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Spring is the season of creation. After the long gray winter, creative energy bursts out with the crocuses and springs up with the dandelions. On a college campus, this vernal explosion can take the form of panty raids and other peculiar rites; it can also unleash genuine creative talent.

On the Washington University campus this spring, the students greeted the season with a nine-day "Festival of the Arts," where student painters, writers, dancers, actors, and artists of every kind displayed their works, showed their talents, and shared the fun with the whole campus.

The entire nine-day wonder was planned, organized, and conducted by the students. While the aid of several Faculty Fellows was enlisted and faculty artists were invited to exhibit their works, the students ran the show. The idea was born last year, but the first spring arts festival was just a warm-up for the extravaganza presented this year.

Thirty-one different events were on the schedule, including exhibitions of painting, sculpture, and design; poetry and short-story readings; an original "Shakespearean" drama; art lectures and films; a fashion show, a dance recital, and a series of concerts of every kind of music from baroque to modern jazz.

All the events drew large and enthusiastic crowds, and brisk business was done in prints, paintings, and coffee.

With the success of this year's program, the Festival of the Arts has become a campus institution, and similar programs can be expected every spring from now on. They provide an outlet for creative talent, give recognition to outstanding work in the arts, and encourage originality. Besides, everybody has a wonderful time.

Perhaps the most interested spectator at the Festival of the Arts was Carole Tindall, Fine Arts senior, who was chairman of the student committee that planned the whole program.
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Throughout the nine-day festival, the University's student musical organizations presented concerts of many different kinds of music. Concerts were played by the University orchestra, the band, and the brass sextet, and sung by the University choir and the Madrigal Singers.

Charles Armbruster, graduate chemistry student, and the Forsyth Pro Musica, a student group of performers on ancient instruments, presented a program of medieval, Renaissance, and baroque music. Armbruster played a harpsichord he had designed and built himself. In another musical program, eight student composers performed chamber works they had written for various combinations of instruments.

From the brass fanfare that opened the Festival to the Pro Musica encore on the second Saturday, the campus rang with music.
An historic event of the 1962 Festival of the Arts was the world premiere of an original student play, *On the Floor or The Day of the Aardvark*.

The student authors, William Chaitkin and Cary Lichtman, dedicated their play to William Shakespeare, "from whom we derived all of our inspiration and much of our material."

Complete with a king, queen, the ghost of Uncle Morris, and a triad of witches, *On the Floor* brought to the stage a kind of drama not seen since Shakespeare's day—if then.
Scenes from works of Mozart, Puccini, and Verdi were presented by student singers in a special Opera Workshop. Sung in English, the excerpts were performed without benefit of special costumes, scenery, or props, but the singers managed to convey the spirit of the original works with skill and zest.

Harold Blumenfeld, associate professor of music, introduced each scene, giving the work's musical background and telling the story of the opera. He also provided "orchestral accompaniment" on the piano.

Carolee Coombs, graduate music student, and Robert Armbruster sang the lead roles. Miss Coombs has won a Fulbright scholarship to study in Rome.
Wohl Center was really swinging for "Gaslight Square Jazz Night." To start the program, the students presented the Natchez Queen Jazz Band in a concert of authentic ragtime. The second half of the program featured the St. Louis Jazz Quintet and the choir from St. Stephen's Episcopal Church in a performance of a special jazz mass, "Jazz in Liturgy."

Following the formal concert, the St. Louis Jazz Quintet played a program of modern jazz, featuring trumpeter Fred Stacey, whose father was the great Goodman pianist, Jess Stacey.

Audience rapport hit a new high during this popular portion of the Festival. Most of the attention was focused on the performers, but there were also a few spontaneous Charleston and Twist performances competing for the spotlight.
The 1962 Festival celebrated not only the traditional arts. Among the more unusual exhibitions of student originality and artistic skill was a fashion show presented at Wohl Center. Spring and summer clothes designed by students in the School of Fine Arts dress design program were modeled by their creators. Bob Bibb, sophomore design student, was the commentator.

Through the years, the University's dress design program has helped make the St. Louis area the Junior Miss center of the fashion world, as the student fashion show illustrated.
As a stunning demonstration of a lively art, the Washington University Dance Theatre presented “Façade,” an original work in which such basic dances as the waltz and the sailor’s hornpipe are employed to create accompaniment to a modern combination of music and poetry.

The dance group, directed by Annelise Mertz, assistant professor of dance, was followed on the same evening by a student production of a one-act play, *The Jar*, written by Donald Finkel of the Department of English.
While not originally scheduled as part of the Festival of the Arts, the annual student Quad Show was presented during the same week and, by its very nature, provided another important illustration of student talent.

This year's show was the popular Broadway musical *Tenderloin*, and like all Quad Shows it offered the audiences an opportunity to see a fast-moving, entertaining performance, and the participants the chance to appear in a real stage production and to get a thrilling experience of greasepaint and footlights.
As a research scientist, teacher, and administrator over a span of 60 years, Arthur Llewelyn Hughes has made major contributions to the structure of modern physics, developed an army of scholar-scientists, and helped build the University's Department of Physics into one of the world's best.

This past spring, Dr. Arthur Llewelyn Hughes, professor emeritus and former head of the Department of Physics at Washington University, came into the office of Professor Robert N. Varney. He carried application forms for a National Science Foundation grant which he hoped to carry on cosmic ray research next year, when he will become 80, and he was a little perturbed. One of the routine questions was: "List your publications."

"Do you suppose they want everything I ever wrote, clear back to 1907?" he asked, worriedly.

They discussed it a while and finally decided that his publications over merely the past 30 years ought to be sufficient.

Arthur Llewelyn Hughes was born in Liverpool, England, on December 18, 1883, of John and Elizabeth Hughes, and spent his boyhood and youth between Liverpool and the small Welsh town of Alegele. His father died early of that disease of the Welsh poor, tuberculosis, and at 14, to support himself and his mother and sister (who were to die, later, of the same sickness), he applied for a job as telegraph messenger boy in the English Civil Service. He failed, by one inch, to meet the height requirement; and the path to success as a postman was closed to him forever.

At 18 he entered Liverpool University to take training as a teacher in the English elementary school system and also to work for a bachelor's degree. There he studied physics under a young instructor named Charles Barkla, who was doing research on the nature of X-rays, research which eventually won him a Nobel prize. Barkla's electroscope were homemade—cubical metal boxes with a charged gold leaf hanging down in each. The rate of movement—a measure of the ionization—was observed through a low-powered microscope with a scale inside. Much depended on precise estimates of tiny motions, and, wanting to be free from any taint of unconscious bias, Barkla asked young Arthur Hughes to do the job. The student jumped at the chance and even got the wild notion that he might follow physics as a career.

Barkla strongly urged him to drop the "pass" course—a broadly based course which 80 to 90 per cent of all students took as the most painless way of preparing themselves to earn a living—and substitute the very rigid "honors" course, taken by only 10 to 20 per cent of the students. The honors course was designed to give very thorough training in one special field; Hughes took his in physics. He never became a messenger boy, and he never became an elementary school teacher.

In 1908 he was awarded an "1851 Exhibition Scholarship" and chose to study at the famous Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge—a mecca for the physicists of the day.

Sir J. J. Thomson, the Nobel prize winner and discoverer...
of the electron, was the director of the Cavendish Laboratory and professor of experimental physics at Cambridge. He ran his empire with an absolute minimum of red tape, taking in fees, grants, gifts, and other income and paying salaries and buying apparatus as he saw fit. His habits were casual. After weeks of ignoring someone, Thomson would sometimes get interested in what a man was doing, make a number of useful suggestions which might take weeks to carry out, and the next day infuriate the student by asking what he had done in addition to what they had discussed the day before.

After he had been at Cavendish Laboratory a few years, Arthur Hughes, as a candidate for the doctor's degree, submitted his published papers to Liverpool University, along with the $100 fee. J. J. Thomson happened to be external examiner in physics for Liverpool at that time, so the reprints were sent to him for his opinion, together with a check for the job. It was Thomson's habit to pick up his letters each morning at the laboratory, read them, then drop them on the floor. Naturally, the students got them and so kept up on the latest gossip in physics. Hughes was kidded unmercifully when the precious application and reprints, thoroughly mingled with sawdust, turned up for everyone to examine. J. J. Thomson had, however, pocketed the check. There was a limit to his casualness.

Thomson was an inspiring and fascinating lecturer and teacher. Very often he departed from text to spend several lectures on the background of the research that some graduate student was doing, giving him and the rest a far better and deeper insight into the significance of the work than its author had himself known. Hughes's own methods of running a physics department were to be not quite so flamboyant, but he never forgot the teacher's role as inspirer, revealer, and pusher—the guide who pointed, however gently or firmly, along the path on which the student was already walking to the goal at its end.

Hughes's first paper had to do with "cloud chamber research." Today a cloud chamber is "a powerful detecting device for studying cosmic rays and other radiation." But in those innocent days it had to do merely with those masses of condensed water vapor, not yet mushroom-shaped, which float through the skies and whose fallout, whether solid, crystal, or liquid, is only water.

Another research Hughes carried out was to prove experimentally Einstein's theoretical postulation of a few years before of the photoelectric effect—that is, the theory that the energy of photoelectrons released from a metal by the impact of a beam of light depends on the light's frequency. At the same time, unknown to Hughes (and in science, but it is always striking), their findings were identical and were published almost simultaneously, both confirming Einstein. "It was as though," Hughes says, "its time had come and it was waiting to be born." This is not an uncommon occurrence in science, but it is always striking.

In 1912 Arthur Hughes, newly "Doctored," was offered a job with the weather service of India. J. J. Thomson advised him to take instead a preferred assistant professorship at the newly founded Rice Institute in Houston, Texas, for which Thomson would recommend him. To Hughes, India and Texas were equally exotic; he accepted Thomson's advice.

Rice Institute was an unusual institution, founded on a principle closely approaching the oft-stated ideal of a modern university: "a community of scholars and zealous learners."

Dr. Lovett, the president, wanted to make Rice the Harvard of the Southwest, and went to great trouble collecting a faculty which included men like Julian Huxley, later head of UNESCO, and Hermann Muller, later a world-famous geneticist. "There were about 35 of us at first and all were under 30 years old, except two old men in their mid-thirties. It was a wonderful experience for me. I remember being struck by the student self-government plan, something I had never heard of in England. One of the campus rules was, 'Students are requested not to carry guns on the campus.' I was also pleasantly surprised by the easy friendliness between students and faculty. I remember one genial student who said to me, after seeing his grade, 'How about raising the little old grade, professor?'

It was a tremendous eye-opener for Hughes. Students and the details of organization and administration of a university might vary from country to country or school to school; the real test was the degree of dedication to, and the amount of accomplishment of, the primary functions of the university: study and research.

The experience also impressed him with the value of youth and the "young" viewpoint. Years later, contemplating the expansion of the curriculum at Washington University to take care of the great increase of knowledge in physics, he worried that it might involve keeping graduate students in school throughout their twenties, "when much of their best work might be done."

Hughes took time out, in World War I, to return to England and work on anti-submarine devices for the British navy. The equipment and facilities were meager: "The governments could not yet understand or believe the effect that science would have on war."

He kept up his own research, publishing regularly, and, on his return, accepted the post of research professor of physics at Queen's College in Kingston, Ontario. He was married to Jessie Paterson Smyth in Montreal in 1919, and it was in Canada that two of his three children, David Ferrar and Ann Elizabeth, were born. The third, John Peter, was born in St. Louis.

In 1923 he was offered the chairmanship of the small Physics Department at a place called Washington University in a place called St. Louis, Missouri, to succeed the great Arthur Holly Compton, who had just finished the work on the scatter effect of X-rays which was to win him the Nobel prize.

Until 1933 the Department of Physics was in Eads Hall. There were five faculty members. There was little equipment, supplies, or funds. "When I came, the equipment that Compton had used for his Nobel work was still up—"at least most of it. We should have saved it for a museum, but we had little funds. Dr. Jauncey was carrying on.
X-ray research; he needed it and changed it as necessary—
lead shielding, for instance, is expensive—until it was all
changed around."

At Rice, and again at Washington, Hughes urged prom-
ising students to stay in physics—only to see them turn
away, time after time, in favor of engineering or business
or other more "practical" careers. Physics seemed an
esoteric study, remote from the needs or understanding of
everyday living, offering only few and poorly paid jobs.

Still, the work went on. If you check back copies of the
Physical Review, you cannot help being surprised at the
amount of publishing that this small department did. One
of the criteria for the effectiveness of a department head
is the quality of men he attracts for his faculty. Men who
have served under Hughes include Lee A. DuBridge, later
chief of Radar Research at M.I.T., adviser to presidents,
and now president of Cal. Tech.; Clarence Zener, present
head of Westinghouse Research Laboratories; and after
the war men like Eugene Feenberg, Henry Primakoff, and
George E. Pake. With DuBridge, Hughes in 1933 pub-
lished Photoelectric Phenomena, the standard work on the
subject until it finally went out of print in 1959—an aston-
ishing performance in a quarter century in which most
physics texts became obsolete in months.

Except for wartime leaves, Hughes was head of the
Department of Physics for 30 years, until 1953, when he
was 70. From the beginning he was meticulous and con-
scientious; he carried always a notebook in which he re-
corded the progress of each graduate student. When the
Dean of the Graduate School wanted some specific infor-
mation, Hughes would simply pull the book from his
pocket and begin to read. He remembered J. J. Thomson
and put his graduate students to work on research the first
day they walked in; he visited the lab daily asking about
progress; he expected responsibility in the laboratory com-
mensurate with the beauty and awesomeness of the laws
and processes studied. A student who did not meet these
standards, however bright, had trouble with his job rec-
ommendations. A former student says, "He was a man so
meticulous in every detail that he could give the fire in-
surance underwriters the value of scientific publications
in dollars per linear shelf foot."

He was a hard taskmaster; yet there is scarcely a former
student who does not think of him fondly. He remem-
bered the Welsh boy who had happened to get a Charles
Barkla for an elementary physics teacher, and he taught
freshman physics himself until retirement and made it
a rule that every department member teach one beginning
as well as one advanced course.

It is common for news magazines, whenever they get
the chance, to describe scientists of some dignity as "elfin"
or "pixie-like." It is perhaps unfortunate for Arthur Hughes
—probably the Alleghen blood—that it is really true of
him. He has a large round head, eyes to match peeking out
from under a heavy brow, a partially hooked nose, round cheeks, a long chin, and a permanently sunny expression, even when tracking a meson or flunking a student.

Very early Hughes saw that Eads Hall was inadequate and began to assemble "The Book of the Building"—a loose-leaf notebook in which the requirements of a good physics building were listed in order of priority. The crash of 1929 came, and he reluctantly put "The Book" on a shelf. On May 1, 1933, Chancellor Throop called Hughes in and told him of an anonymous donor who wanted to finance a new physics building but wanted the work to start immediately. "When can you start?" the chancellor asked.

"Tomorrow," Arthur Hughes said, and ran for the book.

Jamieson and Spearle, the architects who had done much work on campus, were delighted with the details. Ground was broken on July 15—only two-and-a-half months after the conference—and Wayman Crow Hall was built very quickly. It cost $257,000; on a per-foot basis it is the cheapest physics building in the country, yet it was widely acknowledged as the best of its time. To a layman it seems never to have been finished. "Why plaster?" Dr. Hughes says, with that gnome-like smile. "For the cost of plaster I could get an extra bay. Besides, in some rooms where the architects insisted on plaster, pieces later fell and hit professors on the head." Which ends that subject.

"And why put the pipes in the walls? This way you can modify them or repair them without tearing up the concrete."

What makes even a modern generation of physicists lyrical about Crow Hall is not obvious. The building is composed of basic "modules" which can be converted to offices, classrooms, or laboratories as needed; each is fitted with easily reached utility services and drains. During the depths of the depression, when few people took physics seriously, it was designed for tremendous expansion. For a number of years the third floor was used mainly as a skating rink for professors' children, and the basement for parties. Both are overloaded now, and the projected Arthur Holly Compton Research Laboratory, planned as a companion building employing many features first entered by Hughes in his book, will someday soon be taking over its research function. Crow Hall will then convert its laboratory to other uses and go on with little strain.

At Washington University's 1962 commencement, Arthur Hughes, then approaching 79, was awarded an honorary doctorate. The citation said: "Co-architect of the entire structure of modern physics, his investigations have ranged from the properties of quanta and electrons to atom bombs and mesons. As a scholar, teacher, administrator, and wise counselor, he has built a veritable army of scholar-scientists for the world and developed a small Department of Physics here into a world-famous one."

This phraseology was not intended to put Arthur Hughes on a lonely pinnacle with Albert Einstein but rather to emphasize that Hughes saw in which direction twentieth-century physics was going and, "as a scholar, teacher, administrator, and wise counselor," helped to bring it about. In the thirties he switched the main line of his own research to atomic and nuclear physics—an unusual decision for a man of his age and reputation. (There is a story that a new faculty member, on being assigned to teach an advanced class, asked to be relieved on the ground that he had never studied that field. Hughes quietly reassigned him; but later remarked to a colleague, "With that attitude, what course could I possibly teach today? My last formal courses were before the Bohr atom!")

In 1939, Dr. Sherwood Moore, director of the Institute of Radiology of the Washington University Medical School, called in the Medical School's adviser in physics, Dr. Hughes, with a new and radical idea. Dr. Moore had come into fresh research money and felt that bombardment with neutrons might be much more effective against cancer than the conventional X-rays. He was willing to use the money to test this belief, knowing that, if it were true, it would be of tremendous benefit. Would Dr. Hughes study the problem and make recommendations? Dr. Hughes traveled around the country, examined different high-energy accelerators, and recommended the building of a cyclotron.

The Washington University cyclotron is in an underground building to the west of the powerhouse, with the control room in the powerhouse itself. It weighs 100 tons, with a pole-face diameter of 45 inches—exceeded in size and weight, during the war, only by the cyclotron at Berkeley, California. In November, 1941, clear evidence came through that it was working properly, and on December 7 came Pearl Harbor. Shortly after, the U. S. Army's Manhattan Project took the cyclotron over full time.

Arthur Holly Compton was at that time director of the Metallurgical Project at the University of Chicago. One of the major functions of the Washington University cyclotron was to produce pure plutonium—an element unknown in early 1941—for testing at the Metallurgical Project. By the end of 1942 about 500 micrograms had been obtained—less than enough to cover the head of a pin—but most of it from the Washington University cyclotron—and this was enough for the micro-chemists in Chicago to analyze successfully. On this basis the immense atomic plant at
Hanford, Washington, and the eventual construction of the atomic bomb were authorized.

In 1943-44 Dr. Hughes was on leave to serve as assistant director of the Los Alamos atomic energy project. After the war, the Institute of Radiology abandoned the use of neutrons in cancer treatment, and the cyclotron was turned over to the Department of Physics.

An educator is judged by his work, his students, and his associates. His family also judges him. There is a story that the understanding that Dr. Hughes should not be disturbed while lecturing was so strong that it took all the courage his wife could muster to call him out of class and tell him that their house was on fire. (Mrs. Hughes laughs heartily at this story now.) His children describe glowingly their summers together in the Thousand Islands, when he took his work to their summer cabin.

It is part of the legend of all physicists that they are bunglers with everyday devices. Dr. Hughes undertook to fix a thermostatic control to keep water temperature constant for the family's collection of tropical fish—and wound up electrocuting the fish. The story which brings the loudest whoops from his son and daughter concerns the time a corked jug was water or gasoline, and decided that the experiment would be to hold a lighted match to its mouth. (Mrs. Hughes laughs heartily at this story now.) His children describe glowingly their summers together in the Thousand Islands, when he took his work to their summer cabin.

The result was a dramatic and explosive demonstration, causing considerable damage, of the validity of the Boyle and Gay-Lussac Laws. Conclusion: gasoline.

Arthur Hughes still speaks Welsh, and in 1959, after retirement and almost 50 years' absence, he returned to visit Wales—to the bleak area from which he had come. His wife relates that as they passed his grandfather's farm, where he had spent so much time, she urged him, despite his reluctance, to knock. The door was opened by a beaming cousin, who spoke in the words—if not the accent—of a sentiment which is often expressed on the campus of Washington University: "Come in, Arthur Hughes! The news is out that you're about!"

The eldest son of Jessie and Arthur Hughes, David Ferrar Hughes, is dead. He received his B.A. from Washington University in 1942, majoring in physics, and volunteered for service in the Naval aviation branch that same year. He flew a dive-bomber and won the Distinguished Flying Cross and two Navy Crosses before being shot down over Hanoi on January 6, 1945. He was officially declared dead January 16, 1946.

Arthur Hughes is as reticent about his feelings as about his accomplishments. But in a speech not very long after, he discussed war and what the next one would be like. He predicted the accuracy and range of rockets not yet built, and the damage they could do with nuclear warheads. "It is thus up to all of us, scientists and non-scientists alike, to work as we have never worked before to devise procedures for replacing wars by saner methods for settling disputes."

In World War II, governments had become convinced of the value of physics for war, and perhaps for peace; and after 1945 funds, enrollments, and administrative responsibilities soared. "Before the war we might have $3,000 a year for research; after the war it was over ten times that." (Precise figures are confidential, but it has since approximately doubled again.) Newly invested Chancellor Arthur H. Compton and Dean of Faculties Joyce C. Stearns were both physicists, and sympathetic. After the cyclotron became the sole possession of the Physics Department, 32 Ph.D.'s used cyclotron research to get their degrees between 1946 and 1950; just as cyclotron-time referee was a taxing job. There were eight graduate students before the war and 50 after.

There had been only five faculty members before the war; an additional five were immediately authorized, with four more to come in 1948. The five were Feenberg, Primakoff, Sard, Kurie, and Manley, all of them now well known nationally; the second batch included George E. Pake, who will become provost of the University this fall.

Despite the load, personal research went on. One major project concerned the establishment of standards of radioactive strength, very important now in measuring fallout, and of steadily increasing use.

In 1950, a committee, to be succeeded by other committees and individuals, set out to find a successor for Dr. Hughes. They finally settled in 1952 on Dr. George E. Pake; and, in 1953, when he was five years beyond normal administrative retirement age, Dr. Hughes retired as head of the department, and in 1956 as active professor.

But Arthur Hughes is still not really retired. Since 1953 he has been working with men like Dr. Sard and his graduate students on cosmic-ray detecting devices. In the spring of 1962, Hughes and Virgil Johnson, a post-doctoral fellow—the young physicist and the one long past his three score and ten—came up with a new development in the use of spark chambers which may revolutionize techniques of detection. His story is not ended—perhaps because physics and education themselves have not ended in his lifetime. "There was an old joke about Oak Ridge," he says, "that if the Germans had been able to spy on it, they couldn't have figured out what was happening, because trainload after trainload of heavy machinery and materials went in, but nothing came out except papers. That's the way with a university; ton after ton going in, and nothing coming out but papers—and students, maybe a trifle heavier between the ears."

Some have said that Arthur Hughes might have been even more famous if he were not so modest. He thinks this irrelevant; it has little to do with his job and goals. He will not abstract his philosophy; but if he would, it would probably go something like this:

"The secrets of nature, and their beauties, are all about us; we cannot ignore them and live; we must search for them however they demand and do whatever is necessary. Sometimes the way seems to have nothing to do with physics and is hard, as in trying to raise money for a needed building during the depression. Sometimes it is close but very delicate and difficult, as in probing for the heart of the atom. But sometimes it is only just below the surface, as in recognizing and nurturing ability in a student—perhaps a poverty-stricken Welsh boy—in need of encouragement or a scholarship. And sometimes, of course, it seems to require no more than the application of a lighted match."
This spring, Mr. Sullivan was one of the featured speakers on the Wednesday Assembly Series in Graham Memorial Chapel and also met with the students for informal discussion as part of the Forsyth Houses program. In this article, he summarizes the main points of his Assembly address.

COMMUNISM AND THE COLLEGE STUDENT

By WILLIAM C. SULLIVAN

Assistant Director
of the Federal Bureau
of Investigation
If a student is to be educated, and not merely trained as animals are, the conditions of his academic environment must be permeated with freedom to pursue the truth as a sovereign individual of inherent dignity and worth. Any system of thought and practice which would prevent this should be of serious concern to all students. As communism wherever found regards education not as the pursuit of truth but as a weapon to advance communism, it has become of increasing concern to the students of our nation. They well realize the implications of Joseph Stalin's statement: "Education is a weapon, the effect of which is determined by the hands which wield it, and by who is to be struck down." V. I. Lenin had previously set this line: "The school must become a weapon of the dictatorship of the proletariat." William Z. Foster, former chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, who died in Soviet Russia in 1961, informed his American communist followers in the field of education that

... the Party must take careful steps to see that all teacher comrades are given thorough education in the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism-Leninism, will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure and at the same time to conduct struggles around the schools in a truly Bolshevik manner.

Finally, Foster predicted that when communism comes to power in the United States,

... the schools, colleges, and universities will be coordinated and grouped under the National Department of Education and its state and local branches (directed by the Communist Party, USA) ... the students will be taught on the basis of Marxian dialectical materialism...

The contrast between communist and American education is at once clear. "The state is the end of the communist system; the individual is the end of the American system." In the communist system, people "can be compelled; the American people must be persuaded." Under communism "power and decision-making are concentrated; here, they are diffused." Communism "speaks with one voice; we speak with many voices." The communist goal "is the domination of the world; the American society has no single goal, unless it is peace and freedom for human beings to pursue many goals."

Vice Chancellor Robert L. Payton made this contrast in educational systems crystal clear when he said:

In a free university, the truth is not available in a book or a can or written on a stone tablet. In a free university, where no idea is beyond challenge, it is difficult to feel sure you have all the right answers. ... In a Soviet university—and in my opinion calling those institutions universities is as preposterous as calling the Soviet Union a democracy—the truth is available in a can. There are books that everyone absolutely must read, courses that everyone absolutely must take, ideas that everyone absolutely must accept...

As repugnant as communism is to the free intellect, we must recognize the fact that it has strongly established itself in the world. Its empire is a reality which daily challenges the United States. The communist countries forming this empire—17 in number—extend from central Germany to China, and when night descends on its western frontier, dawn is already breaking on its eastern frontier. There are 40 million communists in the world controlling the lives of a billion people in a world of three billion. There are 87 communist parties active throughout the globe, 70 of which are in noncommunist nations. Additionally, countless local, state, regional, national, and international communist-front or satellite organizations help to carry out the programs of the communist parties. These parties, as staff organizations, are the "engineers of the revolution," the elite, the vanguard, the powerful dictatorial bodies. The tactics they formulate are likened to battles within the ideological and operational war, while their strategy relates to the protracted war itself, directed without cessation against all which is noncommunist.

Because of the unique nature of militant communist thought and practices and because of the steady progress it has been making throughout the world, a most thought-provocative study on national security has set forth this conclusion:

The recurrent shock of our age is the discovery that concepts and patterns of action of a more secure past no longer fit present reality.

We cannot, then, "do business as usual" and expect to defeat the threat of world communism. This is the time for originality, intellectual pioneering, fearless social progress, and cultural creativity. To this end, our students, professors, colleges, and universities as a whole have much to contribute. To do this, they must, among other things, face up honestly to three facts.

1. Total Challenge. Communism challenges this nation in the military, scientific, economic, political, sociological, educational, psychological, literary, and philosophical categories. It attacks our entire body of culture.

2. Change. This challenge is taking place in an age of unprecedented change accentuated by technological, demographical, terrestrial revolution. The social transformations occurring today in Latin America, Africa, and Asia may one day make the Renaissance and Reformation seem like minor eruptions upon the surface of history.

3. Conflict. Challenge and change have generated a global conflict of values, means, and ends.

It is an age of revolution, but for our student youth it is also an age of great promise. Properly educated, motivated, and committed, countless opportunities are theirs—to understand, mold, and direct the colossal flux of our time toward the highest goal to which man has aspired through the long and difficult centuries. This goal, and also the central issue in our struggle against communism, is freedom under law—freedom of thought, expression, action, worship, inquiry, dissent, experimenta-
This is what is really at stake in opposition to communism in the United States because this party, like all similar parties, lives, moves, and has its being in the universal communist disciplinary (dictatorial) principle:

Party discipline does not expect anyone to relinquish his own convictions if these convictions are not at variance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism. But it makes it incumbent upon every member to obey the adopted decisions and conscientiously to carry them into effect even if the member does not agree with them or had proposed some other decision.


The internal security problem created by this kind of communist thinking for the United States is one of four parts: (1) the activities of the open party; (2) the underground; (3) intelligence gatherings; and (4) espionage operations. The last three listed are communist efforts which must be countered by proper agencies of the government supported by the citizens. However, the first part to the internal security problem—the activities of the open Communist Party of this nation—can, in addition to governmental measures, be countered also by intelligent, rational, and calm efforts of our citizens and, in particular, by members of the academic communities—students, professors, and educational administrators. It is the academic community and its relationship to communism that I will concentrate on here.

May I suggest for consideration that the greatest contribution the academic community can make to overcoming communism is to preserve academic freedom and to use it without exception for the maintenance of truth where it is known and for its discovery where unknown. If our academic communities can do this, they will, from their special posture, deal communism a mortal blow, for it cannot flourish where freedom exists. It is articulated, truth-oriented, and effective. This is why any curtailment of academic freedom is helpful to communism and injurious to the democratic process. Free enterprise must not be limited to our economy. It must penetrate and vitalize our educational institutions and other major segments of American society. A report prepared by the heads of several universities states:

_Free enterprise is as essential to intellectual as to economic progress. A university must, therefore, be hospitable to an infinite variety of skills and viewpoints, relying upon open competition among them as the surest safeguard of truth. Its whole spirit requires investigation, criticism, and presentation of ideas in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual confidence..._

It is this "free enterprise" among scholars which has resulted in some of the most brilliant refutations of communist thought and practices being made. These efforts have given us today large numbers of learned articles, essays, surveys, and books demonstrating the superiority of a free, open society of pluralistic democracy over the unfree, closed society of monolithic communism. Our scholars have made it clear that we can compete successfully with communists not only on the production line, but also on the cultural plane.

This fact is especially important for the future, because if we emerge the victor in the conflict of ideas, values, and principles, physical conflict can be averted. Hence the role of the professor, the educational administrator, and the student could be the decisive one.

I have mentioned the student. Communists have always been interested in youth, believing that if they can control the youth they one day can control the nation. As early as 1922 the Communist Party organized the Young Workers League, an aboveground organization, and the Young Communist League, an underground group. These two groups merged into the aboveground organization, the Young Communist League, in about 1925. Subsequent to the Young Communist League's dissolution in 1943, the Party attempted to organize youth through groups such as American Youth for Democracy and the Labor Youth League. Today, this interest continues with the Communist Party, USA, making a nationwide appeal to students. Magazines are prepared especially for them. Communist speakers and debaters are extremely anxious to appear before large numbers of students on our college campuses. The student is invited to attend communist "festivals" in foreign lands and is generally exposed to communist propaganda. How will he fare?

In the late thirties and early forties some American students did not fare too well when faced with communist propaganda. In different instances, they succumbed, joining ultimately either the Communist Party, USA, or communist-front organizations. Others signed and circulated communist petitions and resolutions. The majority finally became disillusioned and broke away from communism.

Today, the American student seems to be more sophisticated, more analytical, and less inclined to be "taken in" by any kind of propaganda, be it from the extreme left or the extreme right. It is expected that he will continue to be so. As J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has written, the overwhelming majority of the youth of our nation:

... has demonstrated that it deserves our confidence and support. It has shown an increasing awareness of and interest in both national and international affairs, including a penetrating and analytical approach to the false appeals of communism...
As Mr. Hoover has observed, the youth of our nation has demonstrated the qualities essential for its role in meeting what is both a challenge and a threat. The challenge is posed by the legitimate revolution of rising expectations, with its demand for freedom as the first step in bringing the benefits of modern civilization to all mankind. The threat, of course, is the international communist movement which, not content with having enslaved one third of the world’s population, is committed to imposing its totalitarian system upon the entire world.

What should be the role of American student youth in combating communism? Every student youth has the opportunity to make a substantial contribution—first, by looking to his own spiritual well-being and, second, by seriously examining and fulfilling his duties and his responsibilities to society. Too often we are prone to demand our “rights” and ignore our correlative duties.

More specifically, our student youth ought to exercise his precious freedom to seek the truth in all things; to learn the actual nature and tactics of communism; to assist in civic programs for social improvement; respect human dignity; obtain a knowledge of American history, traditions, and heritage; combat public indifference to social problems; and counter bigotry and prejudice by demanding fair treatment and justice for all.

In their associations with others, students need to temper knowledge with understanding and respect, and to avoid preoccupation with unreal issues. Whatever the vocation, each American youth should accept his responsibilities to his family and to society with a spirit of adventure. He should accept and play a positive community role which will effectively undercut any communist appeal and will insure the achievement of a better way of life.

In this way, the joint efforts of all will assure the continuance of our way of life and a full realization of our American heritage. But, it must be the “joint efforts of all” and not just a few. Applying this thought to academic communities, it should not be expected that our student youth will measure up to the standards of which they are capable without sound education and sagacious guidance, leadership, and inspiration on the part of our educators.

The challenge of communism is total, and nowhere will the impact, over a period of time, be greater than in the philosophical realm. This challenge takes the form of three profound questions: (1) What is my origin? (2) How should I conduct myself throughout life? (3) What am I able to hope for at the end of life? Communists do offer definitive answers to these three questions, based on dialectical and historical materialism.

In the United States to date we do not have definitive answers to these questions. Can and will our educators give to us in the future more definitive answers in accordance with the values of our democratic process?

We do not know. Time veils this information from us. But this we do know now: The role of the educator in this global struggle between communism and democracy is a vital one—it could be the decisive one. The influence of educators is great; therefore, their responsibility is equally great. Communism came about through the thinking done by certain men and women, and through the thinking of each of us it must be met. It is the quality and the goal of our thinking which must be given primary consideration by our educators if they are to make the contribution of which they are capable. They work with the future because they work with youth. Lenin gave us something to ponder over when he wrote that, in the relentless drive for the minds of men and the world itself, “youth will decide the issue of the entire struggle.” It might be added that youth will decide it in accordance with the kind of education it receives.

Will our student youth receive, with ever-increasing effectiveness, an education which has for its main purpose the complete development of the individual—physical, mental, moral, emotional, and spiritual? To the degree that this purpose is fulfilled, to the degree that our educators, with active home and community support, can induce our student youth to think logically, be factually informed, live morally, act freely, and produce creatively in order to achieve the maximum level of self-realization commensurate with the rights of the individuals and the rights of society—to that degree will our educators make their lasting contribution to solving the communist problem.

If the degree of success attained in the area of education is great enough, there will then flow from our schools and colleges young men and women well equipped to enter the ever-more-complex areas of adult human experience in this revolutionary period of history. This is a unique revolutionary period in history: one in which each day knowledge must eliminate ignorance; justice must contend with inequity; truth must expose falsehood; freedom must vanquish tyranny; religion must prevail over atheism; tolerance must surmount prejudice; good must grapple with evil; and hope must cope with despair.

With our student youth prepared to do this, we can expect in our nation a strong upsurge of original thinking, intellectual pioneering, and spiritual and moral growth, coupled with social vision, which will be translated into social performances inherently and vastly superior to anything which communism can present to the world. And, lastly, the influence of the kind of education which could produce this response would be limitless and timeless, for it has been said with profound wisdom that educators affect eternity; there is no telling where their influence ends. There is no telling where their influence ends because educators transmit to students in an endless procession the culture, wisdom, ideals, and aspirations of the mind and soul of man, and these are immortal.

"Today, the American student seems to be more sophisticated, more analytical, and less inclined to be 'taken in' by any kind of propaganda, be it from the extreme left or the extreme right."
PHILOSOPHY IN CLAY

The pictures on these pages represent an unusual project: an attempt to portray abstract ideas in solid form. This plastic approach was developed by Bernadine Madole, a graduate education student at Washington University, as her way of coming to terms with the concepts she encountered in a philosophy of education course on "Images of Man and the Dilemma of Modern Education."

Designer of the course and its teacher is Dr. Arthur Wirth, associate professor of education. The integrating ideas for the course were set by an initial consideration of Goethe's Faust as a symbol of modern man in conflict. In later weeks, the classes read and studied the great innovators whose ideas have profoundly influenced the processes of education, among them Darwin, Marx, Freud, Dewey, and Watson.

Shortly before entering the course, Miss Madole had begun to study sculpture. Soon she found her readings in philosophy influencing her sculpture to the point where she asked permission to do her course report in clay instead of writing a paper.

A native of Oklahoma City, Miss Madole studied dance in Berlin in 1957. She has a bachelor of science degree with a major in dance from the University of Wisconsin and is now working toward her master of education degree with a concentration in philosophy. She also teaches dance at a nearby high school.

The whole concept of what she had done, Miss Madole admits, is hard to put into words. However, when her classmates viewed the pieces, they decided that "a web of meaning began to make itself apparent."

""Remain men in possession of your own souls!"
—Schweitzer, Goethe, Five Studies

"...the other hidden world."
—Eiseley, The Mind as Nature
"Between Man and Man...."
—Buber

"...reaching blindly forward into time."
—Eiseley, The Mind as Nature

"...it is better to do nothing."
—Dostoevsky, Notes From the Underground
By EDWARD D. EDDY JR.
President, Chatham College

The Collegiate Storm Is Brewing

Up to this point in their history, the great majority of American colleges and universities, some 1,800 in number, have been behaving not unlike owners of single, disconnected pieces of beach property. Before the tourist season begins each year, they have busied themselves in painting the picket fence and re-shingling the roof in the hope that their cottages will rent for a slightly higher fee and that the tenants will be just a bit more desirable. Such minor repairs, they contend, may interest the kind of tenant who stays throughout the season, instead of the annoying type who checks in and out in a hurry.

In recent years, however, the property owners have been warned by prognosticators that a serious storm is brewing off the coast. Indeed, the storm may reach hurricane dimensions previously unrecorded. Suddenly the individual colleges discover that fences and roofs and long-term tenants seem fairly trivial compared to the potential severity of the storm. At each meeting of the educational real estators, the stories of pressures on the high-school senior and of the experiences of college admissions directors have become successively more fantastic.

No hurricane of any kind was ever given better advance notice. Every prognostication indicates that the colleges will be inundated by students within three to four short years. If anything, the storm analogy errs because it implies a momentary disruption. From all indications, the college demand is here to stay.

Answers aren’t easy, but perhaps a few intelligent questions help to give focus to a partial understanding of the
Edward Danforth Eddy Jr., president of Chatham College in Pittsburgh, is a forceful and outspoken advocate of changes that will make education more honestly and realistically attuned to modern society and to the new quality of needs of the students pouring into America’s colleges and universities.

Dr. Eddy was vice president and provost at the University of New Hampshire when he accepted the presidency of Chatham in 1960. He attracted national attention with his 1957 book, Colleges for Our Land and Time, and even more with his 1959 study, The College Influence on Student Character.

A hurricane ahead. An initial question could be put this way: Are we willing to be realistic about education? Are we in the colleges, for instance, willing to admit that we have not been entirely honest in our claims about the effect and the efficacy of higher learning? We have created conditions which now threaten to wreck us. We have sent aloft the airplanes to seed the clouds—and we wring our hands because the rain threatens to swamp us.

Several years ago John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation warned against using education as a lure for status. He wrote in his annual report:

“There is in this country a distressing overemphasis on college education as a guarantor of economic success, social acceptability, and general human worth. . . . There are widespread social attitudes which seem to equate a college education with human dignity and the right to hold one’s head up in the world . . . . The excessive emphasis on college education as the only ‘respectable’ outcome for a young man or woman has created a cruel narrowing of the conception of personal development beyond high school.”

Are we willing to lend our strong support to building and supporting a different kind of educational experience for the student who will not benefit greatly from college, and to allow that experience to share in the prestige? This question which guidance counselors, college faculties, and college alumni can help to answer.

Second question: Are we willing to call a halt to senseless collegiate comparisons? Not every institution of higher learning in this country could or should be a facsimile of Harvard. And yet this is the trend toward which high-school counselors, parents, and students are pushing the colleges. This tendency toward uniformity weakens all of us. We pride ourselves in public on our diversity and then, in private, pity ourselves for our differences.

Are we willing to encourage and support, then, the college which wants to be distinctively excellent at its own chosen level? We are in desperate need of intelligent non-conformity in higher education. And, in our guidance, we must protect the non-conformist colleges from receiving applications only from the ill-fitting and ill-prepared among students. Do we really believe in diversity in American higher education? If we do, let’s support it in fact as well as in word. To cease competing and comparing requires the development of what John Gardner again has called “a point of view that permits each kind of institution to achieve excellence in terms of its own objectives.”

Such a course will knock down completely the already leaning tower of prestige among certain colleges and universities in our country. But we know what the perpetuation of the forces of institutional prestige can do to the individual student. In his study of high-school students, James Coleman concluded: “One gets the impression that these students and their parents have been so concerned about the problems of getting into the right college that they have nearly forgotten what a college education is all about. . . . In some highly privileged schools, the students go to the right colleges, but for the wrong reasons. In many small isolated high schools, the students have the right reasons, but they end up in wrong colleges.”

The perpetuation of prestige has helped to weaken the
concept of learning for learning's sake. It makes a farce of some of our truly worthy academic endeavors.

In addition, the individual student may become the victim of the second-choice complex which plagues many a student and many a college. Perhaps one simple solution to all this would be for the secondary school to give recognition to all who enter an accredited institution and to stop bragging about the few who were luckily shoehorned into the famous few.

Question number three: Are we willing to believe in the diversity of students within the college as well as in the diversity of the colleges themselves? Many high-school counselors now are demanding that the college admissions officers tell them "what type of students you want." Such a course leads inevitably to a homogenized and pasteurized student body. The future of our common intellectual life is endangered if colleges are not willing to take a chance on the unpredictable. We should not want "types"; we should want individuals. Every college admissions reference form might well include two key questions: "Has the candidate ever been identified with unpopular but worthwhile causes?" and "Has the candidate ever done anything which is truly individual, distinctive, creative?"

If high schools force upon the colleges only one kind of student for each college, the colleges will return to the homogenized product who is described by Harold Taylor as "well-rounded... in the sense that all of the rough edges have been smoothed off until he is perfectly round, like a tennis ball with a little friendly fuzz on top."

The vitality of a campus and the development of the individual student come from a presentation of many points of view among both faculty members and students. Most of us believe firmly in equality of opportunity for the admission to college of students of ability—but do we also believe in inequality of opportunity once a student reaches college? The colleges will be deprived of this important inequality if all high-school counselors seek to simplify collegiate standards by making all students distressingly alike at the outset. No college, for instance, is really helped by the easy descriptions which are appearing with distressing frequency in national magazines and in easy "guides to choosing the right college."

Question number four: Are we willing to make the mighty effort to achieve genuine democracy in higher education? We are faced with a shocking loss of talent because of socio-economic barriers. A recent University of Wisconsin study demonstrated "clear proof that a student of ability... in the professional and executive category had definite plans to attend college, and these differences are still great even when ability, as measured by intelligence tests, is taken into consideration."

According to the Wisconsin percentages, for instance, 63 per cent of all the students whose fathers were in the professional and executive category had definite plans to attend college, compared with only 21 per cent whose fathers were unskilled workers. Until we have together made a gigantic effort to overcome these socio-economic handicaps, we cannot say that America is truly a leader in democratic education.

Question number five: Are we willing to encourage the judgment and selection of colleges on criteria which are in keeping with sound academic aims? This question presupposes our primary interest in the individual as a potential scholar, not as a status seeker. A parent looking for a college for a son or daughter might want to do two things beyond the usual. First, the parent could subscribe—and this, I admit, is rank heresy—to the student newspaper to find out what concerns students and how they keep themselves busy. In this way, the parent might isolate the two or three major issues seriously discussed on that campus in a particular year. Then the parent might seek answers to a number of embarrassing but perhaps pertinent questions. Among them could be included:

1. What is the average teaching load?
2. What has been the faculty turn-over during the past five years?
3. To what extent is there in-breeding in faculty and administration appointments?
4. What is the pattern of dormitory living?
5. What is the realistic level of expectancy in academic work in campus life?
6. What books and magazines are in greatest demand in campus bookstores?
7. How many concerts, plays, exhibits, and lectures by visiting scholars were scheduled during the past year?
8. What is the record of graduate-school acceptances?
9. Has the college taken a stand on such national questions as the disclaimer affidavit?
10. Is there a clearly defined core of knowledge which the college expects in the four years of collegiate activity?
11. When was the curriculum last examined intensively and revised extensively?
12. What are the typical faculty office hours?
13. What are the extent and nature of faculty activities beyond teaching?
14. What change has occurred in the amount allocated for library acquisitions in the past ten years?
15. Is there a sense of community anywhere and everywhere?

Realistic answers to realistic questions such as these are the sensible guide to appropriate choice—not sentimentality over the dream of an alma mater which never was, or touched-up photographs of a building with no right to be.

Finally, question number six: Are the colleges ready to adapt themselves to a different sort of student who is ready for a higher level of achievement all along the line? Only when such an adaptation is achieved will we be meeting our obligation to the individual student. It is evident to many of us, for instance, that the brighter students are no longer the naive and unsophisticated freshmen with whom we have long been dealing. And yet the freshman year of study in many colleges is still geared to an outmoded concept of the student. We are smothering their interests by perpetuating the lock-step of lower-division study. We have not revised our courses and our programs to capitalize on the enriched high-school program. True, many institutions are providing exemptions in certain areas; but, at best, exemption is only a temporary answer and not the permanent solution. Although high-school preparation for college is still raggedly un-
even, the colleges can assist by raising the standards of intellectual challenge in the beginning college years.

In the same fashion, extra-curricular life in colleges is geared to the student of yesteryear. By and large, American high schools have usurped for their own what we have traditionally considered collegiate-level activities. Interscholastic athletics now rival in form and fury the once-traditional intercollegiate program. Student publications are often more expertly produced at the high-school level. And the secondary-school social life matches what we have known heretofore only at the college level. Students date earlier, smoke earlier, drink earlier. And they are tired, by the time they reach college, of decorating a gymnasium with crepe paper for the Junior Prom.

The colleges should not fail to capitalize on these changes by providing the kind of extra-curricular program with an intellectual emphasis which the colleges have long wished might be possible. It is possible now, if the colleges will only recognize the latent student interest and stop bemoaning the disinterest in the traditional.

As the level rises, however, the colleges must be wary of the over-encouragement given the over-achiever, just as they must be wary of all undue forms of competition which are basically unhealthy for the student. In the years ahead, colleges will be far less tolerant of the deviant in any form—for the simple reason that another, possibly equally intelligent, student is ready to take his place when a vacancy occurs. Our concern for the system and the schedule never should be given priority over our concern for the individual and his right to be an individual.

In summary, there are some steps to be taken to lessen the impact of the storm:

We can be honest about education's value and not insist upon its social necessity for every individual.

We can cease our senseless competition, whether it is between public and private colleges or among the private.

We can provide room and encouragement for the necessary diversity in form and function among colleges and insist on diversity within all colleges in order to avoid a homogenized campus culture.

All of us together can work to be sure that American education is truly democratic because it does give equal chance to the student of abilities devoid of false preselection by class and caste.

We can establish new criteria for judgment by parent and student. In turn, we must then be ready to meet the new standard of student interest and ability.

The national admissions crisis, in which the individual student is often tragically forgotten, must be solved by the colleges and the secondary schools working together in the short time that is left. The storm warnings are up, but few of us are ready to evacuate. The colleges will do well to keep repeating to themselves Gilbert Highet's admonition that the student "have no faults, except the very ones they are asking you to eradicate: ignorance, shallowness, and inexperience. . . . It will be useless . . . to wish that there were only two or three, or that they were all more mature. They will always be young, and there will always be lots of them."

And to this we should respond with enthusiasm: Thank God.
Dr. Gwendolen Carter, professor of government at Smith.

Max Rheinstein, Tyrrell Williams Lecturer, professor of law at the University of Chicago.

Ornithologist Jim Fowler, with friend.

Harvard professor and WU alumnus Paul Freund, Founders Week speaker.

Nobel prize-winner E. M. Purcell, Kennedy Memorial Lecturer.
THE COMPANY WE KEEP

Pictured on these pages are a few of the distinguished visitors to the campus this past academic year. Most of them appeared on the Wednesday Assembly Series, and many also met with the students for informal discussion.

Art director James Sweeney.

Alan Hovhaness, composer.

Political scientist William Carleton.

Theodore Yntema, vice-president of Ford Motor Company.

Garrett Mattingly, historian from Columbia University.
Ralph Ellison, novelist and critic.

Helen Gardner, Oxford professor and literary critic.

Artist Stephen Greene, Steinberg lecturer.

Michael Field, of the duo-piano team of Appleton and Field.

Professor A. Doak Barnett, of Columbia University, who gave the Oreon E. Scott lectures, this year on China.
Morroe Berger, Princeton sociologist.

William Rusher, publisher of The National Review, debated Cold War strategy on a program sponsored by the student Conservative Club.

Sir George Paget Thomson, Nobel prize-winning British physicist.

Jewish theologian, author, and teacher Abraham Heschel.

Senator Hubert Humphrey talked on urban renewal.
The following prospectus was submitted to the Washington University Magazine by Victor T. LeVine, assistant professor of political science. Any similarity between Dr. LeVine's imaginary Institute offerings and the contents of some college catalogues is, of course, entirely unintentional.

THE INSTITUTE
OF
IRRELEVANT
STUDIES

The University is pleased to offer a two-to four-year program leading to the degree of Master of Irrelevant Studies (M.I.S.) for the two-year program, and the degree of Doctor of Philosophically Unproductive Irrelevancies (D.-P.H.U.I.) for the four-year program. The University is particularly eager to solicit the participation of graduate students whose personalities make it impossible for them to earn their own livings after the receipt of the B.A. degree. Thus it is hoped to build up an elite corps of inaudible, incomprehensible, and incoherent scholars acceptable in the academic world by even the most rigid standards.

The Curriculum of the Institute is divided into categories of courses that are either Structured or Unstructured, Organized or Disorganized, Functional or Dysfunctional, Homogeneous or Heterogeneous, and Rigid or Flaccid. It becomes possible for a student to take a Structured, Disorganized, Functional, Homogeneously Flaccid course of study. Or, on the other hand, he may elect an Unstructured, Organized, Dysfunctional, Heterogeneously Rigid course. Or, if he wishes (according to his individual needs), he may choose some other pattern. The University is anxious to please everyone.

Following is the list of current offerings of the Institute. Units are in parentheses; Roman I, II represent semesters offered; visiting lecturers are indicated where applicable. All other courses will be taught by Members of the Regular Irrelevant Staff.
GROUP 1—POLITICAL THEORY

2. Obscural Science. The theory and practice of jargonese. Particular attention will be paid to the construction of meaningless models. (2) II

GROUP 2—INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

3. Seminar: The International Relations of Labrador. The true significance of Labrador in the International Scene will be explored. The instructor's Doctoral Dissertation will be the text. (5) I, II Dr. R. E. Triever

GROUP 3—POLITICS

5. Anal-retentive, Oedipal-oriented, Libidinal Aspects of Acculturative Patterns in Miltown, U.S.A. A penetrating analysis of anal-retentive, oedipal-oriented, libidinal aspects of acculturative patterns in Miltown, U.S.A. Two field trips, lab. (4) II Prof. Ganz Verschimmelt
7. The Politics of Disintegration. Formerly offered by the Tupelo (Miss.) Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology. (4) I Dr. O. Faubus
8. Applied Political Behavior Analysis: The College of Cardinals. (3) I, II

GROUP 4—COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT


GROUP 5—PUBLIC LAW

11. Government and Institutions of the New Mid-Saharan States. A course providing more than the usual emphasis on boundary problems. (6) I, II

GROUP 6—PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

12. Cuban Court Procedure. A reassessment of the Breakfast Food Theory of Jurisprudence, with special reference to sugar. (2) II Dr. Fidel Castro
13. The Efik-Ibo Legal System. Evolution of the customary law, with special emphasis on the contributions made by petition-writers; theory of status-quo as illustrated by the evolution of court fashions. The course will be conducted in Bantu. (4) I
14. Unpaid Bills. The analysis of the legal impact of documents, of which the following is an example:

"Sir, I am directed to inform you that a Bill No. 134648 of 13 March 1957 for the sum of £28 8s 0d being the cost of one case of White Horse Whisky and one case Heineken's Beer was recently submitted to this Ministry for settlement by the Manager, U.A.C. (Provisions Department). This expenditure is observed to have been incurred by you two days before the election after which you ceased to be a Minister. As this is believed to be part of your election expenses, I am directed by the Hon. Minister to request you to refund this amount to the government."

15. Municipal Sewage-Disposal Problems in Anchorage, Alaska. Theoretical and practical studies; field work at the source. (4) I
16. The Organization and Administration of White Citizens' Councils. Another offering of the late Tupelo Institute. Opportunities are open to graduates of this course to apply for positions as Citizens' Council Internes. (6) I, II
ON JUNE 26 AT BANFF, CANADA, the American Alumni Council presented the 1962 Robert Sibley Magazine of the Year Award to the Washington University Magazine. The Sibley Award is the big one in this business—to alumni editors, it's the Oscar, the blue ribbon, the Most Valuable Player in the League award. There were more than 700 college and university publications competing for the awards presented at Banff, and the Washington University Magazine brought home the Canadian bacon.

In the competition in specific categories, the WU Magazine also won first place in the “appearance” division, first place in alumni reporting, and second place in photographic content. The cover of the November issue was picked as one of the “Best Covers of the Year” and Herb Weitman’s imaginative study of J. H. Hexter was selected as one of the “Year’s Best Photographs.”

The Sibley Award was established in 1943 by the American Alumni Council in memory of Robert Sibley, for many years alumni director of the University of California. In winning the Sibley Cup, Washington University finds itself in excellent company. Previous winners have included such institutions as Dartmouth, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, Princeton, Vassar, the University of Chicago, Emory University, Rutgers, Barnard, and Johns Hopkins.

Until four years ago, the Magazine had never been among the top contenders for the Sibley Award, although it had received special recognition in several categories. Then, Robert L. Payton, now vice chancellor for development, became the editor. In 1959, the Magazine came in third in the Sibley Derby and it finished close to the top in both 1960 and 1961.

To judge the entries in this year’s publications competition, the American Alumni Council invited a panel of outside experts, including the education editor of the Washington Post; an assistant director of the National Education Association; the editor of the NEA Journal; the promotion director of Time magazine; the art director of George Lohr Studios, and a vice president of the Barton-Gillet Company.

Credit for achieving this national recognition for the Magazine, and for the institution through the Magazine, must be widely shared. Margaret Batts, the assistant editor, has given the publication the benefit of her intimate knowledge of the University and of her extreme regard for accuracy and thoroughness. Herb Weitman’s outstanding photography has been of major importance in the Magazine’s success and has, incidentally, spawned a host of imitators and a whole new school of photography among alumni editors from coast to coast. Of crucial significance has been the work of the Magazine’s designer, Peter Geist, of the School of Fine Arts. In an era where too many publications are relying on circus layouts, tawdry display, and tortured typography, the clean, simple Geist layouts have been judged the best in the business.

The foundation laid by Bob Payton has been a solid one on which to build and the example he has shown an inspiring one to follow. As the editor, Payton blazed the way; as the editor’s boss, he has provided a climate in which the editor has complete freedom to do as he chooses, to plan and execute each issue without interference, and to remake the Magazine into his own image of what the publication should be.

Perhaps the most credit for the Magazine’s showing should go to a group of contributors whose names don’t even appear on the masthead—the many faculty members who wrote articles for the publication during the year. Faculty contributors this past year have included J. H. Hexter, professor of history; John Fowler, associate professor of physics; John H. Kautsky, associate professor of political science; Buford L. Pickens, professor of architecture and director of campus planning; Siegfried Reinhardt, instructor in art; Barry Commoner, professor of plant physiology; William N. Chambers, professor of political science; and Ross M. Trump, dean of the School of Business and Public Administration.

Alumni have also contributed to the publication’s success. Pieces by Shepherd Mead on “How to Succeed at WU Without Really Trying” and by Frank Croom Kirtz on John H. Watson, M.D., were among the most popular articles to appear last year.

HOWEVER, THE Washington University Magazine is not published to win awards. It is designed to help keep alumni and other readers informed about the University, the kind of faculty it is building, the type of students it is attracting, the goals it is striving for. It attempts to share the scholarly, intellectual, and cultural life of the campus with the readers and to give them some idea of the excitement that a growing university generates.

Yet a judgment by the experts in the field is an excellent yardstick for the editor. It gives him some objective way of measuring how well he is doing in his attempt to reach the major goals of a university magazine.

It is gratifying personally to the editor to win the top award in his field. But the honor is more than personal. It calls national attention to the institution and serves as just one more illustration of the position Washington University has achieved among the leading educational centers of this country.

In commenting on his choice, one of the AAC judges remarked that he thought the Washington University Magazine was doing “an outstanding job of conveying the atmosphere and spirit of the institution” and that reading the Magazine had given him an insight into and an understanding of a great university of which he had previously known little.

Winning the 1962 Sibley Magazine of the Year Award was a great honor for the Washington University Magazine. Even more, it was a well-deserved tribute to the University itself, for the Magazine, in final analysis, is merely a reflection of the University.

—FO'B
GEORGE PAKE TO BECOME PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

George E. Pake, internationally known physicist, will become provost of Washington University in September. As first deputy to Chancellor Eliot, Professor Pake will perform those duties formerly associated with the position of vice chancellor and dean of faculties and will also have special responsibility for research development.

For Dr. Pake, this will be his second tour of duty at Washington University. In 1952, at age 28, he became chairman of the University's Department of Physics, serving in that post until 1956, when he accepted a professorship at Stanford University.

George Pake is a graduate of Carnegie Institute of Technology, a Harvard Ph.D., a Fellow of the American Physical Society, chairman of the Physics Advisory Panel of the National Science Foundation, one of the pioneering investigators in the field of magnetic resonance, and an accomplished performer on the French horn.

His appointment, following fast on the heels of Chancellor Eliot's, speaks well for the University's future.