

Newsweek

FEBRUARY 19, 1945

EDUCATION

School for Monsters



Future Gauleiters: GI's exposed the curriculum of a goosesteppers' college

Many German political leaders, army officers, and SS officers are graduates of the six *Ordensburgen* (schools for higher leaders) directed by Dr. Robert Ley, Reich Organization Leader of the Nazi party. These schools are not for youth but for men chosen for such offices as Gauleiter. The course is three years, with each year spent at a different school. Last week the American Ninth Infantry Division captured one of the six, Ordensburg-Vogelsang, and with it a pamphlet by Ley, "Der Weg zur Ordensburg" (The Way to the Ordensburg). The pamphlet gives these pointers on training for leadership in the New Order:

☐ For admission, students must have an "inner calling." There are no examinations for "we believe we can read one's mind and soul by looking straight into one's eyes and face."

☐ The schools teach race history, art history, philosophy, economics, social science, drawing-room procedure, and sports—mainly sports. All students are required to dive from a 30-foot board, whether or not they can swim. All students must learn "how to ride a horse, to rule the living animal with their iron will."

☐ "These men, to whom the National Socialist party now gives everything that a real man can hope for from life, must realize and keep in the bottom of their hearts that they are now dedicated to the order for life and death and that they must obey it without question."

☐ "These men must know and realize that from now on there is no road back for them. When the party takes the Brown Shirt away from anybody, the person involved will not only lose the office he holds, but he, personally, and his family, wife and children, will be destroyed."

☐ "Every National Socialist leader must know that he is climbing a steep grade. You can walk here only if you have the sleepwalker's sure touch. You can have this assurance only if you are inspired by an absolute belief in and unshakable loyalty to Adolf Hitler and his idea."

Ordensburgen

Salvaging the Humanities

The lot of the humanities—language and literature, the fine arts, music, philosophy, and history—is not a happy one in colleges and universities today. Their predicament distresses Dr. Fred B. Millett of Wesleyan University, and in “The Rebirth of Liberal Education,”* published this week, he surveys the situation and tells what to do about it.

Dr. Millett arrived at his diagnosis after an academic grand tour of American campuses, made in 1942 at the request of David H. Stevens, director of the humanities division of the Rockefeller Foundation. In eight months he canvassed six colleges and ten universities and subsequently expanded his notes into five provocative chapters.

Science the Bogeyman: Dr. Millett finds three basic reasons for the unpopularity of the liberal arts: (1) the great number of subjects offered undergraduates (multiplied in state universities by politics and local economic interests); (2) the attitude of the “normal extroverted American,” who demands vocational courses leading to material success; and (3) “most dangerous foe of the humanities—science and the scientific method.”

The way the humanists genuflect to the scientists irks Millett. Not, he says, that science doesn't have a legitimate place in the liberal arts. It is appropriate and necessary, for instance, in language study, but language is a medium and its end is literature. Whether Caesar crossed the Rubicon or not is a scientific fact, but it would be an insignificant one if Caesar were not a problematical, influential human being. Subjective evaluation has its place, too, and Millett sees no reason why humanists should develop inferiority complexes because they cannot measure their entire stock in trade by scientific yardsticks. Their students regularly break down material into such minute scientific segments, unrelated to other fields or to life, that the Ph.D. thesis has become “an industrious accumulation of facts more or less relevant to a subject of supreme unimportance.”

Millett sees hope of a revitalized liberal arts in experimental programs and new teaching methods. Cultural surveys and orientation courses cutting across departmental lines—stemming from the contemporary-civilization courses originated by Columbia after the last war—are offered at Colgate, Princeton, Stanford, and other institutions. The Chicago Plan introduces the student to basic fields of knowledge.

Down With Exams! The lecture-quiz-final exam sequence is on the way out, Millett finds. Comprehensive tests and small discussion groups are on the way in.

*Harcourt, Brace. 179 pages. \$2.

Ordensburgen

Universities are becoming student-centered instead of faculty-centered. But the most promising innovation in contemporary teaching, according to Millett, is the "Return to the Text" movement—studying the original works of art or literature instead of hearing lectures about them. Ironically, while men's colleges have preached "the apron-string virtues of dependence and docility," women's colleges have tried new programs; perhaps, as President Constance Warren of Sarah Lawrence says, because "fathers want their sons to have a *good* education, but don't care what kind their daughters have."

On the debit side, Millett draws an unflattering picture of the average liberal-arts professor. He is usually lower middle-class; "his incidence of neuroses is relatively high"; and his prestige and success depend upon inconsequential factors. The "born teacher," says Millett, is an actor-preacher, and when he has genuine scholarship in addition, he is a rare bird indeed.

The Prexy Can't Help: The teaching profession will pick up, Millett predicts, when instructors are selected more carefully and when graduate schools train teachers as well as scholars. But he warns against expecting too much of the college president, who is primarily the business agent of the trustees and not necessarily an educator.

Before guessing on the future of the humanities, Millett takes a pot shot at educators who have jettisoned them at the "drop of a brass hat": President Edmund Ezra Day of Cornell, who can say with no embarrassment: "Liberal education is out for the duration," and Dean Christian Gauss of Princeton, who maintains that a knowledge of Plato does not make a man a better soldier. Indignantly, Millett denies that the humanities can be rationed like beef.

In his opinion liberal-arts colleges have lost sight of their goals and need emphatically to reclarify them. Their objectives must be distinguished from those of professional and vocational education. Non-utilitarian, they do not and should not teach how to earn a living. "The humanities [they teach] rank highest because their disciplines are primarily concerned, not merely with physical or social, but with individual and humane values."

Newsweek