

Report from the Salzburg Seminar  
in American Civilization at Scholss  
Leópoliskron, Salzburg, Austria,  
July 15th - August 31st, 1947.

Poul Norregaard Rasmussen,  
"Lysebu", Voksenkollen,  
Oslo, Norway.

Trying to escape too much talking and trying to give you, what you in special are interested in, I will in the following follow the headlines, you gave us for discussion in the evaluation seminars. In adding a 9th section with "mescellaneous", I hope in this 9 passages can give you my main points.

Let me say before beginning, that when I in the following write "the Seminar" with initial capital, I mean the Salzburg Seminar as a whole. When I write "the seminar" with small letter, I mean the different seminars as a special form for instruction, as we used in Salzburg this summer.

Let us go on:

1. The value of the Seminar for its European members. This is indeed a great question. It is so great, that I hope you forgive me, if I put it at the end of this report - as a sort of a conclusion.

2. The program within the field of one's specialisation. Let me divide my answer into parts: the lectures and the seminars. But let me first say about this division, that it seems to me to be a very good division, a practical and indulgent division of the whole instruction at the Seminar. I will advise you to keep this division in the following summers.

About the lectures in economics, I will say:

It is of course to be expected that it would afford too long a time to give a real detailed picture of the economic life in U.S.A. It is therefore quite natural, that the given picture is proportionally in broad outlines. And as far as I can see, this is all right. I will go as far as saying that you could go longer and give more broad (and not so many) lectures - and then use more time for the seminars.

In spite of the broad outlines, the lectures in economics gave exactly the broad outlines which were needed, in special when you remember, that the lectures were prepared for all students and not only economists. Of course this means that the professional economist could not receive so much from these lectures. Although not familiar with any detail in the economic life in U.S.A., one can't escape studying economics, to learn a little here and a little there on this topic. I would so think, that the professional economist did not take so much with him from these lectures, as the other students. In spite of that I have been glad to follow these lectures because: I have learned how to attach the problems, when you have to give a picture (in a brief summary) of the economic life in a certain society. For later teaching I think this can be of great value. Besides that I have brushed up my knowledge about the economic life in U.S.A. I missed a little thing: in the discussion of the national income in U.S.A. I should have been glad to hear a little about the distribution of the national income. And I would have been glad, if there

in the lectures had been given a survey of the whole institutional frame for the economic life in U.S.A.

About the seminars in economics, I will say:

The whole student body at the Seminar was very heterogeneous - varying from graduated students (to take an example from the economic seminar, a man as Witteveen was very clever) to students, who didn't know anything about modern scientific theory (here I will not give any name!). When you in a seminar shall combine these, you can not let the seminar go on a very high level. And the result is, that some students learned a great lot of things and others had the occasion to repeat, what they knew before they came - and not much more. I think this was the situation at the seminar. Of course this is a little exaggerated, but there is a little in it. For my own part I will say that I learned a deal at the seminars, but not so much, as I had expected. I think it would be a good idea - if you will take heterogeneous student body next year - to concentrate the seminars to one single point, and then dig deep in this point. I think it is better than going on the surface of a great lot of things.

3. Desirability of homogeneous or heterogeneous student body. This is a very interesting point, and as far as I can see, it must be your main point, when you make decisions for the next Seminar. But logically, this point cannot be answered, before I have given an answer to point 4. So let me take this first and then return to this.

4. Concentration of field of specialisation or combination of specialised seminars with general course in various fields. As far as I can see, it would be a very good idea to make the Seminar to a substitute for high graduated students, for whom it is impossible - from personal or economic reasons - to go to the U.S.A. (or any other country with a special high scientific level in a given field). In this way the Salzburg Seminar would be a peaceful place in the center of Europe, where scientific turned students from the whole world could meet together and receive knowledge and inspiration. And a central thing can here be mentioned: You would in this way be sure, that people received real knowledge - and not (only) a wonderful holiday! This would mean, that the central point of the Seminar would be concentration of field of specialisation.

But I think that you - even in this case - should combine it with general courses in various fields - but these lectures should be even more broad than the lectures this summer. Even a scientist - and perhaps in special him - has a need for "other things" and you could here give him - in addition to the special things - "other things" (compare here point 5).

The consequence of this - which is my personal point of view - would be that the answer to point 3 would be that it is most desirable with homogeneous (high graduated) student body.

But you excuse me, but I have not with this finished my answer to this question. My mind is double - as we say in Denmark. Because: I can not escape the feeling that perhaps a great part (and a very



valuable part) of the mission of the whole Seminar will be dropped in this way. Many (brilliant) students would be cut off from the Seminar, if you - for membership - put out the condition: very high graduation. And perhaps it is the students, which could learn a great deal and really need the Seminar, you in this way would cut off. In many countries it is today completely impossible to be "high graduated", because they have no libraries and no teachers. And these students will perhaps more than clever graduated students need and enjoy the Seminar, and perhaps take with them to their country much more than the clever graduated students.

I think this is very central, and you must never forget to think upon this, when you decide the tendens of the next Seminar.

The consequence of this point of view would be, that you should perhaps still have specialised seminars, but the most central should be the general courses in various fields.

And another consequence is that point 3 should be answered: To fill out the most central mission of the Seminar, we have to take a heterogeneous student body.

This is what I can answer to this question (and to point 3). I am not able to give you a definite answer. But let me stress out, that as far as I can see, you have in planning the next Seminar no more central question. When you have solved this dilemma, you have solved many other questions.

5. Which subject outside your field of specialisation should be present.

To this point I will not say much. And the reason is, that I am quite content with the subjects, you had chosen this summer. The only superfluous lectures were - in my opinion - the lectures in historiography. It was too special. And why was there not instead a short lecture in the history of U.S.A.? And perhaps you should only have one course in "government" - I mean: the lectures on "government" and "political sciences" had - in many respects - the same problems and one lecture here is enough (I mean one series of lectures).

In all I think you should cut down the number of lectures. You have to do that, if you expect a real work in the seminars - and at the same time expect the students to follow all or a great part of the lectures. Perhaps you could put the lectures in economic history and economics together. If you choose to make the Seminar a place of sciences (cfr. point 4) you must remember, that it is impossible to give a great concentration in the seminars and - besides that - to follow long and many lectures in other fields. I would propose that you should plan the lectures to be more broad. And not so many.

You would perhaps too be interested in my opinion or impression of the lectures outside my field. I shall not here come with a long declaration, but only mention (without under-rating the others), that Prof. Matthiessen gave me the great enjoyment here. If you always could be sure to have such a man, the Seminar could never be spoiled.

## 6. Teaching techniques.

I have been speaking before about the division in lectures and seminars. It is good - keep that. But about more practical things, I can say a little:

Cut the lectures down to 45 min. It is a very good custom in Europe, - you should take it with you to U.S.A. When you have been listening for 45. min. you are tired and must have a rest.

It would be a very good and valuable thing, if the papers from the seminar could be mimeographed before the seminar. The discussion would be much better, if every man could sit with the paper before him. In this way it would be possible for every man to prepare the discussion.

A better library is needed.

## 7. Channels for the selection of students.

This is a point where I am not very competent. I have only been working a short period with student-organization, and so I can't say if it is possible to let the selection be done by the different national organizations. I will only say that if you choose this, you risk that the student-organizations will use the Seminar as a sort of a scholarship for students, who have done a good and great work in the special national organization. But you can't be sure, that it means that it is a student with the qualifications you should prefer. On the other side, this is of course the cheapest and easiest method for you.

An alternative is that you select the students yourself. Here the weak point is that it is not so easy to get good information through applications. Here the local organizations have the advantage that they know (personally) the students.

Selection through applications sent to you would of course be proped up, if one of you could travel through the different countries and speak with the students who you - on the basis of the applications - should be specially interested in. On the other side this is, of course, a very expensive thing.

Perhaps it would here - in the problem of selection - be possible for you to use some of the students from the last Seminar. You must - if you should like it - use me as much as you should like. (But I can't promise you to travel to the other countries. I have time to do it, but I have no money - my whole wage is about 40-50 dollars in a month!!)

I must mention one thing about the selection. It is that the Seminar must be prepared much earlier, than last time. The students must know in good time about the Seminar and must be able to prepare themselves for the Seminar. Perhaps half a year or so. You can't expect that the good students shall be able to go to the Seminar when they first hear about it 3 weeks before!



## 8. Extracurricular activities.

I don't know quite what to say here. You think upon a thing as the concerts in Salzburg? If we take them as an actual example they are of course only an "attraction" more for the Seminar. And they do not spoil anything. The students wouldn't work more without the concerts - instead they would perhaps go to the cinema (and I don't hope you doubt what to prefer). In general I think we can say that as long as the extracurricular activities only are running in addition to the Seminar, you shall not be afraid.

(Later on I will write you a letter, where I will try to go deeper into this question).

And now I will return to the first point and try to give you an answer. I could speak for hours on this point, but let me try to do it short and clear. Let me put it in few points:

### 1. The value of the Seminar for its European members.

- a. I had (and made use of) the occasion to meet students from other European countries and from U.S.A. and discuss common cultural and political problems with them. What this means can not be over-stated. Remember that we have been cut off from other countries for years.
- b. I had in special the chance and was forced to meet students from Germany and Austria - former enemy-countries. Here I was forced (in a spiritual way) to look upon them as human beings. It is very central - .
- c. I had the occasion to speak with high graduated students from Europe (in special in this connection the Netherlands and the other Scandinavian countries) and U.S.A. and professors from U.S.A. about scientific problems in my own special field. In this way I learned a good deal. Most of all I learned from private discussions with Mr. Carl Kaysen (he was indeed a very good man for the Seminar - he understood how central these private discussions must be). About the value of the seminars and lectures in economics I have been speaking above.
- d. I had the occasion to learn about different parts of the American civilization which I didn't know much about before.
- e. About all I learned some things in my own field at the seminars. But not so much as I had expected.
- f. I had the chance to read books which are not available in my own country yet. But the library was not good.
- g. For later teaching it is central for me to have seen how it is possible in a relatively few lectures to give a good picture of a given field.

h. I saw a good deal of Austria. It was the first time I was outside Denmark!

i. I had the occasion to listen to wonderful concerts.

j. I learned a good deal of English (even you - after reading this paper - may say that it is still very bad).

If you allow me, I will at last conclude in this: For me the Seminar was a very great experience. I feel now more like a cosmopolite than before. And so I can conclude that even with the faults of the Seminar taken into the picture, the Seminar was good.

So: Go on, you mustn't stop!

(Signed) Poul Norregaard Rasmusson