[illegible] Chandler

file, Manuscript

JUL 08 1985

2500 Buena Vista
Berkeley 94708
June 25, 1985

Editor, Fragments

In praising Henry George, it is well to mention frequently how successful those countries have been which put his principle to some extent into practice. Thus Australia and New Zealand ever since 1840 have been models to the world, with high wages even for laborers (not the case, for instance, in the US West) and employment sometimes over 99%. The current prosperity of Taiwan is also largely due to the ~~land~~ Georgist land-value tax. All these countries tax land fairly high, and buildings none or almost none.

Tertius Chandler
Tertius Chandler

Editor,

On education I feel Oscar Johansson goes not nearly far enough. I enclose an article - perhaps a bit long for your periodical.

Tertius Chandler
Tertius Chandler

Dear Oscar —
Is there no end to the comments about you? Your miserable(?) comments will be appreciated. Love. Fannie sends why? As ever, Jack

Education - Less of It

by Tertius Chandler

2500 Buena Vista
Berkeley 94708

Part I: school

Part II: college

Claims for and against Education

Will Durant in his "Lessons of History" claimed the greatest hope of the human race is increased education.

Some objections can be raised. School is unfree, rather like a jail, with a term lasting 20 years if you're able to stick the course. Childhood and youth are sacred times when innate curiosity is intense and health and zest tend to be strong. Those years are too important to be frittered away memorizing irrelevant trivia in herded mobs under the heavy hand of compulsion. Ben Franklin had just 2 years in school and flunked both times - yet he went on to make himself the ablest and best rounded leader in our history. Pascal and Petrie had no schooling at all. Thus learning can occur outside school as well as in. Perhaps better. Especially now, when there are fine libraries open to all, as well as television, bookstores, newspapers, and magazines. Think of the "National Geographic"!

Here on the other hand are arguments for education:

1. Older people know more, so the young can learn from them. Parental teaching might be preferable (and does increasingly occur), but in many families both parents are off at work. Anyway teachers are specialists in particular subjects. These arguments are valid, and some learning does occur in schools. Yet our system is none too good: some high-school graduates are functionally illiterate.

2. Money! A school diploma is virtually useless on the job market, and so is a college degree. But school prepares for college, which prepares for postgraduate school, which prepares for entry into well-paid professions. How profitable this is can be seen from the following facts. In 1981 the average high-school graduate made $18,138 whereas the average for those with at

least 5 years of college was $32,887. And lifetime earnings for the high-school grads averaged $845,000, compared with $1,503,000 for 5-year collegians. (Both from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1983, p. 181-2)

One should subtract from the Ph D's total the cost of tuition, roughly $40,000 for the 8 years. He is likely to enter his career fairly deep into debt, and if he fails to find an opening in his profession he belatedly joins the drop-outs.

Education has the disadvantage of delivering its cash reward at the wrong time of life. It is youth that is the time of most ardent desire! An aging man hardly needs an increasing income - unless to pay for a divorce or for his children's education.

An underlying flaw anyway vitiates the comparison. It assumes everyone starts from scratch. Quite the contrary is the case. College draws people of higher intelligence and from the richer families, even today. To take an extreme case of privileged youth, J. P. Morgan jr. was assured of a rapid rise in his father's bank whether he went to college or not. Indeed the world's most famous bankers, the Rothschilds, never went to college at all. Neither did the famous rich Americans: Franklin, Washington, Girard, Astor, Vanderbilt, Carnegie, Henry Ford.

As a road to riches, education is a dud.

3. The rah-rah spirit. A person likes to say he or she has been to such-and-such college. It's the "in" thing. This merely amounts to snobbery. It is no valid reason at all, though it draws in mediocre people to colleges like a tidal wave.

4. High ambition. In this country of open opportunity parents naturally drive their children all they can. Yet there are only a few places at the top, in the various professions. Enormous numbers of students press onward in the hope of squeezing into those positions, which are far beyond the natural talents of many of them. For those who are actually fit for professional careers, college plus postgrad study has become the only allowed

route. For the others it is a rather cruel trap.

It is refreshing to recall that Washington, Lincoln, and Truman were among those who made it to president without going to college. All these were unusually good presidents.

5. To train in doing what you don't want to do (T. H. Huxley's reason). This argument becomes absurd when you realize that once a person, beyond infancy, sees a need to do a task, even a difficult one, he is motivated and thus can easily muster the pep to tackle it. Any farm boy knows this. School by its enforced nature turns subjects into drudgery, completely turning off the pupils. Then naturally they don't want to do them. Forcing anyone to do things that are meaningless to him is not good training; it is merely disgusting. Far from being conducive to character-building, it merely produces goose-stepping blind followers. Good for war, perhaps, but hardly much good for anything else.

6. To preserve morals - to put it vulgarly, to keep the brats out of mischief. Alas, it is while off at and around school that the thoroughly bored youngsters learn to smoke, swear, drink to excess, bully, and try out drugs. There the group has some tendency to sink to its lowest level. As a morals-builder and crime-preventive, school, taken generally, can be considered a proven failure.

7. Culture. The claim is often made that if culture weren't rammed into the young, they would never come to appreciate literature, art, fine music. This argument misses the whole nature of cultural appreciation. Mark Twain said in "Tom Sawyer":

> "Work consists of whatever a body is <u>obliged</u> to do, and Play consists of whatever a body is not obliged to do."

When one turns the arts into compulsion, of course they cease to be pleasurable. They become mere drudgery, reluctantly endured. Appreciation has to be a joyous thing, in a milieu of freedom. As Ingres said,

"Don't go to art school. That's a place where men are ruined."

8. Meeting friends. There are of course other places to meet people and most allow of more leisure to enjoy the friendship. Nevertheless it must be said that college is a fine place to make interesting acquaintances. Students are easily met in the dining halls and on campus. Eventually one may make friends too among the professors. Aside from the professors, though, do not expect your college friends to stay with you. You will go your way; they will go elsewhere. A good pal will become your "man in Peoria" or perhaps Carácas. Most of the joyous contacts you make in college are people you will never see again. It is a sobering thought. Whereas if you had stayed in your home town, your friends might be less thrilling, but you might have kept many of them for life. If you like shallow, passing friendships, virtual ships that pass in the night, college is the place for you.

To sum up, education does pass on some learning and introduces a person to many out-of-town folks, while being the only way to enter some professions. And it takes a long, long time!

Conditioned Robots

Raymond Moore observes in "Parent Educator & Family Report," Aug. 1984, p. 6, that

> "The biggest shortcoming of mass education is the fact that students end up completely turned off to learning."

He is not the only one with that objection. Kevin Langdon in his magazine "NET" puts it thus:

> "Education, far from preparing people to live useful and meaningful lives, is actually destructive to whatever hunger for knowledge, intellectual honesty, and dedication to high principles may

exist in a young person before he or she passes through the academic mill."

Or as Bertrand Russell ruefully concluded:

"We are faced with the paradox that education has become one of the chief obstacles of intelligence and freedom of thought."

The educational process has become geared to the College Board Exams, which give it an awesome degree of rigidity. Each school wants its pupils insofar as possible to enter accredited colleges, and passing the Board Exams in the only way. As a result, elective or freely chosen courses in schools are very few. They are becoming few even in college.

The number of years for each subject is also prescribed by the school. If a child masters math in 1 year, so much the worse for him. He must take it for the required number of years, be they 6 or more. Conversely someone of low IQ has to suffer year after year with a subject that baffles him. Insofar as school is adjusted to anybody, it is to the mediocre student, and he, hopelessly unable to lead the class or win any prize, just drones on, loathing the whole procedure. Yet even he is driven as hard as possible, for mental exertion is considered beneficial.

It seems inconceivable to the teaching profession that a boy might want to master some serious subject on his own time and at his own speed, even a subject so straightforward and intrinsically fascinating as History. No! They think it must be all spoon-fed.

In each of the United States pupils must stay in school till a certain age, which according to the state ranges from 15 to 18. A youngster must do this, even if he already knows more than his teachers. This is the law. Evaders are sent to penal colonies called reform schools, so their spirit can be completely broken. Even in regular schools the punishment may be quite severe. In North Carolina a 17-year-old girl for playing hooky just one day was paddled 6 times on the buttocks,

so hard that she had massive bruises. The girl testified. "Throughout the next two days I haemorrhaged and had to see a doctor" (reported in newspapers 3 years later on Oct. 18, 1984). Had she lived in any of 44 other states, she wouldn't have had to attend school at all! In California school spankings in the year 1983-4 just before they were outlawed totaled over 1,600. Schooling, starting too early and lasting too long and an unnatural way to learn anyway, has to be administered by threats and sometimes by brute force. Every state has these laws. There are to be no future Ben Franklins in this country.

During the school year the assignments are so heavy that very little other serious reading is done. So a boy cannot stimulate another by refering to some different reading - and even if he did, the classmate would be too busy to read it. This uniformity of reading is one reason why schoolchildren discuss learned subjects so little; what can you tell another fellow who has been compelled to read the same books? This is intellectual tyranny on a grand scale. Its function is not to broaden the mind, but to adjust it to the status quo. The pupils are being conditioned into programmed robots, some merely a bit more proficient in the set responses than others. Their brains, as active entities, are stultified, even ossified. This unhappy development is inevitable in a compulsory educational system.

All that keeps the system from destroying the students altogether is that most of them instinctively rebel inwardly against it, and cooperate only enough to get by, reserving as much energy and time as they can manage for other activities. Indeed the most unruly boys in class sometimes make good best later on in life. Unfortunately some of the rebellious activities, such as smoking, heavy drinking, and fast driving, are not healthy. But by a discreet degree of rebelliousness and shirking a boy can remain spiritually alive. If on the other hand he cooperates fully, learning his lessons as hard as he can, he may have plenty of A's and B's but

turn into a gutless yes-man, quite incapable of facing up to the problems of life. Agatha Christie wrote:

> "I suppose it is because nearly all children go to school nowadays, and have things arranged for them, that they seem so forlornly unable to produce their own ideas." ("Autobiography," p. 59)

For in school, all decisions are made for them. Pupils are to model themselves on their textbooks and their teachers. Against this, Kahlil Gibran dissented:

> "Your children are not your children. They are the sons and daughters of life's longing for itself. ...You may give them your love but not your thoughts, for they have their own thoughts. You may house their bodies but not their souls. Their souls dwell in the house of tomorrow, which you may not visit, even in your dreams."

Gibran was not looking for programmed robots.

A Shorter School Year

Some sadist must have written the law requiring 180 annual schooldays. They begin in August when berries are still ripening and last into the sweltering heat of June. Fall and spring, by their nature gorgeous seasons, become fixed in young minds as symbols of the agony of school.

It was when I was about halfway through prep school that teachers thought up a way to cut into the summer vacation - our only prolonged free time. They began assigning compulsory reading of novels. This was a grief and an indignity I will not easily forget. I had been reading the finest sort of literature on my own in summers. After that I read the minimum - and hated it. Liberty dies hard in the human soul.

Change should be in the other direction: to less schooling. For a starter, pupils who can pass the final exam should be allowed out of class a month early - and

allowed to start the next year's class a month late. This should produce an upsurge of enthusiasm. The brightest ones would pass all their finals early and get 2 months added onto their summer vacation. They would drive hard for this goal.

Middling students would give it a good try and be glad if they made it even in only one subject.

The dullards would be left, but with many students absent for 2 months, the teachers could give the laggards more time, more person-to-person attention, to help them to reach anyway a passing grade.

Above all, the students would hone their own studying skills and take pride in their progress. The whole atmosphere of school would be changed, very much for the better.

Drugs etc. might simply drop by the wayside.

How Early?

Jean Piaget noticed stages in children's capacity to learn. To impose reading and mathematics on them before their mind is ready is to puzzle and torment them.

School by its nature is force-feeding, and when children are very young, not only their bodies but also their feelings are very tender. To separate them from their parents and to inflict on them cold drill in seemingly pointless subjects can drive their feelings inward and make them feel unwanted and lonely, even in a crowded room. All this Piaget understood. Indeed it is perfectly obvious.

But, Piaget added, give the students those same subjects a few years later, and they can grasp them rather quickly, because their minds have become equal to the techniques needed and because they are old enough to see a purpose in what they are doing.

Raymond Moore in his book "School Can Wait" suggests delaying school to the age of 8 or 10 and in a recent

letter (Jan. 24, 1985, cited in his "Parent Educator") opposes giving any exams before age 10. Similarly Jerome Kagan finds wholly uninstructed Guatemalan back-village children vital and alert at 10 ("Time," Oct. 22, 1984, p. 97). The idea is not new. Robert Owen a century ago in his famous school withheld books from the children until their 10th year. Montessori likewise set the young to playing games. These are the real heroes for the cause of children.

School as Non-School

Best of all would be to drop compulsion at any age. When I was 9-12 my teacher was Alice J. Keelan. She was prevented by law from overturning school altogether, but she did give us one 45-minute period daily indoors but without lessons. So long as we stayed inside, quiet and orderly, we could do as we pleased. This period shaped my entire life. First I just listened entranced as the two older classes recited. I also read a few of the books Miss Keelan had set aside for optional reading. But what gripped me turned out to be parts of textbooks which I knew would never be assigned: the dates of birth and death of great men in the history book and the lists of cities in the back of the geography book. Soon I was making "Birth", "Death," and "Age" lists for the great men for all countries, and lists of cities by regions and by continents. This curiosity about great men and cities alerted my mind, and I took the lead of my class. Miss Keelan used to go around the room, looking over our shoulders, in that free period, never saying anything. One day after she passed me, I saw a big smile on her face. Now I realize why. So effective was this teacher, who allowed study free of supervision!

A few schools in England have operated without any compulsory classes at all. The first was Homer Lane's "Little Commonwealth" for convicts. Then came A. S.

Neill with Summerhill, for more ordinary children, which has functioned well for over half a century. Neill let children attend classes or not. At first all of them just played or worked with his tools. Eventually all of tried out at least some of the classes. When the boys and girls grew up, they had no special trouble getting jobs as dress-designers, engineers, mechanics, etc., and some went into dancing or art. A few chose professional careers, so Neill assigned them one-on-one instruction that got them into Oxford. When the government sent inspectors, Neill told them ("Summerhill," p. 86):

> "You really can't inspect Summerhill because our criteria are happiness, sincerity, balance, and sociability."

They took a look anyway, and were delighted. One of the features was plays put on by the children and generally written by them. Every child wanted to be in these plays and was fitted in somehow.

Puberty

School treats pupils alike year after year. Yet at or around 17 boys notice girls. They are never the same again. School carries on as if the children were still just that. Where I went, aside from a warning to "stay pure," nothing changed. The hard drill on useless scholasticism to get us into college continued. We were to think college and nothing but college, so success in life would be automatic.

I got the message. When at 17 on a ski trip I met a girl I liked, I deliberately dropped her and, by a hard effort, managed to forget her, as I still had over 5 years before I'd be clear of college (actually 9, but I didn't know of postgrad work then). I felt supposed to give up my wish to marry, and just studied on. That was a romance that should have gotten off the ground and didn't. Looking back, I see I could probably have worked in the girl's father's factory. The father and mother liked me.

I was past the then compulsory school-age of 16 in that state - but nobody told me things like that. College was a fixation for my parents and my teachers and hence for me too.

I was not unique. Bernard DeVoto told us in a talk at Harvard around 1935, "No one marries his first love." He meant among the highly-educated, for of course some drop-outs do marry their first choice. It was anyway a chilling remark, an unpleasant commentary on how the educational system impacts on youth. The trade-off of love for a series of degrees is a poor deal. A youth rates his beloved a slut or a wanton when he trades her off for a dubious prospect of future wealth in the distant future. And what he makes of himself is morally so low that I have no word for it.

Some of the youngsters sense a discrepancy and commit suicide. My school lost a boy recently that way. But the educational juggernaut lumbers along. What are a few boys, after all; what do they matter?

Since my school-time, private schools have come to grips with this problem in a way. They have almost all done a sudden about-face, and flung the girls and boys together. They are thus aroused to love earlier and so have longer to agonize. They are anyway together at first, till he goes off to Cornell and she to Florida U. What DeVoto said probably still stands: very few marry the first love. Those who try it will find how unpleasant financial troubles can be when both partners are paying out money for education, instead of taking it in.

Education and puberty thus now clash head-on, but they still havn't come to terms.

On Teaching English

English can be dropped altogether.

It was president Eliot of Harvard who in 1900 put English into our schools by making it a requirement for the College Board Exams. Eliot's idea was that pupils

can be compelled to present ideas clearly and to enjoy literature. He would drill these skills into them. The sheer quantity of disciplined effort would get results and turn our 18-year-olds into incisive, clear, witty writers.

The result of all this massive drill, over nearly a century, has been to make our youths somewhat duller than before. Our few famous writers now are notable for their gloom, their insobriety, and their utter inability to come up with answers to our problems. It would seem Mr. Eliot added a year and more to everyone's education to no purpose whatsoever.

The correct way to teach English fundamentals - grammar, spelling, sentence structure - is while teaching other subjects. That way it has a chance of being interesting. Just so, one teaches the use of a hammer in the process of teaching carpentry; one does not take a special course in hammering. It would be fiendishly dull if one did.

I should add that except on entrance and final exams, a paper should not be marked down for spelling mistakes. To do that merely discourages a pupil from using difficult words - and thus narrows his vocabulary! So mark them wrong and put the correct spelling in the margin, without lowering his grade - till the final exam.

As for the other part of English, which is appreciation, this by its very nature is unsuitable for compulsory indoctrination. It requires joy and free choice. It has to occur in leisure time, without supervision.

Mathematics

Ever since the Russians put Sputnik satellite into orbit in 1957 there have been spasmodic efforts to increase the math load of <u>all</u> U.S. schoolchildren, including future janitors, nurses, maids, and ditch diggers. While I respect those occupations, they do not need higher mathematics. Yet even intelligent men like Mc-

Govern take this line. Actually any useful computations made for war or business will be made by a very few experts - perhaps 1/00 of 1% of the population - and they will be using computers. So training everyone deeply in this subject is really absurd. Mental torture for no purpose whatsoever.

Underwood Dudley of DePauw U, himself a math teacher, commented in the "San Francisco Chronicle," April 28, 1984. He believes we teach math not to solve problems or inculcate logical thinking but simply because we always have. As he puts it:

> "Practical? When was the last time you had to solve a quadratic equation? Was it just last week that you needed to find the volume of a cone? Isn't it a fact that you never need any mathematics beyond arithmetic?....Algebra? Good heavens! Almost all people never use algebra, ever, outside of a classroom."

He rightly adds that mathematical talent is very easy to spot early in life. Surely he is right that a special annual test should be held to see which students should be allowed to take math beyond arithmetic - as an honor, not a requirement! The motivated, proud few would then accomplish more than the slave-driven multitude.

Any School at All ?

Once the need for school was clear. Back around 1800 schools were few and didn't take long, only 4-6 years. They taught basics and were almost the only place for the young to get books. Nowadays the alternative means of learning are plentiful. As already mentioned, they include public libraries, TV, bookstores, newspapers, and magazines. These actually represent an over-abundance. No one can possibly learn all the available material, even in a small town. Children are aware of all these sources and would almost certainly use them more if school did not preempt so much of their time. School

also turns them off study by force-feeding. Subjects now required are almost all of no use in real life.

Yet some, minimal knowledge might be required of everyone, on the ground that everyone can vote and should know enough to vote intelligently. So I suggest a 4-year program, from which any child who can pass the year's final exam before the school year begins would be exempt. Thus many would learn only at home.

11	12	13	14
math	government	ethics	Latin Am. his.
US history	ancient history	Eur. history	2 electives
geography	some language	1 elective	

I've deliberately suggested only 3 courses per year, as the fewer courses assigned, the better they can be mastered. Overwhelming a student merely stifles him.

The enormous reduction in schooling herein proposed would save an enormous amount of taxpayers' money. The size of classes might be cut from about 35 down to 10. With smaller classes the rate of learning should improve. It is conceivable that students so educated would come out remembering more than high-school graduates do today. In any case the nervous strain on them would be far less, and their health should be correspondingly better. They would also in nearly all cases be closer to their parents and sibblings. Learning from relatives can be enormous as well as effortless.

If some state wanted to drop compulsory schooling altogether, I wouldn't oppose it. I would not wish this change to be imposed by the federal government however.

Self-Reliance vs the Educational Treadmill

Youth is a time of decision, when a man picks his wife and his job. For these matters he needs self-reliance. You'd expect society to give a high priority to seeing he gets a chance to develop this trait. Instead it does just the opposite. Educational requirements and starting wages are both severely rigged against youth. Small wonder that half our marriages end in divorce.

The root trouble is lack of jobs in our uneasy economy. Unemployment ranges from 7 to 11%, frightening youths into taking prolonged education in the hope of landing a secure job in a profession. In New Zealand by contrast, where a land-value tax has opened up land to appropriate use and created jobs, most young men skip college and go straight to work. They become self-reliant around 16.

Since education is so important in our system, we have a right to ask what is its actual effect. Does it prepare for life? No. It trains in memory and obedience. Adult life, especially in marriage, calls for more: decision-making and social responsibility. These arise naturally at home but not in the educational system, where teachers make the decisions. A student moreover is competing against all the others, a self-centered attitude he will have to drop when he goes onto a job or into marriage.

Required Reading

In British colleges (but not schools!) university students pick their own reading. Here students are told what to read and when to read it. At least one American professor recoiled from this conformity. Carl Sauer spoke to us his class at the University of California at Berkeley in 1939:

> "The required book list defeats its own purpose. Books should enable you to meet ideas, meet other

personalities, if you like, appropriating from them what you can use, what you need. I don't think I remember a single thing that I had to read as required reasing for any professor in college. I think if I had had any share in the discovery of something, a few ideas would have stuck....Doing things for instructors is basically not doing anything at all."

Do Universities Broaden Minds?

Does university training help or hinder in developing intellectual capacity to do highly original work? To test this matter, one can list the creative thinkers of recent times and see how many of them went to college. Since 1750 the leading minds in thought and literature have been perhaps the following:

non-U	born	university-trained	born
Voltaire	1694	Montesquieu	1689
Franklin	1706		
Hume	1711		
Rousseau	1712		
Gibbon	1737	Jefferson	1743
Owen	1771	Goethe	1749
Scott	1771		
Jane Austen	1775	Grundtvig	1783
Champollion	1790	Byron	1788
Heine	1797		
Balzac	1799	Macaulay	1800
Engels	1820	Marx	1818
Schliemann	1822		

Tolstoy	1828	Lewis Carroll	1832
Twain	1835		
Ellen Key	1849		
Maupassant	1850	Freud	1856
Petrie	1853	Binet	1857
Shaw	1856	Gandhi	1869
Tagore	1861	Schweitzer	1875
Wodehouse	1881	Durant	1885
Ferber	1887	Thurstone	1886
		Jimmy Yen	1893
		Fell	1917

The above are 35 men and 3 women with exciting, creative minds. They each left the world somehow richer in scholarship or joyous thought than they found it. Over half never studied at a university, Gibbon was briefly there but was turned off by it, a few had very little even of schooling, and one (Petrie) had no schooling whatever. Only 7 went on to the Ph D or the equivalent; of these, two, Freud and Schweitzer, had several doctoral degrees. So education does not necessarily crush out all capacity to think - but it does seem to have a tendency in that direction. About half the most recent thinkers do have the Ph D, yet on a per capita basis great thinkers seem to be getting much rarer these days - despite the huge increase in the number of people getting university degrees. The 38 greats selected here were born mainly in the years 1735-1890. Since then there has been a drastic falling off. More and more students flock to college, yet fewer great thinkers appear. Why? Some go into the sciences. Yet the need for social and literary thought remains as large as ever, and vastly more people are now trained for those fields than before 1900. Of course some great thought is surely going on that we are not yet aware of. Yet only Yen and Fell among the 38 are still alive, and both are rather old. Clearly you cannot just pour so many students into college and get out so many great men. What is lacking?

Perhaps it's not so much a lack, as too much of a

good thing. Too many learned professors and section leaders to adjust to, too many books to hasten through at a set speed, too many years to plod away. A Ph D in History is now expected to take 6-8 years - on top of the 12 in school and 4 in college. Perhaps worst of all, the Ph D subject is deliberately kept small, so the student will be able to claim mastery of something. 8 years of deliberate narrowing can have the effect of incapacitating him from ever taking a broad view of anything. Some Ph Ds, for instance, will not discuss politics even with their closest friends. The result of all this mental drill tends to be mashed human, eviscerated person, a bewildered yes-body. Only a very sturdy soul, such as a Freud or a Schweitzer, can come through all this and still retain the ability to think for himself.

Meanwhile the examples of Petrie and Pascal, who had no schooling of any kind, or Franklin and Twain and Schliemann with almost none, show that bright people can teach themselves. As Henry Adams said, "No one can educate anyone else. You have to do it for yourself."

So what should be done about it? The whole M A and Ph D set-up could wisely be eliminated. The senior honor thesis could serve in place of a Ph D thesis - it is the same kind of paper anyway. Seminars could be mostly or wholly dropped. Instead of being brilliant bull sessions, they consist of compulsory set talks based on dull books and force the class down to the level of average members; it is better if the professor does most of the talking - at least he knows something. So university study could, with no intrinsic loss, be shortened from 8-12 years to 4. This one change alone would put hope into students' hearts.

There should also of course be equivalency exams for the self-taught, as well as on-the-job training, for most professions.

Some would claim that if the youthful were encouraged to act freely, their initiative would be too great, that they would go berserk. But I think not: most would

marry, others would travel, invent, and carry on original work on all sorts of lines. Early marriage could balance many of them so they could work better. It is worth remembering in this connection that among the young, idealism and faith are uncommonly strong.

The Purpose of College Courses

Now that nearly everyone is going there, the purpose of college is changing. It used to be to train an elite, of clergymen, lawyers, and doctors, and later also architects and engineers. Then came the time when everyone wanted to join the elite, so everyone went to college, insofar as possible. So college added 2 extra degrees, whereupon students struggled to get all the degrees. Yet there isn't room for everybody at the top. The hope of landing every slum child in a profession is futile.

Practically everyone is going to college anyway. So what should they study?

Those destined for ordinary jobs don't really need to learn anything in college, and many of them know it. They attend college, because it's the thing to do, but they take courses in whatever amuses them, from poetry to ballroom dancing. In other words, they have a good time. English literature is a famous "snap," an easy subject useful for parlor conversation, and ideal for girls who go to college solely to get a husband. Sociology is another famous "snap," having almost no content at all. Of course it is all right for people to learn anything, but should it all be at public expense? We are running short of money. What should be sacrificed? Should we throw out every subject that doesn't make money, including History, Philosophy, Government?

What is college for anyway? It is to please some, and to train others. The pleasure-seekers, essentially cultural dabblers, can study whatever they want - but preferably at private colleges, so as not to impose a