The Caltech Honor System was a good thing while a student but left me unprepared for the dishonesty rampant in industry. In the Caltech atmosphere, I got the idea that all scientists and technical people were honest and straightforward. In industry, after some bad experiences, I have learned that they are just ordinary people, though more clever in their dishonesty.

I have been most thankful I had the privilege of graduation from CIT. Not only a marvelous education but much personal contact with faculty men such as Sorensen, MacArthur, Hinrichs, Kramer, MacMinn, Judy, Watson, etc. A wonderful group of men. Furthermore, it is a tremendous advantage in post-college life to reply when asked where graduated—"Caltech." One is immediately considered to have had a top-notch education and to be highly qualified.

I would like to recommend that new students be screened for psychological maturity. In my own case, my lack of maturity contributed significantly to the waste of a good part of my education.

I am of the sincere belief that the engineering graduate curriculum offered by Caltech at the time I attended (1956-1957) was much too theoretical. A more generalized approach for the average student would be much more beneficial. As an engineering manager for the past 3 years, I find my year of graduate work of relative little value to me.

Why not give a course in business ethics in the senior year in which to make it realistic — such ethics would replace the usual Tech honor system; i.e. cheating, collusion, etc., would not only be allowed but encouraged. In this way the cut-throats in the crowd would be identified among their classmates for future reference, and the honest student — the future victim — would get a "vaccination" against the reality of the world he is about to enter.

There is a feeling at Caltech that I. Q. is the only significant factor in scientific work. I now think interest and personal drive are more important, or at least as important. It is not easy to have a proper combination of relaxed scholarly effort and stimulation to excellence in the same institution. It is not known what constitutes a good education or what is the proper training for a scientist, although there are many workable programs in existence. In striving to have every graduate as nearly "perfect" as possible, an institution like Caltech can reject and fail many who do not fit the mold. Caltech is too introspective, too ready to condemn to failure those who do not exceed them.

Approximately 1/3 of my freshman class left before graduation, which is a great waste and failure on the Institute's part.

The Institute selects on native intelligence, examines on native intelligence and bases the whole education on native intelligence. Unfortunately the type of native intelligence is not the only factor in successful work but is the easiest to measure. I believe that Caltech could benefit by not attacking the students so violently with the curriculum, but rather by relaxing the standards if necessary and let the students come to you.

There would be much to gain if the undergraduates could have their education as less of a grueling, bitter ordeal.

I feel that the students should be encouraged to attend the church of their choice in a similar way that they are encouraged to join a prof. society or take an interest in politics.

When I first graduated, I felt deficient in the so-called "practical" engineering-type course. After a few years in industry, this was no longer a problem. CIT should continue to emphasize basic theory and leave to industry the job of teaching the young engineer the practical and economic aspects of engineering.

Questionnaire gives me a pain.