From a constructive point of view, the existing college represents for the most part tendencies rather than design. It has in the main simply come to be what it now is. True, the gardeners have pruned a bit here and tied up a bit there. But the hedge has been trampled down, and things have been suffered to grow with less regard to the demands of the market than to the fertility of the soil. Provisionally, this style of farming has its advantages. It at least instructs us as to what will grow under given conditions. There comes a time, however, when indiscriminate abundance and variety must submit to a process of evaluation; when wasteful natural productivity is no longer best adapted to meet the demonstrated or calculable needs of a well-defined social organization; when, in a word, we must ask which part of the crop has value, and to what end. This necessity is, I take it, reflected in the question proposed for to-day’s discussion.

Two things have happened in higher education during the last thirty years: in the richer and more progressive sections of the country the traditional one-curriculum college has been practically demolished; the graduate school has been evolved. The demolition of the old-fashioned college helped, of course, to make a clearing for the graduate school, and the concurrent growth of the graduate school

---

1 An address given before the Section of Education at the Baltimore meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.