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Recently I attended the inauguration of a young man elected to be the head of one of our great universities. He discussed a wide range of questions. His address had the keenness and analytical power of the scientist, the respect for scholarship of the productive investigator, and the optimism and buoyancy of a young man. Later I heard the older academic warriors discuss it. "If he had been serving on committees for the last thirty-five years," said one, "he wouldn't have been so sure of some of his points." "If he had been president five years," said another, "he would have said some things differently." Both statements are indubitably true, but neither of the conditions precedent represented fact. One does not acquire the experience of a generation in the committee room during his thirties, nor does he get to know an institution intimately in a month or two.

What then may usefully be done upon such an occasion as this? One may make a sort of confession of the academic faith that is in him. I propose to do just that. The confession can not be founded upon wide experience. It is probably not very original. Certainly it is not final. Experience should teach something, even to a college administrator!

At the risk of an appearance of bad taste, I am going to begin with the autobiography of this address. It is not, for the most part, the product of two months at Lawrence. It has been reduced to order within the last few days, but much of it, most of it—the whole theme of it—was sketched out before I accepted the office. What I have to say is the product of those anxious days when we were attempting to decide whether we should break old ties or whether we should stay in a college, a community, and a home, where every prospect was pleasing. In those days of balancing judgment these were the ideals and the aims that led to the change. Mornings, after nights of thought and discussion, many of these ideas were set down. The challenge to take a first-hand part in realizing these dreams led to a decision.

I believe that there is a distinctive place in American education for the independent college. Lawrence is a college,
not a university. For a long period it aspired to the name, and for a shorter period to some of the functions, of a university. When the State had established and was maintaining a university upon a great scale there was no need, in this commonwealth, for two universities, and there was no likelihood that another could command the funds to do work which would compare favorably with that of a great state institution. Under these circumstances the name was altered to make it correspond with the service Lawrence sought to render. For nearly twenty years, now, we have been a college in name as well as in fact. So far as I know, there is no considerable body of opinion which would have us reverse that judgment and take up the duties of a university. The time may come when it might be wise; we are agreed that it is not now.

Such being the case, many points are determined at the outset. We should not undertake to do work in competition with universities, nor work which they can do better than we. Our curriculum, our government, and our teaching should be built upon principles different from those of a great university. Our aims are substantially different, and the means we adopt to attain our ends must also be different.

Our universities are dealing with enormous masses of students; they have many thousands upon their books. They deal, moreover, with all knowledge,—theoretical, practical, cultural, vocational. We are not faced with those problems. The college deals with a relatively small group. We are not anxious to number our attendants by thousands. Our curriculum does not cover all knowledge, but only certain fundamentals whose importance is generally conceded, though there is discussion enough about their relative importance. We seek to instil respect for all knowledge and introduce the student to its main branches. The college, moreover, prepares for no vocation. It does not turn out preachers, or lawyers, or engineers, or chemists, or economists. Its teaching is not "practical" in the sense that facts learned here put dollars into the pockets of its graduates.

The student does not come to college primarily to learn things, to store an intellectual garret with an assortment of odds and ends. He comes to college to learn how to learn, what to learn, where to learn, and why to learn. Some essentials
he must carry away, but if the main thing be a method, a desire, a spirit, why load the curriculum with informational courses on this, that, or the other practical art? A few fundamentals mastered, a memory disciplined to retentiveness, a brain trained to clear-cut analyses and to constructive syntheses, a mind energized by an inquiring spirit, a character ennobled by Christian principles,—those are the essentials of the education we seek to give. The college bears a relationship to its students at once more intimate in its social aspect, and more responsible in its teaching methods, than a university can usually attempt to have.

Our catalog has for a generation contained a statement like the following: "The aim of Lawrence College is to train for life. It does not pretend to prepare its students for any of the professions, but, by insisting upon thorough discipline and correct habits of observation and reflection, it affords an excellent preparation for professional study. It aims to develop self-control, manliness and womanliness, and a generous public spirit, and to induce such a high moral sentiment as will be in itself a powerful governing force in the college community."

My thesis is that this preparation for life must come through an intimacy of student and teacher more real and more profound than we have been accustomed to have. We may fairly take somewhat seriously the old wheeze about the boy who was exposed to mathematics but didn't take it. The chances are that the exposure was too brief or too distant. Certainly the likelihood of its "taking" would be vastly increased by exposure for a longer time at closer range.

Teaching is essentially a personal matter. We cannot escape that fact. Even when one learns from the printed page, it is usually from the writings of some author who has the capacity to express his personality through what he says. After one has mastered the technique of learning, he may be able to extract information from the works of Dry-As-Dust, but inspiration to more knowledge, and ideas of productive character do not come that way.

Somewhere along the pathway teacher and student have lost step. The difficulty came partly from the enormous expansion of the range of modern knowledge; new facts came in such
volume and so rapidly that there was no fair opportunity to organize them and integrate them in a teachable way. New problems arose from the enormous crowds of students who suddenly flocked to the colleges. Who can be intimate with a mob? Who can have a daily walk and conversation with a throng? Teachers could no longer lead youth along the well-trodden path of knowledge. They had to regiment them, goose-step them along through freshly ploughed fields, working with the aid of cub instructors, in the role of drill sergeants, —and call it education.

The revolt from that system is marked. The Dartmouth student report is an indictment of modern education by the subjects thereof. The reports of numberless curriculum committees in our American colleges are pleas of confession and avoidance. All of us are seeking a new solution.

When shall we say that a youth is educated? Shall it not be when he has gone through an almost indefinable intellectual crisis wherein the world is somehow discovered anew and is seen in terms of a fresh relationship with himself, when he feels his own creative power, his own capacity for discovering truth, as one of the forces which may mold and shape the destiny of mankind? Most of those who get any permanent good out of their college life can look back upon some experience wherein they saw a fresh light dawn upon their world. The nature of this experience, or crisis, varies with different individuals. Some have to go through an agony of spirit such as marked Goethe’s period of “Sturm und Drang.” Sometimes the awakening is sudden and the vision is clear, and it used to be spoken of as a “call.” With others it is a gradual process and has almost no dramatic moment.

The intellectual life is comparable in this respect to the spiritual and to the emotional life. John Wesley, when he had his decisive religious experience, said that he “felt his heart strangely warmed.” Which of us does not remember falling in love? Its catastrophic character is indicated by the words we customarily use. Not everyone looks back upon any particular moment as critical, but for most of us there is some incident which we recall as having had a peculiar significance in the development of our religious experience or our personal relationships.
By saying that it is when this crisis has come that a youth is educated, I do not mean that his education is then complete. Rather, it has begun in a new sense. The new experience may prove transitory, just as the heart, "strangely warmed," may cool again; just as an awakened conscience may return to sleep; just as love may decay. In the same way, the vision of creative intellectual power may fade.

Our duty, then, is to stimulate the arrival of that crisis, to detect it when it comes, and to give food and discipline for its development after it shall have come. There is no more thrilling adventure. There is no field where there is a more direct challenge to the pioneering instinct than this business of education. No work should give us a deeper sense of responsibility, or a keener realization of the need for utter consecration of effort.

How shall we precipitate the coming of this crisis? It is well enough known that there are circumstances which conduce to religious experience. The program of religious education which is gathering momentum in all the churches is an effort to create that atmosphere, just as in an earlier day it was sought to be created by preachers of revivalistic fervor. It is well enough known that there are circumstances which conduce to falling in love. If one seeks to know what some of them are, he need only look at the alumni marriages of this, or any other, co-educational college, and compare the statistics of married alumni and alumnae of co-educational colleges with those of colleges where men or women are educated alone. If it be true that environment affects profoundly our religious experience, and our deepest emotional experience, then we ought to be able in similar fashion to stimulate the coming of this intellectual crisis by favorable surroundings. The best method is by close association of our students with instructors who have experienced that rebirth of the mind, and who have, as a consequence, been growing in mental stature and caliber. We must remember that the impulse to a better life, in a spiritual sense, often centers about a personality. So it is with the intellectual life. The spirit of emulation is aroused. To know as much as someone whom we regard as singularly wise, to do things as well as someone whose effectiveness we admire, or to have a personality of the richness and grace of one's hero,—
these may furnish the initial impulse to a new mental outlook. Intellectual ambitions, that is to say, are often imitative in their earlier stages. It is interesting to watch the pupils of an effective teacher. They copy his manner, his style,—just as a writer or an artist reflects, particularly in his earlier work, the master who has had the most to do with influencing his development. So with the student; his first ambition is likely to be a desire to become a "small edition" of the instructor he admires. If you observe him closely, you will find him unconsciously copying tricks of speech and action. As his intellectual development progresses, he begins to display more of his own personality. Then his ambition has become individualized, for he has a point of view of his own. The great thrill in teaching, as I have experienced it, comes when one sees that element of personal loyalty and affection ripen into individual genius.

This reveals to us the teacher for what he ought to be,—not merely someone who knows a great deal, for there are thousands whose heads are crammed with knowledge, nor one who has the glow-worm's spark of cold light. The teacher must be one who knows things; and knowing them, loves them; and, loving them, enlarges them, makes them live afresh. He must be one who creates new ideas, and so kindles in others the fires that light and warm his own life. Sometimes we have laid, I admit, much too little stress upon the technique of teaching. It was enough if the candidate were a Doctor of Philosophy. He could learn the art of teaching at the expense of patient pupils! Sometimes, on the other hand, we have laid too much stress upon the mechanics of teaching, upon the merits and defects of recitation or lecture or discussion. We argue with vigor and energy, but often without much effect, whether a course can be taught at all by the lecture method, or whether it must be taught by some other technique. But we have never laid too much stress,—and I believe that we cannot lay too much stress,—upon personality. I do not mean to say that we should pay no attention to methods of instruction. Teaching should not draw back from scientific inquiry into its effectiveness. The scientist should not sneer at those who subject his method of presenting a subject to an analysis as sharp as that which he applies to some chemical substance, or to some physical problem. But, after all, our raw material is not like the raw
material of industry. It is not like the specimens of the laboratory. It does not fit readily into a mold or die, though, God forgive us, we often try to force it so. Our raw material, being human, responds to human forces. So the teacher, whatever he may have by way of knowledge (and I do not discount knowledge!), whatever he may have by way of technical training and experience (and those are of great value), must have within himself the creative spirit and must have a personality which makes what he knows attractive. Last of all, he must have character, so that when the imitative spirit is aroused in his students, they will have for their model of the ideal man one whose life is a sound exposition of Christian principles.

How else shall we determine the moment when this intellectual crisis is taking place, save by intimate and personal contact with our students? The physician does not diagnose the ills of a group; each has his own complaint. This experience of which we are speaking does not come to many students at once, but to each individual for himself. Some day, in some unexpected and, mayhap, accidental fashion, he catches a gleam of light, which thereafter makes over the world for him. The experience of Saul on the way to Damascus was more striking and picturesque, but no more real, than the awakening of many a college student. The dawn of a new outlook may center about some incident, trivial in itself, which throws a fresh beam of light across his path. In some experiment he may get unlooked for results, and he comes with shining eyes to the instructor to report his first discovery. In some piece of composition an idea may strike him; he feels fired to express it with vigor and force, and with new realization that it is his own. A piece of literature, read anew, takes on a livelier and deeper meaning. Some work of art is seen afresh with revealed vision. It is like a spark upon tinder. There is started a fire, small indeed, but hopeful. If we are to share that experience, if we are to shape that experience, we must be ready for it. We must blow upon the tinder and add fuel. We must not be so busy that when the experimenter comes with his discovery, however trivial, we dismiss it with a casual comment to the effect that the same result has been attained before. A deep human sympathy, a life unhurried so that there is leisure for personal work when the moment comes, perpetual contact, and real
discernment,—all these are necessary to give us the opportunity to share and to shape that vision. That is the function—I had almost said that is the magic—of the small college.

It is not enough for this purpose that the college should be small. It must have a faculty numerous enough in relation to the students so that each member may have his own circle—his own clientele, if you will. These advisers can never be assigned to the students. The advisees must be drawn by some personal tie which ripens into affection. They must feel for their intellectual leader a loyalty which gives him access, and that without effort, to their deepest experiences. It is there that one feels the thrill in teaching. To take some boy or girl who has been plodding along more or less industriously learning the daily lessons, apparently "a finished and finite clod untroubled by a spark" and to see dawn upon him the doubt "low kinds exist without," and then to see him square away to the task of resolving his doubts by putting his mind to work in the endeavor to broaden the field of knowledge, to enlarge life, and push back by his own effort the shadows that encompass us: that is what teachers live for.

When this crisis has been precipitated, when the intellectual awakening has come, the work is not yet done. The psychologist reminds us that even love requires practice for growth. The history of the religious orders demonstrates to a nicety that spiritual exercises conduce to spiritual growth, to the development of religious feeling. We know that the musician must train his ear, and that even the great artist must forever be practicing. Many an infant intellectual life which has had a promising birth has died of the rickets within a year or two after leaving college. No routine discipline will give to this newly born ambition the food it needs. No mechanism of the curriculum will gear itself to this problem. Again, it is individual attention which is needed. Has there ever been a college inauguration where someone did not quote Garfield's phrase: "The definition of a college is Mark Hopkins at one end of a log and a student at the other." The significant thing to me in that statement is that, as Garfield put it, he provided room for only one student. Mark Hopkins at one end of a log and a thousand students at the other would not make a college. Personal instruction cannot be given to a great class. It can

[21]
come only where there is an intimacy of give-and-take, which the large class cannot hope even to approximate. Some of our teaching must be of that character, but not our most effective work. The Great Teacher spoke to the multitude, but He deliberately chose a small group for the instruction that was to perpetuate His work. He did not meet them on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings at ten o'clock for fifty minutes. He walked and talked with them daily, even in the corn-field. Of course, we cannot do just that. There are environmental limitations that we cannot transcend. Nevertheless, we can learn from it the essential idea that the business of teaching is the art of bringing personal influence constantly to bear in the direction of intellectual progress. The element of personal relationship, the element of comradeship, must be restored. We have been attempting to educate boys and girls in the mass,—wholesale. As well try to feed babies by flooding the nursery with milk. When this new intellectual child is born, it must have a large share of the time and thought of some member of the faculty.

There has been in recent years a marked emphasis upon individual work. This trend is testified to by many sorts of evidence. The rather common practice of having a psychiatrist connected with the college to examine and report upon the mental and nervous condition of the students and to advise them individually on questions of mental hygiene is one manifestation of our realization that each student has his own problem, and that we cannot deal alike with those of high nervous organization, those of phlegmatic temperament, and those who are suffering from nervous disorders. Wholly different sorts of innovations, but equally important, perhaps, are the intelligence tests, the placement examinations, and the other types of investigation which are designed to show more accurately than has formerly been done the precise development of the student in the scale of mental or intellectual growth. These are some of the many educational experiments. They are important. They deserve a thorough trial. Behind them all, beneath them all, and, I am prone to believe, above them all, must be the old-fashioned human relationship between teacher and taught.

This effort at individual attention, you will say, represents an ideal with precious little relationship to reality. It is an
ideal, but we must labor to make it real, recognizing, however, that it is an expensive business. It is costly because it calls for a large percentage of faculty with reference to the student body, expensive because it calls for a large percentage of mature minds upon the faculty rather than a constant procession of apprentice instructors. It calls for a teaching schedule which will give the members of the faculty opportunity for leisure. The ancient writer of Ecclesiasticus was wise in his day and generation when he said, "The wisdom of the scribe cometh by opportunity of leisure; and he that hath little business shall become wise." Leisure is essential not only to wisdom; it is essential also for contact with students. Interviews with students take longer than interviews with book agents! It is more important that a member of the faculty be wise than that he should punch the time clock regularly at eight o'clock. Individual attention requires a salary scale which will give facilities for social intercourse, for that is one of the roads to intimacy. The ideal I have been setting forth calls for a virtual limitation of the size of the college, and a readiness to put our stake in the quality of the product rather than in its bulk.

This experience, or crisis, of which I have been speaking, has its relationship to the curriculum. We have recognized in the structure of most of our courses of study that there are two periods in college education, one much more elementary than the other. The first two years of distribution or generalization are a display of more or less tempting viands in the hope that some one of them may tickle the palate of the freshman or the sophomore. At the same time we seek to give a broad enough basis of information so that the student will not be a perfect stranger in any important realm of knowledge. It is intended to give that background, that cultural foundation, necessary to a superstructure of more specialized work. The forced decision upon a major or a concentration group (whatever it may be called) is an effort to compel a realization of the need for a special interest in some field of human knowledge or endeavor. These mechanisms have been useful. They are, perhaps, inevitable, but no one pretends for a moment that they reach to the core of the problem. The two stages of development through which the student passes, and of which I have been speaking, are recognized, and this structure of the curriculum is intended
to fit roughly into the experience of the average individual. But such mechanisms have within them the inherent and in-
superable defect that they hold the race horse to the pace of the
dray horse, that they are mechanisms, and consequently they
do not meet individual human needs.

The English have recognized the fact that some men will
probably never catch this gleam of light, but will simply plod
along, acquiring information. The pass man is differentiated
from the honor man, and the honor courses are designed for
those who have shown some urge to a larger intellectual life.
The pass degree meets the social requirements of a college educa-
tion. It furnishes a quantum of information, but makes no
effort to pretend to be more than it is. After all, that is simply
dealing with the situation as you find it. It is a gesture, in a
sense, of despair. It does not seek actively to enlarge the circle
of those who want more light. Perhaps we are too optimistic
in believing that the circle can be greatly widened, but it is
worth a great effort.

We ought not to expect our students to come with fully
developed ambitions,—and if we do, we shall certainly be dis-
appointed. They are in search of distinction, but not necessarily
of an intellectual kind. Men and women are forever in search
of distinction, but, like it or not as we will, there are styles in
this matter, as there are in dress. The college entrant of the
olden day sought intellectual primacy. The business world of
a generation ago sought financial distinction. Today, perhaps,
the business world seeks rather the distinction of power. The
undergraduate world has been enamored of athletic distinction.
The alumni of many of our colleges reflect that phase more
accurately today than the modern undergraduate. The newest
style in collegiate distinction appears to be social. The nouveau
riche, the social climber, the humble worker who wants his son
or his daughter to have a better opportunity for an agreeable
social life than he has had,—these and many others have sent to
college a horde of students whose main ideal and ambition is the
social recognition which follows in the wake of a baccalaureate
degree. Shall we leave it so, by the adoption of the pass and
honor system? Or shall we, with more courage, and perhaps
with deeper insight, recognize that among our functions is to
change not only the ideas but the ideals of those who come
among us, and, by the force of example of a devoted faculty, awaken in them an eagerness to be of service to their fellow men, and a desire to enlarge the boundaries of human knowledge?

In seeking thus to change their ideals, in attempting to precipitate this new outlook upon life, we are often handicapped by the notions that they have brought with them. This craving for social distinction is but one of many. Another is the desire to attain vocational efficiency in college. Some freshmen have come to a premature decision upon their life work, and are following a bent from which it is difficult to deflect them. Some of our students, that is to say, do not know what they have come for, and others who think they know have undoubtedly guessed wrong.

The word "vocation" means a calling. It is of precisely this calling that I have been speaking. The "call" should come from forces within one's self. It should be something from which there appears to be no escape. In practice the choice of a vocation is too often of an entirely different character. It is made without investigation. It is determined upon without depth of purpose. There is no apparent reason for the choice, save that it is the path of least resistance. It is, so to speak, a marriage of convenience. Such marriages have not been notable in history either for their happiness, or for their contribution to the society of their day.

The early choice of a vocation is almost certain, in this age, to mean a "practical" choice, for most of us do not feel any inward urge to a life of service until we develop enough maturity to appreciate the full meaning of the term. An early choice tends to close the door to a larger conception of life than the mere winning of bread. We see a similar difficulty in the preparation for college. Many students find themselves handicapped because they did not take in high school the subjects which would properly prepare for college work. Often they are so severely handicapped that they are discouraged from coming to college at all. The impulse to higher education came too late. Many a student feels his call to a life of service,—service to scholarship, service to society, or service to God,—too late to prepare himself as effectively as he otherwise might have done. It would be infinitely better in many ways if this choice of life
work were postponed until the intellectual crisis has been passed and the student has found himself. We would not think of encouraging boys and girls to choose their wives and husbands as early as the freshman year. If they ought not to choose a life partner, neither should they choose, generally speaking, a life work so early. This tendency toward too early a choice has much to do with the decline in the proportion of social and religious workers produced by our colleges.

In saying that we should discourage vocationalism, in urging that we should limit ourselves to strictly collegiate studies and should not undertake to prepare our students for some business or profession, I recognize that we are not meeting a demand for the teaching of practical subjects which will make for earning power after graduation. The answer must be that the purpose of college education is not to supply that sort of demand. The curriculum of a city college, with its many evening classes, or of a State University, is a highly sensitive thing. It must respond to that kind of demand, and it is proper that it should, for the function of the departments which are thus responsive is to prepare students to earn their daily bread. The curriculum of a college is a more stable thing. We are not in trade; we are not preparing for trade; and we cannot produce goods merely to satisfy a customer. Our task is to supply the needs of a community rather than its demands. Many things a community may need for which the apparent demand is small. There is a tremendous need for education that will give those who come under its influence the capacity to occupy themselves outside business hours, and, giving them a mission in life, fire them with a zeal to serve their communities. It would be folly to quarrel with the radio, the talking machine, the movie and the cross-word puzzle. Each has its place in the scheme of things. But it equally patent that the over-emphasis upon them, which makes them into successive crazes capturing the country, arises from a lack of capacity to amuse one's self. What figure is more tragic than that of the man who can think only in terms of his business, and who talks only of his business in the home, on the links, in the club? He even takes his office to church with him. The world of music, the world of art, the world of nature, the world of sport, and the things of the spirit are all crowded out by the pressure of business. The beauties,
the inspiration, the charm of literature; the magic, the interest and the instruction of history, the insatiable curiosity to know,—these leave too many supposedly educated people cold. Their walk and conversation turns about business, and after office hours and in the home they are restless, and fidget for some external stimulus to awaken interest. The relaxation, the refreshment, which come through the eye on the printed page, and the exercise of the imagination by which one can be transferred to a far country or to a different civilization,—these things are lost to them. There is no occasion to quarrel about it; they are not wholly to blame. Our schools and colleges have failed to awaken the interest and cultivate the habit of study, and thought, and reflection. If the art of conversation has languished, it is perhaps because the range of topics upon which a group of people can converse together has been narrowed through the crowding out of cultural interests by the practical affairs of life.

Business needs its techniques; it needs its special knowledges. Some of these can come from experience. Others can come through reading and study. A very few of them should be acquired in college. Our aim is not to turn out a finished product. That is the last thing we want to do. We seek to turn out a product which has just begun to operate at full time capacity, and which is capable of further growth and development. We have been much too prone to believe that reading and study cannot be carried on save in connection with class room work. If that be true, then certainly we have made a failure. If we are to count our education as successful, it must furnish to the graduate the ability to go to the literature of a subject and study it out, organizing his own knowledge. Are we to say that the only method of feeding is the spoon-fed method of the class room? Is there no more intellectual strength produced by our discipline and exercise? Is the apprentice never to become a master, working without supervision? Can he never become a teacher himself? Do our teachers teach only that which they were taught? It is nonsense to suppose that such could be the case. If there be capacity for clear thought, if there be a disciplined mind, if there be developed the ability to do one's own thinking, then, when the bachelor's degree has been earned, the education has just begun.

[27]
It would be a bitter admission if we were to admit that education stopped with college. I have heard it said that alumni represent an arrested stage of mental development, that a year or two after leaving college mental growth ceases for most men and women. Intellectual interests lose their charm. Absorption in business, in the cares of the home, in the routines (even of teaching!) crowd out a lively conception of the wonders of the world. That seems to me the counsel of pessimism, but one must admit that there is more excuse for pessimism, than would be desirable. The challenge to this college is to do in these respects a better job and to send out our graduates with so much intellectual momentum that they will keep going.

We must strive to sink the roots of curiosity so deep in the minds of our undergraduates; we must equip them so well as students, that they may continue to learn from books things which will help them in business and in the home, in leisure hours, and at their daily tasks.

Who expects the student to carry away, wrapped in his sheepskin, a quantum of knowledge that will get him far in this world? Do we not rather count on his having acquired habits of industry, discovered the joy of work, developed sound mental and physical and spiritual habits and caught a vision of his responsibility for the social progress of mankind? How many successful men of fifty are doing what they began to do when they left college? How many successful men are using the facts which stood them in such good stead at final examinations? How much would they have achieved with what they knew when they left college? If the inferences from these questions are correct, why stuff our youth with special techniques? Of the really successful men how many depend upon knowledge alone? Does not success come more from personalities that win friends, from characters which inspire confidence, from minds active, flexible, but grounded upon principle? Are not, then, personality, and character, and activity of mind more to be cultivated than any technique? These are platitudes. We repeat them again and again, and repeating them with our lips, we deny them with our educational practice. If we repeat them, why not have the courage to shape our policy to emphasize those fundamentals that affect life outside the office as well as inside, those forces that make for (dare we still use that
almost ruined word?) culture, for love of art and music, for keenness of perception and for breadth of interest.

This attitude toward the student of which I have been speaking has a second effect upon the curriculum, namely upon the number of courses which may appear in the catalog. The variety of subjects has been increasing with astonishing rapidity. This is due partly to the growth of the field of human knowledge, partly to competition on the part of the colleges in previous years with vocational and professional schools, partly to rivalry among colleges for students and partly, it seems, to pure imitiveness—because "everybody's doing it." There is another reason, somewhat more respectable. An instructor whose mind is still growing wants to study a special field in order to improve his own outlook. He knows that with the pressure of his academic duties, his best opportunity to introduce himself somewhat intimately to a new branch of his subject is by giving a course upon it. He thereupon combs the catalogs of other institutions and urges that our intellectual banquet should not be more coldly furnished forth than that provided by rivals. He is permitted to start a course. Its value being judged all too often on a quantitative basis, there is a tendency to make the course "attractive" to a large number in order that there may be no inquiries as to why a course is given when there are so few in the class. This quantitative measure has led us to draw many students into courses that should have but few. The proposal that I am making would lead to much more individual work. A professor might work with a single student, or with a very small group of students, in a field of knowledge and introduce himself to it along with them without the necessity of listing it as a formal course in the catalogue. He would gain the broader knowledge and intellectual satisfaction that he now seeks. It would avoid the multiplication of courses. Best of all, perhaps, it would give the student his apprenticeship in study where his work is done side by side with his instructor.

The moment seems to be singularly fortunate for some such realignment. The professional schools are coming to be more and more graduate schools; they are no longer rivals of the colleges. There is no need for colleges to compete among themselves for students, for all the colleges find them coming in em-
barrassing numbers. The problem is not to induce them to come, but to train adequately those whom we must admit. Indeed, we are having to limit attendance. The usual method is to turn to higher entrance requirements, which is a sound process, within limits. But why not limit our numbers by having only those come who are ready to do what they can do in any given place? If one would be a graduate of a college of liberal arts, let him seek one which lays its emphasis there. If he must have vocational training, let him seek a school which has accepted that emphasis. It is no longer necessary that men and women should go to schools close at hand. Distance is not a very important factor. The cost of travel is relatively a small item in the student's budget. Colleges and universities are sprinkled so thickly over our landscape that, so far as distance is concerned, a boy or girl has many choices. This differentiation of function, this variety of emphasis, is already being talked of in the medical and scientific world. The localization of specialization has already begun, and it contains an important idea for the colleges. There is a place for the city college with courses in almost everything under the sun, which can be taken morning, afternoon and evening. I observed, not long ago, a course in "Janitorial Engineering," but there is no reason why colleges outside the great cities should stuff their curricula with courses for which they have not the equipment, and for which the demand is, in reality, superficial.

The women's colleges have already done something to achieve this differentiation. Simmons, Skidmore, Connecticut and others give credit for different sorts of courses from Bryn Mawr, Wellesley, or Vassar. It is nothing against either group that the courses of study and the requirements for degrees are so various. It is a reasonable and sensible partition of function.

Shall we not, here at Lawrence, resolve to do a limited range of fundamental things with singular excellence, to concentrate our resources and efforts through a relatively small curriculum, made up of subjects which are recognized as essentials, upon shaping the characters and enlarging the minds of a limited group of students?

This process of selection, this holding down of numbers, does not arise from any notion that there should be an aristocracy in
education. It is not a contention, even, that some students are not fit to go to college; that point is not involved at all. The idea is simply that we should not take more students that we can adequately care for, that we should not attempt to deal in mass production. The materials with which we work are so different from the materials of industry that one cannot simply keep adding units. Our resources are limited. We must, consequently, limit our output. It is better that the limitation should be upon quantity than upon quality. We should make every effort to see to it that we give those whom we do admit the best which they are capable of receiving.

There is this further idea involved in a limitation of numbers; namely, the idea of homogeneity. It is perfectly clear that we can do better work if our students are able to meet our pace. The laggard holds up the whole procession. It is a commonplace that we have been spending more time upon the lowest ten per cent than upon the highest twenty, and that the average individual got the least attention. If we eliminate from this college that lowest ten per cent, it releases time and energy which may be utilized in doing much better work with the remainder.

The attitude toward the individual student of which I have been speaking has its effect upon the management of undergraduate affairs. The ideal that I would set before you is that which Lawrence College had in the days when it was younger and smaller. The third President of the College, Russell Z. Mason, said in his sketch of its history: "The animus of the college government was not simply authoritative or arbitrary but it aimed to teach the student the art of self-control. He was taught to maintain for himself, self respect, and that kind of self respect that refused to disobey the law. The students and the faculty were always on good terms with each other. What was desired by one was desired by the other. We think this an essential part of a liberal education." I do not know that I have heard it said better.

It is folly to expect to develop in students originality of mind and independence of thought, and then hold them with the discipline of children. Some will say that it is hazardous business to give them self-government. Why limit that warning to student self-government? Democracy is intrinsically
hazardous. We must make the attempt. Our only guarantee against failure arises from the fact that in a community where the youth is intimate with maturity, where the elders have constant access to the thoughts and feelings of the undergraduates, there will naturally develop channels for counsel which will steady efforts at self-government.

The small college is admirably adapted to training in this respect. It is a society within a society. Here, for the first time, most of our students live in a group other than the family group. They must make,—it is an important part of their education that they should make,—the inevitable social readjustments which entrance upon a new life always involves. Their whims, their tastes, their idiosyncrasies, long since discounted by a sometimes indulgent, and occasionally scornful, family circle, are subjected to a new examination and a fresh appraisal by contemporaries of an extremely critical frame of mind.

In the coeducational college there is an inevitable readjustment in the relationship between boys and girls. At the end of the period of adolescence they come to a great congregation. There are all types from which to choose friends and companions. There are infinite opportunities for developing acquaintances. Whatever the discipline, whatever the safeguards, there are always possibilities of misconduct. Here, in an environment which we want to make intensely personal in its relationship between maturity and youth, is an opportunity to work out a habit of thought and action on this great question which recognizes not only the fundamental demands of society, but which will tend to put those demands upon a higher plane.

In this trial world, if we may call it so, youth comes under the eye of experienced age, and the faculty makes its comment. Youth comes under the eye of the more critical undergraduate and he makes his comment with rare pith and force. He plays his part in a life which is political in a sense that the government of every group must be political in character. He bears his responsibility for the conduct of matters peculiarly his own, and here he may find out for himself whether he adjusts himself readily to the dictates of social custom or whether he must yield up some of his own individuality to the ordinary necessi-
ties growing out of the fact that we live in a crowded world. It is, I repeat, an essential element in his education.

Last of all, this emphasis upon individual attention has also its effect upon the religious life of the student. We must recognize, with however much regret, that the old methods no longer serve. The student prayer meeting no longer has the intrinsic appeal that it once had. The student must work out his religious beliefs in a manner quite different from that of his father. There is much less emotionalism in student religion now than there once was, and we must face that fact. They do not come to us with the same religious background and habits and training that they used to have. The new science, material and social, has made the problem of religion much more an intellectual problem than it used to be.

Many things are needed if the Christian tradition of our student body is to be maintained. But of this I feel sure: progress can best be made if, as they go about from day to day, they are on such a basis of acquaintance and intimacy that they will feel free to talk of these problems as well as of their scholastic difficulties. In my own life I look back to religious discussions around the table of a history seminary as more important to me than any sermon I have ever heard.

I would have for Lawrence students an opportunity for them to walk and talk with wise and sympathetic members of the faculty,—the sort of men of whom Kipling says:

``And we all praise famous men—
Ancients of the College;
For they taught us common sense—
Tried to teach us common sense—
Truth and God's Own Common Sense
Which is more than knowledge!

``Bless and praise we famous men—
Men of little showing!
For their work continueth
And their work continueth
Broad and deep continueth
Great beyond their knowing.''

[33]
I would have a curriculum, the character of which can be stated today in precisely the same words which were used when the college was founded and which appear in its charter. The course of study should be upon a plan "sufficiently extensive to afford instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and to develop the scholar." I would have the student governed as largely by himself as our courage and faith will allow. I would have him under a religious influence as deep and as personal as steady association with devoted characters can make it. That is my ideal for Lawrence College.