

CONFERENCE ON TUTORIAL EDUCATION

ALAN RYAN ADDRESS

MARCH 31, 2007

Thank you very much. I am glad that the President appreciates the irony of 2 days of lectures on performed instruction that is precisely supposed not to be a lecture. Any tutorial in which the wretched tutor, despairing of making headway, resorts to a 20 minute lecture . . . well, the young person heaves a sigh of relief and takes copious notes, knows they have failed.

I am delighted to be back here for a third time though I think it's 14 years since the last. I am very flattered to be asked to give the keynote. Nonetheless, I start on a complaining note.

Henry Mayr-Harting's lecture to you last autumn has shot my fox, started my hares, and left me with not a whole lot to say on the announced subject other than, "I agree with Henry."

Though I complain, I don't really despair because the situation is familiar to those of us who spent 40 years giving tutorials to clever, diligent students. All too often they show up with essays that tackle so exactly the right subject in exactly the right way that you're left scratching about for something to contradict or even something about which to hesitate.

But rather than just offer a few footnotes to Henry's lecture, I'll take advantage of having spent a dozen years teaching this side of the Atlantic in various places and another 10 years worrying about Dewey's ideas on education to say something not just about tutorials in Oxford but also a few thoughts about other things that have to go with them.

Stephen Leacock visited England in 1921 and wrote a book of humorous essays called, "*My Discovery of England*." It's there that the famous chapter, "Oxford As I Saw It," describes the process of a young man going to tutorials: young man sits down, tutor lights pipe and smokes the student. End of this process, Leacock says, "After three or four years, the youth is well smoked and accounted a deep scholar." Leacock, whom people tend not to know, was the first professor of economics at McGill, wrote a hugely successful textbook on politics, an extremely good book on social justice during the 1930's, and of course what Leacock is saying is the process wouldn't pass muster with the time and motion experts but it does produce something by slightly mysterious means. Most of this conference, I think, is going to be about rendering the means less mysterious, so what I will try to do is give a relatively unsentimental account of how the tutorial system came about, how different it is from the way it was when it first came about, and what it needs as a sort of foil to its virtues. Not its vices, but its virtues.

The myth has tutorials beginning when the university began. Some people believe that the university was founded by King Alfred. Presumably, the cakes got burned because the tutorial overran. Reality, I'm afraid, is very different and you will forgive me if I start on my own turf of New College in the early 19th century. At that point, say 1815, Oxford was in a pretty decayed state intellectually and physically. The introduction of honors examinations in 1811 had improved things because ambitious young persons now had a goal to aim at, but the level of instruction was very low. New College was worse than the average. The college had the

privilege of submitting its students for the B.A. without their taking a university test. Since the college was a very small community (one of my predecessors described it as a society at once contracted, indolent, orthodox, and obscure) there was, of course, no pressure on students to learn anything and no pressure on tutors to teach them. The college only admitted 4, 5, sometimes 3 students a year. They came as probational fellows, probationary members of the governing body, and after two years became full fellows. On becoming a full fellow, so long as they passed their degrees and eventually took holy orders, they could retain their fellowship for life. There were always, as the founder required, seventy fellows on the books. Most of them were graduates, either on their way to taking holy orders or serving as curates in the countryside and waiting for a parish to which the college had the gift of presenting an incumbent to show up. When a parish became vacant, they renounced their fellowship, married, and settled down to the life of a modestly prosperous country clergyman.

The effect on ambition within the college takes little imagining. A tiny society with an assured unexciting living afterwards? Not an actual breeding ground for intellectual energy. Things went better elsewhere. In the early 1800's, Oriel was the center of reform under Provost Copleston, who was a liberal Anglican, but crucially had fellows such as Thomas Arnold and John Henry Newman to help. If you want 2 absolutely classical examples of charismatic teachers, there they were. But there was a tension in the Oriel model and I think the tension still exists. I imagine Professor Dreher is going to say a bit about it in due course, and that is whether the relationship between tutor and pupil is academic in the modern sense—i.e., one heavily based on instruction—or whether it is primarily spiritual and pastoral. Newman had no doubt that it was spiritual and pastoral. When frustrated by Copleston's successor in what he thought was the right provision of spiritual tutorship, he resigned his tutorship. Arnold, of course, went on to become headmaster of Rugby. It's worth detaching tutors from tutorials. That's to say, what tutors did wasn't always much connected with instruction and the relationship between tutors and their pupils changed fairly dramatically over the centuries. In the 17th century, for instance, Oxford changed quite drastically from being a place where indigent scholars went to get an education that would fit them for service in the church, in the law, or for the royal administration. It became partly that but also, rather heavily, a sort of finishing school for upper class young men. The upper class young men never graduated. They came up very young, 14 or 15, and spent a couple of years getting to the end of their adolescence. The job of a tutor was primarily to keep them inside the college during the hours of darkness and out of the taverns and the brothels. Tutorial discipline was sometimes enforced with corporal punishment as well as the more familiar gating and fining. Hobbes was so depressed by the spectacle that he announced it was entirely pointless to try to teach upper class adolescents. Their minds, he said, were entirely on sex and fighting, but then he had been the tutor to the future Charles II. I won't quote the famous passage from *Aubrey*; it is early in the morning.

In the 1820's, most colleges had several tutors who were mostly fellows to look after the undergraduate's education. New College, having only 15-20 undergraduates, never seems to have had more than 2, and they were held in complete contempt by the people they were trying to teach. There is a famous story of a young undergraduate going into his tutor to ask about a proof in Euclid and receiving the answer "turn over, turn over" to which he rightly inferred that the tutor was as lost as he was since the tutor's only advice was to get on to the next page and hope he understood the next problem. The difficulty was that being a tutor was not an

occupation that an energetic person would want to do for a career, before the reforms of the 1850's. The "Oxford Don," in the modern form, was invented between the 1850's and the 1870's. It had always suited some people to spend their entire lives in an Oxford college for reasons sufficiently described by Gibbon, but fellowships in general were not well paid, with board and lodging about £150 per year. It wasn't a job but it also entailed celibacy and taking holy orders. A young man might hold a fellowship for 5 or 6 years without taking orders while he made his way as a lawyer, but once successful he had to resign it because all fellowships had financial constraints on them which was an income from outside of the college's foundation, or about £500 per year, was inconsistent with holding a fellowship. So if you inherited money, you had to give it up. Once you had another career, you had to give it up. The surprise with New College wasn't that reform took so long a time in coming; the surprise was the number of young men, of whom Augustus Hare was the most important, minded enough about intellectual standards to spend 20 years before the 1850's persuading the college to abandon its privilege of demanding a B.A. without university examination. So the reforms of the 1850's don't come out of the clear, blue sky, but the way the change came about was characteristically English: the college's own examinations were just made steadily harder. At the point where it was easier to get a degree by taking the university examinations, nobody wanted to hang onto the privilege, but it was 20 years before anybody got a first.

Oriel's vanguard route was undermined by the theoretical battles of the 1830's and 40's. The torch was passed to Balliol instantaneously and, although people think of Jowett as the great Balliol figure, even when Jowett entered the college as a young tutor, the ethos was in place, and long before he became Master. The notion that the tutor/student relationship was central, was very much what people were committed to. But it is worth focusing on the fact that the instructional element was still secondary to the pastoral element, or to put it slightly differently, the two things were always indistinguishable. What it looked like was a sort of Socratic friendship with whatever degree of intimacy the difference in age between tutor and pupil permitted, but essentially where the older man shared his understanding of what they were reading together and in the process shared his understanding of life in general.

I say nothing about Socrates' relations with Alcibiades, but there is a great deal of emotional charge of the precisely the kind that Socrates describes in these interactions and in Jowett's relations with John Addington Symonds, for example, and the young Swinburne; it epitomized the enormous emotional charge that goes into a lot of these relationships. The reading party, as it were, a symposium up a hillside, becomes the high point of many students' summers because there they would walk, talk, and read with their peers and with one, two, or three of their tutors. I think that this is the same picture as Hopkins at one end of the log and a young man at the other; I think this was one of those occasions where the relationships are the same both sides of the Atlantic, making allowances for all the obvious things you have to make allowances for.

All this was reinforced by the great reform movement in the English public schools that took place between the 1820's and the 1870's. The last great spasm of good old fashioned disorder was the great riot over the hideous food served at Winchester in 1816. This was *the* riot which got so far out of hand that the Hampshire Militia had to be called in to restore order and to stop the young persons burning down the school. Thereafter, the emphasis on the combination of intellectual and spiritual guidance provided by the ideal schoolmaster and the ideal tutor is

common to the school and the university. The effect of this, which is obviously tremendously important, is that the schools could then supply Oxford with the right kind of student and Oxford could feed the schools with the right kind of teachers. So the process gathers momentum. But as the university expanded and new public schools were founded in the second part of the 19th century, it meant that there was never a risk of young men knocking on the barred gates of colleges that had too many students and there was never any risk of colleges looking for students and finding the pool was empty.

So the tutorial fellow in the modern form, which is to say a non-clergyman, non-celibate teacher, is imagined by the 1840's and the groundwork for the creation of the species in large numbers is laid by the 1854 commissioners and the statutes that are given to Oxford and Cambridge at the end of the 1850's. But like everything where you've got people in entrenched positions, it takes place fairly slowly. It was all a great accident: it was an accident that Gladstone could dictate the terms of the Royal Commission and it was an accident that Gladstone accepted the world view of the Oxford Tutor's Association. Before that, it was a dollar to a dime that a reformed university would have been a Scotch-German amalgam, and since I am a long way from Princeton I can say Scotch-German amalgam without risk of assassination, which is to say the research ambitions of German professors attached to the professor-assistant teaching model familiar from Scottish universities. The reason why England didn't go down that track were very often pretty bad. German universities were thought to teach infidelity, not in the modern sense, but in the 19th century sense of thought to destroy people's Christian faith and the names of Strauss and Feuerbach and the practice of the historical criticisms all too familiar in British theological circles. Given the centrality of Anglican Christianity to Oxford, the German model was just unattractive.

The research superiority of the German universities was acknowledged. Not just in philology, ancient history, and philosophy, but rather soon in the physical and biological sciences as well. And, as you all know, until World War II a British chemistry student would have to learn German and after World War II German students had to learn American. In the 1850's, there is no attraction in the German model to Britain and, of course even in this country it's not until Hopkins is founded, in what, 1874? that the German model is naturalized at all. When you look at what somebody did for a Ph.D. at Hopkins, where you could actually do it in 2 years and you had classes for 3 semesters and you wrote your Ph.D. thesis in the 4th semester, you can see that even in American naturalization it isn't the German model where it was 7 years for your first degree and another 7 for your Ph.D. It's not quite the same animal.

The Scots should by rights have won the battle with the English. The Scots had abandoned the so-called regent-ing model, that is to say where a regent master or tutor looked after the well-being and program of their juniors. They'd abandoned that in the 16th century and, after all, even if the bigots of the Edinburgh Town Council had kept David Hume out of a professorship, students did get Adam Smith, Dugal Stewart, and Thomas Reid among others as their classroom teachers. It was a system that created syllabuses and had an orderly progression from introductory work in the first year to advanced subjects in the fourth. A progressive system of that kind wasn't impossible in Oxford but there wasn't a whole lot of structure. The Tutor's Association won both the battle and the war. Oxford wasn't reformed on the professorial model,

though a lot was done to make professorships proper jobs, and by 1900 a lot of new chairs would be created.

But the topic now is tutorial teaching as it grew. Whenever Oxford is short of money, there is always pressure on the tutorial system since it is unavoidably expensive in terms of time and, therefore, in terms of money. Either the faculty is overloaded or the cost per instructional hour is high or both. And the cry always goes up when there's pressure that Oxford's centuries old teaching methods are under threat. Well, whatever the modern tutorial is, it is not centuries old. It is, in fact, unclear how old it is. It's actually quite hard to do proper homework on this, but it is not clear exactly how it got to be the way it had become by 1920. But, I think by 1920, what we have seen in the recent past really was in place. I think it came into its modern form between 1875 and 1920 and the reason in part why it gets its canonical modern form is because the examination system also gets its canonical modern form. Different schools of subjects are created in the second half of the 19th century, some get created well into the 20th century, but history is detached from classics; they think about creating my subject from 1903 to 1928 when they finally get there. As subjects are created for examination, so the picture that what you get a degree for is performance in a final examination (consisting of between 8 and 12, 3-hour written closed book examinations) becomes canonical. The obvious way of teaching people for that is to give them 8 tutorials on each of the examinations they are going to take. The great virtue of this which I won't go on about, is it's the other thing that detaches the relationship between teacher and taught, tutor and student, from the process of assessment and the notion of preserving a kind of intellectual friendship between teacher and taught, uncontaminated by hassling for grades, is then firmly bolted into place. It stays bolted into place thereafter.

It's not terribly hard to chart the process in a broad brush kind of way, but it's worth pulling out a couple of crucial things. Before the reforms of the 1850's, and indeed I think probably before the 1870's, tuition in college took the form of what any American would have described as a repetition and a repetition is precisely what it says it is. The classes would not have been big classes. A college like New College, with only 4 students a year, it's very unlikely they would ever have had more than 5 or 6 persons in a class. But, basically, students were given passages of Latin and Greek prose or verse to construe and did it until they were word perfect. They would learn algebra and geometry in the same way. Intellectual curiosity wasn't encouraged but linguistic facility was. By the time somebody had finished, if they had been a well taught school boy and had then gone through classics at Oxford, they could have read and translated anything in Greek or Latin at sight and could have written, not just perfectly good prose in either of the ancient languages, but could have done technically perfect Greek and Latin verse as well, and could probably do it on the spot. You could probably give him a topic, give him 5 minutes to reflect, and they could have probably done you 25 lines of perfect Greek hexameters for the asking. Yes, those who were paying attention and not out on the river or down the county marshes playing cricket. On the other hand, they wouldn't have had anything interesting to say about the philosophical content of Plato's *Dialogues*, as opposed to their literary form, until round about 1860, when they were treated as literature, not as philosophy. Repetitions were a form of drill: a good scholar with students he liked, and good students would have made it much more interesting, and the experience for persons not in that condition can be imagined from one or two of Dewey's letters in the 1870's where he described the contrast between seminars at

Hopkins, where he clearly thought he had died and gone to heaven, and repetitions in his high school and at the University of Vermont.

The arrival of the essay as the centerpiece of tutorial teaching comes with the creation of the tutorial career as one that a clever young man might aspire to as a lifetime post. People in Oxford were surprised that the tutorial career became attractive. They initially assumed there would be two classes of person, one of which were prized fellows who would be elected at 22 and would leave at 29 and go off and become lawyers or whatever they became, and persons appointed later in life who would settle down to become tutors. What surprised everybody was that the young persons elected at the age of 22 wanted to stay on and become college teachers. College statutes very often reflect the assumptions of the 1870's. By the time you get to 1910, it's clear that those assumptions were just wrong, that the tutorial career became an attractive career because you could marry, you could be decently paid, and you had wonderfully interesting students to teach.

Originally, as I have said several times, reading is what is at the heart of a tutorial. Essay writing and coming in with problems you have been solving appeared to have come into the university from outside from the practice of the coaches who had remedied the deficiencies of Oxford and Cambridge education before the 1860's.

Before the repeal of the Test Act in 1872 (this was the Act that kept non-Anglican Christians out of teaching), a lot of people who, for whatever reason, wanted to work at Oxford and Cambridge but fell foul of the rules about holding a fellowship, taught privately as what were known as coaches. The arrangements were private but good coaches were very much in demand, could charge serious fees, and could afford to insist on high standards. Not all were as good as this. In 1848, *Punch* picked up an advertisement for a would-be tutor who was offering instruction in science during the vacation together, as the advert said, "With opportunities for shooting and fishing." As *Punch* said, "No doubt getting their physics from studying the affect of recoil." It seems that it was the coaches who first set their students work of this kind that the students brought for discussion. In literary subjects it was an essay, in math it would sometimes be an essay but usually it was attempted solutions to puzzles. Coaches were more famous, I think, in Cambridge than in Oxford and some specialized in tuning up potential first wranglers so that they could, as we now say, "ace a test." The first Jewish fellow elected to New College, indeed the second only in the history of the university, was a man called J.J. Sylvester who was getting toward the end of a very adventurous career in the course of which he had actually been a professor in Virginia and had had to flee in the middle of the night when he got into an argument about slavery. He had been an absolutely knock-out coach in Cambridge, ended up at the age of 69 as the first civilian professor in Oxford, and was not asked to return to the old treadmill. That was the kind of person who could do it and did. By the end of the 19th century, the canonical form is in place but it still had its oddities. I noticed that Henry (Professor Mayr-Harting) was astonished by the old habit of reading so-called masters' essays. I read a masters' essay to Sir David Lindsay Keir in my youth, and I have to say that he was pretty uncomprehending. After 46 years, I still remember the occasion as being so absolutely boring that I cannot help hoping that I bored him as much as his textbook on English Constitutional History later bored me. In fact, he wrote 4 essays; one was literally for the master—which as I say was a frost, which I think was probably personal to the both of us but still—you read 3 to a tutor, not in your subject, and I must

say that was very good. I had an extremely agreeable young law tutor who gave me an extremely hard time and that was really good for one's head. When the habit died out, I don't know, but the concept of an essay is itself, I think, something to provide a subject for a conference like this, why an essay isn't an abbreviated American term paper nor a short-form graduate research paper nor what an American student would call a review, takes a bit of explanation not only to American students when they first arrive at Oxford but even to oneself. It requires a lot of self-consciousness to see quite what the animal is that one is looking for.

The essay canonically had to take 10 minutes to read aloud, had to be intelligible at first hearing. To a modern eye, the kind of things students were asked to produce 100 years ago look pretty odd. They were asked, for example, to assess the success of Kant's transcendental deduction of the categories or to sum up Napoleon's career before the Russian campaign of 1812. I have not come across essays, I mean I have not done the kind of homework I'm certain I could do, I have not come across essays from that time but I have come across lots of lists of essay topics and I have always found them very astonishing in their sweep. My guess, and it really is a guess, is that what students actually did is very much what I did some 40 years ago and it goes like this: a tutor would very likely have been reading a new discussion of Kant's transcendental deduction of the categories or else a new book or a new article on Napoleon's successes before he headed for Russia. What the undergraduate was told to do really was to analyze the persuasiveness of these pieces of work. They were, so to speak, set to interrogate the ideas and their author as briskly and as briefly as possible. Yards and yards of narrative, background to assessing Napoleon's career or assessing the whole project in Kant's *First Critique* were absolutely forbidden. You had to start *in medias res*; you had to make 4 crucial points, articulate them, clarify them, analyze them and—if you were feeling particularly bold—to challenge them, and—if you were feeling not so much bold as catastrophically brave—to challenge them in ways you knew that your tutor would actually fight because after all who wants to sit there for 50 minutes with him saying, “Hmm, I suppose that's all right”? What you really want to provoke is, Do you really? At that point, everybody can begin to learn something. Nonetheless, I look back in deep astonishment at tutorial work then. It was only late in the 1920's that there was an intercollegiate agreement that tutors should teach for no more than 26 tutorial as a week. Until that time, most tutors listened to 40 essays, talked to 40 students, wrote notes about their progress, took an interest in their future careers, and very frequently had half-dozen of them to lunch on Sunday. When tutors found time to have a life of their own looks at first sight mysterious. It's less mysterious than it looks and it still leaves one a bit open-mouthed. Terms lasted 8 weeks. Teaching started punctually on the morning of the first Monday and ended punctually at lunchtime on the final Saturday. Tutorials didn't only take place during the ordinary working day, whatever that may be, they took place up to 10:00 at night and they took place on Saturdays as well. David Ogg, the historian, was a very loyal fellow of New College and did practically anything anybody ever asked but said firmly that he could not conscientiously reduce the number of tutorial hours they worked to a figure as low as 25. Conversely, the modern student would think it a violation of his human rights to have to attend a tutorial after dinner on a Saturday evening. Even if sober, he'd think it a violation of his human rights, but it used to happen as recently as 40 years ago—somebody the other day was complaining to me about being taught by Dr. Goff (subsequently Law Lord Goff). For law students, it used to happen frequently because freshly hatched barristers would come up to Oxford for the weekend and teach a lot from Friday

after dinner, Saturday after dinner, and sometimes even Sunday morning, so post-prandial tuition was a standard hazard of a Saturday evening.

The world obviously has changed dramatically. This is a conference about instruction, about assessing the effectiveness of instruction, and practical things of that kind. So what I want to do is just flick very fast through some obvious questions about whether we've lost something-- which of the various things that I have put in as being the components of tutorials are the ones that I think we really mind about. The ancient mode, as I have said now about 9 times, emphasized reading. The later mode tends to emphasize writing: it's knowing what you think because you've written it down. But if you hold my view that you don't know what you think until you hear yourself say it, or you don't know what you think until you see what you've written, then you can see why people emphasize writing. The question of how many people makes a tutorial never crops up in older accounts. I suspect that because the pastoral was still very much in the center of the picture and that tended to imply a one-to-one relationship, though of course we do parties as it were, two to many. So, I'll walk through the components and make some over-emphatic claims so those with sounder judgment can contradict me usefully. I also mention that I don't say anything about what action seems to me really crucial, which is pre-college education. My own view is that if you aren't taught to write before you are 11 years old, you practically never learn. You can write useful prose starting later but it is very hard to teach people to write good, flexible, fluent, animated, expressive prose if you don't start in on them until they hit university. My Princeton class used to look deeply unhappy when I said that it was a safe bet that 25% of them were, for my purposes, functionally illiterate. They would all point out that they had 790 on the verbal SAT, they'd then write the first essay, and I would point out that my figures have been a slight underestimation, this year it was 32%. We'd then settle down to learn how to write.

So, reading: it's not the only way of insuring that the students really read what they are asked to read, but a tutorial environment is a very good environment for insuring it, partly because it's very hard to hide behind other people which you can do in a large class.

In the modern Oxford context, I think that larger reading groups also are very important because in the modern Oxford context there is much more danger than there used to be about students having very little in the way of a common syllabus. Because, once upon a time, there were practically no free choice or special subject papers and now there is an enormous choice. It means that any given student is quite likely to pursue a program which has very little in common with his peers. I think reading together is actually a necessary counter-action to reading in a solitary fashion one-to-one with a tutor.

Essays. Well I've already said why I think essays really, really matter and I just want at this point to do my one footnote that says I don't agree with Henry, which is to say I think that the picture of essay writing and tutorials as having this interactive relationship really is important. I think interrogation perhaps overstates the potential for conflict: they were all so nice that there is very little of it, but I think that if students are to take ownership of what they are learning to really know what it is they've got, nothing beats writing an essay on it which is your understanding of what you taught yourself, articulating it to somebody else and then defending it or giving way gracefully where giving way gracefully is the only decent thing to do. This brings

one into the question of how many students can be members of a tutorial before it's not one. I think again that Professor Mayr-Harting perhaps exaggerates when he says any more than 2 students and it is something else. I myself think that numbers do change matters but if you are good and lucky with your students, you can get the students to talk to each other to turn the thing into what you might think of as a 3, 4, 5 person tutorial because this interactive relationship will really work. If you are unlucky, it's terrible because every student will, of course, hide behind the others and try to bully you into turning it into a lecture. I like the picture of the Williams Model in which one student talks, the other interrogates (or as Americans say, "critiques") and of course the professor than has the role of something like referee, guide, mountain rescue service, I think those obviously could work very nicely indeed and obviously very often do.

The pastoral versus the instructional, I think actually, is a large and interesting subject. I just want to say, ever so briefly, that I think they still are pastoral. I think that part of the point of having this deeply personal relationship is, in effect, that it carries over something of the way in which the final year moral philosophy class given by every college president in New England attempted to do, but it's generally character forming, that people are being shown how to become scholars for the moment, how to take their work seriously, how to acquire the right habits, taste, tactics, of an investigator of a discipline. I think as long as you have good students who are up for it, then the pastoral and the instructional are two faces of the same kind of interaction.

Finally, they need much else if they are to work well, and although we are going to talk about it all weekend, I don't, myself, entirely like discussions of individualized learning. This is partly for an old fashioned Puritan reason: I think a lot of education is actually about making subordinate our individuality to the demands of a discipline, and the demands of a skill. It is to acquire respect for what is very much not us. Consider, as we shall this afternoon perhaps, the way a musician approaches a work. Before they can produce an individual interpretation, some form of disciplined mastery of the work as written is essential. The same is true in every academic subject. An individual interpretation is worth praise only because it sheds new light on something other than the individual, namely the work in front of us. So I think caution about that over-egging it is a kind of vandalism; it tends to distract students from "it" and make them focus narcissistically on "me," and I think one of the things we ought to try and do is to get them into the frame of mind where "it" comes first and "we" come second.

There is of course a great deal more to the whole subject than that, but the last thing I would want to emphasize about why we shouldn't overstate the case for individualized learning and for tutorial teaching in particular, is the old argument that Dewey always produced. Dewey, I have to tell you, was a terrible teacher. I know you want to know this. He really was absolutely terrible. There is an account in Sydney Hook's autobiography, and Sydney Hook worshipped Dewey, he thought that Dewey was a sort of combination of the god in whom he did not believe and the Marx in whom he did believe, and this was the modern world speaking for itself. He described Dewey's lectures as: Dewey would come in with a yellow loose-leaf pad; would stare out of the window at the back; he would talk in a slow, monotonous Midwestern drawl; and he would screw up the paper; more slow, monotonous; and so it would go on. So, I am not advocating Dewey in practice but simply Dewey in doctrine, and it's simply this—that knowledge is a collective possession. Dewey described it as the funded capital of a culture: it is a common possession. Unlike most possessions, sharing it doesn't diminish it but increases it.

Some forms of academic activity in which people have a strong sense that reinforcing the fact that this is *ours* as well as *mine*, I think, is very important. So the fact that I have spent 40 years slaving away as a journeyman tutor does not mean that I think it is the only thing that the education of the young requires. That really would be a myth.