

a self-advertising turn of mind. Too large discretion in the hands of the individual departments would encourage one of the worst of the evils which the Faculty of Graduate Studies was created to destroy.

(II) If the individual faculty were made the unit, the danger described under (I) above might be avoided, but the problem would not be solved, at any rate in the case of the Faculty of Arts, and probably not in the case of others as well. The Faculty of Arts is nearly as heterogeneous a body as the Graduate Faculty itself, and you are merely reviving the old difficulty of the physicist's being asked to judge the research standards of the classicist. You may have reduced the number of the judges, but you have not altered the problem that faces them.

(III) A board appointed for the purpose seems the only solution. Just because it was specially appointed ad hoc, its membership could be so made up as to meet the needs of the situation and safeguard it from the dangers indicated above. It will be easiest to illustrate this from the Faculty of Arts, with which I am most familiar.

1. The subjects should be arranged in groups so that ones closely related fall in the same group. For instance, the following groups might be suggested:
 - (a) Classics, Romance Languages, German, English, Oriental and Semitic Languages
 - (b) Economics and Political Science, History, Sociology and English
 - (c) Sociology, Education, Philosophy, and Psychology
 - (d) Botany, Zoology, Geology, Chemistry, Physics, and Mathematics.

It will be noticed that English and Sociology come twice over. There seems no real objection to this, and it is the result of the dual character which each of those subjects possesses. English, for instance, on its literary side, is closely related to History, on its philological side, to the other language subjects. There is, of course, no reason why groups should be wholly within the limits of one Faculty.