

Exhibit 5

From W.S. Bender - Sept. 18, 1952

File
Cm.A. Policy

CONFIDENTIAL

Discussed at dinner meeting of Committee
Oct. 1, 1952

I. ADMISSION POLICY

There has never been a comprehensive formal statement of Harvard College admission policy. In fact, until relatively recent years there was no real need for such a statement. Admission was a comparatively simple matter when students came to Harvard from a small number of schools in which a common pattern of preparation for college had been followed. The job of the Admission Committee was simply to select from among those who applied for admission those who appeared to have the ability to do acceptable work in the College. The size of the Freshman Class was determined until 1921 by the number of qualified applicants. The only problem was the technical one of setting and administering admission examinations to weed out the clearly incompetent. There was no thought of recruiting students. It was assumed that Harvard would naturally attract enough of the right kind of applicants.

Gradually this situation has changed, however. Quotas have been set limiting the size of the entering class and the number of applicants has increased so that we have a serious problem of selecting a certain number to be admitted from among a much larger number of applicants who are able to do satisfactory academic work at Harvard. Principles of selection, therefore, have to be established, which means that there must be some reasonably clear conception of the kind of student body we want.

Furthermore, we are no longer content to sit back and let students seek out Harvard. One looks back nostalgically at an earlier and simpler day when, if any one had thought about it, it would have seemed beneath Harvard's dignity to recruit students. It would be

TRIAL EXHIBIT
P61
 SFFA v. Harvard
 exhibitster.com

interesting to experiment with the abandonment of active recruiting and see what would happen. But we don't dare to make this experiment, if for no other reasons because our natural rivals, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth and the Little Three are all engaged in energetic recruiting campaigns. The die was cast early in Mr. Conant's Presidency and it is impossible to reverse the process, to unscramble the omelet. With the introduction of the National Scholarship plan in 1934, we began to recruit consciously in an effort to get both more very able students and to broaden our geographic distribution.

When we recruit, however, we are again confronted, as we are by the need to select some from a larger number of candidates, with the necessity of deciding on what kind of student body we want at Harvard. What kind or kinds of students are we trying to attract to Harvard?

The admission problem at Harvard today, therefore, may be stated as follows. What kind of student body do we want at Harvard and how do we get it? The "how do we get it" part of the problem has two phases: recruiting and selection. Since we have been recruiting and selecting for some years now, we obviously have certain conceptions in mind as to both the kind of students we want and the best methods of recruiting and selection. But these conceptions have never been formally stated. There are dangers in trying to crystallize and formulate logical policies dealing with a problem involving such complex and intangible matters as these. One could write a beautiful statement of admission policy which would be logical and high-principled within itself and have little relation to the complicated and illogical realities of Harvard and the college admissions picture generally. Such a policy statement if taken too seriously and too rigidly might do great damage. It is not always necessary to be able to state clearly what you are doing to be able to do a good job. Many pretty blue-prints have been mis-

erable failures when applied.

Nevertheless, I think the time has come to attempt to set down a comprehensive statement of admission policy, in an effort to clarify our own ideas as to what we are trying to do and to lay down the most effective possible program for achieving our goals. I say this not just because I have an innate prejudice in favor of conscious, considered policies and against playing by ear. I believe that such a statement can have great value as a guide for planning and action, that we can have a more effective admission program for Harvard than we now have if we have consciously thought out what we are trying to do and how best to do it—always provided, of course, that we look upon such a statement not as gospel but as a working guide subject to, and indeed requiring, constant revision or elaboration in the light of experience and the wisdom of the group who are implementing it.

Furthermore, the present is a logical time for attempting a comprehensive statement of policy. This is partly because the evaluation of the admission problem and Harvard admission policy has reached a stage where the problems, possible policies and their implications are sufficiently clear to make possible the kind of statement and agreement which would have been difficult ten years ago. It is partly also because, in my opinion, our present admission program is sufficiently unsatisfactory to require a searching reconsideration and possibly drastic overhauling. And it is because a shift in administration is about to take place. Harvard admissions no longer will be a one-man operation; it will be a group operation and it is essential that when the new group takes over it have some kind of reasonably clear, if tentative, idea of what it is going to do.

This paper, then, is an attempt to analyze the Harvard admission problem, to state the goals which the admission program should

try to achieve, and to formulate the specific methods by which we will attempt to reach those goals. It is written with full realization of the complexities and the difficulties involved, and with no pride of opinion. What I say here should be read critically. It is intended as a basis for discussion, not as a final program for action.

Discussion should start with an analysis of Harvard College. We have here no tabula rasa. We have to go on from where we are. And Harvard is a very special kind of place with roots deep in the past, with a special kind of appeal and special hostilities earned, with unique associations and ideas and impressions current about it, rational and irrational, which have developed over the years. An admission program not based on a realistic assessment of the special nature and qualities and reputation of Harvard, as far as they affect admissions, is bound to fail.

Furthermore, although I believe that the Harvard student body can to some extent be consciously shaped by proper recruiting and selection policies, the extent is limited. By far the most important single factor in determining who comes to Harvard is the nature of the College, the kind and quality of educational experience it offers. I modify that statement by saying that it is only partly what Harvard is that determines our drawing power. It is really what Harvard appears to be, what people think it is. And in a sense the whole admission job is a public relations job or an educational job—a job of making clear in the right places just what Harvard is and is not, what is the nature of the education, the experience available in Cambridge. But I venture the opinion that about three quarters of our admission candidates are attracted to Harvard because of what the College is, or what they think it is, or at least for good or bad reasons unconnected with any recruiting activities. Recruiting may affect significantly the remaining

one quarter, and it could conceivably have such results that it would eventually affect far more than that. Nevertheless such the most important single thing affecting admissions is what goes on in Harvard College. The most important contribution that can be made to the admission program is to keep Harvard College strong, to provide here the highest quality of education. Recruiting will not be successful if Harvard provides an inferior education although the existence of inferior education might be concealed for some time.

II. WHO COMES TO HARVARD

No one can state simply or with certainty why students pick Harvard or, even less, why they don't pick Harvard. Students usually don't know themselves exactly why they select the particular college they do, although they can usually find reasons of some sort when asked. A variety of rational and non-rational factors determine such choices. Motives are likely to be mixed within any individual, and probably no two individuals make up their minds on exactly the same basis. Nevertheless it may be useful to generalize about this question on the basis of general impressions, fallible as such evidence is, and to try to define the most important categories of dominant motives which attract students to Harvard now.

As already pointed out, it is essential that one look realistically at the situation. We have a better chance of molding the future if we understand the factors with which we are dealing. So we must start with an analysis of the kinds of people who come to Harvard now and their reasons for coming. Then we can try to state the kind of realistically ideal student body we want to have and lay out a program for getting from here to there.

Harvard College is something like the elephant as described

by the blind men. It looks different to different people. Probably it has a greater diversity of types of students coming for a greater diversity of reasons, seeking a greater diversity of goals, and having a greater diversity of experiences than any college in the country. Nevertheless in my opinion there is a limited number of somewhat overlapping categories of types of individuals and motives which will include a majority of the student body. The most important ones are the following:

1. Harvard sons. About 20% of the Freshman class have Harvard fathers. This is, of course, a varied group ranging from brilliant to dumb, from Porcellian to social meatball, from wealthy to poverty-stricken. By and large, however, it is probably an upper middle-class, non-scholarship, scholastically average group with somewhat weaker intellectual motivation than the average of the class. The distinguishing common element in this group is the fact that all of them have come to Harvard to some extent because their fathers went there, which in itself is perhaps not a very good reason for picking a college.

2/ Sons of Greater Boston social and financial upper-bracket families. To a considerable extent this overlaps with the first group, but not entirely. Princeton, Yale, Williams and even Dartmouth are increasingly popular with these families, but Harvard is still the place to go for contacts and social acceptance. This is a small group and its reasons for choosing Harvard are largely non-intellectual.

3. Another and similar small group coming from what sociologists would call the "upper-upper" social classes throughout the country,

but particularly from the large cities of the Northeast. This group also overlaps with the two previous ones. It is composed largely of graduates of the "snob" schools like Groton, St. Mark's, St. Paul's and Milton, but increasingly because of economic vicissitudes it is coming from a wider range of schools.

The first three groups provide our social elite. Almost all of our final club members come from these groups. For practical reasons they have importance beyond their intrinsic worth as individuals. They offer both a special opportunity to the College and special problems and hazards. They add a strong flavor to the peculiar mixture that is Harvard. Hitherto they have exercised a far stronger influence on the University, on the alumni, and perhaps on society than their numbers and individual talents alone would justify. The existence at Harvard of as large a group of this sort as we have is one of the distinguishing things about Harvard. Its extent is exaggerated outside of the College, and it is responsible for the label of "snob" or "rich man's college" on Harvard and for its reputation as an aristocratic institution. Harvard, for good or for ill, is still one of the small number of colleges which is socially acceptable among our "best" families, Yale and Princeton being the other two chief representatives of this category. Whether this is desirable or not is another question, but it is one of the facts with which we have to deal in thinking about this unique institution.

4. At the other end of the social scale is a sizable group, perhaps 20% of the College, who come from middle and lower income groups in eastern Massachusetts. Our commuters, now about 15% of the College, are in this group, but a good many of them live in residence of course. These students also have a variety of motives. Some come

in order to climb on the social ladder, others because they can't afford to go elsewhere. Except for M. I. T., which appeals only to a special and limited group, and to some extent Tufts, Harvard is the only respectable or, perhaps better, the only "prestige" college in eastern Massachusetts, and it inevitably has a strong drawing power for the abler and more ambitious boys in this heavily populated area, or for the sons of ambitious parents. This group includes some of our finest if least polished students. It also includes some of our least desirable ones. It is an important group numerically--without it we would have difficulty in filling the College. It adds a distinctive note to the College, helping to differentiate it from Yale and Princeton, which have few commuters and local residents. Without it we would face serious housing problems. It creates special problems of assimilation and handling. Political and public relations problems are involved. We have thought little about this group in the past and we need to study the problems involved here carefully. It is my impression that while we have a strong appeal for the able and ambitious poor boys in this area we do not get our share of the able boys from middle-income families. They tend to go to Dartmouth, the Little Three, etc. This is largely a matter of cultivating the better suburban high schools, Newton, Wellesley, Winchester, Needham, etc. As Boston expands into the suburbs, this problem will become more serious.

5. Fifth is a special group of uncertain size, intellectual, musical or esthetic individuals, or sons of families with strong intellectual or esthetic interests, culturally considerably more sophisticated than the average American student and coming largely from metropolitan centers particularly in the East. Perhaps to this should be added those from unusually "liberal" families, with an

unusual concern for academic freedom, political liberalism, etc. ~~There~~ There is a high percentage of Jewish boys in this group. Harvard, more than any comparable institution, has a strong appeal for people of this sort. Its diversity, its tolerance or indifference, its high intellectual and cultural standards, its location in a metropolitan center with theatres and music, its tradition of producing writers, poets and intellectuals of various sorts, makes it an obvious place for such people to consider. This group includes a considerable number of our most interesting and potentially significant students. It also includes some of our most unattractive and undesirable ones, the effeminate, the precious and affected, the unstable.

6. An upper middle class group, sons of successful professional and business men, doctors, lawyers, bankers, corporation executives, independent small business men, etc., most of whose fathers have attended other colleges although some have attended Harvard graduate schools. These are likely to come from middle and larger cities or their wealthier suburbs and to have attended good suburban high schools or country day type private schools or the less fashionable boarding schools. They are mostly paying customers and they have varying degrees of intellectual motivation. They form a solid middle class in the College.

7. Finally there is a group of able, ambitious boys, usually scholarship boys and usually the only boys from their schools, coming from all over the country, small towns or big cities, who have heard of Harvard through a teacher or an alumnus or just because of its general reputation. The fact that they are interested and challenged by a college like Harvard, strange and remote and known as a tough place, is an indication of their independence and their mettle. This is perhaps the most promising group we have. They may have unhappy moments

of adjustment, but in general they take care of themselves and contribute an unusual amount of leadership to the College.

III. WHY THEY DON'T CHOOSE HARVARD

Having discussed in perhaps dangerously over-simplified and impressionistic fashion the categories of students who come to Harvard, a word should be said about the factors which lead students not to come to Harvard. The only study of this important question with ~~with~~ any pretension to scientific validity is that made by Professor Stauffer in 1947, based on a questionnaire answered by most of the Freshman class. What I have to say is based on that study and on my own observations and impressions.

This is a real question. Harvard is the oldest, the richest, the most famous and, with all modesty, the best college in the United States. We have a male college population in this country of over a million. Yet we have had some difficulties in filling a Freshman Class of 1100 with desirable students, and other colleges of approximately our size have had more applicants than Harvard in recent years. Why doesn't Harvard have 5000 or 10,000 applicants each year instead of 2500?

If we had five or ten thousand applicants, expensive and difficult problems would be created. Obviously our goal is better, not more applicants. Yet this question should be explored. The answer can be found in the special nature of Harvard, in its reputation and in the attitudes of the country towards college education. I think the chief factors which influence prospective college students not to choose Harvard are the following:

1. Harvard's location. The general pattern of college at-

tendance in this country is local. The overwhelming majority of college students attend colleges near their homes or in the same state. This is partly a matter of cost, partly a matter of not necessarily undesirable provincialism and social mores. Harvard is further removed from the center of population than any of the great American universities except those on the Pacific Coast. It is a New England college, and lots of people don't like New England, because of its weather, its reputed aloofness and affectness or for other reasons. In trying to develop its national drawing power Harvard runs counter to the dominant national pattern of localism, of over-protection of the young, of suspicion of the unknown, the foreign, the exotic. There is also a common feeling that there is a definite practical advantage for future business and professional men and socially to attend a state or local college and make the right contacts which will be useful in later life in their own communities.

There is the further handicap that Harvard is located in a rather drab and noisy and traffic-ridden part of a metropolitan center. It is a city college and has little of the obvious eye and sentimental appeal of the college in a college town like Princeton or Amherst or Dartmouth or Williams. Some people like the metropolitan surroundings, the theatre, music, night clubs, social goings-on, etc. and wouldn't be caught dead in Hanover, but for those who like the out of doors, quiet, peace, rural beauty, etc., the desire to go to Harvard has to be very strong to overcome the disadvantages of our location. Fortunately, Yale is even worse off in this respect and has practically none of the advantages of the metropolis unless one can afford to commute to New York.

Yet there are a lot of families who want to send their sons

to an Eastern college, or even a New England college, because of the general "quality" reputation of the older private Eastern colleges or their relatively high social standing. There are many families who want their sons to attend a national college rather than a more provincial local college. Why don't we get a larger share of candidates from these families?

2. Harvard's cost Harvard is an expensive college. For a residential student who has to travel any distance the overall cost for a year at Harvard is now about \$2000 and the end of increases is not yet in sight. True, Harvard is no more expensive than Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, the Little Three, etc., although there may be a vague feeling that we are more costly because of our reputation as a rich man's college. Middle-class families may feel that it will be expensive to keep up with the rich Joneses in Cambridge. The problem of cost, however, does not really affect us seriously in our competition for customers with eastern private colleges. It affects us in competition for good boys with state institutions and private colleges in other parts of the country where costs may be five hundred to a thousand dollars a year less than they are at Harvard. A family with three children to educate can not pay \$2000 per year for one child out of current income unless the income is \$15,000 per year or more. And it becomes increasingly difficult to save money in advance to pay for college under present tax conditions. We have long been out of range of lower income families unless the sons could commute or get sizable scholarships. We are now getting out of range of middle and upper middle income families and the situation is getting progressively worse rather than better. Furthermore, there appears to be little prospect that we will ever be able to give more than twenty-five per cent of our students scholarship assistance. The crucial importance

of a highly developed and intelligently run employment, loan and scholarship program is clear. And we need to study further the possibilities in loans of an installment-buying program for middle and upper middle income families.

3. Harvard's high academic standards. More than any other college except M.I.T., with which we do not seriously compete, Harvard has a reputation for toughness. It is thought by the innocent to be tough to get into and tough to stay in. It is felt by many that a student has to work so hard to keep his head above water academically and is under such constant academic pressure that no one except the brilliant student can enjoy the normal pleasures of college life, and the danger of flunking out in disgrace is serious. It is felt that the only person who belongs at Harvard is the valedictorian, the obvious intellectual or the white-faced grind. Our National Scholarship program has probably strengthened this feeling, as has the fact that in most smaller communities a thousand miles or more from Cambridge the only students who have come to Harvard are occasional individuals with exceptional academic records who have received scholarships.

The association of the name of Harvard with outstanding professional schools of law, medicine and business which have a reputation for high standards and being tough to get in and stay in reinforces these notions about the College. The distinction between the College and the graduate schools is blurred and fuzzy in most people's minds. In the hinterland it is all Harvard and all tough.

The fact is, of course, that Harvard does have very high academic standards and should have, although very few flunk out-- probably as small a proportion as at any college in the country--

and it is much less difficult to secure admission under the new College Board examinations and present admission conditions than is generally imagined outside the East. High standards are our strength and part of our appeal. We do not want mediocre students or boys without intellectual interests or potential. The problem is to reach the boys of superior ability and superior human qualities who are not valedictorians, grinds or young "intellectuals".

4. Harvard's social atmosphere or reputation. This is a complex matter, related to the previous point and probably based on an even greater distortion of the facts and vague impressions than anything else about Harvard. There is a common impression that Harvard is a "snob" college, dominated by millionaires' sons from the big eastern cities, by graduates of fashionable boarding schools such as Groton, St., Mark's, St. Paul's, etc. The ambitious, well-to-do high school or private day school graduate from the south or mid-west fears he will not be socially accepted at Harvard or will not have the same opportunities for social satisfactions or leadership as he would at a fraternity college or a different kind of college at least.

The general reputation for academic toughness reinforces this impression. How can a college filled with valedictorians, grinds and intellectuals be a socially pleasant place? How can you have any fun when you have to work so hard all the time and the boys are talking about Plato and Picasso? It is precisely the group of potential paying customers from outside the Northeast, the able boys from families with some cultural background and social position in their own communities who are most affected by considerations of this sort. These are the boys for whom colleges like the Little Three and Dartmouth have a strong appeal.

The well-publicized football defeats of recent years also strengthen this impression. The low state of football is assumed to be typical of all sports. Occasional reports of victories in crew and squash don't help much because these are exotics--unAmerican, effete, Eastern snob sports. Clearly a college which gets liked all the time in the great American game of football has no college spirit, few good fellows and no vigorous, healthy social life.

5. Harvard's coldness and impersonality and lack of concern for undergraduate teaching. It is widely believed that while Harvard may have a highly distinguished faculty, the faculty isn't much interested in teaching undergraduates and frequently is incapable of teaching them, and therefore undergraduate education at Harvard is inferior. The faculty's main concern is research, publication, the writing of books and working with graduate students. They have no time for or interest in undergraduates and merely give routinized lectures to large classes. This is contrasted with the small college where classes are small, the student is supposed to be on intimate terms with his professors and the professors are pictured as tweedy, pipe-smoking, salty characters with plenty of leisure to sit around with their students. It is commonly said that the professional schools dominate Harvard at the expense of the College and that Harvard is a good place to go for serious professional study at the graduate level, but that one should go elsewhere for good and enjoyable undergraduate education. While the graduate schools, particularly Law, Medicine and Business, play an important role in attracting certain students to Harvard College, there is no doubt that they also damage the appeal of the College in many cases.

To this feeling about the attitude of the faculty, the size

of classes, the lecture and examination system, there is frequently added a feeling that the whole policy of the College in handling students is an impersonal, sink-or-swim one, which may work out all right for the unusually mature and highly-motivated and intelligent student who knows what he wants, but is very rough on the normal uncertain Freshman. There is further the reputation of Harvard students for cliquishness, aloofness, indifference, rudeness, lack of warmth and loyalty and college spirit, the Yankee background, the "snob" reputation. All of this adds up to a pretty gloomy, repellant picture, with unfortunately a certain amount of hard fact behind it.

6. Harvard's radicalism. This charge affects particularly students from upper-income, business backgrounds and has become much stronger in recent years. It is part of a general attitude of anti-intellectualism, of fear of "dangerous" ideas, of hostility to free investigation and free discussion now current in the U. S. Harvard as the great champion of academic freedom is the special target of people with such attitudes and fears. Constant sneering goes on in certain circles, and the unfortunate number of publicized cases of Harvard men like Hiss and Frederick Vanderbilt Field who have either been Communists or are widely believed to be, adds fuel to the flames.

There are other charges that are often made linked with charges of Harvard radicalism or communism and with about as much basis. The most serious of these is that Harvard is full of pansies or decadent esthetes or precious sophisticates. It is also alleged that we are dominated by Jews, that we are Godless, that we have a high percentage of mental breakdowns and suicides, that in general we are an unhealthy, overly and sterilely intellectualized place out of touch and out of sympathy with the main healthy currents of American life.

How much this kind of thing affects people whom we would like to have at Harvard is questionable. Indirectly it probably has significantly damaging effects by creating a vague uneasiness in certain circles, an attitude of doubt and distrust of Harvard which tends to make parents less likely to consider Harvard seriously or favorably for their sons. When colleges like Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Williams, etc. are available with apparently most of Harvard's advantages and not smeared, or smeared as much by those rumours and fears, why take a chance on Harvard? The charges may not be true, but again they may, and on such impressions and intangibles decisions turn. The net impact of these things is certainly, damaging to our drawing power among paying customers.

Related, but with a somewhat more solid basis, is a feeling that Harvard is too little concerned with character, with moral values, with principles. That we put too much emphasis on subject matter and not enough on significance, too much on mere brains, on high IQ, on verbal facility and not enough on judgment and thoughtfulness and responsibility. That we turn out too many rather glib, self-centered, slick, smart-aleck types, clever asses, men who have developed tools and techniques but not their souls, that we turn out too many smart operators and competent specialists and not enough solid-citizens, responsible community leaders, men with force and spark and broad, human qualities. I think there is something in this, though less than there is at most colleges. Here is a fundamental educational problem of our time, not just a Harvard problem. From the point of view of public relations at least, a revived Harvard Divinity School may have considerable influence on this problem.

IV. HARVARD CHARACTERISTICS

I have not attempted to evaluate the objections to Harvard

just mentioned. Obviously some of it is absurd, some malicious, some based on ignorance, some distorted or oversimplified or irrelevant. To some extent the widespread criticism is a tribute to Harvard's preeminence and its integrity. Any institution or individual which stands out above the mass and which stands for something is inevitably a target for abuse. This is particularly true of a liberal arts college and particularly in a time of tension and insecurity like the present. The American public at best has no very clear notion of what a liberal education is or how a college functions. At worst it has some very serious misconceptions of the purpose of a liberal education. It thinks of a college in terms of vocational education, or a way to achieve social or economic status, or as an instrument for indoctrination in "Americanism", or in terms of the sports pages, or as a place for four happy post-adolescent years in a collegiate atmosphere, learning how to dress, and drink, developing a "line" and making contacts.

Any college which takes its job seriously, which believes in freedom of discussion and inquiry and in the importance of independent thinking is bound to be to some extent at odds with many powerful forces and conceptions in American life. If it keeps its integrity, it is bound to be attacked and these attacks are a badge of honor. A college is somewhat like a church, in the world yet not quite in the world. It must stand for certain values and ideals or it loses its soul. And in standing for its principles some people will be antagonized and some potential customers will go elsewhere.

We are fortunate at Harvard that we are strong enough to accept such things reasonably calmly. We need not be over-sensitive to criticism. Our survival doesn't depend on attracting a certain number of customers, and as long as we do a reasonably good job we can probably fill the College without too much trouble. Our position and

our resources, however, require us to do the best possible educational job and to be satisfied with nothing less than the best. We should be constantly self-critical and welcome informal criticism from the outside while ignoring the attacks growing out of malice and prejudice and ignorance.

The worst possible reaction would be to try to trim our sails to all the winds that blow. We cannot be all things to all men, or we shall be nothing and will satisfy no one, including ourselves. It is essential that we understand clearly what Harvard is and is not, that we not try to pretend we are what we aren't and vice versa, that we not try to sell Harvard under false labels. Harvard is a special kind of place with special qualities and characteristics and a special mission. We should present it clearly and specifically for what it is. There is great need for what Harvard is. Other colleges have other qualities and other characteristics and ways of doing things with which we have no necessary quarrel. This is a big and diverse country and there are a variety of educational needs and a diversity of educational institutions is needed and valuable.

Without attempting a comprehensive analysis of the purposes and qualities of Harvard College, I would list the following as important characteristics to keep in mind in admission recruiting and selection.

1. Harvard is a college of high academic standards.

They may not seem very high to the myopic eyes of some Harvard professors, but on any relative basis they are extremely high. The median IQ or SAT score of the Harvard student body is one of the highest if not the highest in the country. There are colleges where the great majority of all students have IQ's well below all but the bottom one per cent of Harvard students. Practically the entire Harvard student body is in the top 15 per cent on the basis of academic ability, of the college age population of the U.S. Harvard is a good place for intelligent students and a poor place for most students of marginal ability in our terms, say an IQ of 115 or under. We need to study the relationship of SAT scores to success at Harvard and to realize the unreliability in individual cases of such scores and to interpret them unmechanically. Nevertheless, we ought to be clear about our minimums of academic ability below which it is unfair to the individual and undesirable for the College to go and stand firmly on them.

It does not follow from the above that only intellectual giants should be wanted at Harvard or that we should select entirely on the basis of relative IQ. The idea of Harvard's high standards can easily be and frequently is distorted and over narrowly defined. Within the still fairly wide range of acceptable SAT scores there is room for a variety of qualities, talents and interests. The number of really brilliant scholarly intellects is small and always will be. A college made up

entirely of such individuals would be undesirable, assuming it would be possible. Nevertheless it is clear that Harvard is a place only for people of superior verbal intelligence in relation both to the total population and the college population and that should be explicitly understood ⁱⁿ ~~is~~ our recruiting and selection.

2. The function of Harvard is liberal education, not vocational training. True, most students go to college with preparation for careers in mind--medicine, law, teaching, etc.--and this is perfectly proper. Probably most come without any very clear conception of what is meant by liberal education and it becomes the duty of the College to clarify its meaning or to liberalize the student even if he isn't entirely aware of what is happening to him. It is unrealistic to consider this problem in terms of a pure, abstract, doctrinaire separation of sheep from goats or we would have only a handful of students.

Nevertheless the boy whose eye is entirely on getting ahead in the world, on training which is obviously and immediately related to earning a living, on preparation for a job, should not come to Harvard. If he just wants to be an engineer or a chemist with no desire to be educated, if he only wants training for business and sees no sense in "useless" subjects, he should go to an engineering or a business school, not Harvard.

I'm not so sure about this; some of those develop well

3. Harvard believes in the value of diversity and practices it whether by accident or conscious design. The student who needs to be a member of a simple, homogeneous group of people with ~~similar~~ backgrounds and points of view in order to be happy will not be happy at Harvard. We have in fact an extraordinarily diverse student body. Poverty stricken commuters, Long Island and Back Bay socialites, sons

of upper-middleclass suburbia, midwestern small town doctors' sons, sophisticated intellectuals, former princes, Jew Catholic, Mormon, fundamentalist and unbeliever--they can all be found among the Harvard student body. The faculty also presents a diversity of backgrounds and types and attitudes towards almost every controversial question. To derive the most benefit from this environment a student needs actually or potentially to have certain qualities: independence, emotional maturity, tolerance and intellectual and social curiosity.

4. Closely related to the previous point is Harvard's freedom or non-paternalism. On principle we place on the student the maximum amount of responsibility for making decisions and surround him with the minimum amount of control, regulation and restriction. Unofficially also there is remarkably little in the way of group compulsion to conform to a narrow pattern of behavior or attitude. I believe that the total impact of Harvard, of its group attitudes and traditions and general atmosphere is a powerful one. But it is not something that shapes individuals in the direction of uniformity or standardization. So a superior degree of initiative and motivation, of self-reliance is required.

The boy who because of immaturity or insecurity wants constant reassurance, or authority, or prodding or immersion in a strong and obvious group spirit will not be happy or do well at Harvard. He should be in a church college or living at home and commuting or in a small, homogeneous college group. It is, of course, hard to be sure about 17 year olds. It is not so much the actual, manifest qualities at that stage that we should be concerned about, but the potential. Will these boys grow in the special Harvard environment even though sheltered lives up to that time have given them little opportunity to demonstrate their capacities?

5. It follows from the above two points that what Harvard offers is not a sheltered, comfortable, semi-adolescent collegiate four years but a microcosmic experience. We are much more like the world than most colleges. Our appeal is not the appeal of bright college years, of Spring Proms and the signing down at Mory's and the hazing of Freshmen, although in the diversity of Harvard these things also exist. What Harvard offers at its best is a demanding, challenging, sometimes painful experience of growing up, socially and intellectually and morally, learning to stand on one's own feet, finding one's own level and friends, living amicably with others of divergent interests and points of view, having one's horizons stretched in all directions.

This kind of education involves risks, risks of loneliness and unhappiness, of maladjustment, of making mistakes in judgment and bad choices of friends and fields and courses and extra-curricular activities. It involves the risk of succumbing to "dangerous" ideas, of losing the old religion, being cut loose from early moorings and not finding new faiths and new standards and values. The results of failure are usually unpleasant for all concerned. But these risks are inherent in life and the process of growing up. No one can be protected permanently from exposure to such dangers. Fundamental in the Harvard scheme is the notion that in general American youth is sheltered too long and matures too slowly and that the college years are not too early to begin assuming responsibility for one's own life. On balance mistakes made then are less likely to have permanently damaging results than if they are made later.

A Harvard graduate ought to be better prepared to face the

5. It follows from the above two points that what Harvard offers is not a sheltered, comfortable, semi-adolescent collegiate four years but a microcosmic experience. We are much more like the world than most colleges. Our appeal is not the appeal of bright college years, of Spring Proms and the signing down at Mory's and the hazing of Freshmen, although in the diversity of Harvard these things also exist. What Harvard offers at its best is a demanding, challenging, sometimes painful experience of growing up, socially and intellectually and morally, learning to stand on one's own feet, finding one's own level and friends, living amicably with others of divergent interests and points of view, having one's horizons stretched in all directions.

This kind of education involves risks, risks of loneliness and unhappiness, of maladjustment, of making mistakes in judgment and bad choices of friends and fields and courses and extra-curricular activities. It involves the risk of succumbing to "dangerous" ideas, of losing the old religion, being cut loose from early moorings and not finding new faiths and new standards and values. The results of

... in life and the process of growing up. So one can be
 ... world outside as a reasonably mature, civilized person than the ordinary
 college graduate. This, it seems to me, should be the keynote of our
 appeal to prospective students. We should not sell Harvard as romance,
 as collegiatism, but as the most valuable possible maturing preparation
 for meeting the world and discharging one's duties as workman and
 responsible citizen.

6. As corollary to the above it should be pointed out that at Harvard the extra-curriculum is secondary. We have no Skull and Bones. One cannot make a really satisfying career out of being a big shot on the campus. Campus politics, the "student leader", are far less important here than in most colleges. The athlete is unlikely to be an undergraduate hero. There is a great variety of activities, offering a wide variety of satisfactions, but they are essentially valued at Harvard for their own sake, for the values they have to contribute to the individual participants in terms of deepening and broadening and enriching of experience rather than in terms of career, of contacts, of political success, which can be cashed in on afterwards. The Glee Club, the orchestra, the publications, dramatics, athletic teams, these stand essentially on their own feet and are not part of a complex hierarchy or ladder of careerist achievement.

V. FACTORS LIMITING COMPLETE FREEDOM OF SELECTION

Before I try to describe the student body we want, it will be useful to mention certain factors or conditions which limit our freedom of choice. As I have already said, we cannot just work out some beautiful blue-print or state a lovely set of ideal verbal qualifications and then go out and get 1000 students a year who meet the paper specifications. We are the agents of a 324 year old institution with a unique and not completely logical character and we are operating in a real and complicated world.

The most important limitations to keep in mind in drawing up our specifications are, in my opinion, the following:

1. We can give scholarship help to only about 25% of our students. Approximately 75% must pay their own way, which means that the great majority of our students must come from middle and upper income families. This isn't quite as bad as it sounds. Loan funds,

term-time and summer employment, the possibility of commuting, careful advance planning by parents with limited incomes, all can help to extend the income range from which we can draw. A major part of our admission program of the future must be the most fully and intelligently developed financial aid program. But even with that remember that a six hundred dollar scholarship still leaves about \$1200 a year to be found by the resident student and his family. Short of a government scholarship program, we must continue to draw largely from families of much better than average incomes and we must keep the paying customer steadily in mind.

2. There are limitations of budget and personnel. It is conceivable that if we did enough advertising and put enough people into the field and spent enough money we could get 10,000 candidates and the ideal student body, which might cost us about \$600 per student to recruit. Obviously, however, we must work with a small staff and on a limited budget. The number of potential students we can reach and the amount of time we can give to each one is therefore limited.

3. There are limitations inherent in the selection process. We may know exactly what we want, but evaluating the qualities of 17 year old boys is a difficult and unscientific process. Boys are mixed, not pure, potential as well as active. Interviewing is notoriously unreliable. Teachers, principals, alumni representatives, admissions people, have conscious predilections and unconscious prejudices which color judgments. Any one who has dealt with students for any time at all has seen wonderful results emerging eventually from the apparently most unpromising material, and seen apparently superb characters fall flat on their faces, reveal serious flaws, disintegrate. Eventually

the College Board may develop simple, reliable tests for motivation, emotional stability and integrity and leadership capacity, but until that happy day we must be humble about our power to select for the qualities we want, we must be content with pushing in certain directions rather than others. We are dealing with complex variables, with many-factored situations in which what we can do is only one element. Accident, luck, many influences outside of our control will affect what happens. We are fallible human beings dealing with other very human beings and we shouldn't get doctrinaire or develop delusions of grandeur.

4. We are limited by what might be called political considerations, or perhaps institutional or public relations considerations.

I have stated this already several times and I don't want to over-emphasize this factor. It is important but secondary. We compromise and make concessions, but only within limits. Basic integrity and principle must be maintained.

Nevertheless, the political factors should be kept clearly in mind. We are located in Cambridge, Mass., for instance. I believe for a number of pretty obvious reasons that we have an obligation to admit a number of Cambridge boys just because they live in Cambridge who might not be admitted on a strictly competitive basis. If we ask alumni and Harvard Clubs Schools and Scholarship Committees to help in our recruiting and screening and to provide scholarship funds, we are bound to put considerable weight on their recommendations and go as far as we can in accepting them without giving them final power. If Don Peddie in Minnesota or Mr. X. in Dayton works like a beaver and produces a sudden influx of acceptable candidates, we have got to recognize this in the admission and scholarship committees. There

is a counter-responsibility on our part, of course, to indoctrinate the alumni workers properly. But clearly when we use alumni workers, we surrender some of our freedom of action. On balance we should gain-- that is, by the proper use of alumni we should improve the general quality, geographic distribution, etc. of the student body to a degree that we could not achieve without their aid. If this turns out not to be true, we should eliminate alumni workers.

Similarly, we have developed over the years close relations with fifteen or twenty schools, mostly private, each of which sends us regularly half a dozen or more students, in fact sixty or seventy students in the cases of Exeter and Boston Latin. About a third of each entering class comes from this small group of schools and this is something we can, in general, count on, year in and year out. This saves us time and expense and gives us a solid and dependable back-log of paying customers whom we can count on in good times and bad. Probably a certain amount of preferential handling is inevitable in a situation of this sort. And provided the average quality of the group from any school is as good as or better than the quality of the class as a whole, this is justifiable. At any rate, any tampering with the relationship, any cutting down of numbers or increase in the percentage of rejection must be done very cautiously and diplomatically. Creation of hostility or bad relations with any of these schools could damage us seriously. On the other hand, undue lowering of standards and lack of sensible selectivity can hurt us also.

There is a group psychology problem involved here of a rather complex sort. In a college the size of Harvard there are some real handicaps for the boy who comes as the only boy from his school, perhaps the only boy in several years. There are problems for us in such

a situation too. We probably draw from too many different schools now. It would be easier for us in various ways if we had continuing close relationships with a smaller number of schools from whom we get at least two or three boys every year. We could educate the school officials about Harvard and could evaluate their judgments more accurately. A lot of time would be saved. The boys coming to Harvard would have an easier adjustment. A small core of good boys coming every year would tend to bring others. One could argue that all of our recruiting efforts ought to be concentrated in about a hundred key schools and that properly handled, concentrated and continuous attention to these schools would bring us the best possible student body at the lowest expenditure of time and money. ✓

Be that as it may, the fact is that we will try to increase our appeal in certain good schools. If we are to succeed in this-- if, for instance, we decide that Deerfield and Lawrenceville and New Trier and Denver East High ought to be cultivated intensively--then we probably should go further in admitting reasonably good candidates from these schools than we might do on a strictly competitive basis.

5. There is another related and rather sticky problem. As has been already pointed out, Harvard is one of the few colleges with "snob" appeal.--that is, we are one of the few colleges to which scions of the social and economic upper crust go as a matter of course. A Social Register family in the Northeast can send its son to Harvard Or Yale or Princeton. It isn't likely to send him to Rutgers or Penn. This element has for generations contributed one of the distinctive elements to the peculiar mixture that is Harvard and has given Harvard part of its unique flavor and reputation.

It can be argued that in ideal terms this is undesirable

and undemocratic and I am not sure that I wouldn't agree. On the other hand, if we define this element as the Final Club group, which is only roughly accurate, it constitutes about ten per cent of the College, almost entirely paying guests. Assume for the sake of argument that a third or a half of this group, strictly on their merits in terms of SAT scores, character and personality, was not particularly desirable. If we rejected them for admission, it is possible, even likely, that we would lose most of the rest of the group, including a lot of able and desirable students who would hereafter go to Princeton or Yale or Williams. This is a group which, for obvious reasons, unconnected with its intrinsic human qualities, is likely in after life to wield far more economic and social power than any other Harvard group. It is a group which is a promising source of financial support for Harvard. Can we afford to lose it? Do we have a social duty to do our best to enlighten and educate this group? Will current national, social and economic policies gradually eliminate the group anyhow and thus solve our problem?

6. Our freedom of choice is also limited to some extent by preference given to sons of alumni who constitute at present about 20 % of our student body. This also is the result of a debatable policy. The arguments for it are obvious. There is the argument of tradition or sentiment. If nine generations of Saltonstalls have attended Harvard, one would like to maintain the tradition if possible and continue to admit Saltonstalls. Furthermore, alumni sons are a group who come to us, by and large, without much work on our part. They are a sizable and dependable back log of candidates. We don't have to recruit them. They know about Harvard from their parents. And they *of whom I have heard* are likely to be more fully aware of the nature of Harvard and what *is involved*

to expect and what not to expect than the average candidate and therefore to have fewer and less painful adjustment problems. Balancing this somewhat is the fact that some of them are certainly less strongly motivated than boys who have decided on Harvard on their own and have worked hard to get here. Some also are in passive or active revolt against their fathers and perhaps subconsciously don't want to be here.

The most important consideration, however, is that the University depends increasingly on its alumni for economic and moral support and is spending increasing amounts of money and time in organizing and cultivating them. Admissions policy must be meshed with this to some extent. I suspect that there are forty or fifty sons of alumni admitted each year who might not be admitted if they didn't have Harvard fathers. If we rejected this number, the effect on alumni relations generally would be serious, to say nothing of the personal wear and tear on admissions personnel.

The practical question really is not whether we should give any preference, but what are the limits of preference? I think we should give more careful study to the personal qualities and motivation of this group and set our standards somewhat higher.

VI RECRUITING AND SELECTION GOALS

As already said, the goal of our admission operation is quality, not quantity. We want to get for Harvard the highest possible quality of student body. To many, including many of the faculty, the definition of quality will seem simple. We want the ablest students, defined in terms of grades; more Group I students, more Dean's List students, fewer C students. Within limits I would accept this definition, but, as is implicit in what I have already said, this definition of what we should try to recruit and select is far too simple. It fails to take into account the ~~complex practical problems of admission, the peculiar~~

complex practical problems of admission, the peculiar nature of the human institution, Harvard, the function of a college as opposed to a professional school, and the problem of what is the best kind of environment and experience in which able 18-22 year old Americans can mature.

The goals which I believe we ought to have for our admission program will be stated here quite briefly since the considerations which have led me to select them have already been stated or are implicit in what has been said.

1. We ought to try to increase our proportion of brilliant students and we should give top priority in admission and the award of scholarships to outstanding intellectual ability. We have a strong natural appeal for the ablest students, but I do not believe that we have sufficiently exploited it. Harvard is admirably fitted by the quality of its faculty, the general high quality of its students, its resources in libraries, laboratories etc. and its educational system--tutorial, General Education, etc.--and its methods of handling students, to provide the best possible educational experience for such students, an experience which inferior colleges can not provide adequately. Harvard provides an admirable means for identifying such people, broadening them and preventing their excessive early specialization, and opening doors of opportunity for them to socially useful careers. If an applicant has top intellectual ability, we ought to admit him unless there is convincing evidence of serious defects of character or personality. We ought to be willing to take much longer chances on emotional instability in these students than on others.

There is a question as to how one defines top intellectual quality and it isn't easy to answer. Some of our most interesting and

potentially useful minds have mediocre academic records in school and college. But in general I mean the Group I and high Group II student, perhaps the top 5% of the College, the boys who are going to be the scholars and scientists and top lawyers. I should like to see us double this percentage. To do this we will need to expand our scholarship program, particularly our National Scholarships, and to make special efforts in certain areas such as engineering, where our appeal is weak at present. of p. 21

The quest for more top brains must be pursued carefully, however. It can easily boomerang and damage the overall quality of the student body. We cannot run an admission program in terms of five or ten per cent of our students. There are many who believe that the National Scholarship program, whose goal was more top brains for Harvard, had exactly these results, that by emphasizing our concern for top students, it gave the impression that all we wanted was this kind of person and scared off many other highly desirable students. Mr. Conant now tends to accept this view. I don't!

2. We should work out carefully what our minimum standards of eligibility for admission are and stick to them. This is difficult because of the unreliability of test scores in individual cases and the dramatic examples we have had of students with submarginal scores who have done satisfactory work at Harvard, or better than satisfactory. Clearly it is more than a matter of test scores. It is a matter also of cultural and educational background, of motivation and intellectual interests and curiosity. We ought to be willing to study individual marginal cases carefully and not apply a rigid mechanical criterion. Nevertheless, Harvard is certainly not a good place for students below a certain level of verbal ability and intellectual maturity. They are a drag on the

faculty and deans and are unable to take full advantage of the opportunities available here. They may be subjected to undesirable strains and pressures, develop unjustified feelings of inferiority or a sense of failure, whereas in another kind of college they might have a much better chance for happy, healthy, satisfying development. We have an obligation to boys of this sort not to expose them to undue risk at Harvard, no matter how desirable they may be for their human qualities, their athletic ability or their potential financial contributions to the University, and no matter how much pressure is brought to bear on their behalf.

I believe we have been weak too often in this respect in recent years, but I admit that practically it is difficult to set clear minimum standards.

3. There will probably be little argument about the two previous points. It is in the area between a reasonably clear line of minimum admissibility and the top five or ten per cent of students that the disagreement will come.

I believe that in this area we ought to pay little attention to relative PRL. Other things being equal, we should select the candidate with the higher PRL, but other things rarely are equal and there are a number of factors to which we should give considerably greater weight than PRL and do so explicitly and with clear conscience. In my opinion the most important of these factors are the following, not listed in the order of their importance.

A. Outstanding qualities of character and personality.

There has been and will continue to be a lot of hypocritical nonsense

talked about "leadership" and the "all-round" boy. But we ought not to let reaction against this nonsense obscure the fact that there are enormous differences among individuals as far as human qualities outside of academic ability are concerned and that some people are going to contribute a lot more to society and have a lot more power and influence than others with the same IQ.

It is impossible to describe these qualities in anything except trite terms, and it is difficult to judge whether they are present in any individual and in what strength since they are intangible. Nevertheless we ought to try to identify them and to give considerable weight to them in our selection and some of them are reflected in the candidates' records. The specific qualities on which we should put weight are: integrity, responsibility, sensitivity, warmth, charm, independence, courage, initiative, organizing and administrative ability and capacity for leadership, force, vigour, solidity.

and potentiality in each?

It is worth emphasizing again that only a small proportion of our students will become scholars, scientists, teachers, etc. (for that matter these qualities are important for them also) and that most of them will become business and professional men, and all will be citizens. Throughout our history Harvard has produced an unusual number of men outstanding in business, politics and community life. We want to continue to produce an exceptional number of such men. If we can get the most promising raw material--and for these men SAT scores are less important than the intangible human qualities mentioned--we have a greater capacity than most colleges, I believe, for educating it for civilized, responsible leadership.

B. Harvard parentage.

C. Significance for school relationships.

D. Strong Sponsorship by Harvard Clubs.

E. Geographic Distribution. If, as I believe, there are educational values in a national student body, we will have to give some weight to geography in our selection. Unless we do, the Harvard student body will be much more heavily drawn from the northeast than it is today and the opposite trend, which we have been working hard for 25 years to encourage, will be reversed. This is an old point which need not be discussed in detail here. I would add only this, that I think that small town and rural backgrounds should be given as much weight in our selection as distance from Cambridge. Both of these considerations will help to strengthen the diversity which we want to maintain and increase at Harvard. Unless we do give weight to them, the percentage of boys from metropolitan centers will become undesirably large with resulting effects on the Harvard community and our drawing power.

F. Athletic ability. This is another dusty problem and the answer to it will have to be hammered out in practice and after such debate, I expect. As I see it now, however, we ought frankly to give considerable weight to this factor.

I base this opinion on two considerations. First, athletics are an integral part of the American college scene. Properly conducted they have genuine educational value, useful contributions to make the participants and the college community, which I need not argue here. Harvard athletics are not likely to be in a healthy condition, however, unless we win a reasonable share of contests with our natural rivals. Constant beating lessens the value for participants and the

college community, and in fact, if long continued, will probably lead to abandoning intercollegiate competition. Yet in most sports we are not likely to get enough good players to hold up our end in intercollegiate competition, the recruiting and subsidization of outstanding athletes being what they are today, unless we put some weight on athletic ability in our recruiting, selection and award of scholarships. Therefore, this is justified in terms of its contribution to the health and success of an important part of our educational program.

Second, unless we do put some emphasis ourselves on athletic ability, we will be, as we have been, faced with certain serious problems, particularly in the field of alumni relations and pressures to do far worse things. Unfortunately, athletics is one of the chief nexuses between college and alumni and perhaps the most highly publicized. Problems here result in an unconscionable and disproportionate amount of time spent and trouble for administrative officers. We can fight and win this battle, but at a price. If we can find a way of solving these problems which doesn't unduly compromise us, we should do so.

Third, our general problem of recruiting throughout the country and of getting the help of alumni and support for scholarships will be helped by reasonably successful teams and hurt by unduly unsuccessful teams.

Fourth, I cast one small vote in favor of the athlete qua athlete, provided he is academically competent and of decent character. This is probably pure prejudice, but I happen, in general, to prefer the boy with some athletic interests and abilities, the boy with physical vigour and coordination and grace, over the boy with none. I am

broad-minded, however, and will put the argument on the fundamental ground already stated of the value of diversity. We believe there is value in having at Harvard a variety of types and interests and points of view. We want poets and painters and musicians and scientists and socialites and rustics. Let's have a goodly representation of the athletic type too. Of course, he may, and frequently does, have esthetic or scientific or political interests too. There is the further consideration that in the great middle reaches of the candidates where there are no very strong reasons for choosing one candidate over another, athletic ability offers one positive basis for distinguishing. Of two candidates approximately equal on most grounds, we can in good conscience choose the athlete.

Too strong - what about those other criteria on p. 34?

Fifth, there is a general and important and complex public relations aspect to the athletic problem beyond the alumni aspect. As I have already pointed out, a college like Harvard of high standards and devoted to liberal education and freedom is bound to be under attack and at odds with much in American life. This is a never ending battle. But we must not get too isolated from America. We are part of it and want to contribute leadership to it. If we become too much an object of suspicion and antagonism, if we get too far out in left field, we lose our capacity to influence and contribute to American life and the country loses. Harvard particularly faces this danger because of its preeminence. The all too common association of Harvard in the public mind with communism, homosexuality and sterile and precious intellectualism is a serious thing.

Football and athletics may seem unrelated to this. But if we are constantly beaten, or abandon intercollegiate competition, Harvard's position in relation to the rest of the country will be

seriously worsened, athletics being as important and as publicized as they are and having the symbolical significance they have for Americans. This would be proof of our unAmericanness, of our unsound and unhealthy state. And the whole cause of academic freedom, of intellectualism, of high standards as a normal part of American life would be damaged as I believe it was by Chicago's policy. This may seem absurd to some, but I believe it is important although I haven't expressed it very well. In a sense it is like the boy who is interested in reading and gets good grades and likes his teachers, having to lean over backwards to prove himself a "regular guy" to other boys in his school or neighborhood. He is going to be suspected and he may have to fight his way to respect and acceptance by doing other non-academic things as well as others.

Finally, I fear that an unsuccessful intercollegiate athletic program would eventually have disastrous snowball effects on our recruiting program and our student body. The glory of Harvard has been its diversity; we have always managed to keep some kind of balance among the variety of more or less discordant elements which have made up the Harvard student body, scholars and wastrels, radicals and conservatives, gilded scions and slum dwellers. We must fight to maintain that balance and there are powerful tendencies which would push us to extremes unless kept in check.

Harvard's natural and strongest appeal is for the studious, the intellectual, the esthete. We want them, as part of a whole, not the whole. If they become the whole, it would not be good for them. Harvard would not be a healthy community. Many of the ablest and most vigorous among them would choose other colleges because Harvard would

no longer offer the kind of balanced and healthy experience of college life which they wanted. And if we had a continuously unsuccessful intercollegiate record or gave up intercollegiate athletics, that would be the result, by a double process. We would lose our appeal for the normal American boy and gain in appeal for the hot-house intellectual, the neurotic at odds with his community, the too-early sophisticated metropolitan types, the glib verbalists. This is what has happened at Chicago and it should not be allowed to happen here. These tendencies would, as I have said, have snowball effects, once started, and move towards extremes. This danger is much greater at Harvard than at Yale or Princeton or Dartmouth because of the unique qualities and reputation of Harvard. We should, therefore, be particularly aware of the danger and work constantly to avoid it. Yale or Dartmouth may have to make a special effort to balance their collegiatism, their cheerful extroverts and careerists and mordic blondes with intellectualism. Harvard's problem is the opposite. We must make a special effort to keep intellectualism in balance.

And remember that athletics involves much more than athletics. It is a symbol--and unfortunately the most publicized symbol--of a lot of other things included under the general label of college life. It is a natural, and not evil, desire of most young Americans going to college to have a happy and full extra-curricular experience. If our athletic program disintegrated, it would be tough to persuade them that they could have that experience at Harvard.

So although initially to the casual or doctrinaire observer it might seem that athletic ability had no place among the criteria for selection for admission to Harvard, I come to the conclusion that considerable weight in both our recruiting and selection should be put on it--as is at present. This is a concession or a compromise--if it is a compromise--with the ideal which I make in good conscience.

Our country being what it is, a failure to do this would have eventually, in my opinion, serious consequences for Harvard. Our real problem here, as in so many other aspects of the admission program, is to keep a balance, to avoid on the one hand the evils of high-pressure recruiting with its misrepresentation and exploitation and offers of subsidy and on the other the danger of leaning over backward in the name of amateurism and integrity defined in unrealistic terms.

VII. ORGANIZATION--THINGS TO BE DONE

How should we organize our admission program so as to do the most effective job of recruiting and selection for the ends already stated? All I want to do here is to state briefly the more important items, as I see them, in our future admission program.

1. Be clear among ourselves as to what we are trying to do, what our goals are.
2. Have a real team of all those working on admissions and financial aids with no unnecessary jurisdictional barriers, as little overlapping and duplication as possible and no situation where the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing. This cannot be a one man operation, although I hope individuals will be as definite and as willing to act and take responsibility as possible within the limits of general policy. We will have a strong and sizable group, mostly fairly new to this business and therefore not slaves to past practices and able to look at problems with fresh eyes: Henry, Shaplin, Monroe, Cotton, Cutler, King, Mr. X, Taylor, with help from Leighton, Dyer, von Stade, Weeks and Parkman and possibly eventually from some of the Senior Tutors. We should meet weekly, possibly at Tuesday lunch, to discuss our problems, big and little. Every one should express himself freely, nothing is crystallized and we will

hammer out policy and organization as we go along in the light of the combined wisdom of the group.

3. The coaches, with all due respect, are to be kept out of admissions work. There will be no visiting of schools by Henry Lamar, Jordan or any one on the athletic staff. We should make our policies and methods clear to the athletic staff, however.

4. During the summer we should agree on our program and calendar for the coming year: what schools are going to be visited by whom and when, etc. This should be a carefully worked out plan, keeping in mind available man power and money, the centers most desirable to cultivate and the possibility of continuity. We should not scatter our shots. We should pick a limited number of areas for intensive work and concentrate on them. Each member of the team should have a clear understanding of his assignment and responsibilities.

5. We need to put a lot of time and thought on how best to use alumni in recruiting and screening of candidates. This is the sorest point in our present program and the area in which most improvement is expected of us. Three major problems are involved, as I see it:

a. The selection of alumni workers. How do we get the right men to work for us?

b. The indoctrination of alumni workers. This requires, in my opinion, a new handbook spelling out our policies and procedures as simply and clearly as possible, and a regular news letter going out to all Schools and Scholarship Committee members as well as individual representatives several times a year. It involves also regular meetings in Cambridge and possibly regional meetings. It

means that whenever any one goes out from Cambridge, he should plan his time so that he can have proper opportunity for full discussion with the local representatives. Criticisms and suggestions from the field should always be welcomed and given thorough study in Cambridge.

c. Efficient communication throughout the year with alumni workers about candidates. We need particularly to study the best ways of notifying alumni before, during and after the selection process about candidates, interviews, decisions made, etc.

6. We need to reexamine the internal procedures of the Admission and Scholarship Offices with a view to saving time, paper work and expense. Drastic changes may or may not be in order, but I am not at all happy about what goes on now between the time scores are received and decisions made and announced. We need to rethink our methods of making decisions on admissions and the award of scholarships.

7. We need to reexamine all our letters and announcements to see if we cannot improve their clarity and warmth.

8. We should study our application and scholarship blanks to see if they can't be improved or cut down in size.

9. We need a new Rollo book and a new expense pamphlet.

10. The financial aid program must be constantly improved and expanded and tied in closely with admissions.

11. We need to make a number of statistical studies, notably of numbers so that we will know how to get the size of Freshman class we want without going through the annual agony we now do, and of marginal SAT scores or PRL's.

12. We need to work at the problem of improving interview

techniques and of evaluating intangible qualities. We need particularly to improve our ability to detect homosexual tendencies and serious psychiatric problems.

13. What else?