

Dr Albert K. Heckel, professor of citizenship and dean of men at the University of Missouri, emphasized the need of trained scholars for the solution of the problems of civilization, at the annual Phi Beta Kappa banquet, May 9



The scholar as citizen

BY ALBERT KERR HECKEL

IT has been estimated that about thirty-two billion persons have reached maturity since the dawn of history. All of these billions played their parts on the world's stage. But few made impression enough to be remembered. Only about 5,000 individuals would merit enrollment in a Who's Who of the Universe. Another 125,000 have risen high enough above the level of mediocrity to deserve a place in history. It takes but a minute to name the few who have achieved a special eminence—heroic figures standing in bold outline against the sky. It is obvious that what we call our civilization is the product of a small intense minority. The average man has had little effect upon progress except to put on the brakes.

In my college days it was still the fashion among students to debate the question whether the man makes the times or the times make the man. We knew less about the laws of heredity then than we do now. Today the debate might have to do with the relative importance of heredity and environment. Some persons would have us believe that we are merely carried on "the tide in the affairs of men." They tell us that the Reformation would have occurred had Luther never lived; that we would have been the United States of America had there been no George Washington. Undoubtedly there have been great and inescapable mass movements which brought changes regardless of leaders. There have also been times when a logical course of events miscarried because the leader who was needed did not appear. Circumstance has had a hand in making history. But bound up in every great advance in human affairs we find

a man or a group of men of ability. These commanding spirits so dominated or directed the mass movements of their times as to change the destiny of mankind. We call their power leadership.

One of our present day critics tells us that in America we are now witnessing "the strangest spectacle in all human history"—we have leaders who do not lead. We hear much about the low state of American political life. Our problems of government are greater, more numerous, more complex than ever before, and we attempt to solve them by electing mediocre men to governmental positions. We are warned that the American constitutional government will give way to Bolshevism or some other radical program if our present delinquency in government is not remedied. This lack of leadership is not limited to political matters but touches many other phases of human activity. According to Everett Dean Martin, "The modern world is a ship with an empty pilot house, speeding through a fog."

A valuable book on American democracy, published in 1919, began as follows: "America today is in a somber, soul-questioning mood. We are in a period of clamor, of bewilderment, of an almost tremulous unrest." The same statement with even greater emphasis could be made of America in 1932. We are disturbed and heart-sick, paralyzed into apathy and inaction by our dilemmas. Between these two dates came the period of Harding "normalcy" and Coolidge refrigeration. Americans were governed by wish-fancies; they become inebriated with the easy profits of an orgy of speculation. Prosperity aroused a fanatic optimism which blinded everybody

to the grim shadow of the approaching collapse not only of our economic organization but of our political and social processes. And now the path of American civilization has become perilous. Menaces assail us from all sides and threaten to engulf us. One religious sect, reading the signs of the times, finds in them a fulfilment of the biblical prophecy of the end of the world. Many thinkers feel that civilization is a Frankenstein which threatens to destroy the men who built it.

In the light of all this, we have a right to ask our young people a very anxious question. What is their contribution to be toward a solution of our complex problems? In particular we wish to ask the young American scholar how he expects to function as a citizen of this topsyturvy world. If education as provided by the state is to justify itself, it must fit its beneficiaries to take some part in social management.

A few years ago, when our country entered the World war, the picked youth were drafted for military service. They were tested not only for physical fitness but for mental alertness and intelligence. Intelligence in the fighting man on the battlefield was considered of importance to the fate of the world. Is it not reasonable to assume that the problems of peace also can be solved only by intelligence—by honest and courageous intelligence, and not by stupidity? If the training which our young scholars have received in their formal education has been right, they ought to function as citizens so as to make a wholesome contribution to the life of their times. But some of our student critics tell us that all is not right with education. They say there is too

much emphasis on the accumulation of a mass of knowledge about what is dead and gone, not enough emphasis upon an adventure into new situations and new problems. Students complain that they are not gaining a coherent idea of the world in which they live—the present world of unbalanced budgets, of poverty, of unemployment, of labor struggles, of crime, of the many troubles which ache for remedies. One student critic tells us that college faculties have become “a haven for mediocre talent, worn-out or timid spirits, and retired missionaries.” Are these indictments true? Is education dispelling ignorance and bigotry? Or is it a fact that we are practicing evasions in our training of youth in order to escape from disagreeable or “dangerous” truths? What right have we to expect our young people of intelligence to establish new and needed sets of values if, as they tell us, their teachers and guides are pedants who have no acquaintance with life beyond the limits of the college campus? Can the monastic regime of the cloisters of higher learning fit the student to know the life of our America of today? The fragrance of the flower of a culture that is past has charm and sweetness; we need it; but will it drive us into battle for a better civilization? Our college graduates, turned out with a bachelor's degree and with little more than a meager equipment of half-digested knowledge, will face the world as it is, either with indifference or bewilderment or despair.

True scholarship cannot divorce itself from the changing problems of life. And regardless of what our youthful critics may say, scholarship in our American universities is beginning to venture beyond the musty tomes of conventional lore toward the laboratory and the experiment station; it is shifting its interest from a sterile philosophy which was of too little value in making citizens to a philosophy which is the guide of current life. The scholar of today and tomorrow will not confine his citizenship to a knowledge of the organization and functions of government, to the payment of his taxes, and the occasional exercise of suffrage. The purely political obligations of his citizenship will demand but little of his time. The scholar-citizen will be an agent in the world of affairs; he will accept responsibility as a dynamic member of society. He will have moral integrity. And moral integrity is based on intellectual integrity. He will need to know the institutions of society through which civilization functions—the family, economic organization, education, religion, and political organization. And he will need an attitude of mind which will enable him to penetrate the superficialities of propaganda and to free himself from the catch words of the propagandist. The scholar

will be free from idolatry to fetishes, shibboleths, and slogans. He will not be stampeded by half-truths, or lured by sugar-coated falsehoods. Bigotry will give way to tolerance; narrow partisanship to personal independence. Knowledge will give him insight; high purpose will give him courage.

Today our country is said to be the most lawless of all civilized nations. We have a convenient scapegoat in prohibition. But the crime wave was spreading before the passage of the Eighteenth amendment. While prohibition enforcement has frequently revealed a grotesque administration of law, there are more causes than this for the average of one murder a day. It is not because of prohibition alone that we are spending about a billion a year in the “defense of society.” Of course, we can adopt the selfish attitude of taking the world as we find it. But such fatalism is hardly worthy of the enlightened citizen, and it will never make for progress. It is little more intelligent than the belief of primitive peoples that the criminal was possessed of an evil spirit and was therefore inevitable. Society must accept its own responsibility for social mal-adjustments. It is logical that the scholar shall make these mal-adjustments his problem. With his knowledge of the laws of heredity, of psychology, and of sociology, he can discover the reasons for poverty and moral delinquency, and combat them.

Primary in importance as a social institution is the family. It was the starting point of human civilization. It not only produces new individuals for society, but it bequeaths from generation to generation the social heritage which man has built in his march from savagery to civilization. If, as Ruskin says, “there is no wealth but life,” wise statesmanship will be concerned over the quality of future American manhood and womanhood, and will seek to establish conditions favorable to the increase and preservation of the best in man, mentally and physically. The scholar should be equipped to discriminate between the achievements of critically scientific eugenics and illgrounded and uncritical propaganda. Doctor Pearl of Johns Hopkins University asserts that within the next two centuries America will have reached her maximum population of about two hundred million people. What sort of people will these Americans, yet unborn, be? Will they have a mental, physical, and moral endowment which will enrich our national life, or will they be a mass of dependents, defectives, and delinquents?

We are witnessing a break-down of our family life. The divorce rate has doubled within the past generation. Practically one marriage in every six may be expected to end in divorce. The cynic

exclaims, “There is no place like home—thank God!” But broken homes work cruel wrongs, particularly where there are children involved. The causes of the disintegration of marriage as a social institution are many and complex. Accordingly, the divorce problem will not solve itself. We can not solve it by evading it. Neither will it be solved by tinkering with divorce laws. Divorce is the result of underlying conditions which are interwoven with the very life of our people. The home is in competition with outside interests and agencies and institutions which are the product of history. The industrial revolution worked profound changes in our economic organization, and its influence ramified for good and for ill in every direction. One of the effects was to dislodge marriage as a supreme interest in the life of women, for the Revolution brought them a new freedom. To many women marriage becomes a fetter instead of a fulfillment. Moral and social chaos have resulted from the modification of ancient standards of value. Any elaboration of the underlying causes of family instability is impossible in this paper. But it is obvious that there can be no real solution of perplexities until their causes are understood. It is to the scholar that we must look for a constructive program. Fortified by scientific knowledge he can bring enlightenment to the public and arouse the public conscience to its social responsibilities.

Among the biggest problems which we face today are the economic problems. The world is in the grip of an unparalleled economic depression. Wealthy America could not escape it. Although our graneries are bulging with surplus food supplies, we have multitudes of hungry men desperate for bread. America is a land of plenty; at the same time she is a land of want because we have not learned how to manage plenty. Able-bodied men, eager to work, cannot find employment. Our capitalist system seems to be straining and cracking under its own weight, and it is being attacked from the outside by radical groups determined to bring about its collapse. Here again the causes are neither simple nor few. Industry itself is one of our most complex social institutions. And many of us fail to remember that our whole industrial system is little more than a century old. When about one hundred fifty years ago man began to supplant human muscle with mechanical power, he at once increased his store of benefits and the number and complexity of his troubles, troubles theretofore wholly unknown in the thousands of years of civilized existence—problems of the wage system, of class struggle, of congestion in population, of the factory system of production, of governmental regu-

THE SCHOLAR AS CITIZEN

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 315)

lation, and many others. All these problems took the world unawares. We were not prepared for them. And now our industrial system has become so complicated that it extends into almost every human relationship. It has become so powerful as to threaten the very foundation of our democracy. The laborer is in danger of becoming dehumanized, a mere cog in a machine. Our task is to conserve the great gains of industrial evolution without destroying personal human values, the happiness and well-being of men and women. Chaotic muddling will not serve. The task demands the most capable, the most intelligent statesmanship we can muster.

The profound and rapid changes which are going on in our civilization are putting new demands upon another of our major institutions—the school. The subject-matter of our education of yesterday is likely to prove inadequate to the needs of our society of tomorrow. There must be a change in the content and spirit of our college teaching and study—at least a change in emphasis. We used to be satisfied to define the education of a man as the “harmonious development of all his powers.” We were thinking of the individual within himself. Now we can no longer think of any man as an individual but as a member of society impinging upon and being impinged upon by other members of society. We think of him in his changing human relationships. Our mental processes have not kept up with them. Doctor Glenn Frank, in a notable address several months ago, made the statement that western capitalism must make a change in its philosophy. Quoting him: “it must put the social function of industry above the private interests of the industrialists... its primary and its secondary objectives... must change places.” Discussing the subject further, he said: “Something has happened to American individualism in the last few years... There is no longer anything sacred in the name.” Doctor Frank’s observations may well be applied to American education. In our present uncontrolled world we must socialize the processes of education. We have need of the trained scholar who can diagnose the intricate causes of our ills and exercise a dependable part in their cure. We need as never before in all history, citizens who can think straight, men without bias or bigotry, men who have reason for their opinions and who have the executive and moral training to carry their opinions into action for the salvation of society.

In discussing the functions of the citizen we cannot overlook an institution which has been one of the strongest of forces affecting government—the institution of religion. Its influence has been

ever-present, because religion springs from the deepest sources in human nature. The destiny of nations has been determined by stern virtues, and moral enthusiasms, and devotion to ideals which were made vital by man’s faith in spiritual values. Unless we regard life as without meaning, a senseless event in a purposeless world which ends in oblivion, we must commit ourselves to some philosophy of life. William James observed that “No one of us can get along without the far-flashing beams of light which philosophy sends over the world’s perspectives.” We are not now concerned in doctrine, or dogma, or conflicting sects, or in the relative merits of fundamentalism or modernism, but in a guiding theory of life based on a living faith—not a faith built on superstition, but on the truths of science; nor a religion measured by the size of a church building but the ideas and ideals which have creative power. The scholar needs not only mental but moral daring. He may not find institutional and creedal religion of any interest to him, but he surely must realize the need of some moral and spiritual force in this complicated civilization of ours. We have not had very happy success in our efforts to make people good by legislation. The home, the school, and even the church are failing to supply the inner convictions which make for triumphant living. If it be true, as one American scholar has said, that “no great civilization has ever outlasted the demise of its religious faith,” then religion may well be a matter of positive and intelligent concern to the public-spirited citizen.

Good citizenship calls for an understanding of the great social institution—government. Yet the governmental problems which contemporary civilization has created require a higher degree of enlightenment than the average citizen is capable of showing. Besides the average citizen does not consider special training as a necessary qualification in the representative whom he selects to make his laws. That legislator will have to deal with questions of taxation, international finance, reparations, public health, international relations, and a multitude of other issues of finance, and trade, and business which would tax the powers even of men of soundly educated ability. But democracy distrusts intelligence; it sneers at the “scholar in politics.” Outstanding leaders such as Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Wilson were chosen to the presidency by accident or political fluke. It is estimated that one out of every ten workers in America is a governmental employee, and that only about 15 per cent of the public servants are qualified by character, education, and experience for their positions. In spite of all this, the condition of our democracy seems to be a matter of diminishing im-

portance to the voter. Only about 50 per cent of the persons eligible to vote are interested in exercising their suffrage. This political indifference is doubtless due to cynicism over political corruption and incompetency. But we shall continue to have these abuses so long as our “best minds” keep out of politics because it is “dirty.” We lament the lack of adequate leadership. But democracy shows little capacity for what has recently been termed followership. All too often democracy flays and crucifies its great leaders, and chooses to follow second rate men. Democracy is safe only when it will put its trust in well-informed and competent leaders. No scheme of popular government has succeeded without them.

What part would we have the American scholar take in this enterprise of social management? There is a common legend among college men that the student who makes high grades never amounts to much in after years, at least not in the world of practical affairs. He is thought to be too visionary, too bookish, too “high hat” to fit into the hurly-burly of life. It is the man who has been in extra curriculum activities who is expected to be a leader after he leaves college. The “activity” may be an altogether superficial one, and the undergraduate who has taken part in it may be altogether shallow minded, yet his participation is supposed to train him for the realities of life. This is a legend based on student near-sightedness. There is abundant statistical evidence to refute it. According to Mr Walter Pitkin: “For the first time in recorded history, the best minds are gaining control of business, politics, and social welfare.” Quoting him further, “The fighter long ago yielded to the man of cunning. The man of cunning is now slowly yielding to sheer intelligence. And little by little all the institutions of war and cunning are crumbling. Over their reeking ruins men of the twentieth century are erecting a new society which is being planned and managed by brains.” We may not wholly agree with Mr Pitkin, but I believe it to be true that education, instead of being a handicap in the world of affairs, is coming to be an absolute essential. Governor Cross of Connecticut, who went into political life from a university deanship, has recently sought to interest young college men in politics. He frankly discusses the obstacles to their entry upon a political career. He makes it clear that, “the political scene is no place for the anaemic dilettante, who is unwilling and unable to learn how to meet hard blows and stubborn opposition.” But he also shows the opportunity which exists for the well equipped young citizen who learns the needs of our democracy to bring his trained mind to the service of the public welfare.

But whether or not our scholar enters officially into the political arena, he has an equipment which should cause him to be an interested citizen in the important social and governmental affairs of his country. The mere mention of Russia in any class room is enough to arouse even the drowsy student to a show of interest. This is not strange, for Russia is in the throes of a vast experiment; she is attempting to forge a new life, organize a new order, create a new outlook for the Russian people; and youth is intrigued by the mere adventure of it all. Yet the problem of politics in America is just as closely and immediately bound up with life itself as is Bolshevism in Russia.

We do not ask the scholar to be a reformer in the technical sense; we do not ask that he be a radical, or a conservative; but we do want him to be intelligent. What, for example, will be his attitude toward one of the major questions now before the American people, that of prohibition? It is a question which will never be settled by a battle of words between two sets of extremists.

We anxiously scan the horizon for the appearance of a new leadership, for the man of new power, freed from old familiar futilities which will lead us nowhere. We also realize that democracy is dependent upon a citizenry intelligent enough to recognize and follow right leadership. Is it expecting too much of our colleges and universities to ask that they furnish both the enlightened leaders and an enlightened body of graduates who will be a leaven of high social and political activity in the citizen mass. It is a big order.

▲ ▲ ▲

USING YOUR 1932 LEISURE TIME

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 317)

zens are prone to blame present conditions 100 per cent upon the stock crash. They forget that hundreds of thousands of men had been thrown out of work by mergers, by new machines and improved industrial methods, many months before the descent in the price of securities.

A report of the National Bureau of Economic Research shows that in the eight-year period from 1922 to 1929 the increase in the per capita productivity in manufacturing amounted to thirty-five per cent. The rise in the use of mechanical power was three and three-quarters times as fast as the growth in population. The horsepower available to the American worker today is three and one half times as much as that at the disposal of the English worker. The thirty-five cent per capita increase in the productivity in manufacturing was achieved by seven per cent fewer workers in 1929 than in 1922.

Direct results of this hectic industrialization may be summarized under the following heads—first, the insecurity of the

worker's job; second, technological conditions which have thrown hundreds of thousands of working men into unemployment; third, the elimination of men over forty years of age from industry; fourth, the fact that too much slack is seen between the displacement of workers and the development of new industries to utilize their services, and fifth and finally, the loss of skill by the worker.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, secretary of the interior, has referred to the 1930 census figures which show 557 major occupations with thousands of specialized jobs, illustrating our modern complexity. He has found that more than 300 occupations have ceased to exist in the past one hundred years. Unemployment today does not present the comparatively simple task of finding another job—it presents the complex task of educating the worker to fit his efforts into another, entirely different line of work.

Millions of workmen, now jobless, are stabbing around in the dark, hunting jobs, living with relatives, losing their initiative and morale, many of them unemployed because they are not prepared for a new kind of employment. Educators have accepted the challenge with the installation of correspondence courses, extension class work and the numerous other activities of Extension Division work as conducted in forty-two state universities. Extension class work increased more than 250 per cent between 1921 and 1929, the enrollment growing from 59,399 to 152,095 students. In addition many correspondence schools offer help to a large number of people.

Other motives for adult education, in addition to the matter of presenting educational opportunities to those who are economically handicapped, are found in the field of working out an adjustment of maladjusted personalities—or taking the round worker from the square-holed job; and also in the field of providing a continuous cultural development medium for the individual. The scope of adult education is vast. Its opportunities are almost limitless.

Thus we find that the big work in education in future years will include attention to the needs of adults. Adult education is an American institution. In Europe and Asia, a man stays in the class where he is born. He receives a rudimentary education in his youth and then his future is fixed. He has no opportunity to change his environment, such as is available to Americans. His level is fixed. In America, opportunity awaits the efforts of the individual. Education late in life may bring as much happiness and worthwhile accomplishment as that secured in early years. Today, a man may study as successfully at forty as at fifteen. He may fit himself for some specific job or he may improve himself in a cultural way for the full enjoyment of life.

The bright spot in the industrialization

of our nation and our workers is seen in the increase in the leisure time. Unemployment has given many men limitless time and opportunity for study. The worker with a job today can use his leisure time, at least partially, in study and self-improvement. He should be keenly alert to these possibilities in his job, and if he views unemployment ahead, prepare himself by means of educational facilities for employment in a better field, or some new field. If he is a round peg in a square hole, he can attain happiness and usefulness by preparation for a more suitable job.

Every American is entitled to individual growth and improvement and the joy that comes from living a useful life to the fullest degree. In the home, this means education for parents as well as for children. It has been said that the ideal home is not a paternalism of parents nor a bolshevism of adolescents but a partnership in which the experiences of the elders are blended with the experiments of the younger.

Education, to be successful, must be considered a continuous process, enduring from the cradle to the grave. The facilities are increasing with the tremendous growth in the extension division of our universities and correspondence schools. The increasing tendency toward purposeful study and self-improvement, definitely exhibited in recent years, brings a hopeful view to the consideration of Mr Babson's statement that leisure time will either make or break America. I feel that we will continue to take advantage of this leisure time and make a new and better America by creating more alert, better informed Americans.

▲ ▲ ▲

EXIT—KING HALL

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 304)

one could hardly get into his room. I remember one was the *New York Times* and another was the *Oklahoman*."

E. P. R. Duval, associate professor of mathematics and W. S. Campbell, associate professor of English, remembered Reverend Griffith as a scholarly gentleman of architectural ability.

Mrs Fayette Copeland, wife of Fayette Copeland, associate professor of journalism, lived at King Hall while in school here. "Architecture was Rev. Griffith's hobby," she recalled. "His room was hung with many pictures of fine buildings."

And speaking of the house mother, Mrs Copeland said: "Miss Roscoe was a woman of very high ideals and she, like Reverend Griffith, was very interesting in conversation."

"Miss Roscoe's life had a beautiful influence over those with whom she came in contact," said Dr Lucile Dora, professor of French, and a close friend and admirer of Miss Roscoe. "Sororities were eager to have as their members women