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IN TIMES of stress man is fain to find a scapegoat for his troubles. At such times the ancient doctrine to which Rousseau, for example, adhered, is preached again. Man, by nature, is good. He is corrupted by institutions. Therefore change the institutions—so that the true and beautiful nature of man may emerge. Today all institutions are under fire. Proposals for remaking them are to be found on every hand.

Educational institutions naturally share this plague of proposals with all other types. The American college has not produced persons capable of bringing in the millennium; therefore it has broken down. It must be reconstructed. Historically it grew, "like Topsy"; that must be the trouble. There must be a plan. A new college must be fabricated and articulated. These are the words of nearly all the reformers. Whatever is, is wrong. Let us "make a plan" and "rebuild." All these words betray the dominance of the engineer, of the mechanistic concept of the world and all that dwells therein. The apotheosis of the engineer has made us think always in terms of plans, of construction and machinery. We do not understand man. So we talk about the things we understand. Institutions are conceived as structures; they approximate manufacturing plants. We feed in the raw freshman and take out the alumnus—or as it is called, the "end-product." Looking upon the end-product we perceive that it is not good. So we will tear down the institutions, redesign the machinery and produce something else. Upon what we will produce, no one agrees—just so it be different from the past and present, and "better," especially "socially" better. We must remake society, a better whole out of worse parts. It's a wonder no one suggested it as a W.P.A. project!

Not having the faintest idea what we want, we must approach the matter experimentally. Here our second modern god appears—the scientist. He experiments and produces marvels. We will
experiment and doubtless marvels will follow. Some experiments
will be controlled. Others will be with deuces wild—at least
many have been. Knowing more and more about man in nature
and less and less about the nature of man, we will follow the
procedures that produced the first result and hope, against all
evidence, that they will reverse the second.

I grew up, unwittingly, under the 9–4–4–3 plan which was
later modified to an 8–4–4–3 plan, then to a 6–3–3–4–3 plan. The
latest stream-lined model is 6–4–4–3–2. All this abracadabra
would make an ordinary numerologist tremble. But are not
figures and formulae the data of the engineer and the physicist?
By these catalytic numerals we unite our twin gods into one.

More than twenty-five years ago one of the early reformers in
education began to insist that the college should drop the last
two years. Intermittently during the progress of our adven-
tures in an educational wonderland, “Off with his head!” has
been repeated. Occasionally someone has suggested a compro-
mise; give the colleges three years—take off the head just above
the ears. That much will never be missed! Still more recently
the suggestion has been made that lacking a head it be given
more feet by adding the last two years of high school to the col-
lege. Thus it will have four years; so it should be satisfied.

It is said in defense of all these suggestions that it—whatever
“it” may be at the moment—conforms more nearly to “natural”
divisions, of which there are none! Adolescence does not come
on perfect schedule. It does not have standardized effects
educationally nor even physically.

It is said in further defense of proposed reforms that they will
save time. It reminds me of the salesman trying to persuade the
farmer to feed his hogs cracked corn. “Hogs can digest it
faster,” said the salesman. “Well,” said the farmer, “what’s a
hog’s time worth?” Suppose we do learn faster. Suppose a
high school graduate “knows” as much as the college graduate
of a century ago. What of it? Have not likewise the horizons
of knowledge widened? Have not the difficulties of synthesis
increased and become more acute as they have become more com-
plex? Does the high school graduate have as satisfactory a
philosophy of life (I suppose one should say “environmental ad-
justment") as did the college graduate of a hundred years ago?
Not if the reformers are right, he hasn’t.

Anyway, what is the hurry? Does business or industry or the
professions want them faster and faster or better and better?
What is their complaint? Not of our structures, techniques, or
cabalistic numbers, but that the college graduate has not breadth,
mental and moral energy, emotional stability, and readiness to
learn still more.

To what goal do we hurry them? Skid them rapidly over gen-
eral education with survey courses that they may enter the por-
tals of specialization. As though that were the end and aim of
man. It may prove his end, but never again his aim. We live
among the indubitable blessings of specialization, but we suffer
from its undeniable shortcomings. Seeing those deficiencies of
specialization as an ideal one would expect a more balanced em-
phasis. It is about twenty-five years too late for this distortion
to go unchallenged. We know that these premature specialists
will, many of them, go out to give a “general” education which
they neither understand nor believe in. Others will distort the
procedures of business, of law, of social and political organiza-
tions through narrowness of outlook and lack of broad views.
Specialized training we must have. But with every profession
overcrowded, why not defer it until it may rest upon a broad and
sure foundation?

At the same moment that we listen to the juggling of time sig-
nals, we are told that the conception of a timed education is
wrong anyway. Some learn faster than others. The four-year
period is ridiculed as “time-serving,” and the jail is held the
closest analogy to the college. Indeed the jail is held to be the
more liberal. From a sentence to jail a man may deduct time for
good behavior, whereas the college sentence contains no such
mitigation. Let us admit that there has been too much time-
serving. Is the cure to substitute some other unit in place of
time? If it is not all-important, is it therefore unimportant?
What is to be gained by establishing some new arbitrary unit
which likewise may be short-circuited so far as intellectual growth
is concerned? Why not suggest that the time be used profitably?
Perhaps that would be too simple an answer.
In point of fact you must give the bachelor's degree upon an arbitrary basis. It may be arbitrary in point of time. It may be arbitrary in point of matter. Hitherto it has always been a combination of these two—four years and a certain mastery more or less certainly estimated or measured. Now it is sought to use only the arbitrary measure of material learned; time being held of no essential importance. Yet the chief protagonist of this view reports that the time element remains for most substantially four years. This fact comes closer than any previous datum to lending statistical validity to a conception that is rejected.

It is insisted that our estimates of achievement have not been true measures. Very well, improve them, but what has that to do with the structure of the institution? It is said we must change it all because it takes too long to get a degree. How long is too long? Is someone worried lest a person might know too much, have too broad an outlook, or too mature a judgment to justify a bachelor's degree?

Again, the complaint is made that the degree does not mean anything. Does any present proposal for reform stand a chance of changing the situation? Degrees have been granted for hundreds of years. Never until relatively recently did anyone dream of standard degrees. More of the apotheosis of the engineer. A degree, historically, was precisely what it appeared to be, a grant from an institution which gave the student upon any grounds that seemed reasonable to it, its imprimatur. I suppose I should say aequatur. The Master's degree was granted later without residence or examination upon the theory that an educated man would keep on growing intellectually. Only when the tailor-made product of the American college proved that false, was the Master's degree made a degree in course; it is scarcely more reputable in consequence. Degrees granted by an institution were, by courtesy and faith in its integrity, recognized elsewhere. The recognition rested only upon the assumption of its integrity.

A standardized degree is impossible. The same degree will always mean more from some institutions than from others. Why not? Does anyone expect all the students who go to an American college to get their money's worth? They do not get their money's worth uniformly anywhere else. Recently I read an
advertisement of an agency devoted to that business. It stated that "the best full-page advertisement attracts fourteen times as many readers as the worst." The cost of preparing the worst may be greater than the cost of the best. That is a statistic; therefore it must be right; blessed be statistics! Yet no one is seeking to standardize the value of a full-page advertisement. Some buy well; some buy badly. It is so, it will be so, in education. If, by the aid of an institution, a man achieves a liberal education he may pay some part of the cost, but he cannot pay with any price for the value received. If by reason of slothful will, blunted purpose, or want of integrity in the institution, he fails to get an education, any payment is wasted. He has suffered damage by lingering in an environment which yielded him no profit.

Whatever structure, system, or measure you adopt, some men will barely meet your arbitrarily established essentials for your degree. Others will achieve goals far in excess of any minimum standard you set. The degree has never been, and never will be, a measure of a man's education. There is no reason to wish it were.

There can be no standard degree, and there can be no standard college. It looked for a time as though an effort would be made to achieve those results. It is in process of abandonment, and speed the day of its total eclipse. It is inconceivable that there should be such a thing as a "standard" faculty. When all the statistics are gathered and all the studies are made, they do not explain Socrates or Jesus or any other significant teacher. Teaching is, and remains, an art. It is the projection of one's personality. The phrase a "standard personality" would be a contradiction in terms.

Let us forget the eternal tinkering with the structure and form. We have the four year college. No one has found a substitute for it that wins approval of others. Let it stand. Let us cease trying to imitate the engineer's slick efficiency in automatic packaging which would measure out the precise dehydrated weight of a quantum of information and label the package A.B. That is not the ideal at all.

What is the ideal? It is growth, physically, mentally, spiritually, emotionally, esthetically. It is the achievement and the
refinement of a sense of values. Growth at the adult level cannot be measured accurately. Intellectual achievement may be measured better than moral growth, or emotional development, or esthetic discrimination, or spiritual power. Some of these cannot, in any objective sense (in any engineering or scientific sense) be measured at all. But they can be recognized. Sometimes we act as though subjective judgment were a synonym for utter damnation. It may be, but not necessarily. Judgments may be wise, just, penetrating, constructive. It all depends upon the judge. Behold a statistic has shown that a series of judges, good, bad, and indifferent with different ideals, aims, and personalities have judged the same student work variously. That is not the point. The point is to get good judges and accept their variations as inherent. Members of the Supreme Court of the United States serve for life. They are protected from many forms of pressure. But they do not often vote unanimously. Wise, just, learned, impartial men will always have individual standards of value. So be it. Let us measure where we can. Where we cannot measure, let us form responsible judgments. A premature effort to weigh the imponderables will do vastly more harm than good, for it will lay a false emphasis upon externals, upon the forms. It will withdraw attention from the substance and the significant realities.

The definition I have postulated has an effect upon the question of the time element in a college course. So far as “book-knowledge” is concerned, either the four year degree or the degree given wholly on the basis of examination may produce almost identical results. But only a denial that growth requires time, and an assumption that student life has little significance outside rigidly academic pursuits could induce one to insist that the total result of the two systems could be the same.

The basic requirements for the degree reflect the values which the college holds significant. If intellectual achievement is the exclusive goal, the time element may become subordinate. If on the other hand physical, emotional, esthetic, spiritual and social values seem significant to the college, even though they may not be metered or measured, then time is of the essence of the matter.

The opportunity to secure a degree by passing a test without reference to time spent in residence is obviously an inducement to
do so. In so far as it is an incentive to save time it encourages an abnormal concentration of attention upon a single phase of experience, and tends to slight other significant aspects of life. It is an encouragement to skimp leisure, to eschew social life, to neglect church and the life of the spirit generally, and to wear down the body by failure to have sufficient diversity of activity and interest. Even within the intellectual sphere it has some undesirable tendencies. Almost inevitably it puts a premium upon "book-learning" as distinct from reflective thinking, upon getting the material rather than bringing it into an organized relationship to some framework of values. Reflective synthesis is seldom achieved under pressure; one must chew the cud of reflection in something approximating leisurely calm. There, alone, if time is so utilized, is adequate justification for four years.

We disapprove the business man who becomes so absorbed in his manufacturing or mercantile activities that he allows the politician to run the city and the state, the preacher to run the church, his wife to run the home, and his children to run to the movies. Why then should we set up a system of education which approximates in its emphasis the very things which we abhor in our civilization?

One of the best teachers I ever had urged us always to reason from a strong case. Very well. Suppose you knew that Student A who came to your college was going to live a healthy, normal, robust life, and be killed in an automobile accident the day he received his degree. Suppose he and all but yourself were in ignorance of that fact. You alone had responsible knowledge of it. Upon what basis would you organize his college years?

Would you distract attention from present reality and its exigent problems and satisfactions by dogging him to make up his mind about a vocational adjustment? Would you hurry him forward to some intense specialization? Would you insist that he was in college for intellectual discipline and that all his energies should be poured into that—all else to be a by-product? Not at all. We should recognize that whatever significance would ever attach to his college experience would be immediate. We should want him to acquire a sense of values, an acquaintance with beauty, a philosophy of life that included death. In short, we should want those four years to have intrinsic significance,
a value not dependent upon future use, upon income, nor height, 
nor depth, nor any other creature.

In place of that omniscient knowledge about the future of one 
student we have complete, or almost complete, ignorance of the 
future of all students. Their futures are unpredictable. Despite 
all our personnel techniques, as long as there is growth, they will 
remain so. That point suggests the same solution as in the 
earlier hypothetical case. College is an experience valid within 
itself, or not valid at all. It is dependent for its genuine validity 
upon nothing that follows. The immediacy of these values does 
not mean that they are transitory. That they are present values 
does not mean that they do not encompass the future. They are 
stable values. Therefore they have significance not only for 
college years, but become part of the student's continuing and 
permanent equipment.

College is an experience both individual and social; it is intel-
lectual, physical, emotional, spiritual. It is a time for the matu-
ration of personality. By definition, maturity requires time; it 
should not be unduly hastened by hothouse methods. It may 
be influenced toward perfection by controlled environment.

Therefore, with the insistence of President Robert Maynard 
Hutchins that "the three worst words in education are character, 
personality, and facts," I cannot agree. "Personality," he says, 
"is the qualification we look for in an anti-intellectual teacher. 
... Apparently we insist on personality in the teacher because 
we cannot insist upon intellect; we are anti-intellectual." This 
is a characteristic modern statement. It sets up a sharp anti-
thesis and ignores all middle ground. It is a false antithesis; much 
more could be said in defense of the thesis that personality and 
intellect are interdependent.

"We talk of character," he goes on to say, "as the end of edu-
cation because an anti-intellectual world will not accept intelli-
gence as its proper aim. Certainly since the Meno of Plato 
we have little reason to suppose that we could teach character 
directly. Courses in elementary, intermediate, and advanced 
character will fail of their object. The moral virtues are formed 
by lifelong habit, to which a university education contributes, 
but which it cannot be its primary purpose to supply. A uni-
versity education must chiefly be directed to inculcating the intel-
lectual virtues, and these are the product of rigorous intellectual effort."

Why set up an antithesis between character and intelligence? Only for purposes of discussion may one distinguish between the two. Personality is divisible only through abnormality. Therefore neither character nor intelligence is complete or safe without the other. Therefore character is as much a sound product of education as intellect. While it is true that courses in elementary, intermediate, and advanced character will fail, it is equally true that courses in elementary, intermediate, and advanced intellectual virtue would also fail. It is not alone the moral virtues which are formed by lifelong habit; precisely the same statement can be made regarding the intellectual virtues. If the intellectual virtues are the product of rigorous effort, may not the same statement be made regarding the moral virtues? The basic problem is the same, it is the problem of self-mastery, of self-discipline. Without that fundamental achievement neither character nor intellect will thrive. As was said long ago, "He that setteth at nought wisdom and discipline is miserable."

College years should supply the opportunity for and stimulate the exercise of both. To insist upon this is not to be anti-intellectual. On the other hand to insist upon intellectuality at the sacrifice of all else is to deny the whole process of education itself. If our aim is to escape the domination of facts and to erect ideas and principles into their adequate stature, we must not begin by destroying the possibility of synthesis, through insistence upon the disparate nature of the elements of experience. Cold intellectualism never solved any problem that daunted mankind. Somewhere in the motives that carried forward the work or in the interpretation of the data, emotion played its inevitable part. Over-emphasis upon intellectualism may produce a wholly undisciplined emotional nature and lead to wild excesses. Character, personality, intelligence belong together. In isolation or imbalance they lose significance. Professor Whitehead summed it up with the remark, "Wisdom is the fruit of a balanced development. It is this balanced growth of individuality which it should be the aim of education to secure." This is simply the echo of Solomon's great prayer, at the critical juncture of his career, for an "understanding heart to ... discern between good and bad."
Let us admit without cavil that values cannot be transmitted by direct teaching procedures. They must, in Professor Hocking's magnificently simple phrase, "be felt." Each is a new discovery for each individual. That does not mean that we may not facilitate discovery. We may, we should, surround him with beauty. Not the history of art merely, not the analysis of art alone, not art only in the curriculum, but daily, natural, inevitable association with beauty; care in our architecture, in our landscaping, in our dormitory and classroom decoration; incentives to surround himself with artistic things—these are obligations upon us. Music not alone as an intellectual problem, but music, great music, as often and as insistently as possible; that should be an inevitable concomitant of college life. Beauty, also in science; let not the biologist become so engrossed with his classifications that he does not turn aside to point out the sheer beauty of what may be had for a glance. Our campuses teem with birds, which the students never hear and which they do not see. Let not the astronomer fail in his descriptions of the stars to remind his students that a shepherd boy once said, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handywork."

If we as faculty members live ever in sensitive awareness to beauty, we create the environment wherein the student may come to his own discovery naturally and almost inevitably. Most of our teaching is by unconscious example rather than by verbal effort. Wordsworth with poetic insight said at the conclusion of *The Prelude*:

Prophets of Nature, we to them will speak  
A lasting inspiration, sanctified  
By reason, blest by faith: what we have loved,  
Others will love, and we will teach them how;  
Instruct them how the mind of man becomes  
A thousand times more beautiful than the earth  
On which he dwells. . . .

When men prate about the necessary reconstruction forced upon us by the economic debacle it gets somewhat wearisome. What effect has it had upon the glory of nature, upon our literary and our intellectual inheritance, upon our heritage of art from all the ages and every continent, upon the universal language
and literature of music, upon an emotional life that is well ordered and adequately disciplined? None of them is taxed or invalidated. It has deprived our students of a few things their fathers never had and never missed. It has made their physical life a shade more difficult—but, except in isolated, tragic cases, not insupportable.

For centuries history has emphasized the rôle of individuals in shaping their own lives and the events in which they participated. Every great ethical system has put the individual and his supremacy over his lower nature at its center. Not until twentieth century experimental psychology made individual differences a scientific discovery did we get excited over the matter. Is it not amazing that just as the individual took on this fresh significance he ceased to be important? The reformers are bent not upon the reconstruction of men, but of society. As Norman Foerster well remarked, "We are in danger of so emphasizing the concept of society that we cannot remember the concept of the individual." Under this misdirection we bid the student look around him and concern himself with the poor, with peace, with politics—with everything outside himself and upon which his impact will be negligible at that stage.

He should be trained socially. But the root of that training must be some emotional drive. Shall it be purity of race deified, as with Hitler? Shall it be any of the other hysterias and fanati-cisms which betray a distorted emotional life? I suggest that his first preoccupation be with peace. But not international peace—nor even peace with others. Let him make peace with himself. How many students do you know (how many adults?) who have yet cast the beam from their own eyes? I am not suggesting a course in elementary, intermediate, and advanced beam-casting. The life of the college flows under the bridges the courses build. I am suggesting that beneath all the sleek data-dominated efficiency of our personnel services some wise person should know the student. With never a technical phrase, with never a complex in his vocabulary, he should seek to assist the student in his groping for a coherent pattern of values, by which his own life may seem valuable but worth risking in some high enterprise. Before he sets out to conquer the world, let him conquer himself. That takes time. It is not the function of some well compounded
hash in a survey course to nourish that quality. Nothing that we know about individual differences justifies this overemphasis upon society. The great religious leaders of our world history have called for the spiritual regeneration of men. They have never excused them upon the ground of social pressures. They have approached reform not wholesale, not by the reconstruction of society directly, and as a whole, but by the regeneration of the hearts and minds of those who composed society. That regeneration is still fundamental.

Beyond this personal experience he must, of course, have social experience. It lies ready to hand. The campus is a social laboratory. It is a world in microcosm. It has all the problems of the world. Poverty is there, privilege is there, selfishness, greed, race problems and prejudices. There is even a species of international relations, for the deviousness and chicanery of international politics can teach nothing to interfraternity rivalries. This may remind the student that the economic interpretation of international life is not the whole story. Here is a world ripe for his reforming zeal. It is small, indeed, but big enough, heaven knows. Why do we, and why does he, neglect it for wider horizons? The answer is simple. It is always easier to solve the other fellow’s problem. It is always easier to form judgments that do not carry responsibility, and to propose actions which others must take. The campus is a field for “shared activity” ripe unto the harvest. Anyone who, as an undergraduate, reaps fruitfully in that field will be well equipped to wield his sickle manfully in the world abroad. He will have had no imitation of experience, no synthetic reform; he will have lived significantly and may be trusted to go on doing so.

Much of this experience in value discovery, in personal discipline, and in social effectiveness will be extra-curricular. Whoever is guilty of the heresy that the curriculum is the whole of a liberal college should promptly recant. The American college in its origins and for more than two hundred and fifty years was built upon no such false doctrine. The faculty was with the student in his uprising and his downsitting, his prayers, and his meals. It was not unusual for a faculty member—for a consideration—to manage an undergraduate’s finances. The history of chapel exercises is ample evidence that traditional concern was not limited to
intellectual attainments. The final faculty meeting to vote degrees was dominated by no registrar with his course-credit complex. The student was discussed in all his aspects. There was regularly committed that recently discovered academic deadly sin of confusing "personality evaluation with measurements of intellectual attainments." If the reformers have their way we shall sin no more. We shall simply omit the personality evaluation and graduate anyone who can pass an examination without having been caught in acts jeopardizing the good name—of the students? No, of the institution. I am opposed to the sin, but equally to the proposed remedy. In the traditional American college the standards of moral behavior were maintained by a watchful faculty wielding pains and penalties. To this day most colleges exercise a discipline upon the personal conduct of students—often punishing them for acts which the institution does not seek to prevent either by influence or control. I am proposing no return to old procedures, but with all my heart I am proposing a return to the ideals which lay behind those procedures. Let the college seek to graduate scholars, not only, but gentlemen. Let it employ all its powers, residential, curricular, architectural and esthetic, personal and professional, to that end.

Without shame we have undertaken programs of physical education not primarily intellectual in character. We have set up infirmaries and health services. When a man is emotionally starved we offer him a psychiatrist. Why then should we tremble if it is suggested that we deal constructively and responsibly with the problems of values, with emotional and spiritual and esthetic growth? President Henry Sloane Coffin summed it all up when he said, "A man’s wealth may be estimated by the number and intensity of his appreciations. An education which renders a student stronger in his power to criticize than in his capacity to enjoy is ruinous."

Nothing that I have said discounts at all the criticisms of the intellectual program of the college. That surely must be strengthened. Adequate emphasis upon emotional and spiritual values will contribute to that end. The exercise of the mind is a painful experience for most people most of the time. It requires some great objective to induce one to bear the agony of thought. "Adjustment to a social order" is not a very passionate ideal.
Making money may be—and probably accounts somewhat for the superior industry of those taking training and professional work. The liberal arts college is not a training school—though the element of training has been introduced irrelevantly in response to one sort of pressure or another.

If, instead, we set as our objective an exciting experience in self-realization, there is a goal worth striving for. Public interest in football has led us to think that exhibitionism is the motive which will encourage boys to endure hardship. Those who go in for cross-country running, or the half mile, go through a rigorous training, a grueling physical experience. They face a certainty of fatigue, pain, tension, and strain. But usually very few see them run. They do it from an innate desire to realize their fullest potentialities for speed and endurance. The improvement of their time against their own previous record brings profound satisfaction. It is self-realization upon the physical side.

Emotional self-realization produces the same sort of drive. Students will work like slaves to produce a play. They will enter into the script and, without the technical training of an actor, do astonishingly well in interpreting difficult parts. They will sing the great choruses of The Messiah or the chorales of Bach with freshness, with devotion, and with appreciation. For these and many other forms of emotional expression they will make sacrifices of time and energy, meet with disappointment and failure—then try again and yet again. Religious self-realization is much more rare. Why? Of course it is intrinsically more elusive, more difficult. More important, however, is the fact that we do not offer like enthusiastic and assured leadership. Intellectual self-realization is the adequate objective within that field of effort. It does not need the adventitious aid of a moneymaking future or of a paved avenue to some profession. If a man has moral certainty and self-confidence arising from self-realization, he will not be worried unduly about his economic capacity when that problem becomes exigent, if it has not already become so. This we know if we have ever been teachers. And personal experience is fortified by the fact that students in colleges of the liberal arts have made on the whole the best showing in tests taken by many kinds of institutions. The more purely
they have been devoted to the liberal arts, the better the showing. Allowing for all kinds of reservations due to self-selection and other factors, the record is still impressive.

Again Wordsworth states the ideal:

... the enduring and the transient both Serve to exalt; they build up greatest things From least suggestions; ever on the watch Willing to work and to be wrought upon, They need not extraordinary calls To rouse them; in a world of life they live, By sensible impressions not enthralled But by their quickening impulse make more prompt To hold fit converse with the spiritual world, the highest bliss That flesh can know is theirs—the consciousness Of whom they are, habitually infused Through every image and through every thought.

Once this ideal is put at the center of the work of the college much else falls into perspective. Formal organization ceases to have so much influence. Courses and curriculum can be greatly simplified. The concern lest the student concentrate too early and too heavily for purposes of professional preparation is diminished. The position of the instructor as taskmaster is modified. The fact that he is judge does not make him the enemy. If he be a worthy and skillful judge, the student bent on self-realization will welcome his comments and criticisms, as he does those of the athletic coach. The question of time will solve itself. However brilliant the student, however rapidly he learns, he will be in no hurry to leave so long as the environment is stimulating and he has a conscious sense of growth in power. He will be neither time-serving nor time-saving, he will be growing in power and gaining the satisfactions that conscious growth will bring.

Some of you doubtless have by now identified me in one respect with the recently rediscovered man who floated through the air with the greatest of ease. Instead of proceeding grandly down from precedent to precedent you may feel I go nimbly up from levity to levitation. This is no program, you may say, for all American youth. Granted. For how many? I do not know; it has never been adequately tried. But the obligation of the liberal college is to bring freedom only to those who can stand it.
The obstacle has not been want of ability, but want of will, want of incentive, want of direction. We have confused the student by offering what we could not deliver, and by failing to offer what we are equipped to provide. If now we have the moral and spiritual force to state one true objective with vigor and persuasiveness, we have no means of knowing how many will respond. What have we offered? "General education," we have said. It is a feeble and vapid expression. It reminds me of Todd Duncan's song in Porgy and Bess, "I got plenty o' nuttin' and nuttin's plenty for me." "Survey courses," we have said,—a rapid summary of things already summarized in high school. A "sample of science"—but who after small boyhood wants to collect samples? "Preparation for real life"—but has not life begun at seventeen, and when will it be more real or more exigent than in those post-adolescent years? So we have gone on talking about everything except what the student is profoundly interested in—himself. We have asked him to put on a cloak of knowledge, and he does not like the pattern. It is out of style. Let us openly make the appeal which matches his dearest and most secret ambition—to be a significant person, physically, intellectually, emotionally, spiritually.