NEW FACES OF 1967: Nearly one thousand new freshmen arrived on the Washington University campus this fall from forty-three states and many foreign countries. Here are just a few of them, caught by the camera during those first confusing days of collegiate life. For more freshman faces, see the inside back cover; for more of the freshmen, see "The Miniskirt Era," Page 52.
COVER: Fall is here, school has started, and a new crop of freshmen, complete with beanies, has arrived on campus. For a sampling of the new class, see the inside covers and "The Miniskirt Era," on Pages 52-56.
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BASIC RESEARCH
AND THE UNIVERSITY'S FUTURE

Universities are the locale for most of the basic research done in the United States. The universities are, of course, both public and private. Let me turn first to the general aspects of the problems facing basic research in the universities.

Most of us are aware that the dominating components of research funds in the universities come from the federal government—about three-fourths of all research funds. We are also aware that our military involvement in Southeast Asia has placed a severe strain on the federal budget, which of course reflects itself either in cuts or in decreased growth rates for many federal programs.

The period of rapid growth in research funds to the universities was the late 1950’s. Even in the face of the Vietnamese war, research funding has grown somewhat each year. But, during the past three or four years, the growth in federal funds for research has fallen substantially behind the increasing demands from new universities, from expanded numbers of faculty members in the established universities, and from increased numbers of graduate students. The effective federal funding of research per faculty researcher has in fact begun to decline. The effect of this decline is to transmit pressures to other university funds which are increasingly over-committed.

University funds from all sources have certainly grown extensively in recent years. But the growth rate, as with federal research funds, is not keeping pace with the increase in student and faculty numbers, with the demands of both students and faculty for higher quality facilities and services, and with inflation in other operating costs.

Let us turn first to the state universities. Although it is certainly true that state legislators are now lavishing more funds upon their various expanding state university systems than was ever dreamed of a decade or so ago, I am told by my friends in the state universities that the state legislature all too often responds to the need for new funds only after the students are already registered at the campus. In addition, there is a serious lag while new buildings are under construction and new faculty members are recruited to occupy those buildings in order to provide the kind of instruction that the students already needed when the appropriation was made in the legislature.

If this picture is even partially valid, it is a forlorn hope to expect that state universities can somehow carve new and expanded research support out of resources that fail to keep pace with the teaching needs for the many undergraduates descending upon the campuses. It is especially forlorn when one recognizes that the states have in the past relied on the federal government to support research, and thus have not adjusted to the notion of bearing this added cost item. An interesting confirmation of the inadequacy of state funds to support the state universities is provided by the booklet Margin for Excellence, published by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. This booklet contends that these public institutions require, in order to be really excellent, an extra margin of financial support provided from private sources—a contention about which I shall say more later.

It is clear that the state legislatures, in at least some instances, can be generous in their efforts to support excellence. For example, the Einstein and Schweitzer chairs in the state of New York provide for each professor a “package” of something like $100,000 per year, a very substantial portion of which may be used for salary. The margin for excellence in this example does not seem to be private support, and, indeed, obtaining approval of a state legislature for such out-of-line salaries has apparently proved easier than finding private sources. Not even private universities have found private support for salaries at the level provided by these state-supported chairs.

What about the private universities? These institutions regard their ability to provide very high quality education as one of their major reasons for being. At their best they can offer a more personalized kind of instruction in an uncrowded setting because they are not faced with statutory requirements to take all comers. These institutions feel an intense pressure to provide the highest quality of education because they are acutely conscious of burdening the student with tuition charges. The quest for quality means attracting first-rate faculty to teach the undergraduates, and that in turn means maintenance of strong graduate and research programs to attract and hold that faculty. These are the very programs, whether in public or private
This article is an expanded and revised version of the article Dr. Pake wrote for the August 4, 1967, issue of Science. The Science article, in turn, was based on Dr. Pake’s remarks at a session on “Science and Government: Short-Term Support of Basic Research,” sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences. His main theme is that lagging federal research support and spiraling costs are jeopardizing the survival of private universities in the United States.
universities, that are primarily supported by federal funds. The present squeeze on federal funds deals a body blow not only to strong graduate education, but also to quality undergraduate education.

The decline in federal funds is only the beginning of the problem for the private universities. There are a number of other factors which have seriously curtailed the growth in financial support for private institutions.

The first factor is that inflation in costs has substantially exceeded the rate of growth in endowment income. There are lots of reasons for this. With the investment practices current in universities, and with restrictions which donors sometimes put on disposal of assets, it requires on the average more than $25 million in endowment to provide $1 million in annual operating income. Few universities, facing the kinds of pressures of finance that are now upon them, could afford the luxury of salting away $25 million (if they had the opportunity) in order to obtain only $1 million toward the next year's operating expenses.

One can suggest, of course, that a significant portion of endowment funds should be put into good growth stocks, so that there can be substantial capital gain. In fact, this is done to a considerable extent. However, the legalities surrounding the investment of funds designated as endowment by the donor normally require the capital gain to be considered as part of the endowment and not as income.

A number of universities have recently begun legal studies to seek ways to use a portion of this capital gain. Unless such methods are found, the capital gain in endowment during a particular year can be $10 million, while an operating deficit of $1 million pushes an institution closer toward the wall.

A second factor in the declining growth rate of income to private universities is the invasion of the area of private philanthropy by the state universities. The magnitude of this encroachment may still be small proportionately, but there is an organized effort behind this invasion, as mentioned earlier. Admittedly I have a private university bias, but I am astounded by some of the assertions in Margin for Excellence. Only an incredible forbearance on the part of private universities can prevent this booklet from becoming a very divisive force in higher education.

A third influence—which appears to be on the wane at the present moment—is the effect of a low stock market on private donors. Wealthy individuals who look favorably upon universities as objects of their philanthropy were hard-pressed in 1966 to feel as wealthy as they did a couple of years before. And gifts based on stock market holdings at low value provide less tax relief for the donor.

A fourth factor that has reduced private giving to universities is difficult to measure accurately, but it certainly should not be underestimated. It is the effect on potential donors of some student and faculty opposition to the Vietnam war and of certain highly publicized aspects of student behavior—from long, unruly hair to some instances of drug use. The influence of mass media through disproportionate emphasis on what they or their readers consider unorthodox behavior, whether in universities or elsewhere in our society, must torture the consciences of news reporters, editors, and publishers. This influence seems to me to be a subject that merits extensive social science research.

Potential donors often seem to join some members of the general public in making the mistake of viewing specific publicized incidents as typical of the faculty members and students of our universities. Presumably, donors really have to like a university in order to give substantial portions of their hard-earned resources to it. At the present moment in our history, many of them simply find it more and more difficult to like the universities, and previously expected support has not been forthcoming.

Whatever factors may be the cause, we do know, from data assembled by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, that voluntary gift support for higher education declined in 1965-66, after several years of steady increase. In reporting this decline in the July 12, 1967, issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education, CFAE's president pointed out that collegiate operating budgets are rising nationally at an annual rate of 14 per cent. The same issue presented figures showing that appropriations of twenty-eight state legislatures for support of state colleges and universities in 1967-68 averaged 45 per cent higher than two years.
ago. (Many state institutions operate on biennial budgets.)

Thus, we have a clear picture of the national trends in the financing of higher education: (1) sharply increasing operating costs, (2) approximately proportionate rises in state appropriations for state colleges and universities, (3) a recent decline in voluntary private gifts to support higher education—accompanied by an aggressive effort of state universities to increase the share of these private gifts which they receive. The present university problem is evident.

We have talked about financial squeezes more or less in numerical terms up to this point. That is, we have referred to the rapidly increasing numbers of undergraduates on our state university campuses, and we have referred to the pressure on private institutions to strengthen their graduate programs, which of course means some increase in the number of graduate students. But, beyond the effects indicated by a mere count of the number of undergraduate students, of graduate students, and of faculty researchers on the campus, there is what the Physics Survey Committee of the National Academy of Sciences called the “process of maturation” of our educational system. The point here is that the American educational system is still engaged in a transition from the situation of the 1920's and 1930's, when serious scholars of science in America often had to anticipate the necessity for carrying on graduate studies or postdoctoral studies abroad before they would be prepared for careers in this country.

Since World War II, we have been steadily engaged in a process of establishing quality research and graduate study on American campuses, so that we might have a fully self-sufficient educational system that leads the world. This effort to establish research and graduate study in the United States is still far from complete. To make it complete, there will have to be further investments in graduate research facilities, in reducing teaching loads in some institutions, and in increasing faculty-to-student ratios. So long as substantial portions of the higher educational system remain immature, we must expect that the growth rate for the funds supporting graduate education and research will need to be far larger than suggested by the simple numerical increases in over-all numbers of students at all levels.

Our universities are becoming morasses of red tape. Fifteen years ago, when federal support of research was just appearing on the campus, there were prophets of gloom and doom who predicted that federal funds would surely lead to an encroachment upon the academic freedom of the universities. So far, there has fortunately been little evidence indeed of encroachment upon that freedom. But university business offices and accounting have been wholly taken over, in effect, by federal procedures, regulations, and auditors. With effort reports, cost-sharing arrangements, progress reports, proposals for renewals of grants and contracts, and, of course, accounting in detail for the expenditure of every special fund associated with each of our hundreds of contracts and grants, our business and administrative offices wallow in a welter of wasteful work.

It may be argued by some that we can recover the cost of all of this kind of activity through the indirect or overhead charges associated with our contracts and grants. It is true that after years of being limited by federal statutes which expressly prevented full payment of indirect costs, we have for the last year or two had legislation which permitted us to attempt to recover full costs as audited by the Bureau of the Budget's famous Circular A-21. That circular, at the outset, does not allow all the costs to which the universities feel they are entitled. But even our audit of the costs allowed by Circular A-21 may be disputed by the government auditors. Finally, after negotiation, the government approves an indirect cost rate which can be substantially less than that determined by the university. However, new indirect costs during a particular fiscal year—such as those which were required to set up effort-reporting and cost-sharing procedures—cannot be put into the indirect cost rate until the next year based on the audit of this year's cost. In summary, we are not allowed full costs as we would determine them, and there is a lag in collecting allowable new costs as additional red tape tasks are loaded upon the universities.

But perhaps the most serious effect of all these red tape problems is a kind of an intangible change in the nature and quality of the university. In its current form, the entire cost accounting syndrome is, it seems to me, intrinsically foreign to the academic atmosphere. As these cost account-
In a word, it is the demand for finding it more and more difficult to discern the distinction between the university and a business corporation in which the financial statement—not educational accomplishment and scholarly achievement—becomes the determining factor in measuring success or failure. Is this really good for education and scholarship and fundamental research? Is there no way at least to halt the trend of the last few years, which, if continued, could ultimately immobilize the creativeness of our universities in the shackles of time clocks and unproductive record-keeping?

For some reason, the country seems suddenly caught up in a demand for instant solutions to all its problems. Although the federal government and protesting student groups may disagree on the specifics of a policy in Vietnam, some of the federal agencies and some of the student groups seem to agree on one general principle: ignore the fundamentals and solve our various problems immediately. In a word, it is the demand for relevance. Some of the students don't want to learn the basic laws of science, to study mathematics, or to learn history because they are not yet able to see the relevance to the problems of modern society. The federal agencies, whether for budgetary or for philosophical reasons, sometimes appear to downgrade basic research because they don't see its relevance to putting a man on the moon, or to treatment of cancer, or to devising a better weapon for the jungles of Vietnam. There is a kind of an irrational demand to do this or that now, without taking the time to develop the tools to do the job at hand.

From these attempts to achieve solutions at less than the real cost (a demand for an unreasonable kind of cost effectiveness) come efforts to use the universities, in the crass sense of the word. Agencies ask the universities to develop educational programs, to correct deficiencies in primary and secondary education in the cities, to develop social action programs to deal with poverty, alcoholism, or other social problems in the cities, or to turn scientific research into solutions of engineering problems for mission-oriented agencies in Washington.

But here, as in every other product a university produces, no one wants to pay the full cost. A university is regarded as a source of infinite wealth just waiting to be lavished on the solution of the various problems which run rampant through society. Society seems to have forgotten that the primary functions of a university are teaching and research, both of which are necessarily forerunners to training and equipping those who will try to solve the important applied problems of our times. If universities sold their services at a profit and were participating in an expanding economy, then it would make sense to ask the universities to reinvest some or all of the growing profits in these new social programs. The difficulty is that all services are sold at a loss and there simply are no uncommitted general funds.

I have already alluded to the factors which have curtailed the growth of financial support for private universities. In this section, I want to focus less on what is happening to growth rates and more on the sources of income that are today available to the private university. Washington University, a medium-sized private university, spent some $40 million on its educational and research programs in the fiscal year 1965-66. This omits cost of dormitories and food service, on which the University loses relatively little. The entire residential campus was built during the past ten years, resulting in larger capital costs to be amortized than for most universities. Let us find out what were the sources of income to meet that $40 million expenditure.

First of all, there is endowment. We are a medium-sized university (even small by public university standards), yet we have one of the larger endowments of private institutions in the U.S. (ranking somewhere between 20th and 25th). Its market value at the end of 1966 was approximately $120 million. Presumably it is the size of that number that leads some of our townspeople mistakenly to regard us as a rich institution. In point of fact, of course, that endowment earned income in 1966 amounting to a little less than $4 million, or less than 10 per cent of the total operating expenditures of the University. If endowment income is that small, how did we operate the University at all?

First of all, we charged the students a substantial tuition. In 1966, it was $1700 for the academic year. Tuition provided in fact about $10 million or one-fourth of our operating costs. Government research grants and contracts provided another substantial portion of our operating funds, $14.5 million or about 36 per cent of the expenditures of $40 million. (That percentage is not high among quality institutions of the U.S. If it seems high, consider the major institutes of technology which receive something like 75 per cent of their operating funds from the federal government.)
We have now accounted for some $28.5 million of the $40 million spent. Where did the other $11.5 million come from? It turns out that there are some miscellaneous sources of direct income, just one example of which is patient and laboratory fee collections at the Medical School, and all of these various sources totaled $3.5 million. Then there are a number of so-called organized activities for which we expended $3 million, which was offset by $3 million of income. That leaves finally $5 million of income to account for.

The $5 million remaining, half of which was restricted, came from private sources. It is, in fact, the $2.5 million of unrestricted private annual giving upon which we have had to depend to try to keep the University solvent. It is a struggle each year to raise these funds and in two out of the last six years we have fallen behind, with the result that we have a substantial accumulated deficit.

One point of this discussion is to dispel the myth that the University's endowment of over $100 million represents great wealth. Another myth is that somehow the University sits on top of a large pile of "general funds," which can be used to meet various purposes, such as increasing faculty salaries, cost-sharing on federal grants, or underwriting the solution of applied problems within the community. The simple fact is that we sell our research, our educational functions, and our social service to the community at a loss.

Before the tuition is ever collected, it is more than obligated to pay the salaries of the faculty. Endowment income, for all except the half dozen or so wealthiest universities in America, is becoming an almost negligible component of the annual operating income of the institution. It may not be enough even to maintain the physical plant.

Our universities have talented and highly trained people on their faculties, priceless books in their libraries, valuable equipment in their laboratories, and eager and gifted minds among their students. All of these resources can be, and should be made available to help the nation meet its important educational and scientific problems, and even some of its social action goals. But if society wishes to call upon these resources in efforts to meet the nation's problems, it must pay the cost.

Finally, I cannot resist remarks on the tactics of both private foundations and government agencies which engage in the support of various educational, research, and social programs in the universities. My first complaint is that these public and private agencies have a disease that I will call "gimmickitus." Even if a university has a good, solid program of distinction and quality under way, one cannot sell it to these agencies unless it is dressed up to indicate a new angle or some alleged new approach. I suppose it is easier to recognize that a program is new than to select the best programs from existing ones. Or perhaps it is easier because there are fewer new programs than existing good ones. In any case, the tendency is to regard good, solid, substantial work as simply not exciting or "innovative" enough to merit support. (This comment does not apply so much to project support grants as it does to institutional programs and grants.)

A second tactic is what I call the "hit and run" approach of the foundations and government agencies. The thought here is that the foundation or agency money is to be used for a period of time as "seed money." The agency wants to get something started and then pull out, leaving it for the university to sustain, from its "general funds." This of course has to mean previously uncommitted general funds—but we have seen earlier that there are no such funds, at least in most private universities.

American private universities and their independent boards of trustees certainly are grateful for the substantial institutional support they have received from agencies such as the National Science Foundation in its Science Development Program, and from private organizations, such as the Ford Foundation in its program of challenge grants. But, given the other fiscal developments that have been described earlier in this article, given the Ford Foundation's apparent decision to abandon its program of challenge grants, and given the fact that none of the customers of the university seems to expect to pay full costs, it is tragically clear that the invaluable, quality national resource represented by the private universities of the U. S. faces a crisis of survival.
As Chief Naturalist at Yellowstone National Park, Washington University Alumnus John Good can answer any question about his two-million-acre natural wonderland except one:

**HEY MISTER, WHERE'S YOGI?**

By JAMES P. PATTERSON

Millions of years ago, violent geologic activity occurred in the area now shared by the states of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. An enormous volcanic caldera spewed molten lava from countless vents, forming a topography that would centuries later stagger even the most imaginative of men. In the eons that followed, many forces of nature clashed on this battleground and the scars of their encounters added to the wildness of the country. High in the range of mountains now called the Absarokas, a tiny river flowed toward the north. At the seven-thousand foot level, it encountered a geological barrier and formed a huge lake. Years of erosion finally paid off for the river. It cut through the barrier and left the lake in a dizzying leap, cutting a grand canyon in the process and exposing many layers of bright saffron rock. The Yellowstone River was born.

Geological ages passed by and time and erosion continued to take their toll. The Yellowstone country remained relatively young, compared to the ancient, worn mountains east of the Mississippi.

The Yellowstone country became a wilderness refuge for game and the few Indians who ventured into it were awed and mystified by the bubbling springs of hot water and steam and the roughness of the terrain. The white men who first ventured west of the Mississippi River, in the late 1700's, seeking new sources of beaver and other fur-bearing animals, found the tales of the Indians hard to believe.

In the early 1800's, members of the Lewis and Clark Expedition traveled through Yellowstone and their reports did much to popularize the area. Today, more than 2,250,000 people visit Yellowstone National Park annually, and they manage to do it between major snowfalls. The Park is open only from May 1 to October 31.

Established as a National Park in 1872, Yellowstone is the oldest, largest, and one of the most popular of our National Park Service attractions. Americans have become familiar with its chief features—Old Faithful Geyser, the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone River, and, of course, the Park's abundance of wildlife. The responsibility for the protection of these attractions, and the protection of the citizens who come to view them, lies with the National Park Service rangers who work the year around to assist nature in putting on one of the most spectacular shows our country offers.

Protection is one responsibility. Perhaps an even bigger one is the job of explaining to more than two million urban-oriented visitors exactly what they are seeing and why it is what it is. This job is ably handled by a Washington University alumnus, Chief Naturalist John Good.

Good, who holds a bachelor's and a master's degree in geology from Washington University, views his Yellowstone domain as "a vignette of the natural America that was." He works long hours at the never-ending challenge of keeping the Park, its natural attractions, and its wildlife population as near to its original state as possible—and all for the enjoyment and appreciation of the visitors whose closest brush with wildlife has been television's Yogi Bear.

Although the "Jellystone Ranger" is the arch-villain of the Yogi Bear series, Good speaks with affection of Yogi. "He gives us all kinds of good publicity," Good stated with a smile. "After all, this is Yogi's home. Kids yell out of windows of cars to our rangers and ask, 'Where's Yogi?' We get a fair amount of mail addressed simply 'Yogi Bear, Jellystone Park, U.S.A.' and it comes right through to us. One little girl wrote to Yogi from Liverpool, England, but sadly, I couldn't answer her letter because she forgot to include her address."

The good publicity that comes from Yogi Bear's antics doesn't begin to solve the problems that make up Chief Naturalist Good's job. He explained that the Park's uniformed staff consists of two groups performing separate but related jobs. The rangers are the protective force, guarding the Park, its trees and natural growth, its animals, its geysers and fumaroles from all manner of dangers—tourists, fires, floods. And they protect the Park visitors from the dangers of the Park.

The Park naturalists, under Good's direction and leadership, work to maintain the Park as a natural wilderness...
A bull elk, his antlers "in velvet," grazes in a Yellowstone meadow. A snow field lingers in the background, although the photo was made in late June.
Above: John Good can find the silence of a needle-carpeted forest or the roar of a mountain stream plunging through a tree-strewn canyon, simply by hiking a few yards from any road in the park.

Below: A bear cub casts a baleful eye at the lens as he awaits his mother along a Yellowstone Park roadside. Female bears with cubs offer an appealing but dangerous subject for amateur photographers.
Above: "Roadside bums" are those members of Yellowstone's bear population that spend their lives panhandling free meals from tourists. Below: Visitors find the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone truly awe-inspiring, especially when Chief Naturalist Good is on hand to point out that an apparent speck at the bottom is really a rock the size of a house.
big animals and it takes a little while for the drug to knock them out.

"Our ranger stood there, watching this groggy bear and waiting for the drug to take effect, when up drove a visitor with a car full of kids. The visitor hopped out of the car and walked right up to this bear to take a close-up.

"This man had a flashgun on his camera and just as the flashbulb fired, the bear keeled over in his tracks."

"The ranger said he'd never seen a tourist get back in his car and move out so fast. I guess he figured the government would make him pay for the bear he'd just 'killed' with a flashbulb."

Commenting on the eating habits of bears, Good said, "These roadside bums eat everything they're given: potato chips, bread, popsicles, all sorts of stuff. But the back country bears have diets much like hogs. They're real vacuum cleaners. They eat grass, leaves, berries, or the carcass of a dead elk when they can find one. In the spring they may go after an elk calf."

"Nearly all the panhandling bears are brown bears, Good pointed out. "You've got to get up into the back country to see a grizzly bear," he continued, "and I'm glad of that. Grizzlies are big and mean and really dangerous."

A LTHOUGH BEAR BITES constitute a major public relations problem for Good and his staff, an even more vital problem, and one that attained national proportions, concerns an animal not noted for its ferocity: the elk.

"The elk is a very dominant animal and can easily run other animals out of the winter grazing range, which is only about 90,000 acres in a bad winter," Good said. "The meat-eaters—bears, cougars, and wolves—used to keep the elk thinned out, but we don't have any wolves now and just a few cougars."

Good continued, "There's a continuing program where we trap as many elk as we can and transport them outside the Park boundaries where they can be legally hunted. But there isn't always enough money to trap as many elk as are needed to keep the herd thinned. So then the rangers have to shoot a few of them and this has caused a public uproar. The meat is packed and distributed to Indian tribes in the area so the elk must shoot are not wasted," Good said, "But it is a very hard program to sell to a conservation-minded public."

"The alternative would be to get funds to feed the elk during a bad winter," he went on, coming to the crux of the problem, "but if funds weren't available after one winter of feeding, the elk would be dependent upon us for food and would die of starvation. It's a lot less cruel to shoot a few animals than to let the entire herd starve."

Yellowstone National Park has an obvious hold on John Good and he has no regrets about not entering the field of law, his one-time major as an undergraduate at Washington University.

After a year at Notre Dame and a hitch in the Navy during World War II, Good entered the University to study law and commerce. "It was Professor Hinchey who got me started on this geology kick," he explained. "I had to take a science course and somebody told me that geology was a good one to take. Norman taught the course and it was just like a drink of cool water. I switched my major and also did my graduate work under him."

It was during his undergraduate years that Good met his wife, Merrie, who was then studying dress design at the University. Today, the Goods have two children, fifteen-year-old Katy and twelve-year-old Lou.

How did John Good make his way from the hilltop campus to Yellowstone National Park? "I left the University in 1948 and worked for Standard Oil of Texas for a couple of years as a geologist and geophysicist. Then I came back to St. Louis and worked in the coffee business with my father, but I didn't like that either. So I started with the Park Service down at Carlsbad Caverns in New Mexico as a park guide."

"The Park Service required experience as a seasonal ranger and although I had my master's in geology, I couldn't afford to work summers with a wife and child to support, so I started as a guide. I'm glad I did because it gave me good experience in both protection and interpretation work."

Good continued, "From Carlsbad I went to Lake Meade for two and a half years and made the switch there from ranger to park naturalist. In 1955 I went to Dinosaur National Park as Chief Park Naturalist. I worked there for a couple of years and then went to Washington, D.C., as National Park Service Geologist at headquarters. I came out here to this job in 1960."

Good's future is definitely tied to the Park Service. "It's Service policy to switch people around," he said, "so I would like to have a park of my own, of course, but no more headquarters duty in Washington. That's not why I joined the Service. I want to stay outdoors."

"His love for the outdoors is shared by his family and the Goods spend their vacations visiting other national parks, an enjoyable busman's holiday."

The Park closes on October 31 or with the first major snowfall to close the roads. Winter means hard work for the Park staff, planning for the next season, conducting maintenance and repairs on the structures, and keeping a watchful eye on the activities of the animals on the winter range. Some visitors come into the Park by snowmobile to see Old Faithful, which lives up to its name regardless of the season, or to see the winter wildlife show, which is, in Good's words, "just terrific." When the warm winds begin to blow and the spring thaw starts, Good and his staff are ready for their two-million-plus guests. Road repairs are finished. Seasonal rangers have been briefed. And then, all too soon it must seem, the first car comes through the snow-bordered pass and a new season is on.

The new season arrives with the old question, "Hey, mister, where's Yogi Bear?" It's a difficult task to keep the visitors happy and the Park looking natural, but John Good enjoys that job. As in any job, the going gets rough from time to time, but Good has the consolation of knowing that in Yellowstone he can hike just a few yards from the traffic and enjoy the tranquility of the Rocky Mountains, just as they looked to Jim Bridger 150 years ago. It takes more than an occasional sonic boom to shatter that kind of peace of mind.
John and Merrie Good enjoy some of nature’s finest scenery in their Yellowstone back yard. The couple, who met at Washington University, spend their vacations visiting other national parks.

The boardwalk along Terrace Trail is a popular spot for visitors with cameras. John Good’s fund of knowledge about Yellowstone is constantly challenged by curious visitors.
Dr. Eduardo Slatopolsky teaches a patient's wife to operate an artificial kidney. Machine will be purchased by patient and will become a life-saving part of his routine at home.
Basic findings in medical science have been piling up at a gratifying rate. But how does the clinical researcher subject these findings to the careful investigation needed to see whether they may be used to improve medical treatment? Investigations involving patients require super-controlled hospital environments far beyond the financial capability of most research institutions. In a major program to accelerate the application of basic research to clinical medicine, the National Institutes of Health have funded clinical research centers at ninety major medical schools. Washington University's center was one of the first and is now the largest. In only six years of operation, the Center's work is pointing the way to better methods of medical care and diagnosis.

CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTER

By ROGER SIGNOR

On the morning of March 1, 1957, Mrs. Charles Kling of St. Louis collected her mail and went through it carefully. Her pulse quickened when she came to a letter with the return address of a certain research institution. She quickly opened the letter and read the following:

"Dear Mrs. Kling:

With regard to your letter of February 13, I should like to point out that our research laboratory is not concerned with clinical medicine. At the present time, the human and monkey growth hormones are only available in very small amounts for investigations in experimental animals. It is hard to say when this research will be completed."

Her heart sank and she could find little solace in the scientist's closing expression of sympathy for her predicament. But she was not defeated. An intelligent, mature individual, Mrs. Kling expected no miracles. Like any responsible parent, she was keeping her eyes and ears open for some sign that medical science might have pushed ahead in an area that would determine the future of her three-year-old-son, Stevie. Stevie was a bright and cheerful lad, although he had had more than his share of sickness, including a condition marked by a severe lack of sugar in his blood. The problem that preoccupied Mrs. Kling, and the rest of the family, however, was Stevie's size. He was three years old, but his body was the size of a one-year-old. Mrs. Kling had known that Stevie was lagging behind a normal growth rate since he was one. It had become obvious that he was lagging far behind when he reached his third birthday. If nothing could be done to accelerate Stevie's growth, he would ultimately become a miniature adult similar to the dwarf, General Tom Thumb, who was three feet, two inches tall at maturity.

Physicians had narrowed Stevie's problem to a pituitary gland deficiency. This tiny gland at the base of Stevie's brain was not providing him with enough growth hormone. It is one of many hormones secreted by the gland and it stimulates growth of cells in various parts of the body. Individuals who have a deficiency of growth hormone alone become so-called "pituitary dwarfs," who are tiny, but usually well-proportioned and of normal or above average intelligence. (The popular term for dwarfs of this type is "midget." All extremely small individuals are described medically, however, as dwarfs.)

The next three years were trying ones at the Kling
household. Stevie grew a quarter of an inch each year. "Perhaps it wasn't that much," said Mrs. Kling. "We might have only been kidding ourselves." Stevie entered kindergarten and got by in his studies; but it was difficult for him to relate to classmates who were physical giants compared to himself. The Klings wondered whether time would run out for Stevie as far as his ever being able to benefit from any future hormonal treatment. Gaps, or "epiphyses," between the bones, which allow for rapid growth in children, gradually are filled in until complete closure some time after puberty. In pituitary dwarfs this process is delayed. Theoretically, Stevie could catch up rapidly in his growth if supplied with the proper growth hormone before his epiphyses had closed substantially. There was no word, however, from local physicians or from journals on the availability of a growth hormone for cases like Stevie's.

Mrs. Kling kept up with the medical literature through her sister, who at the time, worked in the medical library at St. Louis University. In 1959, at the suggestion of a St. Louis University researcher whom her sister knew, Mrs. Kling again wrote to the out-of-state scientist who was most frequently quoted in the medical journals on growth hormone research. This time there was no answer at all.

Mrs. Kling's sister then asked her friend at the university if she knew of anyone else who might have an idea about new research developments. She suggested a senior staff member, but quickly added that it was unlikely he would know of any clinical application. She made a note to call the professor anyway. A few days later she recognized the professor in the hall outside the library. She decided to approach him on the spot. To her amazement, he said he did have knowledge of a new clinical research program at Washington University. He was certain that one of the areas in which clinical researchers were going to specialize was a test of human growth hormone. The woman rushed to a phone to tell her sister, who in hours was in touch with Dr. William Daughaday, director of the division of metabolism at Washington University. He told her that he had long been interested in the problem of growth hormone; moreover, only within the past couple of months he had been placed in the position of being one of the first investigators in the country who would be able to direct pilot clinical tests on human patients. Mrs. Kling then contacted Stevie's pediatrician, who advised her to admit Stevie to the clinical program.

At a subsequent appointment with Mrs. Kling and Stevie, Dr. Daughaday confirmed the diagnosis that Stevie was a pituitary dwarf and told her that research with animals had strongly indicated that human growth hormone would be safe and effective in Stevie's case. He explained that there would be no cost to the Kling family for the treatment, which would cover several years. His research was being conducted under a National Institutes of Health program in which General Clinical Research Centers were being established across the country for investigations to see whether findings in basic biology could be applied to human problems.

Stevie's story was an extremely happy one from that point on. He was five and one-half years old when Dr. Daughaday began administering human growth hormone to him. Stevie had grown only an inch or so from the time he was one year old. In the first year on the hormone he grew six inches. Now, he has just turned 13 and is about four-and-one-half feet tall, not too noticeably shorter than his classmates. Dr. Daughaday increased the amount of hormone dosage last July, anticipating an increased rate of growth in the next year or so. The dosage was discontinued for a short period to guard against Stevie's building up a large amount of antibodies to the hormone. But it is clear now that Stevie will attain a height not far below normal; he has escaped the prospect of going through life the size of a Tom Thumb.

Human growth hormone for clinical application was first obtained by Dr. Daughaday and other investigators, who, on their own, had collected pituitary glands through university medical center pathologists. They then had the time-consuming task of isolating and purifying it. But this job has been taken over by the National Pituitary Agency, formed recently by the National Institutes of Health. It serves as the receptacle for nation-wide collections of pituitaries from human cadavers. Scientists supported by NIH isolate the hormone in highly purified form and send it to various researchers such as Dr. Daughaday.

Mrs. Kling and other parents of children with growth hormone deficiency periodically go from hospital to hospital eliciting the help of pathologists to take part in the National Pituitary Agency's program. The parents' work is organized through a voluntary lay group called Human Growth, Incorporated.

"The hormone generally works beautifully on pituitary dwarfs, and Stevie's response was very dramatic," said Dr. Mary Parker, a colleague of Dr. Daughaday who attends these children in the pediatrics ward of the Clinical Research Center. She pointed out that Dr. Daughaday was one of the pioneers in growth hormone research. But the opportunity to apply his very special skills and a major advance in his field came only through the establishment of an extraordinary facility such as the Clinical Research Center.

Washington University's General Clinical Research Center, with a total of thirty-three beds, is now the largest NIH center in the nation. The pediatrics ward in Children's Hospital has eight beds and the adult ward in Barnard Hospital has twenty-five. In the case of a brand new treatment such as human growth hormone, scientists can't be sure that it is bringing about the desired effect unless many patients are observed in a carefully controlled clinical procedure. This regimen includes mea-
Stevie Kling, in back of sign, is shown with his kindergarten class in 1960. In the four years before he entered school he had grown only about an inch. Late in 1960 he began receiving human growth hormone at the Clinical Research Center. He then grew six inches in one year. He was photographed, below, with his class this fall. Now at four-and-one-half feet, he is not too noticeably shorter than his classmates.
Four-year-old Elaine Koesterer also has progressed remarkably on human growth hormone.

Dr. Mary Parker measures Elaine's growth progress at the Clinical Research Center.

Although quite petite, Elaine is happily accepted by her playmates.

Mrs. Koesterer has found her charming daughter a valuable asset in volunteer work for Human Growth, Inc.
measurements of metabolic balances, closely controlled diets, testing of each individual’s tolerance of the dosage, and bone X-rays. Very important, too, are the special consultations that are uniquely available in a major university medical center like Washington University’s.

Growth hormone deficiency is just one aspect of the complex problem of human growth. Dr. Parker explained that only 10 per cent of all extremely short people are pituitary dwarfs; another 10 per cent have severe thyroid deficiencies which sometimes can be corrected by dosages of thyroid hormone; about 30 per cent have a variety of congenital or severe disease problems in which treatment for smallness is less clear cut and depends on the extent of the disease; and, roughly, the remaining 50 per cent is simply reflecting normal slow growth, which, for the most part is because of a family history of shortness. Most referrals received by the center are in the last category, Dr. Parker pointed out. The best that can be done for these children is to make sure that they are receiving proper diet and to reassure the children and their parents that the shortness is not pathological and is not related to dwarfism. A few extremely short children are simply malnourished and they thrive once they are hospitalized. Emotional deprivation seems to be an important factor in other small children.

The unusually clear-cut improvement that can be shown in pituitary dwarfs such as Stevie is the ideal in bringing the findings of basic biology to bear on human problems. The sixty-four other clinical projects at the Washington University center are in varying stages of development: somewhere between getting a basic understanding of the nature of the disease and the actual testing of specific courses of treatment. Most of the projects will take long periods of time and precisely controlled observation before rational courses of treatment are developed. This always has been the nature of the beast in applying basic biological findings, and it is the critical reason why the formation of general clinical research centers was so essential.

Dr. David Kipnis, professor of medicine and director of the center, explained that the concept of such centers was formulated in the 1950’s by several nationally distinguished scientist-physicians, including Dr. Sol Sherry, professor of medicine at the University. They testified before Congressional committees that the nation’s large investment in basic research was completely justified. Findings in this area were piling up at a tremendous rate. But the country needed better ways to test whether the findings had rational application to human diseases.

“At the time, clinicians lacked the physical resources for controlled tests, which would have to have superb standards of care. Obviously, patients couldn’t be expected to bear the astronomical cost for such care and, in effect, subsidize the research all by themselves,” Dr. Kipnis said. NIH conducted the prototype of envisioned “clinical centers of excellence” at its hospital, The Clinical Center, in Bethesda, Md. The results were highly encouraging, enough so that, in 1960, Congress appropriated funds for the first university centers. Washington University was one of the first two centers to admit patients that year. Approximately $7,000,000 for seven years’ operation was budgeted by NIH for the Washington University center, which has just been approved for another seven-year period of operation with approximately the same budget.

Aside from the obvious dramatic effect of growth hormone, several more subtle questions have been answered at the Washington University center and the eighty-nine other NIH centers which now exist.

In Dr. Kipnis’s own specialty of problems relating to diabetes, it has been proved that obesity makes people resistant to insulin, hence the predisposition of overweight people to the disease. “We also found a significant degree of insulin resistance in obese patients who don’t have diabetes,” Dr. Kipnis said. “It turns out that they are secreting plenty of insulin, four times the rate you would find in a normal person. In an individual with a family history of diabetes, obesity per se will exhaust this pancreatic function over a period of many years. So it is clearly good preventive medicine for such individuals to reduce.”

One interesting sidelight in the study of diabetes was substantiation of the theory that almost all obese people can reduce drastically if they will follow a caloric restricted diet. About 90 per cent of obese people placed on carefully controlled diets in the research ward reduced exactly as predicted by the clinicians; this showed that the vast majority of obese people have no intrinsic difference in their basic metabolism. Obesity may bring about certain metabolic changes. But the restricted caloric diet was tremendously effective, despite an individual’s insistence that “it hadn’t worked at home.”

“On the other hand, why obese individuals may tend to eat so much, why the mechanism regulating appetite seems to be awry, seems to be the critical question. Research on this intriguing question is also being conducted in the center,” Dr. Kipnis added.

Another basic finding about diabetes has been in the development of a better understanding of the function of insulin. Insulin is not secreted by the pancreas to use or “burn” food stuffs; it is secreted to speed up the rate at which food stuffs are stored for future use as energy. It also had been erroneously assumed that only sugars triggered the release of insulin. Actually, tests at the University and other centers have shown that proteins and amino acids can stimulate insulin secretion, Dr. Kipnis pointed out.

Among the sixty-five investigations at the center are: studies of whether kidney transplants from cadavers will carry out complex renal functions over long periods of time; research into the common problem of malabsorp-
tion in the intestine which, for example, may be reflected
in intolerance of milk because of an enzyme deficiency;
evaluation of the use of drugs to reduce the level of choles-
terol in the blood; biochemical studies of muscular dystro-
phy and various muscle diseases; use of radioactive com-
ounds which may permit a much more highly selective
chemical destruction of tumors; studies of chemotherapy
in leukemias; and evaluation of the long-term effec-
tiveness of open heart surgery.

Before a patient is admitted to the center his case is
reviewed by an independent committee of six physicians,
all of whom are full professors. They examine every as-
pect of the proposed course of treatment and any ethical
considerations such as possible risk are weighed against
possible benefits. Not even a simple change in diet can
be made without the committee's approval.

A careful explanation of the planned treatment is given
to the patient by his physician and by the center physi-
cians. Once the patient is hospitalized he can justifiably
feel that he is in the "safest place in the world." There
is full-time coverage by the best nurses available, who
are hand-picked by the center and are all qualified to be
ward supervisors. The center has two full-time graduate
dietitians. There is a laboratory right in the ward in addi-
tion to the investigator's own specialized laboratories.

"I routinely use the 360 computer on the main cam-
pus in our tests," said one clinician, Dr. Philip Eaton.
"Very simply, you couldn't buy this kind of care. The rea-
son for such an elaborate set-up is that you can't prove
that a given treatment is helping a patient unless you
carefully follow the results in a large number of pa-
tients, and then compare them to a group of patients
who have not had the treatment."

One of the problems being studied by Dr. Eaton is a
common condition known as hyperlipemia, which is char-
acterized by a high level of fat in the blood plasma. Many
clinicians suspect that the various forms of this disease
are a major cause of heart attacks. Dr. Eaton's laboratory
is one of a few in the country which have the specialists
equipment to do the biochemical assays which establish
the presence of different types of hyperlipemia.

Dr. Eaton is currently studying a 54-year-old man who
became a patient at the center on June 26. He comes
close to being a "typical patient." His physician con-
tacted the center when he had failed to respond to standard
treatment. The man had had two heart attacks, and there
was a family history of deaths from heart disease. The
symptom that had brought him to his doctor in June was
angina, or heart pain. He wasn't sick enough to be hospi-
tialized, but he was uncomfortable, worried, and had
lost several days' work. After checking his cholesterol level
and finding it quite high, his doctor followed the seemingly
logical course of putting him on a low fat, high carbo-
hydrate diet.

Enigmatically, the fat content of the blood soared. At
this point the doctor recalled something Dr. Eaton had
mentioned in a discussion at the Medical School. Such
a seemingly paradoxical result could be a tip-off to a
recently uncovered form of hyperlipemia. In this form,
a normal quantity of carbohydrate in the diet will result
in the production of abnormal amounts of fat in the blood.
The doctor called the center to see if Dr. Eaton would
be interested in running tests on the man. He was, and
the patient readily agreed after his doctor had explained
the situation to him.

The tests conducted by Dr. Eaton verified that the
patient had this form of hyperlipemia. (In one of the tests,
the blood serum was actually milky in appearance from
the high level of all fats or lipids.) The man was placed
on a carefully controlled low-carbohydrate diet and the
milky serum disappeared in about a week. The patient
spent about two weeks in the ward and he and his wife
were carefully instructed on how to carry out his new diet.
He was discharged and returned to his job. But the story
is far from ended there.

The man will be observed by the center over a long
period of time, along with many other hyperlipemia pa-
tients. If a statistically significant number of patients like
him escape heart attacks then the diet will have been estab-
lished as the rational course for preventing heart
attacks for this group. Hyperlipemia is probably a gen-
etic disease and members of the patients' families also
are being tested for evidence of the condition. It may
be shown that change in diet is necessary for such patients
at a relatively early age. There can be no dramatic result
to point to now in such long-range studies. But if the
evidence ultimately implicates hyperlipemias as the pri-
mary forerunners in heart attacks, it would be one of the
most significant strides to be made in preventive medicine.

Because one can't give a conclusive answer until the
evidence is in, it wouldn't seem surprising if Dr. Eaton's
54-year-old patient might not be willing to cooperate
in all the tests. However, he eagerly volunteered to enter
the research ward. He took the attitude that it was a
privilege to be able to be a part of such an endeavor.
And this is the attitude of the vast majority of the pa-
tients involved in the new center.

Many of the patients and their families even ask if
they can help the scientists in some way. Stevie's mother
and other parents, for example, feel very fortunate that
they can do so through Human Growth, Inc.

Another parent who volunteers her efforts for the lay
group is Mrs. Robert Koesterer of Granite City, Ill., whose
four-year-old daughter, Elaine, has progressed remark-
ably on growth hormone. Each month, Mrs. Koesterer
drives to nine hospitals throughout St. Clair and Madison
counties to collect pituitary glands.

One hospital worker had told Mrs. Koesterer that it
would be too time-consuming to help her parents' group.
"I brought Elaine along on one of my subsequent trips,"
Mrs. Koesterer said, "Now the hospital is one of my best
customers."
Dr. Davis Kipnis, director of the Clinical Research Center, won two national awards this year for his research.

Dr. Philip Eaton leads a laboratory discussion; each ward in the center has its own laboratory, plus the investigator's specialized laboratory.
ALL THAT FALL
By
Samuel Beckett

Typescript for Grove
Samuel Beckett
1957

Typescript of play, *All that Fall*, prepared for Grove Press edition, its first American publication, is part of extensive Samuel Beckett manuscript collection owned by WU.
The Rare Book Department of Washington University Libraries is engaged in the exciting project of collecting working papers, as well as the published works, of a selected number of contemporary British and American authors. The three-year-old Modern Literature Collection is already attracting scholars to the University to study working methods, biography and literary influences revealed by the papers.

COLLECTOR’S ITEM

On a Friday night last spring the National Book Awards winners for 1967 were announced. The award in poetry had been given to a volume entitled Nights and Days by a young American poet, James Merrill. The announcement caused a flurry of activity in Washington University’s Olin Library, for the library had in its possession the complete original manuscript of the award-winning book.

For the second year in a row the librarians arranged a display of hundreds of pages of handwritten drafts, typed sheets, and printer’s galley proofs for the book of poetry which was awarded top prize in the national competition. In 1966 that book was Buckdancer’s Choice by James Dickey, and in the Rare Book Department of the University library are 900 pages of manuscript materials related to the seventy-nine-page book.

These materials are a small part of an ambitious project begun three years ago by the George N. Meisner Rare Book Department. At that time the department selected thirty contemporary British and American writers upon whom it would concentrate—collecting published works, worksheets, editorial correspondence, and literary papers. The list has now grown to sixty and the library seeks any and all material which relates to the work of these artists. The result is the Charles Winston Memorial Collection of Modern Literature, one of four special “working” collections which form the basis of the Rare Book Department’s value to the University as a unique scholarly research tool.

The decision to create a modern British and American literature collection reflects the vitality which has characterized the department since it was created in 1962, at the time Olin Library was being built. Tucked away in a quiet corner of the top level of Olin, it dispels the picture of a rare book department which bears a generic resemblance to the Bank of England. The department is a glass-enclosed, brightly lighted suite of rooms to which changing displays of its valuable contents draw numerous visitors. Its chief is William Matheson, a whisper-voiced, salt-and-pepper haired version of the corporate executive. Among its handsome bindings, its first editions, its signed copies, and its illuminated texts are ink-blotted, hand-corrected, dog-earred sheets—the working papers of artists as fresh on the scene as electronic music and op art.

In 1964, the late Charles Winston, then the library’s book selection officer, and Mr. Matheson presented to a committee of five writers connected with the University a plan to create the modern literature collection. They asked the artists to serve as consultants in selecting a limited number of contemporary novelists and poets whose work they considered might be of lasting merit.

Mona Van Duyne (Mrs. Jarvis Thurston, wife of the English Department chairman and a recognized poet in her own right) recalls her experience as a member of the poets’ committee.

“The selection was a strenuous and challenging process. We pooled and called on all experience at judging that we had garnered from long commitments to writing, editing, teaching, and reviewing poetry, ... But this, we discovered, was not enough; we needed also something like the gift of prophecy, since we had to make rather risky guesses about the direction poetry might take in the future.”

“We began with a list of over one hundred publishing poets. From this list we had to eliminate, if we hoped to acquire papers and worksheets, all those with solidly estab-
of the committee or those who were at the moment being critically neglected. This was necessary because the library had almost no money to use for the project, whereas many other libraries are engaged in big-time financial competition for worksheets."

Miss Van Duyan, Donald Finkel, the University's poet-in-residence; Constance Urdang (Mrs. Donald Finkel), also a poet; Stanley Elkin, novelist and English professor; and Naomi Lebowitz, critic and faculty member, selected thirty poets and novelists, the bulk of their American and all but one living at that time.

Shortly after the list was settled upon, the project's originator, Charles Winston, became ill. He lived only long enough to hear that the first worksheets had arrived at the library. Miss Van Duyan, with the aid of the other consultants, took on the task of helping solicit manuscripts from the authors selected.

As Miss Van Duyan suggests, the enterprise was audacious because funds were extremely limited. "We were to use, instead of money, the promise that all of a writer's publications, not just his papers, would be collected here; provision of an appraisal of the gift for income tax purposes; and a personal appeal of friendship or acquaintance we might have with any of the writers." In addition, the library indicated by the selectiveness of its collecting its confidence in the promising future of the artist.

"Whenever possible," Mr. Matheson explains, "we have tried to obtain manuscripts by gift, providing on occasion appraisals and a small cash payment for the actual work of gathering up the papers and sending them off." The acquisitions which have not been entirely gifts have been purchased for small sums or at very reasonable prices.

The success of the approach has been remarkable. James Merrill has given the manuscript material of virtually everything he has written and has indicated that the University will continue to receive the bulk of his papers. From James Dickey the library has acquired, by gift and purchase, worksheets of several complete books of poems and a magnificent collection of letters from other poets. Donald Finkel has given a large collection of his papers. May Swenson, another younger poet, presented a large number of worksheets and has also indicated she will continue to deposit her work with the University library. Poets David Wagoner and Robert Sward are generous contributors of their work, and several other poets, the bulk of whose papers are already committed to other libraries, have responded to the University's requests.

The flourishing Charles Winston Collection now includes some 1,200 volumes and an impressive number of worksheets, final typescripts, journals, and corrected proofs. In some cases, and more particularly in the case of the novelists, the collection contains extensive, sometimes nearly complete, inventories of book and periodical publications with a smaller representation of manuscripts. Ford Madox Ford, the author who was posthumously selected, was chosen because consultants felt he was a writer of major importance whose talents had been underestimated. Although by 1964 almost all of Ford's manuscripts had made their way to other institutions, the University was able to acquire a complete typescript of one of Ford's novels, A Little Less than Gods, several letters of literary interest, and an autograph manuscript of one of his poems. The Ford collection now contains these materials, seventy different titles by Ford in first edition, plus variant editions, translations, works containing short contributions and critical studies, to a total of more than 120 volumes. During the past three years, interest in Ford has taken an upswing and Matheson believes it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the library to bring together today a collection as fine as the one it now owns.

Though the ultimate success of the venture can't be fully predicted, there are numerous promising indications of success. Four of the finalists for the National Book Awards of 1967, besides last year's winner, were poets selected for collection. "We cannot talk of monetary value in relation to the materials we have collected," Mr. Matheson said, "because we do not intend to sell them. When they come into our hands they are off the market. We are collecting materials which, we hope, fifty years from now we could not afford even if they were then available.

"You will not find manuscripts of T. S. Eliot or Robert Frost among our collection. They are too expensive. A library in the position of ours is better off collecting materials which are not now at the crest of the wave."

The interest in the literary manuscript, however, is new at a crest of the wave of book collector's fashion.

"Thirty or forty years ago," Mr. Matheson explains, "a manuscript by a living author was frequently less expensive than a first edition that was in demand. When John Galsworthy was the rage, his books, particularly his first books published under the name of John Sinjohn, sold for
Robert Sward "mocked-up" his book-length poem, *In Mexico*, in collage. He intersperses newspaper clippings, quotations from speeches, and his and others' observations about America with text of poem.

That John Foster Dulles
Is happening; God help us all!
Dwight David Eisenhower
Is happening.
John Fitzgerald Kennedy,
Lyndon Baines Johnson,
Happening.

Can it be stopped?
This step
This word
This war.

Happening

"History regrets to inform you
Of the death of history."

Clio, Goddess of history,
Goddess of War,
Goddess of Death,
"The Lord is my shepherd,
I shall not want..."
The Firebombing

Or hast thou an arm like God?

- The Book of Job -

Denke daran, dass nach den grossen Zerstörungen
Jedermann beweisen wird, dass er unschuldig war.

- Gunter Eich -

Home-owners unite.

All families lie together, though some are burned alive.
The others try to feel
For them. Some can, it has to be said.

Starve and take off.

Twenty years in the suburbs, and the palm trees willingly leap
Into the flashlights.
And there is beneath them also.
The shock, the crack of snailshells and coral-sticks.
There are cow-flaps and the howl! cross of propellers,
The shovel-marked clouds against the moon,
And the enemy filling up the hills
The ceremonial graves. At my somewhere among these,
Snap, a bulb is tricked on in the cockpit.

And some technically-minded stranger with his hands
Is sitting in a glass treasure-hole of blue light,
Having potential fire under the undetected arms
Of the wings, on thin bomb-shackles,
The "tear-drop-shaped" 300-gallon drop-tanks
Filled with napalm and gasoline.

Thinking forward minutes from that,
There is also the burst straight out
Over the coast into the moon; there is now
The moon-metal-shine of propellers, the quarter-moon,
Moonstone aimed at the waves,
Stopped by the cumulus.

There is then this re-entry
Into cloud, for the engines to ponder their sound.
In white dark the aircraft staggered, Japan.

Dilates around it like a thought
Coming out, the one who is here is over
Land, passing over the all-night grainfields,
In dark paint over
The woods with one silver side,
Rice-water calm at all levels
Of the terraced hill.

Enemy rivers and trees

Sliding off me like snake-skin
$1,000 or more, while the manuscript of one of these books would probably have had only a fraction of this value. Recently, however, a manuscript of Joseph Conrad's *Victory* was sold at auction for $21,000. The going price for a first edition is about $10, and the price of even the rarest Conrad first edition is light years away from $21,000.

"With the current trend, the price of an original manuscript of an important literary work can be nothing but high. There is only one manuscript and a great demand for certain authors. If a major Faulkner or Joyce manuscript became available, the sky would be the limit."

The interest of institutions in the manuscript for its value to scholarly research has been, he said, a major factor in the rising costs of such material. It is for this reason the University library seeks to assemble and to concentrate its collection. For the scholar, Mr. Matheson explains, the value of a collection of extremely rare, and for that reason extremely valuable, material may be greatly enhanced by the presence in the same collection of a great deal of supporting material, which may or may not be of value in itself.

"We really cannot hope that all of our artists will be considered leading literary figures. But if fifty years from now only five are really recognized, the other fifty-five become extremely important to a scholar studying the period or to a scholar studying the influence of other writers upon the recognized talent."

The library's modern literature collection has already grown to a point of research value. Elsie Freeman, the department's manuscript cataloger, points out that the interrelations between many of the writers are becoming more and more apparent in the material at hand.

"The papers of Robert Duncan, a San Francisco poet, include correspondence, manuscript, and illustrative material emanating from the publication of his collection of poems, *A Book of Resemblances*. Related to the Duncan papers is an increasing group of drafts, notes, and correspondence of poet William Everson (Brother Antonius). Together with occasional correspondence of Denise Levertof and the material of several other collections, these papers provide a personal and professional view of contemporary poets whose work is commonly associated."


Still another group of papers which tends to tie the various elements of the collection together is a number of letters to Babette Deutsch, an American poet and critic who corresponded with William Carlos Williams, Marianne Moore, Thomas MacGreevy, Theodore Roethke, Robinson Jeffers, Kenneth Rexroth, and Conrad Aiken, among others. "The letters give a sort of running 'state of the art' comment on contemporary writing," Mrs. Freeman says.

"Dickey's voluminous correspondence with publishers, other poets, and former business colleagues and his numerous revised drafts from several volumes of poems provide a disarming view of the professional poet at work. Wagoner, a Seattle poet and University of Washington teacher, is represented from his earliest undergraduate work through the present. Sward's correspondence, typescripts, manuscript, and proof materials, all heavily revised and annotated by him, record the emergence of a young, rebellious poet. Our C. P. Elliot collection contains proof of *In the World*; interesting and less familiar published and unpublished essays on Steven Marcus, Marshall McLuhan, R. V. Cassill, Bernard Malamud; and his correspondence with contemporary poets. All of this material is invaluable to investigations into working method, biography, and literary and personal surroundings."

Although the library has not yet published a comprehensive catalogue of present holdings, word of some of its acquisitions has reached outside ears. Magazines have asked for copies of the continuous drafts of poems by Dickey, A Buffalo student doing research for a dissertation on Creeley is using the library's materials. A graduate student from St. Louis University has been studying other material from the Creeley and Duncan collections.

From this beginning, and even at this early date, it is apparent that Washington University Library's bold venture in literary stargazing will be of inestimable value to University professors and students and will draw literary scholars and critics from other institutions to Olin Library.
the eye and the imagination

Herb Weitman, director of Photographic Services at Washington University, instructor in the School of Fine Arts, and winner of the American Alumni Council's "Photographer of the Decade" award.
Every year the American Alumni Council selects the "best photographs of the year" from among those published in the hundreds of alumni magazines throughout the country. This year seven of Herb Weitman's photographs from the Washington University Magazine (reproduced here) were among the twenty-five winners. For years Herb has been pacing the field with three or four winners, but this time he hit the jackpot. When the judges took a second look at the results, they decided that Herb Weitman's achievements had to be acknowledged.

At its annual national conference last July in San Francisco, AAC presented Herb Weitman with a special award for "a decade of distinguished photographic achievement in alumni and university publishing." AAC official Ron Wolk said, in presenting the award to Herb that he "has done more to raise the standards of photography in college and university publishing than any other single photographer."

To Herb himself, the award was gratifying, if unexpected. He began taking pictures at the University when he was still an undergraduate and became a staff member in 1950. He has been covering the University ever since and his approach has created a whole new school of photography. In the tens of thousands of pictures he has taken, he has managed to capture the flavor and quality of this university and its people.

Herb is a master craftsman, but what gives his work its special quality is not just his technical skill. What Herb Weitman has is the eye and the imagination.
the eye and the imagination
the eye and the imagination
Washington University’s School of Law had its beginnings one hundred years ago. Today it is entering its second century with new programs, new ideas, and a new concept of the law and the lawyer.

A CENTURY OF LAW

By KING McELROY
Office of Information

When Barry Bruhn, a Washington University law student, interviews a youth in trouble at the St. Louis juvenile detention center, he often thinks to himself, “The research I do on this case may save this boy from reform school. If I make a slip, he is lost.”

After he interviews the youth, he returns to the Legal Aid Office and discusses the case with the attorney in charge. Legal aid attorneys handle 90 per cent of the cases in city juvenile court.

Although the work at times is depressing and frustrating, Bruhn knows he will be a better lawyer because of it. He’s getting practical experience in interviewing clients, doing research on cases, and filing papers in the various courts. “Just following an attorney around has been helpful,” he said.

Newell Ferry, director of the program and a 1929 graduate of the Washington University Law School, said that the students act as law clerks. “They do everything in the office but give advice to clients or try cases. It’s worth a year of practice.”

The legal aid program has given some Washington University law students an opportunity to obtain practical experience before they graduate. It’s one of the ways that the Law School has met the charge of some critics, mostly practitioners, that law schools are long on theory but short on practice and are turning out scholars who can juggle concepts but who don’t know how to pick a jury.

Hiram Lesar, Dean of Washington University’s School of Law and a past president of the Legal Aid Society of the City and County of St. Louis, said the students receive valuable practical experience in the legal aid program if they are supervised by practicing lawyers.

Dean Lesar said the charge that law school training doesn’t prepare students to practice law is not true. “The best theory is the best practice,” he said. “We teach them how to analyze evidence, how to determine the issues, and how to decide what is relevant and what is not.”

He pointed out, however, that there are some things that can be learned only by experience. “We can’t teach students how to pick a jury, but if they work in legal aid they can learn some of those things,” he said.

The business drafting and planning course taught by Associate Professor Arthur Leff gives students good practical training. Required for seniors, the course gives the students practice in planning and drafting the documents for a major business transaction. This year the transaction deals with the acquisition of one corporation by another.

“The students have to draft documents which involve all phases of law—labor, corporate, securities, even family law,” Professor Leff said. “They have to bring order out of a complex, chaotic situation. I make the situation so tough that it would make a lawyer with thirty years’ experience sit down and cry if he had to draft the documents.”

When the Law Department of Washington University was created one hundred years ago, the eleven students who enrolled didn’t worry about not getting enough practical experience. They served as law clerks when they weren’t listening to lectures. The faculty consisted of a dean and four professors, who were all active judges or lawyers. The students were taught from 4 to 6 p.m., when the part-time professors weren’t busy in their offices or in court.

Now law professors work full time at teaching and research. Some of them have an outside practice but only on a limited basis that doesn’t interfere with teaching.

“Good law schools have a full-time faculty,” Professor R. Dale Swihart said. “You can tell a bad law school when most of the teachers are part-time.”

Professor Daniel Mandelker, a national authority on the legal aspects of urban planning, couldn’t do outside practice if he wanted to. He has no time for it. Among his research projects, he is working with Roger Montgomery, director of the urban design center in the School of Architecture, on pioneer studies in urban renewal. They are studying the relationship between comprehensive planning and urban renewal. Another study focuses on the problems of identifying slum and blighted areas with emphasis on legal and sociological problems. Professor Mandelker is also doing research in discovering new methods of ownership in slum areas.

In addition to research, Mandelker is frequently called upon as a consultant. He is doing such work for the Na-
The growing interest in books in other fields related to the law was noted by Miss Jean Ashman, law librarian. "We have also been buying some books from foreign countries in recent years, principally because of the comparative law course," she said.

The law library is modeled after the renowned Inns of Court in London, the law clubs where students eat dinner and hear lectures. The Reverend William Greenleaf Eliot, the first president of the University, is regarded as the founder of the library since his gifts supplied its first volumes.

Miss Ashman modestly describes the library on the top floor of the Law School's home in January Hall as a "good working library." It contains 106,000 volumes and about 5,000 pieces on microfilm and microcards, and includes practically every standard set of English and American reports, a wealth of legal and related treaties, and a valuable collection of state and federal statutes. Through special gifts and bequests it has received many valuable volumes such as a first-edition of Blackstone's *Commentaries* and the original Kirby Connecticut reports bearing the signature of Chief Justice John Marshall. The library is one of twenty-nine in the nation which has records and briefs of the U.S. Supreme Court since 1960.

Miss Ashman is especially sensitive to the needs of the library because she has a law degree herself. She teaches freshman law students a course on how to use the library.

**One of the fields** which has increased the volumes in the library is international law, taught by Gray Dorsey, Nagel Professor of Jurisprudence and International Law. "When I came here fifteen years ago, international law was taught as one course in about twenty law schools in the country," he said. "Now practically all of the country's 130 law schools have at least one course."

At Washington University there are now six international law courses, taught by Professor Dorsey and Professor William Jones. The field is growing because of expanding international trade and the increased international responsibility of the United States, Professor Dorsey said. He is an officer of the American Section of the International Association for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy.

Professor Jones spent last summer lecturing at the University of Freiburg in Germany. He studied Chinese the previous summer to enable him to read original documents in his course on the law of communist nations.

"Whenever there is a great increase in activity that requires legal regulation, it is reflected in the law schools," Professor Dorsey said. "And whenever an area of human activity becomes more complex, more law courses are required." Some examples are taxation, anti-trust law, labor law, administrative law, and corporate law.

Professor Lewis R. (Red) Mills, who teaches corporation law and security regulations, said, "In these fields, the lawyer is a counselor to the businessman rather than an advocate. In the security field especially, a lawyer must
The School of Law had its beginnings in a two-room law department in the old Polytechnic Institute Building at Seventh and Chestnut Streets in downtown St. Louis.

Miss Phoebe Cousins, the School's first woman graduate, became the first woman to be appointed a United States Marshal.

Dean Wiley Rutledge headed the School of Law from 1930 to 1935 and was later appointed a justice of the United States Supreme Court.
J. W. Stipelman (center), attorney in charge of a Legal Aid office, confers with law student Barry Bruhn during an interview with a client.

Bruhn discusses his Legal Aid work with Juvenile Judge Theodore McMillan. Legal Aid attorneys handle 90 per cent of the cases in juvenile court.

The law library in January Hall contains more than 100,000 volumes and over 5,000 pieces of microfilm. It is modeled after the Inns of Court in London.
guide the client through a maze of federal regulations.

Professor Mills also teaches a seminar on American legal history, which gives the students an opportunity to do independent research and writing. "One semester we discussed the early decisions of the Missouri Supreme Court and found that the judges had relied heavily on English law authorities in deciding the cases before them," he said. "This fall we will concentrate on Indian law."

Professor Swihart teaches several courses in the Law School's graduate program in taxation, which began its second year this fall. "It's the only graduate school program in taxation in the Midwest," he said. In the first year, twelve students enrolled, ten of them practicing attorneys who enrolled on a part-time basis.

The labor law expert, Professor Elmer E. Hilpert, said, "When I went to law school, there wasn't a labor law course worth taking. Labor law has grown tremendously since the Wagner Act of 1935. Now almost every law firm has one man handling labor law."

Professor Hilpert, the oldest faculty member in term of service, began his twenty-ninth year this fall. He is the permanent arbitrator for a large manufacturing company and is on a national industrial arbitration panel.

Four other professors are doing research in rapidly growing areas of law. Professor Jules Gerard, who teaches constitutional law, is concerned with the controversy between the bar and the press over publicity in criminal cases. "Publicity is involved in each stage of the criminal process from arrest through sentencing," he said. "However, most people tend to be concerned about the influence of publicity on the jury's verdict and to ignore its influence at other legal stages." Associate Professor David M. Becker has been preparing articles on legal research he did for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Assistant Professor Warren Lehman has collaborated with DaUin H. Oaks, professor of law at the University of Chicago, on a book The Criminal Process of Cook County and the Indigent Defendant. He also has written widely on urban renewal and race relations and is studying the problem of achieving social change through legislation.

Professor Arno C. Becht, who teaches the first year torts course, has collaborated with Professor Miller on the highly popular textbook The Test of Factual Causation in Negligence and Strict Liability Cases, published by the Washington University Press.

IN ITS FIRST CENTURY, the Law School has been located in six different buildings. The Law Department started in two rooms in the Polytechnic Institute Building at Seventh and Chestnut in downtown St. Louis and five years later moved with the other departments of the University to a new building at Seventeenth and Washington. In 1878, the Department moved into the old Mary Institute building, at 1417 Locust Street. In 1905 when the Department became a school, this building was razed and students and faculty took over the old St. Louis Club building at Twenty-ninth and Locust. Four years later, the Law School moved to the upper floor of the Ridgley Library building on the present campus. It occupied these quarters until 1923 when it moved to January Hall.

Now after almost half a century, January Hall is too small for the School's growing needs. If the Law School is to continue to meet its dual commitment to the students and the community, a new building is imperative. In August, 1965, the University announced a nationwide design competition for a $3.5 million law and social science complex. Some 115 architects submitted plans in the competition, which was won by the architectural team of Schnabel, Anselevicius, and Montgomery.

Down through its history, the School has had many illustrious deans. Henry Hitchcock, the first dean, later became president of the American Bar Association. Another, Wiley Rutledge, who headed the School from 1930 to 1935, later became a justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Then there was Miss Floebie Couzens, the first woman to graduate from the Law School. A leader in the suffrage movement, she was enrolled in the School in 1869 and received her Bachelor of Laws degree two years later.

Judge Wayne Townsend, distinguished service professor emeritus, served as dean from 1945 to 1951, during the post-World War II period when veterans flooded the Law School. "It was a trying time for the faculty," Judge Townsend said. "We taught the year around to cram three years of course work into two calendar years." The enrollment jumped from forty-three in 1943 to 270 in 1947.

Before the war, most of the Law School's students came from the St. Louis area. However, with the influx of the veterans, students came from all over the country. The growing national reputation of the School has continued this trend. Currently, about half of the students come from the St. Louis area. Last year the 250 students enrolled came from twenty-six states and four foreign countries. The graduate programs in urban studies and taxation are expected to attract more out-state students.

After a slight decline in the 1950's, enrollment once again is climbing because of the post-World War II baby boom. There were about four applications for each place in this year's freshman class. As a result, the faculty has toughened admission requirements. A student now must have roughly a 1.5 credit point average on a three-point scale in undergraduate school and must score 500 out of a possible 800 on the law school aptitude test. The quality of the teaching program was demonstrated last summer when fifty-seven of fifty-nine June graduates passed the Missouri Bar examination. This performance topped all other law schools in the state and was the best of any Washington University law class in ten years.

Trends of law school education for the future indicate that students may be required to study four years instead of the present three. The student has to cover so much material now that it is tough to hold the curriculum to three years without cutting down on the basic courses required for the first year.

But one thing appears to be certain. Law schools as a rule aren't going to scrap their traditional teaching methods for what critics call "practical experience courses."

Judge Townsend summed up the case for the law schools in this way: "Law schools teach the most practical of all things—theory—because theory embodies the principles upon which all law cases have to be decided. I don't see how anything could be more practical than that."
Some people confuse gentleness with weakness. Tom Pendergast did just that when he tangled in political battle with James Douglas thirty years ago. The mild-mannered Douglas triumphed, however, in one of the climactic moments of a career distinguished for its dedicated service to the law, the community, and the University.

JUDGE DOUGLAS

By DOROTHY BROCKHOFF

A good man,” according to Ella and the late Sophie and all the others of their gender who have ever belted the blues, “is hard to find.” Had they been reporters, instead of well-rounded ladies with a way with a song, the Misses Fitzgerald and Tucker might have added that such a fellow is not only hard to locate, but uncommonly difficult to describe.

It’s not that “nice guys always finish last,” as one embittered observer remarked. You don’t have to be a Scrooge or Simon Legree to become the top banana of the executive suite or law firm. It’s just that a sinister character or one with a shady past invariably makes “hot copy,” while the virtuous in our midst, unless they happen to be knights in shining armor like Sir Galahad or personalities like Billy Graham, seldom make the front page.

It was Ethan Shepley, a former chancellor of Washington University, who made this very point when he learned that a profile on his friend, James Marsh Douglas, a member of the Washington University board of trustees for seventeen years and its chairman from 1954 to ’61, was being planned. “Jim Douglas,” Shepley warned as a two-month’s search to find out all about his colleague and friend was just getting under way, “is a good, solid, honorable, conscientious, lovable citizen who takes whatever assignment comes his way and does a darn good day-to-day job of it. He doesn’t make headlines.”

This story might have died right there except that Shepley concluded: “I guess the only time that Judge Douglas ever made a headline was during the regime of Tom Pendergast. That was the inevitable result of having a rough, tough political boss run into an honest man.”

Shepley, it turned out, was absolutely correct. Douglas is many things—a distinguished lawyer, a former judge, a first-rate historian, the proud father of a Phi Beta Kappa son from Hobart College, and one of Washington University’s most loyal alumni, but he is not easy to pinpoint on paper. Not that he is difficult to interview.

He talks easily and agreeably—his sentences punctuated by a wry wit, often directed at himself. You learn many things from Judge Douglas in a two-hour conversation with him, but you don’t learn as much as you’d like about him, for His Honor uses the pronoun “I” almost reluctantly. A quizical man with what one writer once described as “an almost cherubic expression,” he gives the impression of being a mild-mannered, easy-going, kindly human being. Quiet, unassuming, and modest, he is, as Shepley accurately observed, “a chuckler, not a guffawer. I don’t think Jim bursts into loud laughter, but he has a twinkle in his eye, and a very, very keen sense of humor.”

Modest and unassuming, these are the adjectives which seem to suit Douglas best. And yet it is this unaffected, unpretentious, and very gentle man who defied “Big Tom” when Pendergast was as powerful and as feared as any political boss in the country. Quite obviously, this is a man of quiet courage and inner strength, but these are qualities which you have to discover for yourself. Douglas isn’t given to self-analysis and he isn’t the type to philosophize about himself.

What then is he really like? What, in short, makes him tick? The search for these answers led all over the state—from former Governor Lloyd C. Stark’s beautiful estate, “Aberdeen,” at Eolia in picturesque Pike County to the Supreme Court of Missouri in Jefferson City where recently retired Justice Laurence M. Hyde reminisced about Douglas. It involved the study of carefully preserved papers in historical societies, research in law libraries, and conversations with friends, nearly all of them lawyers.

Occasionally, several attorneys would huddle together for an interview. It was on one such occasion that Douglas’s partner, Robert Neill, leaned back in his chair and exclaimed with a bemused laugh, “You know, I’ve learned more about Jim this past hour than in all the years I’ve been associated with him.” Joseph J. Gravely, a
well-known patent attorney, thought about Neill's comment for a few minutes and then exclaimed, "Well, that's easy to understand. Jim's just not a horn-tooter."

Gravely might have added that Douglas has plenty to toot about. Viewed in perspective, there are many highlights in Douglas's career, but certainly the most climactic period was his confrontation with Pendergast and his forces. Douglas aroused the famed political leader's wrath not long after he was named to the Missouri Supreme Court by Governor Stark in April, 1937 to fill a vacancy caused by the appointment of Judge John Caskie Collet to the United States District Court.

Only 41 at the time, Douglas was quickly dubbed the "baby member" of the Missouri Supreme Court. A bachelor when he was appointed to this position, Judge Douglas was married on August 5, 1939, to the former Mary Elizabeth Lumaghi of St. Louis. In 1942, their son, James Kimball Douglas, was born. "I was the object of much interest among my colleagues on the Supreme Court, all of whom were a great deal older than I," Judge Douglas recalls. "Indeed, James Kimball was the first baby born to the wife of a sitting judge of the Missouri Supreme Court."

It was not Douglas's youth, however, but his integrity which turned Pendergast against the jurist from St. Louis. The Missouri Supreme Court, at the time that Judge Douglas became a member, was deadlocked over the so-called insurance rate compromise worked out by a Pendergast lieutenant, R. Emmet O'Malley, state superintendent of insurance. It was the outgrowth of many years of litigation over fire insurance rates in which the state had defeated the insurance companies.

While the dispute dragged on, excess premiums amounting to $12,400,000 had been impounded and were due to be returned to 800,000 policyholders who had paid the premiums. Writing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Curtis A. Betts, a staff correspondent, said: "The insurance companies tried many means to retain this money, and finally the compromise scheme was worked out. Under it the companies proposed to return to the policyholders 10 cents per cent and to retain 80 per cent per cent for themselves." Pendergast persuaded Governor Stark's predecessor to approve this compromise, and about $10,000,000 was divided up.

When Stark came into office, he directed that the compromise be contested in the courts. At stake was $1,740,000 which remained to be distributed under the so-called 80-20 scheme. Recalling this period, Judge Douglas explained: "The court was divided three to three when I came on the bench. Three favored the compromise; the others felt it was unlawful. The latter group believed that all the money should go to the policyholders. I agreed with them." Because of his conviction, Judge Douglas voted to invalidate the compromise. In the 4-3 decision, his was the deciding vote.

Friends warned Judge Douglas that in taking such a stand he was committing political suicide. Braving the insurance rate case, Jim demonstrated that he was a man of complete integrity. It required real courage to stand up under this test. Frankly, I'm sure most people who were politically wise believed that Jim Douglas wrote himself off the bench when he did this, because in those days Missouri Supreme Court judges had to campaign actively for their places on the bench.

Because the constitution provided that a judge be appointed to serve only until the next election, Douglas faced a political contest the following year. For more than twenty-five years, it had been an unbroken custom of both major political parties in Missouri that an appointed judge was nominated in the next election without opposition. But Pendergast was so angry that he decided to forget all about tradition, and backed Circuit Judge J. V. Billings of Kennett, Mo., in the Democratic primary.

In taking this action, Pendergast tried to disguise the fact that he wanted direct representation on the Supreme Court and announced that he was opposing Douglas because he didn't like Governor Stark. The infuriated governor responded by throwing the weight of his office against Billings in the contest. Post-Dispatch reporter Betts called the Douglas-Billings race the "bitterest intra-party fight in Missouri politics since 1922 when Breckinridge Long contested with former Senator James A. Reed for the nomination for his seat in the Senate.

During the campaign the governor called on the voters to "save the Supreme Court from political boss control." "The contest," Douglas declared, "developed into a battle between the governor and the boss." Squarely in the middle was the beleaguered Douglas. Given to understatement, Douglas characterized it as "an interesting race." But of it, he added, "The people realized for the first time in the history of the state, I think, that there was a candidate for the Missouri Supreme Court."

It is not surprising that they did, for Douglas personally stumped the state shaking hands so many hands that he developed a callus on his own right hand. Of the battle, Stark said recently: "I fought harder for Judge Douglas in that election and spent more of my own money than I did on any of my own political races."

In the midst of the turmoil, Douglas talked with Joseph J. McAuliffe, the managing editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, who was reputed to have the best political information in the state. He told Douglas, "Well, Jim, I think that this time Pendergast has made a mistake. He's gone too far. Congress wouldn't let FDR pack the United States Supreme Court; I don't think the people are going to turn the state Supreme Court over to Pendergast."

McAuliffe was right. Douglas won the nomination by the largest vote ever cast for a Supreme Court judge and in the succeeding general election he led the ticket, winning by 303,449 votes.

At the time few understood precisely why Pendergast was so interested in the fire insurance litigation. Later, in a federal income tax case, the government was able to prove, Douglas explained, "that Pendergast had been bribed to the extent of $440,000 by the insurance interests." Pendergast gave $62,000 of this sum to O'Malley. District Judge Merrill E. Otis sentenced Pendergast to fifteen months in prison and fined him $10,000. O'Malley received a one-year sentence. The power of the Pendergast machine was broken.

The toppling of the powerful Pendergast had all sorts
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of repercussions. It led to the adoption of the Non-Partisan Court Plan, known as the Missouri Plan of Judicial Tenure, making it unnecessary for some judges, including those on the state's Supreme Court, to enter political primaries. Such judges ran for election strictly on their record. It also won Douglas the reputation of a vote-getter, with the result that political leaders, including the canny Truman himself, for a time considered him as a potential candidate for the governorship or the United States Senate.

But Douglas entertained no political aspirations. And so for twelve years, until he resigned from the Court at the end of 1949, Jim Douglas went quietly about the business of being a Missouri Supreme Court Justice. Sitting in Division One, except for two years, 1943-45, when he served as chief justice, Judge Douglas earned a reputation as a first-rate jurist. But you won't learn that from him.

Of the experience, he says matter-of-factly, "It was an absorbing but very rugged job. When I first arrived in my Jefferson City office and saw the walls lined with books, I thought all the answers were there if I can just find them. But I found that wasn't the case. New matters were coming up all the time. The factual situation was different and so the results were different. Being on the Supreme Court stretched your mind, it made you think."

Those who watched his career closely while he was on the highest bench in the state are more explicit. Reminiscing about this period in Judge Douglas's life, Shepley said with conviction, "He made a splendid judge because, unlike some of us, he can be completely non-partisan. What I mean is that he has no inclination to pre-judge controversies that are brought to him. He has a remarkable capacity to listen with an open mind. In the legal profession, we call this quality judicial temperament."

Another admirer was United States Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, who had been a Harvard classmate and close friend of Douglas's father, Walter Bond Douglas. Not long after Douglas became a member of the Missouri Supreme Court, Justice Brandeis gave him some advice he never forgot. As Judge Douglas remembers it, Brandeis emphasized that to a state supreme court no case is unimportant. Each time that you render a decision, Brandeis told him, "you are handing down principles for the future. He added that a judge ought to take an interest in public affairs and in matters involving the bench and the bar, but not at the expense of his judicial responsibilities. "Nothing," Justice Brandeis stressed, "must be permitted to interfere with a judge's official responsibilities."

This advice Judge Douglas took to heart, which is undoubtedly one of the reasons why there was genuine regret throughout the state when he announced his decision to return to private practice in St. Louis. The Kansas City Star editorialized: "Nothing short of a top-notch replacement will take the edge off the loss .... Douglas has ranked with the best on [the] court."

Probably the most scholarly assessment of his abilities as a Missouri Supreme Court Justice was turned in by Boyd Carroll of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In a lengthy article, he noted that Douglas had written several notable opinions including "the ruling, early in 1941, against the legislature's partisan attempt to keep Forrest C. Donnell, Republican, out of the governorship to which he had been elected. The decision, in which the other judges, Democrats, concurred, was a peremptory order to the House to seat Donnell as Governor, then permitting a contest to be filed in proper form. The contest was filed but was dropped when a partial recount increased Donnell's majority."

Douglas agrees that this was one of the high spots of his career. At the time that he was called upon to write the opinion, he remembers that the Court was again divided three and three. "I was in the middle. I knew that if the opinion were to be really effective it had to be unanimous. It was unanimously adopted," he added. Quite obviously, Douglas was responsible for persuading all the judges to his point of view. How he did it is a question the judge sidesteps. One who knows him well believes he had his way "because on the court Douglas was the catalytic agent or crystallizer."

He was also extraordinarily able. Carroll, in his summary, observes, "In his twelve years on the bench, only one of (Douglas's) opinions had been reversed by the United States Supreme Court. In that case," he continued, "the United States Supreme Court reversed former rulings and held that a restrictive covenant or agreement entered into by property owners was not enforceable in the courts, although recognizing it was a legally executed agreement." The ruling involved restrictions adopted by certain St. Louis property owners on Labadie Avenue barring sale or rental of residential property to Negroes. Of the United States Supreme Court's momentous decision, Judge Douglas says succinctly, "that was the beginning of the general movement that broke down the color line."

In educational circles Douglas is perhaps best remembered for the opinion he wrote which invalidated a rule of the St. Louis Board of Education barring employment of married women as teachers in the public schools. When he elected to step down from the state's highest tribunal to join the St. Louis law firm now known as Thompson, Mitchell, Douglas and Neill, there was much speculation about why he was leaving Jefferson City. Undoubtedly, many factors entered into his decision, but perhaps foremost in his mind was the belief that in St. Louis his son would have better educational opportunities. Also, Judge Douglas says with rare frankness, "I began to worry that I might get sloppy. I decided that I'd much rather go back into private practice than to deteriorate into a poor judge. It's very grinding work, and sometimes after you get the knack of it you are tempted to write too fast. Then you have to go back and make corrections in a supplemental opinion. I didn't want to do that."

Judge Douglas has never regretted leaving the bench. At first he wondered whether he could forget his judicial habit of impartiality and become a persuasive advocate again. But these self-doubts quickly faded away. "I found," he said, "that I could get in and really fight for my client's cause when I knew his case was right. I enjoyed it."

Once he became a practicing lawyer again, however, clients were not the only people who sought his services. "The first person who came to my office when I came back to town," he recalls, "was Luther Ely Smith, Sr. He said, 'Jim, I'm glad you're back. We've missed you. Welcome to
Washington University. He was an obvious and a happy choice. Born in St. Louis on January 6, 1896, the son of Walter and Francesca Kimball Douglas, he had been educated in the local public schools. After graduation from Central High School in 1914, he entered Washington University, but he did not receive a degree until 1921. "I was," he delights in recalling, "an undergraduate for seven years with ins and outs." In 1916, as a member of Battery A, Missouri National Guard, on the Mexican border interrupted his studies. Then World War I came along, and he was commissioned a second lieutenant with the 90th division, in the 342nd Field Artillery.

Douglas served in the St. Mihiel sector, and then was part of the Army of Occupation stationed in Germany until he returned to the states in August of 1919. Re-entering the University, he earned his L.L.B. degree in 1921.

After graduation, Douglas joined Nagel and Kirby, a law firm in which Shepley's uncle, Charles Nagel, was a partner. Not long afterwards Shepley became an attorney for the same firm, and he and Douglas became good friends as well as colleagues. Douglas was on the staff of Nagel and Kirby until his election to the St. Louis circuit court in 1935. Because of these associations, it was only natural that Shepley should invite his former associate to become a Washington University board member.

Of his service on Washington University's board, Judge Douglas says enthusiastically, "It's been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. It's a great honor and it's exciting to be connected with an educational institution. Some of the excellence of the University sometimes brushes off on you a little bit." About his accomplishments, Douglas says little, but Shepley is not so reticent.

"Jim," Shepley says warmly and with more than a trace of emotion in his voice, "has been about as faithful and helpful a board member as one could imagine. He does very little speaking at meetings, but when he has something to say it is pertinent. You can see the judge in him. He waits until all the arguments are in, and then he very quietly makes a suggestion—generally quite helpful."

When Shepley became Chancellor of Washington University in 1954, Douglas succeeded him as chairman of the board, a post he occupied for seven years. "Jim was tremendously helpful," Shepley continued. "He's fun to work with and always pleasant. I've never known him to become irritable and he has very good judgment. He's terribly proud of the progress that the University has made during the past few decades, and he understands the basis of its strength. He knows what it takes to make a good university. He always stood firm on any issue where he felt the strength of the University was involved."

"Very few people," Shepley emphasized, "realize what a demanding job it is to be chairman of the Washington University board of trustees. Among other things, he's required to sign any document of a legal nature executed on behalf of the University. And the business transactions of a University which spends vast sums every year—more than $44 million annually—are substantial."

Shepley added that during the years that Douglas headed the board the University owned a great deal of downtown real estate and it was his responsibility, in the last analysis, to be completely familiar with these holdings. "Jim carried a terrific burden quietly and without complaint," he said admiringly.

"He also knew how to run a meeting beautifully. Jim Douglas never let a meeting get out of hand. He was a man of few words himself, but he had a quiet but rather firm way of seeing that the meeting didn't drag out unnecessarily. And yet he wasn't too crisply efficient. People were encouraged to express themselves."

Shepley explained that running a large educational institution like Washington University is not easy. "This is a place where scholars both at the faculty and student level are constantly challenging the old ideas. When you're trying to learn more, you question the existing situation. Now there are always people who resent this," the former Chancellor said. "They like things as they are. But Jim Douglas understood that it is the function of a University to question the status quo. Because of his understanding he always cooperated with me wholeheartedly on all issues including those which might have caused some other people to raise their eyebrows."

With his busy law practice and his devoted service to Washington University, it is difficult to see how the Judge, as people still call him in deference to his years on the bench, found time for any other interests. But he did. The Missouri Historical Society, Civic Progress, the American Bar Association—these are but a few of the organizations in which he has played an active role. In addition, he was chairman of the task force on legal services and procedures of the second Hoover Commission.

For his service to his profession and the community, Judge Douglas has received many honors, including the annual award of the Lawyers Association in 1951. Last year, he was given a citation of merit by the University of Missouri Alumni Association "for outstanding achievement and meritorious service in law."

As the recipient of so many distinguished honors and the concerned participant in many groups, however, Judge Douglas has found it virtually impossible to develop any hobbies. "My chief hobby seems to have been work," he said ruefully. "I've had to work hard all of my life, and I guess it's just become an ingrained habit." Admittedly, the Judge has been busy—much too busy to collect stamps, coins, or butterflies. But not too busy, concluded Joe Gravely, one of those who knows him best, "to collect friends." Of all the praise that has come his way, Judge James Marsh Douglas, we suspect, treasures this simple but eloquent tribute most of all.
With the advent of Medicare, the number of ward patients in our teaching hospitals has been declining. If this trend continues, Dr. Drews points out, there will be an acute shortage of adequate patient material for the training of the next generation of physicians.

Dr. Robert C. Drews supervises the work of a resident in the Washington University Clinics.
MEDICARE AND CLINICAL TRAINING

TODAY THE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL of Medicine, along with other centers for medical training, is pondering the problem of obtaining adequate patient material for the training of the next generation of physicians. The situation is becoming acute in the training of surgeons. For the purposes of this article, I shall draw my references from the training of eye surgeons, since this is the area with which I have the most intimate contact. The situation, however, is quite analogous in most other medical specialties. Some, such as urology, have already been hit as hard as ophthalmology; others are just beginning to feel the pinch.

Historically the training of physicians and surgeons has been accomplished by preceptorship. The students of Hippocrates learned the master's art not only from his lectures, but also by watching him care for the sick. They were then to emulate his example. Surgeons learned their trade by watching their seniors. Those who managed to acquire a large volume of experience early in their careers did so on the battlefields. The preceptorship system presupposes that the preceptor is both an excellent physician and a good teacher. If those two conditions are met, however, the master's precepts become his disciples; if they are exposed at all to the ideas of other colleagues, it is through the prejudiced eyes of their mentor.

The preceptor system of medical training became more and more unworkable with the introduction of scientific medical methods and the subsequent explosion of knowledge. In the last hundred years, medical schools have developed rapidly. By the turn of this century it became extremely difficult to obtain a license to practice medicine in the United States without a diploma from a recognized medical school. Preceptorship training was no longer acceptable. The Carnegie Foundation's Flexner report of 1914 led to major revisions and improvement in the medical schools themselves. Schools that were unable to offer first-rate training were closed. Preceptorship, however, remained the accepted way of obtaining postgraduate education in the medical and surgical specialties until residency training programs gradually developed on a scale large enough to supply the needs of the nation.

The question, "Doctor, have you ever done this operation?" was a common one for our grandparents to ask. They were well aware of the fact that training in both medicine and surgery fifty years ago was based on lectures, observation, and practically no direct experience. The young surgeon had completed medical school and, if he were an unusually dedicated young man, may have taken an internship. He might even have gone to Europe to study in such centers as Vienna and Heidelberg. Depending upon his financial means, his total period of study abroad would have lasted somewhere between three months and a year or two. He would then return to this country armed with the latest concepts in diagnosis and therapy, quite capable of lecturing on the latest techniques in surgery.

But those were hard times to get established. The public was skeptical of young physicians and the physician himself often recognized his own need for further training. If he were lucky, he could obtain a preceptorship in a well-established office where he could examine and watch the management of a large number of patients being cared for by one of the more prominent surgeons in his city.

AFTE AFTER A VARIABLE LENGTH of time he would summon all possible courage, borrow some more money, and set up his own office. Lack of other people in the waiting room made those patients who did come skeptical of the talents of this new, young doctor. A few grey hairs or a mustache could be a definite advantage. Yet, it was common knowledge that, in spite of all this study, in spite of all these years of preparation, such young men had not had much surgical experience. Indeed, a man could have had several years of training beyond medical school and never have performed a single operation.

For the last twenty-five years, preceptorship in the surgical specialties has been replaced almost completely by
residency programs. Further, the various surgical specialists have devised board certification programs, not just as a means of signifying that those who are board certified have achieved a certain level of knowledge in the specialty, but also, and most importantly, as a means of improving the training offered by the residency programs themselves. Each director of such a program prides himself on the fact that his residents are so well trained that they can achieve board certification.

The residency programs expose the men in training to many teachers, each of whom is expert in some particular aspect of the surgical specialty which he is teaching. In ophthalmology, for example, some men teach retinal detachment surgery, others the diagnosis and management of patients who have eye muscle problems, still others the biochemistry of the eye. This range of exposure was impossible in the perceptor system.

But lectures on these subjects and the observation of the management of patients under private care is only a beginning of the training of the present resident in a surgical specialty. As the resident progresses through his training program and becomes proficient in the theories and practice he has heard and seen others perform, he must ultimately reach the most important level of training. It is in the forge named responsibility that the alloys poured into the surgeon-to-be can be hammered into a sure, dependable, and trustworthy product.

When should this responsibility be assumed? Should the young surgeon perform his first operation after he has finished all of his training and is in private practice? Obviously not. A good residency training program provides the resident with an opportunity first to observe and then to assist in duties of increasing importance. The medical student holds retractors, the intern cuts off sutures, junior-residents tie knots, and by the end of their training, senior residents have assumed the responsibility of a surgeon-in-charge of a given operation. In good residency programs, the entire training period is carefully supervised, not only through the hierarchy of residents, but by attending and full-time surgeons on the staff so that there is constant supervision and consultation on the care rendered on the resident's service in training hospitals.

Because of this system, excellent training programs such as that of the Department of Ophthalmology at Washington University privately pride themselves on offering the patients on the ward service a better level of medical and surgical care than that which is available on the average private service. The best and latest thinking of some of the best minds is available in matters of decision for ward patients. Criteria of care are rigidly enforced at the highest levels and the more complex levels of surgery are performed only by men who have immediate training and skill. The man who finishes this training program is eminently qualified to care for the patients who present themselves to him, even on his first day in private practice.

This qualification has become recognized publicly, to the point where many patients, and even surgeons, by preference now seek out younger men from outstanding training programs to perform their surgery. This is quite a contrast to the experience of half a century ago, when gray hair was considered an essential attribute of a good surgeon.

On whom should the resident learn his surgery? The immediate reaction of most patients is, "I don't want anyone learning how to operate on me!"

Under our present system of training, such a statement is naive. Surgical techniques are learned gradually over a period of three years or more by assisting with tasks of gradually increasing complexity. That someone would learn how to do an appendectomy by picking up a scalpel and proceeding to operate is unthinkable today. It was not unthinkable fifty years ago and unfortunately may be the case tomorrow.

One basic difference in care on ward and private medical and surgical services today is that on the private service the patient has the right to choose his own physician or surgeon. He knows in advance who will do the surgery and who is responsible for it. He knows that he will be seen both before and after surgery by the man that he has chosen for the job.

On the ward service, a patient may be worked up in the clinic by several residents, none of whom performs the actual surgery. The immediate postoperative care is usually given by the surgeon, but thereafter the patient is returned to the general care of the residents. Although there is continuity of supervision, the surgeon usually does not see the same resident for a period of more than one year, if that long. This is because residents continue to advance through the residency program and are shifted from one part of the resident service to another to complete their training. Thus, although the patient's care is usually excellent and may be on a personal basis at any one time, it lacks a long-term personal basis. This is one reason that some patients who can afford it choose private medical care rather than clinic care.

In the past, the volume of indigent patients has always been great enough to assure an adequate number of patients for a thorough residency training program. In recent years, however, clinic patient visits in the eye clinic at McMillan Hospital have averaged about 32,000 a year. Each year over 1,000 major eye operations are performed on the ward service. Each resident finishing the program at Washington University is an experienced eye surgeon.

The advent of an increasing number of prepaid medical health care programs, especially on the east and west coasts, led to drastic reductions in the amount of surgery performed on ward medical services in those parts of the country. As early as 1960, occasional instances were found where men who completed residency training at major eye hospitals in the eastern part of the United States had never done a cataract operation.

The advent of Medicare has tremendously intensified this problem and Medicaid (Title 19) is now making it universal. The amount of surgery performed on the ward service at McMillan Hospital since the introduction of Medicare last year has already fallen 20 per cent. The total amount of surgery performed in the hospital has
remained the same; these patients are now being operated on in private service. Even patients who are initially seen and followed in the clinic transfer to private care when it becomes time for surgery, in the mistaken belief that they will inevitably receive better care. Uncle Sam is paying the bill and these patients now not only have the right, but also the opportunity, to choose to have their surgery performed by anyone they wish. As Medicare coverage is extended, unless some correcting steps are taken, we can only foresee a demise of the ward surgical service and an end of this form of training in the next several years.

Then how will the next generation of surgeons be trained? Several solutions are being considered and debated. None of them is good.

One solution would be to stipulate that the head of a department, acting with the approval of the Executive Faculty and the Dean of the School of Medicine, could demand that all private surgeons turn over a given percentage of their private surgical patients to the ward service. The ward service now does two-fifths of all eye surgery at McMillan Hospital. If most of the surgery were to shift to the private service, it might be reasonable, in order to maintain the surgical training program, to require each staff member to turn over one out of every four of his surgical patients to the ward service for surgery.

I cannot imagine how this can be done openly. Imagine your own reaction if, when you needed surgery, your surgeon were to look up and say that you were the fourth person on his list of those to be operated on and that therefore you would be admitted to the ward service to have your surgery performed by one of the residents at the hospital. In years gone by such a system was actually practiced sub rosa. At the time of surgery the operating surgeon stepped aside and allowed the resident to perform the operation in his presence. Ghost surgery in any form, whether by a novice or by someone highly skilled, was roundly and properly condemned forty years ago. Medicare may force a return to it in some areas of the United States to afford training for the next generation of surgeons.

The team concept of surgery is also one which can be used to facilitate residency training, especially if large surgical services are established in medical centers. A few "supersurgeons" established under the auspices of the University could capture a large proportion of the surgery performed in St. Louis, for example. These men would be far too busy to perform all parts of the surgery themselves and would operate with the aid of residency teams. These teams would perform the preliminary and final parts of the surgery (making and closing the wound, for example) while the supersurgeon attended and performed only the more vital or complicated parts of the procedure. This is a well-recognized and perfectly legitimate technique for allowing a man who is highly skilled in a surgical specialty to do a far larger number of operations per day than would otherwise be possible.

The same technique lends itself admirably to giving residents increasingly direct surgical responsibility and training. The novice can perform simple and non-critical parts of a surgical procedure. As his skill increases, he can be entrusted with more and more complex tasks until finally he has performed any given part of a given operation many times, while the overall supervision and responsibility, and indeed some part of the operation itself, is borne by the private surgeon. This is a form of ghost surgery by a different and probably a more ethical route, but it is still ghost surgery. In my thinking, it remains ghost surgery even if the patient is told that the operation will be performed by a "team" of surgeons, and even if the private surgeon retains responsibility.

This form of sharing surgical experience is considered unethical today and is being considered more ethical as it becomes more and more necessary as a ruse to provide residents with surgical training. The problem of such an "ethic" is seen when it places no restriction on how much or what parts of the surgery must be done by the private surgeon. Presumably if 95 per cent of the operation were done by the resident and 5 per cent by the private surgeon, it would be ethical, but a 100 to 0 per cent split would constitute outright ghost surgery and therefore would not be ethical.

Another solution is to send young surgeons to other countries where there are large indigent populations. At present, eye residents from the Wilmer Institute at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore are being sent to Algeria. We are sending our own senior residents to El Salvador for three months to increase their surgical experience. This is an unsatisfactory solution and a temporary one at best.

Senior residents of the University of California in San Francisco spend time in various private offices watching and assisting the surgeons in their work. Unless these private men choose to allow the residents to perform ghost surgery under their auspices, the residents receive no direct experience from this type of program. It is a return to the old preceptor system.

With ward surgical services rapidly diminishing and ghost surgery unacceptable, the arbitrary forcing of some private patients to have their surgery performed on ward service unthinkable and unfeasible, and the training of American surgeons abroad a poor and temporary measure, one wonders just where the next generation of surgeons in the United States will receive their training. The old system of preceptorship with limited experience looms at us menacingly from the past. Furthermore, this problem is not limited to surgery. The problem of the training of physicians in internal medicine and other nonsurgical specialties is just as great, if perhaps not quite so acute.

So far, American medicine has been unable to find an answer despite increasing concern and conference at local and national levels. Like many of the complications of Medicare, the results will not be faced by the present generation of Americans, but by the next.
HE UNIVERSITY HAS seen many fads and fashions come and go in its 114-year history. It has experienced and survived the Hoopskirt Era, the Flapper Era, the New Look of the late Forties. This year is the height of the Miniskirt Era.

We felt that the phenomenon should be recorded for posterity. Imagine what merriment these pictures will invoke at the twenty-fifth reunion of the Class of '71! What the freshmen of 1971 will be wearing defies imagination.

This may be the Era of the Miniskirt, but it's also the age of the Maxistudent. The Class of '71 may be short on hemlines, but it's long on board scores.

There's nothing mini about that.
Down the up staircase.
the miniskirt era

Two variations on a theme: minishorts and the miniskirt-jeans combination.
Colleges and universities are very much in the news these days. It's true that a great deal of the attention focused on higher education by the national media seems to concentrate on protests and riots, on pot and LSD, on short skirts and long hair. But there is also a concerted effort on the part of the nation's press and radio and television to report on more lasting, more constructive, and more meaningful news from the campuses.

With the hundreds and hundreds of institutions of higher education in this country, it is difficult for the media to keep up with the real news from all of them. Yet, we feel that recently Washington University has received a considerable amount of attention nationally. To list just a few examples:

1. In July, Time led off its science section with a report on the pioneering research being done by Robert M. Walker, McDonnell Professor of Physics. The article discussed Professor Walker's development of new methods of dating inorganic materials—including meteorites from outer space—and pointed out that his work will have profound importance not only in space science, but in a host of other fields from cosmology to archaeology.

2. Two weeks later, Time followed with a two-page article on Washington University's art collections. Included were full-color reproductions of several of the University's prize paintings.

3. In August, an Associated Press feature article on the Washington University-Monsanto Company materials research collaboration appeared in more than 250 newspapers throughout the country.

4. Shortly after, a major United Press International piece about Washington University's Laura Root and her work on alcoholism appeared in hundreds of newspapers.

5. A Columbia Broadcasting System special hour-long color program on "Art in St. Louis" appeared on five major CBS stations. The show was dominated by Washington University artists, the School of Fine Arts, and the University Collections.

It all goes to show that while no news may be good news, good news really gets around.

Another piece of good news recently was the announcement that the University intends to continue to operate the School of Dentistry.

Last year, a special five-man committee representing the faculty of the School of Dentistry was formed to prepare a plan to strengthen the School and to work to insure its future.

At the time the committee was announced, a joint statement was issued by Chancellor Eliot and Dr. Earl E. Shepard, dental alumnus and chairman of the committee. The statement summed up the problem succinctly:

"Washington University's Dental School has a fine professional reputation. The college records of its incoming students rank among the first eight of the nation's fifty dental schools. Its graduating seniors rank even higher on the national examinations. Its clinics serve thousands of St. Louisans.

"The School's operating deficits, however, are large and have been increasing, and much of its equipment is old and needs replacement. Therefore, to keep the School operating and improving, still more careful and constructive planning for both the immediate future and the long run is required. The special committee, the University administration, and the Trustees will give this thorough consideration in the coming weeks in the hope of finding ways to maintain and strengthen the School of Dentistry."

The special committee's report was studied in detail by the Trustees and at its September meeting the Board announced its approval of the continuation of the School of Dentistry under the administrative supervision of the Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs, Dr. William H. Danforth, to whom the School's dean will report in the future.

Chairman Charles Allen Thomas stated that the Board "acted expressly on the assumption that by 1970 the School will achieve the goals of financial independence and increased enrollment, facilities, and services projected by the Dental School faculty's special planning committee."

In its report, the committee predicted that internal improvements and foreseeable increases in financial support, both public and private, would make the School financially self-supporting within three years.

Next month, Washington University will be the host for the annual News Horizons in Science Seminar of the Council for the Advancement of Science Writing. The five-day session will bring to St. Louis and to the campus between one hundred and one hundred and fifty of the nation's top science writers to receive briefings in the latest developments in physical and biological science, medicine, and social science from a broad-cross section of authorities in their fields from all over the world.


Bill Vaughan, BSJ 36, nationally syndicated columnist, noted wit, and the star of Washington University's champion Alumni Fun team, has a new book out this fall: Half the Battle, published by Simon and Schuster. Moreover, the book's publication date, October 12, was proclaimed as "Bill Vaughan Day" by the mayor of Kansas City.