LAWRENCE vs COLLEGES X, Y, AND Z

November 18, 1935

Valley Inn, Neenah, Wisconsin

Address given at dinner for A.A.U.P. in celebration of Henry M. Wriston's 10th anniversary as President of Lawrence College.
The invitations to this dinner referred to it as a celebration—or by some amiable word of that general character. In this office, I suppose survival is a matter of congratulation, for official mortality is very high. But one cannot come to the end of a decade such as this last with any feeling of personal pride whatever. One meets such an occasion as this with humility, for memories call forth not only joys and achievements, but failures and mistakes in disheartening numbers.

One of the great achievements of this period, like all advances the fruit of the effective co-operation of many people, is the establishment of the Institute. Its unique quality as an educational and research organization, its financial success, its energy and morale, its effective research have all been remarkable. Being so young and so successful it sometimes forgets how much it owes to the college; and the college constituency seeing the Institute's prosperity in the midst of its own financial adversity sometimes is tempted to look upon it with jaundiced eye. Each should come more fully to appreciate the other.

The conservatory at the outset of this decade was swelling in numbers and in ambition. Some were afraid that it would overshadow the college. Its record has been one of declining numbers but constantly improving work. Its financial position is not yet stabilized, but its educational function is clearer than ever before. The maintenance of
morale in adversity, and the simultaneous improvement of teaching constitute a genuine achievement.

For the college the outstanding obvious fact is the financial reverse that set salaries back, that held many programs in suspense, and called upon the faculty for sacrifices wholly undreamed of during the years just previous. The most encouraging development is the classification of aims and of a program designed to achieve them.

I have been reflecting upon what kind of a statement would be appropriate to this occasion. One might continue upon the line already started and review the history of the changes that have been wrought. In large measure, however, that was the theme of the annual report last June, and that material should not be repeated.

A second possibility would be to give some new statement of academic faith. That was the theme of the inaugural address ten years ago. So many of you have joined our number since that time that I was tempted to palm the same speech off tonight. Upon re-reading it, I would not change one article of faith. The changes are in intensity and in quality rather than in substance. There is little that I could say tonight which would be new.

There is a third possibility which I will attempt to explore, namely, to fit those two points of view together. I will seek to inquire what changes have come in the premises of our situation, and discuss how effectively the program has been adapted, upon the one hand, to these changes, and, on the other hand, to that statement of faith in a liberal college, with which I undertook the work.

Ten years ago there were 12 degree-granting institutions in Wisconsin. Today there are 23. Among the 12, Lawrence stood fourth in point of size.
Among the 23 it stands ninth. Among the 12, only Ripon was within the Fox River Valley. Among the 23 there are in addition, Oshkosh, St. Norberts, Jordan, Mission House, and Stevens Point. In Upper Michigan there was then but one degree-granting institution, the Michigan School of Mines. Now Northern State College and Jordan have been added. There were then no publicly supported junior colleges in Wisconsin or Upper Michigan. Since then the University of Wisconsin has developed its extension center in Milwaukee into the substance, if not the form, of a junior college, and in Upper Michigan a number of junior colleges have been established. In Wisconsin a number of county normals hitherto giving only one year of work now give two, and some clearly aspire to be junior colleges.

The Bureau of Education in Washington lists 63 Wisconsin institutions which purport to give work in the field of higher education. The only states with larger numbers are California, 112; Illinois, 108; Iowa, 68; Massachusetts, 71; Missouri, 65; New York, 113; Ohio, 71; Pennsylvania, 101; Texas, 91--nine states. Those figures, however, take no account of the population, and, more specifically, of the high school population which must supply college students. Based on the number of high school graduates available for each institution of higher learning, Wisconsin has by far the largest offering of higher education. Among all that group it offers more educational opportunities per unit of high school graduates than does any other.

During a decade when the population has been growing by 250,000 or 300,000--about ten percent--the number of institutions offering work has increased enormously, and the number granting degrees has practically doubled. Moreover, these ten years have been years of financial stringency.
Under that circumstance students tend to go to institutions having the lowest fees. The teachers colleges, under the stimulus of the degree-granting privilege and low fees, have increased their enrollment from 4,921 to 6,180 or 25.5 per cent. The undergraduate enrollment of the University of Wisconsin has grown from 5,752 to 6,316 or approximately 10 per cent. The newly established privately endowed college Mission House, St. Norberts, Jordan, Mt. Mary, all but the last in our own immediate area, have grown markedly. The older group, Beloit, Carroll, Lawrence, Milwaukee-Downer, and Ripon, have lost enrollments.

Experience in Wisconsin is not peculiar in this respect. President Wilkins of Oberlin has recently made a careful study of enrollment trends. One hundred and ten colleges of liberal arts have increased their attendance since 1921 only about one per cent. In 1925-26, the year I came to Lawrence, they had grown, in the four years from 1921 to 1925, 14.5 per cent. In the last ten years all but one per cent of that has been lost. Since 1921 fifty-eight universities, of which thirty-two are publicly supported, have grown 37.2 per cent. Their percentage loss since then is slight. In the period from 1921 to 1931, a representative group of teachers colleges grew 145 per cent—a steady march forward which appears to have continued in more recent years. From 1921 to 1931, junior colleges mostly publicly supported grew 601.6 per cent, and their growth has continued steadily since 1931. In his summary President Wilkins remarks, "The independent college of arts and sciences, once overwhelmingly dominant in the field of higher education, now enrolls only a little more than a quarter of the total number of collegiate students." The fact that liberal college enrollments in Wisconsin have declined since 1925 is, therefore, an experience shared with the rest of the nation.
Nor do those facts tell the whole story. Competition has sharpened in other important respects. Ten years ago only the University, Marquette, Beloit, Carroll, Lawrence, Milwaukee-Downer, and Ripon were accredited by the North Central Association as standard four-year colleges. To that list must now be added Mt. Mary, Stout Institute, La Crosse, Milwaukee, Oshkosh, Superior, River Falls.

One other point must be mentioned. Ten years ago the normal schools began their professional training in the first year, and a good many specialized courses at the University also began their training courses in the first year. In other words, if a student chanced to want a liberal arts course, the normal schools and parts of the University were inappropriate choices for his school life. The failure of training and professional courses to develop an adequate background became so patent, however, that today most institutions devote much of, if not all, the first two years to the broad outlines of what is called "general education". So far as titles of courses are concerned, therefore, there is relatively little difference among institutions. In appearance, at least, they are all giving attention to the liberal arts for at least two years. A number, like Northern State Teachers College at Marquette, Michigan, give a four-year liberal arts course. A bill came close to passage in the last session of the Wisconsin legislature designed to make all the teachers colleges in Wisconsin state colleges. Had it passed, they would then no longer have used the professional degree of bachelor of education but would have conferred instead the traditional degree of the liberal college--the bachelor or arts.

These are the changed premises upon which we must base our thinking. We ought now candidly to examine whether our program is a sound one and
whether we have taken the course most likely to lead us to a position where we can serve our public most effectively.

First of all, our present program involves accepting a position upon the scale of size which will be increasingly modest. That seems to me inevitable, and I accept it without any regret whatever. Our problem is to make the most effective use of our resources. The students do not and cannot pay the full cost of their education. We ought not to undertake to handle more students than our resources warrant. Even as our assets grow we ought to spend our money, and also our energy, on the intensification of our program. Measured on the basis of size, therefore, we will not again occupy a conspicuous place in the total educational pattern.

If we are not to be impressive in size, we must seek other marks of distinction. They should come through the quality and the coherence of our program. But first we must face the question. "In all this growth of state and municipal institutions is there room for such a program?" I think there is. It must be remembered that the growth of institutions of higher education is much more rapid than the growth of the population as a whole. Not only a larger and larger number, but a larger and larger per cent of young people are going to institutions of higher education. The mechanization of industry and the consequent postponement of entry into economic productivity for young people, on the one hand, and the expanding program of education, on the other hand, are drawing more students into higher education. The return of prosperity should accelerate, rather than retard, that tendency.

The United States has already an utterly distinctive position in that respect. The number of students in institutions of higher education
per 1,000 of population runs about as follows: United States, 8.9; Norway, 2.5; Denmark, 2; Germany, 2; France, 1.7; Great Britain, 1. These figures show one fact of fundamental importance to our enquiry. Education abroad is exclusive and competitive. The great objective of the lower schools is to weed out those with less than the highest intellectual gifts, sending forward only those of unusual distinction of mind. Whether they achieve that result may be argued, but there is no doubt of the central purpose. They consciously promote an aristocratic conception of educational opportunity. In the United States, on the other hand, the effort is always to keep the student in school. Democracy in educational opportunity and differentiation of institutional function are inseparable. If the pupil is not fitted for one kind of school a search is made to find one to fit him. This has gone so far that in California half the persons with I.Q.'s of 80 of less who are of college age, are actually in some institution of higher learning, incredible as it may seem.

Those facts indicate several things. First, within the American system there is still room for some institutions wholly devoted to the ideal of a liberal education. Second, in all this welter of students, good, bad, and indifferent, there are plenty of adequate caliber so that a college such as Lawrence may continue to secure a fair quota. Third, it is necessary to comb the haystack to find the needles. We are faced with the fundamental problem of finding a new constituency. That is the educational background and the adequate explanation of our recruiting policy and the organization of the admissions office. It is fair to say that up until about the period of the war high schools consciously prepared students for college, and those students who sought
admission to college desired the kind of education a good college would give. After that time, however, high schools paid less attention specifically to college preparation. With the tremendous growth in attendance, the high schools broadened their programs and graduated hundreds of thousands who had no understanding of what is involved in a liberal education. Now, in all this mass of high school graduates we must find those who can profit from our program and show why this is the kind of college they are, or should be, seeking. That is the positive aspect, and the most significant part, of the recruiting effort. In judging our program of student admissions too much attention has been paid to the numbers who matriculate. We could have all the students we could possibly accommodate if we did not care what their tastes, training, capacities and interests might be.

There is a great temptation at this point. All too many colleges have yielded to it. They have given courses that either are or look like those which many students want. They spread curricular bait for students and pretend to give them what they ask for whether they have the staff and equipment to do so, or not. Seeing the universities drawing multitudes of students, they give imitations of university courses. Giving students what they need, and what they ask for, are two wholly different things.

You may well ask how I know that colleges have yielded to this temptation. I think the experience of one college can be made to demonstrate the proposition without falling into the fallacy of generalizing from the particular. In one state an enormous amount of money has been spent over a period of seven years to test the achievement of students in high school and college. Nearly fifty colleges have participated.
Those colleges, the study reveals, tend to draw to themselves students of characteristic levels of academic capacity. Some take only students of marked ability and achievement, some take the run of the mind, and some attract very low grade students. Likewise, after they secure the students, the colleges achieve different results with them. Some carry their matriculants to higher and higher levels of achievement. Some just carry them. College X, which I am to discuss, was at the median. As many colleges were worse as were better. It is for that reason that I dare to generalize from College X. It graduated 211 students after four years in attendance. The investigation has demonstrated that a common period of attendance was all the students had in common. In carefully constructed tests some showed brilliant achievement. Others seemed wholly to have missed the point. Yet both groups, and all in between, were graduated together. So great was the disparity in achievement that this amazing fact developed. When the whole college was tested, all four classes being given the same test, it was discovered that if the 211 showing the highest achievement were graduated, 52 persons or 25 per cent would have been graduated from the senior class; 62 persons, or 29 per cent, would have been graduated from the junior class; 48, or 23 per cent from the sophomore class; 49, or 23 per cent, from the freshman class. It was further discovered by testing the same students year after year that twenty-three who entered with good achievement scores did progressively less well as they lingered in that fetid intellectual atmosphere.

Uniform achievement is, of course, an impossibility. But disparities so extraordinary as that described show two things. First, there was an utter failure to gather students of sufficiently related abilities, tastes,
and training, so that they could be called an intellectual group. They were a group only in a physical sense. It becomes perfectly clear that there was no admissions policy save one of numbers. The aims and objective of the students, as well as their abilities and their training, were utterly incoherent.

The second clear inference from the results is that, getting this unmanageable and indigestible mass of students within its gates, the college could not deal with individual students according to their needs. Doubtless the stupidest were dropped. Obviously the more brilliant tended to rust out. Instead of gaining in power and competence their talents were buried in a napkin—and they lost even that which they had. Offering too many students too many things, the college gave them all too little. So he got nothing at all so far as the intellectual life is concerned. And remember that half the colleges in that state did less well; many others did very little better.

Now it can be told, for now it has been proved. But what is there writ large in a scientific study is what we have known all the time. The college that decorates its offerings with meretricious attractions draws students, whose desire for those gaudy but insubstantial offerings simply defeats its own educational function. It may balance its budget. It may grow in size. It may wear the spangles of success, but it is not educating the young people who come.

The Lawrence admissions office, therefore, has as its major task, not securing numbers, but finding, and interesting, a group who want the kind of education we offer at the kind of pace we set. If they have not the ability they cannot succeed. If they are out of emotional harmony with our objectives they will not try to succeed. There is only
one institution in the country, with which I am acquainted, which does practically a perfect job in these two respects. By doing this preliminary work so well it solves many more of its problems. The last ten years have seen a progressively better job done at Lawrence in this vital aspect of our problem. Too often we take the numbers of our freshmen as the most significant figure. The academic aptitude median and the high school percentile median are infinitely more important in judging success or failure, educationally.

However, well this job is done no freshman class will be uniform. Individual differences are so many and so great that even the most carefully chosen ground in the world will show marked disparities in taste, capacity, character, and emotional response. We must immediately seek to discover those. Freshman Week is not merely or mainly a hortatory attack upon defenseless neophytes; it is a time of gathering more data to sort the individual out from the group. It furnishes an opportunity to encourage those who have the capacity to go at once into more advanced work. It gives a chance to fit his program to each student. The educational tailoring done at that time is of the greatest importance. We should find what his needs are and supply them.

Ten years ago I spoke of something to which I have never again referred in like terms. Indeed, I had forgotten the passage. Yet it lies at the root of my interest in two of our most characteristic procedures.

"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 drawn upon their world. The nature of this experience, or crisis, varies with different individuals. So we 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.

"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. How shall we precipitate the coming of this crisis?

"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 be 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."

This point of view, as I have said, lies at the root of two of our most characteristic procedures--the sophomore tutorial and the tutorial work in the major field.

Throughout the year the sophomore is supposed to be deciding upon some field of special interest to challenge his intellectual activity.
Yet, broadly speaking, it is the most confused and unguided year in college. The freshman year is carefully calculated to carry on work begun in secondary school. The most careless colleges make some show of counseling new students. The sophomore year breaks into new subjects, and counseling is conspicuous by its absence. In that confused year the student must make a significant choice. To the end that the work might be coherent, to the end that the student might have an intellectual guide, to the end that this mental crisis of which I have spoken might be stimulated and wisely directed we have undertaken the sophomore tutorial. Writing in a different connection, the sophomore tutor dealt with this very issue, "The crux of the difficulty lies in the problem of how the student is to be given an imaginative grasp of a goal which will stimulate him to individual effort and what is called personal achievement." That is the central function of this new enterprise. It is work under personal direction not in any specific subject but in all fields. It is a challenge to thought and intellectual organization. For lack of funds it is confined to a small group. It should be broadened at the first possible opportunity.

The tutorial work in the major field looks in the same direction. Transferring the emphasis from imparting knowledge by the teacher to the growth of the student it nevertheless reserves to the teacher his highest and best functions—stimulation to interest and effort; guidance toward the most effective manner of expending effort; friendly and personal commendation, criticism, or, if need be, censure. Each student should go at his own best pace, neither hurried nor hampered by others. In the senior year, at least, the students should in this favorable environment exemplify that private life of the mind which is the ideal of adult learning and living.
At the end comes the comprehensive examination. Properly regarded it is not merely a requirement for graduation— not just another hurdle to leap. It is an opportunity to demonstrate how significant has been the growth of the individual. It is not merely a periodical check of what is passing through his mind. It is not merely an inventory of things to which the mind has been exposed. It seeks to discover what has grown into the structure of his thought life, what has found permanent lodgment in his aperceptive mass.

That is our answer to the challenge of College X. We will not take a job lot of students, and, neglecting their individual differences, regiment them through four years. We will seek students of comparable ability and training, fit by taste and temperament to grasp the philosophical significance of a liberal culture. Then, despite their similarities we will accent their individualities, seeking for each his earliest awakening, and his finest intellectual development. College X in the midst of diversity emphasized uniformity. Lawrence, in the midst of similarity, must emphasize individuality.

Unhappily College X tells only part of the tragic story of much higher education. It reveals the failure to develop the mind of the student. It tells nothing of what happens to his emotional life or to his character.

The program of investigation by which College X is revealed on the intellectual side has taken many years and many dollars. It has made graphic, it has proved, what informed opinion already asserted. Any program for the investigation of the aesthetic, the emotional development of students would take very much longer and vastly larger sums. Only the foundations of such studies have yet been laid. But for those
familiar with higher education it is perfectly clear that the record of colleges in the development of appreciation, an awareness of beauty and the realization of its significance in life, sensitiveness to the values in literary, dramatic, musical, artistic expression, is even worse than in the strictly intellectual disciplines. Let us express this failure by an imaginary institution, College Y.

The public schools make almost no pretense of serious constructive work in this field; their emphasis is wholly remedial. A study of the great 4,500 page "Survey of Secondary Education" shows no evidence even of a beginning of a constructive program for dealing with the emotional life. In all that mass of material there are 23 pages on art and 43 on music! Even that is largely technical. This great enterprise designed to reveal "pioneering trends and innovating practices: never mentions emotional qualities positively or constructively. As for colleges and universities, when one studies their experimental programs the emotional life (save as a problem for clinical and remedial treatment) is all but neglected. Preoccupation with the techniques of instruction and with the practical aspects of life has led them to neglect the sources of the drives that make life bearable! Emphasis upon technical training and vocational preparation has crowded out attention to the well-springs from which the primary satisfactions must be drawn.

Even in their form institutions of higher education have neglected to provide the barest essentials for influencing aesthetic development and emotional maturity. The traditional American college was a residential unit. The students lived a life apart. They were in what we would now call a controlled environment. Their waking and sleeping, their spending and their saving, their work and play, their religious
life, their social life were all the immediate and intimate concern of
the faculty. Unhappily those controlled environments were all too often
drab and dreary and the moral discipline pretcy distasteful. Nonethe-
less, it was a controlled environment and capable of development in the
direction of that enrichment of which I speak.

Recent developments in higher education have been toward abandoning
that constructive environmental influence. The teachers colleges have
grown greatly since 1921. Among them all, here in Wisconsin, there is
but one dormitory. Junior colleges are seldom residential. Great
universities which house their students are the exception.

This development means the abandonment of some of the most ef-
fective instruments for guiding students toward the development of taste,
and in the direction of emotional balance, not only, but emotional
breadth and depth and vitality. The range of activities of many in-
stitutions is narrowed because of their structure and form of organization.

Lawrence is primarily a residential college. I hope the day will
come when it can be wholly so. That is one of the justifications of a
four-years program. If the college is concerned exclusively with the
attainment of a reasonable degree of proficiency in a stated range of
subjects, then it might conceivably be wise to grant the degree when
a set of examinations was passed without any reference to the time which
might have elapsed. But if the college is concerned with growth, time
is of the essence of the matter. And if we are concerned not only with
the growth of the mind but growth of character and of taste, time takes
on still larger significance.

Growth is profoundly affected by environment. Colleges and uni-
versities which increase their environmental emphasis have gained in-
struments of first importance for shaping taste and moulding character.
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We should, therefore, seek to control environment as far as it is at all possible to do so, not in the interest of inhibiting the student's activity, not as a means of negative control, but positively as a means of widening his horizons, of expanding his appreciations, of sensitizing and refining his awareness of beauty.

The dormitories and the fraternity houses, therefore, are not mere places of habitation. They are educational or anti-educational influences. They should be built with taste; they should be decorated with skill. They must be managed, as now they are, with the emphasis, of which Miss Waples recently spoke so feelingly, upon comely comestibles rather than incredible edibles.

The artist series is part of the student's education. That is why it is included in the tuition charge. It is not something tacked on by way of a decoration. It is at the heart of our program. Without the musical tradition built up through the years by the conservatory and the artist series, that great and significant educational demonstration, the a cappella choir, would be impossible. It is the cumulative result of many years' emphasis upon discriminating taste in music, upon musical expression intelligent in character but warm in its interpretation and rich in its disciplined emotional expression.

The exhibits of pictures, the pictures rented to the students are in like fashion essential elements in the program. It is a great satisfaction to see the pictures in the Carnegie teaching collection circulate more freely. These are indications that foundations are being laid upon which we may build steadily. Greatly as I desire the courses in art to be developed further, much more do I hope to see students in art giving the same free, yet disciplined, emphasis to expressional work.
that we already have in music. The program of dramatics is extra-
curricular in form but in substance it also is of the essence of the
college. There also we see emerging, not yet wholly appreciated, the
same zest in emotional expression that may be found in the choir.
Through the years I hope it may ascend to a plane of like excellence
in the quality of its literary and artistic taste. These activities
are designed to unite intense effort with joyous satisfaction, to
join in harmonious balance intellectual achievement and emotional
power.

Someday as the intellectual deficiencies of College X have been
exposed, the emotional and aesthetic poverty of College Y will be fully
revealed. The program just sketched is Lawrence's answer to that
challenge.

I must detain you for a word about College Z. The deficiencies
of X are intellectual, of Y emotional; Z makes no contribution to char-
acter. Its failure in this field arises out of many of the same de-
iciencies. It has too many students. It controls them environmentally
too little. Its emphasis is too exclusively practical, or scientific,
or intellectual; that is, its sense of proportion is inadequate to its
total task. Its examinations ask merely, "What do you know?"; whereas
the college should also ask, "What are you?"

This is enormously difficult. We are living in an age of defeat.
For a brief moment at the mad crescendo of the year, idealism and faith
were dominant. But they rested upon the rotten foundations of greed
and brutality. When the test came they were swept away. The voice of
America's prophet was stilled. The great peacemaker of Germany was
assassinated. France's statesman of peace left only a heritage of
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moving phrases. When the peace of idealism and faith was rejected, Clemenceau's realistic peace was substituted. That was predicated upon victory, but the superficial character of the victory faded before the fact that victors and vanquished were both defeated. Now with neither ideals to guide, nor realistic policy, the world turns again to force. It turns to force which its moral sense abhors--but its moral sense is defeated, and force remains. So to political and economic and social confusion we must add moral confusion.

The confusion has been accentuated by a false interpretation of science, and an unbalanced emphasis upon scientific method in areas where it is wholly inappropriate or appropriate only for specific and limited purposes. Science insists upon measurements and more measurements. Men who are not scientists have become enamored of measuring, forgetting what the best scientists have never forgotten, that realities cannot be measured. So blind have they been that they have taken the attitude that what cannot be measured in education is not significant.

Confusion retards the growth of character, the development of moral sense, appreciation of ethical values. We must rise above the confusion for those are essentials of our task. Though we escape the sins of College X and the tragic insufficiency of College Y, if we fail with College Z, we have failed utterly.

The situation, confused as it is, is by no means hopeless. The very scientists who added confusion are now contributing to clarity. Scientists have become the most persuasive exponents of a metaphysical interpretation of reality. J.W.N. Sullivan has well summarized this point in his book on LIMITATIONS OF SCIENCE: "We are no longer required
to believe that our response to beauty, or the mystic's sense of communion with God, have no objective counterpart. It is perfectly possible that they are, what they have so often been taken to be, clues to the nature of reality. Thus our various experiences are put on a more equal footing, as it were. Our religious aspirations, our perceptions of beauty, may not be the essentially illusory phenomena they were supposed to be. In this now scientific universe even mystics have a right to exist."

Personality is coming again into its own, and personal influence remains at the center of the most significant aspects of education. The great teacher is first of all a great personality. The form his teaching will take may vary for teaching is an art. An art must forever seek new forms, new means and modes of expression, new media, fresh interpretations, even radical innovations. Art which is fixed is sterile. While it has life it will burgeon. Evidences of vitality will be on every hand. But always great teaching will be an intensely personal matter.

Therefore, the solution of this moral and spiritual problem must come through contact of students with teachers who amidst prevailing confusion have themselves escaped confusion. The clarity of their ethical perceptions must appear not merely in formal instruction but in informal intercourse. The most significant religious discussions in which I participated as a student were about the table in a history seminary devoted to the reconstruction period after the Civil War. More potent than discussions were the daily lives of our teachers. The gentleness of spirit of a Caleb T. Winchester, the clarity of moral perception of a William North Rice, the exalted mysticism of an Oscar Kuhns, the philosophic serenity of an Andrew Campbell Armstrong were
forces in the lives of youth in college with me. No visiting preacher left a message that still lives. No formal religious exercise attained to permanent influence, but the daily contact with men of charm and distinction of character made us unwittingly into disciples. The persuasiveness of their lives was greater even then the wisdom of their teaching.

The tutorial plan is an effort to restore an intimacy of contact which modern technical advances have tended to overlay and to obscure. It opens the way for those excursions from the formal path which are spiritually, as well as intellectually, refreshing.

No one has laid even the foundations for a study of the effectiveness of colleges in this respect. No predictable number of years, no sums of money can hope to achieve it. The fact that it cannot be weighed or measured detracts no whit from its significance. One may take comfort from the remark of a student who spent only his last year at Lawrence and who, after graduation, wrote, as an aside in a letter on another topic, "I wish I could have spent more than one year here, for this year has been more fruitful than any two of the others. Having gone to another college I feel I have a better criterion for judgment than other students have. And I am very sincere when I say Lawrence is much better than anyone realizes. I have found excellent co-operation from the faculty and administration. But its most outstanding characteristic is the fact that the student body is composed of ladies and gentlemen and not young hoodlums."

A program of individualized education, the effective influencing of the intellectual, emotional, and ethical growth of young people costs money. The more personal it becomes, the more it costs. Mass education
will always become economical. During the last ten years, according to figures supplied by the University of Wisconsin the educational expenditure per student in the Colleges of Letters and science and of Education has fallen from about $216 to approximately $185. Expenditure per student in the teachers colleges (figured on the basis of the gross budget) has declined from $394 in 1925-26 to $263 in 1935-36. Despite salary cuts and drastic economies the figure at Lawrence goes in the other direction. The per student expenditure for educational purposes has risen in ten years from $305 to $401. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has made an exhaustive study of educational expenditure per student. Many regard that figure as the most important single item in judging the excellence of a college. In that study Lawrence was shown to be at the 89th percentile among all the institutions of higher education in the twenty-two states represented in the organization. In giving these figures, however, I do not want you to interpret them negatively. They are not designed to indicate that the state-supported institutions are not doing a good job. The purpose is to show that the tasks are in many essentials different, and that inescapably the costs will be different.

I have come to the end without saying a single new thing. Instead I have sought to show how the program of the college has been adapted to the environmental pressures, while preserving and developing the ideal of the liberal college sketched so inadequately a decade ago. The exclusive position of such a college in the whole scheme of higher education is gone; a distinctive position there still is. Do you believe in it? Or do you envy the easily balanced budget and the sterile complacency of College X, the bleak and barren but economical
program of College Y, the confused expediency of the program of College Z.

If you believe in our program there are challenges to be met. The trustees must find the funds to fill in some of its dreadful gaps and do it soon. The faculty must perform the daily miracles without which there is no teaching. We must lay aside every personal objective that interferes with this major objective. By dynamic faith and concerted effort we may fulfill the true destiny of Lawrence College.