

To: The Faculty

From: Dr. Hicks

Following the address on Values given by Dr. Averill at the meeting of the Association of American Colleges in Atlantic City, he was requested to speak on the same general topic at the gathering of higher education in Chicago a few weeks ago. His address is so poignant that I thought all of you would be interested in reading it. A copy is therefore attached.

"The Climate of Valuing"

Lloyd J. Averill
Kalamazoo College

I.

If we are to consider the role of the college in assisting the student toward worthy and enduring values, we shall need at the outset to reconsider the view we have traditionally taken of the status of a student's values when he first enters the college.

It has, I think, been a widespread assumption among college teachers that when a student first appears on the campus he brings with him, as a part of his baggage, some reasonably identifiable set of tenets which function for him as faith, and some reasonably coherent set of motivations and inhibitions which function for him as ethics. It has also been the operating assumption of many college teachers (a) that the student has simply adopted the faith and ethics of his family with its cultural bias, (b) that he therefore holds them quite uncritically, and (c) that no significant learning is likely to take place until he has been separated from this received Weltanschauung at least a sufficient distance to be critical of it, even if finally he decides to return to it. So we direct our teaching to what might be called euphemistically a "therapeutic disengagement" of the student from his purported roots.

(Parenthetically, it is ironic to see how some teachers, who affirm that a concern for values has no place in the classroom, nevertheless apply themselves with regular enthusiasm to this process of "de-valuation" with no awareness at all of the inconsistency. Apparently, then, one can relieve a student of his values in the name of objectivity, but to offer him anything in exchange would introduce an unwarranted subjectivism--a strange logic!)

It is this generally assumed state of affairs which, I suggest, is seriously in need of reconsideration. I have no fresh research to offer on the attitudes of entering students; I can only invite you to confirm--or to confute--an admittedly impressionistic view of things, drawn partly from my own student relationships and partly from the reports of others I trust. Indeed, the need for reconsideration was first suggested to me by Marjorie Reeves, Vice Principal of St. Anne's College, Oxford, in her admirable and insightful pamphlet called Three Questions in Higher Education. Commenting on our common assumptions that students bring fixed values with them to college, Dr. Reeves wrote,

This view seems to me to be inadequate on two counts. In the first place, it assumes (in the student) an already existing security whose bonds

must now, at this stage, be burst; it takes no account of the very real insecurity of so many of the young today who reach the university stage without having received any real nurture. Instead of coming up to college with solid ground under their feet, they are already bewildered and without faith. Fruitful exploration can only be undertaken from a secure base and with proper equipment: to invite many of the young today to an intellectual and spiritual exploration is like sending out homeless and destitute wanderers into the wilderness to perish.¹

Nor will it do any good to complain that this is simply a Britisher's view of the matter. I doubt that there is a more perceptive observer of our American youth culture than Brooklyn College social scientist Edgar Friedenberg, whose book The Vanishing Adolescent ought to be required reading for every high school and college teacher and administrator in the country. After commenting on the widespread feeling that something is wrong in American education, he proceeds to show that it is not, as sometimes alleged, a problem of low standards, or lazier students, or duller ones. And then he adds,

We feel that the students are less disciplined, and are here a little closer to the mark. But it is an inner discipline that is lacking; the school fails to provide a basis for it. The undisciplined behavior which sometimes results is often a sign of the anguish which results from having no core of one's own.²

When I first read Miss Reeve's passing comment, and later found full and frightening documentation in Friedenberg's study, I knew that I could confirm it as well out of my own acquaintance with students in recent years who are reaching "the university stage without having received any real nurture," "having no core of their own." Most recently it was the freshman who came, somewhat hesitantly and apologetically, to confess that he wasn't able to make much out of traditional Christian faith. Perhaps, he thought, it was because his parents, although nominal churchmen, were really quite indifferent toward religion. "What did they feel strongly about?" I asked him. After a thoughtful pause he replied, "I can't think of a thing." That is precisely Friedenberg's point, and he makes it--persuasively for me--on a cultural scale. Adolescence--that period in life when self-definition takes place, in which self-identity is achieved--has vanished because the young person is surrounded by a culture which gives him no sharp contrasts by means of which to clarify his own experience, no sharp images

¹Hazen Foundation: New Haven, 1957. Pp. 24-25

²Dell: New York, 1962. Pp. 83-84

against which to measure his own identity. In the American community instead of sharpening and clarifying, we blur and round off; when conflict arises, we do not try to spell it out but rather rush in to mediate and especially to moderate it. Writes Friedenberg,

A society which has no purposes of its own, other than to insure domestic tranquility by suitable medication (and he clearly thinks that describes us,) will have no use for adolescents, and will fear them; for they will be among the first to complain, as they crunch away at their benzedrine, that tranquilizers make you square. It will set up sedative programs of guidance, which are likely to be described as therapeutic, but whose apparent function will be to keep young minds and hearts in custody till they are without passion.³

That seems to me peculiarly and poignantly to describe many of the college students I know: fine, brave, uncertain, wistful young men and women, whose minds and hearts have indeed been kept "in custody till they are without passion." That, I am persuaded, is the increasing legacy of the American College through its entering students, and it ought to force a re-examination of everything we profess and do.

II.

It ought, for one thing, to turn us toward a view of teaching which is unapologetically personal. To be even more explicit, it ought to turn us toward a view of learning which is essentially biblical in character, and perhaps even in origin; namely, as Marjorie Reeves has phrased it, that "reality is apprehended in and through relationship."⁴

The tendency of our times, of course, is quite the oppsite. Indeed, there is danger, with the increasing size of our colleges, that we shall come to think too much in terms of units and techniques and too little in terms of persons and relationships; danger that we shall come increasingly to think of students as "personnel," a nameless and faceless agglomerate to be kept amused, bemused, and harmlessly organized by whatever social distractions and group techniques embattled administrators can muster.

The American college--and here I am talking quite as much about the smaller college as about the larger--is for many students a place of real loneliness and confusion. It is partly that he

³Ibid. Pg. 37.

⁴Op. Cit. Pg. 6

brings these things with him, out of a background which I sketched a few moments ago; but when he arrives on the campus he too often finds that, rather than being assuaged, they are fed. Student loneliness has almost nothing to do with the frequency or infrequency with which one body impinges upon another on the campus. That observation may not strike us as particularly fresh, since the existentialists have succeeded on the whole rather well in convincing us of the classic alienation of our contemporaries, and David Riesman and his associates have demonstrated how aloneness flourishes in spite of our crowded humanity. But the very fact that this lonely image is so widely recognized, and indeed has almost come to be taken for granted, may really prevent us from seeing the peculiar kind of alienation which afflicts the college student. It is brought on, I am persuaded, by his segregation not from his peers but from the mature members of the academic community.

There is, of course, a tendency in most cultures to segregate the generations, partly because the older generation is always threatened by the younger. In the college culture we make a virtue of this segregation and call it "independence." To be sure, where "independence" means the conditions within which the students own personal resourcefulness can be developed, it is a highly important goal of liberal learning. But let us candidly admit that the kind of "independence" many teachers are interested in is nothing more than the isolation of the developing intellect from the mature intellect; the effective separation of the student, whose natural preoccupation is with facts, from the scholar, who has presumably learned how to transmute factual knowledge into wisdom. And the result of this separation compromises both the intellectual and the humane ideals of the college.

I am far from suggesting, by way of answer to this problem, that the college ought to be a custodial institution, with its senior members standing in loco parentis to the junior members; that, I think, would simply delay the process by which students reach their own maturity. What I am prepared to suggest, however, is that the senior members of the college ought to stand in loco magistri (if I may be permitted an obvious pedantry which, however, my colleague in classics informs me is at least in good form); that is, rather than serving a largely forensic function, as we so often do whether in matters of discipline or of instruction, we ought to serve the function of "masters" in the old and honorable meaning of that academic term.

Paul Goodman, in a recent provocative article, has insisted that "nothing could be more relevant to the problem of the colleges today" than "the traditional ideals and conditions of the first universities." However that may stand as a generalization, I am convinced that Goodman is right on this point: in those first universities, he says,

Teaching and learning was a personal relation necessary for both the teacher and the student. No matter how betrayed over a thousand years, this principle cannot be buried. Then as now, the student on leaving his family desperately needed

older adults to whom he could transfer his affection--men whom he could identify with and imitate; who could show him ways to order his confusion by principled thought, and help him prepare for a meaningful career in the adult world. This is what teachers did. It cannot be done if they are cut off from students.⁵

If we accept that, it will lead us to want to find some way of talking about the life of the student outside of formal instruction which does not involve reducing it to a "student personnel program." For as long as we talk in those terms, we shall probably perpetuate the unhappy and unfruitful notion that we can turn all responsibility for it over to that peculiar class of people known as "student personnel deans"--the Dean of Men, the Dean of Women, and even the Dean of the Chapel.

We often say that the liberal arts college has regard for the whole person: that it is concerned to assist the student in becoming a more complete man and not simply a more efficient technician. When that fails to happen after four years, as it does too much of the time, a combination of factors is at fault. For one thing, teachers and administrators alike are too willing to accept responsibility only for what they consider their own respective pieces of that person, and are content to leave the other pieces to other teachers and administrators, on the mistaken assumption that when all the pieces are added together the result will be personal wholeness for the student. That seems to me an expectation which is naive at best. It is probably perpetuated, among college teachers especially, by one of the most durable of our academic myths, namely, that a man's intellectual powers exist in isolation from his volitional, valuation, and affectional powers. So then in order to be a good teacher on this view, it is only necessary to treat the student as an isolated intellect; and, equally important, the teacher will feel obliged to expose nothing more of himself to the student than the content of his own intellect. Volition, valuation, affection--these are the pieces of the person which are assigned, not to the teacher, but to the "student personnel program" and its administrative specialists.

As a result of this separation, the student seldom sees a teacher as a complete person, has therefore few if any models of the mature integrated personality, and thus is left without sufficient clues as to how his own growing and special intellectual competence is to be integrated with the rest of his experience. The result is personal confusion for the student, the product of his peculiar loneliness. At a time when the developing personality desperately needs models to help him toward an adequate sense of personal identity, the only available ones come from the student's own peer group. And as a consequence, the college campus can be

⁵"For a Reactionary Experiment in Education", Harper's Magazine, November, 1962. Pg. 66.

described without exaggeration as a place where one learns what it is to be a man by imitating imitation men.

Whereas intellect receives attention at a ratio of about 20:1 (we have a lot to say about this ratio in our promotional literature), with luck volition, valuation, and affection will receive attention at a ratio of 300:1 (and the less said about that, the better).

Now let there be no misunderstanding here. A liberal arts college is not a finishing school. The proper end of learning is not gracious living, in spite of the inscription over the entrance to our women's dormitory; but neither is the proper end of learning a disoriented and disorganized personality whose intellectual competence has outstripped his personal competence. Certainly I am under no illusion that this view of the educational task is universally accepted by teachers and administrators. Recently a philosopher from Duke criticized the view of Paul Goodman, which I quoted with approval above, in these words:

These social scientists seem to imagine that a university is a sort of psychiatric institute, complete with transference and counter-transference....Higher education is not psychotherapy. The suggestion that 'the function of a college is to help its pupils formulate the problems they face' seems to me to be just false....(Goodman) does not understand the function of a university (which is to turn out people who know something, preferably something of importance)....⁶

Well of course a college is not a psychiatric institute, and education is not psychotherapy. But this philosopher-critic gives away his own game, it seems to me, when he innocently suggests that it is not enough simply to know something to be educated, but that one ought preferable to know something "important." But as soon as one qualifies the noun "knowledge" with the adjective "important," one moves beyond fact to value, beyond the objectively discernible to the subjectively grasped and grasping, which is to say, beyond the intellectual to the personal. A sense of the importance of knowledge is not derived simply from a study of the facts; facts become important in the presence of our commitments.

If in our learning we are to aim not simply at knowing something but at knowing something important, we shall have to deal courageously and candidly with our commitments--both the teacher's and the student's; for importance implies the fashioning of our diverse experience into personal priorities. If we are to aim not simply at facts but at reality, we shall have to deal courageously and candidly with our world-views--both the teacher's and the student's;

⁶N. L. Wilson, in a letter to the editor, Harper's Magazine, January, 1963. Pg. 4

for reality implies the fashioning of discrete and disparate facts into some intelligible and meaningful whole. If we are to aim not simply at learning but at wisdom, we shall have to deal courageously and candidly with our standards--both the teacher's and the student's; for wisdom implies the fashioning of a descriptive knowledge into that discriminate weighting of experience which distinguishes between "higher" and "lower," between "is" and "ought."

Then I am ready to insist that great teaching is always personal in this sense, that it engages the teacher in his wholeness with the student in his wholeness. It is at the same time the fulfilment of the traditional aims of liberal learning and the answer to the existential need of the contemporary student.

But personal teaching is also inconvenient because it is not easily restricted to the classroom, not readily defined by scheduled hours; it is often unwilling to settle for the formal, structured relationship but breaks out in spontaneous and imaginative ways. And it is this which makes me somewhat pessimistic about the future of this kind of teaching. There are, of course, some among us who simply do not accept this view of the importance of the personal; but there are others among us who frankly can't be bothered, and I fear the number of the latter may increase. There is some evidence that the new popularity of college teaching is drawing into the profession many who are not teachers by conviction, who have no clearly marked-out view of teaching, but who nevertheless find it relatively easy to win appointment to faculties because of the increasing teacher shortage. Whether or not we can convince these indifferent teachers to accept the inconvenience which goes with great teaching is the test of the future.

We shall have little chance to do so unless we begin now to develop an institutional consciousness which accepts what President John Sloan Dickey of Dartmouth calls the American college's "duality of historic purpose: to see men made whole in both competence and conscience....To create the power of competence without creating a corresponding sense of moral direction to guide the use of that power is bad education."⁷

III.

If a reconsideration of our task ought to turn us toward a view of teaching which is unapologetically personal, it ought also to turn us toward a view of teaching which is unapologetically religious. I mean this statement to apply not only to the church-related college but to the public university; not only to the liberal arts school but to the technical institute.

⁷"Conscience and the Undergraduate," The Atlantic, April, 1955. Pp. 31, 32.

There is, in the academic community, an observable loss of religious depth. It is partly created for us by the superficiality of the prevailing religious culture, but it may be a useful exercise to see where we schoolmen have made our own peculiar contribution to that loss of depth, since it may not lie where we would ordinarily expect to find it.

It is not to be found, for example, in our refusal to use our classrooms for explicit sectarian advocacy; that is precisely as it should be. Nor is it to be found in the occasional shock sustained by student piety in having an historian question the purity of Luther's religious motives, or in having a psychologist suggest that Paul of Tarsus might possibly have been more susceptible to epileptic seizure or auditory hallucination than to revelatory experience, or in having a biologist hint that a literal interpretation of Genesis is scarcely credible. Such things are, at most, only temporarily unsettling to most students. Finally the problem of relating Christian faith to higher education is not just the intellectual problem of accommodating the conceptual world-view of Christian theology to the humanistic and scientific world-view of liberal scholarship; to treat it so requires a definition of Christian faith which is to exclusively cerebral and an understanding of religion which is academic in the worst sense.

Generically considered, religion is the quest for that meaning which has power to give shape to experience, purpose to existence, and motivation and moral energy to the human enterprise. Its coordinates are intimacy and ultimacy, finitude and transcendence, nature and history, good and evil, the self and the other, faith and doubt, despair and hope, life and death. And it is precisely these things which we have excluded from the learning situation; and it is their absence, rather than the absence of an intellectual synthesis of world-views, which has generated the loss of religious depth.

It is not simply that, as academicians, we do not find the Christian doctrine of original sin a useful category of analysis; the problem is deeper. We do not make any conscious connection between learning and the fact that men experience themselves as ambivalent creatures. It is not simply that we do not find the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation intelligible; the problem is deeper. We do not make any conscious connection between learning and the fact of man's cosmic loneliness. It is not simply that we do not find the Christian doctrine of the church compelling; the problem is deeper. We do not make any conscious connection between learning and man's wistful search for accepting relationships. It is not simply that we do not find Christian worship edifying; the problem is deeper. We do not make any conscious connection between learning and man's experience in his own life and in all of life of a mystery deeper than ignorance.

Then let me say it again: the peculiar contribution of the college toward the contemporary loss of religious depth--and it is a contribution as well toward student confusion--lies, not in an expressed indifference or hostility toward the Christian tradition, or toward any other explicit religious tradition for that matter. Rather it lies in the exclusion from our learning of those questions which are most peculiarly and poignantly human.

There is not among college students any great revival of religious interest, if one means by that interest in conventional religious institutional traditions. But I am deeply persuaded of the view recently expressed by one sensitive observer of the college: that students are indeed more "religious" than other groups within our culture, in the wholly legitimate sense that they are more conscious of their personal need and more receptive to healing.

Certainly that gives point to Michael Novak's comment, in Harper's supplement on the American college, that

the greatest contribution to the religious life of the university could come from teachers and scholars--formally religious or not--who could lead the student to the profound human experiences lying below the surface of the academic curriculum....Religion can thrive only in a personal universe; religious faith, hope, and love are personal responses to a personal God. But how can the immense question of a personal God even be posed and made relevant (in the colleges) when fundamental questions about the meaning and limits of personal experience are evaded?....God, if there is a God, is not dead. He will come back to the colleges, when man comes back.⁸

Then I am ready to insist that all great teaching is religious teaching in this sense, that through it we find access to what Paul Tillich calls "the dimension of depth," both in ourselves and in the world which is present to our scrutiny. So, says Archibald MacLeish, when Robert Penn Warren lectures on "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,"

the relation between the poem and the world of life life in which the poem exists is discovered.... Every man, says Mr. Warren quietly, kills his own albatross....and there, with those words, the bird, the scene, the poem all come true--come real. The metaphysical talk about symbols and symbolism....chokes on its own inanity and what is left is meaning, the only kind of meaning that truly means, personal meaning, immediate meaning....The murder of the bird becomes the murder of which we also are guilty, all of us: the destruction of life, the denial of love. The horror of thirst and windlessness, motionlessness, becomes the horror of stagnation we too have sensed when our rejection of love, of life, has stilled the winds of vision that

⁸"God in the Colleges," Harper's Magazine, October, 1961. Pp. 176, 178.

should drive us. The salvation by wonder and pity becomes a salvation we should recognize if it came....This myth of the poetic imagination....has become a myth of myself which I-- student, teacher, man, woman, whoever--am called on to live as life....It has been accomplished not by squeezing the pips of the text but by a perception which has one foot in the text and the other in the world so that the two, text and world, are made to march together.⁹

Such teaching, both scholarly and profoundly religious, is at the same time the fulfilment of the traditional aim of liberal learning and the source of that self-knowledge which is so desperate a need of the contemporary student.

IV.

My final comments are directed not to the teacher but to the administrator. While I am convinced that the answer to the problem of worthy and enduring student values lies primarily within the scope of the teacher-master, the administrator has an obviously crucial role to play. Although the frequency and consistency of his contact with individual students may be less than that of the teacher, the contact the administrator does have with the student is likely to be at a greater depth and intensity than that of the teacher. Furthermore, the effect the administrator has on the general esprit of the campus, through the making and implementing of policy decisions on all phases of campus life, is a factor which can scarcely be ignored in a consideration of that environment within which worthy and enduring student values can be expected to develop.

1. Administrators should be encouraged to think out carefully, and state quite explicitly, the standards and expectations which define acceptable behavior on the campus, ranging from academic honesty to dormitory life to social conduct. I am not here proposing some ideal set of such standards and expectations, since the situation of each campus must be determined in terms of its own integrity. I am proposing that more of us ought to adopt the candor of President Blandings of Vassar, whether or not we are invited by our students to do so; and I am also proposing that we be prepared to take full advantage of the controversy such statement would be likely to stir up, believing that controversy provides an excellent environment for unusually effective teaching. What penalties, if any, are to be attached to student breaches of the announced standard seems to me distinctly of secondary importance;

⁹"What Is English?" Saturday Review, December 9, 1961. P. 14.

the important thing is that there be such a standard, and that it really represent a consensus of the senior members of the college, and it be stated quite plainly.

I am aware, of course, of all the arguments which suggest that we cannot legislate standards, but I am convinced they are really half-truths. Let me remind you of the comments cited earlier from Marjorie Reeves and Edgar Friedenberg about the confusion, even the emptiness, which students bring with them to college. When we provide for our students explicit standards and expectations, we make possible at least three things: (a) we provide a clear consensus of the thinking of the senior members of the college, many or most of whom the student will hold in high regard, and with which he can begin to identify himself; (b) we provide for some students an explicit sanction for standards which privately they would like to adopt but are hesitant to do so lest it brings them into conflict with the prevailing student culture; and (c) we provide to the student who rejects the stated standards a way of measuring himself against a norm which he can scarcely dismiss as arbitrary.

2. The administrator must continually guard against the temptation not to take a student's problem seriously because "it's the tenth time I've heard that same problem from a student this week," or because "every student has that problem when he gets to be a sophomore." We are required to take the student's problem seriously because we take the student seriously; learning, whether in classroom or administrative office, ought to serve genuinely humanizing ends. We are required to listen as attentively as if we have not heard the problem before; indeed, the problem, though it does bear resemblance to others we have heard, stands in a unique history because it now appears in the life of this person. And we are required to make our response to the student as an individual having a unique history, and not as if we were addressing some general class of beings ("sophomores") who were going through a mechanically identical phase.

3. The mature administrator, like the mature institution, ought to have sufficient resiliency of spirit to withstand certain recurrent tests. For one thing, he ought to be willing to put up with a certain amount of apparent incorrigibility. The problem, and what seems to me the proper administrative response, are both well illustrated in this letter sent by a student to a college administrator:

I suppose I never have thanked you for the trouble you have gone to for me. Whether I attempted to transfer out of the college, get married, get divorced, commit suicide, etc., you have been most understanding and helpful. I thank you for the kind attention you have given me.

I am looking forward to a scholastically and socially exciting, but, otherwise, uneventful year. I promise you that.

That young man's problems are by no means solved, but the balance is a different balance in his life because of the resilient response of a mature administrator.

A second such test is to be found in the inconvenience caused by student nonconformity. Indeed, I venture to suggest that the degree to which an administrator responds to nonconformity as a personal threat is a telling measure of his own maturity and security. The fact is that most of our institutions want "excellence" in our students, but we have not yet decided whether we are prepared to pay the price of "creativity" in them, which may be quite another thing. A conventional and conforming learner may be an "excellent" student but is scarcely a creative one. One recent summary of research on creativity has concluded that it can be distinguished by the following characteristics:

1. A willingness to take a calculated risk larger than others would take in a given situation;
2. An ability to sense and also to question the implicit;
3. A capacity to be puzzled;
4. Traits that might be called 'behemian;'
5. An openness to the seeming 'irrational' in himself;
6. Considerable sensitivity and exuberance;
7. A greater acceptance of himself than is the norm.¹⁰

Not all nonconformity on the campus qualifies as the mark of creativity, but on the face of it, it is not always possible to make the distinction. The administrator must therefore decide in advance whether he is prepared to suffer the inconvenience of nonconforming students for the sake of an environment in which some, at least, may be brought to creative achievement.

The third such test, closely related to the other two, concerns explicit criticism directed by students against both teachers and administrators. Again, the character of the administrator's response to criticism will be a measure of his own maturity and security. If Friedenberg is right, the adolescent process of self-definition, which was once well under way by the time a young person reached college age, has been delayed, so that more and more young people are reaching college in a state of confusion about their own identity. The campus thus becomes the locus of the quest. But the search for self-identity involves conflict; indeed, says Friedenberg, "adolescence is conflict--protracted conflict--between the individual and society."¹¹ Then college administrators will have to decide whether they are prepared to live with perpetual and protracted conflict, in order to help young men and women toward their own

¹⁰"The Creative Child," Look, November 7, 1961. Pg. 114.

¹¹OP. cit., P. 32

mature self-identity, or will rather insist upon smoothing over or even suppressing the conflict, thereby refusing to provide the conditions for mature self-discovery.

4. The administrator who is concerned for the development of worthy and enduring student values will view the aim of discipline as reconciliation and restoration rather than as punishment. Friedenberq reports with strong approval that in the public school misconduct is now commonly treated as a maladjustment in the relationship between the student and the school, rather than as a fault which lies entirely with the student; thus the content of the disciplinary measure may require readjustments, not simply on the part of the student, but also on the part of the institution.¹² It seems to me that this approach to discipline is even more appropriate to the college than to the public school. It focuses attention where it belongs--on the character of our relationships--and prevents that forcing of a student into an interior loneliness or isolation which is so often the result of conventional punishment. Discipline which seeks for appropriate relationships creates a situation in which genuine learning about values can take place; discipline which is directed primarily toward punishment builds, not values, but defenses.

5. One of the least tapped opportunities on the campus for student development of attitudes and values lies in student employment on the campus; or, to put it more accurately, campus employment frequently encourages in the student precisely the wrong attitudes and values about the dignity and integrity of work and the ways in which men serve by engaging in useful labor. Administration of student campus employment should fall not simply to business offices and maintenance supervisors but to administrators who can seek imaginatively to draw this experience into the total complex of vital learning experiences which comprise a college career.

Morris Keaton wrote not long ago about "the climate of learning" on the campus. My function here has been to address myself to "the climate of valuing" on the campus; for finally it is not a program but a total environment created by students, by teachers, and by administrators, which determines the worth and the endurance of the values which emerge out of the education we offer.

¹²Ibid. Pg. 90-91.