not take them just as they came, in clumps and in vast confusion. He took command of the facts, told them just what it was he wanted to know, and they thereupon gave him the answer to his question. Now the moral of these disquisitions upon the life and work of Galileo Galilei is that since the facts relating to university costs are so clumpish and confused, it will not do to be Aristotelian in dealing with them. We must be very careful to determine just what are and what are not the facts relevant to our question; and especially we must not say, "Of course."

If, then, we strip the question of its confusing details, get it ready for association with the stark facts which are its proper mates, we shall find in the measuring of costs of instruction for any given group of students two major determining factors. These are, first, the number of teachers required, and second, the amount of salary paid to each teacher. There will be involved in any scheme of teaching many other costs than these, and to some extent these other costs will vary with the nature of the teaching methods followed. There are charges for administration, for buildings, for supplies and equipment, for assistance of various kinds. And a complete study of any one

situation would follow each of these in its windings and variations. But for the present inquiry these facts do not seem relevant. What we want to know is whether, other things being equal, teaching in classes is more or less costly than teaching by individual conference. Our comparison has to do, not with the costs of buildings or of equipments, but simply and solely with that of teaching. To put the matter very simply, the question would be, "If you have a fixed number of students to teach, and if two different systems of teaching are tried, in which of the two will the salary total of the teachers be greater?"

But again, even this statement of the question is too clumpish for experimental purposes. In the salary total there are, as we have seen, two factors—first, the number of teachers, and second, the specific amounts paid to the different teachers. And this combination of two variables is still too complicated for the methods of Galileo. Can we not eliminate one of the two factors? Fortunately, there is no reason why just that cannot be done. It is clear that differences of individual salaries are not relevant to our question. As one compares individual and class teaching there is no reason whatever why the two systems should differ in the amounts paid to individual teachers. Salaries may be high or low under a class system, high or low under a tutorial system. For the purposes

of our study we may assume, therefore, that in the two systems of teaching which we are comparing the salary scale is the same. And the effect of this assumption is to eliminate one of our variables—differences of salary. We are left, then, with only the other factor to consider—the number of teachers. And the question now takes its simplest form. “How many teachers are needed to take charge of a given number of students; does the class method or the tutorial method require the greater number of teachers? If, for example, one has 100 or 1,000 or 10,000 students to instruct, what will be the number of the faculty under the class method and what the number under the tutorial method?”

Now with the issue thus simplified one might hope that the facts would prove amenable to reason, that they would speak clearly and decisively in answer to our question. It would be especially fortunate if we could, as it were, find our Leaning Tower within the university itself. We should like to compare the ratio of teachers to students in the Experimental College with the corresponding ratio in the freshman and sophomore years of the College of Letters and Science, or with the ratio in that college as a whole, or even with that of the university in general. But for a multitude of reasons these comparisons are hard to make with accuracy. If lists of teachers in the Experimental

College and in the university are to be compared, it is necessary to omit from the latter (1) administrative officers, (2) librarians, (3) retired teachers, (4) teachers on leave, (5) research teachers, (6) teaching of physical training and military practice, (7) research assistants, (8) clerical assistants, and (9) others not easily classified. And further, teachers who give only part time to the work must be counted only for such fraction of full-time as is given. But even when these allowances are made the lists are not easily determined. It is practically impossible to isolate the teachers of freshmen and sophomores; they are not a separable group. And because of the interrelations between various schools and colleges, the totals for the College of Letters and Science and for other divisions of the university can be established only by decisions concerning which much difference of opinion is possible.

For the purposes of our general question of teaching ratios it will, then, be better to deal with a more simple situation, one in which we can find liberal colleges not conjoined with other departments as they are of necessity in a university. For this purpose we may take the totals of teachers and students in twenty-six independent colleges from many parts of the country. Given in the alphabetical order of their states, they are the following: Mills, Wesleyan, Illi-

nois, Knox, Rockford, Grinnell, Bowdoin, Goucher, Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Williams, Carleton, Dartmouth, Princeton, Hamilton, Vassar, Wells, Marietta, Reed, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, Sweet Briar, Beloit, Lawrence.

Now the significant facts for our demonstration can be very simply stated. In the year 1929-30 the total number of students enrolled in these colleges was 20,505. The total number of their teachers, on a full-time basis, was 1952. Their average teaching ratio is therefore 1 to 10.5. In other words, in these colleges which do their work almost wholly under the class system, one teacher is needed for every ten or eleven students.

But, as against this, the teaching ratio in the Experimental College is 1 to 18. The list of Advisers is made up in the supposition that each of them will take twelve students under his charge. But the Advisers are giving only two-thirds of their time to the college, the other third being reserved for classes "on the Hill" or for graduate study. The full-time ratio is, therefore, 1 to 18. For example, in the year 1929-30, to which the figures quoted for the twenty-six colleges refer, it will be found that 155 students were enrolled in the Experimental College and that, in addition to the chairman, who took no part in group or individual conferences, thirteen Advisers carried on the

teaching. On the full-time basis this means that 155 students were taught by 13 times $2/3$, or $8\ 2/3$, Advisers, a ratio of 1 to 18.

If now we compare the two teaching ratios, 1 to 10.5 and 1 to 18, the result would hardly seem to justify the statement that the teaching procedure of the Experimental College is more expensive than that ordinarily used in our liberal colleges. If the Experimental College arrangement were transferred, just as it stands, to the twenty-six colleges mentioned they would need, not 1,952 teachers, but only 1,139—a saving of 813. If, in order to state this difference in financial terms, we assume that the average salary in these colleges is \$3,000, their total salary roll would be \$5,856,000. But if, on the same salary scale, the teaching were done at the Experimental College ratio, the total would be \$3,417,000—a saving of \$2,439,000.¹ It is in the face of these facts that, in answer to the question, “Is individual teaching more expensive?” one so commonly hears the answer, “Of course it is; how could it be otherwise?”

¹In the carefully assembled tables published by Raymond Walters in *School and Society*, vol. xxx, no. 781, December 14, 1929, the corresponding totals for these twenty-six colleges are 20,266 and 2,117, a teaching ratio of 1 to 9.57. The list of teachers, as compiled by Dean Walters, includes several groups which have been left out in the calculations given above.

It may be noted also that for the 226 colleges and universities given by Dean Walters as on the approved list of the Association of American Universities, the full-time student total is 442,493 and the teaching total 44,973, a teaching ratio of 1 to 9.84.

But the outcome, as it stands, seems, even to an ardent advocate of individual teaching, too good to be true. The figures are accurate, and yet one wonders if they can really mean what they say. How is it possible that by taking students one at a time, instead of in groups of 10 or 50 or 500, one should reduce the teaching ratio, the teaching cost, by about 42 per cent? Now the answer to that question will be found only when it is remembered that under the class system, as it is ordinarily used, each student has five classes rather than one. In the Experimental College plan the students are taught in only one subject. In the usual plan they are taught four or five or even six subjects at a time. And the effect of this arrangement is to multiply some factor in the situation by four or five or six. If, for example, 180 students are taught in the Experimental College by ten full-time teachers, each teacher will take full charge of eighteen students. But if under the class system the student take five courses, then the total number of registrations will be 5 times 180, or 900. Each of ten teachers will then, on the average, find not eighteen, but ninety students enrolled in his classes. If, as is commonly the case, the teacher conducts three classes, the average enrollment in those classes will be thirty.

The result may be stated in a different way if we borrow a point of view from the field of "scientific

management." Under the class system, each student is handled five times; under the tutorial scheme he is handled once. And just as in a mill, so in a college, it is the number of handlings which largely determines cost. The statement would be more accurate if we said that under the Experimental College plan a student has six or seven meetings with a teacher each week, while under the class system he has fifteen or sixteen. And it is this difference which is decisive in the fixing of costs. Whoever wishes, in our colleges, to reduce expenditures for teaching without lessening teaching efficiency would do well to begin at this point. The chief ground for attack upon the arrangement that a student should take five or six courses at a time is that it is bad educationally, that it is incoherent and chaotic in its teaching effect. But it is also enormously expensive. But however that may be, the argument must not lose sight of its main contention, which is that as compared with twenty-six representative colleges, the teaching burden in the Experimental College is lower by over 40 per cent.

It may be noted in passing that the plan of the Experimental College has been to cut down the number of a student's appointments in the hope that their teaching quality, and hence their total effect, might be improved. Each week the student has one individual conference, one group meeting, and four or

five meetings of the class as a whole. When one speaks of this as "individual" teaching it is necessary that one carefully specify the sense in which the term is used. It should be clear that the meetings are not all of the individual type.

As already suggested, it would be very satisfactory if at this point the argument could go on to a comparison of teaching ratios between the Experimental College on the one hand and the College of Letters and Science and the whole university on the other. But for the reasons given, it hardly seems advisable at this time to attempt the necessary calculations. We may, however, give, if not a whole comparison, at least half a one. In the University Directory for the year 1930-31, the number of students in the College of Letters and Science, including graduate students, is given as 6,349; and the total number in the university at Madison is 9,401. If these students were taught at the Experimental College ratio of 1 to 18, the number of full-time teachers required in the two cases would be 353 and 522. Whether or not the numbers of persons now engaged in the work are greater or less than these figures could be determined only by careful investigation. It is a study which might well be made. It would also be important to determine the relative teaching ratios in the upper and lower colleges.

Two further remarks seem necessary before this discussion is ended. First, the comparison discussed in this section has had reference to the possible substitution of tutorial methods for those of the class. It is in relation to this possible change that one asserts that it could be made without additional expense. If, however, as is sometimes done, the tutorial scheme is added to the class method, if two teaching costs are assumed instead of one, the result is of course a very great increase in the salary total. But such additions are unsound in educational as well as in financial terms. What we need to consider is not an addition to our teaching procedure, but a transformation of it.

And second, the Experimental College has done its teaching, in addition to its experimenting, at a teaching ratio of 1 to 18. But the Advisers would gladly see that ratio brought somewhat nearer to the level of the twenty-six colleges cited, if the necessary funds were available. The ratio of 1 to 18 was fixed in order to make sure, on the basis of a rough estimate, that the college could carry, and was carrying, as heavy a teaching burden as the other parts of the university. The validity of the experiment seemed to require that. But especially in the freshman and sophomore years, where the personal element in teaching is so exceedingly important, it would be a

great gain if the funds should make possible a change to 1 to 15 or even 1 to 12. One hesitates to suggest this when he is told that in the public schools of Madison the ratio is 1 to 22. And yet, even with that in mind, the suggestion may be justified. The teaching of freshmen and sophomores in a liberal college is both peculiarly difficult and peculiarly important.

VI

EXPERIMENTING IN A UNIVERSITY

Chapter Fifteen

COÖPERATIONS

THE investigation made by the Experimental College may be viewed from two sides. First, it is an activity of the Advisers. They were given an opportunity to study a problem and they have done it well or ill. But second, it is also a study made by the University of Wisconsin, to whose faculties the Advisers belong, whose agents they are in the carrying on of the venture. Now the report thus far has dealt with the work of the college from the first of these approaches. The study has been described from the viewpoint of the men who were immediately making it. And when speaking in these terms it has been desirable that so far as possible the Advisers should describe rather than assess. It is not for them to say whether or not the experiment has been well or badly done, whether or not it is a success—whatever that term may mean. They must remember that in the last resort decision upon the values and methods involved in their pro-

cedure rests, not with the writers of this report, but with the university to which it is presented. But with regard to the other phase of the situation, with regard to the action and attitude of the university, the Advisers are free from such limitations. They may, and should, speak frankly and unreservedly of the relation of the university to the experiment which it has established and conducted.

The first remark to be made is that, whatever its immediate results, whether these be good or bad, great or small, the action of the university in setting up the Experimental College was in principle a notable contribution to higher education in America.

Our colleges and universities have thus far had little success in negative criticism of their own work. They are able to add new procedures whenever funds are available. But they seldom withdraw or nullify existing arrangements. They can pile up tutorial schemes on the top of non-tutorial schemes in vast accumulation. They can add electives to requirements and then requirements to electives. They can invent orientation courses and surveys and majors which will counterbalance devices for specialization and distribution. In a word, they can always add, but in general they cannot subtract. To use President Frank's striking phrase, whatever is tends to become a "vested interest." The principle of "tenure," fundamental in

importance and yet terribly costly in its interference with freedom of action, applies not only to individuals, but also to arrangements.

When one makes this statement one is not challenging either the intelligence or the disinterestedness of the university community. The difficulty lies far deeper than the moral or intellectual quality of any teacher or group of teachers. It is an inescapable aspect of "the present university situation." Just what that "situation" is no one seems to understand. No one masters it and brings it under control. In it the forces needed for the accomplishing of our educational purposes are present and yet those purposes are very partially realized. The making of American universities, like the making of America, is still in the stage of very early beginnings.

But in the midst of this general frustration the University of Wisconsin did devise a method of negative criticism. In idea, at least, the new plan of experimentation provided for the comparative study of different ways of teaching and the substitution of one of these for another on the basis of relative merit. It must be admitted that as yet not many "substitutions" have been made; it may even be that the "idea" will dwindle away without even emerging into an important "substitution"; and yet the fact remains that the idea was formulated and accepted as a basis for actual

teaching and for the criticism of established teaching procedures.

The action taken was, briefly stated, the segregation of a small group of teachers and pupils with authority to exercise in their own field complete freedom as to the substitution of "other" methods and contents and conditions of study for those prevailing in the regular courses "on the Hill." And to make this freedom secure it was voted by the faculties that, however far the teaching in the Experimental College might wander from the regular paths, its students, if approved by the college, would be given the same academic credits and standing as their fellows who had followed the usual procedure. To anyone who is familiar with the measuring of "credits" in university administration the significance of this vote is startling and revolutionary. In terms of machinery the awarding of a degree is a certification that the student has followed a specified program of studies: the "guinea pigs" of the Experimental College might have taken a program radically different from those specified at Wisconsin, and yet the faculties declared their willingness to certify that these students had met the requirements for degrees. To the mechanically minded administrator this is of course sheer untruthfulness. Never, elsewhere in American college or university life, was the credit system dealt so lusty

a blow; never was the machinery given so telling a demonstration of its proper subordination to the educational values which it is intended to serve.

Concerning this achievement of the faculties, three remarks may be made in passing.

First, historical fairness demands that we record the fact that this form of arrangement, so novel and revolutionary in colleges and universities, has long been accepted, and has worked successfully in many lower schools. Throughout the country, wherever the school system is highly developed, there are to be found just such "experimental groups" set aside in very much the same way and for essentially the same purpose.

Second, it has often been said by members of the faculties at Wisconsin that the vote of which we are speaking did not express the better judgment or the real intention of the majorities which enacted it. It was taken, we are told, under the compulsion of a new administration rather than because the members of the teaching force believed in or desired the experimentation which was planned.¹ In the nature of the case there must be, of course, some truth in this statement. When situations are complicated, no one can limit his interest in any project to a single purpose, a single set of reasons, or a single point of view.

¹ See public statement of Professor Grant Showerman, published in *School and Society*, April 11, 1931.

But when allowance is made for this complication, it would seem that the assertion made is not only grossly unfair as an account of the behavior of the faculties, but also untrue as a description of the attitude of the community at large. So far as one can tell from records and from recollections, the truth seems to be that the university and its college entered upon the new venture in good faith and with a common purpose.

Third, the outstanding administrative merit of the new plan was that it seemed to give to the college complete freedom of action while leaving the work of the surrounding university wholly undisturbed. It is this promised combination which makes the project so significant in its suggestiveness for other colleges and universities. Its advantages over against plans which would, for example, at one stroke inflict upon an entire freshman class and an entire set of freshman teachers a new and untried scheme of instruction, are obvious and convincing. It experiments without creating academic chaos. And yet there is another side of the picture. One cannot inject so radical and so independent a college into the life of a university without creating two sets of difficulties. First, there will inevitably occur interferences of the newer activities with older ones, and *vice versa*. Second, it is equally inevitable that, in the meeting of

conflicting views upon difficult problems, misunderstandings will come. Now it would be idle and silly to dwell upon these interferences and misunderstandings for their own sakes. To gossip about them would be to waste one's time in fruitless or harmful ways. And yet, as inevitable incidents in any process of university experimentation, they are significant. As such, and only as such, they must be dealt with before this report is finished. The next two chapters will therefore tell, as briefly as possible, first, of certain typical interferences of the Experimental College with other activities of the university and of their interferences with it; and second, of a certain typical misunderstanding which, in varying forms, must arise in a community in which newer and older, untried and tried, procedures are brought face to face, are subjected to comparative criticism.

Chapter Sixteen

INTERFERENCES

IN THE reading of this chapter and of the next it should be remembered that this report is written with reference to a practical question upon which the Wisconsin faculties must soon take action. That question is, Shall the university continue or discontinue the experimentation which was begun in 1927-28? Now, in actual discussion, this question falls into two parts. First, is the experimentation in itself valuable to the university and to the cause of education? Second, does the experiment help or hinder the other activities of the university? The chief interest of the Advisers, who present this report, has naturally been directed to the first of these two questions. And yet, the second must also be dealt with. One might assume or even prove that, in general, such experimentation is valuable, is sorely needed. There would, however, still remain the question whether in any particular institution it does not cost more than it is worth. Can a

state university, for example, being what it is, afford to engage in radical experimentation? Is not the strain too great? Are not the "interferences" and "misunderstandings" too serious?

It will not be possible in these two chapters to attempt a full discussion of the question just stated. The problem of the possibilities and limitations of a state university goes far and deep into the conditions of American social and political life as well as into the more limited conditions of education. All that can here be done is to relate a number of experiences of the Experimental College so far as they are relevant to the question. We may tell how and at what points the college has interfered with other parts of the university and has been hindered by them. For example, we may record the difficulties which arise when a new teaching unit breaks into the departmental organization of the faculty. In the field of the organization of student life we may see how one experiment blocks and hinders another. We may observe how, when student regulations have been formulated and administered in one set of terms, a new department which knows not those terms can create for others and for itself exasperating difficulties of procedure. These observations, as has been said, will not solve the general problem. They may, however, throw light upon the practical question which the University of Wisconsin

now faces. They may also be of value to any other institution which is considering whether or not to take the plunge into thoroughgoing experimentation. It is highly improbable that either at Wisconsin or elsewhere the same difficulties would again appear in exactly the same forms. But, both at Wisconsin and elsewhere, it is certain that corresponding difficulties must be counted on if experimental units are established. One cannot make too strongly the statement that the ways of self-criticism, for an institution as for an individual, are not, and cannot be, the ways of easy and smooth adjustment.

I

The first difficulty to be noted has arisen in connection with the appointment of teachers. Here at the most sensitive spot in university administration the Experimental College has inevitably both caused and suffered interference. The teachers in the college were in general, to give two-thirds of their time to it and one-third to the regular departments. But this arrangement implies that in all questions of appointment, tenure, promotion, or salary the department and the college must agree in their recommendations. The responsibility ordinarily held by the department alone must now be shared with an alien institution

whose interests and purposes may be, or may seem to be, far removed from those of the department. If, as in the experience of the college was commonly the case, the two sets of recommendations agree, the only difficulty to be met is that of a rather unwieldy form of administration. When, however, as in two or three cases, there is radical disagreement between the two recommendations, the strain is severe and the burden upon the officers receiving the recommendations is very great. And further, there is serious danger that in the midst of such divided counsels individual teachers may suffer unmerited and serious injury to their careers.

It has been often suggested that this difficulty might have been avoided if the teachers in the Experimental College had been made a separate faculty, with a separate budget and a separate scheme of appointments. But if this had been done essential values would have been lost. These fall into two groups. First, it is important for the project that the Advisers shall be, and shall be accepted as, members of the regular teaching staff. This is desirable for purposes of mutual acquaintance and understanding. But it is necessary also for the sake of experimentation. Just so far as possible general conditions within the two groups must be kept uniform and comparable. If one

is trying to determine the influence of different teaching methods and contents in two different situations, it is essential that teaching quality in the two situations be practically identical. Everyone knows that teaching quality is more important than either contents or methods. To leave it, then, as an undetermined variable, would be to destroy any attempt at significant comparison. Second, under the present departmental organization of our universities, it would be impossible to secure teachers for an Experimental College if they were not given, at the same time, departmental standing. Tenure, promotion, the securing of other positions, not to mention one's rating among his colleagues, are at present practically determined by departmental influence. Men could not afford, they ought not to be asked, to give up their permanent connections with departments in favor of membership in an Experimental College which may be relatively temporary and episodic in its duration of existence.

An interesting variant of the suggestion just made is that the Experimental College should have a rapidly changing group of full-time teachers. Members of the regular departments would be delegated to the college for short periods, one or two years, and would then return to their regular assignments. This plan

would have a decided advantage in keeping clear the connections with departments, and it would widen the acquaintance of the college throughout the university. It does not, however, remove the administrative difficulty. It would still be necessary for department and college to agree together as to when a wandering member should leave and when return to his natural habitat. And further, in the earlier years, at least, this arrangement would have seriously weakened the work of the college. Experimental problems in teaching are not quickly solved nor even quickly grasped. They require long-time consideration. Certainly it has been desirable thus far that the College have a fairly constant group of men to give coherence and continuity to its investigations. It may be that in later stages of experimentation the suggestion would be more workable.

But enough has been said to suggest the nature of the "interference" with respect to appointments. Who can say what is the best way of dealing with it? Perhaps our departmental organization is too rigid. Perhaps there should be no experimental colleges. Certainly, whenever and wherever the two institutions meet there will be a new and vexing problem. Unless an institution is willing to grapple with that problem experimentation should not be undertaken or, if undertaken, should not be continued.

II

The second difficulty to be recounted has to do with the relations of the Experimental College to the dormitory plan. It is the story of the interference of one experiment with another. Here Greek meets Greek in a grand tug of war. The new experiment hinders and is hindered by, not the old and established practices of the university, but another strong and lusty member of the "experiment" family which had sprung into active being only a year before its own birth. In the same building, the same dormitory, these two youthful ventures work out their fraternal relations.

The movement to build up a system of dormitories for men is one of the most significant and promising of the recent activities of the university. Springing from a suggestion of President Van Hise, the plan had been studied over a long period of years. To borrow a phrase from the Study Commission one might describe it as an attempt to modify "the determining conditions of undergraduate education." Both the importance and the difficulty of the issues involved had been recognized by the committee in charge, and its members had given a vast amount of time to their consideration. In the fall of 1926, one year before the beginning of the Experimental College, two new dor-

mitories, Adams Hall and Tripp Hall, were opened as the first explicit move of the committee toward the working out of its policies.

Meanwhile, in the planning for the Experimental College, very strong emphasis had been placed upon this same problem of the social conditioning of undergraduate life. The Advisers had been directed to consider, not only the content of study and the methods of instruction, but also the forming and shaping of a student community which should be favorable to study and teaching. Accordingly, in the "preliminary hypothesis" it was insisted that all students should live in one dormitory and that the offices and studies of the Advisers should be in the same dormitory.

It is worthy of note, at this point, that it was the building of these new dormitories which made possible the starting of the Experimental College in the desired form. The Dormitory Committee very generously allowed the college to take over four sections, one-half, of Adams Hall. It was also hoped that in the second year the college, with its two classes, would have enough students to fill all the sections of that building. That hope, however, was never realized. There have always been the two sets of students in the same building.

Now in this situation of common purpose and generous attitude "interference" developed quickly and

in a short time, furiously. Within the larger community, a smaller community was marking itself off as something so different, so determined to be different, as to make the keeping of the peace at first practically impossible. Two sets of factors, at least, contributed to this result.

First, the two groups of students were not congenial. The announcement that the college would follow methods radically different from those usually employed in higher education attracted many students who were openly critical of the regular teaching in the university. The much-misunderstood announcement that the methods of the college would be those of freedom attracted young men who were regarded by their fellows as "red" and "radical" and "communistic." For several reasons the percentage of Jewish students was unusually large. The percentage of students from Wisconsin was small. These differences acted at once as forces of division in student sentiment and attitude. In a lesser degree they divided the college within itself. In a much larger degree they marked off the college as something "queer" and "hostile" and "alien" in the larger student community.

But the second factor was even more important than the first. It quickly appeared that with respect to the ways of "making a community" the minds of

the Dormitory Committee and those of the Advisers were working along very different lines. They had a common purpose, but they were approaching it from radically different directions. Now again it would be quite beside the purpose of this chapter to attempt to state the differences of these two "experiments" or to argue their merits. It is highly improbable that in any future form of college experimentation exactly these two attitudes will again attempt to live together in the same dormitory. But it is probable, even certain, that anyone who attempts to experiment in "residence" plans, to apply to one part of a university a scheme of communal life which is widely different from that employed in other closely related parts of the community, must expect to create for others and for himself interferences which are exceedingly hard to handle.

There can be no doubt that on both sides the relationship between the committee and the college proved to be a very trying one. The arrangement grew out of a common interest and had its origin in a very generous action. However, especially during the first two years, it brought to the committee constant disappointment and anxiety as to the working out of its own plans. Only as the college, in the two later years, gave ground, submitting to the necessities of the situation, have the difficulties of the com-

mittee been lessened. The coming in of the Experimental College, at the end of its first year, was for the Dormitory Committee a badly disturbing influence, if not a positive misfortune. And in like manner, on the side of the college there has been grave disappointment. The hope of a separate building in which might be fashioned a separate community life has dwindled away. Just what has been gained, and what lost, in the field of social organization has been discussed in another part of this report. For the present chapter it will suffice to say that both committee and college have learned that "experiments" in university life are sensitive and difficult neighbors; they are quick both to suffer and to cause "interference." Dealing as they do with principles to be tested, they do not easily adjust to practical situations. In a double sense one may speak of them as a university's "problem children."

III

A third field in which interferences are almost inevitable when experimental arrangements are inserted into the midst of regular procedures is that commonly known as "internal administration." This field, of which the deans have charge, is so complicated that one cannot hope to give in a brief statement any adequate view of its possibilities in any

direction. Only a very general illustration can be offered as bearing upon our present interest.

In the University of Wisconsin, as elsewhere, there has been built up an intricate system of regulations applying to individual students and to their group activities. These have to do with such matters as promotions, absences from classes especially before and after holidays, eligibility for fraternities or athletic teams or other activities, and the awarding of scholarships, prizes, and honors. In general these regulations and the rewards or penalties which they imply are stated in terms of classes scheduled and of grades received. Now by its early decision to depart from the regular scheme of classes and to give no grades until the end of the two-year course, the Experimental College at one stroke made the rules as printed inapplicable to its students. But on the other hand, it had been agreed from the beginning that the students of the College should be in all social ways regarded and treated as regular members of the university. They were to be subject to the same principles as to conduct and were to be eligible on the same basis to fraternities, teams, and all other activities.

Here was a situation in which "interference" was easy and the appearance of interference inevitable. Everyone knows how sensitive a student community is to any suggestion of unfairness or inequality in the

application of such rules as these. When a group of students is waiting impatiently for the coming of holiday time, it is intolerable for them to hear the rumor that other students are free to go whenever they please. When a student community is passionately debating whether the eligibility grade for varsity athletics shall be one point or eight-tenths of a point, it is maddening to be told that in the Experimental College there are no eligibility requirements whatever. These statements are, of course, not true. But they are believed, and that belief itself becomes a serious interference with successful administration. The task of translating the old rules into the new terms is not a difficult one. But there is difficulty, when strains are present, in establishing confidence that the translation has been fairly done. The interference can be avoided only if administrative officers and students on both sides of the relationship have sympathetic understanding of the experiment which is being made. But with the coming of suspicion such understanding disappears, and so a vicious circle is established. Under these conditions, an experimenting university must expect to meet, and must be prepared to beat back, waves of suspicion and hostility which will otherwise be serious interferences to the achieving of genuine education.

IV

Experimentation usually involves added expenditure. The cost may be, as in the case of the Experimental College, very small. And yet the hard fact remains that, in a university budget, money which is spent on a new experiment is taken away from some other activity which has been, or might be, going on. Here again is an interference which a university community will resent unless it can be clearly justified. And here again the greatest danger is that of rumor and misinformation. The university is not democratic in its financial administration. The members of a university group are not accurately informed as to its scheme of expenditures or as to the specific items which fall within it. And from the point of view of experiments this is a great disadvantage. Such ventures are particularly the victims of vague and inaccurate rumor. And they are therefore judged in terms of supposed unfairnesses and favoritisms rather than in terms of educational principles involved or educational values created. For every reason, democracy in the organization of a university is desirable, but nowhere does the need become more imperative than in connection with the setting up of a university's attempt at self-criticism.

V

Still another "interference" from which the college has suffered may be briefly mentioned. In general, "experimental" ventures must expect to have difficulty in finding students, and especially the right students, upon whose minds and personalities the experiment shall be conducted. Parents, especially, are not eager in this way to offer up their sons for the public welfare. But if to this there is added the hostility, the lack of confidence, in the surrounding university community, the situation may become exceedingly difficult. And at this point the reaction of many members of the university community in the first two years of the college created conditions which might have ended in disaster. In fact, the rumors that the college would be discontinued were constant and very disturbing. It would serve no useful purpose at this time to give in detail the forms in which hostility and lack of confidence were shown. It is enough to say that they were present, that they were freely expressed, and that such expressions added enormously to the burdens of those who were responsible for the carrying on of the experimental venture. When one says this one is not saying that the hostility was not justified, that the lack of confidence was without reason. One is only recording the fact that they and their

expressions were a characteristic interference which any university experiment must be ready to meet.

SUMMARY

Many more "interferences" on one side or the other might be mentioned, and those which have been noted might be elaborated in far greater detail. But the essential point has been at least indicated. We may, clearly, admit the values of experimental studies and yet question whether it is wise to carry them on in a state university. How do the gains compare with the losses—for the university and for the college? Would it be better to have experimenting done in private colleges and universities? Should it be done in special, separate institutions established for the purpose? Now again these questions go far too deep for discussion in this report. But the experience of the college does seem to justify one or two remarks. First, it is clear that experimenting in a state university means, in a very real sense, fighting for one's experimental life. But, on the other hand, it may be that fighting for one's life is better than having it safely assured without effort of one's own. One can picture situations in which an experiment might be more peaceful and undisturbed, but this does not give assurance that it would be really more free, more certain of its own integrity. There are inevitable diffi-

culties when one has to borrow everything which one needs—teachers, buildings, students, funds, and even the right to exist. And yet the corresponding difficulties and dangers of assured possessions have often been noted. Even an institution gets tired of fighting for its life, and yet that may be better and healthier than to spend one's days "sucking the greasy penny of security." One cannot, therefore, close this chapter upon the "interferences" which have come upon and from the Experimental College without turning again to recall that it was the University of Wisconsin which gave to the college its being. And the generosity with which that action was conceived is not surpassed in the annals of American faculty history.

Chapter Seventeen

MISUNDERSTANDINGS

IT WAS suggested in the previous chapter that "interferences" get their sting chiefly from misunderstandings. This chapter will attempt to disclose in various forms one central misunderstanding, an ambiguity of meaning which must appear whenever "experimentation" and "regular work" are going on side by side in the same institution.

The ambiguity referred to is connected with the question, "Is the experiment a success?" From the very first week of the existence of the Experimental College, that question about it has been eagerly asked and eagerly debated. But throughout the querying and the debating there has persisted a confusion as to the meaning of the question, which has made the asking of it largely fruitless and the debating of it chiefly a form of personal exasperation. It will be worth while to examine the question as asked by various individuals and groups to see if we can eliminate the confusion by discovering its sources.

The purpose of the college as stated by the vote which established it was "to formulate and to test, under experimental conditions, suggestions for the improvement of methods of teaching, the content of study, and the determining conditions of undergraduate liberal instruction." It is, of course, in relation to the achieving of that purpose that the success of the college must rightly be measured. But in their relations to the question, different groups have had very different interests, and it will be found that by the stress of those interests the question has been dragged now into this form and now into that, with the result that the various answers have become quite unmeaning in their relations to one another.

I. PARENTS AND ADVISERS

For example, the parents of the students, even before their sons came to the college, had to answer the question, "Will it be a success?" And by their decision they presumably answered "Yes" to a question to which other parents on the same evidence were answering "No." And again, during the four years in which the college has been doing its practice teaching, parents have been answering the same question upon the basis of their observation of its effects upon their sons. Some of them, a few, have been sadly disappointed. The great majority of those who have ex-

pressed their opinions have told of gratification in varying degrees. One can safely say that, so far as recorded, the general answer of parents to the question stated is decidedly "Yes." But the difficulty here is that the question, "Is it a success?" as asked by the parent, has a quite different meaning from that which should be given to it by the university which devised the experiment or by the Advisers who are conducting it. The two questions are related, but they are also radically different.

What can it mean to say, before an investigation has begun, that it will succeed? What does it mean to say, during the first two weeks or the first two years of a study of educational methods, that its results are gratifying? Obviously each of these statements may have two different meanings, one of which is the more important for the parents and the other more important for the Advisers, though each group, it is presumed, shares the other's interest as well.

When a parent sums up the two-year experience of his boy as "good," he may be stressing any one of a number of factors which would be either disturbing or irrelevant with respect to the question which the Adviser is considering. He may be saying, "I think it is a good thing for a boy to be for two years in an atmosphere in which men are experimenting, are

breaking loose from regular teaching methods." He may mean, "My boy found as companions an unusual group of young fellows who were attracted by the novelty of the Experimental College procedure." He might even be saying, "I think the Advisers an exceptional group of teachers," just as his *vis-à-vis* is deploring, "I wish they could have found some good men to do that job." But in any case the parent is stressing factors which, to say the least, would not be stressed by the Adviser. The latter, in stating his problem, would like to eliminate the influence of novelty if he could; he would like to assume or to arrange that the students be an average group, a cross-section; he would choose, on impersonal grounds, to take it for granted that he and his fellows are an ordinary group of teachers, fairly representative of the general teaching quality of the university. And the reason for the difference of attitude and presumption between the two is that, while using the same words, they are asking two different questions. At the end of two years, the parent asks, "Have these two years been good for my son?" At the same time the Adviser asks, "Have I made any headway in finding a course of study, a method of teaching, a set of social conditions which might be substituted for those now in use?" The father's question is, for the time, answered. The Adviser's inquiry has hardly begun.

These two must then be different, even though related, questions.¹ To confuse them is to plunge oneself into misunderstanding.

2. REPORTERS AND ADVISERS

And in very much the same way, Advisers and reporters have used a common set of terms with quite different meanings. It is true that a number of special writers and reporters who have made studies of the college have done so with genuinely critical and imaginative understanding. They have questioned the Advisers and have discussed with them in their own terms. They have written about an experiment as if it were an experiment. But in general such reporting does not serve the immediate interests of the press. The newspaper writer is urged on by the demand for "news." It is interesting to see how that urgency can change the meanings of words so that, even when joined with the best of intentions, it becomes a source of misunderstanding and confusion.

When the Advisers, in the fall of 1927, began their study, no one could tell in advance what lines it

¹ It should be noted in passing that to separate these two questions is not to declare one of them to be fanciful and the other real. Both have been and are real questions for the Advisers. It is true that their primary business has not been to "attract students" by the promise of a good education. On the other hand, it is equally true that unless students are attracted there will be no experiment because there will be no one to experiment upon. One of the most serious "practical" difficulties of the college has been the unfavorable impression of it which in some way or other became early established in Wisconsin schools which prepare for the university.

would follow nor how long it would take. For this reason, the suggestion of a definitely limited period of time for the experiment had been rejected by the Faculty of Letters and Science. New courses of study were to be devised, new methods of teaching were to be worked out, new schemes of social organization were to be fashioned. And in addition, these various courses, methods, arrangements were to be tested by standards not yet formulated, by principles not yet stated. It was apparently a long, intricate, unpredictable inquiry. But when the reporter came, asking for news, he could hardly be satisfied by a long-time story of uncertain progress in such a study as this. He needed something startling and immediate in its interest. He wanted to tell of something that had happened or that would soon happen. If, for example, it should have chanced, and could be shown, that in its first leap the Experimental College had hit upon forms of teaching which are clearly better than those of the regular courses, that would be news indeed. Headlines would quickly appear announcing, "Experimental College Achieves Extraordinary Success: University to be Quickly Reorganized." Or if, on the other hand, some one within the college will speak frankly of its difficulties and doubts, or some one outside will flatly declare his condemnation of the point of view which it is testing, that too is "news." Again

headlines will come forth to inform an interested public, "Experimental College Proves Failure: Project Soon to be Abandoned by University."

Now when these news items are examined in relation to the actual situation, it becomes clear in what way the interest of the reporter tends to create misunderstanding. In his search for news, he dramatizes the competitive element in the situation. Here is a university which has been teaching for very many years. How startling is the story that a group of men can, at one stroke, by one lucky hit, show its whole procedure to be faulty! Or, on the other hand, here is a body of radical reformers, claiming to be able by sheer intuition to remake the scheme of education. How delightful to see their house of cards, at the first touch of reality, fall into ruins! By such dramatic contrasts as these, two schemes of education, the old and the new, are set over against each other like rival hockey teams. The Experimental College is interpreted, not as studying a problem for the university, but as attempting to demonstrate its superiority over the university. Its "preliminary hypothesis" becomes, not the beginning of a long and difficult inquiry, but a dogma, a panacea, a cure-all for the ills of education. The Advisers are not investigators; they are salesmen. The university is not studying its own methods; it is suffering, and resenting, hostile criticism.

3. THE UNIVERSITY AND THE ADVISERS

If now we turn to the university community itself, it is interesting, and even tragic, to see how the same misunderstanding inevitably and rapidly develops. However generously conceived was the plan of the Study Commission, its effect was to let loose within the community forces of rivalry and competition. The founding of the Experimental College divided the university into two groups of teachers and students. One of these, the larger, was primarily engaged in conducting the regular teaching. The other, the smaller, was under orders to criticize; it was trying to find out whether or not the regular teaching could be improved. Now in such a situation it is not necessary to analyze how the attitude of rivalry is developed. In a hundred different ways, whose quality may be summed up under the term "sensitiveness," the community reacts to criticism and counter-criticism. Comparisons are made; superiority is asserted and denied; and soon conservatives and innovators face one another in the familiar forms of hostility and misunderstanding. And in the midst of this situation the question, "Is it a success?" falls apart into its two separate meanings. Presumably the faculties are still asking, "What progress are you making with your consideration of the different forms of

teaching?" But for many students and teachers in the university, under the stress of a demand for the decision of a dispute, the query has become, "Can you make good your claim that you are doing better teaching than is done 'on the Hill'?" In its first meaning, the question has to do with the progress of an investigation. In this sense it asks, "Are you making headway with your study? Is your first general suggestion taking shape as a definite program? If so, how well does that program work? Are you finding other suggestions which might be tried; and especially, are you getting at the heart of your problem?" But in its second meaning the question is quite different from this. It is interested in a quick administrative decision. It asks, "Has the college made good? Should it be continued or abolished? Has it, or has it not, discovered methods of teaching which are clearly superior to those now in use? If not, why should it exist any longer?"

It has been said that the divergence of meaning of which we are speaking can be found in a hundred different forms. There is, however, one point at which it becomes most obvious and, it must be added, most unfortunate. The point in question is that of provision by the Faculty of Letters and Science for the making of reports upon the work of the Experimental College.

The action which established the college had provided that "periodic reports of the progress of the work of the Experimental College will be presented (by the Advisers) to the faculty." This was amended by the addition that "Similar reports shall be made and presented by the Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science or by some other committee of that college specially chosen to study the work of the Experimental College." But in relation to this provision, misunderstanding quickly arose to block and hinder effective coöperation.

On the one hand, the Advisers welcomed the arrangement as giving promise of conference with the faculty to which they were responsible. They hoped that such a committee would keep in touch with what they were doing, would discuss with them their problems, would report upon their progress or lack of it. But in this they were doomed to disappointment. No such permanent committee has been delegated or appointed. Many requests, formal and informal, that this should be done, have been made, but they have been made in vain. Apparently the relation of conference which to the Advisers has seemed so desirable has, from another point of view, seemed wholly undesirable and improper.

The presence of the divergence of interest and meaning of which we are speaking was clearly re-

vealed in the report presented by the special committee of 1929. The committee looked deeply into the situation and expressed itself as strongly convinced of the desirability of coöperation and understanding between the faculty and the Advisers. Upon the basis of a study of documents and of interviews with separate Advisers, it gave an admirable description of the activities of the college. And with respect to the progress of the investigation it recorded impressions which could not fail to be exceedingly gratifying to the Advisers. First, it said, "The underlying situation which the Experimental College was designed to meet constitutes a major problem in contemporary education." And again, "We have found at work upon the details of the experiment the collective intelligence of a superior body of teachers." And third, "We believe them to have made substantial progress in the formulation of study content and teaching technique." But, in other parts of the report, one finds statements which seem to be curiously out of tune with those which are here quoted. "It is our opinion," the report says, "that in the not distant future an appraisal of the Experimental College enterprise will be demanded, in fairness to the people of Wisconsin, in the interest of educational theory and practice, and for the good of the Experimental College itself." And upon this basis the report recommended "the ap-

pointment of the committee referred to in the Letters and Science minutes of May 26, 1926, whose obligation it shall be to obtain such a complete insight into the theoretical aims and practical functioning of the Experimental College as will justify an appraisal in May, 1930."

Now the divergence of meaning in question is seen in the relation between the two statements here given: (1) the Experimental College is making substantial progress in dealing with a problem of major importance and (2) the college should be appraised in May, 1930. When this latter statement was made in May, 1929, the college had not yet completed its first draft of a freshman curriculum. At the time, May, 1930, at which an appraisal seemed to the committee essential, the sophomore course of study had not yet begun to emerge from confusion and uncertainty. What, under these circumstances, could the term "appraisal" mean? It was not until February, 1931 that the Advisers reported to the faculty that they had ready for its consideration "an alternative way in which the teaching of the freshman and sophomore years might be done." And to this they added the statement that any genuinely experimental study of their problem would provide that other methods "should be formulated and tested by actual operation and comparison of results." It is clear that the differ-

ence of opinion here involved has reference, on the surface, only to the time at which a given action shall be taken. No one doubted that the college venture should be appraised. But on one side the date of that action is pressed forward, while on the other it is equally pressed back. The Advisers are planning, perhaps heedlessly, for the detailed and undisturbed prosecution of their study. They have no hope of immediate results. But, on the other hand, those who are concerned with more immediate and practical interests feel compelled toward the making of an administrative decision and the making of it quickly. It is from the pressure of these two attitudes that the question, "Is it a success?" takes on its doubleness of meaning. To one group the question means, "Is the study making progress toward the solution of its problem?" To the other group it means, "How long should the Experimental College be kept as a part of the administrative machinery of the university?" And on both sides the advocates are driven by what seem to them the essential and significant interests of education and of the university. It is a natural conflict arising out of a natural misunderstanding. One may be certain that it will appear whenever a university engages, in unusual degree, in experimental study of its own teaching.

SUMMARY

As one closes this story of coöperations, interferences, and misunderstandings, it need hardly be said that the recounting of difficulties is not intended to discourage further experimentation at Wisconsin or in other colleges and universities. Its purpose has been rather to call attention to the fact that all such experimentation must be conducted within a larger scheme of teaching, against a background of personal and institutional arrangements. And it is essential that any college or university which plans to experiment should frankly face in advance such difficulties as are here related, should provide against them before they come. But further, it should be said, the costs of which we have spoken seem very little in relation to the values which may be achieved if experimentation is carried on successfully. The more one engages in the studying of our collegiate teaching the more one is convinced that the problems with which it deals are real, that the issues by which it is confronted are significant. The work of our American colleges needs thorough and radical reconsideration. No person, no group of persons, can have confidence in his ability to deal with those problems and issues successfully. No one can tell in advance whether the outcome of criticism will be to justify and reëstablish present pro-

cedures or to bring about a fundamental transformation of all our teaching arrangements. But in either case, the carrying on of experimentation is imperative. The Advisers may well say, in summary of their experience, that they were given by the University of Wisconsin a genuine problem of vital importance and that they have tried to make at least a beginning in the attempt at its solution.

VII

CONCLUSIONS

Chapter Eighteen

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

As THIS report comes to its close it must present the recommendations which the Advisers wish to make with respect to the carrying on of the study in which they have been engaged. Before that is done, however, two further remarks seem necessary.

First, this report has been prepared in accordance with the vote of February, 1931, taken by the Faculty of Letters and Science, which provided that in the consideration of the work of the Experimental College the Advisers should "be brought into active coöperation with the committee of the faculty which is now studying the teaching of the freshman and sophomore classes or with some other committee appointed to work in the same field." With this end in view it was further voted (I) "that the Advisers be directed to prepare for the consideration of such a

committee a full and detailed report of their experience in dealing with the problems of freshman and sophomore instruction," and (2) "that the Advisers be authorized to appoint a committee which will present to the Faculty committee the report of the Advisers and will discuss with the committee the principles and situations with which the report deals."

As this report now goes into the hands of the two committees which are to consider it together, it is well to remember that the faculty had in mind also another report upon the Experimental College which would be available for those committees. The report which the Advisers were directed to prepare was described as "more subjective"; it was to be an account of the experience of the Advisers in their study of the educational problems assigned them. But it was understood that a more "objective" study than this would also be needed. This was described in the following terms: "In the first place, we may by comparative studies of records in all their forms attempt to determine the educational values of the specific program which the college has formulated as compared with the values of that program which is followed in the regular courses of the College of Letters and Science. This task, we are glad to say, has been undertaken by the Bureau of Guidance and Records of the university. It is obviously not a task for the

members of the Experimental College, but for an outside, disinterested body.”

The Bureau of Guidance and Records has been for a long time busily engaged in collecting, tabulating, and analyzing the information which may be useful in measuring the educational influence of the Experimental College. It is exceedingly important that everything possible be done to further this work of the bureau so that its results may be available for the committees which are to study this report and for the faculty which will pass upon it. The information which the bureau is assembling should be of value in making possible an assessment of the educational effect of the Experimental College upon the students whom it has used for the purposes of its inquiry. In the words of the report of February, 1931, “It is a long and difficult research, and no one can tell as yet when its findings will be available, nor how clear and conclusive they may prove to be.” But it is very desirable that they be made as clear and conclusive as possible.

And second, a final word may be said on the “more subjective” side. Probably the most profound impression which has been made upon the Advisers by their adventure in the teaching of young Americans has been the sense of their own lack of adequate liberal education. This is not said by way of imitation of

Henry Adams, the story of whose education, or lack of it, plays so dominating a part in the course of study of the second year of the college. It comes rather from a deeper and more lively realization of the possibilities and responsibilities of American education together with the sense of the obstacles and hindrances which stand in its way. As one studies the liberal teaching of our colleges, whatever their course of study, whatever their methods of teaching, the most appalling fact about them is the scantiness of their educational result, the poverty of their intellectual quality. And if one may speak only for himself, there can be no doubt that the deeper reason for this lies in the quality of the teacher himself. We do not teach liberal understanding well chiefly because we do not know what it is. We are very much at home in the field of scholarship. If a student will limit his interest to some field of intellectual abstraction, we can show him what the human mind has thus far done in that field, can build up in him the proper technique, can equip him, according to his ability, to take his place in the ranks of the craftsmen of that study. And along more practical lines, where scholarship is applied, without criticism, to the accomplishing of practical ends, where the human mind is used as the servant of its own lesser interests, we are again amazingly able, both in achieving results and in training younger

men to create still greater ones. But if the liberal question is asked, our skill and mastery vanish. If men inquire, "What should American life be; toward what ends should it be guided and inspired; in terms of what scheme of ideas and values should it be interpreted and controlled?", the characteristic attitude of many of our ablest scholars is one of despair and utter incapacity. We have many sciences but little wisdom. We have multifarious and accurate information, but we have lost hope of knowing what it means. And to say this is to say in the most unmistakable terms that we are ourselves, for the time, beaten in the struggle for liberal education and therefore unable to lead our students into its activities. Far deeper, then, than any question of curriculum or teaching method or determining conditions is the problem of restoring the courage of Americans, academic or non-academic, for the facing of the essential issues of life. How can it be brought about that the teachers in our colleges and universities shall see themselves, not only as the servants of scholarship, but also, in a far deeper sense, as the creators of the national intelligence. If they lose courage in that endeavor, in whom may we expect to find it? Intelligence, wisdom, sensitiveness, generosity—these cannot be set aside from our planning, to be, as it were, by-products of the scholarly pursuits. They are

the ends which all our scholarship and our teaching serve. If, then, one is set to inquire how American teaching can be better done, the most fundamental phases of the inquiry must concern themselves with the forces which create and fashion the attitude, the life, of the American teacher. The primary question concerning our academic system is not, "What is its effect upon the student?" but rather, "What is its effect upon our teachers?" If we can get them rightly placed in relation to their work, nothing in the world can prevail against them.

II

The recommendations which the Advisers wish to make to the general faculty may be summed up in a single sentence, namely that, if possible, the experimentation which the Advisers have been allowed to begin should be continued in the University of Wisconsin. What has been done thus far is very incomplete and fragmentary. It is only a first step—the formulating of one possible way of teaching. But with the taking of that step there have been developing a point of view, a framing of questions and suggestions, which lead on indefinitely along the road of experimental inquiry. It would seem to us very desirable that the university should go on further along the road.

To this end we would recommend that, beginning with the year 1933-34, the university should make the following provision for experimentation:

(1) There should be set up to study the problems of freshman and sophomore instruction four experimental units. One of these should be, as at present, for men, and should be lodged in the same way, in one of the men's dormitories. A second should be for women and should be lodged in a women's dormitory. A third should be for men, but without dormitory arrangement. A fourth, also without dormitory arrangement, should enroll both men and women.

If these four units were established, it would be desirable that the faculties, chosen as far as possible from the present teachers of the university, should, during the year 1932-33, work out, each its own course of study, each its own plan of teaching method and social organization. There should be some scheme of conference and coöperation between them, but primarily they should be independent units, making independent though related investigations.

(2) There should be set up a corresponding unit to study the problems of instruction in the junior and senior years. The issues here involved are radically different from those of the earlier years, but they are in the same way vital and significant. Already valuable suggestions have been made by members of the

general faculty. And there is need of at least testing the merits of plans which would radically modify our present procedures rather than attempt to improve them at this point or that.

No one can, of course, tell whether, from such experimental inquiries, new methods would emerge which would be accepted as superior to the old. But one can be practically certain that if such experimentation were established and accepted as a normal and approved part of the life of the university, it would be a profoundly helpful influence in enhancing the teaching power of the institution. It would contribute to the making and keeping of teaching a self-criticizing activity. Surely nothing less than that is worthy of an institution of learning.

VIII

POSTSCRIPT

Chapter Nineteen

ACTION BY THE ADVISERS

THIS report was presented to the Advisers for individual reading in the early days of December, 1931. On December 10th, it was formally considered at a meeting of the Advisers at which Professors Agard, Gaus, Sharp, and Rogers were also present.

Criticism of the writing of the document, ranging from suggestions of verbal change to the demand for the rewriting of the second section entire, were made. As the writing now stands these suggestions have been largely incorporated in the text, including a complete reconstruction of the section mentioned.

Four votes were passed at the meeting, as follows:

(1) It was voted to approve the recommendations suggested and to adopt them as expressing the will of the Advisers.

Discussion of the second recommendation brought to clearness the fact that, with respect to the third and fourth years the Advisers have no defined plan

to offer. What they have in mind is that the College of Letters and Science should, with respect to the upper college, take action corresponding to that taken with reference to the lower college five years ago. They hope that a faculty group may be established to initiate experimental study along such lines as may seem to that group desirable.

(2) It was voted that the chairman of the Experimental College appoint the committee of the Advisers, mentioned in the report of February, 1931, which shall join with the committee to be appointed by the Faculty of Letters and Science in the consideration of this report.

(3) It was voted that, since the various attitudes and opinions of the Advisers with regard to the work of the college seem to be adequately stated in the discussion of the report as written, the separate Advisers will not write additional statements. The report is therefore approved by the Advisers and is to be issued as the Report of the Chairman of the College, approved by them. It is further understood that each Adviser may, at any point in the report, ask for the insertion of footnotes expressing his point of view on issues as stated or discussed.

(4) It was voted that the Bureau of Guidance and Records be asked to furnish such factual information as may be available bearing upon the determination

of the value of the teaching which students have been given in the Experimental College. It was suggested that this material should be appended to the report, with such explanations and interpretations as might serve to bring out its significance. Later reflection, however, has made it clear that the collecting and presenting of this information, which will bear upon the appraisal of the work of the college, should be sharply separated from the report of the Advisers. It will be needed by the faculty committee, and by the general Faculty, in the determination of future policy. It is to those bodies, therefore, that the bureau should make direct report of its findings. The Advisers have tried to describe their venture; they must now leave it for others to assess.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Prefatory Note and Chapter I and II of the Report as Presented to the University of Wisconsin

NOTE

The story which this book tells has been written with two sets of readers in mind. Primarily it is an official report to the Faculty of Letters and Science in the University of Wisconsin. But it is also intended to inform an outside public concerning a fascinating adventure in the study of education which the university has made possible.

It has not been easy to decide whether, for these two sets of readers, the story should have two different writings. There is at this point a genuine and serious conflict of considerations. On the one hand, the two groups are widely different in their acquaintance with fact, in their background of interest and attitude. What is familiar to the one group is strange to the other; what is taken for granted by the one may be obscure and even absurd to the other. But as against these facts, it seems very desirable that the telling of the story in its general aspects should not be in any way separated from the peculiar and unique setting within which the events have taken place. One of the most striking features of the Experimental College experience has been its giving opportunity for the formulating and testing of a general point of view in the midst of an actual, concrete, shifting and changing, working

situation. If the two stories were separated there is danger that one or the other of these two elements would be lost, that their connection would be broken. It has seemed advisable, therefore, to present the story in exactly the same form to the two groups of readers for whom it is intended. But this being true, it follows that the book may well ask from its readers patience and endurance in trying passages. If the machinery of academic procedure should seem to rattle unnecessarily, if the explanations of educational policy and controversy should seem trite and over-familiar, it may be hoped that the reader will assume that the argument has not at this point lost significance, but rather that just now it is directed toward the other set of readers. It would be worth the enduring of a good deal of noise and weariness if one could find any new insight into ways in which young Americans could be taught to do better living than they are now doing. It is as an attempted contribution to the achieving of that end that this report is presented, this book written.

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

In the creating of the Experimental College there were joined together two academic stocks. One of these was already present within the University of Wisconsin itself. The other came from the East, a thousand miles away. As

one tells or reads the story of the college it is important to keep in mind this duality of origin. It is probably not a leading motive, but it is always there giving dramatic quality to situations and to the many diverse ways in which the members of the university community respond to them.

I. BEGINNINGS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

In the Annual Report of the University Committee for the year ending November 2, 1925, there appears a record of deliberations and recommendations which, on one side, led to the founding of the Experimental College. Whether to its credit or to its blame, upon that committee must be laid responsibility for initiating the series of events with which the present report deals.

The statement made by the University Committee is an exceedingly interesting and significant document. As their deliberations proceeded the members of the committee were awaiting the selection of a new president of the university and the beginning of a new administration. In this situation, the report tells us, it was "realized that no questions involving any considerable change of policy should be acted upon during the year." Rather the committee attempted only "to make a rough survey of the field, and on this basis to present queries and suggestions to the faculty and to the new administration." Eighteen meetings were held during the year "in addition to many informal discussions with various members of the faculty, alumni, and students, as well as with the chairmen of a number of other university committees."

The report presented three topics for the consideration of the faculty and of the new administration:

First: the relation of the university to the students.

Second: the relation of the university to the alumni.

Third: the relation between the faculty and the Regents. It is the first of these which is especially relevant to our story.

Under the heading, "The Relation of the University to the Students," the committee says, "From alumni, from graduate students, and from undergraduates this Committee has received many adverse criticisms of the character of some of the instruction given at the University. More especially is this criticism directed against the large courses of the first two years, in which it is claimed that the students do not get as good teaching as is reasonably possible to give. Is this commonly expressed point of view justified? Obviously the large classes mentioned are not a deliberate choice of any department, but a necessity forced upon us by the ever-increasing number of students and the lack of a proportional increase in staff and buildings. This problem was presented to us from so many sources that a meeting of the Committee was held on April 28, to which the Chairmen of all University departments were invited, to discuss the possibilities of improvement in our teaching method and in our student contacts." This statement of the committee would seem to make it sufficiently clear that, prior to the beginning of the new administration, the university community was widely and deeply concerned as to the effectiveness of the teaching in the first two years. And further, the community was evidently

of the opinion that here, as well as elsewhere, unsatisfactory teaching arrangements are chiefly due, not to deliberate choice from within, but rather to mechanical and inescapable pressures from without.

In support of its attitude, the committee called attention to a then recent report of the Board of Visitors (to the Regents) and commended its references to (1) the need of improvement in instruction, (2) a more adequate advising system, and (3) closer connection between secondary schools and college authorities. It then went on to say, "This admirable study confirms us in the opinion that this University has grown so rapidly as to become somewhat disarticulated." It suggested that it would be well if the members of the faculty would read the annual reports of the Board of Visitors. It mentioned the possibility of the establishment of junior colleges. It recommended the separation of "advising" from "discipline" in the hope that there might be "a Class Adviser appointed for each freshman class and continued as the 'guide, philosopher, and friend' of that class till graduation." It spoke of the need "for the development of intramural sports and games" and for "the creation of better living, social, and recreational conditions for our students." In the latter connection it expressed the hope that the new Memorial Union might be "effective in leavening this huge heterogeneous mass of students and faculty."

"This huge heterogeneous mass of students and faculty"! The University has "become somewhat disarticulated"! Especially is criticism "directed against the large courses of the first two years"! The problem of "teaching methods and

student contacts" is "presented to us from so many different sources"! The class Adviser should become a "guide, philosopher, and friend"! There is need for "the creation of better living, social, and recreational conditions for our students"! And finally, the members of the faculty should read the annual reports of the Board of Visitors! As one meets these striking phrases one is inclined to rub his eyes to make sure that these are actual words. But there is no mistake; the words are there and they are dated. Nor are they written by outsiders or newcomers. The Experimental College did not begin its work until more than two years after the meeting of April 28, 1925, at which the chairmen of all university departments were called together to consider teaching methods and social contacts. No, these phrases express the well-considered and sober judgment of a responsible faculty committee of the University of Wisconsin of the year 1924-25. It is that committee which, after deliberation with individuals, departments, and committees throughout the university, bluntly calls for reconsideration of teaching procedure and social arrangements, with especial reference to the freshman and sophomore years. Criticism of its own procedure is evidently not a new nor an yet accidental thing in the life of the University of Wisconsin.

But the committee also proceeded from conference and deliberation to recommendation. The second of its three recommendations reads as follows: "II. An All-University Commission of five members (with power to add to their number) shall be appointed from the Faculty by the President to investigate the problems of the articulation of the

University in its several parts, but especially to study problems of improvement of instruction and more helpful contacts between students and faculty. The President shall be requested to grant sufficient freedom from other duties to the chairman or other members of this Commission to enable them to pursue these studies."

2. TENTATIVE STEPS OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY

In the fall of 1924 Mr. Glenn Frank, then editor of the *Century Magazine*, published an article by Mr. Alexander Meiklejohn, not then connected with any institution of learning. It was entitled, "A New College, Notes on a Next Step in Higher Education." Conversation between editor and writer concerning the principles and methods of procedure suggested in this article led to consideration of ways and means by which a new experimental project in liberal education might be established. During the winter of 1924-25, a group of which Mr. Frank was a member, was formed in New York to consider such a project and, if it should seem feasible and advisable, to take action in furtherance of it. For this committee Mr. Meiklejohn prepared a more specific set of proposals.¹ The discussion of these had, however, made little headway when, in the late spring of 1925, Mr. Frank accepted the presidency of the University of Wisconsin. During the summer the new president suggested to Mr. Meiklejohn that he join the Wisconsin faculty. The two thereupon began consideration of possible fields of activity in the

¹ Published in the *New Republic*. April 14, 1926, under the title, "A New College."

university. To both men the most attractive possibility was that of transferring to Wisconsin the new educational enterprise by establishing there a small unit along the lines already suggested. This plan was long and carefully debated, but in the end it seemed clear that it should not be adopted. Neither of the two was as yet well acquainted with the nature and functioning of a great state university, but both were convinced that, however desirable in itself, the attempt to introduce a novel and relatively independent institution into so complicated a structure would end, and probably end quickly, in disaster. The plan was therefore abandoned, and it was arranged that Mr. Meiklejohn should come to Madison as a student and teacher of philosophy, beginning his work in February, 1926.

3. THE STUDY COMMISSION

The plan for a new college, conceived in the East, was dead. In Wisconsin it came to life again, but in a different form. In its second birth it is not a "new" but an "experimental" college. For the proper telling or reading of this story it is essential that we see and feel the importance of that transformation.

Mr. Frank began his active presidency in September, 1925. Mr. Meiklejohn was to begin his teaching of philosophy in February, 1926. On January 16, 1926, the former sent to the latter a letter in which the following startling words appear: "Would you be shocked if I told you that I think I have found a way to create and sustain 'an experimental college of liberal arts' inside the university?" The letter then outlines the form which the project might take

at Wisconsin, and proceeds: "Personally I should dislike to see such an experimental college set up here if it meant the indefinite postponement of fairly prompt and far-reaching readjustments in the regular college procedure. But after all that can be reasonably and rightfully done soon to the college as a whole, there will remain the need for a real laboratory for higher education in which the most radical hypotheses may be tested and tried. I am confident that such an experimental laboratory set up inside one of our great universities will more quickly and effectively provide leadership for the whole system of higher education in America than would a separate experimental college." And again, the letter says, "I am concerned that the University of Wisconsin shall provide the first really experimental laboratory of higher education."

If we ask, Why did the new president so quickly reverse an earlier decision, why after four months in the university did he find it ready to give birth and sustenance to a project which before his coming had seemed alien and unwelcome? the answer may be found along two different lines. First, the activities of the University Committee, already mentioned, revealed and suggested a demand within the community for fundamental study of its teaching aims and procedures. But side by side with this there had also appeared an active interest in reconsideration of the social phases of student life. And especially in the plans for the building of dormitories for men there was expressed a definite and very powerful determination to seek new forms of group living which should give promise of genuine educational values. But it was just these two interests which

the projected new college in the East had taken as its dominating purposes. If then the teaching motive of the earlier, narrower venture could be taken up into, could become an item within, the larger survey of its teaching which the university demanded, if the earlier plans for the forming of a social group should be found to harmonize with those which were to be developed in the new dormitories, then the new college in its changed form might find a useful, a happy place in this self-criticizing university. In a word, it seemed possible that by entering into the larger scheme of experimentation to which the university was apparently ready to commit itself the new college might be transformed into an experimental college. It was upon the basis of this supposition that the president joined with the University Committee in urging the appointment of an All-University Study Commission. The membership of the commission was as follows: Glenn Frank, President of the University; George Clark Sellery, Dean of the College of Letters and Science and Professor of History; Charles Sumner Slichter, Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Mathematics; Harold Cornelius Bradley, Professor of Physiological Chemistry and Chairman of the Committee on Dormitories; John Rogers Commons, Professor of Economics; Michael Frederic Guyer, Professor of Zoology; Alexander Meiklejohn, Professor of Philosophy; William Herbert Page, Professor of Law.

4. FORMAL ACTION

Under its instructions to make a general study of the university, the commission very quickly decided upon the

first two years of the College of Letters and Science as the point at which its initial inquiry should be made. It directed Mr. Meiklejohn to prepare general proposals for experimental procedure in those two years along the lines of his earlier, published suggestions. These proposals, after being subjected to sharp and lively criticisms, were made into a concrete plan by a subcommittee of Dean Sellery and Mr. Meiklejohn, and this plan was approved. It was recommended to the Faculty of Letters and Science, first in a general report, and next as a scheme of concrete legislation. This scheme was amended in two particulars by the Faculty of Letters and Science, and, being then adopted on May 26, 1926, was in turn approved by the University Faculty and by the Board of Regents. The Experimental College thus came into legal being.

5. FIRST ARRANGEMENTS

Since action had been taken late in the academic year, it seemed impossible to make necessary preparations in time for the opening of the college in September, 1926. Mr. Meiklejohn was appointed chairman of the college with instructions to arrange for the selection of a faculty, to invite the registration of students, and to make other plans so far as that could be done in advance of the action of the faculty group which was to have the college in charge. These arrangements were made during the year 1926-27, and in September, 1927, the college began its work. The eleven "Advisers"¹ who had accepted appointment were: Alexander Meiklejohn, Walter R. Agard, John

¹ This is the title by which the teachers in the Experimental College chose to be named.

M. Gaus, Laurance J. Saunders, Percy M. Dawson, Samuel G. A. Rogers, Malcolm P. Sharp, Paul A. Raushenbush, William B. Phillips, Carl M. Bögholt, John W. Powell, Jr.

CHAPTER II

THE FORM OF THIS REPORT

I. THE FORM

How shall one tell the story of five years of complicated discussions? The question is not an easy one. In answer to it the Advisers have chosen a rather unusual type of formulation. This report will not be a concerted statement expressing simply all those facts and conclusions about which its writers are agreed. Except in its recommendations it will not claim at any special point to be representative of the college as a whole. It will be rather a series of individual statements prepared by all those who have at any time served as Advisers or outside lecturers in the college. The first statement, written by the chairman of the college, will attempt to give a detailed narration of the experiences and studies of the five years, weaving them together into some sort of a single texture. The other statements will take the form of comments upon this, either by question on matters of fact, by expression of agreement or disagreement, or by the raising of issues to which the writer has some special relationship of interest or responsibility. It is hoped that this form of statement will give, on the one hand, the continuity and coherence which the

understanding of a group of related questions demands, while, on the other hand, it provides full scope for the presentation of all significant differences of experience and opinion.¹ The question here stated and the answer adopted are so revealing of the peculiar situation and quality of the college that it seems worth while to consider them further.

Throughout its brief existence the Experimental College has been a place of meeting for conflicting points of view. It has been an institution about which and within which people have differed widely, excitedly, even passionately. That this should be true was implied in the very definition of the college itself. It was, from the first, a provocative invitation to the holding and expressing of differing opinions, to the carrying on of controversy.

In accordance with the purpose expressed in Mr. Frank's letter of January 16, 1926, the college was to be an experimental laboratory for the trying and testing of rival theories of college teaching. In this laboratory, old and highly respected methods of teaching were to be criticized and called to account. In it, likewise, new and untried forms of education, procedures as yet half-baked or raw, were to be given a chance to reveal whatever of promise there might be in them. Theoretically at least, in this experimental laboratory all points of view about liberal education were, first, to meet, and, second, to submit themselves to scrutiny.

Now it is very obvious that the first half of this program

¹ In Chapter XIX the reader will find that upon presentation of the chairman's statement this arrangement was abandoned.

is much more easy to carry out than is the second. In a university community one can easily assemble a collection of ideas about education and the assembly can be made sufficiently varied and comprehensive. But what is the process of "scrutiny"? How is the meeting brought to order? Just what are the principles of procedure, the standards of judgment which are followed in a laboratory where teaching arrangements are the materials of investigation? How does one transform a huge collocation of theories about education into an ordered, measured, scientific judgment which has a right to claim authority over them?

The truth is, of course, that the notion here involved, that of social experimentation, of scientific method in the study of human relations, is a very difficult one. The term, social experimentation, means something, and that something is exceedingly important. There is a vital difference between the carrying on of a social activity along traditional and uncriticized lines and the attempt to determine the relative values of different social activities by comparative determination of their effects and by the measurement or estimation of these in relation to the achieving of desired ends. Even in fields in which accurate measurement of conditions and effects is practically impossible the term "good" or "scientific" or "experimental," as applied to thinking, is useful as indicating an attitude of critical approach, a disposition of inquiry, which is essential to intelligent social planning. And yet it remains true that the term "experiment" cannot be made to mean in the social sciences what it means in a physical laboratory or

even in a biological investigation. It expresses the fundamental scientific demands for accuracy, for testing, for coherence, and yet the social field is one in which questions of accuracy, of verification, of coherence must be, and must remain, in relatively large degree, matters of personal and conflicting opinion.

Now if this be the nature of social experimentation, there is revealed the difficulty of the question, "How shall one tell the story of that particular social inquiry known as the Experimental College?" And the difficulty is that, as has been said, the history of the college is, in large measure, the history of the meetings and conflictings of different points of view. Sometimes those conflicts are explicit and head-on. Often they are indirect, accidental, half-realized. But in either case, the question remains, "How shall an individual or a group which is involved in a whirl of warring opinions upon many questions arrange to give a comprehensive and coherent account of the whole process which, taken together, those opinions constitute?" The issue here stated is not that of fairness or impartiality. It is one of rhetoric rather than one of morals. It is the question of so assembling and arranging a confusing and baffling mass of controversial material that it shall have intelligible meaning. No form of statement would be adequate to meet this demand as one would wish it met. The Advisers have taken the one which seems most promising, one which attempts to combine the values of a continuous narration with those of independent comment and discussion by all the individuals who have shared in the study.

2. THE OUTLINE

The discussions with which the report must deal fall into two fields. First, there were the three relatively definite and specific problems which were assigned to the college in the sentence, "The purpose of the new College will be to formulate and to test under experimental conditions suggestions for the improvement of methods of teaching, the content of study, and the determining conditions of undergraduate liberal education." These three problems relating to freshman and sophomore work mark the field of discussion within the "laboratory" itself, within the group of students, lecturers, and advisers. But there is a second field of interest which is determined by the fact that the college has been an integral part of the University of Wisconsin. The questions considered by the college are also considered by the wider university. The arrangements made by the college affect and are affected by the arrangements made in other parts of the university. The issues considered by the college are in reality, only special phases of wider issues which are being studied by the university as a whole, not to mention other universities and schools throughout the world which meet them as permanent and inevitable incidents of the enterprise of education. Now it is evident that this report should in the main limit itself to the first of these two fields. The Advisers have not been asked to tell the university about the thinking which the university has been doing during these past five years. They are directed to report upon their own more limited studies. And yet the narrower story cannot be adequately told with-

out some reference to the wider. That reference should be kept as limited as possible, but it cannot be eliminated if the report is to be intelligible. The Experimental College must be seen not only as making a study of educational problems, but also as doing that for and within the University of Wisconsin. Accordingly, the last section of this report will, under the title "Experimenting in a University," give an account of relations between the college and the wider community by which it has been established and maintained. The main body of the report will be devoted to a statement of the problems which the Advisers were directed to study and to an account of the experiences in which that study has taken form.

3. BEFORE THE DISCUSSIONS BEGAN

Still another set of observations should be made if the studies of the Advisers are to be seen in their proper setting. Though the vote of the Study Commission, the faculties, and the regents was couched in general terms, it must be remembered that there had been presented to all these bodies specific suggestions as to the lines which experimentation might first take. When they voted, they had in mind not merely experimentation in general, but also experimentation in certain rather definite forms.

And in like manner, when the Advisers assembled for their first meeting in September, 1927, they found themselves already committed, by previous action of their chairman (based on preliminary conferences), to certain tentative decisions upon policies concerning which there might be, and in fact has been, very wide difference of opinion

within the group. One cannot assemble a class of students, one cannot pledge university funds, take over rooms and buildings, organize a faculty, without at the same time determining some matters of policy as the basis on which the enterprise shall be begun. And so it came about that in all three of the fields within which they were to seek experience and to form judgments, the Advisers at the start found that provisional decisions had already been made. It was virtually decided that the greater part of the first freshman year should be given to a study of the Athenian civilization in or about the age of Pericles. It was practically assured that the tutorial method of teaching would at first predominate. It had been arranged that all the students of the first class should live in certain sections of Adams Hall. These necessary preliminary decisions, taken together, became, as it were, the first tentative hypothesis with which the activity of experimentation began. They were all, of course, open to reversal, to modification, or to rejection upon the basis of future experience. But the fact remains that it is in relation to these first arrangements, to their continuance or the substitution of others for them, that the story of the deliberations of the Advisers must be told.

It may be worth while, at this point, to indicate in a very general way the course which the forming opinions of the Advisers have taken in relation to the three phases of this "preliminary hypothesis." First, in the field of the course of study there has been wide and serious difference of opinion as to the value of the original decision. It is probable that an overwhelming majority of the Advisers would

agree with the one or two primary principles upon which that decision was based. But to many of the Advisers it seems that those principles might find more significant contents in which to clothe themselves. And to a small minority the principles themselves are open to serious question. Second, in the field of method there is substantial acceptance of the advantages of the tutorial scheme of instruction. Many details, and even many important features, of the procedure are uncertain, but in general the hypothesis is sustained. Third, concerning the determining conditions of undergraduate life as centering about residence in Adams Hall the Advisers find themselves perplexed and baffled. Here again, there is probably strong support for the general purpose expressed in the arrangement. But the actual conditions of life in Adams Hall and in the surrounding university community have seriously complicated the situation. The Advisers have sought and received valuable assistance from outside, but the social problem here involved remains for them, under actual conditions, a very difficult one.

4. EARLIER REPORTS ON THE COLLEGE

As already noted, two amendments were made by the Faculty of Letters and Science to the recommendations of the Study Commission. They will be found in the sixth and seventh paragraphs of the document which records the vote of May 26, 1926. One of these amendments provided that results of the new experiments should be applied to the College of Letters and Science only by specific action

of the faculty of that college. The other amendment provided for "Reports."

Upon this point, the recommendation of the Study Commission was as follows: "It was understood that the detailed set-up of the experiment, when completed, will be submitted to the Letters and Science Faculty for discussion and suggestion, and that periodic reports of progress of the work of the Experimental College will be presented to the Faculty." To this provision the new amendment added the following sentence: "Similar reports shall be made and presented by the Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science or by some other committee of that College specially chosen to study the work of the Experimental College." In other words, the faculty voted that reports of progress should be made not only by the Advisers, but also by some committee of the Faculty of Letters and Science.

In accordance with these provisions the Advisers presented on October 17, 1927, their "set-up" report, and in each succeeding year reports of progress have been by them presented to the Faculty of Letters and Science. The arrangement for similar reports by a committee of the faculty has, however, been allowed to lapse, with the exception that on May 10, 1929, a special committee, appointed in that year to study the work of the college, presented its findings.

5. ANOTHER REPORT STILL TO COME

There is still one other source from which may be expected in time an important study of the work of the Ex-

perimental College. It is the University Bureau of Guidance and Records.

At their first meeting in September, 1927, the Advisers considered plans for the securing of objective measurements of the work of the college and of its students. A memorandum was at once sent to the president of the university in which comment was asked upon (1) the general question of tests, (2) the possibility of securing some expert member of the faculty to advise and guide the Advisers in the giving of tests, and (3) the establishing of a university agency for the making and interpreting of personnel records. When this memorandum was sent to the Faculty of Letters and Science the Advisers called attention to two principles involved in the measurement of college records: (1) that such testing and measurement should be largely carried on by persons who are not upon the staff of the Experimental College, and (2) that, being comparative, it necessarily involves the testing of students and teaching in other parts of the university. Since that time the Bureau of Guidance and Records has been established and it has begun the building up of a scheme of comparative records on the basis of which it hopes to publish reports on the work of the college. It is obvious that these reports should be quite separate from those which are made by the Advisers of the college. Each, however, should in valuable ways supplement the other.

APPENDIX II

A REPORT

BY

DR. FRANKWOOD WILLIAMS

Granted that liberal teaching is disturbing to a young man just reaching maturity, the question is, Why is this so? Need it be so? What can be done to minimize the disturbance?

It needs must be so and for reasons that the Advisers have already found; the solution of the problem will be found in analyzing, further than the Advisers have thus far been able to do, the nature of this disturbance.

The adolescent, as he enters college—not some, all, if one does not let himself be deceived by outward appearance—is a most insecure individual and one of his chief problems is that of freeing himself from the anxiety caused by his insecurity. This is a problem of greater importance for him, as it is one that will affect his entire life, than obtaining at the moment any amount of factual knowledge. His instructors have been accustomed to think that he came to the university to learn, but this is true only in a minor sense. His purpose to learn—in the manner available at a university—is only one element, and often a weak one, in a larger plan blindly directed at solving his insecurity problem—he calls it by many names if he is sufficiently aware of it. In his effort to establish some se-

curity for himself he has up to this time more or less accepted unthinkingly and given his allegiance to such social organization and standards as he has found about him. These are things tested and established that he can tie to—"democracy," "industry," "religion," "ideals," "science," "success," and the like. Or, if for the moment his effort at freeing himself from his former dependence has led him into a rebellious attitude, he may find security in "radicalism," or he may have identified himself with some one in his environment who has impressed him and become "ambitious" in some direction. These are fumbling movements in the right direction in his effort to free himself from earlier too great dependency, and to become independent but at the same time secure, and they are to be respected; but they must also be properly evaluated if we are to understand the boy.

Bring these things seriously into question as by examining them in the process of liberal teaching, the boy's security is upset and he is thrown into "panic." This will manifest itself in many ways, depression, over-excitement, irritability, confusion, worry over unimportant matters, stubbornness, surliness, stiff-mindedness. Some will revert to earlier habit patterns and show an increasing dependence and desire to be directed and guided; others, in an effort not to do this, will become rebellious and attempt to assert their independence in bizarre and curious ways. A flood of emotions and reactions are let loose, as the Advisers are well aware, that would tend to disconcert the strongest-hearted and raise the questions that have been asked in Chapter XIII—is liberal teaching, after all, inad-

visible for adolescents; does it require of them more than they are able to stand; instead of helping them are we actually injuring them?

The teaching has precipitated something, but it has not created a new difficulty. It has not created an anxiety that did not exist before. It has merely uncovered a condition that already existed, a condition that the boy brought with him to the college. It has opened an old wound, but a wound that was already healing badly. It has revealed the thoroughly unhealthy condition beneath a satisfactory-seeming exterior. It is less serious to have this situation revealed at this time (between eighteen and twenty) than later when responsibilities are greater.

Whether it would be better to let well-enough alone, whether what has happened will be injurious, will depend entirely upon how it is used. If the situation is left at this point it can well be injurious, for the boy left naked before cold winds will in his panic seek cover in unwisest ways, if he is not upset altogether. If, however, the situation is considered a beginning rather than an end, and is used constructively, incalculable benefit can result. But, for the false security that has been taken away, a truer security must be found.

How this is to be brought about is a matter for experimentation itself, but a few tentative suggestions may be made. We may think in terms of the individual and of the group. The eventual winning through of the student will be an individual matter, to be sure, but a part of his problem can be worked out with the group.

The problem resolves itself (1) into the management of

the symptoms manifested by the individual or by the group and (2) into the management of the condition itself. In the first place, we must not confuse symptom and condition. We must be alert to symptoms, but not disconcerted by them. They are valuable indicators of what is going on, but that is all. To have our attention distracted to them is almost as fatal as confusing symptom and condition. Almost the only excuse for attending to symptoms at all is that they are likely to disturb others, and this may set in motion a trend of events that makes the situation unnecessarily complicated. Symptoms are seldom to be treated themselves; symptoms will yield with the successful treatment of the underlying condition.

Having clearly in mind, as one starts with a new group at the first of the year, not only what the steps in the teaching method are to be from month to month, but what the emotional process is going to be through which the student will pass, would it not be possible to regulate this as well as the teaching? In general the process is going to be one of loss of security, confusion, and the building up of security. The problem is, how to control panic during the period of insecurity and not let the situation get out of hand. This can best be managed, so far as the group is concerned, it seems to me, by not permitting the group temperature to rise too high—individuals may develop a flaming temperature at any moment, but that is a matter for individual handling and we are concerned for the moment with the group.

Knowing what is to happen, preparation should be made in advance for controlling the group temperature. As tem-

perature mounts and gets close to an uncomfortable or unbearable point the school should be ready with relief. This relief should be not in change of method or change of content, but in temporary distraction away from the growing anxiety. Physical exercise and athletics are the usual outlet offered, good both as distraction and in the building up of physical health. A variety of "recreations" can be utilized. I would suggest, however, the arts as even better means of "escape," and it is "escape," deliberately planned, that we are speaking of for the moment. These would not be offered as permanent solutions for the student's anxiety problem. They would be offered as of value for the moment in meeting a situation with which he is not yet able to cope in order that he may gain strength or, at least, conserve strength, to carry on with his conflict until a solution is reached. One would have a care that students did not accept such avenues as permanent solutions. For students with special talents one would not have concern, as for them the particular art may well become not so much an avenue of escape as a means of expression.

The point, however, is that the school should be prepared in advance with these things. In time it would be possible to know with a very considerable degree of accuracy at just what periods these things must be introduced in order to bring necessary relief. Until such experience could be gained it would be necessary to be ready and to offer them as it was seen that the need was arising.

This has been done to some extent and, I believe the Advisers agree, with benefit. I would emphasize its importance and urge much more extensive preparation for it,

sufficient (only to be determined by experience) to absorb the too great anxiety developing at any given time in the group. Obviously, whatever was prepared would not be forced upon the student. It would be made available and its use encouraged in the same way that material in the study course is made available and its use encouraged. Initiative cannot be left in this matter entirely to the student. Because of the very need it seeks to relieve, the student is prevented from having much initiative. Left to himself, he will likely stew in his own juice with further handicap to himself.

The greatest possibility for temporary security is offered by contact with the Advisers. As they are well aware, the Advisers are in a position to add to or to decrease the amount of anxiety in the student. This will be done not so much through what they say as by their attitude. Anxiety on their part will be rapidly communicated to the student. The present Advisers, with the finest will possible to be helpful to the students, have been handicapped by their lack of knowledge of the student himself. This is not surprising. Teachers have been trained to teach, or, in the university, not even that. They have been trained in a subject. The object they are to teach has been taken for granted. The Advisers of the Experimental College, in an ordinary college situation would stand out as instructors with an uncommon knowledge of the student, interest in him as an individual and desire to help him. But in the Experimental College where, in the process of growth, emotional problems become almost a part of the teaching process, their knowledge has not been sufficient. They are the first to admit this.

This is not the place to go into the matter deeply, but a few words may be said. It is of the greatest importance that the Adviser be thoroughly objective in viewing his student. He must be able to stand apart and, with understanding, watch what is going on in his student and apply his remedy in accordance with what he observes. He must not identify himself with the mood or the confusion of the student. For the moment the student is a piece of jetsam floating about in a wild flood. If he finds the Adviser nothing more than another but larger piece of jetsam, he may join with him in a fellow-feeling of misery, but he will not gain much security. In a commendable effort to be honest with the student, not to pose or to hold themselves up as "authorities" to be respected, to be what any honest instructor is, a fellow student, the Adviser is inclined to lean over backward, as it were, and to reveal himself too fully. Not too fully for one able to understand but too fully for an adolescent who is to be helped through an insecure period. What the instructor does, how much of himself, his own doubts and fears and uncertainties, he reveals and how much he withholds must be determined not by impulse or by a general principle of honesty, but by what it is that he is trying to do and by what is demanded by the particular circumstances. As to the answers to the many questions that arise for discussion in liberal teaching, the instructor may be as uncertain as any student. A frank admission of this will be helpful rather than harmful to the student. But the instructor may be expected to have a greater confidence in the integrity of his own mind, of the process of thinking and study, of the method of his teaching, of what is happening to the student, and of its

probable outcome. These give him a strength that the student does not have. It is the strength, it is hoped, the student will in the end obtain. It is the strength that must provide for the student during his insecure period. And, as has been said, it is a strength that will be communicated not so much by word as by attitude.

The present Advisers have been at a great disadvantage, to be sure, in that the strength that would ordinarily be theirs has not been altogether theirs by reason of the experimental conditions under which they have been working. They could not have confidence in their method, as it was experimental, and they could not have full confidence in what was happening to their students because it was not clear to them. Such a situation is temporary, however, and will correct itself with greater experience. With greater experience in experimentation will come, too, a confidence in the ability of the young adult to weather experimentation so that each new situation need not cause concern.

It would be easy to say that a psychiatrist should be a member of the staff of Experimental College. But this would not be my opinion. The advice of a suitably trained psychiatrist should be available for individual cases as in any large teaching organization. The problem as a whole, however, is a problem for the Advisers, and it is one which, with greater experience and with better working conditions, they can solve. To good will, however, must be added a more precise knowledge of the nature of the emotional strivings of the student. This is not news to the Advisers who were almost painfully aware of this need.

How Advisers shall get the information they need is a troublesome problem. It is not necessary that they be "ex-

perts" in human behavior, but they should have a working knowledge sufficient to give them assurance in what they are doing and a reasonable sureness of touch in any given situation. In the course of events, as the teaching profession becomes more aware of the objects they are endeavoring to teach, aware not only of the intellectual processes, but of the emotional processes of their students, instructors properly equipped will appear. But this does not help us for the moment. Given a sensitive but reasonably well-adjusted individual as an instructor, something should be accomplished through a carefully planned course of reading. Left to himself in the selection of this reading, the instructor is likely to develop as great a panic as his youngest student in the face of the questions the instructor raises for him. To plan such reading would not be easy. There is no "book" that can be read; there is, in fact, no series of books to be read in this, this, and this order. The material the instructor needs exists in very considerable quantity, but it is scattered and not readily to be found by those unfamiliar with the field. Those working and writing in the field have not been working with the instructor primarily in mind, and the knowledge that they have gained which would be of use to the instructor has, unfortunately, not been assembled in anything like an adequate way. This could well be the task of some one if that some one could be found. One equipped to do it is likely to be found with commitments that make it impossible; those with available time to do it are usually not equipped. However, it should be possible to have prepared a reading guide that would be helpful. Advisers—and others—must, however, prepare themselves for such reading by giving up

the idea of obtaining something quickly. There is no field in which it would be more difficult to feed with a golden spoon. What knowledge others have gained has been gained through a lifetime of work and study, as is the case in any field, the Adviser's own, and this knowledge and experience cannot be put into a few sugar-coated pellets to be swallowed without pain. When the Adviser chooses, or is forced by circumstances, to enter this field he is undertaking a responsibility that will require of him all that he has to give.

Better than a reading course—which at best cannot be arranged to meet always the immediate problems; which allows misinterpretation and misunderstanding; which raises questions that are answerable but which may not be answered in the material at hand—would be a suitably trained psychiatrist available for regular, informal discussion with the Advisers. The informality would, of course, be in the conduct of the discussions; the content of the discussions should be systematically planned by the psychiatrist, although sufficiently flexible to allow for the discussion of current problems. In other words, a seminar of the Advisers led by a suitably trained psychiatrist. Until such time as teachers are adequately prepared to deal with the human equation in their teaching, and particularly in schools such as the Experimental College, where the very method of teaching increases this problem—and, let it be said at once, helpfully and to the good of all concerned—assistance from the psychiatrist would seem an absolute essential. The Advisers' situation is not unlike that of the student. The problem of both is that of insecurity under the circumstances. As the Adviser is in a position to give

security to the student during the period that he is finding his own, just so should a psychiatrist, also a fellow student, but a little further along the particular road concerned, give security to the Adviser. In neither case should the security of the more experienced be allowed to become a substitute for the lesser experienced. The Adviser must not take responsibility for growth from the student, nor the psychiatrist such responsibility from the Adviser. In both instances the help is merely until the other fellow "gets on his feet."

Some teaching in the field of human behavior has been given in the college. With care not to injure balance and perspective in the course as a whole, this might well be extended somewhat. A student at the Experimental College quickly becomes aware that one of his chief problems is himself—his habits or lack of habits of work, his likes and dislikes, his prejudices, his moods, his feelings about things. Information about these problems will not alone solve them, but it will get him a step farther than endless mulling and feverish introspection. With less need for such preoccupation he is in a better position to attend to and profit by the educational opportunities given him.

My confidence in the experiment is implicit in what I have already written, but perhaps I may be permitted a more direct word. Not as an educator—others must judge the educational significance of the experiment—but as a student of adolescent development, the essential rightness and soundness of the experiment seems to me unquestioned. It is not the last word. There is another step, but for a future so distant as to make its discussion imprac-

ticable here. The experiment is a safe stride in the right direction.

In so far as the results may have fallen short of the desires of the Chairman and the Advisers, this has been due not to any essential unrightness of the plan, but to the entering in of factors which could not have been wholly foreseen by men of their training. Such difficulties as have arisen in the course of the experiment—I refer to the emotional reactions of the students—are minor, when properly understood, and do not affect the plan as a whole. Often they have appeared both to the Advisers and to others as mountainous, but this is not the case. These problems are not unimportant, but they are incidental and they are manageable. Without special knowledge, in the beginning, as to some of the factors that would be involved in the experiment, those who have conducted it have had an amazingly sure instinct in isolating and evaluating and, indeed, handling some of the more important of them. With greater understanding and experience on the part of the Advisers and with the organization of the college better designed and equipped to meet the problems that it is now known will arise in the process of liberal teaching, some of them can be eliminated and others brought to an undisturbing minimum.

APPENDIX III

NOTE ON CONTENT OF CURRICULUM

The following memorandum, which suggests a possible curriculum content for a "lower college," to be considered in case the recommendations of the Advisers should be adopted, has been written by Professor John M. Gaus, who has played a major part in the planning of the sophomore work in the Experimental College.

MEMORANDUM

This suggestion springs from two sources—(1) experience with the regional study of the sophomore year of the Experimental College, and (2) reflections upon the peculiar opportunities and obligations of a state university. It is, in effect, a recommendation of a course of study which might profitably be adopted in one of the proposed "lower college" units.

It has been fashionable in some quarters to depreciate both the achievement and the opportunity of the state university. Yet the student may find there the study of the wider aspects of problems observable at first hand in his own community and region. The peculiar relationship of the state university to its state may assist in integrating the past experience and present studies of a student to the problems with which he must later grapple as a citizen.

At present many factors conspire to make this integration of intellectual effort with close-at-hand problems de-

sirable and even necessary. Recent university legislation regarding the curriculum assumes a reconsideration of the objectives and content of the freshman and sophomore years. The urgent problems freshly revealed by the economic depression will increasingly be thrust upon university men and women. From them must be recruited both those who will contribute as scholars to the understanding of these problems in research and teaching, and those who will actively participate in other ways in the civic life of the state.

Teaching experience in the Experimental College at once forced a further consideration of these matters and afforded a rich opportunity for practical observation concerning them. It is an obligation arising from this privilege that one to whom they are of special interest should discuss them further here and draw some conclusions.

As a result of the adoption of the recommendations of the Fish Committee Report the university is committed to certain policies relating to the selection of student personnel which will increasingly attract wide interest throughout the state. The first two years of study, those in what we may term the junior college, are now officially recognized as complete in themselves; investigations are now being undertaken which are aimed at the more accurate prediction of those high-school students who can profit most by university work. There can be little doubt that this will subject the university to very careful scrutiny as to whether its course of study and methods of instruction in the first two years are such that students of whom "college ability" is predicted profit from their two years and enter the junior class, entrance into which is to be

more difficult than in the past. Here the problem will be largely one of motivation of the student. There will also be the other question as to whether the university can offer, in these two years, something of value to those who for various reasons will not continue. Both questions will be examined more sharply in the future by school-teachers and parents.

The demands which the state will make in the future upon university-trained men and women will probably increase. There is much evidence for the view that the next few decades will see our states confronting some very difficult problems of policy which will profoundly affect the status, opportunity, and the means of support of their universities. For example, it is interesting that the state in whose university Professor Turner developed the frontier concept is now facing an almost complete revolution in the problem of its basic resource, land. For at least the next half century Wisconsin will have to work out an intelligently directed land policy; yet at the present time there are many who assume that automatically as the forests are cleared profitable agriculture succeeds. Nor can the educational aspects of this be left to the College of Agriculture alone, despite the fact that it possesses outstanding scholars in all phases of the problem; for the issues ramify out into standards of social services for the undeveloped or marginal regions, aid from the more prosperous regions, the development of industries, the rearrangement of governmental services and units, and the whole way of life which it is deemed desirable to encourage in the state, given the available material and human resources. Yet this is only one, and that perhaps the least

dramatic of the problems that Wisconsin has confronting it. There is no young man or young woman in the state who aspires to a college education who should not be brought into acquaintance with these questions and stimulated to some sense of civic responsibility for personal activity in regard to them.

In an inadequate and modest way the regional studies have served to reveal to many of us at least that junior-college students of quite varying backgrounds and abilities can in some measure be brought to see the challenge indicated here. Yet at the present time it is the problem of the junior college which is in many respects and from most points of view the most difficult. There is not only the difficulty of the adjustment of the student as a total person to perplexing new situations, but a sense of uncertainty on the part of the teacher as to what he is to attempt in his courses. The prestige attaching to certain types of research has drawn many of the more influential and important teachers away from these problems to advanced seminars and their own research. By the same token, this may be in part responsible for the disconcerting difficulty in interesting undergraduate students of good ability in their formative years in advanced scholarship and significant research—a situation so serious, for example, that the Social Science Research Council is now conducting special inquiries into the question of recruitment of able undergraduates into graduate study for ultimate teaching and research. My own belief is that we shall also require many more similarly trained “public servants” in the future, not only in governments, but also in such fields as banking and industry, where the wider community as-

pects of the decisions of "private" business are now being revealed to us in no tender way.

I therefore recommend to the sympathetic consideration and action of the committee which is to consider this report the establishment of a course of study in the first two years whose content shall be the state of Wisconsin. There is occasion here only to indicate briefly some of the concrete material which I have thought about for this during recent years. It falls into what may arbitrarily and obviously be viewed as the physical, social, and cultural aspects, the study of each to be pursued through the two-year period.

By the physical aspect, I mean the lay of the land and the resources which it offers to the various techniques which men have devised for making use of them, seen in historical perspective with the transition from the Indian hunting economy through French and British fur-trading imperialism to American agricultural settlement, lumbering, dairying, and varied manufacture. This would involve substantial reliance upon the earth sciences and their application, and biological sciences and their application. It would include the physical factors in determination of settlements, transport, and the development of economic activity.

By the social aspect, I mean the development of economic and political organization for getting at and utilizing these resources, the basis for the conflict of groups and parties which ensues, the relationship of these resources and the needs of the people to other regions and countries, with resulting questions of national and international policy, the migration of people here, and population trends.

By the cultural aspects (employing the term somewhat

narrowly) I mean the stock of ideas brought by the different peoples and those developed here, as reflected in books and institutions. This might be attempted through permitting a choice of more intensive study of the cultures once related to the region—*e.g.*, eighteenth-century France, or eighteenth-century Britain, nineteenth-century Germany, New England of the first half of the nineteenth century, or the Middle West of the last half-century.

While I have for my own interest worked out possibilities of specific assignments in books, field trips, and the like, this is the place only for suggesting the general idea. Its development clearly calls for the pooling of ideas and experiences of a group—preferably of fifteen or twenty people drawn from the fields suggested. I believe that its development by a group of teachers in the fashion suggested in the final chapter of the report would serve to give more meaning to instruction in the first two years, stimulate certain students to an interest in pursuing research into problems or ideas revealed as urgent and significant in terms of their own experience and observation, and give the basic instruction of the university a more vital part in equipping students for the tasks of civic life.

APPENDIX IV

Assignments prepared for the class which leaves the college in
June, 1932

EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE FIRST YEAR BOOK LIST

1930-31

The following books are in the Freshman Study Rooms (Fellow's Suite) in La Follette House:

- Agard, W. R., *The Greek Tradition in Sculpture*
Anderson, W. J., *The Architecture of Greece and Rome*
Aristophanes, *The Frogs and Other Plays; Plays* (Loeb Classical Library); *The Clouds*
Aristotle, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (tr. by Ingram Bywater); *De Partibus Animalium; Politics* (tr. by Jowett); *Æconomica* (tr. by E. S. Forster); *Nicomachean Ethics* (tr. by Welldon)
Atherton, G., *The Immortal Marriage*
Bakewell, *Sourcebook of Ancient Philosophy*
Barker, Ernest, *Greek Political Theory*
Bell, Clive, *Art; Civilization*
Bonner, R. J., *Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens*
Botsford, G. W., *Hellenic Civilization*
Burnet, John, *Early Greek Philosophy*
Bury, J. B., *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*
Calhoun, G. M., *The Business Life of Ancient Athens; The Growth of Criminal Law in Ancient Greece*
Cambridge Ancient History (ed. by J. B. Bury and others)
Carpenter, R., *Esthetic Basis of Greek Art*
Carritt, E. F., *The Theory of Beauty*
Collignon, *Le Parthenon* (pictures)
Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens*

- Cushman, *Beginners' History of Philosophy*
- Davis, W. S., *A Day in Old Athens; A Victor of Salamis*
- Demosthenes, *The Crown, the Philippics, and Ten Other Orations*
- Dickinson, G. L., *The Greek View of Life*
- Epictetus, *Moral Discourses* (tr. by Elizabeth Carter)
- Euripides, *Alcestis* (tr. by Gilbert Murray); *The Bacchæ* (tr. by Gilbert Murray); *Hippolytus* (tr. by Gilbert Murray); *Iphigenia* (tr. by Gilbert Murray); *Tragedies* (tr. by A. S. Way); *Trojan Women* (tr. by Gilbert Murray)
- Fowler, *A Handbook of Greek Archæology*
- Fox, *Greek and Roman Mythology*
- Freeman, K. J., *Schools of Hellas*
- Galen, *Galen on the Natural Faculties* (tr. by Brock)
- Gardner, E. A., *Ancient Athens; Six Greek Sculptors*
- Glaspell, Susan, *The Road to the Temple*
- Glotz, Gustave, *Ancient Greece at Work; Greek City*
- Greenidge, A. H. J., *A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*
- Grundy, G. B. (ed.), *Murray's Small Classical Atlas*
- Gulick, C. B., *The Life of the Ancient Greeks*
- Harrison, Jane, *Ancient Art and Ritual*
- Heath, Sir Thomas, *A History of Greek Mathematics*
- Heiberg, J. L., *Mathematics and Physical Science in Classical Antiquity*
- Herodotus, *History* (tr. by George Rawlinson)
- Hesiod, *Poems and Fragments* (tr. by A. W. Mair)
- Hippocrates, *Works* (tr. by W. H. S. Jones, Loeb Library)
- Holdt, Hans, *Picturesque Greece* (pictures)
- Homer, *Iliad* (tr. by Lang, Leaf, and Myers); *Odyssey* (tr. by Butcher and Lang); *Odyssey* (tr. by Samuel Butler); *Odyssey* (tr. by Bates)
- Horton, *Home of Nymphs and Vampires*
- Howe, George (ed.), *Greek Literature in Translation*
- Hutchinson, W. M. L., *The Muses' Pageant* (mythology)

- Hyde, William DeWitt, *The Five Great Philosophies of Life*
 Jebb, *Attic Orators*
 Laistner, M. L. W. (ed. and tr.), *Greek Economics*
 Lippmann, Walter, *Public Opinion*
 Livingstone, R. W. (ed.), *The Legacy of Greece; The Greek
 Genius and Its Meaning to Us*
 Lucian, *Works* (tr. by H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler)
 Mackail, J. W., *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*
 Marshall, F. H., *Discovery in Greek Lands*
 Mears, *Greece Today*
 Mitchison, Naomi, *Cloud Cuckoo Land*
 Moore, C. H., *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*
 Murray, Gilbert, *A History of Ancient Greek Literature; Euripides
 and His Age; Five Stages of Greek Religion; Tradition
 and Progress*
 Myres, J. L., *The Political Ideas of the Greeks*
 Norwood, Gilbert, *Greek Tragedy*
 Pindar, *Odes* (tr. by J. Sandys)
 Plato, *Dialogues* (tr. by Jowett); *Dialogues* (selected from Jowett
 translation)
 Plutarch, *Lives* ("Dryden Plutarch," revised by A. H. Clough);
Six Lives (Perrin)
 Poulsen, Frederik, *Delphi* (tr. by G. C. Richards)
 Pouten, *Grieschen Landschaften*
 Prall, *Æsthetic Judgment*
 Richter, G., *The Sculpture and Sculptors of Ancient Greece*
 Robin, L., *Greek Thought*
 Ross, W. D., *Aristotle*
 Sargent, *Greek Athletics*
 Savage, C. A., *The Athenian Family*
 Scoon, Robert, *Greek Philosophy before Plato*
 Sheppard, *Greek Tragedy*
 Showerman, G. (ed.), *Century Readings in Ancient Classical
 Literature*
 Sophocles, *Antigone* (tr. by Neufeld)
 Stage, W. T., *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*

- Swindler, M. H., *Ancient Painting*
 Symonds, J. A., *Studies of the Greek Poets*
 Taylor, H. O., *Greek Biology and Medicine*
 Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War*
 Toynbee, A. J., *Greek Civilization and Character; The Tragedy of Greece*
University Prints—Greek and Roman Sculpture (pictures); European Architecture
 Verrall, *Euripides, the Rationalist*
 Vinogradov, P., *Outlines of Historical Jurisprudence; The Jurisprudence of the Greek City*
 Warren, H. L., *The Foundations of Classic Architecture*
 Xenophon, *Hellenica*, Vol. I, (tr. by Carleton L. Brownson)
 Zielinski, *The Religion of Ancient Greece*
 Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth; Solon and Cræsus*

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

September 24, 1930

Each student should have for use the following books:

Herodotus' *History*; Thucydides' *History*; Edman: *The Works of Plato*; Plays of Æschylus; Sophocles' *Antigone* (Neufeld translation); *Ædipus the King* (Murray translation); *Medea*, *Alcestis*, and *Trojan Women of Euripides* (Murray translation); *Clouds*, and *Knights of Aristophanes*; Plato's *Republic*; *The Legacy of Greece*; Botsford's *Hellenic History*; Zimmern's *The Greek Commonwealth*; Homer's *Iliad* or *Odyssey* (Modern Library or Macmillan edition).

Following is the first assignment of reading:

Thucydides, pp. 119-128; Four Socratic Dialogues: "Apology," "Crito," "Phaedo" (narrative at beginning and end); Æschylus, *Agamemnon*; Sophocles, *Antigone*; Euripides, *Medea*; *Legacy of Greece*, pp. 289-320.

372 THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

For the first paper, due Saturday noon, October 4, make a careful study of the Funeral Speech of Pericles. Analyze the meaning of the various points and the way in which they are woven together. Give your own reactions to each part and to the speech as a whole.

The following meetings will be held at 9 A.M. in the New Soils Building:

Thursday, September 25, discussion of the assignment.

Saturday, September 27, Mr. Bögholt on the Apology of Socrates.

Tuesday, September 30, Mr. Agard on the Geography of Greece.

Thursday, October 2, Mr. Agard on Greek Life as Seen in Greek Art.

Saturday, October 4, Mr. Agard on the Greek Language.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

October 6, 1930

The study of human relations in fifth-century Athens may well begin with Athenian wars. For the next two or three weeks we shall consider Athens' relations to other states.

Reading:

Herodotus' *History*, especially Vol. II, p. 94 to the end.

Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*.

You may find it desirable to begin your acquaintance with Thucydides by reading some selected passages, which will introduce you to his character and indicate the structure of his story. The following passages, in the Everyman edition, are suggested:

For the period between the Persian Wars, ending in 479, and the Peloponnesian War of 431, and especially the work of Cimon and Pericles, Bk. I, Ch. IV.

For the beginning of the latter war, and Pericles' policy, Bk. I, Chs. II, III, V, and Bk. II, Chs. VI and VII.

For the leadership of Cleon, Bk. III, Ch. IX; Bk. IV, Ch. XII; Bk. V, Ch. XV.

For the influence of Alcibiades, and the Sicilian Expedition, Bk. V, Ch. XVII; Bk. VI, especially Ch. XVIII; and Bk. VII, especially Chs. XXII and XXIII.

For some famous passages on revolutions in Greek city states, see pp. 217-227, 276-278; and for an interesting comment on a revolutionists' government in Athens in 411, see p. 607.

See also:

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, Bks. I, II, for the completion of Thucydides' story; Plutarch's Lives of Themistocles, Aristides, Cimon, Pericles, Nicias, Alcibiades; Æschylus' *Persians*; Euripides' *Trojan Women*; Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, *Knights*, *Peace*, *Birds*, *Lysistrata*.

For the geography consult:

The Map of Greece in La Follette Den; Zimmern, pp. 15-43; Murray's *Classical Atlas*; Holdt's *Picturesque Greece*; Neubigin's *The Mediterranean Lands*; The *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. V, for valuable maps.

For the historical summary consult:

Botsford, pp. 169-328; Breasted, pp. 322-393; Rostovtzeff, pp. 249-281; Bury, pp. 219-345, 390-513.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

October 6, 1930

The following larger books, together with some of the books listed above, are on reserve in the University Library, for reference:

Cambridge Ancient History, Vols. IV and V; G. B. Grundy, *Thucydides and the History of His Age*.

Some reading on modern warfare:

B. Russell, *Why Men Fight*; Angell, *The Great Illusion*; Remarque, *All Quiet on the Western Front*; Zweig, *The Case of Sergeant Grischa*; Zola, *La Débâcle*; Reynal, *The Unknown Warrior*; Tolstoi, *War and Peace*; Sherriff, *Journey's End*; Anderson and Stallings, *What Price Glory?*; Robert Graves, *Good-bye to All That*; Sassoon, *Memoirs of an Infantry Officer*; The London Naval Conference: news accounts and editorial comments.

Paper:

Each student may bring a notebook, and drafts of his map and his paper, to conferences with his Adviser. A map should illustrate and accompany the paper. The paper, due October 20, should be on the following subject:

Describe the policy and activities of Athens in her foreign affairs under (1) Themistocles, (2) Pericles, and (3) Alcibiades.

Indicate in your study what you find to admire or criticize in her policy and its execution.

Talks:

Tuesday, October 7, at 9 o'clock, Mr. Meiklejohn will speak to the class about the plan of work for the year, and particularly the plan for the fall term.

Thursday, October 9, at 9 o'clock, Mr. Sharp will discuss some problems raised by the events described in the Histories of Herodotus and Thucydides.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

October 20, 1930

In our study of Greek society we find men holding conflicting opinions in regard to matters of public policy. Both parties to a controversy are observed to claim "right" or "justice" in support of their views. A question naturally arises as to the meaning and

validity of these terms. The reading and discussion during the coming week will be concerned mainly with this question.

Reading:

Otto, M. C., *Things and Ideals*, pp. 57-155
 McGilvary, E. B., *Warfare of Moral Ideals* } These books are on
 reserve in the uni-
 versity library.

Plato, *The Republic*, Bk. I and Bk. II to p. 368

Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*

Plataean Episode, pp. 146-152, 183-187, 204-217; Melian Episode,
 pp. 392-401; Mitylenian Episode, pp. 187-204

Paper, due October 27:

The student is requested to take *one* of the above episodes and examine it in the light of the week's reading and discussion. Is there a "right" involved in the situation? If not, give the basis for your judgment. If so, how do you justify your opinion?

Talks:

Tuesday, October 21, Professor McGilvary of the University Department of Philosophy.

Thursday, October 23, Professor Otto of the University Department of Philosophy.

Friday, October 24, Mr. Bögholt will lead the discussion.

Saturday, October 25, Mr. Bögholt will lead the discussion.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

October 27, 1930

It seems desirable to consider next the way in which the Athenians conducted their daily life, earned their living, and governed themselves. We shall find that their daily activities raised troublesome problems, comparable to the problem of war; and we shall find, again, that Plato has something to say about these problems. In order to understand the life of the city, we shall concentrate attention, for the next four or five weeks, on Zimmern's *Greek*

Commonwealth. At the same time, it seems desirable that we should be doing a first reading of Plato's *Republic*, in preparation for a period devoted to a discussion of Plato's ideal city. Throughout the period we shall of course be interested in discovering whether the experience of Athens and the suggestions of Plato throw any light on our contemporary situation.

The first topic for investigation and discussion is *the creation of wealth*.

Reading:

Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*, especially Pts. I and III.

See also:

Æschylus, *Prometheus Bound*; Aristophanes, Comedies; Glotz, *Ancient Greece at Work*, especially Pt. III; Calhoun, *The Business Life of Ancient Athens*.

As you may have discovered, the books on history listed in the first assignment contain a good many observations about the economic and political life of Athens.

For a modern book comparable to *The Greek Commonwealth*, see Lynd, *Middletown*, especially Pt. I.

Paper:

"Ways of Earning a Living in Pericles' Athens" (due November 3).

Talks:

Tuesday, October 28, and Thursday, October 30, there will be opportunities for the class to discuss questions raised by the assignment, with Mr. Koch or Mr. Sharp or both.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

November 1, 1930

CONFLICTS ABOUT WEALTH

Reading:

Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*, especially Pt. 2, Ch. 5.

See also:

Plutarch, *Life of Solon; Life of Pericles*

Aristophanes, Comedies

The Old Oligarch (in pamphlet form; and reprinted in Botsford and Sihler, *Hellenic Civilization*)

Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties in Athens*

Aristotle's *Politics*, Everyman edition, Bk. 5.

Compare any relevant modern material like *The Communist Manifesto*; R. H. Tawney, *The Acquisitive Society*; Andrew Carnegie's *Autobiography*; The writings of Henry Ford

Paper, due November 10:

Describe the conflict about wealth with which Solon had to deal. What did Solon do about this conflict? Did any similar conflict face Pericles? Do you find any similar conflict today? If so, what is your opinion and your own attitude toward it?

Talks:

Tuesday, November 4, and Thursday, November 6, there will be opportunities for the class to discuss questions raised by the assignment, with Mr. Koch or Mr. Sharp or both.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

November 10, 1930

FUNCTIONS AND STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT

During this period, the situation in Athens should be compared particularly with the situation in Sparta, and still more particularly with the ideal scheme described in Plato's *Republic*. It seems likely that "democratic" Athens is being criticized, and "aristocratic" Sparta qualifiedly approved in the *Republic*. If we can develop a reasonably clear understanding of the government of both Athens and Sparta, we shall, among other things, be better prepared to understand and discuss Plato's philosophy of government.

We have now become acquainted with a good deal of the litera-

ture dealing with the economic and political life of Athens and Sparta; and it therefore seems unnecessary to set forth an extended list of readings.

Reading:

Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*, especially Pt. II, Ch. 6

See also:

Aristotle, *The Constitution of Athens*; Plutarch, *Life of Lycurgus*; Glotz, *The Greek City*; Greenidge, *Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*; Vinogradoff, *Historical Jurisprudence*, Vol. II; Calhoun, *The Growth of Criminal Law in Ancient Greece*; Bonner, *Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens*.

A suggestive modern book is A. P. Herring, *Group Representation Before Congress*.

Paper, due November 17:

What work did the governing bodies of Athens do, and how were they organized under Cleisthenes? Compare the constitution under Pericles. Compare the constitution of Sparta. Discuss the merits and defects of each constitution.

Talks:

There will be meetings of the class at 9 o'clock on Tuesday and Thursday, November 11 and 13.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

November 17-December 1, 1930

DEMOCRACY

During the next two weeks we shall have an opportunity to go over all the material which we have thus far been studying; and to organize and enrich our knowledge and understanding of the social, economic, and political life of Athens and the modern world. There will be an opportunity, for example, to consider the relationship of such institutions as the family, slavery, and the empire, to the other institutions and events which we have been studying. There will

also be an opportunity for each of us to think further about any special phase of Athenian life which has interested him particularly, and to discuss the relationship of this phase of life to other aspects of Athens and the modern world. To prevent reading and discussion from becoming utterly formless there will be a two-weeks' paper on the rather large subject, "Democracy."

Suggested Readings:

Herodotus' *History*, Vol. 1, pp. 250-253, Vol. 2, pp. 35, 40-45, 46, Vol. 1, pp. 86-87; Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War*, pp. 217-227, 276-278; 570-614; Xenophon, *Hellenica*, Bks. I and II; Plato, *Republic*, especially Bks. VIII and IX; Aristotle's *Politics*, translated by William Ellis, especially Bks. III to VI, inclusive; Sophocles, *Antigone*; Euripides, *Alcestis*, *Medea*, *Trojan Women* (for the position of women); Savage, *The Athenian Family*; Zimmern, *Solon and Cræsus* (essays on slavery), *Political Thought* (in *The Legacy of Greece*), *The Greek Commonwealth*; Jebb, *The Attic Orators*.

See also the books listed in previous assignments. Again compare books on contemporary conditions. Further suggested readings on conditions at other periods than the fifth century are:

Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*; G. B. Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*; Wallas, *The Great Society; Human Nature and Politics*; Santayana, *Character and Opinion in the United States*; Unemployment Conference Committee (Herbert Hoover, Chairman) *Recent Economic Changes in the United States*; Lippmann, *Public Opinion; The Phantom Public*; Frank Kent, *The Great Game of Politics*

Paper, due December 1:

What do you mean by democracy—social, economic, political? Consider the social, economic, and political life of Athens, with reference to the question whether Athens was democratic in the sense in which you use the term.

Meetings:

There will be meetings on Tuesday and Thursday mornings at 9 o'clock unless announcements to the contrary are made; and other meetings will probably be held, and announced on the bulletin board.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

December 1930

The chief desire of the Advisers for the period beginning Tuesday, December 2, is that the students should make a beginning, at least, of a sympathetic and thorough study of the *Republic* as a statement of Plato's Utopia. In connection with this study of the *Republic* the students are asked to read *Humanity Uprooted*, by Maurice Hindus, as a book throwing light upon or giving point to Plato's discussions.

The following supplementary readings are suggested:

(1) Aristotle, *Politics*, Bk. II, Chs. I-V; (2) Mumford, *Story of Utopias*; (3) Bacon, *New Atlantis*; (4) More, *Utopia*; (5) Bellamy, *Looking Backward*; (6) Butler, *Erewhon*; (7) Wells, *Men Like Gods*; (8) Russell, *The National Being*; (9) Dewey, *Impressions of Soviet Russia*.

The paper for the period should be handed in not later than December 19. The student may choose any topic he wishes bearing on Plato's *Republic*.

During the period there will be talks by advisers and outside lecturers on the *Republic* and on various phases of social planning.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

January 6-February 2, 1931

GREEK ART

I. *General Plan:* Use your eyes, looking critically at room decoration, dress, automobiles, buildings, sculpture, paintings, etc. Visit the exhibitions in the Union and the University Library. Get simi-

larly acquainted with Greek art—costumes, objects of everyday use, and the buildings, sculpture, and vases suggested below. First, look at pictures of them, sketch them, remember them. Ask yourself regarding each object: Do I like this or not? Why? Find out all you can about it. Then ask yourself questions like these:

(1) What sort of people were the artists in Athens? Why were they artists? Under what conditions did they work? What was their function considered to be? Their relationship to other members of the community?

(2) How far did they follow artistic traditions? Did they tend to maintain traditional moulds or invent new ones? (Cf. with Greek drama.)

(3) In what respects did Greek art express changing Greek social standards and national ideals? What was the relation between art and athletics? art and government? art and religion? art and morals?

(4) How do you respond emotionally and intellectually to Greek art? Does it seem to you "cold"?

(5) What values of texture do you find in Greek art? color and modeling? line, pattern, and mass? Distinguish these values in various buildings, statues, and paintings.

(6) Compare the temple at Corinth, the Parthenon, and the Temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens with respect to artistic conception and technique. Also the Charioteer of Delphi, the Parthenon "Theseus" and the Hermes of Praxiteles. Also vases by Execias, Euphronius, and Meidias. Does the evolution imply æsthetic progress?

(7) What are the limitations of Greek art?

(8) What survivals of Greek art do you find in contemporary life? Are they important? Especially, what ones do you find in Madison? (Use your sketchbook) Which is closer to the Greek—the Nashville Parthenon or a prairie home by Frank Lloyd Wright? the Lincoln Memorial or the Shelton Hotel?

(9) To what degree are we justified in copying or adapting Greek art today? Is it in any way expressive of contemporary culture?

(10) What regional art have we developed in America which is an adequate expression of local character?

(11) By what standards do you judge a work of art? Compare the Parthenon, Chartres Cathedral, the Shelton Hotel, N. Y. Compare the Apollo of Olympia, Donatello's St. George, Bourdelle's Mickiewicz. Compare Euphronius' Munich cup drawings, Botticelli's Primavera, Picasso's drawings.

(12) Define art. What is it good for?

(13) Compare the function and value of art in Greek and American life. Also, if you are interested, continue the comparison in mediæval France, Renaissance Italy, contemporary Russia.

II. *Objects for Special Study—Buildings*: Parthenon, Erechtheum, "Theseum," Temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens, Theatre at Epidaurus. *Sculpture*: On the temples of Aphaia at Ægina, of Zeus at Olympia, Parthenon, Mausoleum at Halicarnassus; great altar of Pergamon. Also the Charioteer of Delphi, Ludovisi Throne, Victory by Pæonius, Hermes by Praxiteles, Athenian tombstones of Dexileos and Hegeso, Agias by Lysippus, Aphrodite of Melos, Victory of Samothrace. *Vases*: A few by Execias, Euphronius, Brygus, Meidias.

III. *Books*—(1) For pictures: *Picturesque Greece*; B. U. T. *Greek and Roman Sculpture*; Richter, *Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*; Swindler, *Ancient Painting*.

(2) General Reference: Fowler and Wheeler, *Greek Archæology*; E. Faure, *History of Art* (Vol. I); H. S. Jones, *Ancient Writers on Greek Sculpture*.

(3) Architecture: Anderson, Spiers and Dinsmoor, *Architecture of Ancient Greece*; Warren, *Foundations of Classic Architecture*; Marquand, *Greek Architecture* (details); E. Gardner, *Ancient Athens*; Weller, *Athens and Its Monuments*; Collignon, *Le Parthenon*; Robertson, *Greek and Roman Architecture*.

(4) Sculpture: Richter, *op. cit.*; E. Gardner, *Handbook of Greek Sculpture, Six Greek Sculptors*; von Mach, *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*; Collignon, *La Sculpture Grecque*; Dickens, *Hellenistic Sculpture*; Poulsen, *Delphi*; Agard, *The Greek Tradition in Sculpture*; Lawrence, *Classical Sculpture*.

(5) Vases: Pfuhl, *Masterpieces of Greek Drawing and Painting*; Buscher, *Greek Vase Painting*; M. H. Swindler, *Ancient Painting*.

(6) Interpretation: Plato, *Republic* (Books 3 and 10), *Phædrus*, *Laws* (Book 2); Walter Pater, *Greek Art*; G. L. Dickinson, *Greek View of Life*; P. Gardner, *Principles of Greek Art*; R. Carpenter, *Esthetic Basis of Greek Art*; C. Bell, *Art*; Santayana, *Reason in Art*; Havelock Ellis, *The Dance of Life*; Carritt, *The Theory of Beauty*; Benvenuto Cellini, *Autobiography*; Leonardo da Vinci, *Notebooks*; Homer Saint-Gaudens, *Augustus Saint-Gaudens*.

(7) Modern implications: S. Cheney, *Primer of Modern Art*; E. Faure, *History of Art* (Vol. 4); L. Mumford, *Sticks and Stones*; S. Cheney, *The New World Architecture*; Edgell, *American Architecture of Today*; Taut, *Modern Architecture*; LeCorbusier, *Towards a New Architecture*; S. Casson, *Some Modern Sculptors, Twentieth Century Sculptors*; L. Taft, *Modern Tendencies in Sculpture*; A. M. Rindge, *Sculpture*; C. Post, *History of European and American Sculpture*; F. J. Mather, *Modern Paintings; The Arts*—October 1925; S. LaFollette, *Art in America*. Also get acquainted with the art magazines in the University Library Periodical Room, especially *The Arts*, *Creative Art*, *Art Digest*, *Architectural Record*, *Architectural Forum*.

IV. *Talks*: There will be the following talks:

January 6, "What is the use of architecture?"

January 8, "Greek architecture."

January 20, "What is the use of sculpture?"

January 22, "Greek sculpture."

January 27, "Greek painting."

V. *Conferences*: Mr. Agard will meet students interested in discussion in the Soils Building at 9 o'clock on the following mornings: January 7, January 15, January 21 and January 29. Tentative subjects for discussion are: Plato's conception of art, art and morality, art as "significant form," art in America.

VI. *Assignments*: During this period compare Greek and modern art in detail. It is especially desirable that each student try his hand at some artistic expression: Use a sketchbook, take photographs of architecture and sculpture hereabouts, buy modeling

clay. Visit Mr. Topchevsky's studio, work with him, get acquainted with what he is doing and how he is doing it, find out what your artistic ability is. Examples of your own craftsmanship and a paper on some phase of the function and value of art will be due February 2.

FRESHMAN LITERATURE ASSIGNMENT

February 3-23, 1931

General Plan: Students are advised to read plays aloud, assigning parts, and to keep a notebook recording their reaction to the reading, especially contrasting the spirit and technique of Greek and modern literature.

Required Reading: (1) [a] Either the *Iliad* (Bks. I, II—omitting catalogue of ships at the end—III, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XXII, XXIII, XXIV) or the *Odysey* entire.

[b] Poems by Sappho in Showerman (Century Readings, Sappho translated by W. E. Leonard); [c] Mackail's *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*; [d] Aeschylus: *Agamemnon, Libation Bearers, Eumenides, Prometheus*; Sophocles: *Antigone, Œdipus the King, Œdipus at Colonus*; Euripides: *Bacchæ, Hippolytus, Trojan Women, Alcestis, Electra*; Aristophanes: *Frogs, Birds, Clouds, Lysistrata*; [e] Aristotles' *Poetics*; [f] Plato: *Symposium, Phædrus*

Suggested Reading: (1) Other plays by the four Greek dramatists, by Shakespeare, Ibsen, Tchekov, O'Neill, or any other good writer of plays.

(2) Any of the following books about Greek literature and drama. F. L. Lucas, *Tragedy*; Norwood, *Greek Tragedy*; Flickinger, *The Greek Theatre and Its Drama*; J. Harrison, *Ancient Art and Ritual*; Symonds, *The Greek Poets*; G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*; D. M. Robinson, *Sappho and Her Influence*; J. W. Mackail, *Lectures on Greek Poetry*; M. Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties in Athens*.

(3) It would be well to read some good modern novel as an interesting contrast to the narratives of Homer.

The Written Assignment for the period will consist of an informal notebook or diary of your reading, in which you may discuss points that interest, please, or puzzle you in whatever you may read; include quotations, and make any comments that appeal to you. Here are a few suggestions of things that you might conceivably make note of. Which books were your favorites? Which did you dislike and why? What differences or resemblances did you notice between the various Greeks, between the moderns, between the Greeks and the moderns? How much do you think you lost of the Greeks and the Elizabethans by the fact that their writings are inevitably reflections of a way of life different in many respects from ours? How much of your interest and pleasure in reading was derived from the characters and ideas presented? How much from the beauty and power of the ordering and writing? How clearly can you distinguish these two kinds of satisfaction? Do they really exist as distinct from each other?

Don't let consideration of these questions cramp your style. They are merely tentative suggestions to get you started. This notebook should be brought to the personal conferences and will be handed in to the adviser on February 23.

FRESHMAN LITERATURE ASSIGNMENT

February 3-23, 1931

Talks for the Period:

Tuesday, February 3, "An Approach to Poetry," Mr. Beecher.

Thursday, February 5, "An Analysis of the Agamemnon," Mr. Agard.

Tuesday, February 10, "A New 'House of Atreus,'" Mr. Beecher.

Thursday, February 12, "The Three Greek Tragedians," Mr. Agard.

Tuesday, February 17, "Homer," Mr. Winspear.

Thursday, February 19, "Aristophanes," Mr. Winspear.

Discussion Meetings:

Discussion meetings will be held in the New Soils Building at 9 o'clock every Wednesday and Friday. Mr. Beecher will lead these

discussions the week of February 2; Mr. Agard, the week of February 9; and Mr. Beecher, the week of February 16.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

February 23-March 2, 1931

So far we have been making a phase-by-phase study of the various activities of Athens. But there is an important question, as yet only suggested, which should be faced squarely before the end of this year: To what extent were these different activities interrelated in the experience of the individuals and of the community as a whole? We must try to find out what sort of values the Athenians prized most, and how they sought to realize them. In other words, what is the total picture of their community life, and how far did they succeed in creating what may be considered a great civilization?

In order to raise these problems, the Advisers will lead the following class discussions:

Tuesday, February 24, "Socrates and Civilization," Mr. Meiklejohn.

Wednesday, February 25, "What Was Fun for a Greek?" Mr. Agard.

Thursday, February 26, subject to be announced, Mr. Powell.

Friday, February 27, subject to be announced, Mr. Havighurst.

The following books are suggested:

Clive Bell, *Civilization*; O. Spengler, *Decline of the West*; R. W. Livingstone, *The Greek Genius and Its Meaning for Us*; G. L. Dickinson, *Greek View of Life*; F. R. Earp, *The Way of the Greeks*; A. Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*.

It is suggested that students buy Clive Bell's *Civilization*.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

Religion Period—March 2-16, 1931

Reading:

Every student is asked to read Zielinski—*The Religion of Ancient Greece*, omitting Chapter VII. Copies of this book are on reserve

in the La Follette Library. A few copies of this book may be purchased at \$2.50 each in the college office.

Those who wish to get a good foundation for the consideration of Greek religion are advised to carry through the following reading program.

For aspects of early Greek religion:

Hesiod—*Theogony*; *Iliad*—Bks. V and XIV; *Odyssey*—Bks. VIII and XI.

For mythology, one of the following: Harrison, *Greek Mythology*; Hutchinson, *The Muses' Pageant*; Gayley, *Classic Myths*; Fox, *Greek and Roman Mythology*;

For a survey of the field of Greek religion, one of the following: Dickinson, *Greek View of Life*, Ch. I; Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion*; Nilsson, *History of Greek Religion*; Moore, *Religious Thought of the Greeks*, first five chapters.

For the relation of religion to the drama: Harrison, *Ancient Art and Ritual*.

For original material concerning the religion of the common people: Mackail, *Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, sections on religion and on death.

For the influence of Greek religion upon Christianity: *Legacy of Greece*, article on Religion by Inge; Moore, *Religious Thought of the Greeks*, Chs. IX and X.

Library Facilities:

It has been arranged that some of the freshman Advisers will leave their offices on the second floor of La Follette House unlocked. These rooms are to be considered a part of the library and may be used for reading when the library is filled, provided they are not already in use by Advisers for study or conference.

Paper, due March 16, on the following subject:

What things, in your judgment, does religion do for men and how well did the Greek religion do these things for the Athenians of Pericles' time?

Meetings:

Saturday, February 28, 9 A.M., Professor A. E. Haydon of the University of Chicago.

Monday, March 2, 9 A.M., Professor Haydon.

Tuesday, March 3, 9 A.M., Discussion, Dr. Meiklejohn.

Wednesday, March 4, 9 A.M., "Humanism," Mr. Hart.

Thursday, March 5, 9 A.M., "The Mysteries," Mr. Havighurst.

Friday, March 6, 9 A.M., Discussion of Zielinski's book, Mr. Agard.

Tuesday, March 10, 9 A.M., "A Survey of Religion in Fifth-Century Athens," Mr. Havighurst.

Wednesday, March 11, 9 A.M., "Judaism versus Hellenism," Mr. Havighurst.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

Science Period—March 16-30, 1931

This period will be devoted to a study of the answers found by the Greeks during the sixth and fifth centuries to the fundamental questions which science has always been asking about the nature of the world. Some attention will also be devoted to tracing out the relationship between modern scientific concepts and those of the Greeks.

The talks which will be given during the period are designed to help you to understand the material which you read, some of which may prove rather difficult, and also to relate the Greek science with modern science, which the reading assignment does not do. It is advisable that you complete some of the reading assignment which accompanies a given talk before listening to that talk.

The schedule of talks and reading assignments is as follows:

Tuesday, March 17—9 A.M.: "Introduction to the Science and Philosophy Periods," Dr. Meiklejohn. Reading: Fuller, *History of Greek Philosophy*, Ch. I; Cushman, *A Beginner's History of Philosophy*, Vol. I, Ch. I.

Wednesday, March 18: "The Rise of a Scientific Interpretation of the World Among the Greeks," Mr. Havighurst.

Reading: Hesiod, *Theogony*; Aristophanes, *Clouds*; Bakewell, *Source-book in Ancient Philosophy*, sections on *Xenophanes*, *Heraclitus*, *Protagoras*; Scoon, *Greek Philosophy before Plato*, Pt. I, Chs. I and VIII.

Introductory reading on Greek cosmology: Scoon, Pt. I, Ch. I; Pt. II, Ch. II; Heiberg, *Science and Mathematics in Classical Antiquity*, Section 1.

Thursday, March 19: "The Milesians," Mr. Havighurst.

Reading: Scoon, Pt. I, Ch. II; Cushman, Vol. I, Ch. II; Fuller, Ch. III.

Friday, March 20: "Heraclitus and Parmenides," Mr. Havighurst.

Reading: Scoon, Pt. I, Chs. IV and V; Fuller, Chs. V and VI.

Tuesday, March 24: "The Pluralists," Mr. Havighurst.

Reading: Scoon, Pt. I, Chs. VI, VII, XI; pp. 196-212; Cushman, Vol. I, Ch. III; Fuller, Ch. VII.

Wednesday, March 25: "The Pythagoreans," Mr. Havighurst.

Reading: Scoon, Ch. IX; Fuller, Ch. IV; Heiberg, Sec. 2.

Thursday, March 26: "Squaring the Circle," Mr. Havighurst.

Reading: "Mathematics and Astronomy," in *The Legacy of Greece*.

Friday, March 27: "Greek Medicine," Mr. Norman Cameron.

Reading: Thomson, "Natural Science," in *The Legacy of Greece*; Aristotle, *De Partibus Animalium*, Book I; Heiberg, Sec. 3; Singer, "Medicine," in *The Legacy of Greece*.

Hippocrates, Vol. I

General Introduction, Secs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8; *Ancient Medicine*, Secs. 1-5, 13-16, 20; *Airs, Waters, Places*; read it all, especially Section 24; *Epidemics I*, Sec. 1; *The Oath*.

Hippocrates, Vol. II

The Sacred Disease, Sections 1-10, 19-21; *Breaths*, Sections 2-15.

Other books to which you may want to go for further information are:

Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*; Stace, *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*; Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*; Robin, *Greek Thought*.

Subject for Paper, due March 30, may be chosen from the following:

(1) Describe and criticize from the viewpoint of your own knowledge the answers of the sixth- and fifth-century Greeks to one of the following questions: What is Being? What is Becoming? What is the relation between the One and the Many?

(2) Describe the answers to the above questions given by one of the scientists of the sixth and fifth centuries and criticize it from the point of view of the knowledge which you think he might have possessed.

(3) Describe the conflict between Parmenides and Heraclitus, and criticize their answers to the question in dispute.

R. J. HAVIGHURST.

FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

Philosophy Period, March 30-May 4, 1931

During the troublous times of external wars and internal party strife which followed the death of Pericles, the cultivated youth of Greece began to ask questions of one another—to ask about themselves and about the activities they were supposed to carry on. There arose critical discussion of all sorts of fields—morals, manners, military tactics, politics, poetry, grammar, and more besides—in terms of the *ideas* or concepts or definitions which those activities involve; and some men, whom we should call philosophers in a stricter sense, turned to critical discussion of the ideas involved in the very practice of critical discussion. They asked one another about the nature of Reason, and whether Parmenides had the right of it in exalting Reason over Sense-perception. They asked whether the things revealed by this Reason were more real than those revealed by perception, what “reality” meant, then, and whether it didn’t all smack of irreligion. They asked how one concept could stand for many cases, or one Truth arise among many men, when clearly what is sensed depends upon the nature of the man who senses it, and the smell of Truth upon whose nose detects it.

They asked their fathers, and their uncles, the dignified Strategoi,

what Duty ever did for them, that they should do so much for her: Weren't the unjust more likely than the just to win power and pleasure? And their uncles, who had power but no joy of it—you know the kind of life those Strategoi led—assured the young men that not pleasure, but Wisdom, was the aim of life. So the young men turned to men who professed to teach Wisdom and Virtue: Protagoras of Abdera, and Gorgias of Leontini, and Hippias of Elis, and Prodicus of Ceos; but Socrates was forever interrupting with his questions, whether Virtue could be taught, even if you could decide what it was; or was it the same as Wisdom? One of these young men, pondering these questions with unusual boldness and persistence, became a great philosopher: Plato, the pupil of Socrates and the teacher of Aristotle.

Now, the Greeks were living in a Democracy where mass-opinion was powerful, and where most people thought in confused, superstitious ways, and believed what they read in the papers, and flocked to teachers of Personality and Public Speaking, and paid great tribute to athletes. So the thoughtful ones found it important to discover what good Thinking was, where Reality lay, what kind of Happiness to aim for, and whether Man was really the measure of all things. What kind of Democracy do you find yourself living in? If it seems somewhat like theirs, wouldn't you expect to find their questions somewhat vital for yourself? I don't insist; I only want to suggest that in reading Plato we are entering, not a perfumed study, but the society of a man who fought to understand and fought to criticize his own age, and whose voice has the unique merit of sounding contemporary in every age.

JOHN W. POWELL.

For the next five weeks our discussion will center about the problems suggested: the use of reason, the nature of the concepts it works with, the sort of reality it discloses; the value of pleasure; and the general sophistic position as to the relativity of all judgments of fact and of value. There will be class discussions on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday of each week; and three short

papers will be asked of each student. The effort will be rather to get the problems clearly stated than definitively answered.

Papers will be due as follows:

Monday, April 6: Plato's analogy of the *Cave*: a brief discussion of its meaning and implications; *Republic*, Bks. VI and VII, and in Edman from p. 430 on; *Fragments*, as mimeographed.

Monday, April 20: Pleasure as the aim of life: your own views in the light of Plato's *Protagoras*; *Theætetus*; *Republic*, Bks. I and II, to the end of the argument on justice, and Bk. IX. *Philebus* and *Gorgias* are recommended also, and may be found in the complete Jowett in La Follette Library or in the university library.

Monday, May 4: State the issue between Plato and the Sophists as to Relativity, giving careful textual references on both sides. Give your own argument on the question. *Protagoras*; *Theætetus*; *Symposium*; *Phædrus*; Phædo, Meno, and especially *Gorgias* are recommended also. The *Republic* is rich in material.

Appended is a list of modern contributors to the Platonic discussions—not very many—nor always the best, but worth attention:

Berkeley: *Principles of Human Knowledge* (Everyman or Scribners); Descartes: *Discourse on Method*; *Meditations* (Everyman or Scribners); Dewey: *The Quest for Certainty*; William James: *The Philosophy of William James*, Ch. IV (Modern Library); *The Will to Believe*, Chs. II, III, VI; Jeans: *The Mysterious Universe*; Pearson: *The Grammar of Science*, Chs. II, III; Santayana: *The Realm of Essence*; *Dialogues in Limbo*.

FINAL FRESHMAN ASSIGNMENT

April 24, 1931

From May 4 to June 5 each student will work on a special phase of Greek life which especially interests him, and the students working in the same general field will meet as a group to discuss the interrelations between their subjects of research.

On April 27 each student is requested to report at the college office his choice of one of the following groups:

- I. Political and Economic Institutions (Mr. Koch)
- II. Art (Mr. Agard)
- III. Literature (Mr. Beecher)
- IV. Religion (Mr. Havighurst)
- V. Science (Mr. Havighurst)
- VI. Philosophy (Mr. Powell)

The final paper will be due Friday noon, June 5. Final conferences will be held June 6-13, with the Special Adviser and one other Adviser conferring with each student on the results of his research.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR INTRODUCTORY STUDY OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE

The World-Picture of Modern Science

- Andrade, *The Mechanism of Nature*.
Birkhoff, *The Origin, Nature, and Influence of Relativity*.
Bragg, W. H., *Concerning the Nature of Things*.
Darrow, *The New World of Physical Discovery*.
Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World, Stars and Atoms*.
Einstein, *Relativity*.
Erwin, *The Universe and the Atom*.
Jeans, *The Universe Around Us. The Mysterious Universe*.
Joly, *The Birth-time of the World*.
Lodge, *Atoms and Rays*.
Luckiesch, *Foundations of the Universe*.
Millikan, *The Electron*.
Mills, *Within the Atom; The Realities of Modern Science*.
Russell, B., *The A B C of Relativity*.
Shapley, *Flights from Chaos*.
Stetson, *Man and the Stars*.
Sullivan, J. W. N., *Bases of Modern Science*
Atoms and Electrons.
Whetham, *Matter and Change*.

History of Physical Science

- Buckley, *History of Physics*.
Crew, *The Rise of Modern Physics*.
Knickerbocker, *Classics of Modern Science*.
Sedgwick and Tyler, *A Short History of Science*.
Shapley and Howarth, *A Source-book in Astronomy*.
Whetham, *Cambridge Readings in the Literature of Science*.

Scientific Method

- Bacon, Francis, *Novum Organum*.
 Bridgman, *The Logic of Modern Physics*.
 Burt, *Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science*.
 Descartes, *Discourse on Method*.
 Mach, *Analysis of the Sensations*
 The Science of Mechanics.
 Poincaré, *Foundations of Science*.
 Ritchie, A. D., *Scientific Method*.
 Thomson, J. A., *Introduction to Science*.
 Whetham, *The Foundations of Science*.
 Whewell, *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*.
 Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*.
 Wolf, A., *Essentials of Scientific Method*.

Text-books

- Black and Davis, *Practical Physics*.
 Caven, *Atoms and Molecules*.
 Cranston, *The Structure of Matter*.
 Duff, *Text-book of Physics*.
 Kimball, *College Physics*.
 Knowlton, *Physics for College Students*.
 Millikan, Gale, and Edwards, *A First Course in Physics*.
 Saunders, *Survey of Physics*.
 Sheldon, Kent, Paton, Miller, *Physics for Colleges*.
 Smith, A. W., *Elements of Physics*.
 Spinney, *A Text-book of Physics*.
 Weld and Palmer, *Text-book of Modern Physics*.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

Physical Science Period, September 23-October 31, 1931

Meetings:

To be held every day at 10 o'clock unless notice is given to the contrary. Meetings will be held in 206, New Soils Building, until

October 26—The physical reality of atoms and molecules.

November 2—What do we mean by a “true theory” in physics?

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

November 2-9, 1931

The week of November 2-9 will be devoted to study and discussion of biological evolution. Each student is requested to read G. H. Parker, *What Evolution Is*.

Professor Noland, of the Department of Zoology, will discuss the book according to the following schedule:

Monday, pp. 1-40

Tuesday, pp. 40-60

Wednesday, pp. 60-145

Thursday, discussion of the paper assignment

Friday, pp. 145-175

The paper, which is due at 8 A.M. Monday, November 9, is to be on the subject, “Is Evolution True?”

Mr. Havighurst, or any of the other Advisers, will suggest extra reading on evolution for those desiring it. Those who find the Parker fairly easy reading are advised to read the following chapters of Baitzell, *Evolution of Earth and Man*, in parallel with the other reading.

Evolution of the Earth, Chs. I and II; *Origin and Evolution of Life*, Chs. III and IV; *Evolution of Man*, Chs. V, VI, VII, and VIII; *Mechanism of Evolution*, Chs. XII and XIII.

MEMORANDUM ON REGIONAL STUDIES

October, 1931

Date when due:

Each study is to be completed and handed in at the college office not later than Monday noon, February 8.

Objectives:

Every student ought to gain from his regional study a clearer

understanding of his particular community—in terms of its physical basis, its historical development and changing character, its present-day practices, values, and problems. Each author should seek not merely to describe his community, but also to interpret and appraise it (hence factual data should be not merely listed, but rather used and explained in terms of their meaning and significance). Each study may well raise in the author's mind more questions than he can answer, but such problems are worth formulating and may well be included in the completed paper. The value of each regional study should lie not merely in doing (as well as limited time, materials, and other studies permit) a given piece of intellectual work, not only in gaining more knowledge and awareness of one particular community, but also in a greater ability to understand and evaluate any concrete situation the student may confront in American life.

Scope:

Certain general requirements and suggestions were outlined last June concerning this year's regional studies and are well worth keeping in mind, as follows:

(1) Each paper must include some account of the physical characteristics and historical development of the region—as background essential to an understanding of the modern community.

Such basic factors as location, natural resources, means of communication, etc. (changing in character and importance with changing technology), should clearly be treated to some extent in every study. (See Lobeck's *Physiographic Diagram*, J. Russell Smith's *North America*, and other physical and economic geographies.) Maps and charts can be used to advantage in presenting much of this material on the wider area within which your community is located.

Of course these physical factors are relevant only in view of the people who have come to the region—at different times, from other countries or regions, with varying motives, cultural backgrounds, and economic skills. How did the place and the people interact, and what kind of a society gradually emerged? How

does this process of growth and development throw light on the community of today (toward which your whole study points and with which it is mainly concerned)?

(2) Based on and closely related to such essential background aspects as these, each study should also include:

Either a general survey and appraisal of various phases of life in the region, as in *Middletown*—(probably possible only where the student is dealing with a fairly small and familiar community);

Or a more intensive study of some one aspect—in which the student is especially interested and in which the life of the region is significantly revealed. (Of course any such aspect will touch and should throw light on the general situation at many points.)

Note: Quite a wide variation between individual regional studies (as to scope, content, organization, emphasis, treatment, style, etc.) is naturally possible under and consistent with the above general requirements. In fact, each study will (and should) reveal the background and values of the author, as well as those of his region.

Procedure:

Each student ought by this time to have selected his region, to have collected some material for his study, to have decided what special phase or phases he plans to emphasize, and to have consulted his present Adviser on this program. These regional study plans should by now have been tentatively approved by the adviser.

The regional study is to be carried on by each student throughout the entire semester, along with the other work regularly scheduled for the whole group. In other words, as the year's schedule now stands, no solid time (free from college meetings and assignments) will be available for the regional studies, except the final exam period from January 25 until the papers are due. Each student is responsible for planning his own work accordingly. (By the middle of November, for instance, he ought to have completed a first draft of the "background" section of his paper.) The final conference with the present Adviser, sometime in November, will be partly devoted to regional studies. Similarly for the conference

just before the Christmas recess, each student should line up his study, to see what gaps are left and what work remains to be done, and discuss this situation with his Adviser. (He may, of course, consult with his Adviser also at any time during the semester.)

Two copies, typed, are to be handed in with whatever maps, illustrations, or charts you may find useful. You should attach a *bibliography* in which you evaluate critically the materials you have consulted, pointing out those of value and those not of value as a guide to the reader; your *footnotes* and *quotations* should be used with a similar view of aiding the reader (and should follow the printed "instruction sheet" available in the college office); and a *table of contents* should be given. Finally, you are to attach a *statement* in which you set forth your criticisms and impressions and suggestions concerning the regional study assignment and any record of your attitude toward it as it developed during the progress of your work.

READING LIST

1931-1932

Architecture:

Louis Sullivan, *Autobiography of an Idea*.

Autobiography and Biography:

Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*.

Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House*.

Mrs. Chesnut, *A Diary from Dixie*.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Letters*

The Heart of Emerson's Journals, ed. by

Bliss Perry.

Hamlin Garland, *A Son of the Middle Border*.

James G. Huneker, *Steeplejack*.

William James, *Letters*.

James Weldon Johnson, *The Autobiography of an Ex-Colored Man*.

Ernest L. Meyer, *Hey! Yellowbacks*.

John Muir, *The Story of My Boyhood and Youth.*

Lee Sage, *The Last Rustler.*

Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln.*

Mark Twain, *Life on the Mississippi*
Roughing It.

Booker T. Washington, *Up from Slavery.*

Walt Whitman, *Letters.*

Economics:

Stuart Chase, *Mexico*

The Tragedy of Waste.

W. E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom.*

Henry George, *Progress and Poverty.*

Selig Perlman, *History of American Trade Unionism*
Theory of the Labor Movement.

Ida Tarbell, *The History of the Standard Oil Company* (2 vols.).

Thorstein Veblen, *A Theory of the Leisure Class.*

Education:

Alexander Meiklejohn, *Freedom and the College*
The Liberal College

History:

Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History.*

Abraham Lincoln, *State Papers.*

Samuel E. Morison, *The Maritime History of Massachusetts.*

Francis Parkman, *The Oregon Trail.*

History and Literary Criticism:

E. E. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought.*

Nature and Man:

H. D. Thoreau, *Walden.*

Novels:

Sherwood Anderson, *Many Marriages.*

Johan Bojer, *The Emigrants*.

James Boyd, *Drums*.

Willa Cather, *Death Comes for the Archbishop*
O Pioneers.

Stephen Crane, *The Red Badge of Courage*.

E. E. Cummings, *The Enormous Room*.

John Dos Passos, *Manhattan Transfer*.

Theodore Dreiser, *An American Tragedy*.

Louis Hemon, *Maria Chapdelaine*.

La Farge, *Laughing Boy*.

Sinclair Lewis, *Arrowsmith*

Babbitt

Main Street.

Herman Melville, *White Jacket*.

Julia Peterkin, *Black April*

Scarlet Sister Mary.

O. E. Rølvaag, *Giants in the Earth*.

Upton Sinclair, *Boston*.

Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

Mark Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*.

Owen Wister, *The Virginian*.

Edith Wharton, *Ethan Frome*.

Philosophy:

John Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct*.

William James, *Pragmatism*.

M. C. Otto, *Things and Ideals*.

Plays:

E. E. Cummings, *Him*.

Eugene O'Neill, *The Hairy Ape*.

Poetry:

Stephen Vincent Benet, *John Brown's Body*.

Emily Dickinson, *Poems*.

Robert Frost, *Poems*.

Robinson Jeffers, *Poems*.

James Weldon Johnson, *God's Trombones*.

Edna St. Vincent Millay, *Poems*.

Walt Whitman, *Poems*.

Short Stories:

Sherwood Anderson, *Winesburg, Ohio*.

Theodore Dreiser, *Chains*.

Ernest Hemingway, *Men Without Women*.

The State and Man:

L. D. Brandeis, *Business, a Profession*

Opinions

Other People's Money.

O. W. Holmes, *Dissenting Opinions*.

Abraham Lincoln, *Speeches*.

Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*.

Woodrow Wilson, *Collected Addresses*.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENTS, November 12

NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

For three weeks, beginning Thursday, November 12, we shall approach nineteenth-century America as students of the problems of statecraft. Our most important book will be the *Education of Henry Adams*. During this period we shall read this book with one purpose uppermost: to understand the society which Adams watched so critically and to derive from him whatever help we can in interpretation and judgment. Since we shall be chiefly concerned with one phase of Adams' thought, we shall not find all chapters equally relevant. Nevertheless, one of our aims in this period is to acquaint ourselves with the *Education* itself, and everyone is asked to read the book carefully from beginning to end. If you read the book at the rate suggested in the schedule below you will be informed on the parts of Adams' argument pertaining to the discussions of the various general meetings. For further

enlightenment you should read the designated chapters in Beard's *Rise of American Civilization*. The Advisers will give you additional reading suggestions.

College meetings will be as usual at 10 A.M. in the New Soils Building. Meetings devoted to historical analyses will precede meetings in which general issues arising from the historical situations will be discussed. All of the issues will be concerned with phases of the question: What is the individual's relation to the group?

The meetings will be as follows:

Thursday, November 12, Early Nineteenth-century New England—Adams, I-IV; Beard, VIII-X.

Friday, November 13, Jacksonian Democracy—Beard, XI-XVI.

Tuesday, November 17, Was the Puritan outlook a valid approach to life in nineteenth-century America?

Wednesday, November 18, Slavery Controversy—Adams, V-VII; Beard, XVII.

Thursday, November 19, Was the slavery dispute a moral conflict?

Friday, November 20, Diplomacy of the Civil War—Adams VIII-XV; Beard, XVIII.

Tuesday, November 24, What are "principles" in international affairs?

Wednesday, November 25, Post-Civil War Politics—Adams XVI-XX; Beard XX, XXIII, XXV.

Friday, November 27, Do you approve of Adams' attitude toward post-Civil War Politics?

Tuesday, December 1, Post-Civil War Currency Situation—Adams, XXI-XXIII; Beard, XXIII.

Wednesday, December 2, Where lay social justice in the currency issue?

Thursday, December 3, The Progressive Movement—Adams, XXIV-XXXV; Beard, XXVII.

Friday, December 4, Are the principles of progressive democracy adequate for a modern political philosophy?

There will be an announcement on the bulletin board concerning the papers to be written.

BOOK LIST FOR STUDY OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICA

(The letter *U* indicates books in the university library; *A*, in Agricultural Hall; *B*, in Bascom Hall reading-room. Nearly all these books may also be found in the Historical Library.)

There are four important large-scale United States histories whose various volumes, chronologically arranged, will give you information on particular situations. Their authors and scopes are as follows:

- (U) Adams, Henry, 9 vols. 1800-1817. Good for political and international affairs.
- (U) Channing, Edward, 6 vols. 1800-1865. Good especially for colonial history.
- (B-U) McMaster, J. B., 8 vols. 1783-1861. Good for general social description.
- (U) Rhodes, J. F., 9 vols. 1849-1909. Good for slave question, Civil War, and Reconstruction.

There are also three important series of books by specialists on separate periods or topics:

- (U) Hart, A. B. (ed.), *American Nation*, 28 vols. 1600-1917.
- (U) Johnson, Allen (ed.), *Chronicles of America*, 50 vols. 1492-1920.
- (U) Schlesinger and Fox (eds.), *History of American Life*, 12 vols. 1600-1930.

For special references consult Channing, Hart and Turner, *Guide to American History* (University and Historical Libraries). This is a detailed outline of American history with bibliographies under all headings.

The following books are specially recommended for our purposes:

Early nineteenth-century New England:

- (U) Adams, Henry, *History of the United States*, Vol. I, Ch. 3; Vol. IX, Chs. VII-X.
- (U) *Degradation of Democratic Dogma*, Introduction.

- Adams, James T., *Adams Family*, pp. 11-228
 (U) *New England in the Republic*, Chs. II, III,
 VI, VIII, XIII, XIV-XVII.
 (A-U) Becker, Carl, *Declaration of Independence*, Ch. II.
 (A-U) Morison, S. E., *Maritime History of Massachusetts*.
 (A-U) Parrington, V. L., *Main Currents in American Thought*,
 Vol. II, pp. 271-351.

Jacksonian Democracy:

- (U) Fish, C. R., *Rise of the Common Man*.
 (U) Paxson, F. L., *History of the American Frontier*, Ch. XXVIII.
 (A-U) Schlesinger, Arthur, *New Viewpoints in American History*,
 Ch. IX.
 (U) Tocqueville, Alexis de, *Democracy in America*, Vol. II.
 (U) Turner, F. J., *Frontier in American History*, Chs. I, VII-IX,
 XI-XIII.
 (A-U) Turner, F. J., *Rise of the New West*, Chs. VI, VII.

Slavery Controversy:

- (A-U) Becker, Carl, *Declaration of Independence*, Ch. VI.
 (A-U) Dodd, William E., *Cotton Kingdom*.
 (U) Lincoln, A., *Letters and Speeches* (available also in Everyman
 edition).
 (U) Macy, J., *Anti-Slavery Crusade*.
 (A-U) Parrington, V. L., *Main Currents in American Thought*,
 Vol. II, pp. 61-108, 152-160, 339-378.
 (U) Rhodes, James F., *History of the United States*, Vols. I, II.

Diplomacy during and after the Civil War:

- Adams, E. D., *Great Britain and the American Civil War*.
 2 vols.
 Adams, J. T., *Adams Family*, pp. 231-302.
 (U) Foster, *Century of American Diplomacy*, Chs. X, XI.
 (U) Rhodes, James F., *History of the United States*, Vol. IV,
 pp. 76-95, 337-394.
 (B) Thayer, W. R., *Life and Letters of John Hay*, Vol. II, Chs. XX,
 XXI, XXIII-XXX.

Post-Civil War Politics:

Adams, Henry, *Democracy*.

(B) Beard, C. A., *Contemporary American History*, Chs. II-IV.

(B) Bryce, James, *American Commonwealth*, Vol. II, Pt. III.

(B-U) Paxson, F. L., *Recent United States History*, Chs. I-IX.

Post-Civil War Currency Situation:

(B) Beard, C. A., *Contemporary American History*, Chs. VI-VII.

(B-U) Buck, Solon J., *Agrarian Crusade*.

(B) Sullivan, Mark, *Our Times*, Vol. I, Chs. VIII, IX.

(A-U) Turner, F. J., *Frontier in American History*, Ch. IV.

Progressive Movement:

De Witt, B. P., *Progressive Movement*.

(U) Faulkner, Harold N., *Quest for Social Justice*, Chs. IV, V.

(B) La Follette, R. M., *Autobiography*, Chs. I-VIII.

Idea of Democracy:

(U) Abbott, Lyman, *Spirit of Democracy*.

Croly, H., *Promise of American Life*.

(U) Dewey, John, *The Public and Its Problems*.

(U) Fite, Warner, *Individualism*.

(U) Follette, M. P., *The New State*, Pt. II.

(U) Hadley, A. T., *Freedom and Responsibility*.

(U) Lindsay, A. D., *Essentials of Democracy*.

Smith, T. V., *American Philosophy of Equality*.

(U) Wright, H. W., *Moral Standards of Democracy*.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

November 16, 1931

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted

among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . .”

The nineteenth-century development of America is commonly regarded as the working out of the principles embodied in this statement. Describe and discuss each episode we have considered, and show how far these principles were involved. Do you think the series of episodes shows any consistent movement toward or away from these principles? Do you think the statement as quoted from the Declaration of Independence is adequate for a modern political philosophy? If not, what revisions or substitutions can you offer?

Paper due on Monday morning, December 7, 1931, at 9 o'clock.
No papers will be accepted after that time.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

December 7-14, 1931

Reading:

You are asked to read carefully (1) Governor LaFollette's November 24 message to the legislature, and (2) the printed report of the Wisconsin Interim Committee on Unemployment—both available free in the College Office. These documents are to serve as a background for the “hearings” of the Legislature and for our discussions of the unemployment problem. Other reading along these lines will be suggested in College meetings, or by your Adviser.

Meetings:

Tuesday, December 8—The Assembly (committee of the whole) will hold a hearing from 10-12 A.M. (probably continued at 1:30 P.M.) on Bill No. 8A—“Unemployment Reserves and Compensation.” Both sides will be presented. You are asked to attend these sessions, in the gallery of the Assembly.

Wednesday, December 9, 10 A.M.—New Soils Building. College

meeting for discussion of the problem and the evidence presented at Tuesday's hearing.

2 P.M.—The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Labor will hold hearings on two unemployment bills, in some hearing room at the Capitol, to be announced. All members of the college are asked to listen carefully to the arguments presented for and against these two bills.

Thursday, December 10, 10 A.M.—New Soils Building. College meeting.

Friday, December 11, 10 A.M., New Soils Building. College meeting.

(On either Thursday or Friday morning we hope to have a representative "conservative" discuss with us here his views on unemployment and the Governor's proposals.)

Paper:

Due by Monday noon, December 14. (a) Discuss the relation between Wisconsin's unemployment problem and American "democracy." (What implications, if any, has democracy for the solution of this economic question?) In the second part of your paper discuss (b) the economic facts and elements to be taken account of in attempting to deal with Wisconsin's immediate or long-run unemployment problems.

Note: The week of December 14-18 will be devoted to a study of "The Case of Bituminous Coal," which likewise raises significant issues bearing on our whole economic situation.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

December 14-18, 1931

Reading:

The Case of Bituminous Coal by Hamilton and Wright.

Meetings:

10 Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, to discuss problems raised by the reading.

Individual Conferences during this week will be primarily devoted to the regional studies.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

January 11-16, 1932

A brief paper dealing with some aspect of the "public control of business" will be due from each student by Monday noon, January 18, unless the student has previously made a substitute arrangement with his Adviser. (Several of the groups are taking special topics for group discussion and presenting individual papers in that connection.)

The following are suggested as possible topics for such papers:

The background, purposes and provisions of (one or more of) the three major antitrust laws; the work of the Federal Trade Commission as revealed in its annual reports (library document-room); specific unfair business practices; trade associations; industry planning, etc. (the Swope Plan and the Harriman Report); national planning (as discussed in testimony before Senator La Follette's Senate sub-committee—library document-room); conditions under which a business is so "affected with a public interest" that price regulation is economically and/or legally justified; present limits on the effective regulation of public utilities; the problems of administration involved in the public control of business; government competition as a means of control; any other topic growing fairly directly out of the week's general reading, subject to the Adviser's approval; or, alternatively, the economic facts and legal-economic issues in any *one* of the following legal cases:

(To locate any of these cases, in the Law School or the university library, see in the *Public Control of Business* its footnote reference to volume and page numbers of the U. S. Supreme Court decisions; for example, 251 U. S. 417 means Volume 251 at page 417, etc.)

The Standard Oil Company case (1911); the U. S. Steel Corporation case (1920); the earlier United Shoe Machinery case (1918); the Maple Flooring Association case (1925); the Duplex Printing

Press Company case (1921); the Bedford Stone Company case (1927); the Wolff Packing Company case (1923); the Tyson and Brothers case (1927); the Ribnik case (1928); the State of Missouri ex rel. Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. case (1923); St. Louis and O'Fallon case (1929); Green v. Frazier (1920).

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

January 18-25, 1932

The book to be studied this week is *Other People's Money*, by Louis D. Brandeis.

College Meetings: 10 M T W Th F.

A brief paper dealing with some aspect of this book will be due from each student by 10 o'clock Monday morning, January 25, unless the student has previously made a substitute arrangement with his Adviser. (Suggested topics: The structure of the "money trust"; the importance of "interlocking directorates"; the function of the investment banker; the New Haven Railroad case; financing government borrowing by government agency; the possible rôle of publicity; or any other related topic approved by your Adviser.)

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

January 25-30, 1932

The book to be studied by all the college will be *The Acquisitive Society*, by R. H. Tawney.

College Meetings: 10: M T W Th F, largely under the direction of Mr. Meiklejohn.

During this week, as will be further explained at Monday's meeting, each member of the college (including Advisers) will be asked to join one of three groups, respectively, for "capitalism," "socialism," or "communism." Each of these groups will meet, at hours to be arranged, for the purpose of working out and stating its position. Each group will then delegate representatives to explain

and urge its point of view before the general college meetings the latter part of the week.

Over the present week-end, therefore, each student should try to define his own position, and should (by Monday morning) make up his mind which group to join for the week's discussions.

Every student should, during the week (before Saturday noon), write and hand in a brief paper either formulating his own present position or analyzing Tawney's conception of a "functional society."

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN LITERATURE

February 8, 1932

"Come, Muse, migrate from Greece and Ionia

Cross out, please, those immensely overpaid accounts . . ."

"To get back once more on the main-traveled road, to put away all profitless romanticisms and turn realist . . ."

"The artist, if left to himself, may be safely trusted to observe, synchronize and articulate human knowledge in its most comprehensive form."

"The critic who keeps pace with the movement (realism) no longer asks whether the artist has created beauty or glorified goodness, but merely whether he has told the truth."

"What would be the use of poets, if they only repeated the record of the historian? The poet must go further, and give us, if possible, something higher and better. All the characters of Sophocles have something of that great poet's lofty soul; and it is the same with the characters of Shakespeare. That is as it ought to be."

"O O O O that Shakespiherian Rag—

It's so elegant

So intelligent"

"Instead of the sublime and beautiful; the near, the low, the common, was explored and poetized. That, which had been negligently trodden underfoot by those who were harnessing and provisioning themselves for long journeys into far countries, is sud-

denly found to be richer than all foreign parts. . . . I embrace the common, I explore and sit at the feet of the familiar, the low. Give me insight into today, and you may have the antique and future worlds."

Books for General Reading and Discussion:

- (1) *An American Tragedy*, Theodore Dreiser. Liveright. \$1.00.
 (2) *John Brown's Body*, Stephen Vincent Benet. Doubleday Doran. \$1.50. (3) *Manhattan Transfer*, John Dos Passos. Harpers. \$2.00. (4) *Black April*, Julia Peterkin. Grosset and Dunlap. \$1.00.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

Sophomore Literature Period—1932

During the literature period there will be two concurrent undertakings. One of these is to be the reading and discussion of four books:

An American Tragedy, by Theodore Dreiser. *John Brown's Body*, by Stephen Vincent Benet. *Manhattan Transfer*, by John Dos Passos. *Black April*, by Julia Peterkin.

The other undertaking will be the group-studies made by each Adviser with his advisees. The Advisers announce the subjects of these studies as follows:

Carl Bögholt—"Walt Whitman"

(What did this Barbarian yawp about? What difference has it made?)

H. H. Giles—"Byron, Keats and Shelley, T. S. Eliot and Others"

(A study of the "Romanticists" and their belief in the fullness of life as opposed to the modern tendency to seek escape from life in irony and obscurity.)

Robert Havighurst—"The Middle West in Literature"

(The group will make a study of novelists and poets who have attempted to interpret the Middle West. Each student will study the

work of some writer who has written about the Middle West and who interests him particularly. Some of the writers who may be studied are—Sherwood Anderson, Max Bodenheim, Louis Bromfield, Willa Cather, Theodore Dreiser, Edna Ferber, Zona Gale, Hamlin Garland, Ben Hecht, E. W. Howe, Sinclair Lewis, Meredith Nicholson, Martha Ostenso, Elizabeth Madox Roberts, O. E. Rølvaag, Booth Tarkington, Mark Twain, Glenway Westcott, the columnists (T. Robinson, F. P. A., B. L. T., Eugene Field, Keith Preston), W. A. White, Henry Justin Smith, Edgar Lee Masters, Vachel Lindsay, James Whitcomb Riley, Carl Sandburg, Lew Sarett.)

Alexander Meiklejohn—"Dreiser, Dos Passos, Peterkin"

(Reading of other books by the same or related authors. A study of some contemporary novels in terms of the social ideas and attitudes which they express.)

D. Otis—"Sherwood Anderson"

John Powell—"Criticism"

(The group will study criticism, in the persons of certain critics and in the pages of certain magazines, and will attempt (a) to define the character and aims of the critical activity, and (b) to bring into view the approaches and the values of different groups of critics. The men who will be studied by members of this group are: Krutch (*Modern Temper*, etc.), Van Doren, Lawrence (*Studies; Pansies*), Mumford (*Golden Day; Melville*), Bourne, Sherman (*Points of View*, etc.), Foerster (*Humanism in America*), Mencken (books; and *Mercury*, 1931), Young (books; and *New Republic* for 1931), Wilson (*New Republic* for 1930-31), Canby (*Saturday Review*), Eliot (*Criticism in America*; etc.)

Assignments to groups will be made as usual. It is important to note, however, that in any case where a man wishes to work on the project of another group than that to which he is assigned he is free to exchange membership with anyone who wishes to do so. All

exchanges must be made and recorded in the office by Wednesday, February 10, at 4:30.

The plan for the general meetings is to use the first part of the hour for presentation of a point of view, the rest of the time to be devoted to general discussion.

The schedule of these meetings—subject to change at the will of the college—is given below.

1st week—"Art and Life"

Meetings:

Tuesday, February 9 at 11	} The Advisers
Wednesday, February 10 at 10	
Thursday, February 11 at 11	
Friday, February 12 at 11	

2d week—February 14-20—"Theodore Dreiser"

Meetings: Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, at 11

3d week—February 21-27—"Stephen Vincent Benet"

Meetings: Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, at 11

4th week—February 28-March 5—"Dos Passos"

Meetings: Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, at 11

5th week—March 6-12—"Julia Peterkin"

Meetings: Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, at 11

6th week—March 13-19	} . . . Group Reports
7th week—March 20-26	

Since the assignments for the last months of the year 1931-32 are not, at the time of this printing, available, those for the corresponding months of 1930-31 have been substituted.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENTS

February 8 to May 1, 1931

We have found, as did Henry Adams, that to understand modern America we must have some appreciation of the factors that profoundly modified the older classical and mediæval civilizations. The methods and content of scientific study, expanding from physical,

mathematical, and astronomical investigations into the study of plant and animal life, are now invading the study of human behavior and of social institutions. Vast areas of the earth's surface have been discovered and brought within a system of world communication. As a result, we have created a new institutional system in our finance, industry, politics, morals, and religion. Even ancient societies outside the earlier centers of Western Christendom, such as Russia, China, Japan, and India, are profoundly affected by these changes.

As we turn to the attempts of this new society to interpret and appraise itself in literature and the arts, in religion and philosophy, and to find new enjoyments and values of life, we shall find the same influences at work and a corresponding transformation taking place.

Here again we shall initiate our inquiry in terms of the society which immediately surrounds us—that of the United States. We shall first study directly the appraisals made by a few men and women of unusual experience, sensitivity, or achievement; we shall then try to see this world through the eyes of the artist—more especially, because of practical limitations of equipment, we shall turn to the novelist, poet, and dramatist. Following the first of May, we shall study the effort of the philosopher, the moralist, and the religious teacher to appraise and evaluate the worth of life in this rapidly changing society.

Henry Adams shared with some intimacy in all—and more—of these kinds of experience during his lifetime. Any effort to understand what he is saying, and write about it intelligently, therefore, requires a conscious and determined effort to approach life in the Great Society through as many kinds of experience as we can. Naturally some one of these approaches is of most interest to each one of us, and requires a lifetime of effort and study if one would have any success at all in acquiring its techniques and mastering its fundamentals; but this does not entirely disbar us from seeing what the significance and values of other approaches than our own are.

The books assigned for general reading for the next three months have been selected with some reference to their availability in inexpensive reprints. Some can be secured at libraries, but in general you are expected to purchase them for your own library if you can, and if not, then through group libraries by means of which you can have access to them in some form of rotation. This should be possible of arrangement in view of the considerable period of time available for reading them.

From February 9 to March 1, we will study the memoirs here listed, of which you are required to read at least three. You will find most of these available in one or more reprint libraries at from fifty cents to one dollar in price. The *Letters of William James* is more expensive, but you are strongly urged to buy it and read it. You will find it an increasingly valuable resource through the years. The same applies to *The Heart of Emerson's Journals*. You often can pick up these books cheaply on bargain-sale counters in town or in Chicago or in the lists of second-hand bookshops. *Memoirs*—at least three to be selected for special study:

Franklin, *Autobiography*; Lincoln, *Selected Papers* (Scribner edition); *The Heart of Emerson's Journals*; Thoreau's *Walden*; John Muir, *The Story of My Boyhood and Youth*; Mark Twain, *Life on the Mississippi* and *Roughing it*; W. Wilson, *Addresses and Messages*; *The Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie*; Henry Ford, *My Life and Work*; Mary Antin, *The Promised Land*; Panunzio, *The Soul of an Immigrant*; Edward Bok, *The Americanization of Edward Bok*; Carl Jensen, *An American Saga*; Booker Washington, *Up from Slavery*; Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House*; *The Letters of Henry James*; *The Letters of William James*; *The Autobiography of an Idea* (by Louis Sullivan, Chicago architect); *The Reminiscences of Raphael Pumpelly* (geologist, mining engineer, traveller); Cecelia Beaux, *Background with Figures*. It is suggested that you discuss your selections with your Adviser before making a final choice. It is possible that some memoirs not on this list will be thought suitable for substitution.

During March, we shall devote our time especially to group or

individual studies in literature or the arts. All members of the class should read, in addition, the following novels:

Cather, *My Antonia* or *O Pioneers*; Wharton, *The Age of Innocence* or *The House of Mirth*; Jewett, *The Country of the Pointed Firs*; Peterkin, *Scarlet Sister Mary*; Hergesheimer, *Java Head* or *The Three Black Pennys*; Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises*; Lewis, *Arrowsmith*.

Here again, you may profitably consult with your Adviser and possibly make substitutions, although it seems desirable to have a common sharing of acquaintance with the view of American life which these artists convey and with the aspects of technique and presentation which they reflect.

JOHN M. GAUS.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT AND MEETINGS

February, 1931

February 9	Monday	Franklin	Mr. Gaus
February 11	Wednesday	Lincoln	Mr. Duffield
February 12	Thursday	Wilson	Mr. Otis
February 16	Monday	Carnegie	Mr. Duffield
February 17	Tuesday	Booker Washington	Mr. Otis
February 18	Wednesday	Jane Addams	Mr. Giles
February 19	Thursday	Louis Sullivan	Mr. Gaus
February 24	Tuesday	Emerson	Mr. Gaus
February 25	Wednesday	Mark Twain	Mr. Otis
February 26	Thursday	William James	Mr. D. Meiklejohn

Paper, due March 1, at 9 A.M.:

A critical essay on one of the men or women listed, including some consideration of the light thrown upon the development of an American civilization as seen through these memoirs and other reading.

JOHN M. GAUS.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

April 6, 1931

The final paper on *The Education of Henry Adams* will be due on May 6 at 4 P.M. Papers handed in after that time will not be acceptable as a basis for determining, with the Regional Studies, the final grade of the student.

It will be recalled that these papers are designed to constitute extended reviews of the subject, with special emphasis upon two points. Each paper should contain a clear and coherent discussion of the argument of the book, including some comment upon the events and situations presented by Adams, in the light of the studies of the year in the fields of science, social institutions, history and memoirs, literature, and any other relevant materials. Each paper should also present a thorough and critical study of some phase of Adams' thought, observations, or interests which seems to the writer especially significant or important or which has some special interest to the writer. This aspect of the task naturally implies the study and discussion of other books related to the special field of interest just as the first relates the preparation of the paper to all of the work of the year, since it is really a study of the emergence of modern America in particular and the modern world in general.

There will be sophomore meetings during the period, April 15-May 6, on the following topics, or topics closely related to the following, at which various Advisers will discuss some aspect of *The Education of Henry Adams*:

1. Why Assign *The Education of Henry Adams*? Gaus. April 15.
2. Adams as Historian. Otis. April 17.
3. Adams as Economist. Raushenbush. April 21.
4. Adams as Philosopher. Bögholt. April 22.
5. Adams as Medievalist. Duffield. April 23.
6. The Adams Circle and the Arts. Agard. April 28.
7. Adams and Science. Havighurst. April 29.

8. Adams' Theory and Practice of Education. $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Giles} \\ \text{Powell} \\ \text{Meiklejohn} \end{array} \right\}$ May 1, 4, 5.

These dates and assignments of topics are tentative and subject to change.

SOPHOMORE ASSIGNMENT

May 7, 1931

PHILOSOPHY

We may conceive of the work of the past two years as a study of the attempt of two widely different groups of people to conduct an ordered and successful social life. Their arrangements for producing goods and sharing in their consumption, their modes of government, their social institutions, art, and science, all have been the subjects of our investigation. The study of fifth-century Athens soon revealed the presence in the society of men who criticized existing arrangements and deplored their effects upon the welfare of the group. The most important of these critics of Greek society was, of course, Plato, whose reflections upon man and society resulted in a view of human nature and conduct which has influenced thought about these matters ever since.

Likewise, as we have found, modern industrial America has its critics; and the literature devoted to the criticism of existing institutions is increasing in volume. Many of the views expressed, however, leave unexamined the view of human nature, intelligence, its nature and function, which serves as their basis. It will be our purpose during the remaining weeks of the year to make as careful and critical a study as possible of one view with respect to these matters that has had wide acceptance during the last twenty years. The book that will be used in this study is John Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct*. Every student should arrange to have a copy of the book available for his use.

Additional books suggested for use in group discussions:

Lippmann, Walter, *Preface to Morals*; Krutch, J. W., *The Modern*

Temper; Fite, Warner, *Moral Philosophy*; Meiklejohn, Alexander, *Philosophy*; Otto, M. C., *Things and Ideals* and *Natural Laws and Human Hopes*; Plato, *Gorgias*, *Republic*; Tawney, *The Acquisitive Society*; Zimmern, Alfred, *Learning and Leadership*.

CARL M. BÖGHOLT.

THE
EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

Set up in Linotype Granjon designed
by George W. Jones of the Dolphin
Press, London. Format by A. W. Rush-
more. Manufactured by The Haddon
Craftsmen for the publishers

HARPER & BROTHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON

MCMXXXII



THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

by

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

Alexander Meiklejohn has devoted his life to the cause of Education. For many years he has been famous as a professor of philosophy, Dean of Brown University and President of Amherst College. He has been President of The Experimental College since its foundation five years ago and took a leading part in its plan and execution. Dr. Meiklejohn is therefore in an unique position to tell the story and explain the original methods of the college. The members of the faculty were his friends and he was personally acquainted with the student body. At the same time he was largely responsible for the philosophical basis of the school so that he knows it from both the theoretical and the practical side. Under his leadership a community has been formed which has frankly and courageously faced the difficulties for which college faculties, committees, and educationalists everywhere are trying to find solutions.

HARPER & BROTHERS
P u b l i s h e r s

No. 2128

IS CAPITALISM DOOMED?

By Lawrence Dennis

To escape extinction, how must capitalism eradicate its weaknesses—in finance, agriculture, foreign trade, international cooperation and investments. Vividly and authoritatively, this book offers concrete, valuable suggestions, and discusses these specific ills.

"More hard-hitting common sense, more penetrating thinking, more readiness to face distressing facts than in any other discussion of the economic crisis."—*LEWIS GANNETT*.

"The most realistic, searching, constructive book dealing with our current economic crisis."—*HARRY ELMER BARNES*.

"Brilliant . . . convincing . . . eminently successful! The field of economics is greatly enriched by this remarkable study."—*MAX WINKLER*.

"Of almost sensational importance!"—*BURTON RASCOE*.

\$3.00

THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD AFFAIRS

By Walter Lippmann

in collaboration with Wm. O. Scroggs

Walter Lippmann interprets the dramatic events of the past year and shows their inevitable sequence. A compelling narrative which traces the progress of the great depression, and discloses its effects on the foreign policy of this country. A careful survey of the year's events—an exciting, dramatic book.

"Indispensable reading for anyone who pretends to keep abreast of the international situation."—*LEWIS GANNETT*.

"The most revealing and satisfactory account of the main springs of our present foreign policy to be found anywhere."—*N. Y. EVENING POST*.

"A valuable summary of a momentous and unusual year. Its clarity of conception and its impartiality make it a unique contribution to the work of modern history."—*CHICAGO EVENING POST*.

\$3.00

HARPER & BROTHERS, 49 East 33rd St., New York, N. Y.