EVENTS ON THE Washington University campus from March 22 to April 3 were so varied and confusing that the national press services inevitably sent out reports that were incomplete. These confused many friends of the university.

In summary, on the night of March 22-23, some 150 people (students and probably a few non-students) broke into South Brookings Hall, where they did little or no damage. Police were called and the students fled. They regrouped and announced that they would attack the Air Force ROTC building at the other end of the campus. There, however, they were met by a large police contingent and were ordered to disperse. Four students and a non-student were arrested and charged with failure to obey that order and resisting arrest.

On the night of March 24-25, while campus police were watching a peaceful march on the south side of the campus, a number of windows were shattered by rocks in North Brookings and in Urbauer Hall on the north side of the campus.

On the night of March 26-27, another march was made to the ROTC building. Ostensibly the purpose was to board up the building and mark it condemned. A number of marchers, however, carried rocks, bricks, and other destructive implements. Accordingly, the police were again called, the crowd was dispersed, and nine resistant students were arrested.

On Friday, March 27, I cancelled all classes for the day, because the necessary police action of the early morning hours had inflamed emotions to the point where widespread disruption and violence were probable. We needed to cool off with a day of calmer discussion. This worked. Writing this message on April 6, I can say that since the night
of March 26-27 there has been no disruption, destruction, or violence on our campus.

Meanwhile, in the daylight hours on March 23-26, numerous ROTC classes had been interfered with and disrupted by groups ranging from about twenty to perhaps seventy people. It was very difficult to identify these people, as some wore masks and most were unknown to the ROTC instructors and cadets. By March 26, however, fifteen students had been identified and charged with serious violations of the code of student conduct.

As that code required a three days’ notice, hearings before the University Committee on Student Conduct did not begin until Monday, March 30. By Tuesday night, the Committee had not completed a single case and had recessed for two weeks. On Wednesday, with the support of the Senate Council (the fifteen-member elected faculty body representing all schools) I suspended the fifteen students, allowing each to appeal for a hearing before a special panel which was set up by the Council of Deans. I required that any appeal be filed promptly and the case be disposed of by April 14, the second day after classes resume following the April 3-12 spring vacation.

As I read letters from alumni and press clippings from many newspapers, I perceive three questions that need clear answers.

1. Why did we wait till April 1 to act against those charged with disruption? We did so because the established disciplinary machinery had to be given a chance to work. When it failed to work (not through any fault of the Committee, but because the procedures provided opportunities for endless delay) we acted.

2. Why did we “close the University,” as some newspapers reported? We didn’t. We cancelled classes for one day, for the reasons and with the good results noted above.

3. Why did I ask the County Police to get off the campus? Some reports suggest that I did this as the police were “breaking up a riot.” This was not the case. As shown above, we twice called the police and they dispersed crowds which clearly appeared to intend violence and
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destruction. However, on the morning of March 26 the police appeared at the western edge of the campus and dispersed a small group engaged in trying to disrupt a class by making a noise outside the ROTC building and rapping on windows; one window was broken. The group left and scattered, and the police, in formation, marched the whole length of the campus, into the main quadrangle. As there was nothing illegal going on, or threatened, on the quadrangle or elsewhere on the campus, I asked them to withdraw, which they did. They readily responded to our call some twelve hours later, when there was a clear and present danger of violence, as noted above.

More general questions have been asked, and many opinions expressed, regarding ROTC, the ostensible focus of the recent demonstrations. I say “ostensible” because some of the apparent leaders (including two or three non-students) speak frankly in terms of anarchy; for them, ROTC appears to be just a convenient issue that appeals to students who are emotionally opposed to war.

The question of ROTC is under discussion. Advisory referenda in March, sponsored by the Engineering student council, showed 52.9 per cent of those students who voted and 54.6 per cent of those faculty members who voted, as favoring its retention on campus. In each case, votes were cast by about two-thirds of those eligible to vote. The School of Engineering continues to give academic credit for ROTC courses. The issue will be the subject of a special meeting of the whole Faculty Senate on April 14, and will of course be on the agenda of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees later in April.

Finally, I want to make it very clear that we do not and will not tolerate disruption. The old disciplinary machinery failed to work because it gave the accused student a substantial interest in delaying any disposition of his case. The new policy makes it in his interest to get the matter disposed of quickly, and meanwhile gives better protection to the rights of all the other students and the rest of the University.

Thomas H. Eliot
April 6, 1970
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The Interfraternity Council Symposium, co-sponsored by other student groups, drew capacity crowds to hear outstanding political figures and to discuss and debate current political issues.
"POLITICS IN TRANSITION" was the theme of the third annual symposium sponsored in February by the Interfraternity Council. While it might be argued that everything is in transition these days, it is true that the transition in politics seems more radical, more profound, and a lot faster than many other changes.

The Interfraternity Council Symposium Committee, representing the joint sponsorship of the Interfraternity Council, Student Union, the Student Academic Committee, and the Panhellenic Association, brought to the campus an all-star lineup of outstanding political figures representing many shades of the political spectrum.

In keeping with the theme, the symposium did not merely present a series of experts pontificating from the podium. Instead, there was a sequence of open sessions, built around a major statement by a political figure, but including also a panel of experts.

The main speakers were: Senator Eugene J. McCarthy; Mayor Richard G. Hatcher of Gary, Indiana; Thomas Wicker, associate editor of The New York Times; Kevin Phillips, special assistant to the U.S. attorney general; Roman C. Pucinski, U.S. representative from Illinois; John C. Danforth, attorney general of Missouri; Alfonso J. Cervantes, mayor of St. Louis; Howard B. Woods, publisher of the St. Louis Sentinel, and John Staggers, representing Walter E. Washington, commissioner of the District of Columbia, who was unable, at the last minute, to attend.

The purpose of the Symposium was summed up succinctly in the program: "Our objective is not to stress any one avenue for change or to try to convince any group that its particular methods for change are right or wrong. Our goal is to encourage every group of students—the radical, the complacent, the frustrated—to come together to discuss the different methods for solving our social problems."

The approach was highly successful: the sessions were well attended, everybody had a chance to ask questions and express his opinion, and (surprisingly in these times) the reception of every speaker of every shade of political opinion was courteous and civilized.

Ideally, we should like to have run the complete text of all the speakers' remarks, but the space simply didn't exist. What follows are condensations of the addresses of five of the speakers, chosen both for the importance of what they had to say and for the fact that they represent four widely different viewpoints.
Politics are in transition and many of the truths that we have tended to take for granted in our politics have simply become the tenets of generals who are still fighting the last war. I should like to discuss some of the things in American society that have caused a considerable change in our politics and will cause even more change in the future.

The first is the population growth and movement in our country. Between 1945 and 1960, about ninety million Americans were born, for a net gain of sixty million. The population is not only growing rapidly, its characteristics are changing just as fast. By 1980, it is estimated that 75 per cent of Americans will live in urban areas. At the same time, the white populations of the cities will have declined 23 per cent.

Within the general population development should be noted, first, the enormous migration of black people out of the rural south and into the central cities, which has had an impact on our national life which is just beginning to be realized. Another is that where population growth once moved westward or at least onward into empty country, in recent decades and for the foreseeable future, population will be expanding where it is, except for some migratory movement back into the coastal strips.

A second thing I would like to note is what Daniel Bell has called the development of a national society. No matter where something happens in our society, it has an impact throughout the country. We all know about it and we are affected by it simultaneously. Hallmarks of a national society are a managed economy and fiscal policy, a national concept of welfare and a program to sustain it, national publications, and a national culture. We have network television which can expose everyone instantaneously to the same events, same issues, same men.

We have obviously become the classic example in history of a post-industrial society in which the shift has been one to which people perform services, rather than producing agricultural and manufactured goods. In our society, the technical and professional component of the population has been the fastest growing and will soon be the second largest component of our population. In this society theoretical knowledge and human talent begins to surpass the sheer brawn to do industrial labor. In addition, we are increasingly becoming, although we have not reached full growth yet, an affluent educated, and technological society.

Starting from these developments we have some political results that we can already see. Some of the results are not totally political but they have their impact in politics. I think we can see that the Civil War tradition is dying in American politics. The South is moving Republican on many issues, and if there were no Wallace movement it would be even more noticeable.

More important than the death of the Civil War tradition is the revolt against what I call the massiveness of American life. Our people now live in enormous urban belts, belong to vast faceless unions which dominate their earning power and their lives, and work for tremendous
corporations with headquarters far away in which they see only one level above them to their supervisors and never know who the leaders are. Their sons go to universities which are immense, faceless, and impersonal. The family lives in an apartment in a beehive complex or in a house like every other house in a far flung suburb.

The massiveness of American life is tending to weigh us all down and, psychologically, we search for some means of redeeming and maintaining the last tattered vestiges of our individualism. This has resulted in the emphasis on what is known as participatory politics, the inclination to pitch in and make yourself felt. As prisoners of these vast forces we turn to somewhere where we can make ourselves felt.

We also have in American political life a visibly declining influence on the part of our great major political parties. We have first this resistance to the dominance of giant institutions. Second, the very population basis of these parties has changed considerably. The old polar bases of the Republican party in the countryside and the Democratic party in the central cities have been changed and the moves make a considerable difference in the way people approach their politics.

A n o t h e r  r e a s o n for the decline of party influence in our politics is that as our communications and educational systems have improved, it has become far more possible for candidates to appeal over the heads of parties. They don’t need a party except for certain organizational aspects and even there, with the rise of participatory politics (as McCarthy demonstrated) you get better volunteer workers if you are not dependent upon the party to turn them out. But the main point is that you no longer need to be labeled as a Democrat or Republican in order for the voters to know who this strange individual is, whom they never heard of and never will see.

The institutions of government that were essentially developed in the nineteenth century have become less and less capable of coping with the problems which have mushroomed into our lives in the last half of the twentieth century. It has become clear that government is less able to solve our problems, that government costs too much while being less and less capable. As a result citizens have gradually lost confidence in government in its traditional forms.

At the same time, the basic issue of American politics has become not so much what it was in the depression years and even for twenty years afterwards, not so much the standard of living, as the quality of life. As affluence has spread itself widely through American life, as government has become less able to cope with the problems the affluent are interested in, we have become much more concerned about the quality of our lives than about our incomes. This accounts basically for the post-1964 rise of the Republican party, because the quality of living issues have been particularly Republican and the standard of living issues Democratic.

Looking ahead as best I can, it seems to me that we can say a few things with some limited confidence: The first is that the American people are going to continue, on an increasing curve, to be interested in issues rather than in personalities. This is going to be true on sophisticated issues such as air and water pollution or the military role in our foreign policy, as well as in an impatient and less sophisticated manner on such issues as crime, race, and dissent in American life.

Beyond the interest in issues we are going to see more and more open state-primary type elections. This is a direct result of participation politics in which we have already begun to see the results in the reinstatement of some state primaries and particularly in what is happening in the New York elections. I believe, against all odds, that we are going to develop a more representative national nominating convention system. National parties can hardly exist without the convention institution to balance a ticket, to conciliate differences, to choose candidates, but I think that institution is going to have to respond to the participatory impulse.

Another thing which I expect to result is the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to provide for direct popular election of presidents. I also feel that we are going to see many more non-major parties in American politics, not necessarily “minor” parties but not the established parties. As the Democratic and Republican parties become truly national, more factions are represented and the parties become inert masses. The way to get an inert mass to move is to cut off part of it and challenge it. And I think this is what third parties will be doing.

The final possibility in consequence of these trends is that we may be entering upon an era of one-term presidents. If institutions and organizations are declining in their ability to influence the public, this is true of a political party that tends to sustain a president past his difficulties. It is true even of the presidency itself. Only twenty years after President Truman could express great confidence that no matter how unpopular he was with the people the party would renominate him. President Johnson found out that no matter how popular he was with the party the people were going to be very much opposed to his renomination.

I w o u l d  l i k e to finally pose two questions. What effect will it have on the politics of our coming decade that millions of young people under the magic age of thirty will be voting for the first time? You are an activist and idealistic generation, that believes in confronting problems. At the same time people are dying at the other end of the spectrum and are aging out of the youth vote.

Finally, what do all these trends mean? Do they tend more or less toward the conciliation of groups and interests which has been a historical necessity in a democracy where we have such a tremendous variety of people, where we have such a variety of ethnic groups and economic interests, geographical sections? Do the trends mean that we are going to find better means of conciliating this variety and moving ahead in some kind of national concert, or does it mean more confrontation, more clash, more anger, more alienation, and more bitterness?
I am going to talk tonight about the importance of having a proper relationship among philosophies, policies, and programs on political problems and issues. In almost every major area of our concern today there is a feeling of disorder. In some cases, we have much more philosophy than policy, in others more policy than philosophy, and in some, more program than we have either philosophy or policy.

I am going to try to stay away from talking about priorities. We have reached the point where people begin to talk about “prior priorities.” That’s a kind of escalation of order like “basic fundamentals.”

It is significant, however, that we have begun to talk about priorities in politics as we approach problems in this country. It wasn’t too long ago that we really didn’t feel that we had to put things in order or to make choices about what should come first and what should be put off. Only as far back as ’52 and ’56, we were told that this was the greatest nation on the face of the earth, and if we only put our minds to it, we could accomplish anything we wanted.

It is a kind of reflection of the attitude that we carried into the twentieth century, a false optimism in which we believed, that because of science, new means of communication, and new political forms, all of the historical problems would be solved.

A kind of general belief in progress was coupled with the idea of innocence, simplicity, and certainty that marked the approach of the United States to both external and internal problems. Within the last five or ten years, we have had to re-examine our position in both the practical and theoretical order which we had accepted as marking the history of the United States.

Chesterton, in writing about the United States in the twenties, said that every time a problem came up, Americans said, “What we need is a practical man.” “Unfortunately,” he added, “There were always one or two around.” Chesterton remarks that often this was disastrous because the problem seldom was one that lent itself to a purely practical consideration, but may have required a deeper and more profound judgment. We are not so ready today whenever a problem arises to say that what we need is a practical man. In many cases, the first questions which come up are, “Who really understands this problem? Who knows most about it? What do we have to know in order to begin to solve the problem or at least to approach a solution?”

Often this involves a resort to the academic community to a point where scholars and students are not so immune from politics and from practical problems as they once were. As a matter of fact, they used to complain that they were not consulted enough; now they are beginning to complain that they are consulted too often. The
old happy state of having ten or twenty years between the their generalizations and any kind of application of them, or between their generalizations and any judgment as to whether they were right, has been narrowed to the point where judgment comes almost on the formulation of the theory. The judgment as to whether the theory is right or wrong comes almost immediately upon the application. It is an indication of how philosophy, policy, and program have been telescoped almost to the point of becoming simultaneous.

Never in the practical order do we get these things together quite as we would like to have them. As we look back, I suppose the closest thing to a balance occurred at the time of the American Revolution, where there was a good philosophy of revolution. Good theories about what America came to stand for came not from the Silent Majority, but from some rather outspoken men like Patrick Henry, James Otis, and Thomas Jefferson. These were men who said what they thought should happen, and didn’t pretend that they knew what most people were thinking at the time, because it was a question of whether most people were of a revolutionary mind until something had stirred them. They said this is why we ought to do something.

Once the theory was set they moved on to consider what should be done about realizing certain good things that they thought would make for a happier state of man. They then developed a practical program—the Revolution and some of the things which followed.

Today, in almost every major area, there is an imbalance or lack of relationship between philosophy, policy, program. I cite just three or four areas: One is civil rights. There is no question but that we have the proper philosophy about the rights of the individual in this country. It is clear in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution. At least within recent years, it has been sustained by the Supreme Court.

The philosophy is clear enough; the policy is reasonably clear, although it has not been stated in the right places, in government. The great deficiency has been in the program, not just the governmental program, but in all of those programs which are necessary in order to achieve policies we have set with reference to civil rights and equality in this country, and even beyond that to the achievement of what was declared that this country was all about when it was established.

The second area in which the disorder is of a different kind is poverty. In the case of poverty, we have a policy; we are against it. That is the policy which was really the basis of the Great Society. In fact, we outlawed poverty and ignorance and ill health. We said that crime was illegal and undesirable. We even attempted to set a policy on ugliness. This was the policy, but the deficiency was on both sides of it. We didn’t really have a philosophy in this country with reference to poverty. So far as there was a theory, it was that poverty should not be—and in any case, it was its own reward.

One of the problems today is to get some of the people in Congress and in the country to accept the fact that poverty is a reality. So we have the policy, but we don’t have a program. Until we begin to believe that poverty is, that it has a particular character in this country, that it has a position in historical context, we cannot move on to develop the kinds of programs which are necessary if we are to do anything about what is the reality. The same is true about crime and ignorance, and even ugliness. We are wholly deficient in terms of both philosophy and program.

It is more or less in this spirit that we still approach the problems of the cities, not accepting that this is an ordered society that calls for some attention and some planning. It is as if we still believe in highways but don’t believe in traffic control. Here is a case of our not accepting what is the reality of American life today, and of what becomes more and more the reality of the structure of the society—that this is an urban civilization and the principal problems become more and more urban problems. Not enough policy to go with that inadequate philosophy and certainly a totally inadequate set of programs.

With space and foreign military policy, we have more program than we know what to do with, to the point that the program actually runs away with policy and the policy runs away with philosophy. Take the moonshot, for example. The best reason given for going to the moon was that “it is there.” Now, that is scarcely a philosophy.

The consequences of the lack of coordination in this effort are not really so serious as is the case with military and foreign policy. These were the principal concern of my effort in 1968, and continue to be my concern and that of many others.

Our military policy has been out of phase since the end of World War II, and especially since the end of the Korean War. This may be an over-simplification, but someone has pointed out that we are the first great nation that ever called its military establishment a Department of Defense. And of all the nations in the world today, our military establishment has less to do with defense than any other.

But more serious than the integrity of the name is the danger that if you begin to think in terms of defense, there is no limit to the extent to which your fears may go. No matter how secure you may be, if you are clearly on the offensive, you have to worry about some offensive action against you.

We have three branches of the armed services and each is concerned that it have enough strength to pro-
tect us from any other military establishment in the world, plus the other two services. So you have a kind of continuous escalation of fear and insecurity in the demands of each of the services.

It soon reaches the point where the program itself—things like contingency planning, for instance—becomes all-important. Having so much power we are satisfied that any plan within limits can be made to work. The power is sufficient, so you don’t really have to be too concerned about whether the policy is right. You don’t have to go beyond the program to give thought to what your approach in principle should be to foreign or military policy. It comes close to what Senator Fulbright has been talking about as the arrogance of power—a belief, first, that one has so much power he can achieve whatever he wants and second that because he has power he need not be concerned about how it might be used.

On the other hand, we have had to learn, rather bitterly, that power without adequate policy or some acceptable set of principles is power which often goes awry and does not accomplish what we might have expected it to accomplish, even in an undirected way.

The great nations have had to realize first that they cannot accomplish everything they want to accomplish. In many cases, they can’t accomplish even minimal objectives if they seek them only through the use of power, as I think we have in Vietnam. You then develop a kind of lack of attitude for critical judgment. We have the growing involvement in Vietnam explained in terms like escalation, which is a word which indicates there is no point at which you can interrupt it.

We have reduced the question of how to become disengaged almost to a quantitative measure, so that it must be accomplished within a time limit, without very much thought about what in the normal course of reasoned judgment would be the right order, without saying that this is the policy we have and this is what we are going to do to carry out this policy, or these are the conditions which we think have to be realized before we begin this kind of withdrawal.

In the same way, a kind of uncontrolled and undirected military policy has developed. We have had a foreign policy that has gone the same way, except that much of it was a projection or reflection of military policy. In some ways even worse, we have policies and programs based upon a philosophy we have rejected.

We are still projecting policy and program with reference to Asia in light of the principle of containment developed at the end of World War II. It is hard to find anyone now, even among those supporting the policy, who says he is doing it in keeping with the principle of containment. It is a principle in reason or historical judgment which they say we have rejected. The same is true in Europe. We are still projecting a policy and carrying out programs which are almost contrary to what we now say we believe about our mission in the world.

This is the general picture in which we are trying to make political decisions today and to conduct the affairs of this country both overseas and at home. I think the conclusion is rather obvious: in some areas we have to give much more attention to what our basic beliefs in fact are. We have to see whether some of the old ideas are to be rejected, whether some of the new ones are altogether sound, to establish a basis in belief or in judgment in principle in all of these major areas of responsibility.

Having done that, we must examine our policies again to see whether we are proposing to do the right thing in order to realize certain objectives or to make some progress toward realization of those objectives. Then, we must go on from policy to a determination of what the practical program should be. This involves our making some choices in terms of what to do, of what our schedule should be, and also some hard political choices on what measures we can undertake to accomplish certain of these policies.

This is the order of politics. The question of principle is one in which politicians have to turn to other disciplines. We have to give some thought to what the philosophers say, and what the theologians, moralists, and historians have to say. It is a real demand upon the academic disciplines, upon scholars, and in a very particular way upon students.

For students and the academic community to talk about living in the most permissive age is really nonsense. There is more freedom in this age than there has been in any other civilization, but this does not mean that this is a permissive society. Rather it means that with that freedom goes the greatest burden of responsibility that has ever been placed, not upon a generation in the abstract or upon a particular class in society, but upon every responsible person. Almost every day you are called upon to make decisions which are not made for you by society. They are not decisions that you can make within the context of some kind of institutional control, whether it is the church, the military, or an academic, economic, or scientific community.

In a very particular way, this falls upon the academic community—upon students, scholars, and teachers. I would only remind you of this and say that I have not been disappointed in the way you have been prepared to respond, and I urge you only to continue accepting responsibility. It is only upon the basis of knowledge about the past and the present and the application of these things in a reasoned way that we can hope to give direction to life or history.
THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE BLACK AMERICAN

By RICHARD GORDON HATCHER
Mayor of Gary, Indiana

Mr. Hatcher was elected mayor of Gary against almost overwhelming odds. Since his election, he has won impressive moral and financial support, and has come a long way in his battle to transform Gary from a notorious "Sin City" to a progressive, peaceful community.

THE UNIVERSAL FACT of change is the most general description of the Negro community. The very labeling of that community has undergone and is still undergoing profound change. Thus you are hopelessly outdated if you are still saying "Negro" rather than "black." That adjective has emerged because black people are busily changing or redefining themselves these days. That process of self-definition includes an intense criticism of the sort of labels they prefer.

Not only have labels in the black community changed, but also slogans. Today's "Black Power" slogan has replaced yesterday's call for "freedom now." Its advocates hail it as the only viable option for black people taking the dominant role in determining the black-white relationship in American society.

Black power is an attitude, an inward affirmation of the essential worth of blackness. It means that the black man will not be poisoned by the stereotypes that others have of him. When Stokely Carmichael shouted "Black Power!" in that Mississippi schoolyard, he performed the mythic function that some poet must always perform at the proper moment in history. He gave a name to a development in life of Black America which was happening anyway, and which needed naming so we could talk about it and think about it.

The movement towards black power, under other names, has had a long and honorable past. If it has become the dominant tone of black people's emotions and thoughts in the last two or three years, that is only because the accretion of time and frustration has turned incipience into actuality.

My blackness has been the dominant fact of life's experience, as it is the dominant fact of life of every black man in America, and perhaps in the world. Because of the white man's rape of Africa, because of the ignominy of slavery, because of the long and barbarous history of segregation and discrimination, black people are strangers in this, the American village. Because white Americans and white Europeans have developed the ideology of racism to justify these sociological and historical experiences, I am a stranger in this village. But from another point of view, because I am a man, because I have been reared on the words though not the facts of Christianity and democracy, I am also an inhabitant and, in a strange sort of way, a citizen of the village.

MUCH OF the history of Black America is dominated precisely by this contradiction. It has been told one thing—democracy, freedom, "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal"—it has lived quite another: slavery; the Ku Klux Klan; white liberals so concerned with black people that they will tell them exactly what they ought to do, what they ought
to become, what they ought to want; schools that don't teach us; promises from the Supreme Court which turn to ashes; churches that fail to practice what they preach.

That is why we have been forced to fall back on our own resources. For you cannot be a stranger always. To be continuously strange is to pay a psychological price so great that no people can endure it forever. When Black America, then, turns to blackness it has no apologies.

Perhaps the most tragic aspect of being black is the situation in the schools. Some fifteen years ago the Supreme Court issued its desegregation decision. Yet, more black children than ever—North and South—attend segregated schools. They face many teachers who are convinced their pupils are incapable of learning. Their schools are largely for still another generation of porters and domestics.

Even if you could integrate black and white bodies, this does not solve the problem of integrating their minds. Curricula in most of the nation's schools are intellectual monuments to racism. Curricula are not integrated. Black youngsters learn about the great achievements of Italian explorers, Greek philosophers, French revolutionaries and English kings. But their own heritage is ignored or dismissed as "barbaric."

Inadequate health facilities, inferior education, chronic unemployment, substandard housing, are among the general conditions which create dynamite in the ghettos. Yet when the ghetto explodes with frustration, despair, and hopelessness, the larger society becomes indignant and utters irrelevant cliches about maintaining law and order.

**Black America** is fortunate in that our history and culture is more than rich enough so we can find in blackness an advantage, a source of pride, a way to end our estrangement. But there is another side to this. Even though I may find in black culture a way not to be so strange anymore, that is not enough. For my estrangement has also included my powerlessness. I have not only been a stranger in the village, but I have also been a stranger without power. There are times in history when strangers have had sufficient power to keep themselves at least supplied with the necessities for decent living. This has been true of many like the Irish and Italians who came as strangers to American shores. It has not been the case with Black Americans. We have been kept strangers, in part at least, because our strangeness has provided the white Americans with a cheap source for the hewing of wood and the drawing of water.

Black folks are learning, some for the first time, that they are persons of worth, that they are heirs of a glorious past who can inherit a glorious future, that, therefore, they can achieve. Self-awareness, self-esteem, self-dignity—these are among the objectives of black power.

Some of the more militant blacks have even adopted a style of separatism, much like that of the Catholics who withdrew into themselves to consolidate their political power in the cities and eventually sent one of their sons to the White House. It is much like the style of all minority groups in this country who, before they could be integrated into the American mainstream, developed economic and political power among themselves so that eventually they could bargain from a position of strength rather than beg from a position of weakness.

Ever since its volatile, 1966 rebirth, the black power ideology has been primarily a cultural movement celebrating the beauty of the black physiognomy, the glories of ancient black civilizations, and the essential tragedy and triumph of the black experience in America. Afro hairdos, colorful dashikis, a blossoming of black theater, an explosion of black studies, have been among the more obvious aspects of a value transformation still germinating in the black community. Without a doubt, this "cultural revolution" has helped blacks generate pride in themselves and their cultural creations, but the essence, the very soul of this country is power—pure, unadulterated, raw, naked power.

Blacks do not have a grip on any of the six basic levers of economic and political power in America. They do not control large accumulations of private wealth, any of the 200 largest corporations, any part of the military-industrial complex which overlaps these corporations, the federal and state governmental apparatus, the crime syndicate, or organized labor.

Black income is half and black unemployment nearly three times the national average. Not one black firm ranks among the 500 largest U.S. corporations, only two are listed on a major stock exchange, and black-owned businesses are less than one per cent of the five-million U.S. total. Only forty-six black-owned insurance companies border on business bigness, but all of them lumped together control only 0.2 per cent of the industry's total assets, and together, they are smaller than the 60th largest white insurance firm. The biggest black-owned bank does not even rank as one of the nation's 1,000 largest.

What little self-determination blacks do achieve will come about largely through political maneuvering. It is certainly more persuasive than suicidal notions about armed revolution or wistful notions of a geographically separate black nation in the United States. The city administrations in Gary, Indiana, and Cleveland, Ohio, merit careful scrutiny as working models of organized black political power. If nothing else, they provide blacks vitally needed opportunities to gain the political skills and experiences already attained by other ethnic groups.

**These opportunities are long overdue.** Historically, while blacks were still shackling off slavery, Irish Catholics were becoming big city bosses of corrupt but efficient political machines, and Jews were breaking through the power structures of certain states and cities where
they already had a numerical clout. In recent years, the Italians and the Poles have made their political presence felt in certain urban areas. But with rare exceptions, blacks have played a minor role in political history.

Today, numerous blacks in the South still are not permitted to register and vote. This is true even though black registration has nearly doubled to 740,000 in the six states covered by the 1965 voting rights act. Only 62 per cent of the South's voting-age blacks are registered as compared with 78 per cent of voting-age whites.

In the North, black political impotence is not too dissimilar, despite heavy concentrations of blacks in urban areas. Only one black serves among the 100 U.S. senators. Only nine or about two per cent of 435 U.S. representatives are black.

CLEVELAND AND GARY symbolize the increasing importance of black political power in major cities. Instead of just pressing for community control of schools, hospitals, and other institutions in their communities, blacks can now plan realistically to control entire cities. Their stewardship of resources controlled by municipal officials could be the key to the development of black political power that speaks to the needs of the black masses. There probably is no more logical a source of money for such a development. The black poor are very poor, indeed, and they are trapped in an economy dominated by large-scale corporations, in which would-be entrepreneurs have far less likelihood to succeed than in the more open economy of the past.

Nor can much be expected of efforts to unionize blacks; for many of them, if they work at all, are in occupations too marginal and dispersed to be organized effectively. Moreover, the black middle classes will not lead a separatist political development. Substantially absorbed into white institutions, they cannot be enticed back unless handsome occupational rewards are available. Indeed, most members of the black middle class apparently feel the regular political mechanisms have not failed and are capable of solving black problems and achieving a desired goal of equality.

To overcome these obstacles to the development of black political power, then, black control of city hall seems a reasonable first step. This will be increasingly possible during the coming decade because of the black immigration and the white emigration which characterizes most of the nation's larger cities.

Black mayors in seventeen cities can be a reality by 1977. But what purpose is to be served if black people seize political control of their urban misery? With the control of city government blacks will be strategically situated to exercise a significant degree of political and economic leverage. A broad range of appointive offices, the tax mechanism, and the disbursement of municipal revenues will be in their hands. They will be able to tailor law enforcement and education to their needs and prevent recurring incursions on the ghetto of urban renewal, highway construction, and public works programs. They will be in a position to divert funds now being spent on others less in need to improve ghetto services and facilities, to fix budget allocations for services and projects, approve construction plans, and pass on requests for state and federal grants.

Each of these decisions will be occasions to exact concessions from other groups. Employers who want city contracts can be induced to hire and promote blacks, and unions can be opened to blacks by blocking approvals for new construction or by threatening to reform archaic building codes on which their jobs partly depend. Black municipal government can override resistance to public housing in white areas and enforce bans on discrimination in the rental and sale of housing.

Finally, strong local organizations capable of promoting electoral participation and assuring discipline will contribute to greater black influence in national politics. To build such organizations, black leaders will need the public office platform to articulate black interests and public office resources to reward their followers. The city is a beachhead for black political power.

Black people in America, by themselves, may be able to muster the means to defend themselves against absolute repression and achieve some political power, but alone they cannot liberate the total society. For such a function they may act as a catalyst or a leading force; but the completion of the struggle will require an alliance with broad and diverse sectors of American life.

From the black and white liberals we need the organizational skills and the knowledge of how to use existing institutions. From the black power advocates we need the new sense of black pride, the awareness of the crucial importance of power relationships, the concern for the poor and the disinherted, the plain, courageous militancy. From the white radicals we need their willingness to commit themselves to total change, their conviction that only a true, fraternal alliance can reconstruct this society.

AND WE MUST be prepared. That preparation requires more than study; it also requires the kind of insight, understanding and application of what comes from study and discipline and a sharply-felt awareness of and a compassion for the world and the people within that world. It requires not only intellectual preparation, but emotional preparation as well, a willingness, even a compulsion, to enlarge upon what we've learned, and then successfully engaging this knowledge to solve problems, large and small. It requires scholarship, citizenship, service, character, and leadership. Most of all it requires working together. Together, we can turn promise into progress. Together, we can turn darkness into light, despair into hope.
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Kevin Phillips, author of The Emerging Republican
Majority, is special assistant to the Attorney
General in the Nixon administration. He is a
leading advocate of the view that the Republicans
can build a majority by concentrating on the
South, the West, and "Middle America."

T HE 1968 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION marked the end of
the liberal, New Deal era of American politics. We
are beginning a new cycle, an era of New Federalism,
as the President has called it, which will be rooted not in
the fading big cities but in suburbia, the American Heart­
land, and the boom corridors of Florida, Texas, Arizona,
and California.

For a century and a half, American politics has moved
in 32-36 year regimes or cycles, and the time seems to be
upon us again now. Other recent developments support
this concept. In the past, major population shifts have
generally triggered a new cycle. So has the atrophy and
obsolescence of an old regime. As of 1968, thirty-six
years, the usual life of a political cycle, had passed
since the start of the New Deal in 1932. Large-scale
movement of Southern Negroes into Northern cities, to­
gether with a suburban counter exodus of whites, has re­
drawn America's population map.

Moreover, the once-innovative New Deal has become
a tired, affluent, and arrogant Liberal Establishment. If
history follows precedent, the confluence of these factors
signals a political upheaval in motion, the beginning of
a new cycle. This cyclical framework is not a rigid, in­
falible rule, but it offers a useful, generalized back­
drop against which to consider the idea of an emerging
Republican majority. The nature of the new majority—
or potential majority—seems clear. It is largely white and
middle class. It is concentrated in the South, the West, and
suburbia. It is largely conservative, but it has a num­
ber of unconservative outlooks as well.

On the basis of the 1960, 1964, and 1968 ele­
dions, the South, the West, and suburbia are the regional bul­
warks of Republican presidential strength. Political par­
ties do not shift gears overnight, especially when they
have this degree of momentum behind them. They pur­
sue the impetus and trend which put them in office. The
ruling politicians of the Grand Old Party will continue to
look in these directions.

NEVERTHELESS, talk about the Nixon Administration
writing off the Northeast is foolishness. The President
carried Vermont, New Hampshire, Delaware, and New
Jersey in 1968, and he is aiming to do much better in
1972. The 1969 New Jersey election results underscore
this opportunity. The President may not do as well in the
Northeast as he does in other regions, but he should still
carry a majority of the eleven Northeastern states.

Within the Republican party, a major fight is raging
between liberals and conservatives and between North­
esterners and Southerners and Southwesterners. It is
within the Republican Party, and no longer the Demo­
cratic Party, that the great sectional, ideological, and pro­
grammatic issues of the day are now being fought out
and resolved. Throughout American political history, one
of the parties has always been the major, decision-mak-
ing one, and the other has played a minor, responsive role. If the great decision-making of the decade is shifting to the Republican Party, then that raises still another sign of cyclical change.

What is the strategy of the Nixon Administration? Is it aimed at the "silent majority" of "forgotten Americans"? Observers generally agree that the Administration has targeted a constituency and established priorities based on those problems which are of the greatest concern to the Nixon Administration. Those critics who posit this couplet "people" and "those with power" as the foundations for old and new programs, respectively, will find that the Nixon Administration has restored the balance of the social action-constituency by leaving out "the people" and targeting the "those with power." But if history is precedent, the "those with power" can be appealed to in political and socio-economic terms; so can any constituency. But Middle America can benefit the entire nation.

To some people, the terms "Middle America" and "forgotten American" are code words of reaction, constituencies of nationalism. They can be appealed to in negative terms; so can any constituency. But Middle America is really "the people"—the man in the street—and "the people" is an idea—and a constituency—central to American democracy. If you picture Middle America in geographic and socio-economic terms, it is a combination of the South, the West, and the blue-collar and middle-class North, quite similar to the coalition that Richard Nixon put together in 1968. Those critics who posit this Middle American grouping as essentially negative would do well to look at their history books. From the era of Thomas Jefferson right down to the New Deal, the constituencies that now make up Middle America have been the horsepower of national progress.

This is the political ancestry of Middle America, and of what may be an emerging Republican majority. It is a good ancestry, a positive ancestry. Some people will say that the Jefferson, Jackson, Bryan, and Roosevelt revolutions all came from the Left, and that they have nothing in common with the slow-moving Middle American bent of the Nixon Administration. However, past political upheaval in the United States has not come from the Left but from the people. The elites engendering popular revolt were economic elites, landed or industrial elites committed to economic conservatism. Thus, popular change had to come from the Left. No more. Technology and economic growth have raised the old working-class constituency to a new affluence, enlarging the old middle class into Middle America.

At the same time, a separate and antagonistic new Establishment has grown at the top of American society. This is the historically unique Liberal Establishment. In the past, Establishments were tyrannies of no-change: landowners, industrialists, people whose affluence was rooted in stability. The new Establishment is liberal, a tophyhood of change, people who make their money out of plans, ideas, communication, social upheaval, happenings, excitement.

This new Liberal Establishment—the media, the knowledge industry, research and development, the universities and think tanks, the foundations and corporate conglomerates—is to the left of prevailing American opinion. It is to the left of dustbowl Oklahoma; it is to the left of Levittown; it is to the left of Main Street. The average American is fed up with the excesses of the Liberal Establishment. He is fed up with change for change's sake, with calculated erosion of middle-class values and standards, with fashionable liberal bigotry towards Irish, Italians, Poles, farmers, suburbanites, and blue-collar workers. For the first time in history, it is possible that corrective popular upheaval can only come from the Middle American Right.

The emerging Republican majority—or at least the emerging Republican coalition—is a unique combination of the two American political mainstreams. It reaches beyond the South, the populist West, the lower-middle-class urban areas, and other parts of the historic Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, New Deal mainstream of popular politics. Both Middle America and the emerging Republican majority also include the rural, small-town, and suburban North. And much of this electorate is the historic constituency of the Federalists, the Whigs, and the old conservative Republican Establishment. This is the old standpat electorate. The traditional status quo vote.

Although elements of the conservative and popular mainstreams seem to be joining together in a new politics of Middle America, they have never meshed before in any lasting way. If the new coalition works, this could be another creative and enduring popular political era, one that tears down obsolescence and builds anew. If it doesn't, this could be a short-lived Whig era, a basic marking of time, a standpatism, a mere rearranging of existing programs and institutions that breaks no really new ground. No question is more crucial to the American political future and to the legitimacy of the idea of Middle America.

Many parts of the Republican Party are not comfortable with the new popular politics of the South, West, and lower middle-class city sidewalks. They prefer the Whiggery of moderation, of reshuffling the status quo. This presents a real and important paradox. Many of the areas of the country that today claim the label "conservative" are the unconservative areas of our political history, the areas of anti-Establishment insurgency. And liberalism is most outspoken in many of the old status quo conservative bailiwicks. But if history is precedent, only the popular cause can shape a creative new era.
POLITICAL OUTLOOK 
IN THE SEVENTIES

By ROMAN PUCINSKI 
U.S. Representative 
from Illinois

Among the domestic problems that will most trouble Americans during the next decade are pollution, overpopulation, poverty, crime, and, in general, what seems to be a deterioration in the quality of life enjoyed by most Americans, despite the ever-increasing national growth. Most of these problems will exist in, or result from, the crisis in our cities. Because there is no indication of a slowdown in urbanization or rapid solutions to any of these problems, much of the attention of America's legislators and other elected officials in the 1970's will be focused on the urban crisis.

It has been predicted that by the end of this century, 100 million persons will be added to the population of the United States. That is as many people as now live in Britain and France combined. If present trends continue, it is estimated that most of the 300 million Americans in the year 2000 will be concentrated on a very small proportion of the nation's land area. Seventy-seven percent of the coming 300 million Americans would live on eleven percent of the land, excluding Alaska and Hawaii, and only twelve percent of the population would be outside urban areas of 100,000 or more population. A recent report of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development predicts that our present population may double in 69 years that is, in the year 2036 the population of the United States may reach 400 million.

Yet, most of us will agree, it will not take 69 years before we begin to feel the discomfort of over-population. Certainly, the inhabitants of Harlem already feel it. I read recently that if we all lived as crushed as the people of Harlem, the total population of America could be squeezed into three of the five boroughs of New York City. At some point, the whole earth will be as crowded as Harlem—or worse. But today, our problem is due less to population than to the lopsided way in which we grow.

For more than a century, a condition which has been described as “rural push-urban pull” has been working to change the balance between our rural and urban population centers. The flow of the population from soil to concrete has been under way for more than one hundred years. Technology dispossessed millions of farmers, setting in motion a mass migration of ten million Americans from rural, often backward, heavily black, and Southern counties to the cities.

They carried with them all the upset of the uprooted, with its inherent psychological and economic conflict. Families lost their savings and home equity values along with their most deeply cherished associations. Communities lost and continue to lose today with the continuing migration, their tax base for public services. Community institutions wither. When they get to the cities, some of the migrants are too ill-prepared, too sick, or too poor to adjust to city life successfully, and many of them end up on the public dole.

Although many young people desert rural hometowns to seek excitement in the cities, the primary motivation for this migration is economic necessity. The movement of people from smaller to larger places is, to a large extent, involuntary, forced migration. The people go where the jobs are. For the most part, employers have not been free
to create jobs just anywhere, either. They have been bound by considerations of economic efficiency like the location of raw materials and markets and the transportation cost differentials of alternative locations. As a result, the basic pattern of population distribution has been designed by the play of economic forces, not by men acting rationally as environmental architects.

In recent years, the migration from cities to suburbs seems to be just as rapid. And so, in fact, we have an urban push-suburban pull to equal the rural push-urban pull of the past and present. City dwellers distressed by the influx of the inexperienced, often destitute, newcomers from rural areas flee to the suburbs.

In the 1940's, half the metropolitan increase was in the suburbs; in the 1950's it was two-thirds; in the 1960's, the central cities stopped growing while the suburbs boomed. Not only people left the central city, but jobs, too, thereby creating a whole new set of economic and logistic problems. Between 1945 and 1965, 63 percent of all new industrial building took place outside the core of the city. At present, 75 to 80 percent of new jobs in trade and industry are situated on the metropolitan fringe. For the blue collar worker who can afford to move to the suburbs or who can commute, there are jobs. For those stuck in the city the alternatives were work in small competitive plants hungry for cheap labor or no work at all.

In many large and older cities the center city is populated, for the most part, by poor black people, some of whom must commute to jobs in the suburbs. The suburbs are populated increasingly by middle-class whites who commute into the city, where most clerical and administrative jobs are available. The more affluent suburban-dwellers pay taxes in the counties surrounding the cities. In the cities, where there is great need for tax revenue, an increasing proportion of the population pays little or no taxes. The city dwellers, especially those who live in the ghettos which exist in every city, are prey to that universal urban malady—density.

I find it difficult to doubt that this overcrowding, or density, had a lot to do with the urban riots of the past few years. For the black city dweller has problems other than crowding. The Kerner Commission (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders) used Social Security Administration data from 1964 to show that 30.7 percent of non-white families in central cities, as opposed to 8.8 percent of white families, lived in poverty—on less than $3,335 per year for a family of four. Poverty was twice as prevalent among non-white families with female than with male heads, and a quarter of all non-white families were without a father in the home.

As population in general is concentrated, so are poverty, crime, drug addiction, family breakdown, and every other form of social problem. Social evils associated with poverty tend to be mutually reinforcing when the poor are herded together in concentrated masses—as studies of housing populations, for example, have clearly shown.

Racial tension and rioting are not limited to big cities, to be sure, but in their most terrifying aspects they seem to be. Perhaps most important of all, the problem of unemployment and underemployment of the urban poor appears all but insoluble in the largest urban complexes because transportation systems just cannot economically link the inner cities where the poor live with the scattered suburban sites where the new jobs are being created.

There is, indeed, a political, or administrative, crisis in our cities. Demands for day-care centers, senior citizen halls, teen-age recreational programs, welfare, medical care, job-training, home-making, vocational rehabilitation, and a vast array of housing and renewal programs are all new problems for the political system. These are demands that were once the domain of the private sector—not the extended family, ethnic groups, and religious organizations. Now they are elements of a public sector that was not designed to handle them.

The process of urban politics has over the years moved from a concern with citizenship to a concern with what has been called "consumership." Urban governments are now viewed through the lenses of the marketplace simply as providers of public goods and services. No longer do the better educated upper-middle-class and the professional strata of our population have rooted commitments to one area or one location. Political change takes time and a high tolerance for frustration, two commodities that can be supplied only at great personal cost by this mobile corporate and professional elite. Thus the citizens who have always been looked to for leadership to improve conditions may simply choose to move on to an area where the public goods they desire are more available. They have forsaken their local citizenship and, in so doing, have left a vacuum to be filled by the bureaucracy.

This nation's economy will reach $1 trillion early in 1971. By 1980 that trillion dollars will be doubled. The problems which we can anticipate in the wake of this enormous economic growth are literally beyond description and the body politic will have to come up with solutions. Those most aware of the crises in our cities are our city dwellers. But a recent Harris Survey, published in June, 1969, shows that while 60 percent of the American people say they feel a sense of urgency about the plight of the cities and favor decisive action to solve racial and housing problems in the urban centers, the public is unwilling, by 69 to 25 percent, to put more of its own money behind its stated convictions.

There is movement in this direction at the federal level. Secretary Romney recently announced the funding of a whole new community in Minnesota for four thousand people at a cost of some $821 million. This is the first demonstration project in what Romney calls the "de-urbanization of America." We, of course, shall watch its progress with great interest for its success or failure will have a profound influence on the politics of the '70's. Those politics will require courage to reverse the trend and demand that the suburban areas as well as the rural areas must absorb some of the nation's 22 million poor and poverty victims. The cities can no longer absorb this huge influx of poverty's children and expect to survive; the highly touted Model Cities Program will at best bring token relief to the crisis of our cities; the total relief must come in an awareness that this tragic concentration of poverty begets generations of new problems.
Conway mural in the new Kansas City federal building. Other outstanding Conway murals are in the First National Bank of Tulsa and the Brown Shoe Company building in Clayton, Missouri. The Kansas City mural was painted in 1968.
"What am I going to do when I retire?" Fred Conway retorts with that high-pitched laugh that has become a Conway trademark, "Why, I'm going to paint—seven days a week and nights too. Since 1916 I've been trying to get a spot in the right place and I'm going to keep on trying."

After forty-six years on the faculty, Fred Conway will end his teaching career at Washington University's School of Fine Arts this June. During that span of nearly half a century, Conway has earned an international reputation. He has studied and painted in Paris and Venice and North Africa; he has created murals, taught as a visiting professor, and served on art juries from one end of the country to the other. Yet, he always has been and he remains today a St. Louis artist. In many ways, he is the St. Louis artist.

Fred Conway followed a golf ball to Washington University. Almost from the day he was born in St. Louis in 1900, Conway has been drawing. "I've been drawing as long as I can remember," Fred relates. "As a kid I was always drawing at school and at home, in the kitchen, in the living room, in the bathroom, everywhere." For almost as long, he's been playing golf. In fact, getting that little ball in the right place on the green has been almost as important in Conway's life as getting that little spot in the right place on the canvas.

After Fred graduated from Soldan High School, he worked briefly as a printer's devil, devoting his spare time to his twin loves of art and golf. When he was sixteen, Fred was attending night art classes at a school on Grand and Olive run by the artist Robert Bringhurst. During the day, he managed to get to the Forest Park golf course as often as possible.

It so happens that in 1916, as today, the ninth hole of the Forest Park course was right across Skinker Boulevard from the University's Art School. Soon, Fred found it hard to keep his eye on the ball.

"In those days there was a sunken garden next to the Art School," Fred remembers, "and every day that garden was filled with pretty young girls. I got so interested finally that I went over and signed up."

"I'll never forget my first day in class," Fred relates. "My first teacher was Victor Holm. At the end of that
first day, Mr. Holm came up behind me, took one look at my work, and then grabbed a huge piece of charcoal and slashed my paper to pieces.”

After awhile, Fred began to fare a little better with his teachers. He learned a great deal at the school, but he also learned much on his own—sketching, drawing, painting and, as he puts it, “learning to see.”

While still in school, Fred was asked by a St. Louis family to give art lessons to their invalid boy. Fred soon became an unofficial member of the Gladney family, and when he finished school, the Gladneys gave the young artist two years in Paris as a graduation gift.

For a young painter, to be in Paris in the early twenties was to be thrust into the very heart of the modern art movement. Unfortunately, Fred knew not a word of French, he had no one to introduce him to the leaders of the revolution in art then going on all around him, and his instructors at Julian’s Academy and the Académie Moderne were trying desperately to pretend that the early Cubists and the rest of the artistic rebels didn’t exist. “Most of the leaders of the modern art movement were all around me when I was in Paris,” Fred remembers, “usually no farther away than the next table at a sidewalk café. But I wasn’t ready for them. I soon decided that none of those guys knew how to draw!”

Looking back, however, Fred realizes that he learned a great deal in spite of himself. “I didn’t understand what these guys were trying to do when I was in Paris,” he says, “but when their work got to America a few years later, I was ready for it. I’m glad now that I didn’t swallow it all whole in Paris, but that it had time to sink in.”

To Conway, the experience merely served to illustrate one of his most important dictums. “There’s no hurry about when you get it—the main thing is to get it.”

Back from Paris, full of new impressions and ideas and with two years of painting in France and North Africa behind him, Fred joined the University faculty in 1924. He quickly fell into a pattern that has remained essentially unchanged for forty-six years: teaching young people with unrelenting zeal and enthusiasm and understanding; conducting special classes after hours for children and housewives and anybody else interested in painting; taking on huge murals or designing stained glass windows; experimenting in every media and in countless styles and approaches; constantly seeing, paint-
“It’s all very simple,” Fred maintains. “Unless you’re one of those rare ones who have been touched by the hand of God, you’ve just got to work like hell.”

Conway has often been asked why he stayed in St. Louis all these years and didn’t sometime along the line gravitate to New York or Paris or one of the other world centers of art. “I was too busy trying to get that spot in the right place,” he says. But then he goes on to point out that St. Louis has long been an exciting, important art center. “That’s mainly due to some great people—guys like Perry Rathbone, who was director of the City Art Museum for years, and Morton D. May, whose devotion to art and whose encouragement of young artists has been of tremendous importance. Most important probably has been Ken Hudson and the people he brought to the Art School through the years.”

Kenneth E. Hudson, who retired last year after thirty-one years as dean of the University’s School of Fine Arts, is credited by Conway with making the Art School a great one and the city a flourishing art center.

“Look at the people Hudson brought here,” Fred says. “People like Burlin and Gustin and Milovich, and more recently, people like Arthur Osvir. The list is endless. Hudson built a first-rate faculty and he kept a steady stream of illustrious visiting firemen coming through the school as artists-in-residence and visiting professors, and guest lecturers.”

Hudson’s greatest coup, Conway agrees, was bringing Max Beckmann, the leading German expressionist, to the faculty in the late forties. “I’ll never forget when I first learned about it,” Fred reminisces. “Hudson and I were riding along one night on the City Limits streetcar when Ken suddenly turned to me and said, ‘What would you think if I brought Max Beckmann here?’ Well, I nearly fell off the trolley. After I recovered my speech, I said, ‘Hudson, if you bring Beckmann here, they’ll build a statue to you on Grand and Olive!’”

Hudson did bring Max Beckmann to Washington University and, to the enormous benefit of the faculty and students, kept him here for three years. No statue was ever built to the dean, but the influence Beckmann
"Strange Adventure," encaustic, 1938.

"Mother and Child," encaustic, late 1940's, winner of Hallmark Greeting Card competition.
exerted helped build a great art school.

“What Max Beckmann really did for the School of Fine Arts,” Conway says, “was to give everybody connected with the school the feeling that we had made it to the big leagues. Just having Beckmann there made us feel important and it showed that painting was important to the University.”

The presence of Fred Conway on the faculty all these years has helped sustain that “big league” feeling at the school. Here is an artist who has never grown complacent, never stopped experimenting, never quit searching. He is a superb water-colorist, an esteemed portrait painter, an outstanding muralist, a man who defies being pigeon-holed, classified, or assigned to a school or movement.

In 1949, Fred won the biggest mural competition ever held up to that time in this country. He was selected to paint a mural seventy feet long and thirteen feet high in the lobby of the First National Bank in Tulsa. Fred had never painted a mural before, so he asked Ken Hudson how you went about it. Ken told him how to do a sketch and divide it into squares and then project each square on to the wall.

His first morning on the job in Tulsa, Fred climbed up on the scaffolding with his sketch and an elaborate scheme to project the squares. After an hour or so of concentration, Fred recalls, “I decided to hell with all of this. I threw my sketch away, forgot about squares, and started to paint.”

The Tulsa mural turned out an unqualified success, and since then Conway has done numerous other murals—in the Brown Shoe Company building in Clayton, Missouri, in the downtown St. Louis Peabody Coal Company building, in the Kansas City Federal Building, and many more.

“I don’t know what my best work is, but the ones I feel warmest about are the Tulsa and Brown Shoe Company murals,” Conway said in an interview a few years ago. “A big mural sweeps you into the community. For two years on the Tulsa painting, I was going around like a hog eating corn. There are all sorts of pressures on you to get the details to your satisfaction, to keep control of everything that is happening along the whole wall. It’s like walking on a razor’s edge.”

While he may feel that his murals have been his most satisfying work, Conway maintains that the real test of an artist is the water color.

“When you do a water color, there’s no second-guessing. That’s where an artist shows his fingerprints. With an oil, you can go back and correct your mistakes and repair and patch and do things over. With a water color, there’s no second chance. It’s all attack and no retreat.”

Through all these years, there’s no way of separating Conway the artist from Conway the teacher. As Fred puts it, “You can’t teach painting unless you’ve painted. There’s a hell of a distance between the Pentagon and the front lines, and the only guy who can teach something is a guy who has been in the front lines under fire.”

If Conway has one principle that’s guided him through forty-six years of teaching it’s: “Never forget that students are people.” Fred defines a great teacher as “somebody who’s going your way.” In dealing with students, Fred declares, “I don’t try to teach a student to paint as I do. I have utterly no ambition to make my students like myself. All a teacher needs is to be tremendously dedicated, enthusiastic, and hard-working himself. If he has a reasonable amount of talent in the bargain, he’ll make it.”

Students today may not be basically different from those of forty-six years ago, Conway feels, but teaching today requires a great deal more. “In the old days, you could get by with the old pro approach. You could tell students this is how you do it, step by step, and they’d try to do it. Today, they ask a lot more questions and they want to go it on their own.”

What Conway has always tried to teach students, today and from the beginning, is to learn to see. If he had his way, all students at the University, and not just art students, would take a course in “visual education” to learn to see. “A teacher can help a student learn about techniques and media, but his main job is to help the student teach himself to see.”

This attention to the real fundamentals has made Fred Conway a great teacher through all the years of changing movements and fads and schools in art. He’s learned that “you have to deal with the creative process when it’s alive and bubbling at the moment.”

One thing has changed in teaching over the years, Conway feels, and that is that the whole process is a great deal less formal. “I remember standing up all the time my teachers talked to me or criticized my work. When I want to talk to a student, the first thing I tell him is to get a chair and sit down.”

“After all,” Conway says with that same high cackle, “Nothing I have to say is worth being uncomfortable about.”

Fred Conway


Professor Davis has served as a consultant to the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and recently testified on local draft boards before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, headed by Senator Kennedy. He is the author of *Little Groups of Neighbors: The Selective Service System*. In this article, he concludes that the country will require conscription for the foreseeable future, but that the system needs many changes, including abolition of college and occupational deferments, before the draft can be considered truly equitable.
THE DRAFT DILEMMA

FOR MANY YEARS this country has relied—more or less—on conscription to maintain the size of its armed forces. During World War II and again during the Korean War the draft affected many men and the Selective Service System was a fairly visible agency of the federal government. But in the late fifties and early sixties the Selective Service System and the draft slipped into obscurity—an obscurity that was shattered by the war in Vietnam.

As the need for men began to rise sharply in 1965, more and more men were drafted and others began to realize that their deferments might not offer permanent protection from military service. The Selective Service System regained its former visibility, but it no longer enjoyed widespread acceptance and acquiescence. Rather it became for the first time subject to substantial criticism. Many hard questions began to be asked in the mid-sixties and there appeared to be no immediate answers. Were draft boards representative of their communities or not? Were college men sheltered from military service? Were Negroes and the poor more likely to see military service than sons of the middle class? Would a random selection system be more equitable than a system that provided many deferments and took the remaining men in order of their date of birth?

At a somewhat different level some observers asked about the likelihood of replacing the draft with a voluntary army, and still others speculated on the equity of universal national service.

Aware of the many questions that were being asked and recognizing that the draft and the Selective Service System were under unprecedented criticism from many quarters, President Johnson created in the summer of 1966 the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and appointed Burke Marshall to head it. The Commission carried out a thorough investigation of the Selective Service System and early in 1967 issued a report which recommended extensive changes in the implementation of conscription.

The report of the Marshall Commission was largely ignored by the Congress when the Military Selective Service Act was passed in the summer of 1967. The local board organization was retained and college undergraduate deferments were made a matter of right.

Since the passage of this act several changes have been made in the implementation of the draft. In 1968, the National Security Council advised the Selective Service System that it was no longer essential to grant deferments to students for graduate study except in medical fields. Students who were then enrolled, however, could have their deferments continued and graduate students who taught could apply for occupational deferments. The National Security Council also suspended its list of essential activities and critical occupations, but local draft boards were left with authority to grant occupational deferments based on community need.

A few months ago a random system of selection combined with the drafting of 19-year-olds went into effect—although it has been subject to criticism from statisticians who say that the first drawing was not truly random.

Some changes have also taken place in the system. Local draft boards today contain more minority group members than they did in 1966, and as this is written President Nixon has named a new director. Thanks to the results of several court trials which gave judges an opportunity to review Selective Service operations, the administration of conscription is being brought more and more into conformity with law and the Constitution.

But with all these changes there is still, in my view, a long way to go in the direction of changing the Selective Service System. Certainly the changes that have been made over the course of the last few years have not stilled all criticism nor answered all questions. The Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary (chaired by Senator Edward Kennedy) recently held hearings on Selective Service that resulted in a lengthy list of recommended changes. A Presidential Commission headed by former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates has just re-
ported on the advisability of a voluntary army, and its recommendations are now under study by the White House. Later this year the Senate and House Armed Services Committees may hold hearings on the Selective Service System and its operations.

In any event, the 1967 law expires next year and that will surely be an occasion for debate and perhaps change. While we wait to see what happens there may be merit in sketching briefly some of the changes that in my opinion are required, and in commenting on the merit of other possible changes.

A BUNDANT EVIDENCE leads me to the conclusion that the volunteer local board basis of Selective Service should be abandoned. Full-time civil servants should replace the boards of volunteers. As they exist now, local boards are not likely to be representative of their communities, their membership is not widely known, their actions are subject to variation, and the local board concept itself does not appear to have strong public support. The strongest reason for the continuance of local boards seems to be their present existence, and this is not enough.

Of course, arguments on behalf of local boards can be found. By definition volunteers are cheap, but this is hardly a sufficient reason to rely on them when there are contrary arguments. It may be said that local boards know their communities and can adjust the draft to local circumstances. In fact, there is no evidence that they have or use systematic data with regard to manpower in their communities. In any event, many of a board's registrants may not live within its jurisdiction. (Surely local registrants should be transferrable. It seems strange indeed to tie a man to his local board just as he may be about to leave his locality for college and career.)

Finally, it could well be argued that in the implementation of conscription individuals in like circumstances should be treated alike—regardless of community "need."

Perhaps radical restructuring of Selective Service is not now possible. The only alternative is not the retention of the status quo. Perhaps a "half-way house," between an organization of full-time civil servants and an organization composed of local boards, would be an attempt to upgrade the position of local board clerks and give the position substantially more decision-making authority. (The clerk now may be the only one associated with the board who keeps up on regulations and changes in the law.) The local board would not be disbanded, but would be used simply in the capacity of an appeal board. But unless boards are made substantially more representative and expert than they are now, even this would be open to objection.

In addition to the organizational restructuring that seems to be required, a number of procedural improvements might well be made. To describe them all in detail is impossible in an article of this length, but some can surely be mentioned. The public information practices of the Selective Service System have been much criticized. It has been a hard organization to learn much about, and, on
another level, it has been hard to learn much about the draft from its spokesmen. No information, inaccurate information, and misleading information may all come at various times from local board members and clerks as well as higher level officials. Improvement surely is in order, although it will not be easy to insure that more than 4000 local boards are providing accurate, consistent information. A level of supervision that does not now exist is clearly required.

Whether a registrant should have the right to counsel when appearing before a local board is a controversial issue, but surely, given the complexity of the law in the area of conscientious objection, a man applying for a CO deferment should be entitled to counsel. Perhaps all registrants should have counsel, but this opens up another question: Should counsel be provided? If it is not, then right to counsel becomes a right to be enjoyed only by the informed and affluent.

It seems clear that the appellate or review procedures within the Selective Service System are not what they might be and require improvement. Perhaps counsel should be permitted to argue before appeal boards; perhaps registrants should have the right to appear personally before appeal boards. Now, an appeal board (there is one in every federal judicial district) reviews only a registrant’s file when an appeal is taken and the file may be sparse indeed.

Local boards are not required to explain or justify the decisions they have made, and there may be little or no record of what transpired during a registrant’s personal appearance before his local board. At least a more complete record and perhaps a transcript of the personal appearance should be available to an appeal board.

Beyond these procedural matters there remains the question of induction and deferment. I think the random selection of 19-year-olds is a step in the right direction, although the recent drawing was flawed. Steps should be taken to insure that the next drawing is truly random, for difficulties are inevitable if the local board system of quotas is preserved. Ideally, selection should be made from a national manpower pool.

A most serious defect of the present system is that men with student deferments, occupational deferments, and fatherhood deferments are not subject to call. In my view, and in the view of many other observers, these deferments should be abandoned. There is no reason for them. When draft calls are low (this year they will probably be about 90,000) and the supply of college students is as high as it is today, it is hard to argue that college students must be specially protected from military service. The Kennedy subcommittee has recommended that college students not be deferred in wartime.

I would go further and argue that there is no justification for student deferment at any time. Equity requires that whether a man can go to college or not should have no bearing on whether he will go into armed forces. Particularly now that the draft falls on 19-year-olds, there seems to be no reason to continue occupational deferments or deferments for fatherhood. It should be impossible to avoid service by marrying early and becoming a father.

In general, my view is that a system which limits deferments and exemptions to an irreducible minimum (unqualified men, bona fide hardship cases, conscientious objectors, ministers) is the most equitable system—and at the same time the most simple to administer.

In making these several suggestions for change in the implementation of conscription, I have avoided a question that deserves attention: Is the draft necessary at all? Are there alternatives to it? My own view is that there are not. Although the figures vary and are affected by everything from assumed unemployment levels to the number of men required, all the evidence suggests that a voluntary army would increase military personnel costs by several billion dollars. Where will the money come from is a legitimate question.

Quite apart from the cost question (which I do not mean to minimize), there are numerous other difficulties with a voluntary army. How large a force could be procured? Assuming a need for 2,500,000 men under arms, could this figure be reached?

The flexibility of a voluntary army, or lack of flexibility, is another problem. I am skeptical that a voluntary army could be enlarged or reduced as rapidly as world conditions might require or permit. Another problem relates to the skills required in a modern armed force. Even if enough men can be recruited (which I am not at all sure of) will they possess the requisite aptitudes and skills? I am doubtful.

Finally, there are a host of questions dealing with the role of the military in a democratic society and the possible threat posed by a professional military class. From a very different perspective there is also a question about the attractiveness of military employment in a liberal society. Indeed, it may be that the very values that make the draft repugnant to many would also cause the failure of a voluntary army. For all these reasons, and doubtless others, I think that the Gates Commission Report calling for a voluntary army will not be quickly implemented.

At the end, perhaps a word about national service is in order. This is a superficially attractive proposal that has been around for a long time, but a reasonably careful examination reveals several problems. One is cost. Presumably national service personnel, like Peace Corps and Vista volunteers, would get cost of living allowances and perhaps other benefits. Doubtless there would also have to be an administrative apparatus, and the cost would mount rapidly.

Another question concerns the activities or projects of national service people. What would so many people do? And in the end it is clear that national service would interfere with the life of every young man and woman.

My overall conclusion is that the country will for the foreseeable future require conscription to maintain the strength of its armed forces. I think that it should be conducted in the most equitable manner possible. And it is clear that the present system needs many changes if it is to approach that goal.
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Glenn Skewes, graduate student.

Adolphus Busch, board member from 1895 to 1913.

Stephen P. Schwarzschild, professor of Judaic Studies.
THE BEARD REVISITED

ON THE FACE of it, beards are merely a male fashion fad that changes from generation to generation like women's hemlines. Yet, many today bristle at the very sight of a beard and seem to regard whiskers as a sure sign of irreverence and decadence, if not downright subversion.

There was a time not long ago when the absence of a beard on a grown man indicated a regrettable lack of maturity, stability, and sobriety. Luxuriant chin foliage then marked its wearer as a man of substance, propriety, and probity. On these pages we present a gallery of beards—long, short, plain, fancy, trim, and exuberant—as worn by both contemporary students and faculty members and by some of the University's most distinguished trustees and administrators in the last great Age of the Whiskers.

The beard is currently in great favor not only with rebels and hippies but also with undeniable Establishment types and bonafide squares. How long the present fad will last, nobody knows; maybe it will be just a case of hair today, gone tomorrow.
Robert S. Brookings, President of the University Corporation, 1895-1928.

Hudson E. Bridge, charter member of the Board of Directors.

John McCloskey, sophomore.
THE BEARD REVISITED

C. William Emory, Professor of Marketing, School of Business.

William Greenleaf Eliot, first President of the University Corporation, Chancellor, 1870-87.

William Chauvenet, Chancellor, 1862-69.
THE ANIMATED MR. HARRISON

Many novel ideas never become reality, but for one Washington University alumnus, a good idea, unquenchable enthusiasm, and years of hard work produced remarkable results. Fourteen years ago, Lee Harrison III, an aspiring young graduate of the School of Fine Arts, conceived the idea of a computer that would produce animated images: "a magic box that would allow visually creative men with imagination to create worlds that don't exist."

He went back to school, received a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering in 1959, and is today, at forty, the founder of a new company, Computer Image Corporation, which holds patents on his inventions—two computers that permit an artist to produce animation instantaneously for television, educational, and industrial films, and cartoons.

Those familiar with the process of creating animation by hand can well appreciate this advancement. Traditionally, each second of finished animation represents twenty-four pictures or cells, each drawn and painted by hand, then photographed one at a time in sequence to create motion.

Walt Disney's Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, an 83-minute film and a classic in animation, took 750 artists three years to complete. Using Animac, the more advanced of his two computers, Harrison's company recently produced an eight-minute film for Encyclopaedia Britannica in three days. It would have taken three months by more conventional methods.

An artist-musician turned mathematician-engineer, Lee loves to relate with boyish enthusiasm the adventures and misadventures that brought him to his current status. Harrison's career as an innovator began while he was an art student, when he joined with Don Fisher, then assistant dean of the School of Engineering, and Fisher's brother, Bob, who taught architecture at the University, to form a small company called Ideas, Incorporated.

Nostalgic, exuberant, he recalls his early days as a student. He was, in his own eyes, a bit of an oddball. "In the Art School I was the dumb football player, and in the locker room I was the weirdo artist, but I did letter my first year.

"I played football for Weeb Ewbank his last season as coach at the University, and the first guy I ever tackled was Charlie Winner, now coach of the St. Louis Football Cardinals. At that time, I was just trying out for the team, and there was this little guy in front of me. I was terrified that everyone would know how chicken I am and really smacked him. Whambo, I made the team."

Raised in Belleville, Illinois, Lee comes from a family of Washington University alumni. His father, Lee Harrison, Jr., graduated with a bachelor's degree in civil engineering in 1917; his brother James, now a cardiovascular surgeon, received a bachelor's degree in liberal arts in 1947, and another brother, Tom, now a musician, attended the University for several years. All were members of Phi Delta Theta fraternity. Lee's sister, Helen Harrison Wright, also attended Washington University, graduating in 1955 with a bachelor's degree in fine arts.

Lee fondly remembers the Phi Delts mascot, Scrubby, a huge St. Bernard, who was blind, but had an excellent sense of smell. "Scrubby liked to follow me to class at the Art School. We would stop at the Quad Shop, and I would buy a nickel dish of vanilla ice cream and feed it to him with a spoon. One day he followed me to figure-drawing class and sniffed the nude model with his cold nose. The professor asked me not to bring him again.

"I was taught two things in the Art School: that the greatest thing a man could be was an artist, and that I wasn't worth a damn, in the subjective and popular judgments of the day, as an artist."

A veteran of many campus activities, some legitimate and others less so, he reports, "I was big on firecracker wars. The Phi Delts used to attack the SAE's next door, and I was usually the general. Our attacks were well
A pioneer in the field of computer graphics, Alumnus Lee Harrison III has developed a series of computers that allow an artist to produce animation instantaneously. He is currently chairman of the board, vice president of research, and director of creative techniques for his own company, Computer Image Corporation, which creates computer-animation for television, education, and industry. A 1952 graduate of the School of Fine Arts, he began his working career as an artist, then returned to the University to study engineering.

The Denver offices of Computer Image are equipped with a color television hookup for viewing finished animation. Harrison studies a video-tape of computer-produced imagery.
"Scanimate," has been used to create graphics for television, films, and motion pictures. A television camera scans a piece of high contrast artwork, such as the Washington University "WU," and projects the image on a cathode ray tube. By manipulating the computer controls, an artist can distort the image, causing it to zoom, tumble, or explode.
planned and always drew a crowd, police included. And I loved Thurtene Carnivals. The Phi Delts sponsored a fun house, and I used to cut Danny Dunbar, BSIE '52, in half every twenty minutes.” A natural ham, Lee also had roles in two Quad show productions and was master of ceremonies for Bearskin Follies. In 1955, when he returned from his active duty in the Coast Guard, Lee was asked to return to his alma mater and MC Bearskin Follies again, which he did. This was the first year the show was held in Kiel Auditorium.

After graduation in 1952, Lee traveled to New York with aspirations of becoming a published songwriter, as well as an artist. He submitted some songs to an agent, meanwhile working as a Barker in front of a Times Square movie house. Although nothing came of the songwriting venture at this point, years later he received word that the country singing team of Homer and Jethro had recorded one of his songs, a bawdy little ditty called “Ornaments,” in their release, “A Cool Crazy Christmas.”

In 1956, eager for new vistas, Harrison and a classmate of his from the University set out for Lima, Peru, to record monastery bells as self-appointed reporters for the NBC Monitor radio program. In spite of good intentions and a venturesome spirit, the twosome never made it to Lima, but finally settled in Guatemala City, where Lee obtained a commission to do an eighty-foot mural for Pecos Bill’s Texas Embassy, a hamburger joint.

Lee’s stay in this Pan American capital may well have been the turning point in his career. While he was painting the mural, he first got the idea of inventing a “magic box,” a computer that could create animation. Completely lacking technical know-how, Lee came back to the States determined to study engineering to see if his ideas were remotely feasible.

It was really by chance that he returned to Washington University. Harrison explains, “I decided to go to the University of Illinois, so I went up to Champaign to enroll. It was September, and registration was in progress. After standing in line for four hours, I reached the desk, only to be informed that I was standing in the T line and should, in fact, be standing with the ‘H’s.’” Furious, he drove back to St. Louis and went to see his old friend and former cohort, Don Fisher, who had become dean of the School of Engineering. Fisher was afraid that Lee would fail the stringent engineering curriculum and admitted him somewhat reluctantly. Much to Fisher’s relief, Harrison made the Dean’s List the first semester. Recently, at a 1969 presentation before the Aspen Chamber of Commerce, Lee was able to introduce Fisher, who is now a patent attorney in Colorado, in the following way: “A few years ago he was my dean, tonight he’s my projectionist.”

Harrison tackled engineering and math with a vengeance and has become an enthusiastic mathematician, finding beauty in the workability of concepts and formulas. “I loved my classes in engineering. I was there for a purpose and was constantly searching for keys to my specific problem. Boy! Was I excited when I first encountered the cathode ray tube. It is very basic to my computers.”

In his work today, Harrison still uses a text written by Professor Emeritus Ross R. Middlemiss. Intrigued by the relevance of art to math, Harrison has lectured on art to engineers at New York University and hopes someday to teach geometry to artists.

Soon after he received his engineering degree, Lee moved to Blue Bell, Pennsylvania, where he accepted a job as a research engineer and principal investigator for the Philco Bio-Cybernetics Laboratory. He wanted to work on his invention, but explained, “I was a broke cat, because I’d been in school so long.” In June, 1960, he was married.

At first, Lee worked on plans for his computers on weekends in the attic, pouring so much money into the project that the only heat in his home one chilly evening was the warmth given off by glowing electronic tubes. In 1960, when his ideas became workable, he convinced a group of lawyers, engineers, and businessmen to work with him and to invest in the future of his company. Everybody paid for the privilege of working, and the money went to buy parts and equipment.

By 1961, Lee had saved $2800, enough, he thought, to get the company rolling. He quit his job with Philco and pursued his inventions during the day. At night, his partners came in to help, and the first computer hardware was built. Soon the money ran out, and he became a part-time consultant in bio-cybernetics for Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City. The extra income helped, but didn’t quite cover the cost of supporting a wife, a small child, and an embryonic company.

So he went back to Philco. At Philco, he worked with applying pattern recognition techniques to bio-signals and learned in 1965 that the head of the Denver Research Institute was looking for someone who had expertise in this area. He moved his family and one of his partners to Denver and worked at the Institute as a research engineer until the spring of 1968.

While he was at the Institute, Lee met Myron Smith, a professor in television and the performing arts at the University of Denver. “At that time I didn’t know anything about film and took Myron a brown paper bag filled with little rolls of film produced by the computer. I said, ‘Do you know how to glue this stuff together?’ He said, ‘Edit?’ I said, ‘Yessir.’ And that was my first lesson in film.” Smith became Harrison’s first cinematographer.

In February, 1967, Lee Harrison and Associates became incorporated as Control Image Corporation, with Paul Raiborn, a senior vice president of Paramount Pictures, as the first chairman of the board. A year later, the company had ten employees and had become a full-fledged operation, but it was still greatly in need of financial backing.

Harrison reports, “I went to the board members, who are individually well off, and I told them that in five years we’d be animating with the quality of a Rembrandt. I was enthusiastic, the enthusiasm was contagious, and I came away with a commitment of a quarter of
THE ANIMATED MR. HARRISON

a million dollars." At last the little company was on its feet.
Today, Lee employs fifty persons, most of them with advanced degrees in engineering or the fine arts. In May, 1969, the company, with its new name, Computer Image Corporation, went public, and Harrison has gathered an impressive list of associates and backers. Currently, the president of Computer Image is Bruce L. Birchard, a former vice president of Sony Corporation of America. Thomas B. Smothers III, better known as Tom of the TV Smothers Brothers, is on his board of directors; Lee Weissbrich, art director for Tom Smothers, Paulslen, and Glen Campbell, is on his staff. His star salesman in California is Bob Smith, who some may remember from the early days of television, when he had his own hit show, "You and Your Big Ideas."

With main offices in Denver, Computer Image opened a computer facility in Los Angeles early this year, and is setting up branches in New York, Toronto, and Tokyo to make films and to show how the computers can be used.

HARRISON HOLDS basic patents on image technology used in his two computers: Scanimate and Animac. Scanimate is perhaps the easiest to understand. A piece of high contrast artwork is placed on a light box. A television camera scans the artwork and projects the image on a cathode ray tube which looks rather like a television tube. By controlling a series of switches, the artist can break the artwork into as many as five separately moving components and distort the image on the tube by moving the components horizontally, vertically, or backward and forward, causing it to undulate, explode, zoom, revolve, or twist. To the uninitiated, the process looks very much like an artist controlling the distortion on a television screen.

The animation is created in real time. For example, if a character scrambles across the screen in three seconds, it takes only three seconds for the artist to create that part of the animation. Scanimate can also be connected to a microphone to allow sound to control the movement.

Scanimate has become the "bread and butter" invention of the firm, while the more sophisticated Animac is being perfected. The first Scanimate commercial was for Home Federal Savings and Loan in Chicago. Since then, Computer Image has produced animated imagery for Famous Barr Company in St. Louis, the Bell Telephone Company, U.S. Steel, and Chevron Oil; titles for a Warner Brothers film, The Phynx; and graphics for a number of television shows, including a Smothers Brothers' TV Special.

Scanimate has proved to be highly versatile. For Time-Life Corporation, the firm produced a unique film of the Woodstock Music Festival, animating photographs instead of line art.

Animac, also a digital computer, operates on a different principle. It requires no artwork. Figures, which consist of up to thirty segments or vectors hooked together, are programmed into the computer by the artist and then commanded to move. At the touch of the correct series of keys and buttons, Animac generates, then animates images of almost any form, ranging from letters and numbers to abstracts.

An artist can use his skill and talent to make Animac work for him, and everything he creates is recorded and can be recalled from the computer's memory, eliminating the need to re-draw figures. Once the artist is satisfied with a movement, the sequence is re-projected on a cathode ray tube and filmed by a movie camera in black and white. Color is added during film processing.

The images created by Animac can be controlled by the artist using buttons and knobs or by a person hooked into a special harness. When the person in the harness moves, the animated character on the tube moves in the same way.

Although Lee's enthusiasm is boundless, Animac seems to be its own best salesman. Harrison has invited numerous and varied people to operate the computers, and the reaction is invariably awe. Among those enticed into his lair was the long-time head of the Denver investment firm that took Computer Image public last May.

Lee recalls, "The gentleman came down to see me and to see what his company was getting itself into. I had him talk into the microphone, causing the animated mouth on the screen to move. He said 'Hello, hello, hello,' and the mouth moved simultaneously with the sound. Immediately, he called his senior vice-president and said, 'I don't know what they're doing down there, or how they do it, but I want the deal.'"

At the other extreme, Harrison introduced a skeptical young hippie to Scanimate. After being allowed to operate the computer, his response was: "Man, you've got my soul in there."

ARTISTS AND ANIMATORS, too, have found the computers magical. Saul Bass, who has created many designs for television and film, commented after being shown Animac, "It enables the designer to test and explore instantly whatever visual configurations interest him. The medium suggests fascinating possibilities for experiment."

Much of Harrison's enthusiasm comes from his belief that Scanimate and Animac represent a truly new art form. "Once upon a time," he explains, "I didn't believe in mass communications and television, but I've been converted. Mass communications are where it's at today. These computers represent tools for man to express himself in the modern world. They are creative, electronic, and man can interact with them."

It has been a constant challenge to Lee to obtain support from both artists and businessmen, two groups he feels are usually incompatible. But his diversified staff and contacts indicate that his computers do appeal to both worlds. His staff is composed of men who are equally at home with aesthetic ideas and complex problems, and his work has brought him into contact with artists, celebrities, and businessmen.

One of Lee's favorite anecdotes involves his introduction to one well-known personality. Still a dabbling musician, he recently found himself in a jam session at a party at the home of Tommy Smothers, and relates, "I could really groove with this one cat. Didn't know until after the party that he was folk singer Donovan."
Although Harrison anticipates a good response from commercial film makers, he sees another void that his computers can fill. "One of the major fields ahead is educational film production to teach children graphically, especially the underprivileged. What a well-dressed articulate lecturer can't communicate, animation can." His eight-minute film for Encyclopaedia Britannica, "Growing," won a Gold Hugo Award for an educational short. Computer Image has also produced films for National Educational Television's daytime television show "Sesame Street."

As Computer Image Corporation mushroomed, Lee found he could no longer participate in all aspects of running a company. Now, chairman of the board, vice president of research, and director of creative techniques, he spends most of his time improving the computers, but he admits, "Sometimes I feel a little jealous that I cannot be involved in everything. But the company is too large and it's impossible."

What does Lee have in mind for the future? "Right now developing technology for computers is my whole life. But," he insists, "I have to have a dream to be alive. When I've contributed all I can technically, I'll do something else for the company."

This isn't likely to happen for years to come. Animac is still in the experimental stages, and Lee is intensely involved in the development of Animac II, a more advanced version. The current model creates simple characters, but has not achieved "Snow White" capability. While Scanimate is already a very useful commercial and educational tool, Lee estimates it will take a while to perfect Animac to the point where it will produce sophisticated animation that looks truly three-dimensional.

Still a visionary, Lee is looking ahead to some rather wild developments in the future. He envisions a time when an educator or businessman in New York City, using a picture telephone, can personally watch and direct the progress of computer animation being produced in Los Angeles.

But long before that comes to pass, Lee Harrison III, artist, musician, engineer, inventor, entrepreneur, will undoubtedly have discovered new vistas for his imagination.
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At first glance there is little similarity between the University’s proposed Center for the Performing Arts and Student Activities and the famous plazas of Europe. Yet the similarity is intrinsic and all-important. As the plazas evolved from centuries of adaptation to the human traffic and activity taking place in and around them, so the plan for the Center has evolved. It has been designed by Associated Architects Smith, Entzeroth, and Robert Vickery, associate professor of architecture, around University pedestrian movement with the intent to draw all who pass through into the activities of University life.

The Center, to be created by construction of a theater and multi-purpose building to form an integrated whole with Karl D. Umrath Hall (formerly Lee Hall), establishes a new activities plaza which encompasses the busy pathway between the residence-activities-dining center and the research and teaching areas, through which an estimated 7000 persons a day will pass. To shape this movement, the architects have enclosed the natural pedestrian spine as the central gallery of the new structure, with all activities opening from it.

Almost two years ago, a committee of student, faculty, and staff representatives began to outline priorities for space in the Center. Highest priorities were given to a new teaching theater and to a new University bookstore, and then to two dining areas, an informal snack bar, and a formal dining room where students, staff, and faculty could mingle socially. The committee’s work also uncovered the need for a central information and ticket office for all types of public events, including campus sports, concerts, and plays.

"The conception of the space is as an expandable walkway, linking needed student activities," Vickery comments. "The building will contain multi-purpose rooms and a large unassigned student area, but it is less than realistic to believe that a thriving university with an active, creative student body will not outgrow this space within a few years. We designed the gallery to be lengthened east or west, so that the concept of direct access and natural movement would be maintained."

There is one apparent similarity between the new Center and a typical European plaza—its fountain. Vickery would like to see it named for Mrs. Lois Eliot, wife of Chancellor Eliot. "Mrs. Eliot was the first to point out that despite the grass, trees, shrubbery, flowers, and statuary which make the campus beautiful, one element lacking is the sound of running water. As the focal point of our plaza, the fountain will be a quiet place where friends can meet. Since Mrs. Eliot has always given her time graciously, making it possible for students, faculty, and friends of the University to meet, I'd like to see the fountain named in her honor."
From Forsyth Boulevard visitors will enter a landscaped parking area leading to the main entrance to the Center. Crossing the main lobby, theater- and concert-goers will purchase tickets at an office off the open gallery. The theater, seating up to 800, is to the left of the lobby, the new bookstore to the right. Following the gallery to the right, visitors will enter either the formal dining room on the second level of the east wing, or the snack bar below. Glass wall of the gallery north looks onto the courtyard from all levels.
The tri-level gallery will be a busy thoroughfare with all major areas opening from it. The artist's conception looks east from the main level. Hanging balconies of the gallery and the open stairway serve as lounge areas for students and theater patrons. The glass wall on the north affords a view of the multi-level brick plaza, approximately one-fourth the size of Brookings Quadrangle, which unites the new building with student offices and services housed in Karl Umrath Hall to form a unified student center. At right Architect Vickery discusses the complex which is scaled to match the proportions of Umrath Hall with the theater tower as a counterpart to Umrath's tower-arch.
Main portion of the new building is three-level, with one level below grade which will accommodate student meeting rooms and activities offices. A 5000-square-foot unassigned area beneath the main portion of the plaza connects with the basement of Umrath Hall. At east end the plaza steps lead down to a terrace off the snack bar, with a similar second-level terrace from the main dining room. The area also forms a small amphitheater. Fountain on the west end will be seen from a new plaza entrance to what is now Umrath cafeteria. Plans include renovation of the cafeteria as a student lounge and small musical performance area.

Teaching theater has maximum flexibility with movable walls in the stage area to vary the proscenium opening up to 70-feet wide for dance performances and a rising orchestra pit which forms part of a 'thrust' stage. As a conventional stage with 40-foot proscenium, the theater seats 550. As a modified thrust stage, 800 can be seated in a semi-circle. Ceiling adjusts for acoustical requirements of various types of performances. Fully equipped shops, dressing and rehearsal rooms surround the theater, with adjacent performing arts offices. Dance and theater rehearsal rooms include one equipped with its own sound and lighting systems to enable complete rehearsals while the theater is put to other use.
Washington University's Laboratory for Space Science has been working with samples of every kind of material gathered on the moon by the astronauts of the first two landings. The material includes small rocks, coarse dirt and gravel, lunar soil, and core tube specimens from below the moon's surface. Above: a "moon doughnut," an object only .002 inches across found in the lunar dust. The University's international research team is headed by Robert M. Walker, McDonnell Professor of Physics.
A "dirty" glass spherule with tiny particles of lunar soil clinging to it. The spherules are one of the things that distinguish lunar soil from earth dirt, besides the obvious absence of organic materials. The University team is performing five major types of experiments on the moon samples: measurement of impact pits and studies of stored nuclear tracks, x-ray pattern distortion, thermoluminescence, and differential thermal analysis. Through the studies, they hope to learn about the history of both the moon and the sun.