RELEVANCE AND HIGHER EDUCATION

EDITED BY
WALTER D. WEIR

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL
PROCEEDINGS, ANNUAL MEETING, 1968

RELEVANCE AND HIGHER EDUCATION

EDITED BY
WALTER D. WEIR

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL
PROCEEDINGS, ANNUAL MEETING, 1968

National Collegiate Honors Council
Walter D. Weir, Secretary
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Preface

The papers in this volume were presented at the third annual meeting of the National Collegiate Honors Council at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle, Washington, October 18-20, 1968. Some 240 faculty members, administrators, and students attended this meeting. We were pleased with the lively participation of the fifty students at this meeting and hope that honors students representing colleges and universities across the land will continue to challenge us to build better honors programs.

The papers indicate our focus on the problems of the relevance of curricula to learning and the relevance of higher education to the world. Black and white students alike urged us to make our programs, our curricula, and our concerns more relevant to the moral and social issues of our time, more relevant to a truly liberal education. Two representatives from the world of business, Nils Eklund, Vice-President, Kaiser Industries, and Ralph E. Boynton, Vice-President, Bank of America, pleaded for a greater understanding and communication between the worlds of business and university in one of the most spirited sessions of our meeting.

The NCHC continues to grow—institutional members are listed at the end of this volume along with the program of the Seattle meeting. Our next meeting will be held in New Orleans, October 30-November 1, 1969.

The Council is grateful to its president, Professor Vishnu Bhatia, for his many years of active service and for his year of dedicated leadership. Professor James Tallarico and Professor Julian Barksdale receive our thanks for their labors to make this meeting a success. Professor Dudley Wynn deserves special recognition for his work in organizing the program and for his help in editing this volume.

Professor Dudley Wynn, of the University of New Mexico, is our president for this year and John S. Eells, Jr., Winthrop College, our vice-president. The following members were elected at the Seattle meeting to

a three-year term on the executive committee: Julian Barksdale, University of Washington; Thomas W. Phelan, St. Norbert College; C. H. Ruedisili, University of Wisconsin; Vivian J. Tellis, Alcorn A&M College; and D. Burnham Terrell, University of Minnesota.

WALTER D. WEIR
National Collegiate Honors Council
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Table of Contents

Appendix

CHAPTER 1

Relevance: An Introduction

WALTER D. WEIR
University of Colorado

Our country, our society, and our institutions of higher learning are being torn apart by the struggle between those demanding change now and those relatively satisfied with their present affluence and power roles. If the polarization continues to grow between blacks and whites, young and old, poor and rich, students and other segments of the multiversity, university and community, the American dream of a society governed by, of, and for the people might well perish in a totalitarian plague spread by either the extreme left or the extreme right. If faith in the American dream continues to wane amongst both the left and the right, the university's only relevance will be as handmaiden of a state repressing all freedom in the name of revolutionary order.

Impatience, resentment, bitterness, hate, and violence are building in both camps and time may be running short. We who still believe in the American dream and a free university must act now to give evidence of our commitment. The road to hell is paved with good intentions and endless talkers. More of the same unplanned growth, more of the same affluence for those already affluent, more of the same technology and specialization used to build power structures, war machines, and more consumer demand for material goods, more of the same pollution of our good earth and crying souls, will not do. The cry of our students for relevance in their education is first and foremost a cry for a more just and meaningful society. Growing numbers of students are no longer satisfied with the traditional hedonism of college life, with playing childish games in the anti-community of the multiversity.

They demand we face Holden Caulfield's experience and make our actions correspond more nearly to our professions. They insist we act now to provide opportunities for all men to realize their dignity and potential and that we alter our power structures to create a participatory, demo-

cratic community. They seek the elimination of poverty and squalor in the richest society man has ever known and are sympathetic to the rising expectations of those less fortunate in other lands. Nonetheless, they are convinced that man cannot live by bread alone; they are suspicious of a technological society.[1] They would have us spend less of our resources on technical, specialized, and professional know-how and spend more on the search for vision, for something man can live and die for. They wish to escape the wastelands of J. Alfred Prufrock and search for the Second Coming. They want their universities made relevant to these concerns. They want to resurrect and rebuild the American dream.

We in the university world must listen to their fervent voices and make a commitment to the American dream or fall with it. We must educate "free" men to enter and build a freer and more humane world or be crushed in a new wave of irrational and violent totalitarianism. In our *hubris* and our blindness, we may be unconsciously preparing for the death of the American dream and our own death as well. Lewis Mumford warns us:

> As the church ceased to be the repository of new values, the university gradually took over some of this office. This fact placed a premium upon the detached pursuit of truth, as the dominating life-value, and has ignored in large degree the realms of esthetics and morals. Thus the university has become a classic example of that overspecialization and limitation of function which now curbs human development and threatens even human survival.[2]

Our educational establishment has gone a long way in achieving technological competence and, even, expertise, but it is far from realizing human and humane goals within its own institutions or in society.

The present widespread dissatisfaction with the character and quality of undergraduate education stems in large measure from those who disagree with the ends and means embodied in the multiversity. This dis-

[1] See Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society*. John Wilkinson, the translator, notes: "It is, in fact, the essence of technique to compel the qualitative to become quantitative, and in this way to force every stage of human activity and man himself to submit to its mathematical calculations. Ellul gives examples of this at every level. Thus, technique forces all sociological phenomena to submit to the clock, for Ellul the most characteristic of all modern technical instruments. The substitution of the *tempus mortuum* of the mechanical clock for the biological and psychological time 'natural' to man is in itself sufficient to suppress all the traditional rhythms of human life in favor of the mechanical" (p. xvi). The current hippy movement, the new music, the reduction in science and engineering majors and the almost insatiable appetite for courses in religion and the humanities, are all symptoms of today's student revolt against the technological society.

[2] Lewis Mumford, *The City in History*, p. 276.

satisfaction burns in both students and faculty. The foci of this discontent seem to be: (1) the failure of the university to be relevant to the social and human issues of our time, to make the knowledge of the various disciples in the curriculum relevant to man's most pressing problems; (2) the failure to provide relevant instruments for meaningful self-identity in a *community* of scholars; (3) the failure of the university to provide an adequate *vision* of the American dream and, more important, a vision for humans everywhere—this is not a demand for a monolithic vision, but a demand that the universities spend more of their resources in the exploration, research, and discussion of viable alternatives; (4) the failure to provide a sense of the adventure of ideas; (5) the failure to reward, promote, and recognize professors who are not too busy with government contracts and specialized research to teach, counsel, and guide undergraduate students.[3]

We have lost our sense of relevance in society and in our universities. The real function of education is to educate men for participation in a meaningful world; the production of knowledge is secondary. We have reversed the order and real education is taking place outside the formal dimensions of the university—in mass media, in the bull sessions of the dormitories, through charismatic sages and charlatans. The dangers of this kind of education ought to be obvious, but so long as our universities are engaged in a mad race for excellence defined in terms of receiving grants, achieving higher positions in the pecking order, publishing more specialized research, the flight from teaching will continue and all the disciplines of the university will be tempted to go further along the path of self-destruction through the pursuit of over-specialization and professionalism. Each discipline will go its own way and the searing common and interdisciplinary problems will be unexplored and unanswered until some revolutionary force will impose answers on a frightened, despairing, and sick populace. An American Mao or a George

[3] In the face of rapidly rising enrollments, the flight from teaching has continued and this is nowhere more evident than in the sciences. Since our culture has rewarded engineers and scientists, the scientific model has been frequently adopted by the social scientists and the humanists with disastrous results. Quantity, precision, obscurity, and form drown out quality, content, and human meaning. William Arrowsmith writes: "Teaching . . . is not honored among us either because its function is grossly misconceived or its cultural value not understood. The reason is the overwhelming positivism of our technocratic society and the arrogance of scholarship. Behind the disregard for the teacher lies the transparent sickness of the humanities in the university and in American life generally. Indeed, nothing more vividly illustrates the myopia of academic humanism than its failure to realize that the fate of any true culture is revealed in the value it sets upon the teacher and the way it defines him. 'The advancement of learning at the expense of man,' writes Nietzsche, 'is the most pernicious thing in the world.'" Pp. 116-117 of *Campus 1980*, edited by Alvin C. Eurich.

Wallace—more likely the latter—will provide the answers, however irrational and tragic the consequences, that the professors, busy in their affluent ant hills, refused to provide. We would then experience the bitter fruits of our irrelevance.

We do need specialists; a university would not be a university without them. But must we commit the fallacy of misplaced concreteness and take our specialized abstractions for total reality?[4] Must we fail to provide an education for the whole man, fail to do research in things that matter most, in areas not uniquely that of any one discipline? Must we continue to minimize our efforts to integrate vast reams of undigested knowledge and make such knowledge relevant to our age? Must we establish, as in practice we do, one monolithic model of the ideal professor?

The hunger for academic respectability today is almost solely linked to specialized research and this is just what must be changed if our universities are to educate men equipped to respond to the complexities of our time. It is more than difficult to sustain faculty dedication in liberal education in the face of the powerful necessity of the individual faculty member, especially the younger one, to concentrate on his professional development within his discipline. The student demand for relevance is not directed to the depreciation of research but to the placing of more emphasis on teaching, planning courses, student faculty involvement, smaller units, and to doing more research on the part of both students and faculty on the common and interdisciplinary problems that concern all of us. Students correctly regard such problem areas as "Black and White," "War and Peace," "Man and Woman," "Truth in Art and Science," etc., as relevant. But the forces of specialized research are well intrenched in the educational establishment.

> . . . teaching will not easily recover its great, lost function. The forces arrayed—I will not say against teaching, but for research—are formidable indeed, composing a gigantic scholarly cartel. At its base is the department, the matrix of university power, protected from above by the graduate deans and administrators, who are more and more drawn from the research professoriat and therefore share its aims and ambitions. National structure is provided by the great foundations and the learned societies which form the American Council of Learned Societies. And now there is the new National Endowment for the Humanities, whose depressingly conventional initial programs (inter alia a grant for papyrological studies and historical bibliography) look as though they might have been de-

[4] See Alfred N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*. See also his wise book, *The Aims of Education*.

signed by an unprogrammed computer in collaboration with a retired professor of Coptic. Even the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, designed "to attract men and women to the profession of college teaching" now seems to be tailoring its standards more and more to the pinched professionalism of the graduate schools. There is also the Cartter report of the American Council on Education; intended to assess the quality of graduate programs on the basis of informed opinion, it will almost inevitably have the effect of stifling innovation, if only because informed scholarly opinion is unadventurous and tyrannous as well as profoundly snobbish. My argument is this: At every level the forces making for scholarly conformity are immense, and the rewards of conformity high. If these forces are not directly hostile to teaching, they are certainly profoundly indifferent.[5]

We must create a new balance amongst our multitudinous responsibilities as faculty members, grant greater student responsibility and participation in a community of scholars dedicated to life and the education of free and full men. The faculty and administrators of our colleges and universities need to respond to our culture's and our students' desperate requirement for alternative, visible, and viable life-styles. The life-style of the academic specialist is but one style and that is one that many of our best students—including many graduate students—regard as inadequate for our time. Yet, it is that one style our "better" colleges and universities are imposing on students and their curriculum. Julian Huxley summarizes the contemporary situation and its relation to specialization in these words:

The most bewildering characteristic of the present moment of history is that things are happening faster and faster. The pace of change in human affairs, originally so slow as to be unnoticed, has steadily accelerated, until today we can no longer measure it in terms of generations: Major changes now take place every few years, and human individuals have to make several drastic adjustments in the course of their working lives. Where are these breathless changes taking us? Is change synonymous with progress, as many technologists and developers would like us to believe? Is there any main direction to be discerned in present-day human life and affairs? The answer at the moment is no. Change today is disruptive; its trends are diverging in various directions. What is more, many of them are self-limiting or even self-destructive—think of the trend to explosive population increase, to overgrown cities, to traffic congestion, to reck-

[5] William Arrowsmith, "The Future of Teaching" in *Campus 1980*, ed. Alvin C. Eurich, p. 124.

> less exploitation of resources, to the widening gap between developed and underdeveloped countries, to the destruction of wild life and natural beauty, to cutthroat competition in economic growth, to Galbraith's private affluence and public squalor, to over-specialization and imbalance in science and technology, to monotony, boredom and conformity, and to the proliferation of increasingly expensive armaments. . . . What is to be done? The torrential flow of a scientific printed matter could be reduced if the scientific reputation of a man or a department did not depend so much on the number of scientific papers published. This leads, among other things, to postgraduate students being pushed to undertake researches where publishable results rather than scientific importance are the prime consideration. (This holds with even greater force in the humanities, which too often pretend to be "scientific," flooding the learned market with Ph.D. theses crammed with unimportant literary or historical details). . . . we need a science of human possibilities, with professorships in the exploration of the future . . . the integration of science with all other branches of learning into a single comprehensive and open-ended system of knowledge, ideas and values *relevant* to man's destiny. . . . But before this can happen, we must repudiate our modern idolatry of science and technology. . . .[6]

The papers in this volume are largely devoted to expressions of the need for relevance, explorations in the meaning of "relevance," and to a variety of responses to the cry for relevance. It is not accidental that these papers are written by educators engaged in honors programs, for the best of these programs have long been concerned with the problem of relevance.

[6] Sir Julian Huxley, "The Crisis in Man's Destiny" in *Contemporary Religious Issues*, ed. Donald E. Hartsock, pp. 170-171, 178-179.

CHAPTER 2

And Lose the Name of Action

JAMES L. JARRETT
University of California at Berkeley

The twentieth century has so far witnessed three changes in educational theory and practice of sufficient magnitude to admit of being called "revolutions." The first may be dated from the early years of the century, when the experimental school at Chicago had established itself as a major force, and its founder, John Dewey, moved on to Columbia to refine the theory of progressivism, rooted in a pragmatic epistemology, a democratic, experimental ethics, and a psychology that emphasized individual differences, motivation, and a learning theory whose key concept was "interest." The established position at which the Progressive revolutionaries aimed their shafts featured a traditionally classical curriculum, the enforcement of classroom discipline—in today's catch phrase, "law and order"—the transfer of the training received in memorizing Latin declensions, and above all a conception of the teacher-pupil relationship as one of transmission and reception. It can be argued that most philosophers exercise whatever influence they have on other philosophers, but no one can doubt that when John Dewey decided upon the schools as the area of application for his theories, he made a decision that extended his influence throughout the whole web of our society. By the end of the second world war, however, this influence had begun to seem to so many people iniquitous that early Russian successes in the space race could set off a major exposé of our entire school system as "soft," utterly lacking in standards and rigor. Progressive Education was marked out as the witch that had so arranged things that pupils could not spell, compute, or even read; that teachers were certified without ever having attained competence in any academic discipline; and that the curriculum admitted as equal partners mathematics and household budgeting, French and fly-tying, English and baton-twirling. Suddenly earnest parents everywhere rediscovered the virtues of McGuffy readers, of

homogeneous grouping, of Grades—A, B, C, D, and F—instead of weasle-worded evaluations; and of geometry, physics, and good old-fashioned history instead of social problems and current events. A candidate for the superintendency of public instruction in California could be forgiven possession of an Ed.D. because of his eloquence in behalf of the three R's, phonics, and home-work, and against psychological testing, the debunking of national heroes, dirty words, and the whole ethos of permissiveness. As the latter list suggests, P.T.A. meetings began to reveal strange new alliances, with the politically progressive tolerating attacks on educational progressivism for being secularistic and insufficiently patriotic so long as home economics, industrial arts, marching bands, and automatic passing were berated. Perhaps above all it was discovered by the champions of Basic Education that nearly everything could be taught sooner: suddenly children were reading almost before they were running, college freshman chemistry had to be entirely upgraded in order not to be repetitive, the logic of sets found its way into first grade math texts, the calculus was discovered to be a pre-college study, and in at least one high school in Illinois, Chinese began to be taught *in Russian*. If such subjects were too hard for some students—well, how could we have ever forgotten that there is a vast difference between the gifted and the ungifted, in spite of the Mental Health types lumping together the talented and the handicapped under the wonderful rubric: Exceptional Children. Of course there has to be remedial education, but so must there be honors programs, advanced placement, and programs of enrichment.

Such is the dialectic of history, as Hegel has well taught us, that no civilization ever returns upon itself. Since re-action inevitably accepts the most deeply institutionalized changes wrought by its opponents, Progressivism was by no means washed out by the victories of those whose banners read: Back to the Fundamentals, More Homework, and Honors for the Gifted. But the victories of Academicism were real and the accomplishments numerous. For one thing mathematicians, physicists, linguists, and others began to feel obliged to put their typewriters where their mouths were and set about devising better courses and books and television shows for the public schools. Some results of this return were perhaps a little surprising: for instance, high school pupils began to steer away from art and music, saying that their parents said they needed yet another "solid" course, preferably something in math or science, to help their chances for getting into a prestigious college. But other accomplishments were so substantial that many who remained more or less

above the fray were retroactively astonished that so much Mickey Mouse instruction had been tolerated.

Yet, however recent these victories are, they are already superseded by a new revolution whose power is such that some of what seemed the most solidly-based accomplishments of the Academics have been obliterated. A deep disillusion has set in about students made nervous and cranky by the pressure to keep up. The laws proudly, even exuberantly, passed in California only half a dozen years ago enshrining an invidious distinction between academic and non-academic subjects in the preparation of teachers are now in process of being revoked. Tracking and streaming are under serious attack, not only in America but, even more surprisingly, in England. Engineering schools are being phased out, and college professors in the physical sciences are wondering why the greatly improved high school science courses are not attracting more students to science majors. Increasingly one hears of the dangers of over-intellectualizing the curriculum and of the importance of educating the feelings. The mental health and counseling approach to education seem to have recovered the prestige they enjoyed in the hey-day of Progressivism. Even eminent science educators have recently been expressing doubt about their own still-new curricula, saying perhaps after all it isn't so important that young students acquaint themselves with a body of concepts as that they develop certain ways of thinking creatively and critically—language to bring a glow to the heart of any Deweyan. Possibly most shocking of all is the rising doubt about the value of college education, at least as it has been traditionally conceived, even in such places as Oxford, Harvard, Columbia, and Berkeley.

If the Progressives' revolution was led by philosophers, psychologists, and professional educators, the counter-revolution was led by an alliance of parents and academics. The new revolution (let's call it the Humanities Revolution) is, of course, led by spokesmen for ethnic minorities and by students. The first revolution seems to have had its epi-center in the elementary schools, the second in the high schools, and the third in the colleges, but each has had reverberations in the other levels.

Whenever one is close to large changes, it is especially hard to tell what kind of connection the several changes have to each other, so I want to begin my account of what seem to me powerful and sweeping changes in the present educational scene by admitting that some movements which I will yoke together *may* come to appear, at a more favorable psychic distance, to be relatively discrete: for instance, what I will call the Discovery of Blacks and the Discovery of Students.

In either case, "discovery" may seem an odd word. But let us consider Ralph Ellison's deservedly well-known novel of fifteen years ago, which starts this way:

> I am an invisible man. . . . I am a man of substance, of flesh and bone, fiber and liquids—and I might even be said to possess a mind. I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me. Like the bodiless heads you see sometimes in circus sideshows, it is as though I have been surrounded by mirrors of hard, distorting glass. When they approach me they see only my surroundings, themselves, or figments of their imagination—indeed, everything and anything except me.

It is not too much to say that Negroes in American society have become visible, according to some—such as the Mexican-Americans of California and the Southwest—too visible, magnified out of proportion to their importance as a minority. But Blacks do constitute more than ten percent of our population, and the least controversial thing that can be said of them is that they are beginning to make up for their long decades of near-invisibility and of being cast in stereotyped roles which very effectively kept their behavior confirming our and even their expectations.

An important change in our ethos is revealed by the fact that only half a dozen years ago I responded to a survey conducted from Washington, that our institution had no way of knowing how many colored students we had: we didn't keep records that way. I confess to a little smugness in the tone I easily adopted: naturally we were too enlightened to take account of such unimportant differences as skin color. I excuse myself by saying I was a creature of my times: the great accomplishment, as recently as then, was to overcome discrimination by saying that since there are no important differences between races, all men should be treated exactly alike. One hoped that there would be an increasing number of well-qualified applicants to one's college, so that the absurdly small number of Negro students could be increased, and what a happy day it was when word came from an applicant for a faculty position, a Ph.D. from a good graduate school, every bit as well qualified as the white applicants. The rule of course was, "Other things being equal, we'd give the nod to the Negro applicant."

I'm sure that I was slower than many to see the fatal weakness in that "Other things being equal" clause, because of course it was so extremely rare that other things were equal, and it became apparent that if you waited for that equality to emerge, unaided, you'd wait a long time. But there were some who were no longer prepared to wait that long, and they

have helped some of the rest of us to a belated understanding that is, of course, still incomplete. What has been emerging is a sense of "equality" that is at a far remove from the one many of us had grasped. Now we began to be told, and partially to understand, that just as the "separate but equal" formula—which no doubt at one time represented an advance—came to seem a mockery, so the usual interpretation of "equality of opportunity," as applied, say, to college admission was first an advance and then became a deterrent to bolder thinking. Gradually it was brought home to us that our society had a huge "compensatory" job to do, for instance, by providing new opportunities for courses in remedial reading to the so-called "culturally deprived." But this way of thinking, too, was shown to have weaknesses. "Remedies" are usually inadequate, coming on top as they do of years of failure: what is needed, some people are telling us, is an effective strategy for changing self-concepts in black children, so that they will not, even as early as first grade, think of themselves as probably unable to learn to read, and as in any case living in a society in which such skills cannot help a black person much. What is emerging from black spokesmen is a radically new notion of equality, one which says, "What we demand is not equality of opportunity but equality of *results*." Somehow the system must be devised which will see to it that black six-year-olds can read, and that black nine-year-olds can read at what we are pleased to call the fourth grade level, and so on until the high school graduates are as well qualified as their lighter skinned classmates. Nothing less than this deserves to be called *equality*. And in the meantime, indeed in order to get these results, it is necessary—so this newer message tells us—to stop talking about standards, which may well be just another rationalization of the status quo, and see to it that black students are admitted to college in something like their proportion of the population, and if an insufficient number apply, then—well, who ever heard of a winning football coach that waited for applications to come in? And black faculty members must be hired in strikingly increased proportions. And the racially discriminatory practices of ability-grouping must not be tolerated, for this turns out to be as bad as any other way of telling blacks that they are not as able as the others. To the professors who complain about lower standards, one reply that cannot be shrugged off is: What makes you think your present means of selecting students is so good? Do you really have that much reason to trust gpa's and college boards, even for white students? Well, you *know* they discriminate against Negroes, so forget them.

Much more needs to be said about the discovery of the black, and especially of the black student, but I must let this suffice for the present

in order to leave time for that aspect of the current revolution which I have called Discovery of the Student. I will not here speculate about the historical connections between Black Power and Student Power, or about the transition among student radicals from civil rights campaigns to Vietnam demonstrations to agitation for a broad spectrum of college reforms, but say only that whatever the connection, our attention is now being forcibly directed to the students in our midst, as something more than the notoriously ungrateful recipients of our intellectual largesse that we have long known them to be: namely as uppity people who no longer know their place. Many reasons have been given for not greatly enlarging the power of students in college and university governance, ranging from their evident immaturity to their impermanence, but none of these reasons has, oddly enough, seemed at all convincing to a widening range of students. Or rather, I shouldn't say none: I did have a girl stand up in one of my classes during a particularly tense period of a student strike and say, "I think that we students ought to be willing to obey all the rules out of simple gratitude for being permitted to attend such a great university." The rest of the class was so stunned that they simply gawked at her in silence. As they say, it takes all kinds, including those who act exactly as their elders claim they ought to act.

But the more aggressive, demanding, assertive, headline-grabbing segment of the student culture and a pretty sizable number of less militant but increasingly vocal students have made certain complaints famous, and particularly these:

1. The irrelevance of the curriculum, about which so much is being said in this conference. Though the chief meaning is of course irrelevance to the current political scene, irrelevance to other interests is also being increasingly cited. Of course there is nothing new in this. For instance, vocationally-oriented students have always complained about liberal arts courses as not having anything to do with preparing them to practice their particular trade. I shall never forget the time when the dean of a law school prevailed upon me to come over and offer a course in straight, unadulterated formal logic to second year students. It took me weeks to thaw out that classroom, such was the utterly frozen reception to anything so distant to their chosen profession. But today I fancy I see a broadening of this attitude so that students are unusually prone to complain about a course for not being tailored to their particular interests, even though their interests may be by no means especially vocational. Perhaps because the longer I live the more I am impressed with the ways in which everything appears relevant to everything, I confess to little

patience with this point of view, but at least the charge requires us to rethink our course content for whatever is there from sheer habit, and to remember that the heroic rebels of our own college days are likely to seem tame and old-fashioned to today's youth. The poetry of Eliot, Yeats, and Auden; the novels of Faulkner, Hemingway, and Camus; the philosophy of Bertrand Russell, Santayana, and Bergson; the social protests of Tawney, Beard, and Veblen are likely to seem as quaint to a twenty-year-old today as Browning and Henry George did to me as an undergraduate. Even Dylan Thomas died when the class of 1972 was getting out of diapers.

2. But closely allied to the charge of irrelevance is the objection to requirements. Again, no one is going to pretend that students haven't always complained about requirements, but only as one complains about having to get up in the morning or pay the milk bill. Now, though, students are up in arms about requirements for being insensitive in their universality and because they are a prime evidence of bureaucratic paternalism. The word I increasingly hear is "trust." "The desirable thing," I am told, "is a condition of trust between professor and student, so that together they can decide what the student needs, what he should read, how he should broaden or deepen his studies, what courses he should elect, and what papers he might write." To say that *all* students should take "History of Western Civilization" is crassly insensitive to student differences; to decide in advance what term paper topics are germane to a course is pure authoritarianism. Rather let a student and the professor he has found to be *simpático* work these things out together: then and only then will busy work be transcended and meaningfulness attained.

As a result of such thinking, I am ready to predict that we are in for a massive attack on general education requirements every bit as vigorous as that now being directed at conventional admissions standards of kinds that tend to exclude blacks and Hispano-Americans. (Incidentally, the rivalry between these two groups in my area has become intense. One of the few times in recent memory that I have seen an articulate black student stumped was an occasion in which a Mexican-American blurted out in a meeting to a fellow student, "Yes, that's just the trouble with you Anglos. . . ." Somehow she had never before thought of herself as a full-fledged member of the oppressive majority of Anglos, and she was reduced for a time to meditative silence.) Anyway, this assault on requirements may well be overdue. Certain it is that faculties have very seldom brought students into the decision-making process when require-

ments are being scrutinized. And I take it as equally certain that a very large amount of the courses taken because they are required are as wasted upon current students as about three fourths of the "breadth requirements" of my university were wasted upon me. Yet, I would register the hope that ways will be discovered of persuading students not to form the rigid habit of quick and categorical decisions as to what is irrelevant and is therefore illegitimately required. Surely one of the great educational virtues is a certain willingness to be surprised, to be shown that what one had been inclined to dismiss out of hand has a charm and a significance. In a rather large number of years with "great books" courses, I have heard an impressive body of testimonials that books which, but for their appearing on the list, would have been shunned as dull or alien, turned out to be the ones that made a difference.

Now, if requirements are increasingly under attack, grading is perhaps even more so, and here again I share the student complaint that an atmosphere of grading tends to poison faculty-student relations. But of course the big question is: how *do* you provide appraisal which *seems* a necessity in the present economy—that is, assuming that we cannot afford to hold college places for students who are drifting or for some reason simply not achieving academic goals. Even more important, I should think, is appraisal for the sake of guiding the learning process. Now some of the students seem to me to be admitting the necessity of appraisal, but eager to find more sensitive means than the ones now usually practiced, but there is a more extreme position, as taken by a student who when he complained to me about grading, elicited the suggestions that maybe after all it would be better, so far as further school and job place is concerned, to rely upon letters of recommendation rather than a gpa. But this suggestion was found to be no improvement: as he pointed out to me, *any* sort of "sitting in judgment" on the part of the professor is intolerable. Only when the professor has become a non-judgmental associate can he teach. Possibly so, but is this not simply to transfer the judging to another locus, as in the case of the British penchant for external examiners?

In any case, this resentment of professorial evaluation appears to be part of a growing factionalization of student groups which I regard as especially alarming for reasons not unlike those which James Madison spoke of in the Federalist Papers. By their very nature factions are relatively hardened groupings, and as such make for mutual suspicions and misunderstandings and for the difficulty of genuine communication. One student recently said to me, "You know, as soon as I walk into a classroom I sense that I am at a disadvantage viz-a-viz the professor." It

was only some time later that that word "disadvantage" began to weigh upon me. It seemed more appropriate to a collective bargaining session or a battle than to a learning situation, and yet I cannot dismiss his remark as absurd, both because of my belief that professors are much more inclined than is usually thought or admitted, to indulge in at least minor tyrannies with their students, and that students are increasingly sensitive to "put-downs" and less and less likely to accept them as the price of a college education. This is an unpleasant topic but I know not how to ignore it.

But students are making us aware of other kinds of put-downs too, some of them gratuitous, however much they might have, through long custom, become hard to recognize in oneself. One that interests me particularly is what might be called the "lack-of-rigor put-down." Joseph Katz has described this very well: "The adolescent," he says

> likes to work with great ideas, comprehensive in scope, and his ideas are closely related to his own emotions, confusions, and gropings.
>
> He uses ideas both as a guide out of his confusion and as a way to savor ideationally what he cannot yet experience emotionally, sensually, or in relations with other people.

But

> The professor is aghast at the inaccuracies, grandiosities, vaguenesses, confusions and emotionalities of the student's ideational production.
>
> He wishes to clamp down almost immediately and give the student a sense of what cool, detached, accurate, scientific investigation is like, whether in history, literary criticism or in physics.
>
> The student can conform if he must, because his previous training has already taught him what the coin of the realm is. But it is not what he likes to do, and he gets the sense that his own ideational products are unworthy. He feels humiliated and inept.

But let me turn finally to another turn of events in contemporary higher education, one that has, as yet, received surprisingly little attention. It is now commonplace to remark upon the unusual number of student activists on our campuses, but what has too often eluded our observation is that students are increasingly coming to think of their real education as *being* that activism. Here there is a challenge to a value as deeply grained in college mores as academic freedom: namely the *detachment* of the scholar. Of course we can and must study controversy;

upon occasion we may find it necessary to put aside our books and engage in a demonstration or an election, but, as we are careful to point out, this in our role as citizen, not as professor. Just as the artist or the spectator of art is said to require a certain psychic distance from the sphere of human emotions and practical beliefs, in order to gain the prize of aesthetic appreciation, so too the scholar must be above the fray, or lose the name of scholar.

This detachment has of course through the centuries made the scholar the butt of non-academic satires and disparagements: thus, those distant scholars Marx and Kierkegaard both had their bitter fun with professors, the former lampooning the poverty of philosophy, and offering his correction that the great job was not to understand the world, but to change it. Kierkegaard it was who spoke of the vast gulf that separates those who suffer from those who note that others suffer. But today we have not alone the phenomenon of students dropping out in order to be full-time activists—a decision that is still consistent with the sharp distinction between scholarship and political involvement—but more startlingly the phenomenon of students demanding academic credits for their participation in marches for peace or against poverty. They do not, of course, pretend that they are activists pure and simple, but "participant observers," the participation being essential to the kind of observation which they respect, in themselves and in their professors. On the contrary, I gather that nothing so infuriates the ordinary citizenry as the picture of a professor demonstrating, thus reducing himself to the level of the student demonstrator, both being thought to act in ways utterly inimical to the proper life of the scholar.

There is something about "objectivity" and "detachment" that many students today find infuriating. Particularly is this so when, as now regularly happens, sociologists and political scientists arrive on the scene of a demonstration only minutes behind the advance guard, already armed with questionnaires and interview schedules, to study the interesting phenomenon of student protest. Today we hear more and more about the *immorality* of such research, a charge as shocking as the claim that since active involvement is educative, it deserves full recognition as a step toward a degree. Which in turn is very nearly as shocking as the students' claim that if they are free to read *Soul on Ice*, they ought to be free to bring its author on campus and into the classroom as in his way he is an expert on black militancy. Here of course we will close ranks and demonstrate that the student has gone too far. Eldridge Cleaver is clearly not entitled to serve in *loco academicus*.

If there were time, I should like to go ahead to speak of other, rather

different kinds of educational change: it may be, for instance, that in the new technology of education, a revolution is brewing. It may be that the big move to individualized instruction so long heralded is now on the horizon. It is all but certain that courses will loosen and give way before the legions of the great god Flexibility. And much else.

What then of honors programs? Are they on their way to becoming as quaintly moribund as fraternities and undergraduate chastity? I do not pretend to know, but I sense that in some of the changes I have adumbrated, there lie serious challenges to honors programs as traditionally conceived. The most serious question, it seems to me, is that directed by or in behalf of ethnic minorities against grades and test scores as valid determiners of academic potentiality, and against any groups, however much they claim to be instances not of an aristocracy but a meritocracy which nevertheless tend very strongly toward *de facto* segregation. How seriously should we take those experimenters who tell us of the appalling tendency of groups of children to fulfill the prophecies implicit in their ability grouping, even when they have been secretly sorted according to a table of random numbers?

Could there be an honors activist program?—e.g., say

(1) a "course" not about but against poverty? (Cesar Chavez, in protesting the University of California's pulling back from the grape boycott, said the other day that the University ought not just study poverty but *do* something about it.)

or

(2) a "course" designed to design possibly fruitful campaigns to change public opinion about the war—e.g., coming to a willingness to lose face in order to achieve peace?

or

(3) a "course" intended to try everything possible to help *all* the children of an integrated first grade learn to read by the school year's end?

Incidentally, for at least the latter experiment it would be important to make sure there is a sizable black representation in the honors class itself, perhaps by admitting that none of the usual means of selection is "culture-free" and looking for far more subtle clues to exceptional if deeply latent ability.

Or is successful activism to be counted among the qualities which count when the next batch of honors students is to be selected? Or is honors to be the island of sanity in the turbulent seas of protest, a lay

monastery to which the future magister ludi may retreat for a serene and detached pursuit of scholarly goals? Shall we hold up the existence of honors as a living exposure of the mischievous lie of rampant egalitarianism? I can speak only for myself: and I don't know.

But what I fancy I do know is that honors programs, along with every other segment of higher education, must be pondered anew to determine whether there are sufficient self-corrective devices within their framework, whether there are adequate means of assisting students toward increasing independence of our bureaucracies, of getting—if necessary goading—them to think again of what they are after. But the goading is happening in the reverse direction in ways and to a degree probably unprecedented in the whole, long, mottled history of education. The students are forcing us to see racism where we had seen only high standards, to see tacit support of exploitation and militarism where we had seen only valuable support of research by industry and government, and to see shameful acquiescence in our society's decline and fall, where we had seen only a gratifying increase in affluence. "To live in the ethical is to commit oneself," Kierkegaard has told us. Our students seem to be saying to each of their teachers: "And how about you?"

CHAPTER 3

Conversation, Cooperation, and Community

JAMES H. ROBERTSON
University of Michigan

Although I am delighted to welcome the many faculty and administrators actively involved in honors programs, I am especially heartened by the lively presence at our meetings of honors students. Since they have a direct interest in the quality and shape of their education, it is not only appropriate but necessary that they be active partners in our discussions. They are fully capable of speaking for themselves. To them our warm welcome.

The title of my remarks this morning—Conversation, Cooperation, and Community—is characterized by both alliteration and assonance. I hope the content will add poetic substance as well as poetic style. Professor Herbert Taylor, who follows me on this program, has hit on a new interpretation of the three R's in education—Rigor, Relevance, and Revolt. Quite independently, he and I have come up with three R's and three C's. From my present perspective as Director of the Residential College at the University of Michigan, these three R's and C's are immediately translatable into the Residential College to the third power.

It takes great restraint not to yield to this convenient invitation and to dwell on the Residential College as one promising experiment in the search for relevance in undergraduate education. Another powerful inducement is that the RC—the Residential College at Michigan—is extending the experience and techniques of honors courses and programs to non-honors students, "a consummation devoutly to be wished." If I were to describe our experimental program, I would tell you of the small freshman seminar, the critical scrutiny of primary materials, opportunities for independent study, comprehensive examinations, integrated courses, written evaluations in lieu of letter grades, informal meetings with faculty, student involvement in all aspects of college management. I would relate in heroic couplets the virtues of an intellectual and social

community of living and learning for a relatively small number of liberal arts undergraduates who are still members of the larger university at Ann Arbor. But for those of you hungry to know more of the philosophy and program of the Residential College, I refer you to our latest Announcement, copies of which I happened to bring along.

Rather than yield to the temptation to dwell on the specifics of one experimental approach, I want to talk about three essential characteristics that any educational change should have if it is to be more than a palliative or a shiny expedient. I believe that there are three major reasons why formal education, especially but not exclusively on large campuses, is failing to engage the hearts and minds of students. The first of these is a lack of opportunity for meaningful conversation in the best sense of the term. The second is an unhealthy emphasis on competition rather than cooperation in the teaching and learning process. And the third is a failure, especially in the liberal arts, to give students any sense that they really *belong* to an academic community and have any personal responsibility for making it work.

Curriculum committees rarely talk about achieving these needed qualitative changes in the climate of learning. Their agendas deal with such matters as reshuffling credit hours for the degree, the foreign language requirement, science for non-science students, compulsory physical education, and perhaps cautious ventures into pass-fail options for selected juniors and seniors. Student demands for participatory democracy and academic reform stem from, but rarely recognize, the basic causes for alienation from learning. Their vocal challenges, protests, demands are chiefly reactions against the existing order and provide no discernible constructive program for improvement. Their most commonly heard complaint, and the most scathing, is that we and our courses are out of touch, are irrelevant. Irrelevant to what, is not clear. Their yearning is for viability, credibility, charisma, and Relevance.

These criticisms and desires well up from deeply felt frustrations and impatience. But few students stand still long enough to analyze them and define them. As a consequence, the noise level has risen steadily on campuses all over the country. Until both we and our students address ourselves to the hidden agenda underlying significant educational reform, we will continue to engage in skirmishes, improvise concessions, and live with uneasy truces.

A long time ago when I was young and the world was beautifully simple, one of my old professors—he was over thirty—happened to say that in his judgment the high water mark of a civilized, educated society was the simple fact of two people engaged in conversation. The signif-

icance of this statement, as I am sure you perceive, lies in the full meaning of "conversation." As he used the term the professor meant having something to say, a desire to test it out on another human being, a willingness to listen, to reflect, and to learn, and the courage to reveal one's doubts, uncertainties, and ignorance. It is not aimed at impressing or persuading. In short, conversation is a verbal bridge that arches over the separateness of individuals and recognizes not only the unique human qualities of reason and imagination but also that each person matters. A conversation can be the most effective, the most relevant form of mutual education since it demands the full engagement of the minds and hearts of the two participants. To bring it off, there must be humility and mutual respect of the individuals engaged.

Although conversation is usually a one-to-one encounter, I have heard skilled humane lecturers have a conversation with a class. Also frequent conversations occur between a reader and an author—not authors of textbooks, or syllabi, or footnoted scholarly articles, but authors who reveal themselves and share their insights, values, and uncertainties. These human break-throughs can occur in unexpected places, but they happen most frequently in poetry, literature, philosophy, music, and the arts.

Meaningful conversations are increasingly rare in our society and in our colleges and universities addicted to noise, numbers, and knowledge. Nevertheless, they need to be at the heart of any educating experience if students are to be not merely degree holders but informed and transformed men and women. Opportunity for conversation is desperately needed in any academic community if teachers and students are to have time to explain themselves, to ask questions, to listen to answers, and to make learning and teaching personally relevant and rewarding.

The second hidden agenda topic is how to minimize unhealthy competition in seeking the quantitative rewards for good scholarship rather than the pleasure in learning for its own sake. How can the learning experience become a cooperative sharing instead of a competitive struggle for grades?

By the time students graduate from high school they have had a long exposure to structured, supervised study. Teachers and parents have sensitized students to the reward and punishment of grades. Honors, privileges, status, college admission are all contingent on test scores and rank in high school class. It is little wonder that students quickly develop a sharp eye for what teachers want on quizzes and examinations. Competition among peers is not for new insights but for grades. Since the teachers are the first dispensers of the status symbols, it is exceedingly risky to challenge such authority by asking questions or giving off-beat

answers. As a consequence, there is relatively little joy in learning for its own sake or for viewing the teacher as a knowledgeable, wiser, more experienced partner in discovery.

Despite the springing hope that things will be different in college, freshmen find the same pattern of reward and punishment persisting on university and college campuses. Perhaps it is partly their own fault since no one prohibits them from relishing ideas or from pursuing their awakening interests. But they would do so at considerable risk. If they stray too far off the established path, they may get penalized, admonished, or bounced. Although professors and deans may talk about the excitement of ideas and the importance of individual growth, the coin of the realm is still grades, requirements, credits, and normal progress toward the degree. Comparisons of status are still measured in quantitative terms. Because of competitive jockeyings for places in graduate and professional schools, there is little incentive for students to share their knowledge or insights with their peers. More unfortunate is the infrequent encouragement to work with teachers, rather than for them. It is no wonder that students become disillusioned and frustrated when survival and narrow self-interest force them either to conform or secede. Instead of discovering partners among their peers or their teachers, many students become either academic chameleons or cynical manipulators of the system.

The third dimension for any meaningful curricular reform is to develop a sense of community in which each individual has a stake. On most campuses, students and faculty alike are trapped in a closed, bureaucratic universe. No one seems to know who set the machinery in motion or who controls it. Self-respecting individuals cannot develop any sense of loyalty to a faceless, unresponsive system. The inertial drag of bigness and the inexorable pressures to conform, effectively blunt any effort to change or humanize the relationships to students and faculty. It is little wonder that the individual has little sense of personal responsibility for the welfare of the campus community. Who cares what he does or does not do?

Have our present efforts at educational reform taken into account the legitimate expectations of students that they be taken seriously, preferably as individuals, but certainly as human beings? Are we really aiming at encouraging questions even in our honors courses and programs? Can we extend an open invitation to mutual engagement in conversation? Unless we help create a climate in which conversation can flourish, confrontation or conformity will continue to characterize our campuses. When nobody listens, you sigh or you shout.

Transformation of the educational experience so that it will provide

conversation, cooperation, and community will not result from mere reorganization or creation of new courses or programs. Major, complex campuses need to give serious thought to the desirability of regrouping into smaller sub-communities as one promising antidote to sheer size. Both large and small institutions need to give more than lip service to the concept of the partnership in learning. Teaching and learning are intertwined processes of "becoming." They do not imply a master-apprentice relationship. Rather, a good teacher like a good poet is actively engaged in a creative act which he willingly shares with his students. In short, significant educational reform will come only through imaginative, courageous restructuring of the institutional and the learning relationship. Tinkering with the machinery or installation of safety valves are both inadequate and irrelevant.

Expensive, unrealistic, visionary? Admittedly so, but these are the times which cry out, not for the administrative engineer, but for the educational poet.

CHAPTER 4

Rigor, Relevance, and Revolt

H. C. TAYLOR, JR.
Western Washington State College

Heisenberg, that gloomy priest of the Higher Inexactitude, has laid it down that it is impossible to make an exact and simultaneous determination of both the position and momentum of any body. The more exactly the one is determined, the less exactly may the other be measured. It is remarkably tempting to open this talk by proclaiming a comparable Uncertainty Principle in judging the worth of a curricular offering, i.e., "the more rigorously we may assess the effects of a given course of study, the less relevant will that course of study be."

This is, of course, too patly put. If, however, we agree that the prime purpose of a liberal education is to illuminate the human condition for the undergraduate, it then follows that much of the curriculum wherein learning and understanding may be empirically tested (such as a course in computer programming, or a course in inorganic chemistry, or a course in printing) would not be deemed by most educators as nearly so "relevant" as a course in twentieth century literature, or a course in existentialist philosophy, or a course in post-Keynesian and post-Marxian economics. This Hobson's choice between rigor and relevance is, of course, not a dilemma peculiar to designers of undergraduate curricula—it afflicts the experimental psychologist at least as severely, the white rat for rigor and the impossibly variable human for relevance.

However, the problem of rigor-relevance in collegiate instruction is enormously complicated by the fact that we do not know what is relevant, or, at least, there are wildly competing schools of relevancy. Thus the assessed formulation is reduced to "If we can rigorously measure the results, we know the course is not particularly relevant to an illumination of the human condition, but it does not follow that an absence of rigor produces such relevance."

In the nearly quarter century that has staggered past since our last pre-

atomic world war, there have been claims mounting to a clamor that much of the allegedly higher learning is irrelevant to the needs of the modern college student.

Now, let us make a beginning by admitting that the very term *relevance* has become perilously close to a juju word. It is in danger of being about as meaningful as the term *meaningful* in pedagese. It is rare, in the last decade, that one hurling the charge of irrelevance at embattled academia has troubled to say "relevant to what." I trust we all remember the teachings of the sainted Albert well enough to realize that the term *relevant* is relative and, therefore, requires a referent point.

If we assume that all of the critics mean by relevance that the curriculum be germane to the needs of contemporary society, then it must be admitted straight off that a baccalaureate education has never been completely or even largely relevant from the time of the founding of the universities of Padua and Bologna until the present day. Moreover, it seems to have been forgotten by the overwhelming majority of modern critics that universities have always lacked such contemporaneity, but they have in fact historically served as redoubts in defense of the older educational dispensation and in opposition to the new. Have we so easily forgotten, for example, that the great nineteenth century revolution in science occurred outside university walls, in the main, and that such a figure as Darwin assiduously avoided contact with the citadels of the higher education on the grounds that they were both ascientific and anti-scientific. However, the fact that we academics have heretofore offered a partially or largely irrelevant curriculum does not, of itself, justify our continuing to be irrelevant. Let us assume, for the nonce, curricular relevance to be a good thing, that we have far too little of this commodity, and that we want to obtain more. *What must we do to be saved?*

We might begin by taking heed of our critics. At my own college, Western Washington, as at others, critics demanding greater relevance tend to fall in three quite disparate groups:

(1) Those demanding greater relevance to the needs of the technologico-industrial world;

(2) Those demanding greater ideological relevance and, hence, a curriculum designed to lead to an understanding and alleviation of contemporary social ills;

(3) Special groups who insist that the curriculum is not designed for their particular need.

The third or special group category is, I think, the easiest to consider.

In the past decade Western has spawned a whole clutch of special curricular programs, usually financed in whole or in part by private foundation and/or federal funds. These range from an honors program to a program for the collegiate training of the socio-culturally disadvantaged to several programs for the training of teachers of the socio-culturally disadvantaged. Each set has in its turn caused modifications in the curriculum and has demanded more. As one example, I would single out the Black Student Union. The county in which my college is located has virtually no Black population save for a few faculty members. The Blacks on campus are overwhelmingly the product of an Upward Bound program plus special tutorial programs that the college has launched. *Inter alia*, the student critics within the Black Student Union have claimed that the curriculum is designed by and for upper-middle class White Americans. More particularly, they contend that what we are pleased to call world history is in fact Western-European history, what we are pleased to call world literature is Anglo-American literature with excursions into nineteenth century French and Russian works; that it is not possible for a Black on Western's campus to study the history of Africa South of the Sahara or Black American music or Black American poetry or the sociology of race relations from a Black point of view.

I think it would be idle and fatuous to deny these charges. We have not only been ethnocentric in our presentation of the humanities, but we have proceeded from a relatively narrow social class base as well. Furthermore, these demands can, in the main, be easily met and we are in process of meeting them. Our curriculum, our faculty, and our student body will be the richer for it. It should be noted, however, that not all colleges and universities are going to be able to offer curricula designed to meet the legitimate needs of all special groups. Probably planning on a regional basis rather than a parochial one is required.

Of the three groups crying "irrelevance," there can be no doubt that those who argue for greater relevance to the technologico-industrial complex have been, in the past quarter century, by all odds, the most successful in altering the curricula. As with most small- to medium-sized liberal arts colleges of its type, in the years immediately following World War II, Western provided a minimal amount of scientific instruction—a minimum sufficient to introduce each student to a bunsen burner, a retort, a deceased frog, and little else. All of the physical and biological sciences were housed in one department called the Science Department and their few majors were only brought to sufficient sophistication inadequately to instruct junior high school and high school students. Over the past two decades our science departments have grown about four times

as fast as the college generally in terms of faculty and about five times as fast in terms of funding. Further, it is quite apparent that if we are to continue to stay abreast, let alone make further advances, an even larger share of our faculty and of our finances will have to go to these areas. The amount of money available from federal and private foundations for scientific equipment, research, and curricular improvement has poured in vastly more rapidly than has money for the humanities and the arts. Hence the normal curriculum at Western contains much more of science and much less of letters than it did a generation ago. It is very difficult to see how we can meet the demands for relevance to the technologico-industrial world and simultaneously meet the demands for relevance from group number two, the ideologically committed.

The vast majority of our critics among the ideologically committed belong to the New Left, though two caveats should be voiced here. First, the New Left turns out in practice, on our campus and others, to be a marvelously amorphous group in espousing a wide variety of causes to be approached by an even wider variety of methods. Secondly, it should be noted that a small number of the ideological critics are drawn from the ranks of the rabid Right. It is not, therefore, possible to present any one set of criticisms from the ideologically committed and say that this represents the totality. However, after lengthy observation and conversations with a number of students from the New Left—and with the aid of Dr. Bernard Weiner, the coordinator of the Northwest Free University—I offer the following as a fair representation of the main thrust of the criticisms:

(1) That the Higher Learning in America has become, in the main unwittingly, an ancillary of the technological-military complex of this nation and that curriculum and research have altered direction accordingly;

(2) That even that portion of our curriculum which has remained humanist in orientation is hopelessly out-of-date. In fact there is a tendency for the critic to use the word *academic* as synonymous with obsolescence. Hence they make a distinction between academic poetry and poetry, academic poetry being that from the past, and that poetry and criticism written today by academics for their fellow academics as distinguished from poetry that has got the future in its teeth—it is not taught.

(3) As an immediate outgrowth of points (1) and (2), these critics insist that courses which obviously should be taught simply do not get

included. Thus, for example, at Western we have never offered a course in existential philosophy nor have we offered one in Marxist political science. Our sociologists, political scientists, and historians are much more adept in dealing with nineteenth century revolutionary trends than they are with late twentieth century revolutionary trends.

Students of college catalogs and habitués of faculty curriculum committees will, I think, in conscience have to admit that much of the foregoing is true. However, when the student rebels are asked how we set about building a New Jerusalem in academia's Ivory Tower, their solutions are wondrously varied. At one extreme there are those who think it will be necessary to burn down the physical plant and destroy the power of present administrators and faculty before much of utility can be accomplished. None of these critics seems to have any very clear idea what means they would have to rebuild physically and intellectually or how to set about doing it. Some small number are convinced that the free universities now springing up on so many campuses, including our own, will themselves produce the requisite change. The vast majority, however, want student power. More specifically, they want student representation on curricular committees, on the board of trustees, on tenure and promotion committees, and the like.

I need scarcely remind the historians in the audience that these prerogatives and more were traditionally enjoyed by students at the great medieval universities and I think it no exaggeration to say that student voice in matters curricular has been less powerful in twentieth century academia than at any time in the past and that American students have exercised less curricular power than have those in other countries.

I think that all of us recognize that the vast emphasis upon disciplinary as distinguished from collegiate responsibility in the last few decades has tended enormously to increase the power of the faculty and to decrease the voice of trustees, administrators, and students in the determination of curriculum. Many of these changes were and are inevitable; some, I think, were quite beneficial to the cause of higher education. But I can see little excuse for excluding students from curricular decision-making processes.

Faculty have, or should have, much to learn from students. Our present insularity prevents us from realizing when a course has become outdated, or individual instructor boring, or learning of a student lust for knowledge in a new direction.

Secondly, I think all of us recognize that many of the demands made by student critics are unreasonable at best, utopian at worst, and are not

attainable with present funds and present knowledge. However, until the students become part of the decision-making apparatus, it is hopeless to assume that they will become sufficiently sophisticated to distinguish between the attainable and the unattainable at any given point in curricular time.

Finally, the nature of the life process has laid it down that the students, and not the faculty Establishment, shall govern tomorrow. Students and faculty alike have gone far in the past decade toward destroying that trust, that social contract which must obtain in academia if our work is to be done. The trust which has to exist between the teacher and the taught. Should this rift continue to widen, become a chasm and latterly a gulf, at best it will take generations to repair, at worst it might destroy the higher education process as we know it. I am not at all certain of the validity of many of the specific proposals for change put forward by this generation of students. Also, I am not at all certain of my ability to judge. I am certain that I and my faculty generation should not judge unilaterally. Academia rests upon Reason and Reason demands rather more of dialogue and rather less of authority. Placing students upon salient academic decision-making bodies is a first and vital step toward such reasoned dialogue.

CHAPTER 5

Responses from the Conference

This chapter presents the responses made by Professor Harold Hantz, Professor Joseph Cohen and by various delegates to the papers delivered by Dean James Robertson, Professor Herbert Taylor, and a summary of student-initiated courses at the University of Iowa given by Dean Philip Hubbard.

The first response was made by Professor Hantz from the University of Arkansas. Here are his comments:

Dean Robertson's three "C's"—Conversation, Cooperation, and Community—offer a theme which runs through the comments of all the speakers. The theme is played in somewhat different keys, as it must be, because of the widely differing characters of their institutions. It is a theme which deserves applause and can be recommended for any institution. But I should not be so rhapsodic about the general theme as to soar uncritically. A few notes require more detailed attention.

One of the most distinctive notes in Dean Robertson's remarks is the reduction of the competitive attitude in our institutions in order to foster constructive cooperation. Students come to the university conditioned by family and society to compete. We reinforce the conditioning through grades, publication of Deans' lists, preparation for graduate school, and even honors programs. Learning becomes instrumental to jobs and status. The notion that the life of the mind and the development of the sensibilities might be ends in themselves, something to be lived and enjoyed as each can develop his talents through shared experience with others, is lost in the pressures to mold the young to fit into the established order of business, the professions, and the academic world. Dean Robertson rightfully urges us to reverse this trend. But shall we?

All speakers emphasize the importance of community, and Professor Taylor appropriately concludes on the somber note that if the sense of community in the university is lost, the institution will perish. In the past we may have romanticized the notion that the university is a community of scholars and students engaged in the disinterested pursuit of

truth. But if the fact of community has been exaggerated, the ideal of community for the pursuit of truth no matter where the pursuit may lead is still unimpeachable.

All speakers laud conversation. So do I. But no one quite suggests how conversation can be achieved with many militant students. Perhaps no one can. My own experience has been discouraging. I had thought that conversation, dialogue, the possibility that evidence might change one's mind—all are two-way streets. I have run into monologue, diatribe, and the assumption of absolute truth. I must say that conversation under these conditions is rather difficult. With some students it is frankly impossible. What does one do under these circumstances?

Professor Taylor further concludes commendably that "placing students upon salient academic decision-making bodies is a first and vital step toward . . . reasoned dialogue." The second step, however, without which the first is meaningless, was not mentioned. The second is participation. I have been one of the strongest advocates on our campus of student participation, but I am disillusioned over the results. One instance will indicate the reason, but it is by no means isolated. This past summer a committee was appointed to examine thoroughly the basic and general-education curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences for the purpose of recommending desired changes. I wish you would attend to the composition of the committee—eleven students, ten faculty members, an associate dean, and the Dean of the College. The committee met seven times during the summer with heavy work between some sessions. At the first meeting nine students attended, truly encouraging. Thereafter the average student attendance was two. One student attended all meetings. Her contributions were superb. But what of the others? From the complaints about curricular matters by students one might have supposed that the charge to this committee was of more than passing importance to them. But was it really when the time came for the grubby work beyond the clamor? Critical to the process of student participation is finding students who will participate. Without participation, placing students on decision-making bodies is a charade. The problems, however, are too serious for playing parlor games.

Finally, the Iowa experiment with student-initiated courses is indeed interesting. I hope Dean Hubbard understands the spirit in which this sympathetic criticism is offered. Are these courses anything more than an appendage to the main body of the university? In what way do they really restructure the university if restructuring is needed? Are they anything more than pacifiers to the militants? Of course, if they do pacify, perhaps pacification is sufficient justification for their existence.

Professor Joseph Cohen from Tulane University made the following response to the delivered papers:

We have heard this morning about the three C's: Conversation, Cooperation, and Community; and the three R's: Rigor, Relevance, and Revolt. Perhaps our purpose and our theme here this morning is to articulate, acquire, and activate, or, to put it more simply, to talk, take, and try. In any case, maybe our real letters ought to be SDS, because it seems to me that people who have identified themselves with honors programming have long been dissenters and have been willing to do something about their dissent. They have tended to be "radical" in showing a distrust of the status quo, and by that I mean distrust of the distribution requirements. They have constantly needled faculty and administrators. They have tried to do away with grades and have supported pass-fail systems and that kind of thing. They've been regarded by their colleagues as being involved in intrigue and have been surrounded by suspicion. They have wanted to take over offices and classrooms and buildings to get space for honors programs, and they have sometimes used guerrilla tactics to accomplish their goals. We all may be placed under arrest at any moment!

The point that I want to come to is simply this, that people in honors programming have recognized for a long time that there is a need to restructure and to make the curriculum and other aspects of life in the university more relevant to the lives of students. There has long been a willingness on the part of honors people to develop a kind of qualitative thrust in behalf of properly prepared, properly motivated students. This thrust has been vertical. I suggest that what we need to do now is to take this experience and the structures that we have created in honors programming and develop them in a horizontal way, in a kind of quantitative thrust. We need to find ways of using the honors experience to reach more of our students. Many of them are better prepared today, many are interested in what's happening to them in college, many of them want to know what their role is now and what it will be in the future. We heard this morning how the independent study approach has become a very useful mechanism in this regard. There are others as well. We know that honors people have long been interested in eyeball-to-eyeball dialogue, and we need to find ways of implementing more conversation and keeping the dialogue going.

Another point that I would make in respect to the discussions this morning is that while we want to have a new mix in the curriculum we must be careful to remember the university's fundamental purpose. I am reminded of remarks that Dr. Roger Heyns made at an American Coun-

cil on Education meeting in New Orleans several years ago when he pointed out that the university is not a microcosm of that larger entity the state, that it is not an arena for combat between students, faculty and administrators, that it is not an extension of other institutions such as the home and the church, though parts of these are found in it, and that it is not a vehicle for direct social action. Yes, certainly social action should come out of much of what happens in the university experience. But the university itself may lose its direction and its purpose if it does not remember that, more than anything else, Dr. Heyns said, it is a center of learning. Remembering this, we do need to think in terms of involving students more directly in decision making and policy planning. Like Dr. Hantz, I, too, have been interested in involving students, but my experience has been somewhat analagous to his in one respect: students are interested in achieving power positions, but once they have them they do not always see the importance of following through on committee assignments. If there is one thing I think they do learn fast it is that restructuring curriculum even to a small degree is difficult, time consuming, and very hard work. Just as we have an obligation to use our honors experience for broader segments of the student body, so it has an obligation to us to cooperate responsibly.

The following is a slightly edited version of the responses from the floor:

Let me introduce myself first. *Dick Allen,* University of Colorado. You gentlemen have all been addressing yourselves to the overall question of university reform. I would like to ask you about the graduate school. Is the graduate school, are today's leading graduate schools, putting out into the field the kinds of men and women whom you really want in the colleges and universities, who will implement university and educational reform?

Dean Hubbard: It is my pleasant task each year to help in selecting the Danforth Fellows for graduate fellowships and in this I see the delightful people who can be produced from these educational institutions, to meet with them and find out. I think you are right. We don't produce nearly enough of the kind of people who are interested and willing to see if their competence is at stake. They are more interested and willing to enter into direct dialogue with the students and to exchange ideas not necessarily as the master and the completely innocent recipient. I think that many of the changes which are being insisted upon by students will result in this and I certainly sympathize with Professor Cohen when he says that the institutions are in danger of losing their direction and pur-

pose. But if you listen to what the students are saying they're saying that is precisely what it should do. It's been going in the wrong direction and it's serving the wrong purposes. I'm not saying that the students are right but this is the question. One group says, "Take it easy. You're causing me to lose my direction." The other one says, "You're jolly well right I'm causing you to lose your direction. You're going in the wrong direction." I think you're right. Are our graduate schools pursuing this? It seems that what we have is a very professionally oriented faculty. Their rewards are determined by their status in a national profession . . . of their peers. We have a career-minded student body. They are interested in how they can fit in to the pattern as it now exists and these two groups really get on together quite well. The graduate students are very happy with the way the institutions are and they just want to be left alone while they go ahead and are prepared.

I want to address this again to Dean Hubbard. I'm *Frances Dart*, Director of the Honors College at the University of Oregon. I must start by saying that at the University of Oregon we also have a system of student-initiated courses which are very similar in operation and concept and subject matter to those that you describe. And it seems to me that there is involved in this a kind of betrayal of the very students who are the most active, in a sense the best hope for a constructive kind of revolution. I think there's a betrayal in this sense and I want to ask you to comment on this. The students don't very often ask what things should be relevant to. And I notice our program doesn't state nor ask that question either, although some or most of you speakers have commented on that. But this is crucial. Relevant to getting a degree is not the same thing as relevant to participating in public life, etc., etc. And I think what the students and what we understand by relevance is something that goes outside of the university. And now it's my feeling that the effect of what these new courses are in fact doing is to restructure a college or a university into a new kind of professional school. It tends to say, "Here's a course whereby we'll become specialists in Viet Nam history or specialists in drugs or specialists in whatever."

Hubbard: They are not becoming involved. Now I'm not sure why. You'll recognize that the emphasis the national government has put upon its educational assistance for the past generation has emphasized the sciences . . . and there has been a great deal of freedom developed and they have expanded tremendously. A student in those areas can hardly fail to feel challenged. But in the applied sciences, in our College of En-

gineering, our College of Medicine, our College of Dentistry, all of these are making very fundamental changes in their curricula and making it possible for the student after his period of learning the techniques of analysis, criticism and gaining some sense of history, giving him the opportunity to apply this, to the engineers on problems which come from industry and government and other places where their talents are needed. Our medical students are working with the faculty to set up a clinic in a nearby community where they have a large number of migrant agricultural workers. The College of Dentistry is very much interested in community dentistry in which they take their services to the community without regard to the usual method of practice but rather on the basis of what's needed there. So then our applied scientists are becoming greatly involved, the basic scientists very little. Now, I think with reference to your central point that the students who participate in these programs feel that they are exercising an influence. The faculty who are in them are never the same afterwards. And when they go into their faculty meetings the discussions are quite different. The discussions that we have at the deans' level have become quite different. Some of these things which were put in as totally unapproved and perhaps opposed to the experiments have gained legitimacy now and we no longer ask should we do them but how much should we permit them to expand. So fundamental changes are taking place, but I don't think that we've revolutionized the institution yet.

Woman's voice: . . . direct a question to Mr. Cohen, who made a remark at the end of his statement about the university not being a vehicle of direct social action. I think the problem that comes in here is that it's once again a question of relevance and where you're going. The student today still looks at the university as an intellectual community, some place where he is undertaking and learning ideas. But the student feels that these ideas themselves need to be relevant to the situations that we see in our own society and he tends to look at the university as isolating itself from the demands and questions which are so inherent in our own social framework, and I think the student in opposition is saying that he feels there needs to be some [meaning] in what he is learning, in what he is being taught, there needs to be some formulation for him to solve the problems in which he sees the community partaking. The university is so involved with just merely teaching you academic endeavors or learning literature of the past that it does not involve itself in what is going on today in American society or world society. I think this is what the student means when he says that [the

university] needs to involve itself in direct social action. I don't think he necessarily means that the university has to go out and, say, partake in a direct project, but it needs to prepare and make itself aware to the students that it understands what is going on in society today.

Cohen: I am in agreement and sympathetic with what you say. I think the real problem may be that we have not yet achieved a balance between the scholarly approach and direct involvement in various kinds of community action. Yes, certainly, anyone in a learning experience ought to get direct experience and the best way to do that is to consider, for example, a metropolitan community as a laboratory and go out and do research in it by participating in various forms of social action. The thing that disturbs me a little bit is that the participation oftentimes becomes the end in itself rather than the means to an end. What we need is a balance between analysis and synthesis. We are already involved in social action, we are already busy analyzing in the laboratory of the community. But if this is to have any value, we need time for reflection and synthesis. We must allow for the opportunity of drawing away from the action to get perspective, to cogitate and reflect on our analysis and reach conclusions which can then be used for the benefit of the community. Unless we have this opportunity to synthesize, the analysis, the direct social action, is irrelevant.

Unnamed Speaker: The young lady's concern, and part of the concern on the panel, is surely our confidence that these major social and political and economic problems of society will have to have an intellectual solution hammered out before an economic or political solution [can be] hammered out. There well may be an example that can be taken from law, which is one of my fields, where for years law schools felt that law was too important to our now-practicing lawyers to be involved in the curriculum of the law schools, and they simply taught the decisions of what judges had decided in the past. There's a serious effort now to try to predict legal problems in advance of their happening, to hammer out certain kinds of alternatives so that when the crisis does occur you have some preconceived intellectual solutions to fall back on. It may well be that this is the kind of direction we should go in with regard to some of the social science problems as well.

Richard Fontera, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee: Involved in this question is something that Mr. Cohen has got himself into, and this is very traditional and very lovely and very sad, and this is the idea

really that our concept of scholarship is as old as he alludes to it. We prepare, it seems to me, nobody of this society, whatever their function, if we define scholarship on the model of Erasmus. The trick is, or the difficulty is, and the demand for relevance really is, it seems to me, how do you attain analysis and synthesis not after withdrawing from the experience but while in the experience? And those particular experiments and disciplinary efforts which have achieved this are, interestingly enough, in the forefront of American intellectual life. They are really doing things, because they have the sense, and I would cite fields other than my own, other than genetics, they have a sense that when they come into the office on Monday morning it's quite possible that the entire field has been abolished over the weekend. And that theory and that sense can only be gained by the social theorist who is out there, and it can only be gained when this community to which reference is made is out there together. Now it is quite true that the graduate schools are not producing people who see themselves in a teaching-research combined action role, and actually, it seems to me, that this comment that was just made is a demand for a redefinition of reflection which is not the same as isolation. And until that is done, then it is quite appropriate, I might point out, for one of the commentators, in my view, when talking about students' willingness apparently to participate only two came after a while, to exact standards of group behavior in reference to students that is not exacted when in reference to faculty, because I know no faculty meetings in the United States that are universally crowded. It seems to me this arises directly from the fact of not learning the skills of synthesis and analysis within the group, and apparently believing that all formulations of committees and groups will serve new roles even when they are asked the same old questions. And that is where the collapse begins to take place. And it seems to me that really is part of this answer, that the academy which I belong to has to answer. Our scholarship itself does not have the methodological strands sufficient to fulfill this need, and the students are now beginning it. [This] seems to put on the pressure for the reconsideration of that methodology to the point where it might meet that demand. But we have to in honesty stand moot most of the time and say, "That's not what we do, that's not our bag. And since we run this system, it is our bag which is going to be relevant." That, it seems to me, is what is under attack.

Another Speaker: I think the fair comparison that should be made is between students' activities on such a committee and the faculty's actions

and attendance at a committee of similar importance, rather than a faculty meeting which tends to be rather humdrum, just like debates on the floor of Congress which tend to be much less important than committee work in Congress. I would like to address myself particularly to a couple of things that Mr. Hantz said. One of them concerns radical students and the establishment. It seems to me that the radical students recognize that all of these new courses which we're giving are in fact an effective way of defusing their radicalism, that one of the more effective devices we have for taking care of activists is to move it on to the domain of work so if we want to prevent them from throwing the Molotov cocktail, then we offer them a course in "Theory and History of Molotov Cocktails." So I suspect that many of these courses have just been introduced to get rid of ferment so we can go back to things as usual. They realize it. They realize that they're going to be in the situation that labor unions have come to. . . . And so that's why they're resisting. And they resist it by really refusing to talk to us.

The second point concerns student participation. It seems to me that one way in which we can overcome some of the problems of student participation is in finding the real student leaders and these are likely not to be the student government leaders. These are people who are after status or after prestige or who enjoy the political race, who by and large do not enjoy the business of governing and actually making real decisions. They like the situation in which their decisions don't count because they really can't be held responsible for anything. The problem is to find students who do not represent student thought but are in advance of it. The people who will become the natural leaders of tomorrow are not by and large the ones who assume great prominence in college. So the problem is, then, one of identifying people who are seriously concerned, who have real ideas and who are willing to work.

I'm *Warren Bragg* at the University of Georgia and I'm a student. That's the only thing I can say to recommend myself to this assembly. I think at least from what I've seen here we're addressing the wrong problem. First of all, we're not talking about course curriculum. This is not the problem. Curriculum is here as a vehicle for the faculty to express themselves to the students, unless I'm sadly mistaken. If you want to have a pass-fail course in your university go to a faculty member and say, "Look, give everybody an A or give everybody an F." You don't have to say let's have pass-fail. If you want to have a course relevant to today's society you don't go out there and say, "Here's a course on throwing Molotov cocktails." You go to your professor and he says, "All

right, the course says this is contemporary American history. All right, let's find out what's contemporary and let's talk about it." I don't think that you're going the right way in saying let's restructure the curriculum. Let's restructure this. Let's go back to the people that actually do it. Let's get down to the personal level where students want to operate, where they want to talk to the whole professor. Let's not hide behind a curriculum course or something like that. Let's get down to people and let's ask the faculty to come out and talk to us. I think this is one reason why at the University of Georgia we've been trying to get a faculty evaluation program, and I had one professor come to me and say, "Warren, can you expect to have thirty students evaluate me in one quarter?" And I said, "Sir, you evaluate thirty students in one quarter." "That's not the same." That's what I'd like to talk to you about: the value of getting students active in what's going on on campus, getting them to make decisions. I know administrators get upset with people because they don't come to committee meetings. But I don't think most of your students are geared to go to committee meetings and actually be a part of the bureaucratic structure of the university. They want to express their opinions, they want to participate in the decisions, they want to show what they can add to the university, but they're not there to go out and hand out lunch line tickets to people and things like that. That's not why they're at the university. And so I would say to people who say, "Why don't students involve themselves in the actual workings of the bureaucratic system?" to think about the fact that students, first of all, are not paid for that, they're not interested in that. What they're interested in is the final product. They want to contribute their ideas. They don't want to "manage the educational process." We're only going to be here four years. The first year you're not known, the second year you've finally built a reputation, the third year the faculty and administration see it, the fourth year you're here and you say something, and the next year you're gone and you're an alumnus and you support the institution. Fine.

Another Speaker: For the first time in a hundred years or more we're probably in the infant stages of adding a new function to the university. I believe that universities are becoming involved in action, mission-oriented, managerial functions, and I think we risk that hazard of blindness if we don't seriously consider important implications of this rule. Last spring I had the chance and privilege of attending the Harvard Conference in Texas. And, of course, you know why Harvard was in Texas. But that's beside the point. The important thing that came out

of this conference, to me, which I think has broad implications is that President Pusey enumerated in great detail the extent to which Harvard University—and, whatever our feelings may be individually, it has managed through the centuries to stay on the frontiers of leadership—has become committed and involved since 1950 in community action, mission-oriented, and managerial projects. As one concrete example, Harvard has been managing the City Hospital of the city of Cambridge at their request for the whole year. And I think that it is important for us, if we move into a new function for the university, that we keep straight the independence of research, the imparting of existing knowledge, the criticism of existing knowledge, and the independence of mission-oriented goals. But I think it is very dangerous for us to underrate the significance [in] the next hundred years of direct university involvement in community action.

Holt from the University of Wisconsin, Green Bay: I'd like to comment a little bit more on the student participation. But first I'd like to start out by saying I couldn't quite agree with Warren's assessment that students are just expressers of opinions and don't want to get involved in the business of running the university. I think it's dangerous of students to complain that they want to express opinions without showing a willingness to find out what they're expressing their opinions about. However, I'd like to comment on Mr. Hantz's comment on the student committee that he was involved in. I am involved in several university committees in the University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, and I know the problem he's talking about. It's there. It's hard to get students involved in university committees. It's hard to get them to come to meetings. But I would suggest that possibly the reason for this is more likely the fact that (1) they don't really know what's going on, (2) after years of not being allowed to have their say they are now being told to come out and tell us what you want done, tell us what your opinions are and, frankly, many of them don't believe it. They don't believe they're going to be listened to. I think this is the problem. And since there's a push all over this country in colleges and universities for students to have a say in the running of the university I think it's very dangerous if universities on the basis of a limited experience decide they aren't really interested in the first place.

Hubbard: Several people now have commented on the persistence of students once they are involved in the decision-making process. We have put students on most of our university committees with mixed results,

and I'd like to call to your attention some comments which were made by Sir Eric Ashby, who is Master of Clare College and this year the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge. He was in this country last year. He spent quite a bit of time at Michigan State and he's an outstanding educator and he has many publications to attest to this. And he made an observation recently published in the London *Times* that perhaps we're doing the wrong thing by involving students in the decision-making process, that perhaps we're deradicalizing them. . . . This is not our intent. In fact, if we do that we have failed, and he suggested that perhaps the thing to do is to simply improve the means of communication between the students and the faculty and administration so that they can exercise an adequate voice but not necessarily to involve them in the decision-making process, because this is an awfully conservative, conservatising—I'm using Wallace's words—influence. And then, with reference to relevance, what is the relevance of what we're doing? I'd like to call your attention to some studies which are being made by the American College Testing Service. They not only administer tests but they do a great deal of research to see what is the significance of all these evaluations and they have investigated the correlation between what a student does after he graduates and how the faculty evaluated him in college. The correlation between the grades in college and the measures of their subsequent success whether in terms of income or evaluation by their peers is . . . virtually zero.

Burnham Terrell, University of Minnesota: I think as lunchtime approaches it might be appropriate to suggest that at least a part of the solution to the kind of problems that we've been discussing would consist in faculty members' forgetting, on some occasions, at least, that they are faculty members and scholars. Nobody's going to eat lunch worrying about what he'll learn from that experience, what analysis or synthesis he can develop from it. It seems to me there is much in our lives that could be approached in the same spirit, including social and political action. I can recall some fairly meaningful conversations with members of the student body, one of them held in the headquarters of the State Central Committee of the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party, in which the students participated and one of them was the chairman of the county organization, and the subject matter was whether or not an endorsement should be given to a certain member of the history department. None of the participants in this discussion were regarding themselves in the conversation as law students, professors of philosophy, or professors of history. I think the comment the student from Georgia made about the

whole person being important is lost, all that about curriculum, analysis and synthesis, the relevance of direct social action to the academic enterprise. Why not live a little and forget that we're engaged in an academic enterprise and remember that we are also engaged in many other enterprises which may or may not be relevant to our academic interest. They can be made so. Some rather remarkable episodes can be the subject of analysis and synthesis. I happened to be arrested myself last spring on a rather peculiar charge—violating a Minneapolis municipal ordinance which makes it illegal for an unauthorized person to regulate traffic. It was not my intention to apply the tools of philosophical analysis or synthesis when I engaged in the behavior that produced this charge. I was declared not guilty, by the way. But I have prepared a paper addressed to the philosophical features of a project . . . such concepts as "regulating," "directing," "conforming." I had no such prospects in mind when I went to the corner and started making motions at motorists not to go around the corner because they would receive a ticket. Some of these problems [can be attacked] in the spirit of forgetting that we are faculty members and are merely people, along with students, addressing ourselves to problems that are as important as eating mush, which we manage to do without worrying about its academic relevance.

CHAPTER 6

On Relevance and Meaning in Higher Education

HAROLD D. HANTZ
University of Arkansas

The problem of relevance is nothing new in education. It is as old as the Sophists' criticism of the traditional education in ancient Greece. Because of the antiquity of the problem, one might suppose that the elements of relevance were now clear and that all we have to do is to put them into practice. In view of the conflicting claims today concerning what education should be doing, I wonder whether we are even clear on the elements of relevance, let alone having the capacity to put them into practice. The purpose of this paper is to examine what "relevance" might mean. The discussion does little more than point to elements or factors of relevance. The paper will serve its purpose, however, if it stimulates further inquiries.

Today the demand for relevance is phrased in various ways. We hear that education should be "meaningful" or provide "meaning for life." Again, the quest is for a "good" education or education that is "appropriate for our times." Although these expressions are not identical, their meanings for education so overlap that I shall use them interchangeably.

I shall suggest that there are at least seven factors or elements in an education that is relevant, good, meaningful, or appropriate. Relevance involves: (1) a relatedness to something outside the individual self, (2) the assessment and cultivation of the individual's abilities, (3) commitment, (4) evaluation of the effects of commitments upon others as well as upon the individual or institution committed, (5) the easily forgotten virtue of objectivity, (6) pluralism and a respect for others, and (7) a continuing creativity. These factors are intertwined, but they are distinguishable. I shall discuss them in order, undertaking to illustrate their meaning from the contemporary scene and to indicate some of the issues involved.

(1) *Relatedness to something outside the individual self.* One of the fundamental human needs is the relating of an individual to something outside himself. Normally this need is met through associations with other individuals like the family, religious organizations, and so on. It can be met by a scientist or scholar in the pursuit of knowledge or the creativity of the artist. The essential point is the relatedness to something outside. When this relatedness dissolves or is not adequately achieved, one of the bitterest of human experiences—alienation—results.

Most of us in higher education know that the college years constitute a difficult period of adjustment concerning this need, for the very reason that the customary forms of relatedness of adolescence are often severed or radically revised—those with respect to the family, home-town peer groups, and a realm of values and ideas. Yet frequently we who teach act as if there were nothing to passing from adolescence through the university to early maturity. Many students, however, find there is something to it; and they have a legitimate complaint about the impersonal character of some institutions. I wish to point to some factors which promote a healthy relatedness of student to the university and others which hinder it.

The first place for a healthy relatedness is the classroom. Too much instruction is based upon the sock-it-to-'em theory. Just dish it out. The competent will get it, the incompetent won't. We've done our job. The authoritarian attitude of "You're here to learn, not to ask questions" prevails. Truly this path provides instant rapport among student, professor, subject, and institution. The mind is liberated, and the love of learning flourishes!

To be sure, there is no single style for good teaching, but an approach which constructs a wall between instructor and student is self-defeating. How can a student be turned on by ideas, when, in being turned on, he is smacked down should his ideas run counter to the self-appointed authority? All the buddy-buddy devices of deans of student affairs cannot overcome the gulfs created in the classroom. With all the faults of administrative officers contributing to alienation—which faculty delight in exposing—I am convinced that no less a cause is the classroom. That means the faculty.

A second place for relatedness is the availability of faculty outside the classroom. Professional counselors have their place; but since the faculty insist that they and the students are the heart of the university, is the only place for this heart to beat in the classroom? Students ought to be able to talk to faculty about something other than their major. In our honors program, students comment on the importance of coming to know faculty members in tutorials and research—to have a friend on the

faculty to talk with about things professional and even nonprofessional. If this sort of experience is meaningful to good students, why shouldn't it be to the poor?

(2) *The assessment and cultivation of the individual's abilities.* From time immemorial the preparation of individuals to fit into the social order has been important in education. This purpose consists in discovering an individual's abilities and cultivating them for the benefit of both the individual and society. On the surface there should be little quarrel with this purpose; for if a man has no skill which the social order can use, he has little chance of a meaningful life in that society; and a society which does not provide its members with socially useful skills is in peril.

Many students do quarrel with this purpose, however, arguing that the university is more interested in making them socially useful than in permitting them to discover themselves. I shall return to this criticism, but first I wish to examine what is involved in self-discovery, a notion which is at the center of much present controversy.

I can mention only two of the knotty problems of self-discovery. What do we mean by "self-discovery"? An obvious retort is that when a man talks about self-discovery, he wants answers to the questions, "What am I?" and "What can I do?" Whether these are separate questions or essentially one is itself a problem requiring analysis, but I shall opt for the notion that they are at least bound together so that what I can do and what I do, conceived broadly and not simply as a vocation, constitute a fundamental definition of what I am. I suggest that what I am requires a context, a social and natural order in which I can discover what I can do and therefore what I am.

As an illustration of the futility of trying to discover an inner self irrespective of a context, Descartes is a classic case. After doubting his education, his beloved mathematics, his senses, the existence of the universe, the existence of his God, even the existence of his own body, he concluded he could not doubt his doubting or thinking. "I think; therefore *I am.*" Descartes discovered and proved the existence of the Ego, the I, or at least he thought so. But now where was he? This self-discovery was utterly barren, because doubting everything and just discovering the Ego left Descartes with *nothing* else to think about. To assert, "I am, I am," soon becomes unproductive. Descartes knew it too, for immediately he asked himself what he thought about. His answer was, "God and the external world." Then he began to discover not only what *they* were but what *he* was. He found he was a good mathematician (something I suspect he never doubted in the first place); and he found many other things about himself, God, and nature.

There is a lesson in Descartes' experience. A man learns what he is and what he can do in the society and in the world in which life goes on, in short, as he is related to something other—people, nature, or God—and not simply by looking at his Ego, mind, or soul. Those who would withdraw from society and the natural world to seek what they are alone within themselves are doomed to disappointment. Feeding on one's Ego is a monotonous diet; and if the feeding continues long enough, the Ego will fail of self-nourishment.

If a social context is necessary for self-discovery and if the university as a part of that context provides opportunities for cultivating an individual's abilities so that the individual fits into the social order, then the university is contributing at least this much to self-discovery. Learning a profession is indeed a contribution to knowing what I can do and what I am. Why, then, do many students complain about this function of the university?

The complaint has several sources. There have been times when the purpose of education was primarily moral—the production of good men —not, as now, vocational—the production of good mathematicians, chemists, or engineers. As I understand the student protest, much of the clamor is about this issue. Students are asking for clarification of the meaning of life. They find much around them meaningless—the split-level house and two cars in every garage *for what purpose?* For many, traditional religions have failed in supplying this purpose. They then turn with an almost pathetic faith to the university for what they do not find elsewhere. And this turning is our greatest embarrassment!

The students ask about the great moral questions of life, and we wrap ourselves in a cloak of amorality. Facts, not values—that's our forte. They ask for meaning in life, we give them set theory, the stress of materials, and corporate finance. To be sure, these disciplines supply some meaning, something that the students sometimes do not see. What we do not see is that this meaning is not enough. Let a member of a faculty in general meeting propose that the faculty engage in sustained consideration of what is necessary to produce good men and either he is greeted with snickers of laughter or the uneasy silence that accompanies a dirty story. Oh, there is a passing gesture toward the problem in an occasional course, but in honest moments we know the depth of our failure. It is no wonder that the free university sprouts on the edges of the campus to deal with the "real" problems of life.

A second source of complaint is the pressure to prepare for a profession before a student is ready. The university continues the pressure which parents and society have already inaugurated. As soon as we have the

undergraduate, we ask for his major as if an eighteen-year-old has already answered the basic moral questions of life, is acquainted with life's numerous possibilities, and needs only to learn a profession. Some students, however, want to roam the realm of ideas and values before opting for a profession. When they run into obstructions, some of the brightest and most sensitive simply quit to learn what they can from "the book of the world." One of the paradoxes of our society—or is it a stupidity—is that in a period of affluence, when the options of the young are theoretically at their widest, the university, the family, and society insist on an ever earlier age that the young select one option.

A third source of complaint is that undergraduate education is increasingly subordinate to the interests of graduate education. The basis for this complaint is so patent that it need not be argued. When will the undergraduate cease to be the forgotten man in the multiversity? The same might be asked regarding the relatively few instructors who are willing to work with him.

A few questions leading to reforms suggest themselves:

(a) When will faculties realize that in ignoring the moral quality of education, they are actually making a moral decision which is irresponsible?

(b) Of a less fundamental nature but nonetheless important, why must every undergraduate have a major?

(c) When will undergraduate teaching receive equal recognition with the publication of research? When shall we bury the myth that the narrowness required of much publication is a necessity for a good teacher? The world's greatest authority on Duns Scotus can be the world's worst teacher of an Introduction to Philosophy or a general History of Philosophy.

(3) *Commitments* and (4) *the evaluation of the effects of commitments*. Because of the close connection between commitments and their effects, it will be well to discuss them together.

In regard to the individual, as important as the discovery of one's abilities for a meaningful relationship to others and to things may be, the discovery is not sufficient for the achievement of the relationship. Commitment is needed. Significant relatedness to other men, nature, science, art, or religion is the exercise of a capacity, not simply its discovery. Unused potentialities have a way of withering, whether they are black talents which have had no chance to flower or white talents in a museum of unfulfilled promises.

As necessary as commitments are for relevance, however, their effects require evaluation. Fanatics are wonderfully committed, but they are dangerous as a Hitler or racist are known to be. Commitment itself is no certification that the consequences are benign.

If the reader thinks that these examples are extreme and that in general commitment yields good consequences, I should insist that even milder commitments require evaluation. In the present racial strife it is clear that many white liberals are committed to causes for blacks of which not all blacks approve. "We" often know what is good for "them," what "they" need. "They" immediately are placed in a position of inferiority and often resentment. We may accept without question the Golden Rule, ". . . all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. . . ." But what if other men do not want done to them what we would have them do to us? Evaluation of commitments requires the effort to see whether we can assess the desirability of the consequences not only for ourselves but others.

In turning to the university, what sort of commitments does it have to students and to the community? In turn, do students and the community have commitments to the university? "Community" is an ambiguous term, but I shall understand it to mean both individual members and institutional arrangements. In this sense the community is committed to the university insofar as the community sustains the university financially. What is the university's commitment in return? Part of its commitment is training individuals to take their place in the institutions of society as noted before; and if the university did not engage in this commitment, it is not clear how long the community would continue its commitment. This commitment on the part of the university seems unimpeachable. The question arises concerning its other commitments.

Since the development of the bomb, the university has increasingly engaged in specific research for government and industry and even has enterprises of its own. This commitment raises some very sticky problems. A recent article by James Ridgeway in *Harper's*[1] points to interlocking arrangements of the university, faculty, and government which have little if anything to do with education. The activities raise questions of conflicts of interest and draw the attention of the university away from the students.

"If the university must be committed to the community outside of education, why is it committed almost entirely to the power structure?" asks many a student. Where is its commitment to the disadvantaged, the

[1] "Universities as Big Business," *Harper's*, September, 1968, 29-36.

poor, the weak? Is it that lush contracts and contributions do not come from the ghetto? What of the commitments within the university itself? Why should high-energy physics and space technology have the priorities they do in money and brains over the human problems of the cities? Concerned students cry out for answers.

The thrust of these questions suggests a thorough re-evaluation of the commitments of the university. It may very well be that if the research for business and government overwhelms the education of the young in some institutions, then these institutions should be split into research institutes and into educational institutions.

(5) *Objectivity.* Already it has been noted that commitments require evaluation. Essential to the process of evaluation is objectivity, the ability to view with detachment and without self-interest the consequences of an individual's or institution's actions.

Among other things, objectivity is the avoidance of illusion and the rejection of the assumption of special privilege. It would be well to remember that no man, institution, or community has a privileged position before nature or God. The rain falls upon the just and unjust alike. How intolerable the world would be if it were otherwise. Once men see themselves, their institutions, and their communities with as little illusion as possible, they may begin to achieve a more meaningful relationship with one another and the natural world, which is their ultimate home.

Objectivity is one of the rarest of the virtues. The young today often decry with justification the illusions of the old in their pursuit of success within the Establishment. But the young, too, need to ask themselves whether the pursuit of one's bag without consideration of others is any less illusory, any less assumptive of a privileged position before all other men? Is self-discovery to be supreme self-interest? This question needs to be faced squarely or, should I say, objectively.

Objectivity not only is required for the evaluation of commitments but also plays another kind of role in determining commitments. When an institution does commit itself to dealing with the problems of poverty, race, and the cities, what sort of commitments should it develop? There are individuals who wish to commit the university to training programs in the ghetto or admitting high-risk students as evidence of good faith and concern; but the Foreman study[2] shows how superficial efforts of this kind can be in solving the basic problems. It may very well be that the primary commitment and concern of the university lies first in re-

[2] Paul Foreman, "Race Confronts Universities: A Preface for Policy," *The Journal of General Education*, July, 1968.

search on the basic problems and then, with more effective knowledge, training personnel to work in the ghetto. The most effective commitment may at times involve detachment so that intelligence unclouded by emotion may work its leaven.

(6) *Pluralism and a decent respect for others.* One of the dangers in the demand for relevance and meaning in education is the claim that there is but one kind of education which is relevant or meaningful for all individuals in all societies. A common failing of committed people of the extreme Left, the extreme Right, or even "good" people is the attempt to prescribe and enforce one form of education and meaningful life for all members of a nation or the world. But who can be sure that he knows what is good for all people? Once more we are confronted with fanaticism. Man's history is strewn with consummate sorrow resulting from attempts to prescribe *the* meaningful life for all. In view of the variability of talents of men, the conditions of life over the world, and the social organizations which have evolved, one wonders why a plea for diversity is necessary. Rather it would seem we should welcome the multiform expressions of life.

(7) *A continuing creativity.* If there were one set of abilities for all men, one society, and an invariant natural world there might be just one meaning for life and one form of relevant education. But it is the very diversity of abilities, societies, and conditions in nature which prevents the uniform answer and confronts every person and society anew with the problem of meaning and an appropriate education.

The meaningful life is the one in which the search is never-ending. In Plato's *Symposium* there are wise comments on life, meaning, philosophy, and the gods. Plato points out that the philosopher is a *lover* of wisdom. As a lover he is in pursuit of wisdom which he does not possess. Plato then writes, "No god is a philosopher, for he already knows all there is to know." There's the difference between divinity and humanity. The gods know all there is to know. They possess the meaning of existence already. But they lack the quest. We have that, and it is the hallmark of our humanity. In this quest, the meaning of a man's life is that which he creates out of the conditions of his life. If his life is meaningless, he has failed to create. Meaning in life is, I suspect, a function of a *continuing* creativity.

It is this characteristic of meaning in life which makes the *aim* of a relevant education easy to discern but the *achievement* difficult to realize. The aim is to liberate the creative powers of men. Indeed, the definition of a relevant education can be said to be that education which liberates the creative powers of men. But how? Here we return to what has been

suggested before in all its complexity—the determination of an individual's abilities and an examination of the institutions of society to discover what in them liberates or suppresses these abilities.

In conclusion let me remind the reader that the purpose of this paper is to prompt discussion on the meaning of "relevance" for higher education today by delineating some important factors or elements in a complex notion. Some of the elements may not be of equal weight; others of vital significance may have been omitted. What does seem important is that we be as clear as possible concerning what is involved in relevance if we would have it. If this paper is a step in the direction of clarification, it will have achieved its purpose. Hopefully, continued discussion can bring the meaning into sharp focus.

CHAPTER 7

Relevance and the Role of Honors

MYRON J. LUNINE
Kent State University

Since we in the colleges and universities are looking for relevancy, it might be useful to examine the meaning of the concept so that we will know what we are looking for.

There are at least two distinct aspects of relevancy; and each in turn consists of two dimensions. First there is the reciprocal relationship between the university and society with respect to influence and impact. This is to say that not only should trends, tremors, and explosions in American and world society have an impact on the structure, operation, and purpose of the university but also the teaching, learning, research, and general activities of the university should influence the condition and direction of the nation and the world. The second aspect of relevancy involves the duality of its thrust. This is to say that a relevant education answers not only the human, political, and economic needs of society but also the personal, psychological, and spiritual needs of the individual student and teacher. Or to put this point another way: relevancy in education is as much a matter of process as of substance and indeed may be even more procedural (psychological) than substantive (intellectual).

In terms of both basic elements of relevancy—the reciprocity of impact and influence and the service to both societal and individual needs—American higher education is failing. The substance, style, and spirit of higher education are inadequate and irrelevant. The substance is virtually limited to the concerns, values, ideas, and techniques that serve the academic and social establishments. The style too often is nothing but an extension of paternalistic, pedantic approaches to mechanical and spurious educational experiences. The spirit is mainly one of equivocation and accommodation conjoined with egoism and conformity—in short, cowardice and irresponsibility.

To charge, however, that our educational system is too artificial, too much removed from realities, too much divorced from the arenas of actual problems, too much unable to inculcate into its students (and teachers and administrators) a sense of commitment and responsibility, is to be platitudinous. And to go on to urge that education be made relevant is to be vacuous, for relevancy, as I have suggested, is an ethically and operationally complex goal.

Into the abhorrent vacuum have come the activist-relevantists—people who at best have a one-sided ideological and operational theory of relevancy. For them, the university must respond to and serve social needs by transforming its institutional structure, its distribution of power, its process of decision-making, and its priority of roles and goals. In other words, the relationship between the university and society is not reciprocal but organic, and the individual growth and fulfillment of each member of the academic community can only be a function of the group's confrontation with and solution of social problems.

The idea of the Activist-Relevant University is attractive with respect to its emotional appeal, its moral indignation, its humanitarian concern, and its economic and political critiques. Moreover, many of its structural and programmatic recommendations deserve the most careful and thoughtful consideration.

But the idea and operation of the Activist-Relevant University rest on an ideological base of certainty and purity which, appealing as it is as a social protest and call to action, ignores, distorts, and threatens the essential nature and purpose of education. For education of individuals must not be confused with exhortation of groups. Education is essentially a solitary process of expanding and including, of reaching out, of maximizing one's capacity for reason, imagination, expression, judgment, and active commitment. Action-oriented exhortation is a group phenomenon of contracting and excluding, of pulling in, of appealing to passion, and of engineering conformity.

A university harnessed to the needs of a social force (be it reactionary or revolutionary) becomes a court eunuch—ideologically pure and intellectually sterile. There are too many examples of the growing malignancy of dogmatism, mysticism, and intolerant exclusiveness that afflicts the academic body and soul when it is incorporated into a larger entity and higher ethic: the University serving the Church, the Party, the Race, the State, the Corporation, the "'Relevant."

It seems to me that the question becomes this: do our universities have the independence, flexibility, and wisdom to steer a productive course between those inside and outside the university who would change noth-

ing (with respect to the nature, structure, and operation of the university and of the society at large) and those who would keep nothing?

To be truly relevant, the university must synthesize what is good in traditional-conventional education with what is necessary in activist-relevant education. It must devise programs that transcend rigid departmental and cultural boundaries and that deal intellectually and experientially with the dynamic processes of ubiquitous change. It must construct a style of education that feeds the growth of literate, expressive, responsible individuals. It must create a spirit of education that somehow combines red hot indignation over injustice with cool blue comprehension of the complexities of the problems and of the best means to be employed in solving them.

It is with this task of creating an educational experience that is both excellent and relevant, individualistic and socially responsible, that many honors programs have been concerned for a considerable number of years. A general honors program (interdisciplinary as well as departmental, substantive as well as accelerative), by design, intention, operation, and experience, can provide the best—if not the only—apparatus, ethos, and arena for synthesizing traditional educational values with current social needs, for developing a university community with a consensual notion of what is important, and for experimenting and innovating in order to effectuate the synthesis and the consensus.

In this age of the multiversity (and this condition is not necessarily a function of size), with its various and conflicting communities, cultures, and concerns and with its specialization of knowledge and talent, its quantification of meaning and significance, its vocationalization of education, and its disconnection then of personal beliefs and public acts, the general honors program should be to the university what the university should be to the society: a chief locus and source of conscience, criticism, creativity, and constructiveness.

What our most sensitive and sensible students and instructors want in the university in particular and in society in general are precisely those values and objectives which undergird and propel honors education: *Authenticity* of the ends and especially of the means of the educational experience, of the roles all the participants are playing, of the relationships between all the participants; *Personal Participation* in the dialogue and the deliberation for the sake of defining not only the game and its rules but especially one's self in relation to the game; *Involvement* of the individual with the life of the university and of the university with the life of the society so that one's education and life will be relevant intellectually and practically, personally and socially.

It might be instructive and illuminative at this point to discuss our honors efforts at Fisk University,[1] because Fisk is a seismograph and occasionally a catalyst of trends, tremors, and turmoils both inside and outside American educational institutions. Moreover, just as the black American is the most typical American, so is the black college student the most typical college student: for bright black students today are analyzing and agonizing over the cluster of questions, Who should be taught what by whom how for what purpose? Which is to say, especially they are questioning the validity and authenticity of their education and perforce the quality and acceptability of our civilization.

We have tried to make general honors substantively relevant by including crucially topical authors and subjects in our colloquia (such subjects as freedom, justice, identity; such authors as Malcolm X, Carmichael, Le Roi Jones, Fanon), by encouraging our seniors to do honors projects on subjects and issues they find compellingly interesting—and which they otherwise would have no chance to study (subjects ranging from African music, literature, and politics to legal aid programs for the poor, the impact of automation on the black labor force, the role of religion in the Black Power movement to the death of God, Camus and Black Power, the identity of the Viet Cong to the politics of student power), and by having as the general theme of our eight Ferment Sessions (public talks and discussions) the question of Human Rights and Revolution.

We have tried to make general honors psychologically relevant by being the first area to have students participate in making decisions concerning who will teach what to whom how for what purpose and by encouraging by words and actions a feeling of convivial informality and a sense of partnership between students and faculty.

We have tried to be innovative by encouraging and spawning Non-Western and Afro-American studies and by leading the way to curricular flexibility and to the substitution of Pass-Fail for the letter-grade-syndrome in the colloquia.

We have tried to be integrative by operating on the premises that there is—or should be—an organic unity to the values, approaches, and procedures—if not to the concepts and concerns—of the entire curriculum and that excellence and joy are not confined to any part of the world of ideas and efforts, and by setting up both curricular and extracurricular activities for all members of the Fisk University community.

But these efforts—and they are more efforts than achievements—are not sufficiently adequate to be fully relevant. At best they comply with

[1] Professor Lunine was director of the Honors Program at Fisk University until September, 1968. (Editor's note.)

only one of each of the two elements of relevancy: they indicate a curricular and programmatic response from us within the university to social pressures and problems; they promote individuality and personality by engaging the students and instructors in reasonably meaningful and authentic educational experiences.

The problem at Fisk is a particularization of the dilemma we examined earlier: how can a school organize itself and formulate its programs so as to comprehend and help channel the dynamics of change, actively work for a greater harmony between rhetoric and reality, and, in short, influence society—without becoming *too* relevant, too much action-oriented in accordance with perceptions and policies too ideologically fixed and exclusive?

This is to say that by no means are we content and confident that we are even on the right track with our honors effort at Fisk. It is not to suggest, though, that we swerve from our belief that honors is the place and the process in which to explore and work out at least temporary answers to this basic, pervasive question, answers that can influence the entire university directly and society indirectly.

Having disclaimed success for the Fisk general honors program and admitted uncertainty about even its present direction, I now compound ignominy by defying one of the holiest rules of the basic code of honor for honors: Since each honors program is a unique product of its own institutional matrix, curricular context, and human and material resources, beware of committing programmatic aggression and of practicing institutional imperialism.

Nevertheless, at the risk of being un-American (anti-localistic) and, what might be even worse, unprofessional (chauvinistic), and—levity aside—because this question of the role honors can play in making education relevant concerns all of us and our schools and country, I want to suggest that all honors programs consciously and concertedly address themselves to the problem and to the goal of relevancy.

More specifically, and substantively, I propose that every honors program include and make available to the best students and faculty the following four sequential, problem-oriented, interdisciplinary, intellectual and experiential colloquia: (1) "The United States: Race, Poverty, and the Pursuit of Happiness"; (2) "The Underdeveloped Nations: Population, Growth, and Prospects for Peace"; (3) "The New Civilization: Automation, Urbanization, and the Individual"; (4) "Education: Problems and Possibilities for the Age of Relevancy."

Each of these four colloquia can be explored and developed by students, instructors, approaches, and materials of the social sciences, of

literature and ethics, of architecture and agronomy—to list a few. Each of the four assumes a shared genuine interest and commitment on the part of all the participants, draws on the insight and experience of all in devising the format and in choosing the materials, and need not depend on any external rewards and punishments in developing excellence. Each of the four can provide two-way relevancy by focusing on actual events and case studies and bringing in professionally and/or authentically involved people to the university and by having the students do field work and participatory projects appropriate to the respective main concerns of the colloquia.

The four colloquia, or variations and versions of them, involve an examination—not an indoctrination—of some of the major problems, forces, and possibilities properly educated human beings will have to live with and come to terms with for the foreseeable future.

Imagine our nation's best (brightest and bravest) students and instructors dealing colloquially, creatively, intellectually, and empirically with our epoch's most imposing problems. Imagine our honors programs serving their creative roles as synthesizer of what is good and beautiful and what is necessary and useful, as innovator of what is unorthodox and uncharted, and as integrator of schools that stand in danger of losing their coherence and of a society that now more than ever needs the rigor of ideas and the vision of values.

CHAPTER 8

Relevance: The University and the Business World

This chapter includes the papers delivered by Nils O. Eklund, Jr., Vice-President, Kaiser Industries, by Ralph E. Boynton, Vice-President, Bank of America, and the responses to these papers. Father Thomas O'Brien, chairman of this session, correctly noted that the papers and the following discussion "dramatized the significance of this confrontation" and illustrated that "there is a gap of understanding of Gargantuan proportions existing between the business and academic communities." The session clearly indicated the need for greater communication between these communities and for a sharper focusing on the meaning of relevance in this context.

CLOSING THE COMMUNICATION GAP BETWEEN BUSINESS AND EDUCATION

Nils O. Eklund, Jr.

One of the hottest subjects to be examined by business publications during 1968 has been the so-called communication gap between business and education. Before I get too deeply into my remarks I'd like to examine some of the statements to determine if there really is a communication gap.

Nationwide surveys, studies by the American Council on Education, and analyses by business organizations and publications point out that students on college campuses do not have a clear idea of modern business. Fewer students appear to select business as their first choice for a career although many do in fact enter business. They seem to labor under the impression that business is too crassly commercial and oblivous to the needs of the changing world.

The famous Harris poll in which only 12 per cent of college seniors interviewed indicated they would select business careers if given a choice

is cited as the main evidence of a gap in understanding between what business tries to achieve and what students think it represents. The same Harris poll came up with some more astonishing figures—11 per cent of the students interviewed believed that business is a creative environment, 7 per cent believed business is intellectually stimulating, and only 1 per cent believed that in business there are opportunities to help the less fortunate.

Yet helping the disadvantaged, creating a stimulating environment and developing the creativity of individuals are some of the things that business has been seeking to do and are regarded by business as some of the biggest achievements of the last few years.

Other startling evidence about a lack of understanding of business can be cited. Forty per cent of visitors to the Hall of Free Enterprise at the New York World's Fair were unable to name one advantage of capitalism over communism, and 60 per cent felt that the profit motive is unnecessary to America's socio-economic system. Interviews with students printed in business magazines and on the business pages of newspapers produce comments such as this: "Business is just a nasty word," "Business means that if you make it big, you can buy a Picasso for half a million dollars, and that's not my bag." More important perhaps are the views of students who believe that the key roles in our society are no longer played by men who manage production and marketing, but by those who understand the revolutionary pace of innovation and are prepared to help our society surmount the problems, human and environmental, which it brings.

This kind of attitude suggests that many students at the university really do believe that the world is changing, but business is still cast in the same mold today as it was at the turn of the century. Unfortunately there is some evidence to suggest that business is full of selfish profiteers. The Billy Sol Estes case, the reluctance of the automobile industry to face up to the issue of safety in cars, the fight over truth in packaging, the tobacco industry's violent reaction to strong evidence that smoking is linked to cancer, all these events—aired so loudly in the press and on television—suggest there may be truth in the position that the world changes, but business stays the same.

But business is heading in a new direction. Scandals that were commonplace years ago are rare now. Today businessmen attempt to use their enormous economic power constructively for the good of the community as well as for the good of the shareholders. The profit motive is not being supplanted, but is reinforced. It is still a main dynamic force in business and in the American way of life, but is now one of the twin objectives of

American business. The other is the national good. The profit motive is the muscle of the corporate giant. The national good is both his heart and conscience.

Students and professors are apparently unaware of this new direction in which business is heading. If they are, it is the fault of business that businessmen are not telling their story vigorously enough. It is also the fault of the academic world that it is not paying more attention to this phenomenon of the American scene. But whoever is to blame, it seems fair to conclude there is a lack of understanding between the business and academic communities over the role of business in America today. I have referred to the new direction in which business is heading. Let me give some examples of the way in which corporations seek to make constructive contributions to the national good.

The field in which corporations are best equipped to make such a constructive contribution is that of hiring and training the hard-core unemployed in the nation's big city ghettos and placing them into productive occupations. Until last year this was regarded as a government role in the war on poverty. Private enterprise interest was limited to Plans for Progress, a group of 320 corporations which have pledged to do more than the law requires in the area of equal employment opportunities. Plans for Progress is basically a promotional organization—it does not take action. This came last year with the establishment of the Urban Coalition in most of the large metropolitan areas: a coalition of civic, religious, labor and business leaders and teachers who get together to try to find ways to solve the plight of the cities.

In most cases businessmen take the initiative and give the Urban Coalition its organization, methods, and drive. Urban Coalition is a channel for businessmen to help develop not only jobs, but also economic power in the ghettos through the support of fledgling business enterprises.

The other major business involvement is that of the National Alliance of Businessmen, formed by Henry Ford and backed by many of the most influential businessmen of the day. The organization has launched its program of Job Opportunities in the Business Sector to find jobs for 500,000 hard-core unemployed in the major cities. It is no random figure. The Kerner Report on civil disorders says, "The most compelling and difficult challenge is presented by some 500,000 hard-core unemployed who live within the central cities, lack a basic education, work not at all or only from time to time and are unable to cope with the problems of finding, holding, and performing a job. Members of this group are often among the initial participants in civil disorders."

A second area in which business is making a notable contribution is

urban housing. Recently President Johnson established a Committee on Urban Housing, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser, chairman of the board of Kaiser Industries Corp., and including some of the top American businessmen. They spent one year trying to find ways to clean up the nation's urban slums and to encourage the development of a large-scale rehabilitation industry. President Johnson asked the committee "to find a way to provide the basic necessities of a decent home and healthy surroundings for every American family now imprisoned in the squalor of a slum."

The committee's recommendation was to establish a National Housing Partnership which will involve American industry and financial institutions in the production of low and moderate income housing. The partnership is now preparing the incorporation agreement and arranging the offering of shares to corporations.

In urban culture, corporations offer strong financial aid to the symphony, to repertory theaters, to art associations, and to museums. They also provide personnel to organize and sustain ticket drives. Such support is often critical to the survival of such institutions.

Corporations also donate heavily to fund-raising drives of educational institutions. *Business Management* magazine estimates that current corporate aid to education is running at about $325 million a year. In addition over 400 companies now participate in matching grants. For every dollar that an employee gives to his alma mater, the company will match, to a maximum of $1,000. However, corporate contributions to higher education are no longer regarded as philanthropy. They are considered as investments in the future of the free enterprise system. There are, of course, practical considerations too. Educational chairs at universities are excellent public relations instruments, and scholarships can be promotional devices. Business is finding more and more ingenious ways to support education. *Time Magazine*, for example, was intrigued when St. Joseph College, a small school in Indiana, took a full page ad in the national edition to make a pitch for funds. *Time Magazine* not only refunded St. Joseph's money, but announced a program of giving free advertising space to colleges needing money. Of the 500 applications *Time* received, it selected 50 ads to run in either regional or metropolitan editions.

Much of the support received by agencies such as the United Crusade, the United Chest, Community Chest in annual campaign drives comes from business, which provides not only pledges in cash, but also executives to run the drives. In the Bay Area, for example, senior executives serve on the policy making committees, middle management men are loaned full time for three months to the United Crusade with salaries

paid by their companies, and junior executives loaned part time to set up campaigns in smaller companies and businesses.

Corporations make an impact on the life of a community in other ways. They loan executives to study special problems where business expertise is needed. In Oakland, for example, three companies loaned executives to the city manager to advise on how a public works department could be established to save the city thousands of dollars each year. Other businessmen are making a study of the transportation needs of the Bay Area for the next sixty years.

This is one message business must get across to university audiences. A second is that the corporation today is a creative environment. Except for education, no other type of organization, political, military, or religious, sets out to develop the creative talents of the individual and guide him in the direction of social or economic good. A modern corporation is becoming an implement for discovering the inherent and often latent creativity of individual human beings.

One reason that the creative nature of corporate life is obscured, is that the ghost of the organization man still haunts the corporate corridors. The hero of such epics as *The Man in the Grey Flannel Suit, Executive Suite, The Status Seekers* is still to be found in almost every major corporation. He is the man who is motivated by a desire to rise in the hierarchy so that there are more people under him than above him, and he is seldom innovative except in advancing his own interests. But he is no more typical of the kind of men who work in corporations today than others, such as the hired professionals who identify themselves not so much with the corporation which employs them as with the profession they are in. Whether he is an engineer, a lawyer, an accountant, a writer, or researcher, this type of employee is apt to assign a higher value to his standing in his profession than to his standing in the organization that hired him. His main role in the corporation is that of problem solving, and in this there is room for creativity.

In corporations, too, there is a small group of change makers who aspire neither to positions of corporate power nor to eminence in a chosen profession. They may be the source of new ideas on everything from new product lines to racial integration. They help the corporation meet the challenge of a changing world. It is in this role that graduates can find a creative role to get involved.

A third area in which business has a selling job to do to the university world is that of defining the specifications of a businessman. Students at college have a clear idea of the lawyer, of the doctor, of the dentist, of an engineer, but they are hazy about the businessman. It is true that there

really is no one single type of lawyer, but there are some general characteristics that can be suggested and emphasized. At present businessmen are given negative labels as conservative, conformist, cautious, mercenary, sterile, and colorless. Perhaps we should stress more positive attributes of the businessman. He is a man who gets things done, he is a man on the move, a man with drive, a man who dares to fail.

Businessmen have not told their story to educators, but educators have contributed to the gap in understanding by not communicating with the business world! Businessmen are puzzled by violence on the campus, riots, demonstrations, strikes, and boycotts. They see turmoil, and wonder what it all means. The fact that the turmoil is a symptom rather than a disease is not clear to many men in business. Perhaps the educators could do more to explain the revolution on the campus, and the search for quality that involves experimentation with new ideas. Business wants to know whether the educational experiments will produce better citizens and better potential employees.

What is being done to close the communication gap between businessmen and educators? Some tentative steps have been taken. McDonnell-Douglas conducts forums for students aimed at answering such questions as what new vocations will emerge in industry in the next twenty years, what will people do in these new vocations, and how can students prepare for them now.

The chairman of Motorola conducts a dialogue with leading college students through newspaper advertisements the company buys in college newspapers. The students voice their doubts about corporation policies and methods, and ask piercing questions. The chairman does his best to answer them.

Traveling scholarships have been established by many companies to provide for a student to spend the summer working at a company plant, with the balance of the year free for him to pursue a line of study anywhere he chooses.

Prestige publications such as IBM's *Think Magazine* and *Kaiser Aluminum News* have been hailed on the campus for their creativity. *Think* commissions articles from the best brains of our day. *Kaiser Aluminum News* explores in-depth issues such as the world food shortage, the dynamics of change, and the nature of creativity.

More should be done along these lines, but let us consider some other things that business could do to help close this gap in understanding. First there is a need for a more systematic approach. University relations cannot be left to the college recuriting officer who has many other duties at the corporate office. Nor can they be left to the chief executive and his

contacts as a fund raiser. It is time to consider the establishment of a corporate university relations department to function on the lines of a public relations department, a shareholder relations department, or a community relations department. These departments are essential to the operation of every major organization. Contacts with newspapers are handled by a group of professional communicators who court the press and draw up elaborate programs to make sure the company's message is understood. A shareholder relations officer also takes great pains to explain what is happening to those with a stake in the ownership of the company. A community relations executive spends most of his time establishing contacts with leaders in the community. More recently, companies are creating an urban affairs department to handle the key questions of corporate involvement in ghetto problems.

A university relations department could be created to work towards establishing strong links between a company and universities. The aim of the department would be to insure that universities of special interest to it were advised of the corporation's policies and contributions to solving contemporary problems and its financial support. It would be responsible not only for visits by college recruiters, but also encourage business personnel at all levels to follow the developments at universities and explain them. It would arrange for business executives to make appearances at experimental classes, at seminars on the campus, and to debate students on the merits of the modern corporation. It could encourage some executives to take a short leave of absence to teach a course at a college, and to encourage professors to take a leave from the academic life to serve in corporations.

All corporations publish an annual report for their stockholders to outline the progress achieved during the previous year. Perhaps an annual report for educators is needed to remind them of what companies are doing for the community, the state, and the nation. Such a report would not hesitate to point out that the corporation tries to serve the highest aspirations of man.

Educators can also help close the communication gap by upgrading their teaching of economics. This is needed not only in the freshman and sophomore years at college but also in high school. Such upgrading will give students a sounder understanding of the role of business in the nation's economy.

A survey of requirements of economics training in the certification of elementary and secondary school social studies teachers made these findings:

48 states do not require a high school student to have a course in economics before graduation;

47 do not require training in economics for elementary school teachers of social studies;

22 do not require training in economics for high school teachers of economics.

The bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals recently stated, "The appalling lack of knowledge and understanding of the political economy of the United States was highlighted by several studies that showed that a majority of students were ignorant of our enterprise system to a disconcerting degree."

The lack of education in economics in high schools is something that needs to be corrected, either at the high school level or in the freshman and sophomore years at college. It is essential if our free enterprise system is to survive.

Universities could help business understand the changes in the universities by holding seminars that explain the changing face of the university and what this will mean to corporations.

The understanding gap between business and education will continue to widen unless we recognize, first, that there is a problem, and then try to do something about the problem. Once it was said that the business of America is business. Now it can be said that the business of business is America.

RESPONSE

Robert O. Evans, University of Kentucky

With your permission I shall use my five minutes to comment on Mr. Eklund's paper. The only remark I have to make about Mr. Boynton's parable, of which as he says he did not furnish advance copies, is that the French have a parable that is pertinent to the subject. America, they say, is the only country that has managed to fall into decadence without first forming a culture. But—to return to Mr. Eklund—I would agree there is a communications gap between the university and the business world. I would agree further that there are some signs that the business world itself—sporadically rather than systematically—has made attempts to close the gap. On some levels a dialogue certainly exists.

Moreover, the business world has done a good deal for the academy.

None of us is so naive he would attempt to downgrade, for example, an exciting program like the Corning Glass Traveling Fellowship—though I would remind us that there are only five such fellowships available annually and they are actually supported by the family foundation rather than the company. No one would deny that businesses support the universities in a very real sense—where it counts—with money. I myself once received $500 from a generous General Electric Company to start a scholarship fund for honors students. And I am most appreciative.

However, to say the businesses of America are becoming interested in higher education is not to say the same thing as that their interests and those of faculties and students are identical. The goals of American business are still profits. The goals of educators are not profits—not in an economic sense. Mr. Eklund believes it is a shame there are so few economics courses in our high schools. I am not so sure. I happen to believe in the profit system, but I am not sure we ought to introduce our high school students to Adam Smith. A little elementary supply and demand, maybe —but if I remember correctly, Smith teaches that free enterprise leads to monopoly. And monopoly, whether individual monopoly or simply concentration of power into a few corporate hands, is certainly debatable as a virtue.

The trouble is students object not so much to the profit system, if it is kept within reasonable bounds—we all know the American way of life produces the most goods, more than were ever before imaginable in any society—but some students and faculty members are coming to believe the price may be too high. Take truth in lending for an example. We hear on the television how to get out of debt by consolidating our loans in one "sixty month" package, and we may even get some cash to spend out of the deal. What is not mentioned is that sixty months is five long years, and the poor devil who is sucker enough to fall for the deal will be enslaved for a long fraction of his economic life. And that is not a loan shark's proposition either. In many states the instigator of the sixty month consolidation plan is the local First National Bank. (Notice I do not say Bank of America!)

For every example of good done by business, no doubt someone here will come up with an example of bad. The point, however, is not that the ordinary student or teacher today expects perfection in this life. We are realists about our economy, though the hard core revolutionary today is, of course, an anarchist.

The point is that the college student is learning that the ordinary business values may not be worth the price in human life and aspiration that we have to pay. People are not computer numbers. An income tax, for

example, which calculates every penny automatically is an abomination, for it makes men less than men, and that is the sort of sub-humanization our rioting students object to. They look at the keen competition of business, and no matter how paternal we tell them the corporation may be, they are horrified by its cold substitution of machines for men and women whenever possible, or of supposedly slightly better men for other men when one fails to produce, or drinks too much, or divorces his wife. A corporation president once told me that he selected the very pictures his executives hung in their living rooms. He had sound reasons, too. Create the proper atmosphere at home as well as at the office, and the man would do his bidding so automatically that individual thinking would become a lost art. That is what students go into the streets to protest. They object to the dehumanization of people. It is—except perhaps for the hard-core rioters—that simple.

We in the upper middle classes like to believe that the rioters are a small minority. It is not so. At Wisconsin a year ago the legislators and faculty alike were astonished to find that the corn-fed sons and daughters of that great state, going to school on milk and cheese money, were in sympathy with the hard-core riot engineers. Why? Because they tested the values of our society and found them wanting.

So—my complaint to Mr. Eklund is not that he has not told us what business is doing for us. He has. But he has not scratched beneath the surface and found the real cancer. And he has also not given the American system its full due either. The idea of people's capitalism in which everyone shares in the prosperity of our economy is an exciting concept. But he is quite right—we must continue the dialogue. Between the universities and the businesses and other segments of society we may come up with a prospect for a future as yet undreamed. But it will never happen unless we preserve the basic human values, the traditions of the liberal arts.

HOW TO TELL EDUCATORS FROM BUSINESSMEN

Ralph E. Boynton

Because I was a liberal arts major I have been very fond of poetry all my life and I wanted to bring to you this morning a poem to set the stage for what I am going to say. The poem I selected is by Shelley. I memorized it once or twice during my life, but somehow or other it seems that I recall only bits and pieces of it now. Life has a trick of doing that to one's memory, so I am going to read it to you and hope you enjoy

it as much as I do and hope that it emphasizes in some significant way remarks that I want to leave with you this morning.

OZYMANDIAS

Percy Bysshe Shelley

I met a traveler from an antique land
Who said: "Two vast and trunkless legs of stone
Stand in the desert. Near them, on the sand,
Half sunk, a shattered visage lies, whose frown,
And wrinkled lip, and sneer of cold command,
Tell that its sculptor well those passions read
Which yet survive, stamped on these lifeless things,
The hand that mocked them and the heart that fed:
And on the pedestal these words appear:
'My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:
Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!'
Nothing beside remains. Round the decay
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare
The lone and level sands stretch far away."

The study of history and of archaeology has always had great interest for me, although I've never had the privilege of visiting a major dig. It isn't likely that I would have the patience to brush away the dust and dirt of the ages. I have read and studied history and attended lectures on history and archaeology whenever the opportunity arose. This looking backward seems to be an interest held in common with many others. The volume of historical writing, both fact and fiction, far outweighs that which is devoted to looking ahead. The most fascinating of our efforts to research the past concern those cultures and those civilizations that disappeared in what appears to have been the highest point of achievement. I can think, for instance, of the Minoan period on the island of Crete. There has been great speculation as to what happended to these people, where they went, what caused their sudden cataclysmic decline. The Mayan culture of Central America is again a mystery that many of us have read about with great interest.

Recently I had the privilege of examining some documents pertaining to a hitherto unknown people and culture that rivals the Minoans and the Mayans. It is likely that the information provided will compare significantly to the Dead Sea Scrolls in their impact on us. Therefore, I am going to talk about the translated material instead of the announced or printed subject of how to tell educators from businessmen.

I suspect that I am going to be accused of prejudice. It has been said

that most history is guessing, that the rest is prejudice. But I will take that chance and at least tell you what I see in the translations.

In the beginning they were migrants in the traditional pattern of westward migration which has characterized our world. You know we aren't sure where it all began, but there seems to have been a steady pattern of westward migration which has now reached the point of no return on the West Coast of our country.

The early numbers of these people were small, but they increased sharply in a relatively few years until there seemed to be a great tide coming from a number of directions. Fortunately, there was much compatability among the tribes so they could settle in peace with each other and gradually unite. The land they found was good, the soil was fertile, the water in most places was plentiful and served as a source of early power, their mineral resources were unusually good, the climate was reasonably comfortable as well, and the forests were virginal and they met no great opposition from the indigenous population which was weak and easily conquered or exterminated. The people that emerged from this migration were strong and aggressive, creative, courageous, and religious. The priests were unusual. Although diverse in interpretation of the manner in which to worship, they were fortunately united in the one-god concept and basically, as we look back at history, we have found that the greatest growth and development was when there was one god as opposed to some of the pantheons that existed from time to time. Almost universally these priests were concerned with education for two basic reasons: one, they wished to produce a learned priestly class, and secondly, they wished to enable the people to read the holy books and the classical works. These priests went out into the land and started institutions of learning, and after they had started them education became popular and the state, too, established schools and colleges and what we know as universities. These people in this strange land prospered and developed and grew and multiplied. They fought wars, some for right reasons, some for the wrong. They fought wars mostly against others, but even some among themselves, and they fought wars, sometimes, for what they thought were the highest reasons. But these reasons were not universally accepted. These people built great works, they contributed to the history and the growth and the development of man. Their institutions flourished, and none more than the educational institutions which they founded. Their temples of learning became larger and larger. Their libraries housed more and more books, and they involved greater and greater numbers of the population and the disciplines that they taught covered every facet of business and professional life.

Now the documents are not clear at what point the decline began. Perhaps part of the reason for the decline was that the volume of knowledge became almost overwhelming for students and it was almost impossible to find a way clearly through all that was offered. So much had been discovered that the truth was more and more difficult to find. In addition, the institutions of learning lost their original purpose, because religion ceased to be an essential part of life. You will recall that the priests had founded their schools largely to perpetuate their priestly class, and to disseminate information about the holy books and the good works. It was at this point the young lost their faith and even most of their hope.

In turn, this led to a decline in ethics and morality. Perhaps never was it more clear that those institutions which had been coeducational began to appear more to be cohabitational. There was in addition a sharp and sudden decline in discipline, both individual and on the part of groups. And perhaps most tragic of all, education ceased to have relevance to life and was primarily concerned with perpetuating a kind of education for education's sake, so that the student who was enrolled in this system, at the earliest age, failed the system only unless he attained the highest degrees which were offered by the universities and the colleges. There are other symptoms of this decline—in art, literature, and music. Painting and sculpture, strangely, became ugly, distorted, and meaningless. There was an attempt, by those who were the producers of this art, to claim that their works had significance—but only when they told about them was there any semblance of discovery of the meaning that they were trying to convey, and, unfortunately, the meaning was shallow and distorted. The literature began to be sordid and obscene and the language reflected this, and yet the new mode was described to the people as freedom of speech. The music—man has produced many beautiful sounds in history—but their music became louder and louder, primarily to hide the imperfections; and in the theatre nudity and vulgarity took the place of what had once been great dramatizations of human problems.

All this, in turn, led to confusion among the leaders, especially those who were political. They began to promise more and more to every segment of their people, and strangely to deliver less and less; and professions with all of the knowledge that they were forced to acquire became increasingly distorted in their interpretation of their role to the people; for instance, court calendars became so congested that it took months to bring a case to trial, and when the individual appeared before the court it was increasingly difficult to convict because there were so many ways to excuse conduct which was against the common good. And so, in-

creasingly, criminals were turned loose into the streets; and in civil actions there was great fear, especially among the practitioners of medicine, that they could be forced to pay significant sums that would affect their entire professional life because their knowledge was human and not perfect.

It is at this point that the translations have been completed. I am not certain if additional documents exist. Perhaps these people and their culture and civilization suddenly disappeared as did the Minoans and the Mayans. It would seem a great tragedy if they did because they had so much to offer and their hopes originally were so high.

There is a terrible timeliness in the documents described. We, too, may be facing our most critical time. Religion is in trouble. Morality and ethics are declining. Political leadership is confused and appears weak. Discipline is lax. The streets are unsafe and education seems unrelated to living and unsure of its role.

Perhaps there is a way to tell educators from businessmen, after all. At a time when all institutions are threatened, strangely, business is prospering. More people are employed. More good life is available. There is more confidence in the future and in the business world at the present time in our country than in any other of our activities. There are new technology, new methods, new processes, new products, new systems, new methods to bring the good things, to raise the standards of living, to help the rest of the world find its way. I am suggesting this morning that if you have lost your way as educators, if you have tried to take over as an institution another segment of our society, that it is time for you to find your way back; that it is time for a dialogue to be developed between business and education. There is a time—and it is now—for us to get together to work for the common good and find out how we can work to bring peace and prosperity and intellectual achievements to the people we serve. Rabbi ben Ezra said it much better than I can—"Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be."

RESPONSE

Myron J. Lunine, Kent State University

Mr. Boynton, Mr. Eklund, I am tempted to address you as fellow members of the United States Chamber of Commerce, which indicates the dilemma I have—besides having only a few minutes. I have to decide how to approach this role and how to conduct myself—in 1968—not quite 200 years after *The Wealth of Nations*. On the one hand I should

be cordial, convivial, communicative, which would necessitate my accepting the assumptions underlying these eloquent gentlemen's stimulating remarks: such assumptions as the unquestioned and apparently unquestionable rightness and righteousness of the self-image and the perhaps implicit world view of the American business community; such assumptions as the unquestioned and apparently unquestionable community and identity of interests—that is, shared values, shared methods and goals, of the business community and the intellectual community; such assumptions as the unquestioned and apparently unquestionable nine-times-repeated proposition that all of our problems are due only to a failure to communicate properly and thus to understand each other fully. But that would make for a negative and non-ecumenical Sunday morning.

The other side of the dilemma is that I feel I have an obligation to honors students—which is redundant—to try to be a responsible intellectual, that is, to examine the premises, to evaluate the logic and the evidence, and to interpret and evaluate the arguments or what Mr. Eklund calls "historia." This could be—if I were to do this, this *would* be perhaps —at the price of widening the gap between our communities, increasing the suspicion and tension, and, God forbid, calling into question my own loyalty to what Mr. Eklund calls the American way of life. Hence my dilemma.

Now very briefly to the text. Mr. Eklund, I had the privilege of having your paper in advance. In keeping with some remarks, we are really engaged in a theological and religious activity this morning in which we have been proffered the view that there is one god, free enterprise, and profit is his prophet. For example, we are told the profit motive is still the main dynamic force in business and in the American way of life. But it is now one of the twin objectives of American business; the other is the national good. The profit motive is the muscle of the corporate giant; the national good is both his heart and conscience.

Well, there are several problems with that passage. The "American way of life," while being facile and felicitous, is vacuous and means many things to different people. Who defines the American way of life? What does it include and what does it exclude? Who enforces it? What is the nature of the twins—profit on the one hand and national good on the other? Are they Siamese? Are they identical? Do they suffer from sibling rivalry? Does the study of American history and a, hopefully, dispassionate view of the complexities of American problems suggest that in fact they do serve each other, that is, profit motive and the national good? These are just a few questions.

You talk about the turmoil on the campuses being a symptom rather than a disease. A symptom of what? You talk about the need to establish a corporate university relations department to work towards establishing strong links between a company and a university. I suggest we do indeed have strong links between the companies and the universities. I suggest many universities are in fact corporations in terms of their ideological commitments and their priority of values. Finally, you exhort all of us to improve upon our appalling lack of knowledge and understanding of the political economy of the United States, which exhortation I share and really do urge as universally as possible.

May I just say with respect to Mr. Boynton, with respect to the purpose of a university, the perpetuation of a priestly class and dissemination of *the* truth is not my notion of a university nor, may I respectfully suggest, should it be yours. We have various functions, but our central purpose for being and our first priority of business is to encourage and insure a free inquiry: independent, individual, disciplined, ceaseless questioning of received knowledge and examined behavior. We are not the purveyors and the protectors of any doctrine, dogma, or cant, however pious and popular. We are the defenders of the American way of life as defined operationally as a process, as an approach to life involving a practiced belief in the efficacy of reason, individuality, and diversity. Thank you very much.

FURTHER RESPONSES

David V. Harrington, *Gustavus Adolphus College*

I want to thank Mr. Boynton and Mr. Eklund for so courageously entering into battle with us. I am also glad that I am not the last speaker, so I am not responsible for synthesizing all of this. We still have Mr. Hague and Mr. Wildermuth.

There are a number of problems that occurred to me while listening to these two presentations. I appreciated Mr. Eklund's emphasizing the role of the university and of business contributing to creativity. I was a little more disturbed by Mr. Boynton's parable, even though I will give him credit for some creativity in that. There is importance in looking backward, reading history, and Mr. Boynton suggested we must also look ahead. We must also look at the present, look at it fairly directly to see as well as we can what actually is happening. We have his references to the decline in religion, ethics, morality, even though to many of us it seems as though the young people of this age are more religious than they have been in my remembrance. They don't care much for institu-

tional religion, to be sure, but they certainly are pondering religious questions, talking about them in a way which never occurred to my generation. There was no such intense seriousness evident when I was their age.

Is there a decline in the arts? There is, of course, a use of distortion in non-representational art, but that has been true in every age. Part of the problem is to recognize what this distortion is aimed at, and in every age we have this problem of recognizing an intention to express a new set of feelings, different problems, different anxieties.

It is very well to go on with Shelley and Browning; we owe much to them; but it is good to remember that Percy Bysshe Shelley was detested in his own age for being such an obscene character, for being such a political radical, for practicing free love; but usually we don't look at all that. We look at what has come out of it. There was a great deal of waste, a great deal of sloppiness; but this is part of creativity.

There are serious risks that we must take in order to assure a continuing, developing culture. Mr. Boynton's parable reflects attitudes and fears which I believe have been expressed in every age. Perhaps my own background—I specialized in the culture and literature of the Middle Ages—makes me especially aware of such recurrence. I enjoy, for example, opportunities when some of the far-out religious people come around to my house knocking at the door and saying the world is coming to an end. Look at all the unrest, they say, floods, earthquakes, wars—all of these are signs that the world is coming to an end. And I welcome the opportunity to discuss those matters with them, inviting them in and asking: "Do you know what happened in the 14th century? What plagues there were, what divisions in the church, what revolts, what problems in the universities, what fears for the decline of culture, what certainty even then that the world was coming to an end?" These are recurring problems and perhaps in connection with what Mr. Eklund was saying, the universities are at fault; we aren't interpreting the latest developments. People in English, for example, really are not tackling the very current problem of pornography or obscenity or, perhaps to put it more accurately, the new approaches to poetry and literature. What is the difference between pornography and art, what is the reason for the new emphasis on candidness? Are there some values in this? Are we seeing a new dimension of man that popularly has been held back from us heretofore? I think that there are many problems like this which we need to be communicating in more immediately understandable form to the businessman, and to working people everywhere; and teachers in the

universities and colleges probably need to get out and talk to these people in a more continuing dialogue. So I want to thank our guests again for appearing here with us.

John A. Hague, *Stetson University*

I wish to express my thanks and gratefulness for this opportunity of confronting what seem to me to be extremely significant issues that concern us all.

First, I think that perhaps most of us could agree on some propositions that have been advanced here—1. that we are living in the midst of unprecedented change; 2. that this fact has caused a great many of us, educators and businessmen, to try to rethink our relationship to the general welfare, if you will; and thirdly, we educators certainly have been reminded, rather forcefully, that we need to rethink our role in the midst of this change, and it is refreshing to hear businessmen consider the fact that they may need to rethink their role. The question emerges, then, of how we can communicate effectively about this process.

I should like to advance the proposition that education and business existed as recently as fifty years ago together in what for many purposes was still a non-specialized society. If you consider the budget, for example, that universities on the one hand and business on the other devoted to research fifty years ago against the roughly 1,000 per cent to 2,000 per cent increase that has occurred in that fifty-year period, it becomes clear that one of the things that has happened to us is that we no longer live in that non-specialized society; that we live in a very much more complicated society and necessarily have to face more complicated questions. You were reminded last night that one of the things that seemed relatively simple as little as twenty-five or fifty years ago was equality of opportunity. Under the present circumstances the question of what you have to do to create equal opportunity is obviously a very sophisticated and complicated type of question. Now, given this fact, I think it may be healthy to remind ourselves of something that de Tocqueville noted a century ago, namely, his observation that Americans had a tendency to generalize about all things on the basis of their limited personal experience. My observation is that in a non-specialized society the consequences of doing this were frequently not so painful as they have become in a specialized society. And with this in mind and with the notion that both educators and businessmen confront now the problem of rethinking their role and, if you like, of changing their image, I would like to

suggest some guidelines. It seems to me that educators and businessmen alike should be more candid about acknowledging the limitations of their experience. I think, for example, that businessmen would get a more attractive, a more immediate and positive response, if they would acknowledge more candidly that there are some public problems for which their business experience offers no special insight; that, in the same vein, there is a positive need to broaden the education of all men in our society; that one of the responsibilities of the university, if you like, is to help us become more interesting human beings on the one hand and thus make possible a more creative use of our leisure, but also to make us all more knowledgeable about the community problems of people who live in our society. And the result, it seems to me, would be that we might all think more creatively about the relationships, say, between public and private sectors in our economy. It is impressive to hear some of the steps that business has taken in this direction. Yet, when we talk about providing jobs for the hard-core unemployed, we have to acknowledge that the ambitious goal of the previously mentioned private enterprise project to provide 500,000 jobs proceeds slowly. Further, the business of training the hard-core unemployed means that you have to provide a lot of people with general skills which, once having been acquired, are not saleable to any one particular corporation. Now the skills that are acquired in this process are the sorts of skills that an individual can use equally well in a great variety of corporations and the question remains, then, is it fair or realistic to expect private enterprise to assume this kind of burden or is it not essential that there be some creative mix here between private enterprise and public policy? I suggest that one of the things that needs to happen in this dialogue is that we all need to think more creatively about the relationship between public and private sectors and that we ought not to be hung up about theoretical models that no longer bear a real relationship to our current problems. I would think, for example, that it is desirable for our students to have a more realistic understanding of economics, and at the same time it is desirable for our businessmen to have a more realistic understanding of economics.

I come from a small town in which recently an editorial defined a conservative as an individual who had sound fiscal policies. The writer defined sound fiscal policies in terms of an 18th-century concept of family budget balancing. I would plead that (in our effort at dialogue) we attempt to get away from stereotypes of this kind which persuade businessmen and academicians alike that each other's domain is filled with

individuals who are bound down by traditional ways of thinking, and who are committed to the defense of things that no longer exist.

Although we have grave problems, I share the position of the last speaker. I believe a large number of students and faculty members are genuinely concerned about the problem of applying moral values to social issues. I do not think we are about to go the way of Rome. I believe that the university, for all its malaise, serves the society today in a healthy way that compares not unfavorably with what universities were doing fifty years ago. Indeed the university continues to be a center of very exciting dialogue about critical issues.

David Wildermuth (Student), *Oklahoma State University*

I am here today as a member of one of the world's greatest minorities: the student. Furthermore, I am among a minority of that minority, possessing, hopefully, the liberal and enlightened attitudes which characterize the most sensitive of today's students: the honors student.

I imagine you gentlemen are feeling somewhat tattered by now, so let me begin by saying that I am gratified to see that you are aware of the situation between the business and academic communities, and are concerned enough to be present. The fact that you are here is a sign of the hope of reconciliation between the two groups.

But I have my doubts about the prospects of the success of this reconciliation. I believe the problem is much deeper than indicated. Basically, the problem is a rejection of the values essential to American capitalism. Many aspects of Max Weber's "Protestant ethic" are now considered irrelevant by this minority of minorities which is the basis of my remarks. Hard work for material gain is not important. The duty of the individual to work hard for the betterment of society is no longer valid. The emphasis now is on the duty of society to work for the betterment of the individual. Profit is irrelevant and, in a sense, so is the national good. It might be argued that the American business system cannot survive without these values as a basic element of society. This is quite true.

It is rather frightening, isn't it? It is difficult to question your own way of life, and I think that is why it is so hard for business to see the problem clearly, while of course, educators and especially students have the vision of gods. Education cannot look to business for a way back because that way has already been rejected. It is indeed a way backward.

I would ask you to keep this in mind: the leaders of tomorrow will come largely from this minority of minorities of which I have been talking. Leaders . . . but of business? No.

FINAL RESPONSE

Ralph E. Boynton

One thing disturbed me greatly in the response of one of the speakers, because it indicated that I either had not made something clear to you or that he had not been listening. I am not suggesting that the academic world, the educational world, should perpetuate any particular dogma or any particular truth. What I am suggesting is that, if you have destroyed religion or are destroying it, you must bring in its place some other base for morality and ethics. It just does not appear that you are doing your job. Man cannot live without religion of some kind. If education is going to take the place of present forms of religion then you have an obligation to bring to us some other base on which we can live. Perhaps it will be the religion of education. So I am disturbed because it seems to me that what you are doing is exactly what one speaker seemed to me to be expressing. You are producing nihilistic, anarchistic people who have no way out, no foundation, no convictions except in the negative sense, and man cannot live this way. We have proved this time and time again in history.

I am suggesting that all of us play roles. I play a role as a businessman in the bank. I am kidded about the fact that in our Montgomery Street financial district of San Francisco we wear the Montgomery Street uniform. And, you know, you play roles, too. You dress a little differently in the classroom than we do in our offices. You are more inclined not to shave than we are, although beards may come to us too, because history proves that the pendulum of fashion swings in both directions.

But we all play roles. My criticism of the academic world at the present time is that it is not clear as to its role in the culture, the civilization in which we find ourselves, and it is not producing direction; and I am saying that the businessman knows his role quite well and has been very successful in his role of producing goods and services for the people.

In the United States at this particular time—and I want to reemphasize something I indicated during my remarks, and that is, that education has failed completely to be relevant to the total population. I was for a long time, a couple of years or more, vice-chairman of the Junior College Advisory Panel to the California State Board of Education. The one place where we teach vocational and technical subjects in California, which are really marketable in our present economy, is in that junior college system that serves somewhere between 450,000 and 500,000 students—at all ages, I might add. And yet there was a constant fight to

encourage the teaching of vocational and technical subjects in the junior colleges because the academic community wants to reestablish what I call the academic assembly line which leads from kindergarten to the Ph.D. This is not relevant to universal education. I think we need to think through the role of education in a modern society. The reason we have hard-core unemployed is because education has failed these people. I have reemphasized time after time at meetings in which I have been a member that all the expenditures, the millions and millions of dollars, which go to reeducate, to retrain, to prepare the hard-core unemployed—supposedly we paid for that before; we *thought* we paid for that before. All of these programs must be considered as temporary until education is relevant.

Father Thomas O'Brien concluded the session with the following words: "The side of the academics is characterized, by and large, by petulance and irresponsible lack of realism. The side of business suffers from a tendency toward a sneering contempt for the ivory tower geniuses. There are, of course, limited grounds for both attitudes. The tragedy, for both communities, for the country, and even for the world, is that both communities desperately need each other. I would recommend a continuation of this type of dialogue for the purpose of discovering grounds for mutual respect and constructive criticism."

CHAPTER 9

A Student View of Relevance

DAVID WILDERMUTH
Student
Oklahoma State University

If one word could describe a 1968 college student, that word would be "frustrated." Students, especially honors students, are aware that the world around them is filled with problems, and they are frustrated because they feel that their college education is not preparing them to solve these problems. The college experience is not relevant to the basic human question of learning to live with other men in harmony nor to the many subsidiary problems that arise from the existing disharmony.

One of the most pressing issues facing the American nation today is civil rights. Students hear many people speak out against prejudice, but then they see some of the same people exercising their own subtle forms of prejudice. Although they want desperately to do something, students are told that they cannot erase prejudice overnight. The most readily available method of action is Voltaire's "Hoe your own garden." But the vitally aware and concerned student does not believe that one nice garden will subdue the jungle.

The younger generation cannot accept certain values held by society. For example, there is the student who does not undertand why it is important to have a high grade point average when grades are often not a true measure of a student's abilities or accomplishments. Also, the concerned student places little emphasis on the material success which is so greatly emphasized by those who went through the Depression and the Second World War. Because of this misallocation of values, students are saying to their parents in an emotional outburst, "Your generation messed up this world. Now, how can you expect us to live in it?" The society which the student sees around him is not the society he wants for his own. He wants a world where human values are relevant to the needs of society, but at the same time, he feels that his college education

is not preparing him for that kind of society. It is the explosion of the myth that college is a place of enlightenment that constitutes the tragedy of American education.

Students want to see change, in terms of the resolution of problems such as civil rights, academic freedom, or the place of an honors program, but they feel that the institutionalized means of decision-making do not allow for adequate student expression nor for the implementation of the necessary changes. Their inability to influence the course of events, whether on a campus-wide or nation-wide level, is the source of student frustration. Dissatisfaction and frustration compound each other, until students are forced to go outside the system to make their demands known in an effort to progress beyond the status quo. Activities outside the system can take many forms, violent and non-violent. But when students become psychologically involved in a situation and are confronted with the realization that no one is listening to them or is concerned about what they have to say, they may go to drastic lengths to have their demands met. The recent situations at Columbia University and in France illustrate what happens as frustration approaches its ultimate limit.

So the question arises: What can be done to make the college experience meaningful in terms of the needs of society, both now and in the future? And if it is assumed that the honors student is one of tomorrow's leaders, then it is quite appropriate to ask what sort of education the honors student should receive to prepare him for this role. The answers to these questions cannot be easy, or surely they would have been discovered before now. Based on my own short tenure at Oklahoma State University, which admittedly may not be a typical center of higher education, I can offer only one possible solution.

That solution is student participation and involvement in the activities of the academic community. The college experience should, above all, prepare the student for modern society, both aesthetically and practically. The academic side of college is necessary to provide the basis of this preparation, but academics, in the sense of "learning your subject well," cannot ensure that the knowledge gained will be relevant to the problems of society, or that the student will be able to apply what he has learned to those problems. Something more is needed to answer the question of relevance. That missing element is the actual confrontation of the student with problems similar to those he will meet when he leaves college, and his need for the experience of solving those problems as a part of his educational experience. This is what is meant by student participation.

There are many ways in which student involvement can lead to relevance. One of the most valuable is an effective program in student government. Working in student government gives the student practical experience in dealing with people and working to achieve established goals. For instance, suppose a business administration graduate finds a job in a smoothly-run organization. He fits well into the organization, until one day he realizes that the system could work a little better with a few changes. He visits the head of the company and suggests several modifications, but is told that the organizational structure will not change. If he wants something different, he can find it in another organization. Quite unexpectedly then, our graduate has a problem and does not know what to do with it. What can he do? Whom can he talk to about making the changes? If this person, as a student, had been confronted with the problem of modifying the structure of student government or of university government, he might have a few more ideas about what to do with his present problem.

As another example, one can look at the Student Association of Oklahoma State University. The president of the student body recently set up a research committee to do a study on student participation and prepare a report to be submitted to the administration suggesting changes in university structure which would allow students to participate in campus affairs on a more meaningful level. The students doing this study were first confronted with the problem of convincing the administration that the report would contain serious suggestions and that the study was being done to solve the problems of lack of communication and student apathy rather than to harass the administration. The dual activities of research and personal contact with administrators and faculty members are much more relative to situations which exist outside the university than most course work. When these participating students leave the university, they will be well equipped to deal with problems such as civil rights or poverty which require careful study before action can be taken.

Also at Oklahoma State, an interesting situation exists concerning the Honors Program, which allows some students to participate meaningfully in the working of the program. In the spring of 1967, the Honors Student Council was formed to act as liaison between the students and the faculty and administrators of the program. Among other things, the Council was to publish a newsletter and present student opinion about the development of the Honors Program. Since that time, because of financial limitations and other pressures, faculty and administrative leadership in the program has noticeably lessened. The few honors students

who are members of the Council are very dedicated to the development of the program, and consequently the task of providing the initiative in the Honors Program has fallen largely, although not completely, to them.

In this case, there are a number of students who are actively involved in such things as organizing new honors courses, guiding the development of the general direction of honors at OSU, and promoting interest in honors among all segments of the university. These students are learning to deal with people and to cope with the problems of running an honors program. Their involvement on this level gives them a deeper and richer understanding of the concept of honors. They are receiving an education which is not to be found in the classroom, but which should be an essential element of an honors education, or any education for that matter. However, such an education should be institutionalized, rather than left to chance.

Of course, the major obstacle to this sort of education is that such activities in substantial quantities detract from one's academic accomplishments. Because there is such great emphasis placed on academic achievements in the present system of American education, it is apparent that some institutional changes must be made to allow for student involvement. As a start, students should be given academic credit for major extra-curricular activities. At most universities this is already done to some extent. At Oklahoma State, for instance, students receive credit for participation in such activities as band or debate. But students can also get credit for studying fairy tales in a course affectionately known as "Kiddie Lit." However, neither the President of the Student Association, nor any member of Student Senate, nor the editor of the school paper receives credit for the time he devotes to serving other students. Certainly, a knowledge of children's stories is important preparation for an elementary school teacher, but participation in student government is important for any career, and academic credit should be given accordingly. The practical experience in student government or in editing the school paper helps prepare students for the world they will face at graduation. Such activities should be truly co-curricular rather than extra-curricular.

Of course, everyone cannot participate in student government or work on an honors student council. So, as a second approach, students should participate in the substance and direction of their own education. This is especially an honors approach, but by no means should it be limited to honors students. For example, everyone should have the opportunity to participate in a seminar or colloquium in which he can pick his own

topic and decide how he is going to study it. Such a class allows students to study what is meaningful to them and gives them invaluable practice in teaching themselves.

There should also be an opportunity for students to participate in the administrative side of education, especially curriculum evaluation and revision. In many cases, students have almost no voice in the educational process. They simply come to the university, receive great quantities of largely irrelevant information in a short period of time, and then leave. It is only after they have left the university, when it is too late to make the most of the college experience, that they learn something of the meaning of education.

If students are given a chance to examine, evaluate and direct their own education, their appreciation of the educational experience increases tremendously. It follows that, in general, they will be more enthusiastic about learning and will strive to become more educated. When this enthusiasm for learning is combined with the ability to examine and evaluate a question such as the educational process, the student has received the best possible preparation for answering the next question and solving the next problem. Whether he faces the question of capital punishment or the problem of whether or not to join the Peace Corps, the student who has been involved in the problems of the academic community, rather than divorced from them, will be able to find an answer and act on the basis of that answer. He is no longer frustrated by the inability to act.

Difficult as today's problems are, those of tomorrow are not likely to be as simple. Civil rights and urban problems are far from being resolved; the crime rate is still rising; American foreign policy is costing us more friends than we can afford to lose. The answers to these and innumerable other unseen questions cannot be found if people are not prepared to become actively involved. A college education becomes relevant when it exposes and clarifies problems and prepares the student to find the answers. Student participation and involvement provide the practical experience in decision-making and challenge-meeting which are essential to make the college experience meaningful and relevant to existence.

CHAPTER 10

Relevance In Action

The material in this chapter deals with a variety of attempts to relate relevance to curriculum, to creativity, to independent study, and to a meaningful liberal education. In most cases the ideas and suggestions presented here arise out of the experience of the writers in honors programs. The flexibility and experimental possibilities offered by honors programs have produced a number of educational reforms designed to meet student demand for more relevance.

TOWARD A RELEVANT CURRICULUM

John A. Hague, Stetson University

The phrase "student power" came of age in 1968. Like its counterpart, "black power," it means different things to different people. At one end of the spectrum it simply represents a demand for a more active role in the shaping of university policies; at the other end of the spectrum it reflects an angry desire to tear the fabric of existing university and social structures to pieces. In any case, use of the term indicates varying degrees of dissatisfaction with the status quo.

Why the dissatisfaction? One must, I think, reject simplistic answers if one is to gauge correctly the meaning of student unrest. A unique combination of factors have brought things to a boil for the present student generation. Some of the factors are born of current events; some are the product of modern technology; some are the results of intellectual developments which have been festering for nearly a hundred years; and some have their roots in simple pedagogical failures which the academic community has not managed to recognize or correct.

Let us look at each of these factors briefly. Only since World War II have American universities been able to admit something approaching a representative cross-section of the nation's youth. This development, moreover, coincided with the emergence of a pluralistic society. The inevitable result is that students are bringing a greater and greater diver-

sity of ambitions, problems, and frustrations to the halls of ivy which they enter. A second result is that many students find no real separation between the problems which society faces and their own personal problems. Hence the problems have a sense of urgency and immediacy which was not formerly true. If you are living on a volcano it does not make much sense to talk as though it did not exist.

Modern technology invariably produces a mixture of exhilaration and terror. As more and more areas come under control, one confronts, simultaneously, possibilities of affluence and undreamed-of comforts, and the systematic destruction of personal freedom. So much seems possible and so much goes wrong. The end result is frustration compounded. We know *how* to win the war on poverty but we lack the political know-how to gain the necessary support. We have the desire for peace, but we do not have the know-how to achieve it.

Changes have also occurred in the realm of ideas. Henry Adams, at the end of his life, declared his efforts to educate himself for the twentieth century a failure. Adams realized that there would never again be a time when educators could articulate a body of concepts which, once acquired, would enable men to deal with the problems of their age. Individuals would, therefore, have to acquire new habits and attitudes in order to remain educated. Adams' insight has, in the main, been ignored.

I have great admiration and respect for my peers. College professors are sensitive, intelligent, conscientious human beings, and a remarkable number of them are blessed with a sense of humor. Nevertheless, we are, as a group, subject oriented, and we generally bring to our teaching the dedication of skilled craftsmen who have learned a great deal about the material we wish to present. Nothing in our academic training, however, has prepared us to understand the people with whom we wish to communicate. Moreover, there is evidence that we have not communicated significantly with most of the students who have occupied the seats in our classrooms. When a student with a straight A average says it wasn't worth it, it is time to take notice of our own failures. And the students are saying, in very large numbers, that we have not succeeded in involving them in their own educations; that we have not, in the language of the day, "turned them on."

The situation seems to call for curricular and pedagogical reform, but most of us remain as uncertain as Henry Adams about the steps which will revitalize the university tradition. Given the pluralistic quality of modern society, it seems unlikely that there can be any one set of reforms which will suddenly restore order to our troubled houses. It may be possible, however, to suggest some guidelines within which some

needed reforms can develop. The university can enhance its relevance by seeking three sets of polarized goals. It must simultaneously strive for greater flexibility and greater discipline within its instructional program. Secondly, it must foster a new combination of independence and dependence. Finally, it must work for greater detachment and more realistic involvement in contemporary affairs.

The first two sets of goals go hand in hand. A curriculum which gives more meaningful options to students will produce more freedom, independence, and responsibility. Universities can, I am persuaded, take a giant step in this direction by defining their requirements in terms of proficiencies rather than in terms of courses and hours. If a student understands that he must achieve certain stated proficiencies, and that he can choose any means which his own capacities and the university's resources make possible, he is likely to see his choice of means as a significant decision and to accept real responsibility for his act. For its part, the university would have to assess its own resources and be clear about the kind and variety of assistance it was prepared to furnish. It is possible, for example, that several institutions would decide that it no longer made sense to offer courses in the traditional sense; that it made more sense to offer lectures and discussions on stated topics, leaving to the student responsibility for filling in the gaps.

A wise use of the university's resources may force it to refuse to do for students what they can do for themselves. Certainly it is possible to experiment by setting proficiency requirements which are not satisfied by any courses. Many colleges are already undertaking ventures of this kind through summer reading programs and various types of research and thesis projects. In any case it seems clear that reforms which are designed to make the curriculum more flexible and open-ended will change the instructor's role in a rather significant fashion. He may very well end up by giving far more of his time to evaluating what students produce than to the process of formal instruction. Size of the institution will undoubtedly influence the mix of techniques, but the time is clearly ripe for a reappraisal of the teaching process. Whatever the outcome of this reappraisal, faculty retraining projects are likely to be the order of the day. At the very least, we will have to become more sophisticated examiners and critics.

In order to face up to rigorous evaluation, the student will have to use his freedom in a disciplined way. In learning to utilize the resources of a university community he will discover his dependence upon the community in which he participates. Thus the fact of his independence will make the nature of his dependence clear.

Such changes may not, however, be sufficient to meet the needs and demands of our students. Most colleges and universities can afford to experiment in still more radical ways. There are many institutions which allow members of the senior class to waive all course requirements in order to study a topic of their own choosing. Why not consider giving students the privilege of beginning with a free year? The college could simply require a student, at the end of his freshman year, to defend before a faculty committee a program of study by which he proposed to earn a degree. He would have to convince the committee that he had a legitimate conception of a college education and that he knew his own institution well enough to present a program within its means.

I am arguing that, as educators, we should insist upon the proposition that freedom means responsibility, and that both qualities are essential ingredients of a good education. We know, however, that freedom can be a fearful thing; for many it is a source of terror. If, therefore, we create communities in which students are faced with the responsibilities of significant choices, we must also offer, among other things, greatly broadened counseling resources to help students meet the multiplicity of identity crises which will surely result.

What about the third set of polarized goals, involvement and detachment? Woodrow Wilson, in 1896, offered a striking definition of the ideal university.

> I have had sight of the perfect place of learning in my thought; a free place, and a various, where no man could be and not know with how great a destiny knowledge had come into the world—itself a little world; but not perplexed, living with a singleness of aim not known without; the home of sagacious men, hardheaded and with a will to know, debaters of the world's questions every day and used to the rough ways of democracy; and yet a place removed—calm Science seated there, recluse, ascetic, like a nun; not knowing that the world passes, not caring, if the truth but come in answer to her prayer. . . . A place where ideals are kept in an air they can breathe; but no fool's paradise. A place where to hear the truth about the past and hold debate about the affairs of the present, with knowledge and without passion; like the world in having all men's life at heart, a place for men and all that concerns them; but unlike the world in its self-possession, its thorough way of talk, its care to know more than the moment brings to light; slow to take excitement, its air pure and wholesome with a breath of faith; every eye within it bright in the clear day and quick to look toward heaven for

> the confirmation of its hope. Who shall show us the way to this place?[1]

Is it not possible that the students are trying to help us find that place? That we might create something better by combining our scholarly detachment with their passion for involvement? Or that we might at least create a setting in which these qualities of mind and heart confront one another? Might we not as a result create some new kinds of courses? I am now participating in a course which brings students from a white college and a black college together with community leaders to discuss community problems. All of us are discovering a body of literature which is scholarly and at the same time relevant to problems which are on our very doorstep.

If there is no single curriculum which defines liberal education, perhaps we can clarify, to some extent, the goals we hope to reach. Let our definitions be generous and our means be flexible. Let us grant that students, faculty, and administrative officers will have new roles, the discovery of which may require "blood, toil, sweat and tears." Nevertheless, the tradition, vitality, and very existence of the university are at stake.

HOW DO WE GO ABOUT ENCOURAGING CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENT?

David V. Harrington, Gustavus Adolphus College

One hardly needs to defend the relevance of creativity as an educational goal. But we need more study of what can and should be done to encourage such an ideal. At the very beginning, we must admit that there is plenty of obvious, if overly generalized, support for various causes associated with creativity. All of us are well aware of the risks that universities have always taken to defend the nonconformist, to show at least sympathy, if not solid support, for the creative arts, to provide the best working conditions for theoretical research in the sciences. The doctrine of academic freedom, no matter how poorly understood, does much to defend the independent, creative spirit. In general, nearly all serious thinking people have a high regard for the spirit of free inquiry so necessary for creative achievement. But most of the gains in this area have been for the benefit of the productive scholar or the independ-

[1] As quoted by George F. Kennan, "Rebels Without a Program," in *The New York Times Magazine*, January 21, 1968, p. 22.

ently minded teacher. Little has been done to encourage creative achievement by students, except possibly in art departments or in programs of creative writing. Instead, after one has examined as much as he can manage of the flood of materials concerning curricular innovations and experiments in teaching, one must conclude that the primary gains have been in constructing a disciplined atmosphere for economical transmission of knowledge. We might even concede that many highly selective small colleges choose their prospective students on the basis of independent thought and creative potential; but few if any construct their curriculum or advertise a philosophy of education stressing a conscious awareness of what is known about creativity.

As a starting point, we should look at what those involved in the psychology of learning agree upon as common characteristics of the creative individual, the creative process, and the creative atmosphere. Moreover, we should devote serious thought to speculation about the consequences of these characteristics of creativity for our positions as teachers and administrators connected with the honors program.

It is easy to get caught in a stalemate right at the start when trying to define creativity. On a sophisticated level of achievement, creativity is something that alters the structure of our understanding. It is an advance in thinking and affects others in such a way as to change their patterns of thought. On the childhood level, however, creativity is generally thought of as an unpredictable response, an original, though not necessarily rational conclusion. It is a new way of looking at things, but perhaps is not transferrable knowledge. I have strong suspicion that these two very different levels of creativity are often confused, that the characteristics of creative people on these two levels are equated, with the result of equivocation. One can often find some such statement as the following: "In children creativity is universal. Among adults it is almost nonexistent."

In teaching on a college level we must aim for a level of creativity which is somewhere in between, to encourage an original, independent response or interpretation or communication which will stand up as rationally defensible in terms of as much knowledge as we could fairly expect the student to have about his subject at this stage in his studies. His creative achievement may or may not be a contribution to knowledge; but it should be accepted as representing a rather high degree of creativity if the major defects in the working out of the problem concern material with which the student has had no previous contact. Such a formula as I have just suggested needs more precise definition in terms of the materials in each separate course. Such a definition is a difficult one to work with, unless the teacher has a fairly sure understanding of the

student's previous training and probable resources in studying in his course. In other words, the teacher must have a firm command of his subject matter to encourage this kind of creativity. We regularly insist that teachers have this much control pretty much all the time anyway; but we might timidly suggest that "firm command" doesn't mean that the teacher is obliged to demonstrate everything he knows and only what he knows. Rather, he must even go far enough so that he can make students aware of the vague and fuzzy boundaries of his area. He should be willing to let his students ponder some of the uncertainties most likely to invite original and challengeable interpretations.

Thus the ideal teacher will set up class assignments in such a way as to make the strongest appeal to the creative individual who, incidentally, seems to be a favorite subject for study by psychologists. The two major branches of such study have already been suggested: studies of the men and women who have contributed to the great advances in our culture; and laboratory tests of young children. Again we are "in between" in dealing with college students. We could follow the general summary of qualities associated with the creative individual listed in Hilgard and Atkinson's recent popular textbook for psychology students. The creative individual is independent in thought and action, not interested in group activities that demand conformity, and not easily influenced by social pressures which conflict with his opinions. He has a tendency to be less dogmatic, more open-minded, than people rated as not creative. He is able and willing to recognize his own irrational impulses. He shows a definite preference for complexity and variety, with this preference perhaps reflecting a desire on the part of the creative individual to discover order in what is apparent disorder. He values humor and has a good sense of humor, and he shows great interest in both theoretical and aesthetic values. It is emphasized over and over again by the specialists in the field that there is little correlation between creative ability and intelligence as it is usually measured.

Most of the preceeding conclusions seem based upon studies of people who have made notable contributions and have been productively creative. On the other hand, primarily on the basis of studies of young children, we find the psychologists expressing the rather common conviction that all people are, to some degree, potentially creative. The common qualities abstracted from studies of creative people, for that matter, are neither odd nor rare, and certainly not perverse. But one can frequently encounter the rather tragic implication that the patterns of education and maturation in our society contribute to a repression or destruction of creative impulses. On a simple level, at least part of this

tragic story can be understood if we recognize a few of the very common personal qualities manifested among creative people—personal qualities which for the most part we discourage or even try to stamp out. The creative person often shows a dependency upon others, an unwillingness to take his share of ordinary social responsibilities. In conformity with popular belief he more often defies authority or convention than the non-creative person. He will occasionally display an unattractive sense of omnipotence. At the same time he will reveal surprising gullibility in some intellectual spheres, no matter how critical he may be in others. Still another characteristic of the creative person which receives very little encouragement from our society is one that deals with what may be the most crucial issue in encouraging the development of creativity—the fact that the creative person generally has less control over his emotions, at least at some times, than the less creative person. Or, to put it in other terms, according to Maslow, *primary creativeness* comes from those who can play at fantasy and be spontaneous; only *secondary creativity* can come from those who "over control" their emotions and can't play very well. "Over control" is a slanted term, but the implications of the idea clearly are related to a problem to be examined later, the relationship between encouraging creativity and maintaining traditional standards of discipline.

Difficult as it is to separate the creative individual from the creative process, it is nevertheless a fact that the creative individual is really creative only a small part of the time. On the basis of countless testimonies about what led up to creative achievement, the experts in the field have noticed several prominently recurring steps. These include the obvious first step calling for preliminary labor or preparation. Somewhere in this early stage the creative person experiences "some sort of vague, undefined emotional turmoil or a chaotic muddle of ideas." There is a nervous confusion which combines uncertainty about what the individual is working towards, and a feeling of confidence that what he is struggling with will ultimately prove valuable or relevant. N. E. Golovin describes this initial germinal idea as having three associated characteristics: "(i) The idea itself is relatively specific, narrow, and apparently trivial in immediate context; (ii) however, it leads to a state of nervous excitement and satisfaction which are difficult either to explain or to suppress; and (iii) it seems to open the door to a whole flood of new associations, connections, and suggestions."

The second major stage in the creative process poses an especially difficult problem for the teacher in a classroom situation; this second step assumes a lapse of time in which little discernible progress is made. The

term "incubation" is used to identify this peculiar waiting period, during which time the previously jumbled pieces of an idea mysteriously and hopefully are falling into place. Most of us can testify from our own experience that these fragments of an idea may or may not actually fit together; and a difficult problem for the teacher is to decide whether he can accept the risk of encouraging creativity by providing assignments with creative possibilities, knowing full well that many students working in such a program very definitely will not come through.

If something actually does come through during this incubation process, then the creative individual has reached the third stage, which might be called illumination or inspiration. At this point the individual actually is able to express his idea. The last stage, which the psychologists call verification, perhaps because they deal more commonly with scientific discoveries in their studies, actually involves the most generally recognized disciplined techniques in finishing off a paper or a painting or whatever it is, employing the trained techniques which would justify or prove or emphasize the idea or insight as forcefully as possible. My own feeling is that this last stage in the creative process, which without question is a vital step, in too many academic programs is actually the only step. It is the most certain, thus most respectable, part of any academic discipline. Most commonly we see and discuss an idea only after it has been finished off with this last step. We devote considerable class time to the analysis of complete ideas. The student is not told often enough about the earlier stages of nervous excitement, of frustration because of no discernible progress, of an apparent breakthrough that needs immediate disciplined verification. We need to tell students rather regularly about how common and natural these earlier feelings are in a creative process. Perhaps we should even minimize somewhat our more sophisticated and assured analyses of the finished product.

But the fact remains that, given our present academic situation in which we are expected to accomplish certain things within a limited period of time and are expected to measure the relative achievement of our students, we cannot really devise assignments or course programs which correspond exactly with the ideal characteristics in the creative process. As an expedient, however, we could emphasize the need for greater open-endedness in assignments. This may necessitate getting students started on a term paper or a research assignment somewhat earlier than we do now or it might mean we should be less definite about deadlines. But we must also avoid losing contact with the students. We must keep a sense of expectation in their minds. This may mean more use of early drafts or miscellaneous notes or progress reports for the sake of mak-

ing certain that the student has not lost sight of his objective, and to give as much encouragement as possible for him to get past the incubation stage.

Perhaps all of the foregoing can be summed up by suggesting that the major problem in moving from whatever it is that we are doing now to a more creative emphasis is to decide how much we can sacrifice of those traditional teaching patterns designed for the sake of discipline. Can we willingly encourage, let us say at the start of a course, a greater degree of vagueness, uncertainty, sloppiness, and wastefulness, to provide the open space for freer, more original movements of thought? Can we deliberately maintain a classroom situation in which many students will beg for more restraints or a surer sense of order than we think they ought to have, for the sake of creative opportunities? Can we keep before them an awareness of desirable qualities and feelings associated with the creative process so that they will stay with a problem which refuses to solve itself right at the start, or perhaps never will? Can we encourage them to risk hurtling into what might prove to be a "dead-end," or at best a "negative" experiment?

We must regularly remind ourselves that experimental courses making use of the previously stated principles of creativity, assuming the most obviously noticeable attitudes in higher education, are almost certain to be regarded with suspicion, can yield at best only very modest immediate results, and are not likely to be especially popular for either faculty or students; but are vital for liberal education nonetheless as a healthy, unsettling element, as a testing period for an important intellectual activity which though rewarded generously for favorable after-effects, is not systematically encouraged in its earlier stages in higher education. Therefore, making use of the flexibility and experimental opportunities in honors programs, we should offer leadership in publicizing and popularizing the notion of encouraging creativity within the various programs that we represent.

IS COMPLETELY INDEPENDENT STUDY POSSIBLE?

Frederick Sontag, Claremont College

All independent study programs (ISP) seem to begin by being caught on the horns of a dilemma from which they must extract themselves if they hope to be successful. The very idea of ISP implies that the student will work in independence from the normal curricular requirements and structure. At its minimum, all this means is that different procedures

for instruction will be used than the majority follow, but, particularly in this day and age, this quickly gets translated into freedom from all requirements and supervision whatsoever. In an era in which many students want complete autonomy and unrestricted freedom, all "Honors" or ISP's have to meet the question of the possibility of completely independent study if they are to succeed.

In a former era, independent study simply meant release from a certain amount of course work to do a more or less standard and well defined piece of research; but that era is gone. Now the issue is freedom from all imposition and structure and requirement. The going sentiment is against anything which seeks to shape or to mold the mind (which formerly was taken to be the avowed aim of education). Of course, not every student today shares this rather popular notion, but many who are now attracted to honors and ISP's do. Thus, the burden of meeting this question of educational philosophy is on ISP's, and the future success of all honors programs seems to lie with their ability to meet the criterion of completely independent study.

Pomona has just completed a two-year experiment with an ISP sponsored by the Ford Foundation on several campuses simultaneously. I do not want to try to evaluate the success of that program directly but instead to use it as a context to discuss certain issues which emerged clearly from this experiment. This plan began with freshmen and exempted them almost completely from the normal college course structure. Of course, it had a structure and program of its own which I won't elaborate here. The point is that, because these students were operating within the college but outside its regular lines of instruction, several of the issues regarding the possibility for completely independent study emerge rather clearly.

Perhaps the first of these is whether and how a small college can operate a program within a program (or perhaps outside) successfully. This is not so much an issue in a university, which by its nature has a multiplicity of levels and programs going simultaneously. However, the very idea of a small college is that it has a unified program and faculty geared to operating on one system. Then, in these close quarters, if you introduce a group of students who are operating quite differently, it is a real question whether they will be treated as exceptional students or as second-class citizens who are not a part of the mainstream. I suspect that this did not use to be as much of a problem in quieter days when small college campuses were more pastoral, but nowadays the student involved in ISP is likely to get bypassed by the pressure of routine.

One conclusion here seems to be that completely independent study

cannot be guided any longer by a faculty who give only part time to it. This does not mean that a whole faculty must be released to be geared to this independent style of study, but it does mean that at least a large core of those responsible must be wholly devoted to this method so that those involved in another system are not directly supervisors but are only used as specialized consultants. An independent study program can no longer be superimposed on top of a normal faculty routine. If it is, such special students are not in the instructor's main line of concern, and they are likely to be treated accordingly.

One new problem in ISP's is that they become a focus for anti-institutional, anti-formalistic, and anti-legalistic feelings so prominent on campuses today. In a sense, this gives an incentive to, and puts attention on, honors programs, if they rise to meet the challenge, but it also raises the danger that such special programs will become a focus of negative sentiments and of hostility toward formal education. The problem, of course, is that this is not the best atmosphere in which to launch independent work which will be creative and constructive. In the rush to be free of required study and tests, any program of completely independent study has a chance to meet this academic challenge of the day if it does not simply become a haven for rebellious minds.

This brings us to the question of just how possible "completely independent study" is? One problem here is that today freshmen want the same complete independence which used to characterize only senior study. The Pomona experience would seem to indicate that the freshman year is too early for complete exemption from the normal course structure, and yet today it is in the early period of college that the demand comes for something different from the pressure of regular courses. Perhaps the question of freshmen in ISP is tied to the question of whether completely independent study is possible, in the sense that this first year of college is perhaps the time to face the issue of no structure or requirements vs. the possibility of a variety of forms or structures for learning.

That is, to operate successfully, an ISP should not be independent of all structure and regulation but simply exempt from large course routine; it substitutes for this a structure of more individually guided research and study. However, if this is to be successful, this new structure must be made quite clear at the outset; the men who guide it must be principally committed to this mode of teaching on a full-time basis, and each student must have some one person to whom he is immediately responsible for his program. A regular course structure is less personally demanding, but all ISP's require a great deal of man to man encounter.

The age-old problem of the selection of students is central here, and it is not easy to solve, since today the idea of rigid screening for admission to a program is itself under attack. Yet the success of independent study demands that it not be left to free student option. Special motivation and drive are required, or else a regular course structure is preferable. Psychological stability is imperative, so that intellectual brightness is almost the least necessary item. Freedom in unstructured quantities is traumatic if the student is not psychologically prepared to cope with it, so that it is this factor which needs more to be determined than academic preparation. The problem of a selection procedure that takes these factors into account where pre-freshmen are concerned is almost insurmountable. Thus, the sophomore year is almost the earliest beginning point for independent study in order to allow for an adequate selection process.

Completely independent study programs aim to develop creativity and self-discovery, and these are goals which have always been valuable and which are stressed even more today. Yet we have not solved the issue of whether creativity and self-discovery can be a completely free process, or whether they require structure and direction for their success. Of course, independent study is not a lack of structure or direction but the use of a different kind. However, this must be made very clear to the interested student, or else the impulse to creativity and self-discovery may end in simply a struggle against all requirements and direction.

If an ISP uses a tutorial method, it is not free of all requirements but actually uses a system which is more demanding (if properly done) than class anonymity could ever be. Yet, tutorials cannot be done on the side. The whole energy of the teacher must be freed for that form of instruction. On the other side, a student attending a regular class but not meeting its formal requirements is actually at a disadvantage, because the instructor is committed to a different method of education than the student has come for. It would seem that more and more we cannot have several modes of education going on side by side in a small college setting, or else one of them is going to suffer very second-class status.

To counter the rebellion against the idea of molding the student which is so common today, we have to answer that: (1) completely independent study is not possible (within a small college); (2) that individually tailored modes of instruction are, generally speaking, possible, but only if they are recognized as actually more demanding, if they are subject to careful selective factors geared to admit only those who are psychologically adjusted to such methods, and if the energy of the college faculty as a whole is committed to an independent mode of instruction. It would

seem that no student can be expected to serve two masters, or else he will come to hate one of them.

THE KENTUCKY COLLOQUIA— A SEARCH FOR RELEVANCE

Robert O. Evans, University of Kentucky

Since its inception at the University of Kentucky some ten years ago, the honors program has sought ways to make its courses relevant to the problems of the twentieth century. We have also considered other means, besides courses—ours are called colloquia—of making the honors program relevant. For example, the student advisory committee has recently proposed to the faculty that for honors students all courses except those in the major and related fields should be graded Pass or Fail, with the passing grades to reach to the lowest C. That is surely relevant to students. We have spent a good deal of energy on informal seminars devoted to such topics as LSD. But in the final analysis our search for relevance has focused on the regular instructional offerings of the honors program and has become a continuing struggle for improvement of curriculum.

I should preface a description of this search with a word or two of explanation. At Kentucky we do not have an honors college with separate but better than equal instructional facilities. Perhaps we will never be able to afford one even if we decide to move in that direction. Our instructional component in the honors program has three separate aspects: (1) independent work (which has a relevance to the student's major), (2) homogeneously grouped sections of large multi-section, lower division classes, and (3) colloquia, of which there are six semesters each carrying three credit hours. The two final semesters are undergraduate seminars or pro-seminars in varying subject matter. For example, last year we gave two seminars in "Creativity" taught by a professor of chemistry. This year we are doing a seminar in modern philosophy, that is, logical positivism, existentialism, and the new theology, taught by a professor of philosophy; and a seminar in the philosophical basis of literary criticism, taught by a professor of English. I have no doubt these are relevant exercises for the students who participate, but it is not of the seminars that I wish to speak here.

Nor do I wish to describe the homogeneously grouped sections, which so many of us consider to lie at the heart of an honors program. These are the weakest link in our chain. For one thing, a homogeneously grouped section of, say, history is always the primary responsibility of the

department of history—not the honors program. If we send the department ten students from the honors program, they may decide that the section is not economically feasible unless there are twenty students. They may—notice I say "may"—add another ten on a first-come, first-served basis. That not only destroys the honors concept, but it also destroys the homogeneity. As a matter of fact, we operate excellent courses in chemistry and mathematics every semester. From time to time any given department may—often does—support an excellent, exciting honors course, but more often the funding is not available.

Accordingly, our honors program has become more and more an instructional program with primary emphasis on the courses for which we are directly responsible, our colloquia. We recruit and hire faculty to teach these courses, and I might add we are extremely careful whom we select.

During the past years the first four courses, that is, two semesters of colloquia for freshmen and two for sophomores, have become a reasonably consistent intellectual package. I don't mean to say we have solved all our problems yet, but at least we have developed a direction almost as solid as that pursued in any particular department. We are, in short, a sort of undergraduate department in History of Ideas. Because of other things we do and because we deal only in superior students, we are also an honors program, but it might be more accurate to describe our activities as a Superior Student System whose primary function is instructional.

From the inception our colloquia have been taught with the history of ideas approach and methodology. We have found that this approach works well with students who, while they are homogeneous in superior talents, are divided amongst all the colleges of the university and even more divided in their special interests. About the only thing they have in common besides superiority is a burning intellectual curiosity—because that is the sort of student we select in the beginning.

At first our colloquia did not carry hour credit and had to be added on top of the regular program in which the students were engaged. But we soon found that the honors concept should not mean more work but better work; not more hours, but with advanced placement and evasion of certain prerequisites, less work, at least in terms of hours spent to accomplish a particular result.

Moreover, the faculty who taught these courses were at first borrowed, mostly from the English department, and their primary allegiance lay with their departments—indeed, to the research aspect of their departmental commitment. Our teachers wanted promotion just as much as

any others. Now we hire young teachers with special gifts and training in our subject matter—usually from English departments, Comparative Literature, History, Philosophy, or Languages. We keep them, more or less, through the probationary period for assistant professors. After that we encourage them to affiliate with a specific department. The program is too new to make any generalizations about their success in making departmental affiliations even within our own university, but it goes without saying that our instructors are extremely capable people. It is not unusual for one of them to be singled out by one body or another for teaching excellence.

When we borrowed heavily from the established faculty to carry the major portion of our teaching load, we constantly struggled with two problems. First, some faculty members welcomed too much the opportunity to rest for a semester or amuse themselves with some special interest. Others wished to pursue their graduate specialities with our students. I do not mean we got poor teaching. We got excellent teaching. But the pieces—the various colloquia—managed to hang together by only the thinnest thread. Students could see no consistent intellectual goals at the end of the colloquia experience, and I admit neither could I.

Gradually, we evolved our own curriculum. We began with a set of assumptions, some of which are pertinent here, others not. For example, we decided never to infringe on the academic departments. If they taught a particular subject, we deliberately avoided it. We decided that our subject matter must stand the test of a critical faculty, but we were convinced that the orthodox departmental structure in the state-supported university by no means represented a complete introduction to the world of the human intellect. In short, we argued there was room for the honors approach. We decided that our subject matter must be relevant to the concerns of the twentieth century, but we could not afford to pander either to student or faculty interest in particular problems of the moment. I mean that—after some experimentation—we had to develop the hardheartedness to refuse student requests for seminars in the sexual revolution and faculty requests for discussions of African literature. It took courage to refuse some of the suggestions, all of which I believe have been made in good faith. But the point was—is—that an honors program must find relevance to the problems of our century not in specific answers to current questions but in the development of a certain cast of mind which will equip students to deal, we hope, with any problems—and to deal with them rationally.

To state it another way—it is not the business of the honors curriculum to provide students with *knowledge about* anything. It is the business of

the curriculum to prepare students for coherent *conceptual inquiry*. The honors experience, for the students, and it turns out for the faculty as well, is a process. It is not a matter of an accumulation of knowledge for some particular purpose, although a good deal of knowledge is naturally accumulated anyhow. The aim of the process is to make better individuals, better able to cope with problems, better able to live in our century, and, we hope, better able to provide leadership in our world.

Once we were cognizant of our goal, we were able to construct a sensible curriculum, though admittedly it is still far from perfect. In the first place the works studied, it seemed to us, should often vary rather than always be the same. Who is to say that Plato's *Republic* is always better for superior students than, say, the *Timaeus*. Moreover, teachers get tired of teaching the same works semester after semester. We must insure their constant freshness and spirit of inquiry.

What eventually we did was set up a four-course package in which each course builds upon the preceding one without necessarily having that as its prerequisite. We now entitle these segments, informally: (1) the Greek World View; (2) the Christian World View in the Middle Ages; (3) the Christian World View in the Renaissance and After; and (4) the Secular Challenge of the Twentieth Century. Each colloquium carries three hours credit, and they fit into the regular university requirements.

You can fill in the pieces for yourselves and see the sort of curriculum we have inevitably built. The Greek World View may start with the *Iliad*, read selected tragedies, and end with Plato's *Republic* or Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*. The Christian World View in the Middle Ages may begin with St. Augustine's *City of God*, or Justin Martyr or Anselm, run through the first part of the *Roman de la Rose* and end with Dante's *Divine Comedy*. The Christian World View in the Renaissance and After may begin with *Hamlet* or *Paradise Lost*, include *Don Quixote* or *Faust*, run through Byronism, and end with Darwin or Thomas Hardy. The subject matter is so great that we can vary it every semester for a decade without repetition; yet the same threads can be pursued each time. The Secular Challenge of the Twentieth Century is admittedly a very amorphous title, and as a matter of fact the course tends to become either the philosophical or the theological answer to the secular challenge. We are nothing if not positivist; at the same time we encourage debate and disagreement from our students. We can begin with Sartre or Graham Greene or Joseph Conrad, but I usually like to end with Teilhard de Chardin's *The Phenomenon of Man*, a book which, incidentally, is not discussed in any other course in the institution.

The books I have mentioned are typical. But the point is not to give a course in great books, or even very interesting books, but rather to follow vitally important themes in the history of ideas. This year, for example, we are pursuing a Jungian type of analysis. To do so, I am convinced, is the best way to make the honors curriculum relevant to our century. If by subjecting the students to a process, perhaps not materially different from the traditional goals of the liberal arts, to be fair about it, we can make of them rational individuals capable of applying rational processes to the problems they must encounter if they are to live in our modern world, then we should be successful. But—as we all know—reason has not provided all the answers. Germany has been a nation of reasonable men and some philosophers, but it plunged the world into two horrible world wars. America is not only reasonable, it is also sentimental; yet it finds itself inextricably involved in military conflict in Viet Nam. It is not for the honors program to tell a student how he should feel about Viet Nam, or free love, but rather to inculcate in him an ability to deal with these problems and others like them for himself.

As a matter of fact, we have discovered that we must also deal with other matters besides. The word *honor* in "Honors Program" has come to mean almost nothing more than an ability to earn rewards for academic excellence. But we think we should not forget that it has a more significant meaning. It denotes, of course, an ethical approach to the world. And that is a bias that we have not tried to avoid. Of course, at times an ethical bias may drift over into Christian propaganda, and I often tremble for fear our honors program will be accused of failing to keep separate church and state. However, we exercise extraordinary care. One extremely committed Christian teacher, who teaches from Christian duty—which, remember, includes bringing persons to Christ as well as teaching them decently—once failed to conceal his personal belief from the students. At the end of the second semester a student came to me and said that she believed he must be a Christian, that perhaps, she thought, he hoped they would turn into Christians. She added she herself was an atheist, but she appreciated the intellectual fairness of his approach. Before we were through she convinced me that there must be something to Christian ethics.

One other aspect of our colloquia might be mentioned in respect to relevance. Here I use the word in a stricter, academic sense. In undergraduate education the general method is to pour books upon students, expecting them to read as many as possible as quickly as possible. Not so, in our program. We read a limited number of books, but we try to

read them thoroughly. We may well spend two hours on two paragraphs from the *Republic*, hoping to ascertain what the book really says. I think we would all be surprised at how many books are badly read by intelligent, hard working professionals—not to mention the general public. I. A. Richards has provided us with some idea how poor we are at understanding poetry. I think we are pretty poor understanding prose, too. Look at some of the great conflicts in literary interpretation. Is More's *Utopia*, for example, a political document or a comedy? Is *Heart of Darkness* Conrad's attack on British imperialism or a mythical description of the descent of the human mind into hell? We hope to make our students aware of such difficulties by close reading. I am too modest to claim any substantial success beyond that awareness of problems, but you will guess that I believe we attain some positive results, even if I do not say so.

What is the history of the entire method, you may ask? I believe it comes from the Chicago approach of the Robert Maynard Hutchins era. It seems to me that one way or another, a little here and there, over a period of years, Mr. Hutchins defined the goals and thereby insisted that liberal education become a relevant process, as opposed to an accumulation of knowledge for practical purposes. I do not say he was entirely successful. Our ignorance of his intentions has at times seemed the great educational tragedy of our century—especially when we have fragmented university education into its present series of majors designed to equip students to earn a living. But in honors curricula his ideals may be creeping back into prominence. At least they are in the Kentucky colloquia program.

A PROGRAM EMERGING

Thomas W. Phelan, St. Norbert College

I ask your indulgence on two counts this afternoon. I want in the first place to describe the emergence of one particular program as I have seen it develop. In the second place, I want to make a report on a proposal submitted by our ad hoc Honors Committee last spring.

My purpose in taking this approach is to present a challenge to programs which are not consummated, but are still emerging, and to offer direction to those in process of establishing an honors program.

Our beginnings in 1961 went toward the grandiose. St. Norbert was a co-ed institution with enrollment of 1200. We went for the whole production rather than working toward one scene at a time. Our model was the program at Colorado University. By means of half a dozen self-

sacrificing faculty, we mounted a series of honors seminars for sophomore and junior students. We wrote into the program independent study options for juniors and seniors. We offered a capstone senior colloquium, inter-disciplinary by structure. We offered a lounge and honors library. We made honors work part of load requirements—not extra work over and above normal loads—and by means of stated criteria, we graduated honor students with distinction in the Humanities, Social Science or Natural Science.

Our ambitions were greater than our voluntary resources; but we struggled, and we learned. We learned (1) of the difficulty of altering the general atmosphere of the academic community. We learned (2) that honors students can still compartmentalize the whole program. I mean, they satisfy the criteria without being really affected in the process. We learned, too, (3) through experimenting in honors, of our own naivete as regards the student. We found the "silent generation" at the threshold of a long and penetrating scream. What frightens me today is not the scream, but our continuing naivete about our students. We learned (4) that to give students freedom to express themselves critically on issues relevant to them is to court criticism for the program from all sectors—administration, faculty, students, alumni, parents and the outside community.

We learned a lot of things both vivifying and traumatic. One thing we did not learn: To tailor our dreams to our modest means. (I state that factually, not eulogistically.) Following our own experience and what was honors doctrine, we moved into the freshman year. In so doing, we plotted a new course.

We had no model this time. Our experience confirmed the need to shake at the foundations; to vivisect, as it were, in order to produce the new man. We employed the strategem of the massive assault.

We manipulated an inter-disciplinary faculty into selecting materials related to the general theme, "The Human Condition." One group working together for the first term focused on the question, "What is it?"; another group for the second term on "What produced it?"; and a group for the third term asked, "Where is it going?"

Each of four faculty started the Fall term 1965 with a group of twelve bright freshmen who had been through a summer orientation program and opted for the experiment. Materials selected were related generally to the areas of literature, psychology, philosophy, theology, and economics. The faculty member from literature convinced others of his group, including a psychologist, a theologian, and a historian, to start out

with two "dirty books." In a white, middle-class, Catholic college of the upper Midwest, you probably know what that meant. For the record, Updike's *Rabbit Run* and West's *Miss Lonelyhearts* were chosen.

We used seminar sessions on a regular schedule; but then added, on an *ad rem* basis, panel discussion—faculty, student and mixed—lectures, and cross-group sessions. We required an intellectual autobiography at the beginning; and the keeping of an intellectual diary throughout. We required term papers. We used group and self-rating forms; and the personal interview. We held informal meetings at faculty homes; and sometimes a dinner meeting, using facilities of the honors lounge. We tied into the theme a cinema program (the first feature as I recall was "La Dolce Vita"), and a drama reading series by a group of upper class honors students. Finally, we arranged a field trip per term for related purposes. One was to Chicago for a Giacometti exhibition; another to Milwaukee and Racine to view Frank Lloyd Wright's work; another to the Tyrone Guthrie Theatre in Minneapolis.

I think that out of these ingredients one finds certain emphases. The role of the teacher is completely different. He is no longer the expert, but a co-learner, a friend, mayhap a confidant, and sometimes a guide. The group is responsible for making the learning encounter creative. It is open-ended, critical, personal. The student is asked to express his ideas and defend them in a direct encounter, and to reflect on this process. In this respect the intellectual diaries provide some beautiful examples of such reflection.

One finds, I think, a unity of life and learning. There is relevance between what the student does academically and the rest of his student life. We saw develop a change of attitude toward the meaning of education, toward social emphasis on campus, toward community consciousness.

I hesitate to assess all the things that happened. The manifestations, however, were such that none of the academic community remained indifferent to it. Those participating were not sure what was happening, though they were confident that something like it should be happening on every campus across the country.

A personal note may be in order here. In the development which I have just elaborated, and in what follows through no agency of mine (I was on sabbatical leave last year) my function for seven years as honors director has seen fruition. I began as a pro tem administrator for an enterprise both catalytic and remedial in conception. My function as I've regarded it from beginning to end is midwifery. A major share in the freshman program has been the responsibility of my colleague and

assistant Frank Wood; and I would be remiss not to give credit to one who shouldered both success and travail.

Before the next phase of our emergence could take place, one requisite was necessary. We needed someone who could stand outside and assess in more meaningful terms what was going on; who had the wherewithal to provide skillful ways of evaluating the outcome. We needed someone to articulate objectives and purposes in terms of what was going on, and in terms of directions which we knew we must take.

Fortunately and fortuitously we found such persons on our own campus. They were recent faculty acquisitions with the experience we needed; and who were attracted to St. Norbert, significantly, because of the kind of innovative experimentation which we had undertaken. An ad hoc honors committee was formed, and after six months of dedicated labor, a proposal for a program in *Experimental Studies* was formulated. Though it was a five-man committee, the drafting was the effort mainly of two members, whose perception and vision were, to my way of thinking, extraordinary. For convenience, I shall simply refer to committee functions as a whole.

(1) It undertook a critique of the on-going program. (2) It proposed a House of Studies and something of the social engineering required. (3) It proposed a Four-Year Program of Studies with great attention to supporting rationale. (4) It provided in some detail the ways and means by which the program would be evaluated. I propose to deal with the House of Studies; and move quickly into the program of studies.

The report extols the riches of community learning à la the English College, the French student cafe, the Harvard and Yale house; and deplores the hit or miss basis in student living accommodations, when it is possible, with present techniques, to associate students who share learning attitudes and motivation. Following the lead in this country of Michigan State's efforts, it proposed the use of an existing facility with capacity for 136 students. Initially, at least, 40 freshman boys and 40 freshman girls could be placed in separate wings. To their number would be added sixteen foreign scholarship students, the balance to be filled by upperclass honor students. The existing facility comprises two large wings joined by a common recreation/lounge complex. Living units are suites accommodating eight students, each having a common room shared by eight. Rules are established by the living/learning community. Several faculty living in would round out the community. Faculty function is catalytic. They are viewed as co-learners, guides in learning by example. They would be consultant, friend, and teacher.

The four-year program of studies proposes a 45-credit syllabus which includes both the core requirement in general education and constitutes a major program. Languages and science as well as support courses from other departments are advised to satisfy student needs and interests. Several concurrent majors are possible; or at least substantial work in several fields to prepare the student for vocational goals and/or graduate study.

The impact of the program is geared toward the psychological maturation of the student; it investigates (1) where man has been, (2) who I am, (3) how do I commit myself, and (4) how one integrates self and community. The student is enabled to search and explore prior to any vocational commitment.

The entire program moves with a maximum flexibility in relation to other curricular demands and in its internal structure. Thus there is no one-to-one correlation between class meetings and credit. Class meetings are coordinated with audio-visual materials and with lecture series. Evaluations are made on outside readings, and coffee hour discussions add a touch of informality to the whole. The features I mention are not meant to be exhaustive to a host of possibilities. Where colleges typically assume that the student knows who he is and simply fills out the skills for life, this program recognizes the need to establish self-identity and then moves toward integrating the person with the human community; and places vocational development as an adjunct to the process.

A significant feature of the proposal is a term away from campus, whereby a student is given opportunity to add a new dimension to his learning experience.

Now while details of such a program are important, as are means for evaluating its effectiveness, the report is more concerned with establishing the rationale which is necessary to justify the expense of time, labor and money. The big problem in curricular construction lies in the question "Education for what?" I find in the sensitive perceptions of the sociologist-educators making this proposal a response, not simply to the voice of student agitations, as I have heard some critics charge; but to their meaning and that of other developments in society in phenomenal terms. In other words, what we find manifest in the general unrest throughout higher education is symptomatic of deficiencies and disorders which exist in fact and demand correction.

One member of the committee in a separate paper, an addendum to his section of the report, deals with the phenomenon of utopianism in modern youth. He finds in youth's idealism today "a new vision of life

and of man in pursuit of his meanings." Nor are we witnessing simply the idealisms and frustrations that one normally finds in each generation of youth. To quote again:

> At critical junctures in a people's historical unfolding, utopians emerge. They warn society that an irrevocable shift is underway involving fundamental values and the institutions which manifest them.

The committee report recognizes in the institution of education one such shift. It sees in the spectrum of student unrest signs of system malfunction. The report finds blame in the hypocrisy and insensitiveness with functionaries of the system, while at the same time seeing that such are reflections of a social order which fractionalizes and mechanizes life and man.

I seem to detect an eloquence of pain in the rhetoric of the report; but I must agree with charges of myopia against the many in the educational community who fail to see a reality before their eyes that reveals the insufficiency of old forms. I think we often fail to see that liberal education does not liberalize so much by its content *per se* as by the use we make of such content. It is our vision of man and life today incarnated in the learning experience that will enable the student to work out for himself, and for us, the human reality which he seeks with "a monstrous hunger."

One finds this search in the increasing interest in humanities studies of both Western and Eastern cultures; in the phenomenom of the free college—a curriculum of meaning alongside a curriculum for credit; in the search for community; and, not least, in the search for honesty, which to my mind is the prime characteristic of contemporary youth.

So much of what is said today about liberal education seems platitudinous. Yet a characteristic of our age or time is that even the most seemingly obvious ideas have to be translated into simple and meaningful terms. And we must always try to avoid being the victims of self-delusion. Sensitive to the cry of relevance by the student, we who are interested in honors programs, despite our worthy intentions, may be doing no more than pampering the student elite, or, what is worse, giving them the old stuff under a new name.

The import of what I have attempted to say, in sum, challenges beginning honors programs to adopt a certain style of approach. It bids existing programs to move out; to emerge toward construction of a stage upon which the drama of learning may be played. It emphasizes the learning community as the context in which education of the whole man takes place.

RESPONSE

William W. Kelly, Michigan State University

We have heard from Tom Phelan today an eloquent description of what St. Norbert's has attempted to accomplish in both establishing and improving an honors program. I suspect we all detected a central concern running through Mr. Phelan's remarks. It was perhaps best summarized in this statement: "Liberal education does not liberalize so much by its content *per se* as by the use we make of such content." Thus everything he described at St. Norbert's seems to have been motivated from that concern. We heard first of the specific features of their program, how and why they were developed: the honors seminars for sophomores and juniors, the senior interdisciplinary colloquia, the freshman seminars dealing with "The Human Condition," the "House of Studies," and the various off-campus experiences. Through all of these approaches came a persistent attempt to discover the relationship "between what the student does academically and the rest of his student life."

Obviously, St. Norbert's has succeeded very well in its honor experiences, and perhaps one of the surest measurements of this comes in Mr. Phelan's estimate of the effects of these various programs on the campus community: "Those participating were not sure what was happening, though they were confident that something like it should be happening across the country." In short, the attempts to discover meaningful relevance, for both students and faculty, have been successful. A new level of involvement has been discovered in which not just honors opportunities but a whole college's rationale towards its philosophy of education has been closely re-examined.

It would appear to me that St. Norbert's may well serve as an example of what we might all hope for in our own institutions; namely, that we not only strive for improvement of honors opportunities, but that we seek to make our honors programs the instruments for change and improvement in the whole dimension of undergraduate education.

At Michigan State I might cite briefly just how we have made a few similar attempts. Our problems are totally different from those of St. Norbert. We are a large university, with an Honors College which has grown from 300 in 1957 to close to 1500 today, and of course this growth has imposed severe handicaps on our efforts to retain a highly personal and meaningful approach to a program which has featured freedom of the individual student to develop, in concert with an advisor, a program of studies suited to his own special talents and interests. We have had to

increase the number of staff administering our program; we have had to call upon many additional faculty to become honors advisors, and our problems of communicating with over one hundred persons serving in this important capacity are obviously difficult; and we have had to establish new and additional honors committees in our scattered departments and colleges to maintain and strengthen the quality of honors work in the University.

Along with our efforts have come other substantial developments on campus: the development of three semi-autonomous residential colleges, the establishment of "living-learning" residence halls, the development of undergraduate teaching and research internships, and, within the past year, a major reassessment by a high level faculty committee of the entire structure of undergraduate education at Michigan State University.

The important point, once again, is not so much the particular programs or innovations but rather the central attempt, respected by each, to bring about the best possible undergraduate education for our students. I suspect that this single goal motivates all of us in this audience today.

HONORS PROGRAMS IN VOCATIONAL CURRICULA

M. Jean Phillips, University of Illinois

Many of us are heartened by the ground swell of student demands for involvement and relevancy in education, even though we may be abashed to find that students have forced adoption overnight of policies and practices we have been advocating for years. Alter all, the need for meaningful personal experiences is not the exclusive property of the young.

I confess the outcry for relevancy threatens me a bit; perhaps because I have yet to define the term on an effective level for myself. Simon and Gagnon have written in a recent edition of the *Saturday Review*:

> In many ways, we have made the world costly for children by making most achievement relatively inexpensive. Earlier generations could strive for achievement (something we have transformed into some kind of universal truth) even if the experiences or rewards of achievement were kindly left unspecified because the consequences of failure were so terrifyingly real; it was perhaps enough merely not to have failed. One aspect of achievement was a capacity for pleasure, for accumulating a capacity for what appeared to be personal experiences. These too, we left hazy and unspecified. . . . A genera-

tion is now emerging that tests our imagery of failure and finds it even more mythic than our imagery of achievement.

Most of us, I suspect, became interested in the encouragement of honors programs because we were dissatisfied with the status quo, and felt a dedication to improve the lot of the bright undergraduate who seemed to be forced irrevocably toward a regression to the mean. Though "hazy and unspecified," most of us differentiated between mere achievement—the capacity to earn a living (which we equated with lack of failure) and *real* achievement—the scholarly pursuit of knowledge for its intrinsic worth. Perhaps this is why honors concepts found fertile soil within the liberal arts and why honors programs are only now emerging among vocational and professional curricula.

This artificial dichotomy between materialism and intellectualism rises to plague us occasionally because it creates discrepancies between what we say and what we do when we try to define the meaning of honors or when we attempt to describe our roles and functions.

There is more vocationalism inherent in our roles as honors directors than we realize. During a sensitivity training workshop for Illinois State Employment Service personnel last summer, I was struck by the similarities between many of the tasks I perform and the duties of the workshop participants.

For example, ISES interviewer aides search for ghetto youths, unskilled but eligible for YOC training programs: we identify and select potential honors students. Interviewers contact employers trying to match applicants with job openings: we contact departmental chairmen and faculty concerning program development to meet the needs of superior students. Employment counselors refer clients to auxiliary services: we refer students to the resources of the student personnel offices. Counselors and district managers write endless placement reports and statistical records in justification of budgets: we write recommendations to graduate and professional schools, and certainly are involved in preparing fiscal reports to our administrators. I see a difference only in degree between teaching the job applicant, newly released from a three-year burglary sentence, to stress the positive—that he learned valuable food service skills at Statesville; and in advising the fellowship applicant to turn a liability into an asset—that the reprimand of record cited on his transcript marked the turning point in his life toward maturity and self-direction.

As we perform these functions, our students know, even if we do not,

that, *quid pro quo*, we are involved in a second-order employment process. If an unrecognized dualism exists between words and actions, we need to clarify our thinking lest we fall into the trap of uttering ritualistic references to altruistic goals.

Perhaps we thereby confuse our students who have not learned our system of academic "no-think." We deplore the "grade-grubber" who states he wants to "get into a good medical school as quickly and easily as possible." Perhaps we penalize his naivete while, at the same time, we reward his more sophisticated counterpart who understands the rules of the game . . . the student who impresses us by intellectual aspirations but whose unstated goals are equally materialistic. Maybe this is one reason for our frustrations with the potential Rhodes Scholar who "forgets" deadlines or who questions if the status is worth two years of his life.

As an idealist, I believe every student should have the opportunity for maximal self-actualization of his energies and talents. I believe in the intrinsic value of intellectual attainments. As a pragmatist, I realize much of our work is materialistic in nature. What else can be expected in a society which places a pricetag of X number of dollars life-time income for every year of school attendance. If self-actualization and intellectual freedom happen to be concomitants with the means of providing the "good life," it's pure serendipity.

The point I'm trying to make is we can function more effectively in the honors movement if we understand which philosophical hat we are wearing in any given relationship with students and colleagues.

Students of today take for granted the fact that college experience will culminate in the acquisition of a saleable skill. In addition, they want the brass ring to accompany the merry-go-round of passing semesters—the brass ring of meaningfulness, of involvement, of relevancy.

I'm convinced honors programs can provide a simultaneous challenge toward affluence—both extrinsic and intrinsic.

Perhaps we who are most vitally interested in honors have been unwilling to assume the role of ombudsman in the development of new programs. We are academicians first, steeped in the traditions and biases of our individual disciplines. Physical separation from our colleagues across campus encourages encapsulation within our departments and our established programs. Some of us, particularly with academic homes in the "pure" sciences and the liberal arts have been unaware of the emerging revolution in technical and professional education.

A remark attributed to President Holloman of the University of Oklahoma has become a shibboleth for our Engineering Honors students and

faculty: "It's time we stopped teaching the ics in engineering—mechanics, electronics, statics, dynamics; and started emphasizing the shuns —transportation, sanitation, population, civilization."

Honors work in vocationally-oriented curricula has developed slowly, if at all, for several reasons. In some fields, external accrediting agencies or boards exert controls which limit undergraduate education. Such is the case with teacher certification requirements and state boards for accountants and the health science professions.

Course sequences, prescribed by tradition, have tended to be inflexible and mandatory. Antiquated programs and activities have been continued far beyond their applicability in the space age. If students are allowed individuality of choice, it is only by means of electives taken on an overload basis.

Professional colleges and departments are partially to blame for the inertia. With selective admissions in large universities, the gulf should be narrow, or non-existent, between the theorist and the practitioner, the educated and the merely trained. But old hostilities lie dormant. Attitudes towards honors are expressed defensively, or arrogantly, depending upon the academic orientation of the speaker.

At one extreme on our campus are three departments in the pure sciences, each claiming its curriculum is so demanding that all majors are, by grade-point definition, honors students. This may be so, but their programs are so narrowly technical that students have no non-departmental courses except the minimal number of general education hours required for graduation from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Enviable placement records of graduates in high demand by business and industry are cited in defense of the benefits of immobilization.

Similarly, we hear from the College of Education, "Our students receive individual supervision—in essence we have an honors program." Again, an examination of requirements reveals no flexibility of program to meet individual needs, although honors sections are available in two theory courses.

The opposite end of the continuum is represented by a professional college which has adopted the fatalistic attitude, "Don't talk to us about honors; we have no students worthy of the title." The result is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

We prefer the philosophy of the College of Commerce. "We haven't many superior students, but by providing special opportunities for those we have, we'll attract more."

Two of the most extensive, carefully designed four-year departmental programs of the campus will serve to demonstrate the existing confu-

sion of honors philosophy. The English departmental program is available to all qualified majors; terminal or English education majors particularly are encouraged to participate. Conversely, the honors program in the psychology department enriches only those majors heading toward doctoral study in experimental psychology. Students enrolled in the prosaic fields of general, applied, or vocational psychology cannot graduate *cum laude* because they are barred from honors participation.

Fissures are splitting asunder the shells of pre-vocational programs, however. Graduate schools of law and medicine have relaxed undergraduate prerequisites in recognition that a broadly educated humanist may master the latest technology more efficiently in his professional study and perhaps become a better lawyer or physician because of his breadth of experiences.

Lewis Mayhew predicts that, by 1980, technical and vocational training will be discarded in favor of a liberal arts emphasis. Corporate employers will supply the necessary skills in a 21st century version of the apprentice system.

We are extremely proud of the James Scholar Program in Engineering at the University of Illinois. I'd like to describe briefly some of the salient aspects since the program may serve as a prototype for honors in any professional curriculum.

In my opinion, the most dynamic characteristic of the program is the courage, humor, and imagination of the engineering honors faculty. But they insist the prime component is flexibility. Honors students are allowed substitution of special courses or advanced courses for required courses in both technical and nontechnical fields, subject only to the approval of the honors advisor. A nominal limit of 18 hours of substitution privileges was established at the adoption of the Program. In several cases, this "nominal limit" has exceeded thirty hours and no one expects this is a record.

Four hours of credit (or more) can be obtained each semester by individual study in areas of interest or by research and laboratory projects. No mean privilege when we remember that Stanley Kubrick designated these laboratories as the birthplace of the greatest cinematic hero of all time—HAL 9000.

Autonomy is granted to specially designated honors advisors, who carry reduced advisee loads.

The program encourages and aids students to find challenging summer employment in areas of specialization. (Activities of this kind would be relevant for students in commerce and business curricula, urban planning, architecture, and many others. A few institutions award academic

credits to honors students in education or psychology who volunteer to work with Headstart, tutor the educationally handicapped, or serve as aides in mental health clinics, etc.)

Special seminars and conferences are conducted at frequent intervals, including an annual two-day tutorial conference held at a University-owned park thirty miles from town. Last year's conference provided one of the most stimulating experiences I have encountered. The theme was "Engineering and Urban Development"; there were addresses by experts representing the fields of cybernetics, psychology, engineering, urban development, environmental engineering, architecture, and sanitation. The majority of James Scholars in attendance were engineering students, but a representative number of honors students were from the social sciences. The assassination of the Reverend Martin Luther King the day prior to the conference provided us with a nearly unbearable sense of relevancy.

J. O. Kopplin, former chairman of the Engineering Honors Council, who was responsible for many of the innovations in the program, has written a paper for publication in the proceedings of this conference. I commend it to your attention. In his paper, he develops the thesis that once-only activities assure relevancy in an honors curriculum by enforcing continuous experimentation with content and teaching technique. Three to six such courses have been offered each semester for the past several years. He mentions specifically courses on Space Vehicle Design, Ocean Engineering, System Dynamics, and Science of Engineering Materials.

Once-only courses of this type are offered in addition to recurrently scheduled seminars in which content may change from semester to semester. Two freshman seminars, "The Engineer and Society" and "The Engineer and His Profession," are offered each year.

We also have the Engineering Honors Program to thank for establishing the first truly inter-disciplinary honors course on our campus. Under the supervision of Professor Kopplin, a two-semester Major Systems Design Project studied the problems of the blind, bringing together in a common purpose students and faculty from the various departments of engineering, economics, psychology, sociology, medicine, physiology, and rehabilitation.

It seems to me that this "systems approach" is the only reasonable direction for honors programs to take in the future. While we have been sitting here, Apollo 7 has partially orbited the earth while, during the same few minutes, hundreds of Biafrans have died upon it.

The multiplicity of talents which can take us to Jupiter—and beyond—must be concentrated if we are to solve our social and economic ills. In

this age of chaos, creativity, co-existence, and confrontation, survival will depend upon the capacity of the intellectual to continue education throughout his career. Honors programs may offer the sole opportunity for all our students to explore their essential humanity at the same time they acquire the capacity to think, to innovate, and to create.

THE HONORS PROGRAM AND THE STUDENT

Robert Cumbow (Student), Seattle University

I am asked to deal with the questions:

1. What should students expect to attain in an honors program?
2. Do they attain it? and
3. Why?

The students in an honors program should expect to attain nothing more nor less than an *education*, in the fullest sense of the word. The goal of an honors program—and the goal of a student who enters such a program—is a liberal education. Not the mere recording of isolated facts, ideas, and theories, but the development of a questioning, reasoning, active mind, able to grasp implications and significance of facts as well as facts themselves, able to perceive the interrelation and interdependency of the various liberal disciplines and the dialogue that has taken place among history's great thinkers, able to classify and analyze without oversimplification, able to weigh answers but always aware that there are no pat solutions to the Great Questions.

From the time he enters school, the superior student is alienated by his ability. He is looked up to as "the Brain" or the "smart kid" by fellow students whom he would rather meet and deal with on common ground. Isolated, he tends to stagnate. He becomes bored with schoolwork, which moves too slowly for his rapid, questioning mind. His fellow students come to resent this in him and he becomes even further isolated. The attitudes he is then likely to form will be detrimental—not to his ability to work—but to his *will* to work. As a result, his interest in his studies declines and with it his performance. His grades, which often drop sharply because of this, are no indication of his real ability.

What such a student requires is a new educational atmosphere—an atmosphere of challenge, in which he will never be at a loss for new things to do and to learn, never be ahead of his class, never be wholly satisfied with his work and, above all, never become bored. The only

educational system in which this is always true is that of *self*-education; and an honors program is nothing more than a systematically structured atmosphere conducive to self-education.

Education, especially in the superior student, is stifled and discouraged by the system of teaching now employed in most elementary and secondary schools and on far too many college and university campuses in this country. This system I call the "Teacher-Authority Lecture Method." Under this method the student is not encouraged to do anything more than what will get him a passing grade for the course: listen to the teacher lecture, regarding the teacher as one of only two final authorities on the material to be studied; read the textbook, the *other* final authority; take notes carefully; memorize; and give back the correct information at the correct time. In a system such as this, too much study-material passes from the textbook to the notebook and back onto the examination paper without ever really passing through the mind of either teacher or student.

In an honors program atmosphere, the teacher becomes a guide and a counsellor but must no longer be the authority-figure. The textbooks and their contents become means, not ends. Their purpose is to provide questions—not answers. The real teacher is the student himself, and the real authority is the compass of his own mind.

Another important thing that the exceptional student looks for in an honors program is the opportunity to work with other students of his own capability, students who for the first time welcome him as an equal, rather than isolating him as a superior. To be so welcomed and to feel at ease among his fellows is the solution to half the problem confronting the superior student.

The other half, the need for challenge and for self-education, is solved by a new approach to education. The "Teacher-Authority Lecture Method" is replaced by the "Dialogue-Interaction Method." In an honors program, the teacher (no longer an authority but a guide) assigns readings and asks pertinent in-depth questions which will guide the students' reading. Having completed the assignment, the student weighs his tentative answers to these questions, while at the same time adding to them the questions he himself poses to the thinker, whose work he has read. In class, which is conducted in seminar style, attempts are made by the students and teacher in discussion to answer these two crops of questions. And, inevitably, a third crop of questions appears: the questions the students pose to one another in weighing and challenging their proposed solutions to the encountered problems. The result is a positive and stimulating interaction. A very real *dialogue* takes place among students,

teachers, and the great writers and thinkers they study. This interaction is not the means but the end itself—the goal of an honors student. For, through dialogue comes not the answer but the understanding of the question and its significance, and this understanding is the stimulus, the challenge for which the exceptional student is always searching.

Consequently, an honors program helps its students achieve personality-development as well as intellectual growth and academic accomplishment. As a liberal education should, it develops the *whole* man, molds the ability to think—not to regard thoughts abstractly as things to be learned or memorized but to assimilate them into oneself and to make them one's own. That is what is really meant by *understanding*.

I am aware that the "Dialogue-Interaction Method" has been employed and honors atmospheres created outside the specific structure of an honors program and that occasionally the exceptional student may be challenged and stimulated to self-education without being involved in an honors program. But this is more often the exception than the rule and, in any case, whatever good is accomplished for the superior student outside an honors program may be vastly multiplied within one. Part of what is going on here this weekend is an effort to see what might be done toward creating *more* honors atmospheres in American colleges and universities, improving the programs now in existence, and extending the opportunity for a stimulating and meaningful education to greater numbers of above-average students.

All of this is by way of delineating what the student should hope to attain in an honors program and how such programs are designed to help him achieve this. As to the question, "Do they attain it?", I can answer only from my own experience. I have seen only two circumstances in which a student can fail to attain what he hopes for in an honors program. The first occurs when the honors program in which he is involved is not sufficiently effective to provide him with the equal portions of interest, freedom, and discipline necessary for self-education. When this is the case, due often to careless or indiscriminate staffing and structuring of the program in question, the only solution is that the program itself must be improved. Again, this is part of what we are doing here this weekend.

The other circumstance in which a student might fail to attain what he expects of an honors program occurs if he really does not *want* to learn. The most important prerequisite to learning is a *desire* to learn. Even the best honors program cannot stimulate this, if the student is—for whatever reason—unwilling to learn. And frequently today students are urged into honors programs when they are really not disposed to work

hard and to learn. In this case, they can only fail. What can be done for these students is a problem outside the scope of the honors program and the present conference. Responsibility, discipline and an enthusiasm for learning must be already present in an honors student.

By way of providing one most important topic for discussion, and at the risk of ending my thoughts on a somewhat inconclusive note, I would like to pose a question. Despite its advantages in providing the superior student with an atmosphere of challenge and interaction with minds of his own caliber, an honors program inevitably runs the risk of further isolating such students from minds of average or below-average ability. No longer alienated as individuals, honors students now run the risk of being isolated as a group. But the honors programs do not aim to create groups of freaks or eggheads, unattached to any but their own little world. How, then, may an honors program achieve its proper end of providing a stimulating atmosphere of self-education for the superior student, while still preparing him to cope with a System "outside," as it were, which is dominated by minds less capable than his own? How can an honors student hope to advance his mind in an intellectually stimulating atmosphere without losing contact with the real world he must face and deal with after he has completed his studies? This is one of the most critical problems facing honors programs today and one whose solution will not, I hope, be beyond the compass of this conference.

FASHIONING AN HONORS PROGRAM: REPORT ON A CALCULUS OF RELEVANCE

Kyle C. Sessions and L. Moody Simms, Jr.
Illinois State University

The problem of relevance as it is understood on this occasion is shaped by the question, "What is the profile of the student graduating from the Honors Program in the Department of History at Illinois State University?" Like any profile, that of our graduating student is two-dimensional, an ideal high and a practical reality wide. One dimension is an idealized extension of ourselves. We have constructed an honors program that will result in a graduate who probably is going to teach history. The second dimension involves a compromise. Our graduate comes through a course of study fashioned out of the interplay between the search for a program that is the very best possible and the search for one that is at all possible.

Each dimension illustrates its own problem of relevance, for along

the vertical axis of the ideal, points are placed according to whether the course of study prepares the student to perform in a relevant manner in his society. Along the horizontal axis of practicality, points were and will continue to be placed according to how a program can be made possible within finite limitations of money, curriculum, and faculty. The curve formed by vectoring the points along the two axes describes our profile of the graduating honors history student. A two-dimensional report upon the axes of that profile constitutes this paper.

As we progressed in fashioning our honors program, we steadily realized that we want to inculcate in our ideal student certain characteristics of the intellect that we believe are essential to the study of history. Our objectives encompass certain attitudes, skills, and capabilities we want our graduate to possess upon leaving us. Initially, we sought means to implant a critical frame of mind that is not content with any one explanation. Next, we hoped to implement this critical attitude by supplying the student with some idea of research methods and investigative tools peculiar to historical studies. Finally, our goal was to develop the capability of judgment in our students, bringing it out of their awareness that history is always imperfectly known and is never stronger than the quality of judgment among those who pursue it.

A student endowed with these virtues of mind, it may be argued, probably is able to relate to his society and to function relevantly within it. We perceived, however, a more immediate and pertinent meaning to relevance in our situation. Most of our honors graduates will undertake careers in teaching. We anticipate this to be no less true when we allow that, if we have done our work well, many of them will enter graduate study in history. The sum of these realizations is that when our profile becomes a person, he is likely also to become a teacher. Soon enough he will be in daily contact with young people for whom the problem of relevance between living and learning is quite real.

By now we have come full circle around that axis charting our ideals. The best history honors program will endow students with skills for independent investigation and study, with attitudes of criticism and analysis toward conflicting information, and with the capacity to make and validate judgments on the basis of knowledge that necessarily is imperfect. Many—most—of these students will enter society in careers that shape the skills, attitudes, and capacities of other young people. If we have trained them well, we may have prepared them in their lives as in their work to contribute solutions to the problem of relevance between university and community.

However, considerations about ideal performance can never depart

very far from serious realities relevant to material capacities. In our emerging department within our emerging multi-purpose university, we found considerable receptivity for innovation. Yet we also found ourselves faced with a number of definitely limiting factors. Given restrictions in money, curriculum, and faculty, could we still hope to fashion a viable honors program in history? After careful consideration of the problems involved, we concluded that we could accept our limitations and still work validly within them.

Not surprisingly, our most difficult task lay in developing an honors program that could be sustained by our budgetary resources. For the present, a two-year program in the junior and senior years seemed to be our best choice. Since we could not hope for a separate honors curriculum, or for a broad list of honors offerings each semester, our challenge was to devise a program utilizing to the fullest our present departmental structure and courses. We concluded that our present means allowed facilities and staff for two semester-length new courses forming the nucleus of our departmental program.

In these exclusive, required courses, the students gain honors identity and the challenge of working with each other. The first serves as an introduction to honors work in history and is designed to ground the student solidly in the tools, methods, and skills of historical study, research, and writing. It is a seminar taken once by each candidate, preferably during the first semester of the junior year. The second is a special honors seminar offered once each academic year. Since the content of this seminar is at the discretion of the instructor and varies by year and professor, it may be taken more than once for honors credit.

By successfully completing the new honors seminars, our candidate can acquire six or possibly nine hours of credit toward the required twelve hours of honors courses in a thirty-hour departmental major. Within our limitations, how could we provide additional honors work not involving special honors courses? We decided on a plan which utilizes our existing upper-level courses and provides for independent honors study. Any upper-level course, at the discretion of the instructor, may admit an honors student for honors credit. A distinct program of work within the scope of the course and incorporating the freedom of honors study is devised by the instructor and the student. An honors student also may apply to a department faculty member for independent reading and study. The individual course of study is arranged carefully between professor and student prior to registration.

An honors thesis and comprehensive examinations at the end of the senior year complete our honors requirements. Our view that these are

necessary requirements to round out an honors program in history has been endorsed by our colleagues, even though the requirements might prove to strain our present capabilities. We are in agreement that, inasmuch as our ideal product is likely to become a teacher, his practical relevance both to his students and to his professional activity would be enhanced by a comprehensive review of what he has encountered in history and by an intensive application of the skills he has acquired along the way.

Assessing the interaction we have accomplished between the vertical axis of our ideal objectives and the horizontal axis of our practical goals, we conclude that the main distinguishing feature of our efforts has been flexibility. Initially our ideal was the best honors program in the undergraduate discipline of history. In making this objective relate to the likelihood that most of our honors graduates would become teachers, we made our ideal profile relate to our predictable profile. Further flexibility became appropriate when we confronted the realities of money, curriculum, and faculty in our department. The result has been a calculus of possibility within which still resides the principle of flexibility.

And therein lies the likelihood of enhanced opportunity for our student to relate himself to his university and his community. Virtually all of his honors work—the seminars, the courses, the independent readings, the thesis—is flexible enough to meet his own needs and desires. Our honors board continually reviews the operation of the entire program and initiates necessary changes. As our capabilities increase, we can hope to progress from the present program which is possible toward that which is the very best. For the moment, we anticipate that our graduate, utilizing the flexibility that has been provided, will be able to fill out his honors profile in ways that enhance his relevance to his university, his career, and his society.

ONCE-ONLY ACTIVITIES ARE RELEVANT

J. O. Kopplin, University of Illinois

Lack of relevance, a current concern of students and faculty, stems in great measure from programs, activities, and courses which have been continued through inertia beyond their rightful lifetimes. Another aspect of the problem, of course, is that what is considered relevant by one student or instructor may not be considered relevant by another. However, much of the lack of relevance ascribed to educational programs would be eliminated if completely new programs, activities, and courses

were established each term. This would be impractical for any school or department, but can be practical in large measure for an honors program.

Early in the operation of the James Scholars Program in Engineering at the University of Illinois, it was realized that developing an honors curriculum or establishing a number of permanent courses would not be in the best interests of the students. The primary objective of the program is to fully challenge each student. It was quickly determined that the honors students can not be fully challenged en masse but only as individuals. To do this requires a flexible program participated in on a voluntary basis. The program also must be sensitive to the needs and interests of the students enrolled in it at any time. For these reasons, the James Scholars Program in Engineering offers essentially a new program each semester.

With regard to courses, the program for the past several years has offered from three to six courses each semester on a once-only basis. Included have been courses on Space Vehicle Design, Ocean Engineering, System Dynamics, and Science of Engineering Materials. These courses considered subjects and problems relevant to the engineering profession and were taken on a voluntary basis by students who were interested in the subjects. The primary reason for offering a once-only course or activity is relevancy. The offering of a new set of courses each semester automatically enforces continuous experimentation with regard to course content and educational techniques. This activity of the honors program has proven to be of definite value to the educational program of the entire college.

Two recent activities of the honors program have been most successful. They both are examples of the relevance which is generally associated with once-only activities.

A two-day conference on Engineering and Urban Development was held last April at the University's off-campus Conference Center. Other such conferences have been held, but the subject each time is selected because of student interest and relevance. The fact that the assassination of the Reverend Martin Luther King occurred on the day before this conference was scheduled to start provided more meaning and urgency than was anticipated.

Six experts were brought in for the conference to speak on various aspects of urban development. A cyberneticist and professor of engineering from the campus opened the conference with a discussion of "Potentials and Limits of Engineering Concepts in Problems of Human Affairs." A professor of psychology from Chicago discussed "Attitudinal

Incompatibility and Survival in the Urban Complex." "Effectiveness of Government in Shaping the Urban Environment" was discussed by a professor of environmental engineering from New York and a former commissioner of urban renewal and of city development and planning. A professor of city and regional planning from Philadelphia discussed "Metropolitan Transportation Systems Planning." "The Changing Demands for Water and Air Pollution" was the subject of a discussion by the general superintendent of a large metropolitan sanitary district. The final speaker was an architect from New England who discussed "Problems of Urban Structures and Growth."

Half the conference was devoted to individual and small group discussion. Because meals and lodging are provided at the Center, and because the Center is isolated from the rush and turmoil of the campus, the seventy students in attendance were able to establish many personal contacts with the twenty faculty advisors, the six experts and special guests. These associations, along with the informal individual and small group discussions, were undoubtedly the most valuable aspect of the conference. However, devoting two days (for the students, one day of classes and one day of vacation) to the discussion of a single theme provided the students with an opportunity to become well acquainted with a particular subject and to grapple with some of its problems. One of the guests was kept up almost until dawn in an informal discussion of the forces and conditions existing in inner-city enclaves. The cost of the conference to the students was their time, for which, of course, they received much. The speakers were reimbursed for their travel and related expenses. The total cost of the conference was considerably less than $2,000, a relatively small amount of money for a relevant and highly educational activity.

The second special activity was a two-semester-long Major Systems Design Project. The objective was to have a group of students from different educational backgrounds work together as a team in the design of a major system. It was decided that the specific system to be designed should be selected by the students; however, the general area of investigation was established by the Honors Council as Problems of the Blind. Eighteen students enrolled in the course. They were from the departments of Aeronautical Engineering, Chemistry, Electrical Engineering, Physics, Psychology, and Zoology. After the first couple of weeks, the class was run entirely by the students themselves. They not only conducted all class meetings but actually scheduled the meetings. Two faculty members served as principal advisors, were responsible for academic standards, and handled all arrangements requiring faculty action.

A large number of faculty members, along with several off-campus people from different foundations and service organizations, served as consultants. The class organized and reorganized itself several times during the year. In turn, students served as group leaders and overall chairmen. The students gave two evening presentations of their work. The first was given at the end of the first semester, at which time the students reviewed the work of that semester and outlined their plans for the second semester. A final presentation of the project was given at the end of the second semester. Approximately forty people attended each of the presentations.

The first few weeks of the course were spent in general background study and library research. The first organization of the class was the establishment of four general area groups to study primary aspects of blindness. The medical-physiological group studied the physiology of the eye and of the various cases and types of blindness. The psychological group gathered information concerning the psychological aspects of blindness—the stresses and emotional effects blindness has upon the individual. A third group studied the sociological problems of the blind. This involved gaining knowledge of the blind person's role in society and his interaction with others. Economic problems associated with blindness were studied by the fourth group. This included an understanding of the financial and employment problems of the blind and of families having blind members. A faculty member with experience in each of the general areas served as a consultant to each of the groups. During the period in which the four groups functioned, experts in various areas were brought in to discuss special subjects with the entire class. These included lectures on Engineering for Human Systems, the Neurology of Vision, the Biochemical Processes Involved in Vision, Traffic Safety for the Partially Sighted and Standards of Visual Acuity for Drivers, Psychological Problems and Needs of the Blind, and Major Problems of Blind Students. Contact with the Rehabilitation Center on the campus was maintained throughout the project and several undergraduate and graduate blind students served as consultants to the group and worked closely with the students. Following this phase of the project, the class reorganized itself into four new groups, each of which prepared a specific system design proposal. One proposal considered the problem of information retrieval and distribution of permanent record information for the blind and partially sighted. A second proposal considered problems of travel and mobility of the blind, particularly on the campus and the immediate surrounding areas. The educational problems of the blind and in particular the use of programmed instruction were

considered by the third group. The fourth group prepared a systems proposal for the better employment and utilization of the blind in society. The four proposals were discussed with several blind students and with other consultants, following which the class made the decision to select programmed instruction of the blind for their systems design project.

The class reorganized again into a general studies group, a non-computer based devices group, a computer based hardware and software group, and an instructional programming group. The general studies group concerned itself with the broad areas of programmed instruction and problems of the blind. This group guided the entire project and helped to delineate the specific areas of the other groups so that a systems approach was maintained throughout the investigation. The non-computer based devices group studied and evaluated several such devices and set forth design requirements for such devices for use by the blind. The computer based hardware and software group's primary concern was the adaptation of a sophisticated computer based teaching system (PLATO) which has been under development on the campus for several years. Part of this group was concerned with the design and development of hardware to convert the input to the computer based system from the keyboard device to that of a Perkins Brailler. Their second major task was the design and development of an audio output for the system which would replace the visual output utilizing a television screen. This work consisted of a design of audio-digital converters so that the audio input information could be converted into digital form and stored in the memory of the computer. This information later could be recalled by the computer, converted back to audio information, and sent to the earphones used by the blind student. The other half of this group was involved with the extensive machine-language program made necessary in order to have the computer operate with the new input and output facilities. The fourth group was involved with the creation of actual programmed teaching lessons and testing of these lessons with several blind students. A series of programmed lessons was prepared to teach the use of the abacus to blind students. While the overall systems design was the primary goal of the class, the students did succeed in giving the computer a limited voice and in establishing the fact that the use of the abacus could be taught to blind students through programmed instruction.

There was, of course, no question regarding the relevancy of the project as far as the blind are concerned. All the activities of the class were also relevant to the overall project. The educational purpose of the

project was to study systems design. The students were directly involved with the systems design throughout the course and were engaged with a problem which had much meaning and purpose to them.

Both of the foregoing described activities were judged to be highly successful from an educational standpoint. Both activities were relevant —they were relevant to today's world, to society's problems; and all aspects of both undertakings were relevant to each overall goal. An education is not simply the accumulation of facts but also the ability to evaluate, to judge, to reason inductively and deductively. This ability develops through practice, and practice with relevant subjects and situations is much more stimulating and thought provoking. Students are keenly aware of the needs and problems of society today and expect their education to consider and to involve them in the search for solutions. When subjects are selected for "next semester only" relevance will be considered. A successful honors program can be based on a number of once-only activities—a number of relevant activities.

TIPS: A PROGRAM IN LIBERAL STUDIES FOR HONORS STUDENTS

Robert Lowell Stevens, Northern Arizona University

TIPS means Tutorials in Integrated Programs of Study. TIPS is a program in liberal studies for superior students at Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

We require each student to devote about one third of his college work to liberal studies—usually a collection of specific courses in science, English composition, and the humanities. TIPS provides an alternative approach—study in depth and breadth which centers upon some fundamental ideas, issues, or problems. The approach is interdisciplinary, utilizing methods and materials from many areas of man's knowledge.

During the first year (just completed) TIPS students were considered as future scholars, college teachers, and researchers, as well as future citizens of a democracy. The course (12 semester hours total) was designed to acquaint them with many of the problems that scholars, teachers, and researchers encounter and some of their methods for dealing with them. By encouraging students to be leaders in their college class and to enter community life in certain ways, instructors helped them to see that students are never divorced from society, though in college it may seem that they are.

The course started with these questions:

1. Science
   a. What is the scientific method? What are its objectives, strengths, and weaknesses?
   b. Does scientific methodology have disciplinary limitations, that is, may it be applied or used in areas of investigation other than science? Are there any humanistic methodologies which are distinctive and apart from scientific method?
2. What are the objectives of studies in aesthetics? What does art criticism involve?
3. What are historians trying to do? How does the work of the historian compare with that of other social scientists?
4. What is the peculiar function of philosophy? How does philosophic truth differ from scientific truth?

In seeking evidence for the answers to the questions, students listened to numerous scholars from many fields, took several anthropological, archaeological, geological, and astronomical field trips (there are nine large telescopes in Northern Arizona), attended an opera, showings of about 25 film classics, several concerts and plays, art gallery openings, and about ten lectures by notable persons (such as Arthur C. Clarke and Robert Scalapino). *All* of these events were related in one way or another to the more formal part of the program.

In addition each student "majored" in one of the four areas represented by the questions and "minored" in another. In the areas of his major he was to *demonstrate* in his paper or other project that he had some knowledge of the objectives and methods of the discipline he was considering.

Students taking the course were excused from freshman English, but according to a test involving writing and supervised by an expert in testing, the TIPS students made gains in writing ability significantly greater than those of regular freshman English students.

This course was not designed to provide ready-made answers to philosophical, ethical, or aesthetic questions but rather to give students some means for finding their own answers.

To discover relevance a student must (1) visit the country of the mind, inspect its cities and monuments, or at least study a good map of it, and (2) learn where he wants to live and how he can participate meaningfully in its life. TIPS, we hope, helps the student do this.

CHAPTER 11

Presidential Address: Growth of Honors Programs

VISHNU N. BHATIA
Washington State University

Dr. Wynn, Dr. Weir, Ladies and Gentlemen:

First, I wish to thank all of you for what has been a most enjoyable year serving as the President of the National Collegiate Honors Council. The way the constitution of this organization is set up, it is the executive secretary and the vice-president who do all the work. The president of the organization really has very little to do, except possibly to enjoy the rewards of his previous year's work as vice-president. And the rewards have been many. During the last year I have visited many of you. My travels took me to a number of campuses stretching from the Midwest to that most delightful of all journeys to the University of Hawaii. In addition, many of you have called upon me to consult with you on the needs of your universities, either in the establishing of new programs, or the reorganization of existing ones. All of these things have been most enjoyable, but in retrospect I must confess that in these many sessions where I was supposedly advising you about your programs, I learned a lot more than I was able to offer you.

After a year of these pleasant trips, numerous conversations, and much correspondence, I have come to this meeting more than ever impressed with the amazingly rapid development of honors programs for talented students in the many institutions of higher learning. I am told that there are presently about a thousand or more institutions which have some form of an honors program or a special program for superior students. By any standards of measurement, the growth of these programs has been phenomenal, and one gets the impression that all of a sudden interest in the better student is a fashionable thing indeed. However, this is still a new phenomenon in American higher education, or for that matter,

in our society; because our society has not always been too ready to accept any process or plan that recognizes the selection and the identification of the talented.

Speaking on the campus of Stanford University in 1906, William James said, "The world is only beginning to see that the wealth of a nation consists more than in anything else in the number of superior men that it harbors." Unfortunately, as many people have pointed out, this famous statement by James was too generous, and if anything, he was at least half a century ahead of his time. For it is only in recent years that we are beginning to understand the significance of his remarks, particularly as they apply to our society. In his remarkable book on "Excellence" John Gardner points out that we in America have always prided ourselves on our ability to make the most effective use of our national resources. But until recently, we have been unwilling to include intellectual resources as one of our national treasures. Hence, the development of honors programs in so many of our universities represents a rather profound and revolutionary step. These programs are a clear statement of a point of view that there are those amongst us who are intellectually more capable than most of us and the act of selecting them and providing them with an education that is better than average is in the interest of all of us. But even more than this, we have gradually come to the realization that the development of honors programs in our universities and colleges, most particularly in our state universities, represents one of the most democratic steps in our tradition of democratic education. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the development of special programs for the talented in our universities for the first time makes the educational process truly democratic. Traditionally, the American state university has catered primarily to the large middle group of its students. And at the same time it has lavished much care and attention on those who have required remedial work to bring them up to the average level, or those who have demonstrated promise in such non-academic pursuits as athletics. The development of honors programs, then, provides something for the one group that, at least in terms of formal programs, has been the most neglected on our campuses—the superior student.

Yet, it is hardly necessary for me to talk to this audience about the virtues of an honors program. What needs to be mentioned is that the benefits that have accrued from these programs far exceed our original expectations. For not only have these programs benefited those for whom they are specifically intended, but they have led to a remarkable spillover of benefits to higher education as a whole. It has been noted that in those universities that have developed sound honors programs, one of

the most rewarding results has been that they have caused the faculty to revitalize their teaching expectations and to demand more of themselves. The development of solid, thoughtful programs designed for the best among our students has inevitably resulted in demanding more from the faculty and the administration, and has led to the reducing of the unused potential within the universities. Whenever universities attempt to provide a more intense education for their best students, they cause us, the faculty, to prove ourselves worthy of the challenge. There have been a number of studies which demonstrate that it is not only the superior student who benefits from an honors program but also the faculty members, and ultimately *all* the students. Honors classes permit a degree of continuing interchange between the students and the teacher, and because of the intelligence of the students, that interchange is a profitable one. We all know that honors students are particularly challenging. They do not permit the kind of sloppy thinking or inadequate preparation which unfortunately sometimes characterizes instruction in our classes. They force us to work quite hard, and to research quite thoroughly every point we propose to introduce. They pounce on our inconsistencies and lapses and sometimes introduce interpretations which are novel and worth further attention. They do not accept the easy and generally inadequate answer. In short, they insist that we remain alive and working scholars. Describing this phenomenon, one of the instructors in the honors program at my university stated, and I quote: "The impact of their demands is felt in my other courses. I prepare them more carefully than might otherwise be the case. Their objections lead me to see where my expectations have to be bolstered or where they have to be presented from a somewhat different perspective if they are to make sense to the students. Their comments and examples give me raw material to introduce in my own lectures—raw materials which are often quite suited to the experience and perceptions of their non-honors peers. Their difficulties with the raw materials serve to warn me about the kind of difficulties which are likely to be encountered in other classes. Also important is the enthusiasm for learning present in honors classes which tends to reinforce my own enthusiasm and this is felt, I believe, in my teaching of non-honors classes." The point that I am making is that while we are all familiar with the virtues of the honors programs for the honors students, the thing that we should become more conscious of, and the thing that needs to be understood and recognized, is that the establishment of these programs in our universities and colleges is not a narrow development, but one which has started to have far-reaching effects in enhancing the entire educational process. I am emphasizing this point because in

the past, honors meetings such as this have failed to look at honors education in this broader sense and too often honors programs have been planned without any consideration being given to optimizing this aspect of their impact.

Let me hasten to add that not all that I have learned about honors programs in the last year, or the years preceding that, has been pleasant or positive. While many programs are soundly conceived and well thought out, there are also some which are hastily conceived and casually staffed. Dean James Robertson, our immediate past president, described some of these programs in the following words, "Seeking to obtain quick visibility for an honors effort, some institutions may be devoting time, publicity, and money into such peripheral concerns as honors days, lounges, brochures, picnics, and perhaps even honors blazers. In a few institutions with strong and vigorous administrative leadership, honors colleges have sprung up over the weekend. The educational world in general and the faculty of the institution concerned in particular must have been surprised to read in their Monday paper of the existence of these shimmering new air castles on the campus." Even in those programs that have been developed after considerable thought, the conception has been too narrow. For a properly envisioned honors program must attempt to enhance the potential of the talented students on many fronts. Too often honors programs tend to concentrate only on giving a student a better educational experience in his major field or vocational interest. While this is a necessary and important ingredient of any honors program, I'm afraid it is far too narrow a concept. For purely technological or vocational training, no matter how outstanding it may be, will not produce the qualities of intellectual and cultural enlightenment that are essential for the development of the talented. As has been often said, these qualities of enlightenment reside in a part of human nature that technological concerns only barely touch. The demands and needs of our society are such that the talented students and the potential leaders of our society must be educated in a way that makes them something more than technically competent. The problems of our society are too complex to be trusted only to narrow specialists. The increasing complexity of our lives demands that the leaders of the future generations not only be people who are capable of conducting the orchestra, but have the additional capability of rewriting the score when called upon to do so. And even more importantly, their education must cause them to acquire the sense of those principles that govern the most meaningful and generous relationships between individuals and peoples. It is this kind of an educational experience that is the true meaning of an honors program. For the

principle should be that good students must be able to put knowledge together rather than to go on separating or compartmentalizing it.

The second disturbing factor that I have observed is the tendency on the part of many new programs or existing programs to be so rigidly designed that even though they offer a better educational experience, they do so with such a lack of flexibility that they become victims of the same faults that plague higher education as a whole. No aspect of American higher education today offers the opportunity for experimentation more than honors programs do, and it would be a safe statement to make that an honors program which is not designed to be highly flexible and capable of continuing experimentation shall fail in achieving its objectives. The quality of flexibility is necessary in honors programs not only with respect to the needs of the individual students, but also with respect to the program as a whole. An honors program cannot be expected to succeed in the fullest sense unless it is so designed that new innovations, changes, and experiments with the curriculum can be made easily, quickly, and with a minimum of red tape. Just as we expect our students to assimilate, develop, change and grow, so must our programs.

The third area of disappointment that I have encountered is what I consider to be the failure of large numbers of honors directors to realize that the honors experience is something that is not confined to the classroom. At least half of the learning process that goes on in the environment of an honors program relates not to the formal classroom but to the education that honors students carry out for each other through informal discussions, or what might be called the extension of the classroom. And this learning experience is dependent upon the intellectually meaningful relationships that honors students can be expected to establish with each other. In this connection, we should also keep in mind the very valuable role that junior and senior honors students can play in the education of honors freshmen and sophomores. In most honors programs upper division honors students remain one of the most under-exploited resources available to us.

A most rewarding experience that I have had in my work with the Honors Program at Washington State University was the development of a freshman seminar program, taught not by instructors, but by the seniors and juniors in the program. From what the freshmen have told me, it has been a most meaningful experience for them, not only in terms of what they have learned in these seminars, but more significantly in terms of what they have learned about the learning process in a university and in the development of their ability to get the most out of the university. In short, it is most essential that each of us in our respective

honors programs look for the ways of encouraging advanced honors students to go on learning by teaching each other. In this age of student dissatisfaction and unrest, the honors program can provide an excellent way of involving talented students in a constructive and meaningful way in the educational process itself. And let us not forget we must listen to these student teachers when they report on how they have taught and learned.

A fourth disturbing experience that I have had is this: Sometimes when I have been called upon to assist in the establishment of an honors program in an institution, I have found that what is wanted is a pat formula which has been successfully tried somewhere else which could be adopted in toto. May I suggest that this is one of the worst ways in which further extension of honors programs may occur. If you look around at the various universities that have truly successful programs, you will find that each of these is unique in one or more ways. It seems obvious to me that no one should expect an honors program to succeed on any campus unless it is designed to meet the needs of that particular campus and is designed with the strength and the weaknesses of that campus in mind. In this day of concerns about relevance in higher education, there is nothing quite as irrelevant as a pre-prepared format for an honors program which completely overlooks local conditions.

Finally, I want to comment on the question that has been asked of me on a number of occasions during the last year by various honors directors. The question basically is how do we deal with the small minority of faculty that is basically against the idea of honors and who are highly critical of the development of honors programs. We should, of course, keep in mind that there are many who criticize honors programs, not because they are against the idea itself, but because of a genuine desire to improve one or another aspect of the program. However, the question when it is asked usually refers to those few people who continue to reject the entire idea of honors education. Such persons usually fall into two categories:

1. Those who oppose the idea of honors simply for the sake of opposing something, and one must admit for them an honors program is a very convenient target. Honors programs do not really have a constituency of their own and there are relatively few people who have a vested interest in them. As a result, one may swing freely at an honors program. I have no solution to this sort of criticism. I do think it is usually an excuse by which a dissatisfied faculty member may vent anger which is basically the result of some other problems in his department or institution. Such a person may feel safe in attacking a program which has few

faculty who must depend upon it. We need not be too concerned about this, because it is after all nothing more than one of the side effects of an important advantage of the honors program. This advantage is the very absence of a definable constituency such as an academic department has, and this shields it from the many pitfalls of educational parochialism so prevalent in higher education.

2. The second group of critics of honors programs are those who feel that attention to our capable and talented young men and women is a mark of elitism and is somehow undemocratic. This, I am convinced, stems from a fuzzy-minded concept of democracy. Critics who have expressed this point of view confuse the equality of opportunity with mediocrity. Equality of opportunity does not mean the stifling of the talented, but it means the existence of opportunity for all to develop to the full limits of their ability. We should bear in mind *and* we should point out, that we are constantly involved in the process of selection. Just as we select our leaders, in our educational system we are always selecting students. As John Gardner has pointed out, this selection starts out early in the school life of every boy and girl and proceeds through their educational experience and beyond. The problems of selection are not new. What is new is that they are now played for higher stakes. College admission is one such prize. Admission into the honors program is yet another. It is indeed our democratic obligation to provide the appropriate educational experiences at different levels for all who might be capable of profiting by them, and not subject everyone to the same level of attainment. The good educational system is not one that ignores individual differences, but one which deals with them wisely and humanely. William Learned has written, "The concept of democratic education as one leveled to a colorless mediocrity is as grotesque an interpretation of democratic principles, as the conception of health in which bounding vitality is deprecated on the ground that only average health is fair to the community." No one would believe this!

Appendix

PROGRAM

Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington

REGISTRATION

Friday, October 18, 1968—12 Noon to 9 P.M., Foyer

Saturday, October 19, 1968—8 A.M. to Noon.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1968

3:00 p.m.	A three-hour cruise of Seattle harbor.
8:00 p.m.	Meeting of the Executive Committee in the Board Room.
8:00 p.m.	Showing of International Honors Program film, "Life in a Japanese Fishing Village," by Roby O'Brien (Honors Student), Stetson University. Pacific-Evergreen Room.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1968

9:00-12:00	Plenary Session. Williamsburg Room. General Theme: "Experimentation in the Search for Relevance in Curricula." V. N. Bhatia, President, NCHC, presiding. Welcoming remarks by Charles E. Odegaard, President, University of Washington. "The Success of Student-Initiated Courses," Dean Philip Hubbard, University of Iowa. "Conversation, Cooperation and Community," Dean Robertson, University of Michigan. "Rigor, Relevance and Revolt," Herbert Taylor, Professor of Anthropology and Dean of Research, Western Washington State College. Responses by Harold Hantz, Director of Honors, University of Arkansas, and Joseph Cohen, Director of Honors, Tulane University.

12:15-1:30 Lunch—Georgian Room.
Dudley Wynn, Director of Honors, University of New Mexico, and Vice-President of the NCHC, presiding.
Presidential Address, V. N. Bhatia, Coordinator of Honors, Washington State University, and President of NCHC.

2:00-3:45 Four concurrent Sessions.

1. What's going on in large universities?
   Pacific-Evergreen Room.
   Dean C. Grey Austin, Ohio State University, presiding.
   M. Jean Phillips, Assoc. Director of Honors Programs, University of Illinois.
   Resource person: Otto Graf, Director of Honors Council, University of Michigan.
2. What's going on in smaller colleges? Rex Room.
   Raeburne S. Heimbeck, Director of Honors, Central Washington State College, presiding.
   "Is Completely Independent Study Possible?"
   Frederick Sontag, Chairman of Committee on Honors Study, Pomona College.
   Respondent: Richard Hutcheson, Consultant on Honors, Kansas State University.
3. New and Emerging Programs. Colonial Room.
   Sharon Campbell, Counselor, Honors Program, Howard University, presiding.
   Thomas W. Phelan, Director of Honors, St. Norbert College.
   Respondent: William W. Kelley, Director of Honors College, Michigan State University.
4. Honors Students Meeting. Queens Room.
   Jay Leipham, Washington State University, presiding.
   Robert Cumbow, Seattle University.
   Respondent: Thomas Waite, University of Washington.

4:00-5:00 Business Meeting—Williamsburg Room.

5:00-6:00 Showing of International Honors Program film, "Life in a Japanese Fishing Village," by Roby O'Brien (Honors Student), Stetson University. Williamsburg Room.

6:45 p.m. Buses depart from Hotel for Seattle University.

7:00 p.m. BANQUET
James Tallarico, Director of Honors, Seattle University, presiding.

Welcoming Remarks by the Very Reverend John A. Fitterer, S.J., President, Seattle University.

Speaker: Dean James Jarrett, School of Education, University of California at Berkeley, ". . . And Lose the Name of Action."

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1968

9:00-12:00 Plenary Session on "The University, the Community, and the Student: Problems of Relevance." Williamsburg Room. Father Thomas L. O'Brien, S.J., University of Seattle, presiding.

"How to Tell Businessmen from Educators," Ralph E. Boynton, Vice President, Bank of America, San Francisco.

"Closing the Communication Gap between Business and Education," Nils Eklund, Vice President, Kaiser Industries, Oakland.

Responses:

Myron J. Lunine, Director of Honors College, Kent State University.

Robert O. Evans, Director of Honors, University of Kentucky.

David V. Harrington, Director of Honors, Gustavus Adolphus College.

John Hague, Director of Honors, Stetson University.

David B. Wildermuth, President of Student Honors Council, Oklahoma State University.

Other students will also respond.

12:15 p.m. Lunch—Georgian Room

V. N. Bhatia, President, NCHC, presiding.

Installation of Officers.

Remarks by new President of NCHC, Dudley Wynn.

2:00-4:00 Meeting of New Executive Committee. Board Room.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

University of Akron
Akron, Ohio #44304

University of Alabama
Box 2926
University, Alabama #35486

Albion College
Albion, Michigan #49224

Albright College
Reading, Pa. #19604

Alcorn A&M College
Lorman, Mississippi #39096

Allegheny College
Meadville, Pa. #16335

The American University
Washington, D.C. #20016

Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan #49104

Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio #45387

University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona #85717

University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas #72701

Asheville-Biltmore College
Asheville, North Carolina #28801

Ashland College
Ashland, Ohio #44805

Augsburg College
707 21st Ave., South
Minneapolis, Minnesota #55404

Augusta College
Augusta, Georgia #30904

Baldwin-Wallace College
Berea, Ohio #44017

Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana #47306

Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin #53511

Bethany College
Bethany, West Virginia #26032

Boston University
755 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Mass. #02215

Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio #43402

Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah #84601

Brooklyn College of the City
Bedford Ave. & Avenue H
Brooklyn, New York #11210

Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island #02912

Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pa. #17837

California Lutheran College
Thousand Oaks, California #91360

California State College at Long Beach
6101 East Seventh Street
Long Beach, California #90804

University of California
Santa Barbara, California #93106

University of California
Los Angeles, California #90024

John Carroll University
20700 North Park Blvd.
Cleveland, Ohio #44118

University of Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee #37403

University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio #45221

The City College
Convent Avenue at 138th St.
New York, N. Y. #10031

Claremont Men's College
Claremont, California #91711

Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina #29631

The Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado #80903

Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado #80521

University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado #80302

Concordia Teachers College
River Forest, Illinois #60305

Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Connecticut #06515

Cornell University
136 Goldwin Smith Hall
Ithaca, New York #14850

The Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska #68131

Dakota Wesleyan University
Mitchell, South Dakota #57301

Delta State College
Cleveland, Mississippi #38732

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado #80210

Drew University
Madison, New Jersey #07940

Drexel Institute of Technology
Philadelphia, Pa. #19104

East Carolina College
Greenville, North Carolina #27834

Elmhurst College
Elmhurst, Illinois #60126

Erskine College
Due West, South Carolina #29639

Fairleigh Dickinson University
Rutherford, New Jersey #07070

Fisk University
Nashville, Tennessee #37203

Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida #32306

University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida #32601

Franklin & Marshall College
Lancaster, Pa. #17604

Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina #29613

Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. #20007

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia #30601

Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, Pa. #17325

Gonzaga University
Spokane, Washington #99202

Good Counsel College
White Plains, New York #10603

Goshen College
Goshen, Indiana #46526

Graceland College
Lamoni, Iowa #50140

Gustavus Adolphus College
St. Peter, Minnesota #56082

Hamline University
St. Paul, Minnesota #55101

Hendrix College
Conway, Arkansas

Hiram College
Hiram, Ohio #44234

College of the Holy Cross
Worcester, Mass. #01610

Hope College
Holland, Michigan #49423

University of Houston
Houston, Texas #77004

Howard Payne College
Brownwood, Texas #76801

Howard University
2400 Sixth St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. #20001

Huron College
Huron, South Dakota #57350

Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois #61761

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois #60115

Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois #62901

Southern Illinois University
Edwardsville, Illinois #62025

University of Illinois
Box 4348
Chicago, Illinois #60680

University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois #61801

Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois #61455

Immaculata College
Immaculata, Pa. #19345

Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana #47401

Iona College
New Rochelle, New York #10801

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa #50010

University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa #50613

Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, Kansas #67601

Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Pittsburg, Kansas #66764

Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas #66801

Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas #66502

University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas #66044

Kent State University
Kent, Ohio #44240

University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky #40506

Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky #42101

Lake Erie College
Painesville, Ohio #44077

LaSalle College
Philadelphia, Pa. #19141

Lenoir Rhyne College
Hickory, North Carolina #28601

Lewis College
Lockport, Illinois #60411

Lincoln Memorial University
Harrogate, Tenn. #37752

Lincoln University
Lincoln University, Pa. #19352

Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La. #70803

Loyola College
4501 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland #21210

Loyola University
7101 West 80th St.
Los Angeles, California #90045

Lynchburg College
Lynchburg, Virginia #24505

Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota #55101

Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin #53233

Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia #25701

University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland #20740

Maryville College of the Sacred Heart
13550 Conway Road
St. Louis, Missouri #63141

University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Mass. #01003

Mayville State College
Mayville, North Dakota #58257

Memphis State University
Memphis, Tenn. #38111

Meredith College
Raleigh, North Carolina #27602

Miami University
Oxford, Ohio #45056

University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida #33124

Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan #48823

Northern Michigan University
Marquette, Michigan #49855

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan #48104

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan #49001

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota #55455

University of Minnesota
Morris, Minnesota #56267

Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi #39762

University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi #38677

University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Miss. #39401

Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri #64093

University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri #65201

University of Missouri
Kansas City, Missouri #64110

Moorhead State College
Moorhead, Minnesota #56560

College of Mount Saint Vincent
Bronx, New York #10471

Muhlenberg College
Allentown, Pa. #18104

Muskingum College
New Concord, Ohio #43762

University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska #68508

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico #88001

Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico #88130

University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico #87106

Norman College
Norman Park, Georgia #31771

North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina #27607

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina #27514

University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota #58201

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana #46556

Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio #43210

Ohio University
Athens, Ohio #45701

Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma #74074

University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma #73069

Eastern Oregon College
LaGrande, Oregon #97850

Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon #97331

University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon #97403

Ottawa University
Ottawa, Kansas #66067

Pan American College
Edinburg, Texas #78539

Paterson State College
300 Pompton Rd.
Wayne, New Jersey #07470

Pikesville College
Pikesville, Kentucky #41501

University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa. #15213

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
333 Jay Street
Brooklyn, New York #11201

Providence College
Providence, Rhode Island #02918

University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington #98416

Rice University
Houston, Texas #77001

University of Rochester
Rochester, New York #14627

Rust College
Holly Springs, Mississippi #38635

Sacramento State College
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California #98519

St. Anselm's College
Manchester, New Hampshire #03102

Saint Augustine's College
Raleigh, North Carolina #27602

St. Bonaventure University
St. Bonaventure, New York #14778

College of St. Catherine
St. Paul, Minnesota #55116

St. John's University
Jamaica, New York #11432

Saint Joseph's College
Rensselaer, Indiana #47978

Saint Louis University
221 North Grand Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri #63103

College of St. Mary of the Springs
Columbus, Ohio #43219

Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana #46556

St. Mary's College
Orchard Lake, Michigan #48034

St. Norbert College
West DePere, Wisconsin #54178

St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota #55057

College of Saint Rose
Albany, New York #12203

San Diego State College
San Diego, California #92115

San Jose State College
San Jose, California #95114

University of Scranton
Scranton, Pa. #19610

Seattle University
900 Broadway
Seattle, Washington #98122

Seton Hill College
Greensburg, Pa. #15601

Shaw University
Raleigh, North Carolina #27602

Siena College
Loudonville, New York #12211

University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota #57069

Spring Hill College
Mobile, Alabama #36608

State University of New York
135 Western Avenue
Albany, New York #12203

State University of New York
Alfred, New York #12226

State University of New York College
Oswego, New York #13126

State University of New York College
Plattsburgh, New York #12901

State University College
Potsdam, New York #13676

Stephen F. Austin State College
Nacogdoches, Texas #75961

Stetson University
DeLand, Florida #32720

College of Steubenville
Franciscan Way
Steubenville, Ohio #43952

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York #13210

Taylor University
Upland, Indiana #46989

University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tenn. #37916

East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas #75428

Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas #77843

Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas #76129

Southwest Texas State College
San Marcos, Texas #78666

University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio #43606

Transylvania College
Lexington, Kentucky #40508

Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana #79118

Tusculum College
Greenville, Tennessee #37743

Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama #36088

Utah State University
Logan, Utah #84321

University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah #84112

University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont #05401

Villanova University
Villanova, Pa. #19085

Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia #23215

Wartburg College
222 9th St., N.W.
Waverly, Iowa #50677

Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington #98926

Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, Virginia #22401

Washington State University
Pullman, Washington #99163

University of Washington
Seattle, Washington #98105

Western Washington State College
Bellingham, Washington #98225

Wayne State College
Wayne, Nebraska #68787

Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan #48202

Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado #81230

Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas #67208

College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia #23185

Winthrop College
Rock Hill, South Carolina #29733

Wisconsin State University
Platteville, Wisconsin #53818

Wisconsin State University
Stevens Point, Wisconsin #54481

Wisconsin State University
Whitewater, Wisconsin #53190

University of Wisconsin
1276 Main St.
Green Bay, Wisconsin #54302

University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin #53706

Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio #45501

University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming #82070

Xavier University of Louisiana
New Orleans, La. #70125

Yeshiva University
55 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y. #10033