THE STUDENT INQUIRY

In the spring of last year President Stratton suggested to several members of the Institute’s Committee that they make a more or less detailed investigation of curricula, approaching the subject entirely from the undergraduate point of view. Since that time the idea has outgrown apparent limits. Questions of the sort that are now being discussed, and which are due to the Managing Board and the ASSOCIATE BOARD, have become modified to some extent by the idea of the undergraduate investigation, that the students would have their say in the matter of their courses.

When the Committee first commenced its investigation, it became rather obvious that the most representative expression of student viewpoint could be obtained through direct contact with the entire school, and that the questionnaire system was not the logical way. The reaction of the school to the questionnaire of THE TECH was observed—the latter being very much in the way of a preliminary experiment—and then the group of Juniors and Seniors, working as a Committee on Curriculum, devised the far more inclusive form which will appear one week from Monday.

While several of the issues in the inquiry will deal with the more mechanical details of class work—quizzes, lectures, exams—much of the thought and effort has been directed toward encouraging a closer relationship between the Faculty and their respective classes. The students will be asked to state definite answers to nine carefully worded questions, together with more extended comment at the end. These questions will deal entirely with classes taught to freshmen and Sophomores, and be offered in a free and unreserved manner. At all attending the Institute will be requested to respond, as upperclassmen usually have a broader under- standing of the earlier conditions than those still living among them.

This Student Inquiry is rather unusual among modern technical schools, because though sponsored by the Institute Committee it has the support and hearty endorsement of the President and Faculty members. It is their wish to learn directly from the undergraduates their suggestions and desires in the hope that curricular methods may thereby be improved.

IN QUEST OF PEACE

War, Naval armament, R. O. T. C., are briefly subjects to talk about in these days of D. A. R. and Sculliard and blackidait, while official suppression of student uprisings against compulsory military training goes apace, once welcomed by the presidential hand on the rebellious college editors and liberal columnists, now performs mercilessly for the national patriotic organizations. This is truly an anomalous situation in this age of supposedly free speech.

Subjects as vitally important as these, though, cannot be so very long blacklisted, for they touch the populace too closely. It is therefore with a great deal of interest that we regard the Wesleyan Intercollegiate Peace on War which opened yesterday at that institution for a two day session. Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War on which we are to start the proceedings with a talk on “Peace and Education.”

Up to this stage of the war, the leaves of the various national defense force was to come up for discussion by Rear Admiral Charles P. Plunket (retired) and the noted sociologist, Agnew Thomas. Professor Edward P. Cheyney, famed historian, and Fletcher R. H. Halsey, a member of the Naval Affairs Committee Congress, will close the war with an clash on the question, “What national rights are the two day session will be concluded today with addresses by Admiral Thomas P. Magnussen, now Assistant Secretary of War, and "The Next Step." With this representative parade to lead the way to calm and impartial discussion, much interest on part and related subjects, please may finally be devised that will result in the outlawing of this barbarous game. A hundred blackidait or suppressions can never do as much as this one round-table session at Wesleyan in the direction of peace. And, after all, that is what we are supposed to be looking for.