

of St. John's College which is based upon some hundred odd "great" books. He persists in treating the books as ends in themselves—"old material," "the past for the sake of the past"—rather than as means as claimed by their users, and he disregards the examination of the books in discussions which are quite likely to begin with a relevant question based on last night's newspaper. The great books program may be a mistaken means to the end in mind; it may be a means not suited to college students. But the repeated charge that it is a burying in the past reveals only a historical knowledge of the books and only a superficial knowledge of the program, and advances the discussion not one whit.

The opposition to new currents in *Education for Modern Man* does not mean that the book defends the status quo. Mr. Hook's scorn of present education is exceeded only by his scorn of those who are trying to do something about it. He calls for a return to the tenets of progressive theory, which he claims have seldom been widely and wisely applied. Those who associate progressive

education with complete freedom in education will be surprised at many elements in this application of the Dewey position.

The content of education should be "... selected materials from the fields of mathematics and the natural sciences, social studies, including history, language and literature, philosophy and logic, art and music." It should be taught by a controlled critical or scientific method. It should be aimed simultaneously at vocational and liberal education. The aim is set, the content prescribed, the method rigorous. Freedom of choice and adjustment to individual differences are to occur only within this framework. Mr. Hook in this volume has really adopted a middle ground, and from this stems whatever contribution he has made.

Education for Modern Man is by turn eloquent and turgid, balanced and intolerant, satisfying and aggravating. It has within it a positive program of modern education. I suspect that it will go down more as a tirade against one school of thought than as a contribution to the other.—Lowell Martin.

Responsibilities in Higher Education

Proceedings, 1945: Emergent Responsibilities in Higher Education. Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions. Compiled and edited by John Dale Russell with the assistance of Donald M. Mackenzie. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1946. 142p.

The twenty-third Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions continues the series of contemporary inquiries into the status of undergraduate instruction begun in 1923. Many of the earlier volumes were devoted to particular academic issues, such as the training of college teachers or tests and measurements, and drew their value from the wealth of expert knowledge brought to bear on a specific problem. The present volume follows a pattern begun in 1937 with *Current Issues in Higher Education* and continued with such titles as *New Frontiers in Collegiate Instruction* and *Higher Education in the Postwar Period*. These are admirable subjects all, and quite proper material for an institute, but the very broad scope of the subject inevitably brings with it a thinness of

treatment which makes *Emergent Responsibilities in Higher Education* a high-sounding title which its eleven papers can hardly be expected to approach.

One quickly discovers that the "emergent responsibilities" have been present all of the time, that they are indeed the same ones meant or implied by "Current Issues" and "New Frontiers." The institute appears to have become a tradition; it must be held each year; and a program must be put together. Headlines of the commercial and educational press are scanned, a list of "emergent responsibilities" is made, and individuals are drafted to prepare the necessary papers to be given at the institute. So far, so good. All of this is right and proper. Administrators ought to meet once a year to thrash out the new and puzzling ramifications of their old problems. But before publication of that thrashing about is authorized, it should be fairly certain that all of the commotion has produced something more than a classroom presentation of seminar assignments. If the individual papers are good they can find adequate space in the

regular periodical press, and wider distribution and much better bibliographic access as well. But they should not be published as a group unless they constitute a tightly organized contribution to a specific subject of importance which has not been otherwise treated so well.

Some of the individual papers in this symposia are important and deserve both better company and better format. One of these is Newton Edwards' "Historic Relationships of Colleges and Universities to the Communities and Societies in Which They Have Flourished," a cogent and significant statement of the responsibilities of higher education in all times.

Another is J. D. Williams' "Adult Education Activities in the Liberal Arts College." When the administration and faculty of Marshall College became conscious of the basic problem of misunderstanding between labor, management, and the public, it was proposed to hold a meeting with representation from the college faculty, labor, and management. Labor was enthusiastic; management was not and proposed that two separate meetings be held, one attended by management and the college officials, the other attended by labor and the college officials. The results were more than gratifying: "The respect exhibited by the faculty members for these men when

they left was good to see, and the increased respect felt by these guests for the 'long-haired professors' was just as satisfying."

A "Historical Survey of Faculty Participation in University Government in the United States" by George G. Bogert is followed by an apparently impromptu debate between Ernest C. Colwell, president of the University of Chicago, and Ralph E. Himstead, general secretary of the American Association of University Professors, on the general topic of faculty participation. The two men are really not so very far apart in their views but are so much on the defensive of their ex officio positions that they offer little that is new or enlightening to the historical survey previously presented by Professor Bogert.

In addition to these matters, three papers are devoted to the general subject of counseling, particularly of veterans and war workers, two to the improvement of senior college curricula, and one to university extension. All of these, and those discussed above, are the concern of higher education, may indeed be responsibilities of higher education, but to give these, and these only, the title of *Emergent Responsibilities in Higher Education*, is to overburden seriously the semantics of the English language and to just as seriously underrate the importance of higher education in America.—*LeRoy C. Merritt*.

Research in the South

Research and Regional Welfare; Papers Presented at a Conference on Research at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill May 9-10-11, 1945. Edited by Robert E. Coker, with a foreword by Louis R. Wilson. (University of North Carolina Sesquicentennial Publications, Louis R. Wilson, Director) Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1946. xvi, 229p.

In celebration of its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, the University of North Carolina embarked upon a series of publications relating to most phases of the university's work. These seventeen volumes, published or projected, give greatest emphasis to the various aspects of research activities by the university.

Research and Regional Welfare is a collection of papers presented at a conference on

research held at the University of North Carolina in May 1945. The conference program was arranged and the volume of papers edited by Robert E. Coker, Kenan Professor of Zoology at the University of North Carolina. Coming as it did, just after V-E day, the conference record bears many evidences of the tensions and emphasis of a war period.

The range of subjects discussed was wide, from nutrition to literature, from fish culture to marketing. In general, the topics discussed were suggestive of fields in which research would promote the welfare of the Southern regions as defined by Odum. There was no attempt to outline all needed research but rather to call attention to the possible values of research to the South. The implications for resources for research in the South, however, are evident.