
BENNINGTON COLLEGE BULLETIN

ISSUED QUARTERLY AT
BENNINGTON VERMONT

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF LIBERAL
EDUCATION

VOLUME ELEVEN . SEPTEMBER 1943 . NUMBER FOUR

BENNINGTON COLLEGE
LIBRARY

BENNINGTON COLLEGE BULLETIN

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF LIBERAL EDUCATION

SPEECH BY PRESIDENT LEWIS WEBSTER JONES

At the College Community Meeting, August 29, 1943

THE BENNINGTON COLLEGE BULLETIN IS ISSUED
QUARTERLY BY BENNINGTON COLLEGE, BENNINGTON, VT.

Entered as Second-class Matter September 12, 1932, at the Post Office at Bennington,
Vermont, Under the Act of August 24, 1912 . September 1943 . Volume II . Number 4

THE BENNINGTON COLLEGE BULLETIN is issued quarterly throughout each year. The College does not issue an inclusive catalogue. Names will be added to the mailing list or single bulletins sent upon request.

Visitors to the College are welcome, and student guides are available. The information center is in the Commons Building. The offices of the College are closed from Saturday noon until Monday morning. Members of the faculty and staff are not available for interview during this time except by special appointment in advance.

LEWIS WEBSTER JONES, *President*

MRS. MARY GARRETT, *Director of Admissions and Student Personnel*

MISS MYRA H. JONES, *Comptroller*

MRS. GLADYS Y. LESLIE, *Librarian*

MRS. JUDITH COOKE, *Director of Dining Halls and Residences*

FRANK H. TSCHORN, *Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds*

MISS BERTHA H. FUNNELL, *Director of Non-Resident Term and
Placement*

ROBERT H. WOODWORTH, *Manager of College Farm*

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF LIBERAL EDUCATION

7

I am happy to welcome you all at the opening of the twelfth year of Bennington College. I am glad to see the old students and faculty members, after the very brief holiday which I hope they have enjoyed; and I want to extend an especially cordial welcome, on behalf of the community, to those students and teachers who are joining us for the first time. Bennington College has a tradition of good teaching and good learning, and it is a distinguished fellowship into which you now enter. I welcome you to full participation in that fellowship.

Perhaps I ought to warn you here and now that you are not coming into a perfected college, in which your only responsibility is to accept an education. You will be asked to take a much more active part in the process. Nor is this a haven for boundless self-expansion, with all the normal academic irritations and restrictions removed, a place of miraculously unlimited possibilities. We are of course limited by time, by finance, by our own abilities, and by the whole social matrix. College offers no escape from the world and its difficulties. More than any other place of which I have personal knowledge, Bennington College is a microcosm which is acutely sensitive to the problems of the Great Society. You will be called upon to face these problems very directly, in your college work, in your membership in the community, and in your work during the non-resident term. The problems of peace and reconstruction are not something remotely to be encountered in some vague future: they are immediately with us on this campus, and those of us who are privileged to take part in this educational enterprise must feel our responsibilities toward them.

The opening of the new year is an appropriate time for us to take stock of our position, and to give some joint consideration to the work of the College as a whole, before we are plunged into our individual teaching and learning jobs. We must be sure we understand and agree on our fundamental purposes, if we are to work fruitfully together. I shall, therefore, talk tonight about certain general prob-

lems in the reconstruction of liberal education, and about the particular role of Bennington College.

When we met here a year ago, a dominant consideration was that of our relation to the nation's war effort. This last year has been one of adaptation. We are contributing manpower directly by growing a large part of our own food. We are saving fuel, and providing opportunities for further direct war work in the non-resident term, through the changes in the College calendar. We shall continue to recognize that our first duty is to the nation, and stand ready to make any further adaptations.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, it looked as though liberal education in America might be one of the first war casualties. A conference of educators met in Baltimore in January, 1942, at the call of the President of the United States, to discuss the role of the colleges and universities in the war, and to seek ways of adapting procedures in order to be as useful as possible in the war effort. Men's colleges were faced with the immediate loss of students. It seemed possible that women, too, would be drafted for war work. The talk was all of acceleration, and of putting in all sorts of courses dealing directly with the war, or teaching the technical subjects immediately needed. But the outlook for liberal education was black. Somewhere in the background, the so-called "cultural" courses might be allowed to go on, but there was no evidence of any real conviction of their value. Educators seemed to have so little faith in liberal education that they thought principally in terms of substituting one "useful" set of courses for another. This lack of conviction was symptomatic of the deplorable condition of American higher education in general.

The Hollywood picture of the rah-rah college devoted to football, fraternities and love is, of course, a gross distortion; but it is based on genuine Americana. The typical college hero has not been the serious student. The ideal has sometimes been that of getting by with as little academic work as possible. This entailed a certain amount of skillful negotiation of the curriculum: the successful student must satisfy the odd requirements set up by professors. The really important business of life was not involved.

It is generally fair to say that a college education was thought of as a personal investment. Students ought to learn things and to acquire alliances which would lead to success in economic life. There was a great proliferation of vocational courses. The college was also a

place where one acquired "culture." But culture again was thought of as a personal adornment, which must not interfere too much with the main business of getting ahead.

This relegation of liberal, as against vocational, education to the category of a personal luxury went very deep. There can be found many a middle-aged citizen who looks wistfully back to some course in literature or philosophy which he took in college, remembering faithfully and fondly what the professor said. But this is less a tribute to the professor than a confession that these subjects have never become part of the college graduate's own intellectual equipment, a developing part of his life, since college days. The subjects have been considered irrelevant, something for which a busy man has no time.

This really means that the colleges, as a whole, have been doing little which inspired the continuation of learning. The college curriculum was too often a vast and sprawling hodge-podge of unrelated courses. It aimed to please, and obligingly included anything from salesmanship to archeology. Educational die-hards objected to the introduction of some of the supposedly "practical" courses, but in so objecting, they seemed to accept the judgment that the humanities they defended were in fact not useful. They thus conferred upon them an aura of moral superiority in a crassly materialistic world.

Part of the trouble arose from the habit of thinking about education as the imparting of information. There is, after centuries of human effort, a staggering amount of information to be imparted. The colleges and universities bravely but mistakenly took it all on, and completely lost themselves in it. Every new technical wrinkle in animal husbandry, every current political or economic development, became the subject of a special course. But in their eagerness to keep abreast of the times, the colleges and universities too often forgot all about their main function, which is to give some coherence and unity to the whole of man's knowledge and experience, and to concern themselves with the fundamental problems of man's purpose, and the human uses which all this information is to serve. Very good technicians were trained, but the system produced few educated people.

Among all this rich confusion, it is true that individuals could get an excellent education. But such people must in most cases have

acquired the liberal spirit elsewhere: it was not deliberately cultivated in the educational institutions as a primary goal.

It is also true that, almost as soon as American higher education began to sprawl in all directions, strong movements of reform appeared, combating the general trend. Many small colleges have devoted themselves to the re-establishment of unity and coherence in the curriculum, and have worked to revive the liberal tradition in education. Some have emphasized content, others have emphasized a reform of teaching and learning methods. All these critics of the established order have received some enthusiastic support, and have exhibited considerable vitality. But because it takes unusual conviction to go against the trend, they have also exhibited some of the fierce particularism characteristic of reformers, and have wasted time and energy in attacking one another's roads to salvation.

In spite of the divisive influence of educational evangelism, a great deal of real progress has been made in the last twenty years. The controversies have been stimulating, and were evidence of a keen and widespread interest. More and more colleges have been taking their jobs seriously, and successful educational experiments like Bennington College have exerted a considerable influence.

There are now most encouraging signs that the separate streams of reform have joined to form a strong and united current. The war has emphasized the liberal values by endangering them. The response of a representative group of educators is expressed in a document which I hail with enthusiasm. It is the report of the Commission on Liberal Education, published in the May, 1943, issue of the bulletin of the Association of American Colleges.

The report points to the dangers, as well as the unparalleled opportunities, which confront American colleges and universities as a result of the war. It is concerned about the immediate danger of the neglect of liberal education in favor of purely technical training, and urges young women to regard the continuance of their education as a patriotic duty. It further expresses concern for the survival of free, independent colleges, and discusses the dangers of governmental control. It points to the need for a concerted effort on the part of all educational institutions, if they are to rise to their opportunities, and reconstruct themselves in such a fashion as to be able to offer to returning veterans "an education which will constitute a vitally interesting goal of learning and experience." As a guide to this desired

reconstruction, the report re-states clearly and forcefully the nature and aims of liberal education; and it makes certain specific recommendations for the reform of teaching and administrative methods.

The report insists that the main purpose of a liberal education is to provide coherence and unity: to "serve the needs of man and the whole order of free life in a democracy." It declares that men and women are liberally educated "to the degree that they are *literate* and *articulate* in verbal discourse, in the languages of the arts, and in the symbolic languages of the sciences; *informed* concerning their physical, social and spiritual environment and concerning their relationship thereto as individuals; *sensitive* to all the values that endow life with meaning and significance; and able to *understand* the present in the perspective of the past and future, and to *decide* and *act* as responsible moral beings."

Here are some of the specific recommendations: negatively, the report calls for the abolition of the abuses of the lecture system, the unwise use of text-books, the prescription of courses solely for their supposed "disciplinary" values; the determination of progress by mechanical rules, grades and credits without regard to the individual; the emphasis on faculty research at the expense of good teaching. It deplores the practice of selling education by the piece, the multiplication of isolated and unrelated courses, the erection of artificial departmental barriers, the type of specialization hostile to cultural integration, and the superficial survey course. It points out that the revolt against discipline for its own sake has led to the disparagement of rigorous study and self-discipline; that concern with the present and future has often meant the neglect of the past; and that academic objectivity has too often been interpreted as the refusal to take sides.

The positive recommendations include: more individualized instruction; the use of achievement tests and comprehensive examinations instead of piecemeal tests of information; effective counseling, and the wider employment of teaching techniques which stress self-education under competent direction.

Bennington College welcomes the report wholeheartedly. We are in complete agreement with both its general aims and specific recommendations. Indeed we have acted on similar principles since the beginning. This is of course not surprising. Bennington College was founded on the basis of just such educational ideas as are ex-

pressed in the report, which have long been current among educators. But that puts us in a difficult as well as a favorable position: we can justly feel gratified at the encouragement and confirmation we derive from the report; but we cannot take any new impetus from it. We are in the exposed position of a leader, and are quite well aware, through our own experience, of the many practical problems still to be solved by any college which seriously undertakes the kind of liberal program outlined in the Commission's report. It is these problems I want to discuss with you tonight.

Let us consider first what is involved in providing an education which, to paraphrase slightly the words of the Commission, constitutes "an organic, balanced whole in which the arts and sciences are united and made to serve the needs of man for life in a free society." The sad fact is that the arts and sciences are not united. This organic, balanced whole is not something given. It has still to be achieved in the contemporary world. It is, therefore, the formidable task of educators, artists and intellectuals to work together to create a cultural synthesis, not merely to pass it on.

In developing our program at Bennington College, we have been keenly aware both of the importance and of the difficulty of this task of integration. We have not tried to impose an artificial unity, or to dig one up from a supposedly more unified past. We are not living in the Middle Ages, nor in Ancient Greece. It is with the civilization of the twentieth century that we are concerned. This is all too obviously a civilization in conflict. The lack of coherence in education is only partly the cause, much more the reflection, of a lack of coherence in contemporary culture. It is not only a matter of clashes between nations, races, classes, cultures. There are serious conflicts within our own culture, between art and science, science and religion, and among many rival philosophies. Highly trained specialists, who are joint heirs of a common cultural heritage, work at cross-purposes, isolated from one another by wide gulfs of mutual distrust and misunderstanding.

The typical conflicts of modern thought have certainly not been absent from this campus. Any of you who have lived and worked here will testify to the liveliness of the controversies which characterize our intellectual life together. We have been confronted by the same dangers of over-specialization and lack of communication which are everywhere apparent. But we have made a determined

effort, not to deny this diversity, but to make it serve a unified educational purpose. We have agreed on what are the most important elements in our culture, its central problems and values, and have given these a special emphasis in the curriculum. This program must be, in the nature of the case, a growing and developing thing. It represents our attempt, as a group, to work towards some genuine integration of the arts and sciences which *will* become an organic, balanced whole to serve the needs of modern society.

All of you who join us for the first time, therefore, either as students or as teachers, will find yourselves involved in a cooperative enterprise which may not be in accord with your intellectual habits, but which is part of the obligation of membership in this community. You may devote yourselves wholeheartedly to the study of your chosen subjects; but you will also be asked to try to become literate in other subjects which this College pronounces to be of equal importance, and to work out the relationship of your own specialty to the culture as a whole. This kind of intellectual cooperation requires time, patience, goodwill and a willingness to learn from one another. It is, as we all have reason to know, a highly rewarding enterprise; but it has never been easy, even in a place as small and relatively homogeneous as Bennington College. I should like to remark in passing that I am not very optimistic about the possibility of doing such a pioneering job in a large institution already established in habits of departmental specialization.

To return to the Commission's report: you will remember that the liberally educated man is defined as being "literate and articulate in verbal discourse, in the languages of the arts, and in the symbolic languages of science."

Now literacy and articulateness in verbal discourse is such a well-established educational aim that it requires little discussion. All schools and colleges try to promote it, though most of them are dismally conscious of their indifferent success. We work on it here by insisting that all papers should be clearly thought out and well-written, no matter what the subject. We all know that we have a long way to go, and that the insistence must be unrelenting. But in this field at least there is general agreement on the rules of grammar and syntax, and on the desirability of teaching people to use their own language well.

But what about literacy in the languages of the arts? This has certainly not been part of general education for a very long time. The characteristic development of the Western world in the nineteenth century was in the direction of materialism and rationalism, in which art was given no important place, and the artist felt himself an outcast. In this atmosphere, artists have sometimes adopted attitudes which do not help promote better communication; they tend to develop small cliques and factions, even a sort of personal preciousness, which add to the confusion, and lend color to the popular suspicion that it is all an unimportant matter of personal taste. Artists themselves have been much concerned about their social role, and have written about and discussed it at great length. Some have identified themselves, and art, with some political faith. But the public as a whole is quite indifferent. It is a long time since art was treated as such an integral part of culture that schools and colleges included it as an integral part of education. Again, any college which does so regard art must be prepared to do a pioneering job.

We cannot take our guide from the conventional college curriculum. It is true that the arts have often been included, but they have often taken the form of courses *about* art. They constituted a sort of cultural frill, which students could take if they had time. The literacy so promoted was generally only another aspect of verbal literacy, the ability to talk about art. Actual training in the arts themselves was left almost entirely to the professional schools, which suffer from the characteristic evils of over-specialization and isolation.

At Bennington College, we have revived a tradition much older than the nineteenth century, which recognizes the arts as an integral part of a functioning whole. We do not consider them as polite accomplishments, suitable for daughters, but irrelevant for sons. Nor do we think of the arts as reserved for the few who may be especially talented. The ordered emotions, the disciplined perceptions and insights of the arts are an essential part of a healthy culture, and therefore of general education. Moreover, literacy in the arts requires actual work in them. Painting has to be studied by painting, music by playing and composing, drama by producing plays.

The inclusion of the arts in the Basic Studies program expresses our conviction of their importance in the whole structure of liberal education. Even those of us who are most illiterate in the arts—and

for this group I can claim to speak with melancholy authority—are thus committed to a policy which will give you a better education than we ourselves have enjoyed. I hereby serve notice on all entering students who may consider themselves as scientists, or already dedicated to a life of social service, that an attempt to understand the language of one or more of the arts is expected of them; and all of you who think of yourselves as artists will not be encouraged to leave science and economics to the more pedestrian spirits.

I have discussed first the problems of the arts in the curriculum because they have been most neglected in recent years. But the case of science is entirely analogous. At first glance, the sciences seem extremely well established, and no college has to explain itself if it includes them. But that does not mean that science is integrated into “an organic, balanced whole which will serve the needs of man for life in a free society.” Nor is its role in liberal education clear.

The sciences use a symbolic, non-verbal language in which most of us are even more illiterate than in the languages of the arts. In spite of this, or perhaps partly because of it, science is regarded with an almost universal, if uncomprehending, reverence. It is quoted as *the* authority by advertisers, educators, government officials, even by ministers of religion. We try to be scientific alike in raising crops, raising children, promoting the social revolution, even sometimes in literary criticism. And science is correspondingly feared and hated by those who blame it for all the ills of the modern world. Scientists are just as likely as are artists to be lonely and misunderstood souls. They are often so steeped in specialism that they no longer even understand one another. They feel no more capable than anyone else of coping with the sad state of the world which science has supposedly brought into being. Some take refuge in a small technique and an all-embracing cynicism. Others are misled by journalists and book publishers into pronouncing themselves on all sorts of issues for which their undoubted scientific accomplishments give them no special authority.

This state of affairs is of course no fault of science, nor of the scientists. It is merely one aspect of the general confusion resulting from rapid and uncoordinated social change. Science is, and will probably continue to be, the most dynamic influence in modern civilization. The free spirit of inquiry which has yielded such impressive results in the last few centuries of scientific advance is a

basic element in the great liberal tradition of Western civilization. But I need hardly remind you that the technical aspects of science are exportable without that free spirit, and certainly without other liberal values. The war expresses our determination to use our own great technical resources to defend those values. But the health of modern civilization will not be assured unless we can find some way of incorporating science, and scientific thinking, into the kind of cultural syntheses which will use our power over the environment to realize those values more fully. This is one of the most important tasks of education.

We are attempting here, therefore, to develop more general literacy in the sciences by incorporating science in the Basic Studies program, as well as in the various scientific fields more fully developed in Special Studies. This is not primarily in order to acquire some of the wealth of information about the physical environment which science can provide. It is rather an effort at *understanding*, through using the languages and methods of science. This is admittedly difficult, because of the neglect of this kind of literacy in the schools. It is just as common to be complacent about an inability to understand mathematics as to relegate art to those who have some special talent. I don't know how much general literacy can be expected, in fields where technical skills count for so much, and take so much time to acquire. But we do at least recognize the problem, and shall continue to work at it. Such recognition is, after all, the essence of education.

This holds true even of subjects which, because they use words, are more generally accepted as material for academic study: social science, literature, history, and philosophy. All of us can at least read in some fashion, and communicate ideas verbally. But the problems of *how* and *what* to teach have no self-evident answer even here.

The social sciences, relative new-comers to the academic scene, have enjoyed an increasing and deserved popularity in schools and colleges. Indeed, under the name of "social studies," they have often been made the core of the curriculum. It would seem reasonable, if integration is desired, to center everything about the study of man in society: art, literature, religion, and science can then be fitted into a sort of anthropological view of man's activities as a whole. But this presents certain defects in practice. Learning all about the

social background of art, or the psychological peculiarities, the class and family background of the artist, is no substitute for the art experience itself. Nor does the fundamentally rationalistic approach of the social sciences deal adequately with religious experience.

As the social sciences have become more scientific, they have renounced their normative function, and confined themselves to objective studies of man's behavior. This has led to a great gain in clarity; and it ought to have led to a modesty appropriate to a more limited and specific role. On the whole, however, there has been little observable tendency for social scientists to relinquish their pretensions to practical leadership, while claiming the authority of science.

But if the social scientists can fairly be accused of some tendency to claim more authority than they are entitled to, there is no doubt that the public as a whole still accords them much less. It is a lot easier to be objective in studying potato-bugs than in studying oneself and one's neighbors. The habit of scientific thinking is not widespread. The social scientist's quest for unprejudiced objectivity is likely to antagonize non-social scientists who feel often quite rightly that their convictions are more than prejudices. This may lead to a sort of anti-intellectualism, a refusal to accept the scientific method in fields where it *can* arrive at valid conclusions, and to the erection of grotesque non-rational standards of race, or intuition.

All this means that the social sciences, like the natural sciences, need to be fitted into some framework of thought and education which includes the insights of the arts, philosophy and religion.

Literature is the most respectable of all academic disciplines. It is a universally appealing subject, because everyone likes to read; and it seems to include everything which anyone ever read about. Under its ample academic wings can be found courses in Freshman English, journalism, semantics, philosophy, history, and so on. Here again we have to decide what and how to teach: what is the specific role of literature in a liberal education? President Hutchins of Chicago recently classified the current methods of teaching literature into two categories: history, and the communication of ecstasy. We have adopted neither here. We have agreed to treat literature primarily as one of the great arts, to be studied concretely through its masterpieces, through practice, through criticism. The kind of insight into the human situation so attained is not the same thing as,

nor a substitute for, the study of the social sciences, history or philosophy. All of these are important, and nothing is to be gained by assuming that they are necessarily antagonistic to one another, nor by trying to rely exclusively on one of them.

History and philosophy would surely appear to have special claims to our attention, if indeed we are trying to see human experience as an organic, balanced whole.

The neglect of American history in American schools and colleges has been dramatized by the recent investigation conducted by the *New York Times*. A deplorable and widespread ignorance of history was revealed. (I wonder, by the way, what would be the result of a similar inquiry into what students remembered about chemistry, Latin grammar or any other of the subjects taught?) The investigation has stimulated a great deal of discussion and interest in better methods of teaching history. This is not easy. Real historical understanding has to be slowly arrived at, partly as a by-product of more specific studies. If it is to have meaning, it cannot be absorbed as history in general; it has to be the history of something. Students cannot learn history once and for all, and stow it away as a background for the rest of education. The educated man will continually need to re-read, re-interpret or perhaps re-write history as his own experience changes and develops. The quest for understanding never ends. We hope that all our work here, both in historical courses and in the study of particular works of literature, art and science, will further that understanding.

I doubt, also, whether philosophy can be swallowed neat without indigestion. Direct study is necessary, but also the slow maturing of understanding derived from many types of learning and experience. May I remind you of the Commission's report defining the liberally educated man: he should be "*sensitive* to all the values that endow life with meaning and significance; able to *understand* the present in the perspective of the past and future; and to *decide* and *act* as a responsible moral being." This kind of sensitivity and ability to act on the basis of moral values cannot be guaranteed to follow from the study of philosophy. It is possible to be an able philosopher and a bad citizen, or to be a good citizen without being verbally clear about metaphysics. The goal of liberal education is more than intellectual facility. Its values must be values in action, habits of response in family relations, community life and citizenship. We

try to promote this kind of education at Bennington College not only through the study of history and philosophy, but through all aspects of the curriculum, through the quality of our community life, and through the experience gained in the wider community in the winter non-resident term.

In this long discussion, I have talked a lot about values. Perhaps I should be more specific. It is an emotional word, and there is always the danger that we shall enjoy a sort of holy glow by using it vaguely. I mean by values the criteria of choice. We could of course make a behavioristic study of all the choices people make and act upon, and draw up a list of values from it. The list would be chaotic: people want and strive for all sorts of incompatible goals, and from this striving come most of the personal and social problems around us.

We cannot bring order out of this chaos, either for the individual or for society, unless we have some criterion by which to choose among all the conflicting values: which are most important, for which would we give up more trivial goods? Education is in great part education in choices.

Liberal education would make no sense at all without a faith in the human capacity to make choices, and in the reality of the fundamental choice between good and evil. Such a capacity to choose wisely requires a self-knowledge, a knowledge of society, and self-discipline in some sort of philosophical context. This can never be static, or wholly achieved. The only attainable stability in this imperfect world is perhaps that of continual, conscious aspiration. But without this, we are at the mercy of "conditions," and can never hope to master them, whatever may be our technical proficiency.

I have discussed these problems of liberal education at some length in order to tell you, or to remind you, of the considerations which influence us in building our program at Bennington College. We have not set up any sequence of required courses which will turn you all out "educated"; nor have we let things rip in a kind of intellectual free-for-all. Instead, we have agreed upon the most important areas of knowledge, the kinds of literacy needed, and the types of experience which will lead to understanding of the basic problems of human living. We are trying to make all our specialized work contribute to this whole. The two aspects of the program which we have labelled Basic Studies and Special Studies should en-

rich and feed into one another, as more general literacy is developed by common experience. There is of course no opposition between them. Both emphasize the necessity to acquire skills and techniques, to be concrete, in order to arrive at the general. There is no such thing as a general education without this concrete experience, though we often encounter students who say they don't really want to go into all that detail, they just want to get the general idea. Some special competence in one field is certainly essential for effective living. We act on the conviction that a liberal education is not something opposed to and much less useful than a so-called vocational education. Liberal education is not an item of conspicuous consumption, the distinguishing mark of the lady or gentleman. Its values are eminently practical, and are of the utmost importance to all those who deal with other people, as employers, workers, teachers or parents.

The willingness of the democracies to fight this war rests on a belief that their concept of civilization is a universally valid one: a faith in the possibility of achieving a world society in which individuals can function as fully developed moral beings, no matter to what race or nation or class they belong. It is the responsibility of education to try to bring this world civilization into being. This is obviously enormously difficult, and perhaps it can never be fully achieved. It certainly cannot be done by Bennington College alone, nor by the combined forces of all the members of the Association of American Colleges. But in order to make any headway in the vast task of reconstruction we need to be conscious of our goals. The contribution which the colleges can make towards realizing these is unique and important. They are the guardians of the liberal tradition. No other agency is in such a strategic and responsible position as the small, independent college, free to engage in that "intrepid thinking about matters of importance" which is the peculiar role of liberal education. In this year of 1943, we cannot fail to be aware of the immense privileges and the serious responsibilities which are ours.

Mr. Jones announced at the Community Meeting the following appointments to the faculty:

BURKE, KENNETH *Literature*

Studied at Ohio State and Columbia Universities. Research work, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 1926-1927. Music critic, *The Dial*, 1927-1929. Editorial work, Bureau of Social Hygiene, 1928-1929. Music critic, *The Nation*, 1934-1936. Lecturer, New School for Social Research, 1937; University of Chicago, 1938. Received Dial award for distinguished service to American Letters, 1928; Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship, 1935. Author: *The White Oxen*, 1924; *Counter-Statement*, 1931; *Towards a Better Life: A Series of Declamations or Epistles*, 1932; *Permanence and Change: Anatomy of Purpose*, 1935; *Attitudes Toward History*, 1937; *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, 1941. Translator: *Death in Venice*, by Thomas Mann, 1925; *Genius and Character*, by Emil Ludwig, 1927; *Saint Paul*, by Emile Baumann, 1929. Contributor to leading magazines, including *Poetry*, *The New Republic*, *The American Journal of Sociology*.

KNATHS, KARL *Painting*

Studied at Art Institute of Chicago, Art Students' League. Lecturer, Phillips Gallery, Washington, D. C. Awarded Norman Wait Harris silver medal, Art Institute of Chicago, 1928; medal of Boston Tercentenary. Works in Phillips Gallery, Washington, D. C., Gallery of Living Art, New York City, Detroit Museum.

NEUTRA, RICHARD JOSEPH *Architecture*

Graduate of Polytechnic College of University of Vienna and of the University of Zurich, Switzerland, 1918. Architect and city planner, Switzerland, 1919-1923. Associated with Holabird and Root, Frank Lloyd Wright, 1923-1925. Own architectural practice in Los Angeles, 1926-1943. Lecturer at Harvard, Princeton and other colleges. Consultant: National Youth Administration, U. S. Housing Authority, U. S. Treasury on post office buildings. Awarded many prizes including honor awards, World Exposition, Paris, 1938; Hall of Fame, N. Y. World's Fair, 1940. Member: California State Planning Board; Advisory Board for Schoolhouse Planning, U. S. Dept. of Education; American Institute of Architects. Author: *How America Builds*, 1926; *America New Building in the World*, 1929; co-author: *Preface to a Master Plan*, 1941.