Six-Man Book Committee Assists Phi Beta Kappa

The Key Reporter announces the appointment of a new Book Committee, operative with the Autumn 1948 issue. Now enlarged to a membership of six, the committee is designed to allow for competent coverage of the noteworthy books published each quarter.

Armour Craig, assistant professor of English at Amherst College, is responsible for making recommendations of books in the general area of literary history and criticism.

Marc Friedlaender, professor of English at the Woman's College, University of North Carolina, is charged with making selections from the general area of poetry, drama, and the fine arts.

Eric F. Goldman, associate professor of history at Princeton University, chooses publications of merit from the general area of the social sciences.

Alain Locke, professor of philosophy at Howard University, is responsible for selecting books from the general area of philosophy, religion, and education.

Reappointments Made

Benett A. Cerf, president of Random House, and Kirtley F. Mather, professor of geology at Harvard University, both of whom have served on the Book Committee since 1945, remain to select fiction and natural science books respectively.

The editors of the Key Reporter are aware that the newly-adopted policy, whereby one member of the Book Committee is solely responsible for one province of current publications, will afford the readership more authoritative recommendations than it has heretofore been possible to secure. Each issue of the Key Reporter will contain an extended review of a particularly outstanding book from one of the six general categories into which publications have been separated. In the current issue Professor Craig reviews The Armed Vision, by Stanley Hyman, from the literary history and criticism field, and future selections will be made on the basis of rotation of categories.

Fourty-one members of Phi Beta Kappa have recently been awarded membership in the Phi Beta Kappa Associates, according to a recent announcement by Thomas C. Desmond, of Newburgh, New York, president. Regular membership, limited to 200, is now closed for an indefinite period of time.

The new Associates represent a variety of professions — among them diplomacy, law, engineering, medicine, social work, education, creative writing, naval service, banking, journalism, economics, and investment counseling. Several business executives were included in the recent elections conducted by the Board of Directors of the Associates.

Subsequently to making public the results of the elections, Mr. Desmond, who is a New York state senator, announced that the ninth annual dinner and meeting of the Associates will be held at 7 P.M., November 19, 1948, in the Ballroom of the Colony Club, 51 East 62nd Street, New York. The dinner, which is being held at the Colony Club through the courtesy of Mrs. Thomas C. Desmond, will feature Harlow Shapley as guest speaker.

Dr. Shapley is director of the Harvard College Observatory, a member of the Editorial Board of the American Scholar, and formerly president of the Society of Sigma Xi and of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He will address members of the Associates and their guests on "Some Observations on Present National and International Intellectual Endeavors." The audience will be requested to participate in open discussion at the conclusion of Dr. Shapley's remarks.

New members of the Associates are: John Fisher MacLane, of New York, Phi Beta Kappa Yale University, member of the law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett.

Francis Todd H'Doubler, of Springfield, Missouri, Phi Beta Kappa University of Wisconsin, surgeon, member of the surgical staffs of St. John's, Burge Deaconess, and Springfield Baptist hospitals.

Correction on Northwestern

The main news story, "Educators Unite To Defend Civil Liberties, Assert House Committee Endangers Rights," in the Summer 1948 issue of the Key Reporter wrongly coupled Northwestern University with Evansville College as institutions which are applying pressure to faculty members actively favoring the Wallace presidential ticket. Curtis MacDougall, professor of journalism at Northwestern, who was described as having refused senatorial nomination on the Wallace ticket because of pressure from Northwestern authorities, announced his candidacy for the United States Senate after the Summer issue went to press, and has been granted leave of absence from Northwestern for the fall quarter while his campaign is at its height. Franklyn B. Snyder, president of Northwestern, informed Professor MacDougall at the outset that Northwestern would object in no way to his running on the Wallace ticket, and it was to President Snyder's regret that Professor MacDougall originally declined the nomination.

The Key Reporter regrets that its statement about Professor MacDougall impugned the reputation of Northwestern University, and offers its sincere apologies to President Snyder and to Northwestern.
Higher Learning: Servant of the Body Politic
Education for Life in a Democracy, III

Editor's Note: President White’s article is the third in The Key Reporter’s series devoted to the report of the President’s Commission on Higher Education. G. Bromley Oxnam introduced the series (Vol. XIII, No. 2), and Mrs. Eugene Meyer discussed the commission’s recommendations on federal aid to education (Vol. XIII, No. 3). Two additional articles—one discussing the recommendations on discrimination and the other evaluating the whole report—will appear in future issues.

Liberal education, certainly liberal education in the traditional or conventional sense, was not the chief concern of the President’s Commission on Higher Education. The extension of educational opportunity, the equalizing of educational opportunity, and the role of education in a democratic society were, in accordance with its charge from the President, its major concerns.

By Goodrich C. White

The term “liberal education” stands out on few of the pages of the published volumes of the commission’s report.

Yet it is undoubtedly true that most, if not quite all of the commission’s members, were products of liberal arts colleges, were devoted to the liberal arts ideal, have in one capacity or another given themselves to its furtherance, and are concerned to see it steadfastly maintained and more effectively realized in American higher education. That all the findings and recommendations of the report of the commission serve this end may be gravely questioned by many. But certainly those who question cannot afford to adopt an attitude wholly negative. They must make their case constructively and positively for a conception and a program of liberal education that serves American democracy and that denies opportunity for education to no citizen, young or old, who seeks it and can profit by it.

The commission, under its charge from the President, concerned itself with re-examining “our system of higher education in terms of its objectives, methods, and facilities; and in the light of the social role it has to play.” I do not take the space to quote “the more specific questions” to which the commission was asked to direct its attention. Their specification certainly determined some of the major emphases of the final documents.

The commission’s report represents a consensus—as satis-

factory a consensus as could be arrived at by a group of men and women with varying backgrounds and points of view, working under the pressure of a time schedule determined by a deadline for the completion of the task, and attempting, as a commission, to review and discuss every page of the five volumes of the main body of the report.

That the report reflects some of the controversies and some of the “ferment” so characteristic of higher education is obvious and to be expected. That all these controversies should be resolved and the ferment stilled, was certainly not the expectation of the commission.

Basic Commitments

Certain basic commitments of the commission may be stated briefly. There are clearly involved:

(1) A commitment to the democratic ideal for America;

(2) a commitment to belief in the importance of education in a democracy; and

(3) a commitment to belief in the importance of democracy in education.

Reject any one of these three and most of the report, in toto and in detail, will be rejected. Acceptance of all three does not, of course, imply acceptance of all or even of a major part of the recommendations. Room remains for much disagreement on specifics. But without agreement on these simple fundamentals there is no common meeting ground for discussion of details.

I add, further, that the report will be viewed with suspicion, with alarm, or with antagonism by: (1) those who see in the extension of opportunity for higher education an inevitable threat to quality, and a sure entry upon the path to mediocrity; (2) those who, for any reason, oppose federal aid to education; (3) those who, believing in the “dual system,” see in the expansion of public education an open threat to the survival of privately supported and controlled colleges and universities; and (4) those who, favoring federal aid, believe that church-related and other privately controlled institutions should share proportionately with publicly controlled institutions in the distribution of public funds.

There are real issues here, which have been and will be vigorously debated. Only one of them—the first—has strict relevance to the special topic assigned to me.

So much of general background is necessary, I think, if one is fairly to appraise the report, whether or not such appraisal results in agreement or dissent.

For the rest, summary will not suffice. But the following may direct the reader to the fuller discussion in the report itself, where some at least of the implications are spelled out.

Education with Public Purpose

There is in Chapter I of Volume I a manifest sense of urgency, an earnestly expressed conviction that “it is essential today that education come decisively to grips with the world-wide crisis of mankind,” that “in a real sense the future of our civilization depends on the direction education takes, not just in the distant future, but in the days immediately ahead.” Education must contribute to “a fuller realization of democracy,” to “international understanding and cooperation,” to “the solution of problems.” Our colleges, then, are challenged to define their aims, “to see clearly what it is they are trying to accomplish.” Affirming that “the first goal in education for democracy is the full, rounded, and continuing development of the person,” the commission
Phi Beta Kappa: Its Proper Function

To the Editor:

Very recently an individual well known in literary circles was refused permission to speak on one of the campuses in the Los Angeles area. The reason as announced by the press was that the speaker’s subject was “controversial.” Perhaps the meaning intended was that the speaker was “controversial.” In any case, something was “controversial.”

I was very disappointed by the press as the source of both the decision and the reason is a man well known in the chambers of Phi Beta Kappa. Quite possibly it was not his decision. Quite possibly he was not in harmony with the decision, whether or not it was his. Publicly, however, he was the source.

I have no quarrel with the decision. I was disgusted with it—that was all. Knowledge may be power, and scholarship, exponential knowledge. But it does not necessarily turn faith into food, nor a hand of paper into a hand of steel.

My quarrel is rather with the reason. For it tastes like a battering-ram at the foundations of knowledge, an instrument of knowledge. There is no knowledge which was not sometime at the frontiers of knowledge. And in what land, during what period, was anything at the frontiers of knowledge other than controversial? Controversy, indeed, is the very mechanism whereby the false is separated from the true. It is the arena whereby the flood of human thought is the fine grains of truth can be found. When controversy is ended the dark ages will surely return.

If by “controversial” is simply meant “taboo,” the answer is still the same. Progress has never been a respecter of persons, and persons have always spewed out cysts in the form of taboos to hold their decaying supports built out of the past against the flood of change. It is nothing new. History may always be like that.

I am not here saying that what is, is wrong; nor that what is not, is right. I am saying that the light of it is one way, and must be shut out, that we must have the courage to seek the truth, no matter whither the course may lead.

I submit that that is the burden of Phi Beta Kappa, as Phi Beta Kappa. I have been heartened by the formation of the Committee of One Thousand, described in the Summer 1948 issue of The Key Reporter, and by the frank editorial statement of Walton Hamilton in the Summer 1948 issue of The American Scholar. But I believe that it is the proper function and duty of Phi Beta Kappa, as both a symbol of scholarship and an organization of scholars, to take the leadership in its own name, with the prestige of its own name, in the struggle to restore the freedom of controversy. In no other way can Phi Beta Kappa now justify its existence. In no other way can it attest to the zest for knowledge from which it sprang.

GEORGE T. ALTMAN
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA

They Say...

What seems to be needed is to use some of the modern lore about the psychological processes involved in human relations with language, on scholarship to us.

The purpose of Phi Beta Kappa is, yes of course, to “foster higher standards of scholarship.”

But words, we now know, grow and change, develop or diminish, as time goes on. Ordinary non-academic people have an idea about a shift in the meaning of “scholarship,” an idea based on their own sense of reality. We all know uneasily that such people, with a casual sureness of their own intuition, read on our golden keys, “accurate information about other people’s ideas in books, and ineptness in original thinking.”

Perhaps what Stuart Grummond would have the present generation of Phi Beta Kappa do is to renew the never-ending effort to struggle against what my father, a member of our Society, used to call “the Avernian greased slide into bookishness.”

To inspire us, he wrote in this year of 1948 a striking example of disciplined academic intelligence acting in its own true field, wresting credence with its creation from teacher and student. In the land, during some time at the frontier of knowledge, “controversial,” “taboos always spewed out cysts...”

There may be no...historical connection—between these people, or the average...It is simply due to the...meaning intended was that the speaker was “controversial.”

There is no knowledge which was not sometime at the frontiers of knowledge. And in what land, during what period, was anything at the frontiers of knowledge other than controversial?

I am not here saying that what is, is wrong; nor that what is not, is right. I am saying that the light of it is one way, and must be shut out, that we must have the courage to seek the truth, no matter whither the course may lead.

I submit that that is the burden of Phi Beta Kappa, as Phi Beta Kappa. I have been heartened by the formation of the Committee of One Thousand, described in the Summer 1948 issue of The Key Reporter, and by the frank editorial statement of Walton Hamilton in the Summer 1948 issue of The American Scholar. But I believe that it is the proper function and duty of Phi Beta Kappa, as both a symbol of scholarship and an organization of scholars, to take the leadership in its own name, with the prestige of its own name, in the struggle to restore the freedom of controversy. In no other way can Phi Beta Kappa now justify its existence. In no other way can it attest to the zest for knowledge from which it sprang.

GEORGE T. ALTMAN
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA

Civil Liberties

To the Editor:

It is not my practice to write “letters to the editor.” However, the news story, “Educators Unite to Defend Civil Liberties, Assert House Committee Endangers Rights,” in the Summer 1948 issue of The Key Reporter, has stirred me to this effort. It is just such stories which have caused me great concern, especially since we have just passed through a period of world conflict and have not yet settled our many complex problems arising from that horrible experience. I do not intend to convey the thought that I wholeheartedly agree with everything that has been done by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For I do not consider all of that group’s actions. Nevertheless, I am much more disturbed by the apparent concern on the part of many of our educators for the theoretical defense of civil liberties, while apparently they are ignoring the many important practical aspects of the problem.

(Continued on page 5)
Address Changes

In notifying Phi Beta Kappa of a change of residence, members are reminded that, whenever they are not able to indicate this change on a KEY REPORTER wrapper, they should send us not only their new address but the one to which their Phi Beta Kappa mail was previ-ously sent.


A competent, illuminating anthology and interpretation of one of the century's outstanding thinkers.


Essays by virtually every major critic from F. O. Matthiessen to Cleanth Brooks which not only illuminate Eliot's work but also the state of letters and of criticism in the time Eliot has been writing.


The first carefully critical analysis of existentialism in terms of its historical roots and background.


An attempt to produce a twentieth-century De Toqueville which almost succeeds. Enormously informed, brilliantly perceptive, eloquent and witty, the work is marred only by occasional repetitiveness and stretches of socialist pamphleteering.


An important and penetrating analysis of the basic problems of democratic society and suggestions of the trends of social education by which democracy can be progressively enlarged.


Wilde's life, hitherto the great subject of interest for most people, is here relegated to an appendix. The re-examination of Wilde and his development is a fresh and penetrating job.


A revealing portrayal of current Christian thought and social action, projected through the life and work of the great Swiss medical missionary.

They Say . . . (Continued from page 3)

The average college man, even today, is in a very pliable state of mind when he is studying. If he is influenced in the wrong direction, he may never recover his sense of balance. If he does it is generally only after a long and hard struggle within his soul. The odds are much more in favor of his going the way that he has been taught as the only true direction by the men he regards as unshakably correct. It follows that it should be the job of all our evaluators, and especially those of authority, to see to it that our teachers are worthy of their jobs.

This is particularly true of those persons who have on their own right agreed to work for local, state, or federal governments, either directly or indirectly, in public institutions such as state-supported schools. These persons are being paid by public funds and so are responsible to all those people who make up the government which has hired them. It is then, in my opinion, their responsibility to see that they are carrying out their duties in a manner that is acceptable to the majority of the taxpayers who support them. If the jobholder does not personally agree with the thoughts of the majority, then he should refuse to do his job so long as he agrees with them and is willing to hire him. This is especially true at this time when it is common knowledge that there is in the world a force which is sworn to overthrow our form of government and which is making a strong bid against everything for which our constitution stands. I have also observed that those persons who believe in this other form of government are the first ones to scream that their civil liberties are being infringed upon, whereas, under the form of government that they are trying to run on us, there exists no such thing as civil liberties in any form.

The erosion of civil liberties also carries with it the responsibility to use this freedom wisely as well as to be loyal to the form of government which gives him this liberty.

I do not intend to infer that those persons listed in the article referred to are Communists. I feel sure that they have all given considerable thought to this matter. However, I also feel that many highly educated people often lose sight of the practical. In their theoretical approach they very often — though unintentionally — give support to something that is in truth diametrically opposed to the very thing that they intend to support. I wonder if anyone else shares my belief or am I just a radical thinker myself?

G. EDMOND MASSEY, III

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

Federal Aid to Education

To the Editor:

I noted your report [The Key Reporter, Vol. XIII, No. 3] of passage by the United States Senate of the Taft aid-to-education bill. It seems to me that enactment into law of that bill would be a distinct step in the wrong direction and for this reason: It will place under the control of the government in Washington all the public school systems of the several states. That is to be done by the usual process of appropriating (or rather misappropriating) public funds in aid of the states. That means a further breakdown of our form of constitutional government. The jurisdiction, control, and financing of education — of all things — should be left to the states.

I am well aware of the arguments contra the chief of which is that the backward or poor states will be benefited at the expense of the richer ones. That, however, is no more logical an argument than it would be to state similarly that aid to indigent or unfortunate people is advanced at the expense of wealthy people.

DRURY W. COOPER

MONTCLAIR, NEW JERSEY

Rates for items in the "Know of an Opening?" column are ten cents per word for a single insertion, seven cents per word for two or more consecutive insertions. Replies should be addressed to Member No. — care of The Key Reporter. They will be forwarded promptly to the advertiser.

586. (Mr., Ind.) A.M. Indiana 1941. Experienced secondary and college teacher. 2 years' mathematics department head. 4 years' budgetary, fiscal, and personnel work as air force officer. Desires executive or business connection, or college administrative position. Age 32. Superior recommendations.

590. (Mr., N.Y.) Newspaper, magazine copy reader with wide interests seeks editorial or administrative position. Now on 275,000-circulation daily. A.M. philosophy, psychology. Four years in USAF, 28, single, go anywhere.

592. (Miss, Texas) A.B., geology, University of Kansas, 1945. Three years' experience with oil company as geologist, engaged primarily in microscopic examination well-cuttings. Desires different type work related to geology.


594. (Miss, N.Y.) A.M., California 1946. Desires teaching position, mathematics and statistics, college or high school. Year college teaching experience. Excellent references.

595. (Miss, Mo.) A.B. Vassar 1946 (honors, creative writing, contemporary history). Experienced retail, agency advertising copy, documentary radio; wants forwarding-looking public service job in newspaper-magazine-radio field, any part of country.

596. (Miss, D. C.) A.B. Michigan 1944. Major: English; minors: chemistry, French, history. 3 ¼ years general chemical publications. Seeking instructive editorial, related work.

597. (Mr., Mass.) Married veteran, studying for master's degree in accounting, desires part-time employment with a Boston accounting firm for the purpose of gaining experience.

598. (Miss, N.Y.) A.B. 1945; credits toward A.M.; presently doing research for US delegates to UN, supervising documents index, salary $3750; interested in research in social science field.

www.pbk.org
The Judgment of Action


"The important question, for this book at least, is not what the critic says but what he does, and chiefly the principal thing that he does, the 'essence' of his work." So Mr. Hyman begins his survey of modern literary criticism, the body of methods and techniques which dates from 1924 and the appearance of I. A. Richards's The Principles of Literary Criticism. According to this survey, the critic does many things: he translates and paraphrases (Edmund Wilson), he makes moral evaluations (Yvor Winters), he correlates literary patterns with psychological archetypes (Maude Bodkin), or he correlates literature with the social and economic life of man (Christopher Caudwell). By so categorizing various emphases in modern critical activity Mr. Hyman surveys the above writers and various others — T. S. Eliot, Van Wyck Brooks, Constance Rourke, Caroline Spurgeon, R. P. Blackmur, William Empson, I. A. Richards, and Kenneth Burke — and in considering their "influences" manages to mention almost every literary commentator who has appeared in print in the last 25 years.

But on the subject of these influences Mr. Hyman is superficial and pedantic. Such superficiality may be understandable, for the main task of his book is to describe the activities and approaches of a dozen major critics. But to say this is only to point to a larger difficulty of this book: it is virtually three books.

One is a handbook to the chief works of the 12 major critics; another is an account, undocumented and often trivial, of their followers; the third is a collection of what Mr. Hyman calls his own "biases and opinions," his attitudes towards the writers he surveys. These "biases" run from downright venom (towards Edmund Wilson) to wide-eyed admiration (of Kenneth Burke), and they are often expressed in psychological terms — the structure of a critic's work is a projection of the structure of his personality. But Mr. Hyman can scarcely claim to be an ungalled jade; he should wince at the structure of his own book, for it reveals him as an academician who transcends mere synopsis and summary only by expressions of personal animus or delight.

The problem of modern literary criticism is indeed what the critic does. And whatever else he has done in the last 25 years he has greatly expanded the connotations of the verb to read. We no longer sit down to a book and make a monomaniacal search for its True Meaning. We have learned, especially from I. A. Richards, as Mr. Hyman points out, the techniques of "close reading"; indeed we have learned so much that we should say "open" rather than "close" reading. We can get the inert words off the page in more various ways, we can correlate our experience of literary patterns more widely than any other readers, perhaps, in history: and "we" here means those who have learned from the writers Mr. Hyman surveys. The effects of the new criticism, in other words, are primarily educational.

It is not, then, as Mr. Hyman half-jokingly suggests, that we need an "ideal critic" who knows everything; or, as Mr. Hyman seriously proposes, that we need more and better symposia to synthesize the insights of all modern critics. What we need is not information or synthesis; we need constant and energetic reading as various and adaptable as the literature we confront. The limits of criticism as paraphrase are not the limits of Mr. Wilson's temperament; the validity of the Marxist approach is not to be decided on the merits of Christopher Caudwell's "guilt"; the use and relevance of any approach is what it can do for us when we sit down to read a poem. The synthesis of modern knowledge and insight occurs in the mind of the solitary reader, and nowhere else. The problem is not to give us the dope, to help us pass our examination in the now "covered" field of modern criticism. The problem is to test the doing of the critic by imitating it in the constant effort to read efficiently, happily, and profitably.

Armour Craig is assistant professor of English at Amherst College.

Recommended Reading


A provocative exposition of the dilemmas of our present culture crisis, with a challenging forecast of their resolution through a new philosophy of "unitary" or non-analytical, more scientific thinking.


The first of the projected five volumes of war memoirs, this one covering the period from the Versailles Treaty through the first eight months of World War II. As magnificent as everyone expected it to be, the book is disappointing only in what it leaves out.


An incisive but not too optimistic diagnosis of the ills of contemporary culture, with constructive suggestions of the focal problems which critical thinking must attack.


Essays by some of the best analysts of form and technique in the modern novel. The first major indication that the critical approaches to fiction can be as refined and exacting as those in use by critics of poetry.


In these days of educational quandary and self-examination, this well-chosen anthology offers an illuminating retrospect of basic educational values and objectives.


A social history of the period, emphasizing science, religion, amusements, and literature as well as politics and economies. Always readable and thoughtful, it is generally sympathetic, with the Roosevelt program but remarkably balanced for history so close to the present.
Higher Learning (Continued from page 2)

further insists that “higher education must inspire its graduates with high social aims as well as endow them with specialized information and technical skill. Teaching and learning must be invested with public purpose.”

Educational opportunity must be provided for all who are competent, and on equal terms, without discrimination as to race, creed, sex, geography, or economic status. This is the thesis of Chapter II of Volume I, developed more fully in Volume II. And how many are competent to profit by “higher education”? The commission attempts an answer on the basis of available data. No predictions are made as to future enrollments; potentials, desirable goals, possible goals, are suggested.

But what kind of education? Here the devotees of the liberal arts ideal may be most concerned. Many of them, perhaps, are disturbed and distressed, or in dissent. The discussions in Chapter III and Chapter IV, dealing chiefly with “General Education” and “The Community Colleges,” are relevant here.

General Education

“General education” is the term that has “come to be accepted for those phases of non-specialized and non-vocational learning which should be the common experience of all educated men and women.” The objectives of “general education” are stated; and the “community college” is advocated as one means of achieving the expansion of educational opportunity, with the purpose of “educational service to the entire community” — such purpose requiring “a variety of functions and programs” in order that “differences in capacity and purpose” may be properly provided for.

And what of “liberal education” in all this? Well: “General education is liberal education with its matter and method shifted from its original aristocratic intent to the service of democracy. General education seeks to extend to all men the benefits of an education that liberates.” (In fairness I must say parenthetically that I think the contrast suggested here is too sharp, and that I wish these two sentences and the related statements in other parts of the report had been differently written.)

The “astounding” expansion and disintegration of the curriculum of the liberal arts college, the overspecialization in college and graduate school, the “failure to provide any core of unity in the essential diversity of higher education” and the “crucial task” of providing a “unified general education for American youth” — making for “the transmission of a common cultural heritage toward a common citizenship” — are discussed in terms not unfamiliar to the reader of current discussions of higher education.

Yet (and some question as to consistency can well be raised here) the purpose of general education “calls for a unity in the program of studies that a uniform system of courses cannot supply. The unity must come, instead, from a consistency of aim that will fuse and harmonize all teaching and all campus activities. . . . The objectives of general education are not to be achieved by prescribing any single pattern of courses for all students.” The avenues of approach to the common goals “must be as numerous and varied as the wide differences among students.”

It is insisted that “general education is not elementary or superficial education. It is no easier than specialized education; it should require no less of the student.” There is need for new courses and for new teachers competent and “sympathetically inclined” to teach the new courses. And there is, it is urged, no antagonism between general education and vocational education. “Education is a unified process — American education must be so organized and conducted that it will provide, at appropriate levels, proper combinations of general and special education for students of varying abilities and educational objectives.”

What, then, happens to the liberal arts college of the traditional four-year type, independent or within a university organization?

The “community college,” however sponsored, organized, and related to the high school, is to provide “terminal education” for the great majority, with proper balance of the “general” (which is liberal education democratized) and of the vocational (with which there is no essential conflict). The answers suggested by the commission are found in part on pages 70-75 of Volume I, and, in terms of organization, in Volume III.

So far as organization is concerned, I think Mr. Hutchins is right when he says (Educational Record, April 1948) that the commission did not follow its argument to its logical conclusion.

Beyond this, the following selected sentences suggest the commission’s general attitude; the supporting argument must be sought out and evaluated.

“In any case, the liberal arts college is so well established in the American educational tradition that it need not fear community colleges will weaken its own appeal. It should encourage the development of the community college, not oppose it. . . .

Programs of concentration in the senior college need to be built around a much wider range of intellectual and occupational objectives to serve a much larger and less selected body of students. . . .

Focusing Liberal Education

“Liberal education can be thoroughly useful when its relevance to life is brought sharply into focus by a vocational purpose that gives point and direction to the student’s program. The danger of futility lies in an unfocused, aimless study of liberal subjects. For this reason the traditional segregation of liberal education in one period of a person’s college career and of professional education in another has not served the best interests of either. . . .

Whatever the methods developed, the purpose is clear: to provide a well-rounded education that will fit men and women to understand the broad cultural foundations, the significant accomplishments, and the unfinished business of their society; to participate intelligently in community life and public affairs; to build a set of values that will constitute a design for living; and to take a socially responsible and productive part in the world of work.”

Thus the report of the President’s Commission challenges the proponents of “liberal education” to restate their aims, to re-examine their curricula and their methods, and to appraise their contribution, actual or potential, to “higher education for American democracy.” I have no fear that they will not be able to respond to the challenge; but they must do so with open minds and with sensitiveness to the demands of a nation and a world facing a crisis, a world in ferment, a people with their faces set forward and on the march. Little heed will be paid a call from the ivory tower or from the cloister to turn back to the past for its own sake or to cling to an educational philosophy and program which, however great their charm, have slight relevance to the world in which the issues of tomorrow must be decided.
Claudius Osborne Johnson, of Pullman, Washington, Phi Beta Kappa University of Richmond, professor of political science and head of the Department of History and Political Science, State College of Washington.

Robert Joseph Kerner, of Berkeley, California, Phi Beta Kappa University of California, Sather professor of history at the University of California.

Richard Miner Hewitt, of Rochester, Minnesota, Phi Beta Kappa Wesleyan University, physician and medical editor, head of the Division of Publications of the Mayo Clinic.

Dean Langmuir, of New York, Phi Beta Kappa Williams College, investment counsel maintaining his own firm.

Howard Decker McKinney, of New Brunswick, New Jersey, Phi Beta Kappa Rutgers University, professor of music at Rutgers University.

Stanley Kuhl Hornbeck, of Washington, D.C., Phi Beta Kappa University of Denver, scholar and diplomat, recently United States ambassador to the Netherlands.

John Leslie Hall, Jr., of Norfolk, Virginia, Phi Beta Kappa College of William and Mary, vice admiral in the United States Navy, commandant of the Armed Forces Staff College.

Hatton Lovejoy, of LaGrange, Georgia, Phi Beta Kappa University of Georgia, member of the law firm of Lovejoy & Mayer, division counsel for the Atlantic Coastline Railroad.

Pauline Berry Mack, of State College, Pennsylvania, Phi Beta Kappa University of Missouri, chemist, director of the Ellen H. Richards Institute, Pennsylvania State College.


Hazel Gertrude Kinsella, of Lincoln, Nebraska, Phi Beta Kappa University of Nebraska, pianist and composer, professor of music at the University of Nebraska.

Matthew Thompson McClure, Jr., of Champaign, Illinois, Phi Beta Kappa University of Virginia, professor of philosophy and dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the University of Illinois.

Charles J. Lewin, of Fairhaven, Massachusetts, Phi Beta Kappa University of Wisconsin, editor and general manager of the Standard-Times, New Bedford.


Solomon Stephen Huenber, of Merion Station, Pennsylvania, Phi Beta Kappa University of Wisconsin, professor of insurance and commerce and chairman of the Insurance Department of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, the University of Pennsylvania.

Hans Alexander Klagsbunn, of Washington, D.C., Phi Beta Kappa Yale University, lawyer, formerly director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Martin Meyer, of Brooklyn, New York, Phi Beta Kappa College of the City of New York, professor of chemistry and chairman of the Department of Chemistry, Brooklyn College.

Mina Kerr, of Virginia Beach, Virginia, Phi Beta Kappa Smith College, lecturer on world affairs, national and international.

Elmer J. Land, of Austin, Texas, Phi Beta Kappa Johns Hopkins, professor of physiology at the University of Texas, director of the Institute of Marine Science.

John Robertson Macartthur, of Elsinore, California, Phi Beta Kappa Occidental College, professor emeritus of languages at California Institute of Technology.

Edmond Earl Lincoln, of Wilmington, Delaware, Phi Beta Kappa Ohio Wesleyan University, economist with E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, Inc.

Martha Eunice Hilton, of Syracuse, New York, Phi Beta Kappa University of Nebraska, dean of women and professor of education, Syracuse University.

Robert Morrison MacIver, of Palisades, New York, Phi Beta Kappa Columbia University, Lieber professor of political philosophy and sociology at Columbia University.

Howard Sanders LeRoy, of Cooksville, Howard County, Maryland, Phi Beta Kappa University of Rochester, partner of the law firm of LeRoy & Denslow, Washington, D.C.

Isaac Newton Cash, of Enid, Oklahoma, Phi Beta Kappa Drake University, educator, theologian, president emeritus of Phillips University.


Arthur Harold Kent, of San Francisco, Phi Beta Kappa University of Southern California, lawyer, lecturer in law at Hastings College of the Law.

Eghert Charles Hadley, of Southport, Connecticut, Phi Beta Kappa Middlebury College, engineer, assistant to the vice-president and assistant general manager of the Remington Arms Company, Bridgeport.

Perry Wilson Jenkins, of Salt Lake City, Phi Beta Kappa Miami University, mathematician, engineer, president of the Colorado River Water Users Association.

Walter Alexander Harris, of Macon, Georgia, Phi Beta Kappa University of Georgia, member of the law firm of Harris Harris Russell & Weaver.

Sally Bruce Kinsolving, of Baltimore, Phi Beta Kappa College of William and Mary, poet.

Charles Byron Jolliffe, of Princeton, New Jersey, Phi Beta Kappa University of West Virginia, radio engineer, executive vice-president of the Radio Corporation of America and director of the RCA Laboratories Division.

Maude Miner Hadden, of Palm Beach, Florida, Phi Beta Kappa Smith College, founder of the Girls' Service League of America.

Paul William Johnston, of Shaker Heights, Ohio, Phi Beta Kappa Allegheny College, vice-president of the Erie Railroad, Cleveland.

Roy Malcolm, of Los Angeles, Phi Beta Kappa University of Southern California, professor of political science at the University of Southern California.

William Henry Kiehoffer, of Madison, Wisconsin, Phi Beta Kappa University of Wisconsin, professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin.

Sara Murray Jordan, of Marblehead Neck, Massachusetts, physician, in charge of gastroenterology at the Lahey Clinic, Boston.

George H. Howard, of New York, Phi Beta Kappa Dartmouth College, member of the law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett.

Jay Carroll Knude, of Albuquerque, New Mexico, Phi Beta Kappa University of Nebraska, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the University of New Mexico.
The Undergraduate ... and Political Responsibility

By Howard Mumford Jones

Despite theories of academic freedom, our universities are conservative institutions, says Mr. Jones. In this hard-hitting article, he speaks out about the pressures being brought to bear on non-conformist undergraduates and undergraduate groups with dissenting political views. Here is a fearless and dispassionate treatment of an important issue emerging everywhere on American campuses today.

Mass Media and the Engineering of Consent

By Joseph T. Klapper

A penetrating analysis of the "processes of persuasion" as practiced through newspapers, screen and radio. Mr. Klapper shows how the need to please the widest possible audience makes for an endless reaffirmation of sanctioned attitudes, and how monopoly control affects the critical spirit. This study is magnificently to the point. It should be read by every independent, thinking American.

The American Scholar Forum

Is Our Patent System Obsolete?

- by Walton H. Hamilton
- and Casper W. Ooms.

Revolution and Intervention

By Meribeth E. Cameron

Since 1945, we have poured two billion dollars into China, yet she is no closer to a solution of her many and complex problems. On the one hand, we have attempted to bring together conflicting groups; on the other, we have given material aid to only one of these groups. Dean Cameron, in her incisive article, assesses the results of U.S. intervention in China. She draws a significant parallel between the results of foreign intervention in Russia, after World War I, and the present U.S. position in China — with an urgent appeal for serious thought before further action.
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