

The Inauguration of

FRED GARRIGUS HOLLOWAY

As President

of Drew University

OCTOBER, 16, 1948

MADISON, NEW JERSEY

THE DREW UNIVERSITY BULLETIN

Volume 37 JULY, 1949 Number 3

Published four times in the year, at Madison, New Jersey.
Entered as second-class matter at the post office in Madison,
New Jersey, under the Act of July 16, 1894.

Invocation

G. BROMLEY OXNAM, D.D., LL.D.
Bishop of the Methodist Church
A Trustee of Drew University

OUR FATHER, we bow in petition.

Bless, we pray Thee, this man whom we have chosen to lead us.

Grant unto him the wisdom requisite to sound decision.

Guide him so that his recommendations may be in accord with Thy will.

Strengthen him when the burdens of routine seem too heavy to bear, and so restore his soul that he may be unto us not only a good administrator but also a priest and a prophet.

When he must experience the loneliness of leadership, may he hear Thy blessed Son say, Lo, I am with you always.

Keep him humble in the hours when his splendid abilities win honor and success, and keep him courageous when success is for a time denied.

May he so lead that every student may come to the "glory of the lighted mind" and, better, the "glory of the lighted soul".

Give him the sustaining knowledge that he is training men to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ and to lead in the Church by becoming servants of all.

Bless him and all who are dear to him. Bless this school and grant that its every service may prosper.

We ask in the name of a Teacher who long since revealed the Way, the Truth, and the Life, because Thou wast incarnate in Him.
Amen.

Some Thoughts on Educational Confusions

BY UMPHREY LEE, PH.D., D.D., LL.D.
President of Southern Methodist University

An address delivered at the Inauguration of Fred Garrigus Holloway as President of Drew University, Saturday, October 16, 1948.

IN BEING ASKED to speak at the inauguration of the Reverend Doctor Fred Garrigus Holloway as President of Drew University, I am being honored in a way that calls for especial gratitude. My admiration for this University, my regard for the man who has for a number of years held this office, and my long friendship and my respect for the President-elect make it a matter of very real pleasure that I can have a part in these ceremonies.

After a few years in the kind of office into which Doctor Holloway is being inaugurated one is tempted to speak on the care and feeding of college presidents. But the President himself has had no little experience in this same field and would recognize such advice for what it really is. On other occasions when I have seen unsuspecting men led to the platform and entrusted with the seal of a university I have lamented the lack of a School for College Presidents, where they could learn some of the facts of life before entering upon their profession. But I suspect that a School for Those Who Endure College Presidents might be as helpful. I must content myself, therefore, with some observations on our educational confusions and the relations of a college president to them.

It is frequently said that the president's task is to see the institution as a whole, so that all its parts may be fitly joined together. But too many people seem to be ignorant of what constitutes the whole. Obviously there are professors and deans and students and libraries and laboratories. But the man who enters upon a college presidency with the idea that he is only to give educational leadership to the faculty and students finds his situation slightly complicated by the fact that he must conduct a hotel, one or more restaurants, an investment service, a secretarial bureau, a mercantile establishment (usually a bookstore), a power plant, a park, a public relations office, an employment agency, and frequently an amusement concession. His spare time can be filled in with financial campaigns, public speeches, conferences with people who want to know why their children are

not admitted or their friends not graduated, conferences with other people who want to know why such and such faculty members are retained on the faculty, and with people who simply want to know.

Public relations can be a chore. The president is supposed to maintain good relations between and among the trustees, the faculty, the students, persons who have given money to the university and persons who might give money to the university. He must also be in good standing in the various associations to which he and the institution belong and, generally, in the wide, wide world. All this is not so forbidding as it sounds. American educational institutions have an amazing number of friends. Trustees are frequently intelligent people who are more interested in education than popular myth allows. And there are few more agreeable communities than those on a college campus. Faculties are like all other closely-knit groups, officers in army posts, physicians in clinics, and the like. They see each other every day, and their families are perhaps too well acquainted. One or two members may keep a president busy defending them because of speeches they never would have made if they had been making their living any way other than by teaching; but, on the whole, a college president's public relations are of the better sort.

Traditionally the American college president is supposed to deal much in money. He does have the usual managerial responsibility for meeting a pay-roll, and faculty people are as concerned to receive their salaries as are their better-paid contemporaries who lay bricks or dally with the plumbing. Of course, the president might as well know at the beginning that, if no money is given to his institution, he is to blame. If money is given, someone else was responsible for the gift.

I have often pondered the comments of one of the wisest men I ever knew. He was Doctor Horace Bishop, chairman of the first Board of Trustees of the university I represent. When someone made a considerable gift to a Methodist institution, several well-known men immediately said that they were individually responsible. Doctor Bishop told me that it reminded him of the argument about the South's defeat in the Civil War. An ex-Confederate soldier, himself, the Doctor said that he had heard many explanations. Some said that the South wore itself out whipping the North. Others said that the South lost the war because of the shortage of men. Others said

that the cause was the shortage of money. Doctor Bishop said that he, himself, had always thought that the Yankees had something to do with it. The moral, according to the Doctor, was that, in the case of gifts to educational institutions, the donor should have some of the credit.

The college president will, of course, speak on all current issues, giving the public the advantages of his mature wisdom, and he will do this without offending the institution's constituency or provoking the faculty to reply. This requires naturally that the president will intuitively take the popular side of all questions. To do this he must retain certain qualities of the Boy Scouts which is difficult for his contemporaries: A president is "trustworthy, . . . helpful, friendly, courteous, . . . obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, ... The president must also be agile.

Much of all this, though, the wise president will not do. He will turn the campus and its physical welfare over to someone who knows about the birds and the bees and the boilers, and he will give over the complaints department to someone with a tough skin and a tender heart. For the rest he will try to find what can be done by one man and devise elusive techniques for avoiding the rest. And sometimes he will hide himself away, alone or with faculty members, throw the key out the window and try to think about this matter of education.

It is this latter exercise, of course, that is most likely to drive the college president mad. The college is for intellectual discipline only, says one. The college must develop the personality, says another. The college must prepare students to make a living. The purpose of higher education is culture. The student must be prepared to meet the problems which will arise in the home, in marriage, in business. The college graduate should be educated in citizenship. There are few enterprises of modern man where there is less agreement than in education as to the purpose of the enterprise.

Nor is the controversy confined to colleges of liberal arts. The professional schools, including theology, are involved in the same controversy. Should we, for example, waste a ministerial student's time with theology and church history? Or should we teach him how to administer a parish, to conduct a dignified service, and to apply the proper techniques to labor disputes? The one group argues that the preacher must have an intellectual armament that will carry

him through the troubled years of his ministry, while the other insists that much knowledge will not substitute for skill in human relations.

Theologians will understand that those who recall happier days must predicate some Adamic sin which was responsible for this Fall from primeval innocence. Just who played the serpent in this drama is naturally in dispute. The Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, the triumph of the middle class, Newtonian physics and even Descartes have been nominated for the dishonor. In this country the sacred halls of Harvard have by some been declared the scene of the Great Temptation, since it was President Eliot who introduced the elective system into American education.

On the other hand, those who regard the old ways as reprehensible assume that the light began to break over our darkness only when classical education began to give way before the introduction of science and the social studies into the curriculum. The old theory of education held to a dualistic philosophy. There were certain absolutes of truth and of conduct which must be learned and revered. From these rigidities, the new educational philosophy would free itself. "I assume," wrote John Dewey several years ago, "that amid all uncertainties there is one permanent frame of reference: namely, the organic connection between education and personal experience; or, that the new philosophy of education is committed to some kind of empirical and experimental philosophy."

If the college president is to assume any semblance of educational leadership, he must make up his mind. All the more is this true because the average university is moving in all directions at once. Rare is the institution which does not offer both cultural and vocational courses, which does not combine in its offerings and in its faculties every conceivable educational philosophy. Or, it might be truer to say that the institution, as an institution, has no philosophy at all. Perhaps this is a healthy condition making for growth, but it does not excuse the president from having some philosophy of his own.

I do not pretend to offer anything so pretentious as a philosophy of education, but a few observations can be made. For example, much of the discussion of vocationalism in the university is beside the mark. There is surely no harm to the individual or to the university in the

student's choosing certain subjects which may later be useful to him in his vocation. He may take work in English which will prepare him to teach. He may study the natural sciences with the view of becoming a geologist or a chemist. Indeed, the President of Harvard, in a book just published, says that the university tradition in America is based on "four ultimate sources of strength." These he names as "the cultivation of learning for its own sake, the educational stream that makes possible the professions, the general educational stream of the liberal arts, and, lastly, the never-failing river of student life carrying all the power that comes from the gregarious impulses of human beings."

There is, of course, vocational teaching that has no place in the university, although it would be hard to find any that is not represented somewhere, even in the most ancient and respectable of universities. But the criterion is not the use that the student may make of it, but in the character of the subject itself. Some things can be better taught at an earlier time and should not cost the money and time of a university student. Moreover, many techniques are better learned in an apprenticeship, whether in church or industry. Our time is one of conflicting philosophies, and no amount of skills will take the place of intellectual maturity and vigor.

The primary concern of the university is intellectual. I know that this statement immediately opens the way to misunderstanding. For example, there are those who urge that the university has no responsibility for the student's moral or religious life. Indeed, the influence of this ideal of education is more widespread than is admitted or even recognized. Obviously an institution like this can not agree with any such doctrine. Your concern with the moral and religious life of your students can not for one moment be set aside; but this need not keep one from recognizing that a university to be a university must be primarily about its peculiar business. The Church, the home and other institutions are also concerned with the moral and religious life of students; only educational institutions are primarily interested in the student's intellectual life.

A second confusion that may come from insistence upon the intellectual task of the university arises out of the old dispute about the value of training in the classical languages. The claim that mental discipline is a product of this study and can be transferred to other

subjects and situations is, of course, what has so long been denied. But the classical scholar gained what Mr. Albert Jay Nock calls "an experienced mind." The literatures which he read, the Greek and Roman, comprise (to quote again from Mr. Nock) "the longest, most complete and most nearly continuous record we have of what the strange creature known as *homo sapiens* has been busy about in virtually every department of spiritual, intellectual and social activity." To study critically such a record is to gain an experience, although a vicarious one, whose value can scarcely be overestimated.

But there are other ways of gaining both mental discipline and mental experience. The educational fad of reading the great books of the world in translation calls attention to one source of experience and training open to the modern student. The Great Books experiment is, of course, a useful medicine magnified into a cure-all. But certainly, there is no reason in language or history to confine intellectual interests to this one expression of them.

If anyone has the notion that the pursuit of mental discipline is confined to the students of the classics he should contemplate the modern science department. Until recently there has been a wide-spread belief that training in the natural sciences begets in the student something called a scientific attitude. Actually, what the student seems to acquire, at best, is an attitude that will help him study some other natural science. That it helps him in choosing a presidential candidate remains to be proven. But the contention that a study of the natural sciences does something for the mind of the student which shows itself in other fields than the sciences is evidence that we still cling tenaciously to the idea that men and women can be taught how to think. And the idea is sound. Students in the natural sciences are taught to think in such manner that they can use the materials and methods of these sciences. And they can be taught to use other materials and other methods. There is such a training of the mind as will develop critical processes and critical attitudes of mind. But they are—to use our popular language—of the mind. And the university's task is with the mind. It is with that part of man's total activity that the university is mainly concerned.

But is not the university interested in convictions? If our business is primarily with the minds of men, what about their wills—to use the old-fashioned terminology? The scholarly world has been at-

tacked—and with some justification—for failing to accept responsibility for decision, for following an ideal which bade men wait until all the facts are in. My own opinion is that the attack upon our scholarly methods is properly levelled, not at an overemphasis upon the intellectual in education, but at a deficient philosophy.

The student needs to know the kinds of facts which are available and the ways in which this evidence must be treated by those who live in an imperfect world. There is a world of difference between this use of the classroom and the use of it for propaganda. There is a far too prevalent notion that there is no middle ground between a so-called "scientific" attitude by which one waits eternally for a perfect accumulation of facts and a situation in which the instructor bends all his efforts to persuade the student to act on a certain line. Some of the programs currently advocated to promote convictions on the part of students seem to me more like propaganda devices than efforts to teach students that thinking usually should result in action. If one had to make the choice between the old faulty intellectualism where the goal was thought without regard to action and an educational program which tries to transfer the instructor's *conclusions* to the student's mind directly, I think I should prefer the former.

What about religion? Surely, an institution like Drew owned as it is by the Church ought to put religion as its main concern. Certainly, a large part of your students are concerned with religion profession-ally, but I still maintain that your principal business as a university is the intellectual development of your students—first of all to teach them to think about such materials as may fall to their hands, whether Hebrew manuscripts or chemical substances. It would be good for all of us if we cleared our own minds in this matter. The interests of religion must be conserved in such an educational institution as Drew, not only because it is the home of a famous *schola prophetarum*, but because it is an agency of a church. But the truth is that education by itself does not insure Christians.

In his famous essays on a university, Cardinal Newman would have none of the idea that a liberal education makes a virtuous or a Christian man. The man of the world, profligate, heartless, may be educated; but virtuous he is not. There are indeed attitudes which result from a liberal education. In words once better known than

they are now, Newman declared that the educated man "apprehends the great outlines of knowledge, the principles on which it rests, the scale of its parts, its lights and its shades, its great points and its little, as he otherwise cannot apprehend them. Hence it is that his education is called 'Liberal'. A habit of mind is formed which lasts through life, of which the attributes are freedom, equitableness, calmness, moderation, and wisdom. . . ." Newman may have over-estimated the powers of the educated man; he did underestimate the complexity of knowledge. But the qualities of mind which he sought for liberally educated men sound like a modern pronouncement of those who would see a better integrated education for all.

There is much that the university of a Christian church can do, aside from those extra-curricular efforts which should be made to promote the religious life of the student. Much can be done in the field of the university's primary interest, intellectual development. One of the most helpful things that any institution of higher learning could do for religion could be done by thoughtful men who had gained for themselves some satisfactory philosophy in line with their private Christian beliefs.

All of us are dissatisfied with the relegation of religion in church schools to a few required courses in Bible, but when one considers the treatment of religion in American universities he is appalled at what will have to be done before even our intellectual obligations are fulfilled. There are many men of learning in the western world who are not sympathetic with the church and its teachings, but nowhere in the west more than in America is religion ignored as a topic which the scholar and the scientist can disregard with impunity. One of our major concerns as a university must be with the honest treatment of religion as a major element in our culture. No industry of religious workers among students, no retreats or panel discussions, will cause the average college boy or girl to regard religion as of prime importance when every session in the classroom teaches him that religion has no relevance in literature, in society or in philosophy.

For these reasons I can insist that even a Christian university ought to regard the training of men's minds as the primary task. If we are intellectually honest and vigorous, they will learn that thinking for its own sake is only one of the mental activities in which man indulges, that most of us live in a world where we must cast our lots

with some causes and some people. They will learn, too, the importance of religion in men's lives and they have a right to learn it from those who are sympathetic with religious purposes and religious faith.

How can the greater ends of education in our day be served by administrative officers? One with the experience of Doctor Holloway will be least inclined to think that all can be done by administrative fiat or arrangements. I do not depreciate the importance of the curriculum nor the values of experimentation in teaching methods. All this is good, but little can be done eventually by mechanical changes alone.

Taking for granted the books and laboratories we have learned to expect in good universities, the final criterion is the quality of the men and women who teach. If students are to learn of the relations in the world of knowledge, the connections between the social ideas of an age and theological formulations, of the struggles of men for economic security and for political freedom, of ethical ideals and the inherited folkways of a people, an instructor aware of these relations himself is the final answer. If the student is to become aware of the importance of values in a materialistic world he must sit under some-one who himself feels keenly that what men hold in reverence is as important as the mechanical contrivances ready to their hand or the political structure of society.

American education suffers from the inflation of recent years as truly as any other human activity. Our colleges and universities have been expanding since World War I, and the upsurge of the last few years, while temporarily strengthened by returning veterans, is a part of that steady expansion. But more students mean more teachers, and there are simply not enough teachers to do the job adequately. Still more important is the fact that those who are teaching are largely the product of the old *laissez-faire* educational philosophy. If a man has learned well his own small segment of the vast field of learning, it has been assumed that he need not trouble himself about the relations of what he has learned with what his colleague has studied. We have all assumed that in some mysterious way the student will learn the connections for himself, or that he will, like multitudes of our citizens, pursue his own course untroubled with the common problems of us all.

Obviously we can not go back to re-educate men already past middle life. Yet the devices which we have been trying, orientation courses, survey courses made up of shreds and patches and taught a few weeks, will not solve our problem. The recent report on *General Education in the Social Sciences* issued by the American Council on Education, recognizing that not too many instructors in social studies themselves have a good general education in the social studies, suggests that their recommended course may "incidentally compel the instructors who are responsible for teaching it to acquire in the process a good general education in the social studies for themselves." I am not particularly recommending this book but calling attention to the fact that we may all have to re-educate ourselves if we are to help the student find some unity in the diverse elements of modern learning.

The college administrator will not overestimate his powers. Usually he is wise enough to know that he is a leader and not a dictator. It is in his leadership that the college president shows his own worth. No canned programs, no pre-digested courses will solve all our problems. Each institution has its own differences in students and in tradition, in constituency and in aims. But also fortunately each institution has in its faculties men who realize that the new generation must face new problems and can not open all the portals with the old, blood-rusted keys.

The man who assumes the leadership of an American university in these days must sometimes wonder whether the results of his labors will be worth the distractions, the continuous struggle to preserve unity of interests among so many different kinds of people, the plain physical exertion, which are all a necessary part of his office. But surely also he will have moments when the possibilities of this great endeavor will seem to be worth all the cost. For a university exists to charm some into a love of learning which will be their delight and their daily bread though the heavens fall, but it exists also as a part of our social struggle. The university can not take up all the burdens of the present and of the future, but it has a part in the bearing of them all.

During the war the late Professor Carl L. Becker, than whom few wiser men have taught history during our days, wrote a little book on *How New Will The Better World Be?* At the close of his book

he quoted Burke's well-known passage about the state being a partnership, not only between those now living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.

With those who are dead [concluded Becker] we have maintained this partnership by cherishing what they have bequeathed to us. With those who are living we are maintaining it by fighting to preserve our inheritance from destruction. With those who are to be born we shall maintain it if, besides passing this legacy on to them, we can make additions to its accumulated store of knowledge and wisdom as our generation is capable of producing.

The Dual Responsibility of Liberal Education

BY FRED GARRIGUS HOLLOWAY, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

Address on the occasion of his inauguration as President of Drew University, Saturday, October 16, 1948.

DREW UNIVERSITY is unique in its organization. Founded in 1867 as Drew Theological Seminary, it received from the State of New Jersey in 1868 a charter empowering the institution "to organize faculties of arts, law, literature and medicine at such times as said corporation may see fit, and to that end to appoint professors in said faculties, and through them to provide instruction in the arts, law, literature and medicine, and to confer degrees in the same, and to use and exercise all the powers and functions of a university; and said corporation is hereby authorized and empowered, whenever it shall desire so to do, to change its corporate name to that of Drew University." Consequently, with the establishment of Brothers College of Liberal Arts in 1928, the foresight of the founders was realized and the name of the corporation was changed to Drew University.

Six presidents have served the institution. John McClintock who took office in 1867, came to an early death in 1870. Bernhard Nadal's term as acting president had lasted only three months when death took him. Randolph Foster's three-year term and John Hurst's seven-year term both culminated in election to the episcopacy. The next three presidents had administrations of considerable length, in each case going from active service into retirement—Henry Buttz for thirty-two years, Ezra Tipple for seventeen, and Arlo Brown for nine-teen years. By personal knowledge of the last two, and by the records of the first four, I recognize that each one has made a distinctive contribution to the life of Drew. The University has never had an inferior president—to date.

But our purpose today is not to review history or to predict the future. It would be more fitting to point out the unique position of Drew University to meet one of the peculiar educational problems of the day. To that we now proceed.

Our University is not only privately incorporated; it is one of America's church-related schools, founded by and affiliated with the Methodist Church. The undergraduate college is in no sense sec-

tarian, but does emphasize "the formation of moral and religious standards and personal loyalty to them." Drew will be loyal to this objective and to her traditions. For this we need no apology, no defense. It is unfortunate that the doctrine of separation of church and state has implied the separation of religion and education. To the degree in which education makes religion extra-curricular, to that degree are persons apt to regard it as elective for all of life, elective in the sense that science and literature are "musts" for the educated man but religion is optional, in the sense that one may choose it if one has a "bent" in that direction, otherwise it makes little difference. But this conception of religion must mean that it is related to the gods but not to morality. For morality does make a difference, and it does make a difference what morality one chooses. The religion of which we speak is one of moral emphasis. If "man lives not by bread alone but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God," then we know that what gives function to religion is, among other things, these words that come from God, these moral truths that are as important to life as bread.

Brothers College, our undergraduate school, was instituted as "an adventure in excellence." It now limits itself to 415 students and eventually hopes to reduce the total to 350. It has no quarrel with colleges of large enrollment. It only states its philosophy as one in which superior instruction is attempted to a limited number of students with a resulting intimate relation between student and teacher. It has large plans for the strengthening of its program and intends to carry them out.

The theological school is principally concerned with the preparation of men for the ministry of the Church and admits candidates holding a bachelor of arts degree or equivalent and presenting satisfactory standing in the college graduating class. It also grants advanced degrees to those who are preparing for specialized religious service, particularly teaching religion, Biblical literature and philosophy on the college level. The total enrollment in the theological school is less than 300.

A large percentage of those who come out of Brothers College go on to graduate or professional schools. A smaller percentage take their places in society immediately. The curriculum accordingly is built so as to give a cultural pattern broad enough to prepare the

student for intelligent living, and deep enough to provide a firm basis on which higher scholarly pursuits may be undertaken.

The majority of our Seminary graduates go immediately into pastorates. A smaller number continue on here or elsewhere for advanced degrees. This curriculum, accordingly, is broad enough to produce intelligent and effective ministers of churches, and deep enough to provide a strong foundation for continued scholarly pursuits.

Now we do not feel, in either case, that we have arrived. Our only boasting, if we may be permitted, is that we believe we see the objective and are constantly working toward a closer approximation of it. Our position is favorable because the problem exists in both our schools, each of which has a relatively small enrollment. We have two levels on which to work and need not be disconcerted by the divergent points of view necessitated by the presence of many schools upon one campus.

May we pick up at this point Thomas Huxley's observation "The great end of life is not knowledge but action." It is to be granted that Huxley made this statement in the context of a lecture on technical education and that there are many points in his pragmatic approach to the problem where we would differ. But there is a sense in which his observation has validity, and in that sense we use it. If we may apply the statement politically, we may observe that it is the duty of American educators to impart that body of knowledge which shows precisely what the democratic way of life is, and to do it in such a manner that our graduates will carry that way of life into action. Our task is more difficult than that of totalitarian governments. They, too, have their body of "knowledge" and propagandize their populace with it. They, too, get action, enforced though it be. Modern history shows that the proximity of the communist ideology and communist action is greater than that of the democratic philosophy and democratic action. None of us would surrender the conviction that democracy is the ideal form of government. Its weakness is not found in its philosophy but in the indifference with which many persons regard it in the way they live.

To look at this principle for a moment professionally one may observe that our task is to impart certain bodies of knowledge in such a manner that they will be carried into action. From the point of

view of instruction in the field of medicine, for example, we are concerned about that body of knowledge which is known to be indispensable to the physician, namely, anatomy, materia medica, therapeutics, etc. From the point of view of the layman, one is concerned as to whether the physician called in a case of illness can make the correct diagnosis and a cure. What the layman wants is a demonstration of the physician's ability to bring sickness into health. Usually he will be ignorant of the body of knowledge that is prerequisite to the effective practice of medicine; the medical educator can never be. But all—the educators who instruct the profession and the public upon whom it is practiced—all must agree that the end of this knowledge is action.

There would be no point in multiplying illustrations in other professional fields. If the point is clear in one, it is clear in all. Nor need we add to the political and professional application of the principle other than one more—that of the personal. This is the largest area because citizenship and vocation take only segments of life and personal being is the whole garment into which all other factors are woven. It will forever remain true in the democratic pattern that education must constantly ask, "What kind of a man are we producing?" We ought to be concerned about his habits and his attitudes, his morals if you please, and about those intangible aspects of his life that we have traditionally referred to as spiritual.

For each of us lives not only against the background of a political but also of a cultural heritage. We are concerned not only about bread and butter, clothing and housing, but about books and music, about drama and human relationships. And if we never before have felt concern about science other than the number of gadgets it could produce for our contentment, eager to feel superior to the first man whose greatest discovery was an apple,—well, now we do feel concerned because we have learned this new knowledge about the atom and are concerned how it will be carried into action.

So the undergraduate ought to become thoroughly conversant with his cultural heritage. Indeed, the action to which he is led will be determined in part by the knowledge he possesses. And we can not always pre-determine what knowledge will be functional for him. Granted that it is true that "the great end of life is not knowledge but action", we recognize that the knowledge which one has will help

view of instruction in the field of medicine, for example, we are concerned about that body of knowledge which is known to be indispensable to the physician, namely, anatomy, materia medica, therapeutics, etc. From the point of view of the layman, one is concerned as to whether the physician called in a case of illness can make the correct diagnosis and a cure. What the layman wants is a demonstration of the physician's ability to bring sickness into health. Usually he will be ignorant of the body of knowledge that is prerequisite to the effective practice of medicine; the medical educator can never be. But all—the educators who instruct the profession and the public upon whom it is practiced—all must agree that the end of this knowledge is action.

There would be no point in multiplying illustrations in other professional fields. If the point is clear in one, it is clear in all. Nor need we add to the political and professional application of the principle other than one more—that of the personal. This is the largest area because citizenship and vocation take only segments of life and personal being is the whole garment into which all other factors are woven. It will forever remain true in the democratic pattern that education must constantly ask, "What kind of a man are we producing?" We ought to be concerned about his habits and his attitudes, his morals if you please, and about those intangible aspects of his life that we have traditionally referred to as spiritual.

For each of us lives not only against the background of a political but also of a cultural heritage. We are concerned not only about bread and butter, clothing and housing, but about books and music, about drama and human relationships. And if we never before have felt concern about science other than the number of gadgets it could produce for our contentment, eager to feel superior to the first man whose greatest discovery was an apple,—well, now we do feel concerned because we have learned this new knowledge about the atom and are concerned how it will be carried into action.

So the undergraduate ought to become thoroughly conversant with his cultural heritage. Indeed, the action to which he is led will be determined in part by the knowledge he possesses. And we can not always pre-determine what knowledge will be functional for him. Granted that it is true that "the great end of life is not knowledge but action", we recognize that the knowledge which one has will help

to determine the action. The same is true on the professional level of theological education. One needs to know the role of the minister, but to limit the approach to the functional deprives the student of certain areas of learning which would help to change his own concept of the role of the minister.

The dilemma is not new and it is common to all of us. Living in a world pressed with problems that demand immediate solution, how can we produce an educated populace which can meet these issues and at the same time produce that world of scholarship that will give us the historical perspective, the philosophical viewpoint, the moral insight, and the scientific progress that we need? Here education has much at stake, for if we fail, we pave the way for totalitarian government where the terminus ad quem of each man is prescribed, where the action desired is dictated, and where the so-called knowledge necessary for such action is the required curriculum.

The faculty of a liberal college must be productive, productive in adding to the world of knowledge and productive in adding to the world young men and women prepared to take their places as individuals and citizens. The faculty of a theological school must be productive, productive in adding to the world of knowledge and productive in adding to the world persons who can give it moral leadership and spiritual power. Higher educational institutions functioning in this fashion are the greatest bulwarks to the democratic pattern.

To fulfill these purposes, Drew University faces important needs both in the financing of current operations and in the securing of funds for capital expenditures. We have been laboring in recent years under the unfortunate reputation of having more money than we know what to do with. It would be much nearer the truth to say that we know more what to do than we have money with which to do it.

In the conviction that her history merits pride, that her opportunities provide encouragement, and that her purposes justify confidence, we move hopefully toward the fulfilling of her needs, taking this as an appropriate moment to invite her constituency to respond to the call, a share in which will provide the satisfaction which emanates from the consciousness of help rendered to an institution whose life

is meaningful today, as it was yesterday and as it will be in the continuing tomorrows.

I wish to take this opportunity to express to the official delegates here today my gratitude for your presence and for the friendship of the institutions and societies you represent, recognizing the common interests of all engaged in the program of higher education.

President Baker, it is a high honor to be inducted into the presidency of Drew University. In acknowledging this honor I pledge to the trustees of the corporation the utmost I have in mind and body and spirit. I make this pledge to the officers and faculty of the University, to the students, to the alumni, to the community in which we are located, to the constituencies of the two schools, and to the Church that gave Drew birth and character. And to all I pledge what I covet in return—my friendship.