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"Here Nature has given much by withholding much. Here man found his birthright, the privilege of struggle."

—Semple
Readers of The Monadnock will find that this issue differs markedly from the usual alumni number. The occasion of President Atwood's twentieth year at Clark has been brought to the attention of all alumni and each was invited to write a short article. In selecting replies for publication we have chosen variety rather than quantity in order to achieve a wider sampling of alumni thought. The staff wishes to thank Dr. Preston E. James, who was asked to write at some length about President Atwood, and all others who have been good enough to answer our questionnaire.

We who are teachers or who are working to become teachers can learn much from the example of President Atwood. It was his conspicuous success as a teacher at Chicago and Harvard that brought him the opportunity to prepare his series of texts and to carry some of his ideas into practice in the Graduate School of Geography at Clark. Many of President Atwood's former students will attest that they found in his courses and his conferences some of their most stimulating and memorable experiences. What do we learn about teaching from him?

For one thing, President Atwood had the capacity to make the study of geography seem significant and important. Not all the members of every large class could have felt this; but the records suggest that a good many felt it, and were led to devote their lives to this subject; no doubt there were many other undergraduate students who were moved sufficiently to push on beyond the required minimum of class assignments. I knew some like that. And when students in other courses asked us what was the good of studying the forms of the land, we would attempt to repeat or rephrase what the professor had said so convincingly. We would tell them about the challenging problems which the scholar, devoted to the search for truth for its own sake, could not leave unattacked. There is no doubt that President Atwood knew how to motivate his students.
Did President Atwood teach geography or did he teach students? Stated in these terms the question becomes an absurdity. While the educational pendulum moves away from specialization in subjects, let us not forget the experience of this eminently successful teacher. President Atwood taught geography. He taught a subject which excited him because he was actively at work on its problems. He taught it well because the concepts he handled were developed with crystal clarity in his own mind. If there ever was an example of the importance of combining teaching and research, it is offered us by President Atwood. A research worker can achieve brilliant success without being a teacher; but a conspicuously successful teacher who is not also actively at work on research problems is rare.

President Atwood always insisted that geography was a field subject. When he taught in the classroom he was visualizing the landscapes he himself had tramped or ridden over—that he had seen in storm and sunshine, in the heat of summer and the cold of winter. From his own field experience he drew that vital spark with which he was able to demolish the barriers that usually shut off classrooms from the world of reality.

It was in the field that he came into closest contact with his students. There he taught them to observe with meticulous care, and to record with honesty. One did not guess that gravel ought to cap that ridge on the other side of the valley: one went across to find out. Nor did the field courses consist in open air lectures. Students were given problems, nicely calculated to bring out their best efforts, but not to exceed their capacities. On a problem a student was left to gain his own experiences. Encouragement was given when it was requested, and criticism of the results was not sparing; but in the end the student, whether he was writing a course thesis, a field report, or a doctoral dissertation, had the exhilarating sense of having accomplished something by his own efforts. However haltingly and incompletely, the student was given the opportunity to sense what Bowman calls “the joy of discovery.” And that joy of discovery could not fail to be translated again into the classroom.

When President Atwood came to Clark he instituted among other things, the geography workroom. How many of the persons who have had the privilege of working there have appreciated the deeper significance of this unique feature of the Clark School of Geography? Here teaching and research are combined. Students and faculty, both laden with maps and notes from studies in the field, work together on the drafting and tracing tables of the workroom: almost literally they are surrounded by fine collections of books and maps. Here the gap between instruction and independent investigation is brought closer together than is generally possible, and an atmosphere of real scholarship is created.

Those of us in the teaching profession must not forget the lessons we learned in that workroom. We may change our attitudes and objectives of geographical study; we may accept the very great importance of the modern techniques of teaching and seek to perfect ourselves through study and practice in the field of pedagogy. But we must not forget that it takes more than technique to thrill a class as President Atwood did: it takes experience in the joy of discovery which the teacher wants to share with his students; it takes continued activity in the study of field problems.

Yes, that keeps a person busy. And President Atwood can offer us an example of how busy a person can be. In all the professions of modern society, the pace is harder than it used to be—and geography is no exception.

Preston E. James

GREAT BRITAIN

In a letter dated November 17, 1939, Dr. C. B. Fawcett tells us of the changes entailed when University College of London moved to its war time location at Aberystwyth, Wales.

The decision that the University should be removed from London in the event of war was made some time ago; and much of our equipment was packed up towards the close of the last session. Nonetheless the actual move was a very strenuous affair. The faculties of Arts, Laws, and Economics, and part of the faculty of Science of our College were told to come here and share the buildings and facilities of the University College of Wales. The rest of U. C. L. is in other colleges of the University of Wales, except for some special departments which are scattered in England. Other Colleges of the University of London are similarly removed from London.
The mass air attacks which were anticipated, and which justified the decision not to allow such gathering of students in an area rather likely to be attacked, have not yet occurred. But many of the buildings of the university in London are occupied and used for purposes directly connected with the war.

Here we have more students than we had anticipated. So has our host college. But both schools of Geography are short of staff. We are working with five professors in place of eleven, and with 120 students in a department planned for 40. This little town is similarly crowded. Nevertheless, though we are in conditions of some crowding and short of staff and some materials, we are very much better off than seemed possible. We have all the essentials and there is no shortage of food; while the kindness of our hosts and townsfolk is beyond description. If war has shown us some of the worst aspects of human nature it has enabled us to see more of some of the best.

Now, in the little time left after the work of teaching under present conditions, I find myself most interested in the discussions of after-war organization which are active in non-official circles here. My own views, as any who have read my book on the political geography of the British Empire know, are all in favour of a Federal Union of the free peoples. And I am more than ever convinced that a real union is possible only among peoples who are agreed on such a fundamental matter as that of the freedom of the individual. If the totalitarian tyrannies succeed in stimulating the free peoples to union they will have, quite unwillingly, done a great good to the world and at the same time determined their own failure. I am against a United States of Europe because such a union would, for the next generation at least, have a majority of its citizens drawn from those who have been educated in autocratic states to condemn freedom; it would be a militaristic and aggressive super-state out to conquer the world. Such a union as that suggested by Clarence Streit in his "Union Now" would, on the other hand be able to make a free world for free men. And some sort of wider union must come if our civilization is to survive, either a free union or submission to a conqueror, because the world is the one satisfactory unit area for mankind.

C. B. Fawcett

CANADA

A department of geography was established at this university for the first time five years ago with the appointment of Griffith Taylor as Professor of Geography. This was the first such department in Canada. It is still the only independent department of geography in the Dominion though part time work in that subject has been established at the University of British Columbia, the University of Western Ontario, McMaster University, and the University of Montreal.

The department at Toronto has become popular with the students and has grown in size. Besides Professor Taylor there are now two lecturers and six demonstrators. In addition to the ordinary pass courses there is now a full four year honour course in geography. A close cooperation between geography and such departments as history, political science, and economics has been developed. The subject of geography has been particularly attractive to the students in the teachers' course, and Professor Taylor has been associated with the Ontario College of Education. The interest of teachers has been increased, no doubt, by the growing emphasis placed upon the teaching of geography in the secondary schools of this province through the efforts of the Provincial Department of Education. The amount of time devoted to geography and the scope of the subject have been considerably increased in the schools. Professor Taylor has been closely associated with this development. In this way the University of Toronto and Professor Taylor have become the center for the development of geographic teaching and research in Canada.

RICHARD M. SAUNDERS

WEST

One day, when attending one of my classes at the Geographical Institute of the State University at Utrecht, The Netherlands, the professor of social geography, Professor Niermeijer, introduced a gentleman from the United States, and in his honor lectured to us that afternoon in English. That gentleman from the Far West was President Atwood. We, students, felt very flattered indeed to have Doctor Atwood visit our Institute. We knew about him through our
professor of physical geography, Dr. Oestreich, a disciple of William Morris Davis, and a great admirer of American physiography. We knew him also through Professional Paper No. 60, a publication every beginning student had to study. We were even more pleased with his visit when we learned that President Atwood was on a tour of Europe to study at first hand what was being done in the geographical institutes of the principal English and continental universities.

Little did I dream that within a relatively few years I would be one of his students and eventually would land even farther west than Worcester, Massachusetts!

My years at Clark opened wide horizons to me. I learned to think according to different geographic dimensions, I became acquainted with problems radically different from those of Europe, with new points of view, with fresh approaches.

Above all, those years taught me that which is both the joy and the burden of the geographer: there is always so much to learn, and still so much to do. This is true especially here in America, where the land is new and geography young, where the geographer’s work is not limited by too many boundaries, where he can do research work wherever he pleases, and where, if he wishes to do so, he can think and argue in continental terms.

Therefore, why should we, American geographers, spend our valuable time in endless and usually fruitless discussions as to exactly where geography begins and exactly where it ends? Geography is incontestably the main bridge across the gap between the natural and the social sciences. This alone makes geography an indispensable science.

Let us not quibble among ourselves about exact boundaries. Let us be careful not to acquire a scientific inferiority complex! What other science can define its field with mathematical accuracy? For that matter, where are the exact boundaries of mathematics? Let us worry less about where we should and where we should not work and more about whether our procedures and reasoning are scientific.

Geography is a dualistic science: it has its physical and its social, or if you prefer, its human side. The study of these two sides, and of their probable relationships is unquestionably ours!

For the rest, let us work, not talk. There is yet so much to do! Think of all the analytical general and regional research studies which are still to be made in this country, and for that matter, in our entire hemisphere. Think of all the regional geographic syntheses which beg to be written. It is l’embarras du choix for all of us who like to do some research.

There is equally much to be done along educational lines. Geography is well established in grade schools. It is making fairly satisfactory progress in universities and colleges, but we are faced with a gap which is becoming every year more dangerous: in the majority, and the very large majority, of our high schools, geography has either been allowed to die out, or has been non-existent.

Here lies a task, as honorable as the best research work, for many well-trained geographers with a broad outlook. In order to reconquer some of the lost terrain we shall need geographers who can see and appreciate neighboring fields and who fully understand the field of geography as the main link between the physical and the social sciences. Their outlook should be broad enough so that they will not seek a panacea in some subdivision of the field of geography. It is on the rock of undue specialization that high school geography has been shipwrecked.

Last, but not least, let us remember that while there are many intriguing nooks and corners in this world which cry aloud for geographic investigation, our first task lies in this hemisphere, and above all, in this country. The geography of the United States should come first both in research and in education.

William Van Royen

Clark University’s best advertisement is its alumni, scattered over the world, and their publications. I returned about three weeks before the war began from my year in Europe as an American Field Service Fellow. During the thirteen months I was there I had the opportunity of visiting with geographers in France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. I am happy to assure President Atwood, members of the Staff, and alumni that the Clark Graduate School of Geography is well and favorably known abroad, and that European geographers are looking to Clark to maintain its high standards of instruction and productive research in the future.

Ralph E. Olson
In the Pacific Northwest trained geographers are working in regional planning and in education. Clark has no representative here in the planning work. In the education field, Clark has placed three of the six trained geographers in the teacher training colleges of Washington and Oregon.

In the teacher training game one soon learns that service, not status, is the true measure of a discipline. Geography is not being named geography in the curriculum of the modern elementary and secondary schools. Its status is nil. But it is being taught. Geography is being “lived” in the “integrated” “functionalized” modern “curriculum of experiences,” and its contributions to child and adult education can be what they must be only if our future geographers in teacher training colleges thoroughly understand both geography and education.

Clark provides possibly the best balanced graduate training for geography teaching of any college. Her field study techniques and her several “report” courses (whether we like the hard work or not) fit admirably the best accepted educational theories. Clark has followed the highly commendable practice of providing some training in teaching techniques. No other school can touch her in this vital area,—but it remains under-developed. Here lies a wide open road for growth and leadership service.

NORMAN CARLS

When a well trained and charming musician looked out of the train window in New Mexico and scoffed at the farms because they were not like the ones she knew in Iowa; and a teacher of high school literature of considerable reputation remarked in a group discussing the tax problems of a community “What is wrong with the taxpayers? Don’t they know the schools just have to have more money?”; I am shocked into the realization that we geography teachers have a lot to do. Each year’s experience of teaching assorted courses in Science, Geography and Education convinces me more than ever that the real basis of an educated and intelligent citizenry is a thorough knowledge and understanding of the earth upon which they live and whose resources are the basis of their political, social and economic problems.

AGNES M. ALLEN

MID-WEST

All of us know that the science of geography has made great progress in the United States during the past quarter century. Among the important contributions to this progress was the establishment of the Clark School of Geography. We, as alumni, have benefited thereby. I wonder how many of us have asked ourselves what we might do in order further to promote the good work which the Clark School has done?

There was a time in our history when it was necessary, or at least desirable, to study in Europe in order to get a thorough grounding in the field of geography. That day is now past. However, there is still great value to be derived from contact with European geographers. We can profit by learning their point of view, and by exposing ourselves to that more or less intangible something often called “atmosphere” which envelops the European scientific mind. The Clark School of Geography has forwarded this objective through its invitations to foreign professors of geography to lecture before the seminar or to give courses. The journal, Economic Geography, has created a favorable impression abroad. In still other ways, the Clark School of Geography has helped to develop friendly international relations.

Many of us, through our own departments as well as by our individual activities, have likewise contributed toward the advancement of the field of geography. Perhaps you are ambitious to develop an important school of geography of your own. However, I think we must recognize, it is unlikely that numerous schools of geography in America can be developed to equally high levels. This is particularly true in the case of many state institutions because, due to their inherent nature, they cannot enjoy the same type of flexibility in the matter of budgets and management which private institutions afford. Accordingly, I feel that the Clark Alumni have an opportunity to advance the field of geography in America not only through their own immediate work but also through fostering the development of a great institution at Clark University. This is said without reflection upon the present status of that school. Even Clark will admit there is always room for improvement. How can we do it? There are, perhaps, three ways:

1. We can contribute by encouraging really able students to take at least a part of their training in the Clark School of Geography.
2. We can make a monetary contribution to the school either out of our current funds or by remembering it in our wills. Many of us who carry a little life insurance will have to admit that we are going to be worth a good deal more dead than we are alive. We might share a little of this residue with Clark.

3. There are individuals of wealth throughout this land right now waiting for a good suggestion as to where they might make an effective contribution. They would prefer to give their money to institutions, which advance international good will, than to surrender it in the form of taxes to Uncle Sam. Even when they might not give to our own school, they might give to the Clark School of Geography. Try the suggestion.

We ought to have at least one school of geography in this country, admittance to which will be a coveted privilege and graduation from which will be an uncommon honor. The alumni can help to make this dream come true.

EUGENE VAN CLEEF

SOUTH

There have been many statements concerning the value of a geographic background in other pursuits. Below, a geographer-turned-statesman and his former student indicate the subject's usefulness in the present struggle.

Count Paul Teleki, when recommending me for a fellowship, wrote, "considering the great work done now in geography in the United States I believe this would be the land where his horizon would be most widened". When he wrote "in the United States" he meant at Clark. I was not the first student of his who was fortunate enough to be able to work at Clark. That was twelve long years ago. Now, during these trying times as Prime Minister of Hungary, he declared in parliament that only those who knew geography can know the gigantic problems of our maddened world, and where the politicians and diplomats failed, there only the geographers can succeed. To which I can add only the hope that in the future we shall have more and better trained geographers than ever before—geographers who will be serving the interests not only of their own nations but of the world as a whole in striving to adjust economic and political matters in order to bring and keep peace on earth.

SIGISMOND DER. DIETTRICH

12

Just from a year of being out in the "wilds" of teaching I have thought that more and varied course and field work might be offered at Clark. For instance since Conservation seems to be a subject turned over to the geographer in most schools and, since it is being offered in a great many places, I think something should be offered to meet that need at Clark, perhaps by utilizing some of the faculty at Harvard, Yale, or M. I. T., as in forestry and water planning.

Another lack that I felt last fall in trying to teach a graduate course in "Regional Studies of the United States—The North" was a series of detailed courses on the United States. Most of the students coming to Clark have had a general course in North America, and that's all. Why not offer some special regional courses in the United States and North America since everyone going out generally has to teach at least one course in the subject?

At field camp we worked with top sheets, soil maps, etc., but suppose I am in a region where none of the above are available. Under such circumstances I doubt that I could run a satisfactory traverse. While I don't think the above is the major thing in geography by any means, still it would be a great help to the teacher who has to do a field study or conduct field studies to have a little practical instruction in those lines.

Those are just some of the lacks that I've felt this year. I can say that I have been able to put to use a lot of the things I learned at Clark.

M. W. MYERS

EAST

The opening of a complete school of geography at Clark University in 1921 represents a significant landmark in the progress of graduate instruction. As expressed by the editor of the Journal of Geography: "It is of significance to geographic education in America whenever a new department of geography is established whether that department be in normal school, college, or university. However, it is of more than ordinary significance when a university with the standards of Clark decides to make geography its special field and chooses an eminent geographer as president."
Under the leadership of President Wallace W. Atwood, manned by a competent staff, and backed by ample funds and facilities, Clark’s School of Geography has come to take its place among the leading schools of this country, within the short span of twenty years.

**Rafael Pico**

With the wide scope of our field, we need to remind ourselves of the criteria which make a study distinctly geographic. These are two, distribution and integration. Geographers are concerned with place, with areal differentiation, but so are other disciplines such as geology or agriculture. Mere mapability does not guarantee geographi- cality. The second essential is integration or relationship. This again is not the exclusive domain of geographers, for agricultural economists and sociologists deal with coordinations. But the combination of distributions and integration is the unique responsibility of geographers. Our task is to understand the varied assemblage of features which give personality to the face of the Earth.

In presenting material, we need to make increasingly meaningful use of maps and graphs. I am convinced that we have by no means reached the limits of cartographic representation. New map techniques and considerably more artistry are among the major needs of American geography.

**George B. Cressey**

President Atwood, and indeed all of his Staff, can well review with pride the work of the last twenty years. For a short time after I left Clark, when people would ask me where I had done my graduate work, I would say “at Clark University,” hastening to add “in Worcester, Massachusetts”, and then a few words about the quality of its School of Geography. But I soon found out that it was unnecessary to say anything but “Clark”. People do know of its leading position and its contributions to the field of geography. For a small university to accomplish this in a few years time, without fanfare of any kind, is tribute enough to the quality of its work, and to the genius of its president.

The motto over the workroom door has always seemed to me to be considerably more than a motto over a workroom door. It is the basic principle of a system of education, and I have never known a place where it was more effectively put into practice. A graduate student at Clark is continually “doing things himself, under competent guidance”. The Clark system is not only the “best kind of education” but, it seems to me the only true kind of education, and a large share of the advances which geography has been making in this country can be traced, I believe, to that system.

As I look back through whatever perspective five years away from Worcester has given me, I find only one criticism of the training we received. That is the fact that, with the press of papers, class reports, and research we never had time to browse and ruminate in the Clark library. Our acquaintance with the journals was limited to the minimum essentials, and our knowledge of the classics of geography was too often limited by the press of time to a knowledge of the color of their bindings.

The library to which I have access now is better than many in the country, and is gradually increasing its collection of geographic works, but it will be a long time before I again have access to some of the volumes which were almost at my elbow five years ago, yet which went unread.

Congratulations to Clark, then, as her Graduate School of Geography approaches its majority. Having left her youth, may the School experience a long and useful maturity.

**Robert B. Simpson**

**THE PAST TEN YEARS**

Publishing houses are fond of insisting that “The true university is a collection of books”. Looking at the matter with what is perhaps a less prejudiced eye, the writer is inclined to believe that the true university is a collection of professors and students. Readers must assume that new books have been added to the library, new maps have been placed in new steel cabinets, and new flags have been unfurled from the workroom ceiling. There is even a new drinking fountain. What of the people?

In 1931 a booklet entitled “Graduate School of Geography—The
First Ten Years, 1921-31" appeared. The list of faculty members printed in it was: President Wallace W. Atwood, Ellen C. Semple, Charles F. Brooks, Douglas C. Ridgley, Clarence F. Jones, W. Elmer Ekblaw, Curtis F. Marbut, Guy H. Burnham. There were 23 students in residence and at the June commencement four Doctors of Philosophy and six Masters of Arts were released on an unsuspecting world. We shall take that commencement as a point of departure. For a record of the important events between 1921 and 1931, readers must search in their memories or read "The First Ten Years".

Today, almost ten years later, as the Clark School approaches the beginning of its twentieth year, there have been some changes. We have lost Ellen C. Semple and Curtis F. Marbut by death. Charles F. Brooks is now at Harvard and Douglas C. Ridgley is living in active retirement in Illinois. There have been two newcomers to the Staff. Dr. Samuel Van Valkenburg came from Wayne University and Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, Jr., from the National Parks Service at Washington. There are now 24 full time students and there is no diminution in the number of degrees being given each year.

Information of events between 1931 and 1940 has to come largely from secondary sources. The best reference available in the field is usually kept hidden in a steel filing cabinet in Mr. Burnham's office. The writer has studied it with some thoroughness and appreciates the care with which it is secreted. The small book is "The Monadnock 1927-1938" and it contains enough information about some people to brighten their bright young lives. From Volume I Number 1, issued under the editorship of Albert La Fleur, to Volume XII Number 1 under the editorship of Rose Zeller, this series of Monadnocks supplies a record of sustained geographical effort.

The issue of 1932 contains a photograph of Dr. C. F. Brooks, complete with fur cap and looking a Commissar of all the Climates. The occasion was his departure for Harvard. It was undoubtedly a great loss to the School. Earlier Monadnocks are full of the climatological and meteorological activities he and his students carried out from California to the Gulf Stream and the Labrador Current. Wherever he went he took his tin bucket and psychrometer and the Monadnock faithfully recorded his many resulting publications.

There seem to have been many field trips to distant places in the past ten years. Dr. Van took parties to Europe in 1932 and 1938, Dr. and Mrs. Atwood added another continent to their list by touring South America; the famous Field School of Geography occurred in 1934; Dr. Jones, accompanied by Darkenwald went to Cuba; Dr. Jones went to the Caribbean; Dr. Jones went to the Caribbean again (we've lost count of the number of times he has been there); Dr. Van divided a summer between Puerto Rico and Central Europe; Dr. Jones was off again, this time to Guatemala; President and Mrs. Atwood added still one more continent to their collection by going to Africa (having been to Guatemala in the meantime) and Dr. Van again took a party to check up on European affairs. He seems to have been dissatisfied with what he saw in 1938 because he returned the following spring for a longer stay. In spite of all this watchful care the war finally broke out in 1940. Apart from this impressive record of extra-continental travel by members of the Faculty during the past ten years, a much longer list could be made of their travels within the United States. President Atwood and Dr. Atwood, Jr., have spent several summers in the Rockies, Dr. Jones and Dr. Ekblaw have covered many thousands of miles on lecture engagements. Clark's early emphasis on the need for travel by Faculty members clearly has not weakened in the past decade.

Historical research in the Monadnock files also reveals an enormous amount of writing being done by the Faculty. We have seen Dr. Jones produce his high school text on Economic Geography and the workbook to go with it, Dr. Van his Economic and Social Geography, "Europe" and "Elements of Political Geography" and President Atwood his long awaited "Physiographic Regions of North America".

Dr. Atwood, Jr., has almost seen the last of his manuscript of a workbook on "Physiographic Provinces of North America". It makes a most impressive list and is undoubtedly one of the outstanding accomplishments of the Faculty in the past ten years.

Earlier numbers of the Monadnock were careful to inform us of research work being carried on by staff and students. We read of students visiting Cuba, Puerto Rico, Grenada, Mexico, Jamaica, various parts of Europe as well as every nook and cranny of the United States. Later issues are less informing although advanced research both by members of the Faculty and by students is still the core of geographical work.

Looking back over ten years of progress it is possible to see im-
portant ideas taking shape. Probably the best contribution of the School to advanced teaching methods in Geography is the annual Field Camp. Every year, for three weeks or so, the whole school has deserted the Halls of Learning for the only place where geography may properly be learned—out in the open. From these successive camps a valuable store of reports has accumulated. Regions studied since 1931 have been—Connecticut Valley (twice), Blackstone Valley, Housatonic Valley, Gardner area, and Lowell area, as well as the greater part of the Eastern United States in the historic tour of 1934. The training received by students on these field trips is important because in some cases it is the only field training that they will ever have.

Students of past years seem to have travelled more than those of today. It is only an impression from reading Monadnocks and it may be wrong. In a brief article entitled “Kicking About” there is a brief record of the wanderings of the “Class of 1932”. In reply to the question “Where have you been?” came replies which showed an average of 25 states visited. Almost everyone had been to Canada, seven had visited the West Indies, six had been to Mexico and two to Europe. The most popular foreign city was Winnipeg—but that was doubtless back in the droughty years when international travel had its reward. All the earliest geographers were travellers. One wonders whether the newer generations of geographers are becoming content with more restful pursuits and with acquiring knowledge of other places vicariously.

Continuity is extremely difficult at any university. It is particularly so at Clark because of the short stay of most students. Some are here for a year; few stay more than two years. There are only two elements which make a continuous existence for the Society possible. These are the Faculty and the alumni. It is no mean tribute to these two groups that students in the Workroom in 1940 can look back on almost twenty years of continuous geographical work of a high calibre. As Preston James writes elsewhere it is primarily a tribute to one man with a great idea and the energy and personality to carry it through.

TREVOR LLOYD

STUDENT LOAN FUND

Since our report of last December this emergency fund has been increased by $135. According to Guy Burnham’s book the total now stands at $737.74 of which $350 is in loans outstanding. The major contribution of $100 was made by President Atwood himself, while the remainder was the gift of alumni who prefer to remain anonymous. A letter from one of the alumni reveals the sense of responsibility which has always served Clark so well.

“As one of the Workroom group I came to believe, as I do even now, that we, who have been favored by scholarships and fellowships from Clark, could show our appreciation by helping to enlarge the fund, after we have obtained teaching positions.”

PUBLICATIONS OF CLARK GEOGRAPHERS

(Up to April, 1940)

Ekblo, W. Elmer, A series of Articles in Business Education World:
“Seasonality of Climate a Factor in Man’s Economy”, December, 1939, pp. 238-286.
“Significance of Rainfall in Man’s Activities”, Jan. 1940, pp. 379-382.
“Temperature Limitations Upon Man’s Economy”, Feb., 1940, pp. 479-482.


McCune, Shannon (Editor), “Contemplated Research of Some Young American Geographers in 1940”, 9 pages, cross-referenced, Ohio State University, Columbus.


“Educational Values in Travel”, *Education*, Dec., 1939, pp. 201-204.
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