

DECEMBER 9, 1968 •

STANLEY E. DORST

It lacks a few months of being a quarter century since I prepared a paper to be read in this hall on the subject of "Education." The subtitle, "A Casual Creed," was taken from an essay written by Sir Richard Livingstone, then President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. This essay was one of a series of twelve which he published in 1944 under the simple title "On Education." In a foreword Dr. Virginia C. Gildersleeve of Barnard College wrote, "England in the summer of 1943 seemed almost as much interested in discussing education as in waging the war. With many a city devastated by bombs, with her people exhausted by four years of overwork and constant strain, grieving for the loss of thousands of her sons, still fighting for her very life, she yet had chosen this moment to plan the reorganization of her school system and to extend equality of opportunity in education. The White Paper on Educational Reconstruction presented by Mr. R. A. Butler, President of the Board of Education, and reports of various special committees, were received with wide and lively interest and vigorously discussed.... The few American teachers fortunate enough to be in England at this high moment were greatly impressed by the vitality and enterprise of their British cousins."

Sir Richard was a leading figure in this upsurge of interest in the problems of education in Britain. He believed profoundly that the Allied Powers, between 1919 and 1939, had thrown away a great victory with a rapidity and completeness unexampled in history. Time has permitted clear evidence of the validity of this belief which Livingstone said had been partly due to political ignorance, a consciousness that the prevailing education was a maze without a clue. "The fault in our education was increasingly obvious," said Sir. Richard, "we have come to drift into and through education in a mechanical, automatic, unthinking way; instead of clearly defining to our own minds what we wish education to do for us and asking whether it is doing it and if not, why not. Like religion, education can quickly degenerate

into a routine; then its meaning and its effects are lost." We come to take education for granted; it is our right, not something we should constantly strive for, and so we come to be "light, half-hearted believers in a casual creed."

If this stigma can be leveled at British education did it not apply to the development of higher education in the United States with equal justice? I believe the truth is that we, as a people, no longer held liberal education in high regard...we did not expect much of it. As early as 1909, President Lowell of Harvard voiced this same opinion in his Inaugural Address, saying, "This fact is seen in the comparatively small esteem in which college study is held, both by the undergraduates and by the public at large; for if college education were now closely adapted to the needs of the community, excellence of achievement therein ought to be recognized as of great value. The nature of existing conditions is seen again in the absence, among instructors as well as students, of fixed principles by which the course of study ought to be guided. It is seen, more markedly still, in the lack of any accepted view of the ultimate object of college education."

In 1940, thirty-one years after President Lowell's statement, Walter Lippmann, in an address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, capped his words in a criticism of American education, saying:

"There is an enormous vacuum where, until several decades ago there was the substance of education. And with what is this vacuum filled: it is filled with the elective, the eclectic, the specialized, the accidental and incidental improvisations of teachers and students. There is no common faith, no common body of principles, no common moral and no intellectual discipline. Yet the graduates of these modern schools are expected to form a Civilized community. They are expected to govern themselves. They are expected to have a social conscience. They are expected to arrive by discussion at common purposes. When one realizes that they have no common culture is it astounding

that they have no common purpose, that only in war do they unite, that in the fierce struggle for existence they are tearing Western Society to pieces. We have established a system of education in which we insist that while everyone must be educated yet there is nothing in particular that an educated man should know."

Many other like voices were to be heard during the interval between the wars, and it is astonishing how closely they parallel the criticisms of modern education you have just heard. These were developed in some length in my earlier paper; tonight we can refer but briefly to a few. There were the brilliant essays of A. N. Whitehead published as the "Aims of Education," reaching a climax in his plea for "the habitual vision of greatness" as the goal of education for he said that if we are not truly great, constantly living with the best things in the world - the best pictures, the best books, the best buildings, the best human beings and the best social and political orders - we tend to disintegrate into an age without standards.

"We have indeed," said Livingstone, "become an age without standards, and education without standards becomes a sterile mockery." Lewis Mumford in his "Condition of Man" and Sir Francis Walshe in numerous essays both sing the same refrain; education, which has increasingly been training men to do must again teach them to be. The spiritual core which can give direction and beauty to our lives and which we must largely acquire through education, according to most of these critics seems to come mainly from the clear wisdom of Greece and the religious and ethical vision of Judea and Christianity. From these, education in the first third of the twentieth century had largely cut itself away. If this was true twenty-five years ago how much more does it apply to the dilemma in which we find ourselves today?

During the intervening quarter of a century my attention has been directed largely to problems of education and though the primary focus

has been upon medicine one must not ignore Whitehead's warning that "we cannot separate the seamless sleeve of learning." Close consideration of any phase of education without regard for the matrix from which it sprang becomes a study of techniques and methods from which the essence of education soon is absent and we find ourselves concerned with doing to the exclusion of being.

It has been my privilege to spend some time in the Universities of England and Scotland during the period just subsequent to that referred to by Dean Gildersleeve. From 1948 until last summer I made frequent trips to the Universities of those countries and in the winter of 1949-50 I was in seventeen schools for fairly extensive visits. Not only was I impressed with the magnificent attempt to bring the teaching hospitals and medical schools back to a normal operation but everywhere I found serious concern with the general state of British education. These visits gave me the opportunity to meet many of the principal men in the over-all field of education. These included Sir Walter Moberly, Chairman of the University Grants Committee of Great Britain; Professor William Riddell, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Glasgow; Professor Sir Henry Cohen, Liverpool University Faculty of Medicine; Sir Lionel Whitby, Vice Chancellor of Cambridge; Sir Richard Livingstone, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to whom I have referred above; Sir Hector Hetherington, Principala of the University of Glasgow; Sir Francis Walshe, Chief Neurologist at Queens Square Hospital; Professor Sir Rudolph Peters, Chief of Biochemistry, Oxford University, and many others. I have named this group because every man was vitally interested in the general problems of education, not in medicine only. In reading over the paragraph above it sounds like an oversized attempt at name dropping but this is not the case. England has the long established custom of recognizing her distinguished educators and scientists with the knighthood and these are indeed men of distinction. I met most of them during my long visit in 1949-50 and was passed on from one to another in the most pleasant personal way. Once they learned that I was interested in more than the techniques of medical

teaching and practice they became interested in me and they were exceedingly helpful. I am happy to say that many of them have remained good friends through the subsequent twenty years.

Among the first I was to meet was Sir Walter Moberly, since as Chairman of the University Grants Committee he exercised a powerful influence on the renaissance of medical education in Britain during the post-war years through the distribution of University Grants money. But I soon learned that his interest went far beyond science, embracing the entire field of education. In the summer of 1948 he published his widely known critique "The Crisis in the University." I had read the "Crisis" and referred to it in my conference with Sir Walter. It at once became apparent that he was more interested in discussing the problems raised there than he was in the politics of the University Grants Committee. I told him that I had read Sir Richard Livingstone's essays on education and hoped to meet him during the fall. "Ah yes," he said, "Livingstone has written some arresting essays and he seems to feel confident that our best hope lies in a return to the classics of Greece with Plato as our great teacher, but I fear it is too late to hope for that and believe the universities can find their help from a more immediate solution."

His book, "The Crisis in the University," is the product of a conviction that much ails the universities today and that what is wrong with them is closely connected with what is wrong with the whole world. "The older universities grew up in a world very unlike our own," he writes in his preface, "and the chief seat of the malady is to be found in the underlying assumptions, largely unconscious, by which their life and work are determined. Their traditional assumptions are to some extent outdated and in practice discarded. But there is no agreed answer to the question how far this practice should go and what alternative assumptions should take the place of the old." He continues, "'The Crisis in the University' is written from a Christian standpoint." He believes that growth of a strong Christian influence and

only this can stimulate a return of the high regard for transcendental ideas which Oxbridge is fast losing and Redbrick has never had. Only this can prevent the further disintegration of the universities into mere trade schools and regain scholarship and ideals which train men to be as well as to do. Sir Walter knows quite well that theology can never regain the dominant place as "the queen of the sciences" which it occupied in the medieval universities but he is confident that it may regain admission on another basis. His book is devoted largely to a discussion of the efforts being made in that direction in Britain today. He describes in some detail the work of two bodies, The Student Christian Movement and the Christian Frontier Council, the second composed of a body of Christian laymen who endeavor to work out together the bearing of their faith on secular life today, particularly in the spheres of their own professional and business responsibilities. Contact was early made between the two groups who are now working together. They feel that, owing to the confusion in purpose which they share with the modern world, universities are, at present, crippled in performing their most important function; that Christians have a vital contribution to make though much work remains to be done by them before that can be clearly formulated or become effective; and that, if it can be made at all, there is no time to be lost.

Moberly's argument in support of his thesis is involved and complex and it is beyond our scope to review it here. I wish only to indicate the nature of his concern with the unhappy state of education in 1949. Nor is there time to consider in any detail the attitudes and uneasiness of any of the knowledgeable men I have named above but I do wish to indicate the direction their thinking was taking some twenty years ago and, in large measure, still takes.

Walshe, I was to meet at the Athenaeum. We spent most of the dinner hour discussing the confusion in British medicine, since the National Health Act has been in effect less than a year. Sir Francis was one of those who did not join the Health Service and he summed up his reasons for

refusing to go over to the politicians in an argument expressed with the highest intelligence and integrity. I pointed out that my interest that summer was primarily with medical education rather than with medical practice. Did he think that the initiation of the Health Service would have an adverse effect in that field? He answered most thoughtfully. "No, there will be no immediate ill effect. Bevan is too shrewd to meddle with the universities, and the teaching hospitals might well be strengthened with government financial assistance that is desperately needed." However, he firmly believed that the over-all effect upon the profession of medicine would be bad, and "Ultimately," said Walshe, "the inevitable bureaucracy into which medical practice must degenerate will probably come to have an adverse effect upon the medical schools." Subsequent events of recent years have shown that Walshe came very close to the mark in his two convictions.

Having finished dinner we retired to the quiet seclusion of a small balcony. "But Dorst," said my companion, "you must not narrow your vision too exclusively to the field of medicine. Education in this Island is indeed in a sorry state. We provide what can honestly be called an education to far too few of our young people." He pointed out that "Almost 75 per cent of the British do not go to school beyond the age of 14 and for most when formal education stops all education stops. Surely education which stops at the age of 14 is not an education.

"Since World War I we have opened two new universities and we have plans for seven more to be in operation by 1965. But we will then still be far short of the number of places per capita offered in the States. In a quantitative sense we seem to be hopelessly behind, but," and he smiled, "I believe that qualitatively we challenge the best you produce. Oxford and Cambridge are magnificent universities, none better, but most of the provincial universities built in the 19th century, dingy plants in the middle of blackened industrial towns, are really rather dreadful places."

When I questioned him further about the seven new institutions being planned, he thought the outlook would be better since they were mostly to be placed on the edge of cathedral cities and the planning in each case was to provide for adequate residence halls, so sadly missed in the big city schools built in the Victorian period. He was pessimistic, however, about the possibility of finding enough superior men to staff the new universities. More universities, yes, but he feared they would be of mediocre quality due to lack of competent teachers, then a kind of Gresham's Law would come into operation.

I hope I have made my point, namely, that this group of distinguished scientific educators in Britain were all deploring the change of an educational pattern illuminated by the liberal arts to one dominated by the very practical aspects of business or profession, a criticism shared by Lippmann, Whitehead and Mumford as well as many others in this country. It would be interesting to carry my sampling of British educators farther, to tell you about Sir Lionel Whitby's interest in Emerson, of Henry Cohen's devotion to the classics, of Professor Zuckermann's enthusiastic anticipation of the stimulus which the new universities, then in the planning stage, would have in enforcing an upsurge of liberal education.

But time will not permit and I returned to the United States in the spring of 1950 to find our medical schools at last taking a positive position against overloading the premedical curriculum with science subjects and emphasizing that four or five of the eight semesters should be devoted to an organized program in the liberal arts. At least we were awake to the fact that the students coming to the schools were not in possession of a liberal education, but for the most part, had crammed four years as full of science courses as possible, often including many subjects not required for admission to medical school. This narrow educational background combined with the increasing emphasis placed upon specialization would lead to the development of technicians and applied scientists rather than to the wise and cultured men with deep

understanding of human values so needed in the medical profession.

Medical educators were widely aware of the many problems they faced and through the Association of American Medical Colleges made a determined attempt to investigate the state of affairs in the member schools on a national basis. A series of conferences called "Seminars in Medical Education" was arranged. For the next ten years at least a week in each year was devoted to a concentrated study of one important phase of the education of a physician. Every school in the country was represented, usually by two men selected from the division of medical education under consideration, and the technique of the small study group was employed, each group seldom exceeding twelve members. So, for five days the group spent many hours in earnest consideration of the teaching as it progressed at their respective schools. A chairman and a recorder jointly reported to the meeting in full on the sixth day, and the last was spent in a general summing up of the results of the several sessions.

The decade of the fifties was pregnant with new developments in teaching medicine and the "seminars" acted as a sounding board for the dissemination of information concerning these experiments throughout the country. I have discussed these meetings in some detail because of an unexpected, later to be significant, side result. It was early decided that some time should properly be given to pre-medical as well as to undergraduate and graduate medical education. Accordingly, two sessions of a week each were assigned to this phase of the problem early in the experiment. Though it was quite easy to accommodate two representatives from each of the eighty medical schools it was impossible to invite a member from each of the many hundreds of pre-medical committees throughout the nation. Therefore selected members to the number of fifty were invited from institutions throughout the country who were known for their wise and effective work in guiding aspirants to the study of medicine.

I believe we learned more about their misconceptions of what we thought to be significant in the early college education of those who were preparing to study medicine than we could in any other way. I am also certain that many of them became convinced that the medical schools were sincerely interested in broadly trained men and not in those presenting a mishmash crowded with every science course their school offered.

The side result, which I referred to above, was noted but not understood at the time. There were of course many "off the record" meetings between medical school representatives and those of the pre-medical group, thrown together as they were for a total of two whole weeks. It was a common experience for members of medical school faculties to hear expressions, if not of alarm certainly of concern, over rather significant changes which were taking place on many of the college campuses. We heard of an increasing disregard for the usual and necessary rule that every college must impose upon its student body, of an increasing slackness and actual slovenliness in the appearance and the behavior of both men and women. There were rumors of the use of drugs and increasing sexual laxness, and in short there was a breakdown in the "esprit de corps," the cohesiveness, which had prevailed in most American colleges before the War.

Everyone seemed to consider it a temporary phenomenon probably related to the recent war which should pass quickly. It was pointed out that the student bodies, at least as far as the male students were concerned, were made up of two groups in about equal proportions: first there was the large group of war veterans who were returning to college under the provisions of the G. I. Bill, and then there was the normal input coming up from the high schools who had had no military service. There were also, especially among the veterans, an increased number of married students. These facts, many thought, seemed to explain the general lack of normal tone that had previously characterized the American college campus.

In retrospect it seems to me that we were hearing in those early fifties the distant rumbles of the storm that was to break upon our colleges throughout the country in the sixties. We, in the Association of American Medical Colleges, ran through our scheduled ten annual meetings and one extra devoted to the continued education of the physician while in practice. I believe the experiment was, on the whole, quite a success, and certainly that decade saw a soul searching and self criticism within the medical schools which was most healthy. Everywhere the curriculums were studied and revised and the medical students were brought into the considerations of faculty forums as never before.

And then, suddenly, we were in the nineteen sixties and the activists of the student left were in a state of explosive turmoil. We were faced with a phenomenon new to our schools, and if one may paraphrase Sir Richard Livingstone's words education was no longer "a casual creed" but rather "a chaotic creed." The student rebellion reached full flower first on the Berkeley campus of the University of California and has now spread to schools throughout the land. We in Cincinnati have been fortunate since the movement of the activists at both the University of Cincinnati and at Xavier University have been relatively mild. This I believe must be due to attitudes and practices of both administration and faculty of the two schools. They have maintained a sufficiently accessible and understanding relationship with student leaders so it has been possible to solve most differences by discussion and reasonable adjustment. At least this has been the case so far and I trust it will continue. Trouble has been close, however, since both nearby Antioch and Ohio State University have experienced very unpleasant episodes.

Throughout the country the manifestations of student rebellion have been strangely similar. Some riot, some are merely refractory and object to all discipline, the great majority pass by but take no part in positive reaction to the behavior of classmates which is making a mockery of their

education. Some plead for peace and quiet between the races, some grow long hair, some want durgs, some spout obscenity and others would destroy everything in sight if they dared in childish rage. Sober conservatives join "hippies" and "beatniks" in petitioning for an open dormitory housing both sexes. The draft and the Vietnam war add their chaos of emotions to the confusion of social and individual resentments and all that emerges is an unrest which its most articulate creators admit to be utterly without a program.

What then, apart from the draft and war in Vietnam, is being fought against on our campuses? George Kennan believes it to be a reaction against all of modern life. Not all agitators are against all of life but some are, the rest single out detested parts. That is why they are rebels without a cause. Such cause, as appears, seems simply to ruin the going scheme. As the activists become more violent one is hardly surprised to see that they want and propose to take over the management of the institution. True, only a small number has proposed an actual coup d'etat. But from coast to coast "sensible" students have called upon provosts and presidents to request active participation in such things as the making of the curriculum, promoting instructors, setting tuition fees, running the book store and cafeteria, choosing all outside speakers and candidates for honorary degrees - all this besides sitting on policy making groups from the admissions committee to the board of trustees, taking along the way the committees for allocating space, for authorizing research projects, and for making the budget. Absurd as this all seems it cannot be dismissed with the ridicule it so obviously deserves because these things are being demanded by violently enraged groups of students in many institutions of high rank. The cry of these petitioners obscures their true design, which is not to run the university more efficiently but to toss things around, make holes to let in air, and change everything every few years.

The story of the outbreak of the student left came at first through the daily press, the news

weeklies and television. These, of course, had a field day and the student antics were painted in most violent colors. Beginning on the west coast, where exaggeration has come to be expected, much of the early story was discounted - but not for long. The involvement of the law enforcing agencies to protect private property, to safeguard members of university administration and faculty and the necessity to physically dislodge students from halls and offices of the institution which they had taken over could not be dismissed as the pranks of high-spirited college boys.

Any doubts of my own about the truth of the reports which had been coming daily were dispelled by a long letter from my sister which arrived last spring. Her husband is a professor at Columbia, the letter she sent was a ten page single-spaced account of the riots at Columbia University which began on April 23rd and completely disrupted the work of that great institution. Her husband was one whose classroom and laboratory was preempted by the student rebels and it was impossible for him to meet his classes as scheduled. One class for advanced students he had conducted as a seminar. They were having no part in joining the activists and word was quietly passed along to the effect that they would meet in Professor Hance's apartment on Morningside Drive. This went well for only three or four days, then the vigilantes from the activists learned what was going on. They promptly moved in, threatened and man-handled the students and actually began to destroy the residence. Only prompt action on the part of the police prevented major destruction. The seminar held in the private home of a professor was closed down by rebel pickets and one is hardly surprised to hear that Bill Hance is quite out of sympathy with the student left.

As the months passed our more serious writers have been adding to the rapidly growing record of the rebellion. Most of the knowledgeable critics are definitely adverse to the whole affair but surprisingly there are voices of intelligent men pleading for understanding and gentle treatment of the students and a vigorous check on what they

term "police brutality". Tom Hayden, one of the idols of the activists, said, "First we'll make the revolution, then we'll find out what for." Do they possibly hope to build an improved program of education with such an attitude - are they interested in education at all? We shall see!

This past fall two serious studies have appeared upon the American news counters. The first was written by George F. Kennan, diplomat and long time student of foreign affairs. The second, "The American University," was written by Jacques Barzum, who has lived in the American university as teacher and administrator for more than forty years. Mr. Kennan's book entitled "Democracy and the Student Left" is unique. In January of 1968 he spoke at the dedication of a new library at Swarthmore College. This lecture was printed in the New York Times Sunday Magazine under the title of "Rebels Without a Program." It drew an unprecedented response from students and teachers on many campuses. The book consists of the original Swarthmore lecture followed by twenty-eight letters from twenty-one campuses and eleven letters from the older generation. Then, in a third section, Mr. Kennan replies to the letters which represent a selection from a very much larger correspondence. The letters are by choice chiefly adverse to Kennan's thesis and his reply is a masterpiece of calm, reasoned rebuttal to an attack which was often repetitive, frequently pointless but almost always vicious or vituperative.

Each of these books offers material for a long paper in itself. There is no time to do more than select a few pertinent paragraphs but I most enthusiastically recommend both if you wish a wider grasp of the crisis we now face in education. To one student who was deeply concerned over the plight of the Negro, the continuation of the war in Vietnam, the draft, and who had a deep suspicion of something called the Establishment by which this country is run, he writes: "Very well. We understand the passionate quality of your interest in contemporary affairs - the depth of your concern, the agony of your conscience. We accept your statement that you learned more from one thing than

another, that you learned by way of participation in the excitements of the present political scene — demonstrations, work in the ghettos and what not — than from all your professors and textbooks. We agree that all this is very selfless, very high minded, very courageous. But what in hell — if one might be so bold as to ask — are you doing on a university campus?"

Quite so! It is estimated that not more than ten per cent of the students in schools where rioting has occurred have been active participants in the disturbances, and I believe that ten per cent have no business on a university campus. Certainly they are not there to obtain an education. Is it possible that through our insistence of the value of a college degree we have coerced into our institutions of higher education many matriculants who should be elsewhere, thus committing the error that many of my British friends feared would follow the considerable increase in the number of English universities? They were deeply apprehensive that a fall in academic standards accompanied by an overemphasis on technical training would be the result.

In one of the concluding paragraphs of his reply to the letters Mr. Kennan writes: "The student is the product of his natural culture and his time... Imagination, fears, hopes, desires: all these are overstimulated and prematurely stimulated by exposure to the products of the commercialized mass media, yet there are no adequate countervailing sources of strength, confidence and hope. There is no strong and coherent religious faith, no firm foundation of instruction in the nature of individual man, no appreciation for the element of tragedy that unavoidably constitutes a central component of man's predicament, and no understanding for the resulting limitations on the possibilities for social and political achievement. The student is the victim of the sickly secularism of this society, of the appalling shallowness of the religious, philosophic and political concepts that pervade it." And in a final paragraph, "The outcome is in higher hands than mine. It is here, at the end, admittedly, but at a most critical

point, that the Christianfeith has its part. I do what I can, in my own way and with as much fidelity as I can muster.....This it seems is the best that men can ever hope to do. They know only whether they have done their best." How close this comes to paralleling the thought of Sir Walter Moberly expressed in 1949.

Jacques Barzum gives us a solid three hundred pages of sound criticism of the American university, how it runs and where it is going. Written at the close of twelve years as Dean of Faculties and Provost of Columbia, a university on whose faculty he has served continuously since receiving his Ph.D. degree in 1932, he draws on a long and deep experience in teaching and high level administration. In a postscript he states that the maunscript was in the publishers hands almost two months before the student outbreak of April 23rd that disrupted the work of Columbia University. He adds, "I have since then found no reason to change or add to the substance of what I had written months earlier."

It then is a comprehensive study of the organization and the work of a great, complicated university, not a discussion primarily based upon the student uprising. This is good, because the long chapter entitled "Students or Victims" is not a rehearsal ofthe Columbia riots but is an objective consideration of the unrest which was widespread throughout the nation, and he analyzed the student's cause fairly and objectively. He makes it quite clear that he finds many serious faults in our universities and the current educational program, but nothing to excuse the violent student attitudes and the crises that were building up in school after school.

He openly rejects the tremendous emphasis now placed upon research to the detriment of sound teaching, and like many others he fears the ultimate results of growing dependence upon huge federal grants of money given chiefly for the support of research. He shows us a clear picture of problems of financing a modern university and I believe most business men will be appalled by the account he

gives of poverty in the midst of plenty which compels the university faculty and administrators to go to the federal pork barrel for larger and larger sums. There is no certainty that such money will continue to be available and should it stop or be seriously curtailed the schools will find themselves in dire straits.

He closes his last chapter with sixty-eight suggestions which he believes must all be considered if higher education is to become balanced and healthy in the United States. He concludes that "the foregoing incomplete catalogue of imperfect suggestions (and they cover forty pages), tentative in spite of the way they are put, takes for granted one premise: that the nation wants a university in the honorific and not in the service station sense. To be sure, the nation acts as if it did want the real thing. It seems to be choosing such a university when it speaks of learning and science as contributing to the nation's greatness and of newborn talent as the richest of its natural resources. But it is possible to imagine a society thriving for a considerable time whilst repeating these words and harboring opposite feeling.

"What develops then is a proletarian culture, by which I do not mean the culture of intelligent and cheerful working men exclusively but one in which the prevailing tendency is to suspect excellence - standards of work and degrees of achievement - except in sports. Learning, the search for truth, high art, are then gradually discarded in favor of practical training, applied research and consumption art.... I have tried to sketch, as the latest and least interpreter in an ancient line, what choosing to have a university entails and what a great nation must expect from it - indeed must require. I do not doubt that the United States today possesses the makings of a university as I do not doubt that if circumstances send the institution into eclipse, the idea of a university will survive until another day."

I trust I need not labor the point further - education, the casual creed which

Livingstone deplored twenty-five years ago, has degenerated into the chaotic creed with which we are faced today. If education is to survive standards must be reclaimed, we must hold to ever higher levels of scholarship, the ancient liberal culture must not be elbowed aside by the bombast of science but must illuminate and liberalize it. We must truly accept the unity of mankind and above all we must regain the habitual vision of greatness. Only through a national effort will we become an educated nation, and if we are an educated people - perhaps - we will become civilized in the sense that Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson anticipated at our nation's birth.

Stanley E. Dorst
