genuinely free men in the Swiss cantons, in the towns of Flanders and the Dutch Republic, and on the American frontier, who had never read Plato or Aristotle. They used their freedom, however, in a firm framework of shared values. The crucial problems are not concerned with the definition of the rights of free men but rather with the recognition of the dependence of those rights upon the existence of a common sense of responsibility, or, in other words, upon the vitality of shared loyalties. (Annual Report, 1940-41, Pages 11-12.)

TO SUM up: democracy depends on citizens with shared values and a capacity for team work. Such qualities are as important as a knowledge of government and history. They are the foundations of our free society. They are not developed by a purely intellectual education—and we cannot take it for granted that such qualities will be developed outside the school in the social and economic setting of contemporary America where the self-reliant family and community life of the past have given way to impersonal urban market pressures. Freedom must be defended on the battlefield today—but the species of free men and free women cannot be improvised in a few months of military training. It is a product of slow educational growth. It does not come out of textbooks, even if they are classics. It comes from shared experience—experience that develops a capacity for team work, for intelligent leadership as well as intelligent followership. It would be a mistake indeed to think of the process as a purely intellectual one. The best way to preserve a society that will be intellectually free is to recognize that the free man—the responsible citizen of a free society—is not merely a mind in a vacuum, but also a cooperative worker on a team, capable of give and take, responsive to human values. These are not qualities that emerge by accident and drift. In our past they developed out of our family, religious and frontier life. Today we shall have to build an educational program to develop such qualities deliberately and by design—and some of our current war experiences are pointing in a direction in which we shall find the educational instruments with which to achieve this purpose. In that sense educational reconstruction is as vital to freedom as the military struggle itself. (Annual Report, 1941-42, Page 9.)

ASKED whether there are any signs that his "shared activities" philosophy is being adopted in other colleges, Dr. Gideonse said:

"I certainly see stirrings in this direction. Even the educational benefits of military training point that way. It is being more generally real-

ized that the important thing is doing, as well as thinking, things together. As far as military service is concerned, it is bound to have important effects. The stress on mathematics and technical training will diminish after the need for them is gone, but the group activities, the shared work and experiences are bound to remain.

"I am convinced that one of our big mistakes about Fascism and Nazism at their beginnings was to reject everything they undertook. It was a false way of fighting them. They grew up in a bourgeois society, and the thing we should concentrate on is not what they did but the weaknesses they fed on. Their group activities caught on because these were the kind of activities that were ignored in Western society. I believe that we should learn from our enemies and find out what gave Fascism and Nazism their appeal. Then we would see what could legitimately be grafted on our tree.

"For instance, one of the finest expressions of group activity was the Sokol movement of the Czechs, and it was one of the reasons why they had so strong a democracy. And I've always felt that the Civilian Conservation Corps did a fine work, not in planting trees but in the rebuilding of men. Kids from the fringe of society, beaten before they were even started in life, were rehabilitated by the C.C.C. camps. And don't forget that the privileged youngsters needed this sort of group work and association as badly as the underprivileged.

"Since Brooklyn College students started going into the Army, I have a standing order that boys in uniform have priority in my office when they return on leave. I find that they are much better men than they were before, and I'm impressed by the fact that the Army has developed something our ordinary civilian educational program ignored or neglected."

DR. GIDEONSE is practicing what he preaches about "shared activities." During the past two years some 200 Brooklyn College students have worked together on farms in New York State over a ten weeks period, providing much-needed labor for crops and chores and at the same time getting precisely the kind of experience that their college president advocates so strongly. Ever since his Chicago days Dr. Gideonse has been championing "well-planned work camp experience" as a remedy for "some of the deficiencies in our present educational pattern." But as he wrote in his 1940-41 Annual Report as President of Brooklyn College:

The reception that was given to the suggestion gives a measure of the magnitude of our problem. On the left it was promptly labelled "fascist" because the Nazis have used such camps to achieve their own purposes. It should be clear, however, that the work camps were originally used on a small and voluntary scale under democratic auspices in the Weimar Republic to treat the very symptoms which later led to Nazi control, because the German Republic did not have the courage of its convictions when it came to the application of effective remedies. On the right the suggestion was promptly smeared with the label "communist" apparently on the ground that it carried an aroma of New Deal methods. It seems clear to me that we are likely to deprive ourselves of all effective therapy if we are to discard all ideas or techniques simply because some totalitarian government has also used them. If there is anything to the analysis which I have just presented, it follows that totalitarianism is a response to social symptoms that are also present—although still in a less acute form—in our own community. It is therefore extremely likely that they may have developed or extended devices which if used in time and with sufficient persistence, may achieve democratic ends.

We would hopelessly handicap ourselves in the race for survival if we condemned social means simply because they were also used by others to achieve ends that are not our own. The important thing is to keep our eyes on the ball, that is to say, on the preservation and enrichment of the values of a free and democratic society. Anything that can help us to achieve them more fully should be