Barbara Krekeler, arts and sciences sophomore, in her role as campus tour guide, points out the sights to a group of students from St. Louis' St. Mary's High School. Barbara is one of a group of Washington University students who are working as volunteers with the Office of Admissions to inform and counsel high school students interested in coming to the University. See "Student Admissions Aides," page 8.
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"We are determined to deserve support from our alumni, and from corporations, foundations, and individuals. I am confident that if we deserve such support, we will get it."

Chancellor William H. Danforth

"...the legislature of Missouri and our Governor are convinced that state support of private education is vital to Missouri both as sound business procedure and as necessary insurance for the future of the state."

Trustee Chairman Charles Allen Thomas

"Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people."

John Gardner
In an era when costs are rising faster than income, Washington University, like most other colleges and universities, is faced with difficult financial problems. In an effort to cope with the current financial squeeze, additional support is being sought at the same time that stringent operating economies are being put into effect. "Despite the many problems we now face and will face in the immediate future," Chancellor Danforth maintains, "I am confident that Washington University will survive and continue to grow as a first-rate university committed to excellence."

This is a story without an obvious ending, a problem without an easy solution, a puzzle without a quick answer. But, it is a story that a lot of people are betting will have a happy ending after all. In fact, many people are spending huge amounts of thought, ingenuity, and plain hard work to be sure that the story does have a happy ending.

This is the story of the private colleges and universities of this country and the tight spot many of them are finding themselves in during an era when costs are rising far faster than income. It is a time when many of these institutions are being faced with severe restrictions, when some of them are concerned about their very survival, and when virtually all of them are struggling to make ends meet without sacrificing quality.

Any discussion of the role of the private college or university immediately poses the question of why there should be any private institutions of higher learning. Are the private college and the independent university anachronisms? What would be so bad about it, anyway, if all private universities and colleges disappeared and all higher education were supported and controlled by government, state or federal? After all, many state-supported universities are doing outstanding jobs of teaching, research, and community service.

The answers most commonly given are that independent colleges and universities offer a necessary diversity in our system of education, that they provide alternative methods of governance that help keep scholars and teachers free from political control, and that they afford the opportunity to experiment with curricula and institutional innovation. With no obligation to admit every resident of the state with a high school diploma, the independent schools can be much more successful in setting and adhering to high academic standards for admission.

Washington University, of course, shares many of the problems of the other institutions of higher learning in the nation. It has been an independent private university since its founding nearly 120 years ago. Until after World War II, however, its national reputation rested mainly on its great medical school. Washington University as a whole was known as a good, but primarily local university. After the war, Arthur Holly Compton began the deliberate and most difficult task of bringing the rest of the University up to the level of its medical school. Chancellor Compton, and Chancellors Shepley and Eliot, after him, worked diligently and successfully to transform all of Washington University into a national university devoted to excellence in teaching and research. By any objective measurement, they succeeded.

Today, Washington University has an undergraduate student body that is about 80 per cent from outside the St. Louis area, an exact reversal of the pre-World War II ratio of 80 per cent local and 20 per cent out-of-town students. The University was ranked in both the 1965 and 1970 American Council on Education reports as among...
the top twenty-five of all American universities—public or private. In Nobel Prize winners, in National Academy of Science members, in grants awarded by national foundations, by every accepted yardstick, Washington University has made it to the academic big leagues.

Washington University’s rise to national academic stature has been accompanied by an equally impressive increase in the amount of financial support it has received in recent years. Rated among the top twenty-five universities in the country academically, it has recently ranked among the top twenty universities in the amount of private support it receives. The successful conclusion of the University’s “Seventy by Seventy” fund campaign was a striking demonstration of public confidence in the institution, but ironically that same success may hamper current fund-raising efforts because many people seem to think that the campaign met the University’s financial needs for the immediate future. Unfortunately, it did not.

That inevitable letdown at the end of a major fund drive is just one factor contributing to the difficulties involved in raising sufficient funds to close the gap between endowment and tuition income on one hand and increased costs on the other. The depressed economy, changes in the tax laws pertaining to gifts and donations, adverse public reaction to student unrest, all hurt fund-raising efforts.

Fund-raising, however, has not been the major problem. The most powerful pressure on the University’s financial balance has been rising salaries. Salaries in recent years have risen twice as rapidly as the cost of consumer goods. Institutions and industries whose primary expenditures are for salaries are all faced with rapidly rising costs—whether it be the cost of haircuts, medical care, or education. At a university, salary costs are more important, perhaps, than in nearly any other enterprise. A university is not just bricks and stones, not just laboratories and classrooms, dormitories and parking lots; a university is mainly people—and good people cost money.

John Gardner has made the same point in a different way, saying, “Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people.”

The answer to the financial problem does not lie in endless tuition increases. Tuition can be raised only so high if the university is not going to price itself out of the market. Moreover, at Washington University, tuition pays for only about one-half of the average student’s cost of education.

Endowment is also important, and Washington University has a relatively large endowment built up over more than a century. A large proportion of that endowment, however, is restricted to the School of Medicine or to other specific schools, departments, or programs, and the income cannot be used to help meet operating expenses in the central budget.

Actually, the secret to achieving a balanced budget is simple—at least in theory. While one hand is stretched out for help, the other is tightening the belt. At first, belt-tightening seems relatively easy. It requires a close, cold look at the institution’s operations and a resolve to cut all frills, eliminate all needless expenses, and trim all fat. What is learned quickly, however, is that there really isn’t that much fat to trim; that, in fact, while you are in the midst of cost-paring, expenses are rising faster than you can cut. After a while, you begin to think that prudent pruning is not enough and you begin to wonder what major programs and activities might have to be dropped.

Like most other institutions of higher learning, Washington University has been going through this soul-searching process. One important element in the process has been the Priorities Committee, appointed in March, 1971, by Thomas H. Eliot, who retired as Chancellor last July. Dr. William H. Danforth, then Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs and now Chancellor, was named chairman of the Committee, and Executive Vice Chancellor Carl A. Dauten was appointed vice chairman.

The Priorities Committee was charged with studying the University’s central budget in detail and with recommending ways of bringing planned expenditures into line with anticipated income. (The central budget includes all segments of the University except the “reserve” schools of medicine, law, dentistry, and social work, which operate within their own budgets. This explains how the entire University can end its fiscal year “in the black” but still have a deficit in the central budget.)

The basic premise on which the Priorities Committee was established is that the central long-range priority has to be the maintenance of Washington University as a first-class university committed to academic excellence. Working from that foundation, the Committee has looked upon its main task not as one of setting priorities but of recom-
mending ways the budget could be balanced. Yet, every recommendation the Committee makes about the budget necessarily involves priorities. When you recommend spending money on Project A and not spending money on Project B, you are, in fact, dealing with priorities.

During its first academic year of operation, the Priorities Committee and its three subcommittees held thirty-five lengthy meetings. Its members interviewed senior administrators having responsibility for sources of income or budget preparation, examined and studied pertinent source documents, and heard many and varied members of the University community with information or ideas to submit.

In composition, the Committee included, in addition to the chairman and vice chairman, three vice chancellors, five deans, seven faculty members, and three students. Advisors to the Committee included the associate vice chancellor for administrative services, the treasurer, and the director of planning and management studies.

At the end of its first summer’s work, the Committee submitted a preliminary report which made several general as well as specific recommendations. In the report, the Committee pointed out:

The improvement of Washington University’s financial situation must be accomplished in a way such that the University continues to be an attractive and desirable place for students and faculty. At present, talented faculty and first-rate programs attract an able student body from all over the nation. In the long run, the financial as well as the academic health of the University depends upon maintaining an environment that fosters this excellence.

We believe that no large single part of the University should be sacrificed so that other parts can escape financial stringencies. In the academic area, for example, the elimination of a single school would decrease income as well as outgo so that the net gain to other parts of the University would be minimal, if any. Faculty quality cannot be sacrificed to benefit the student body . . . nor can the quality of student life be sacrificed to benefit the faculty; the University will prosper only if it is attractive to students. Similarly, administrative services such as record-keeping, accounting, maintenance, and upkeep on buildings are essential to this large and complex institution.

Operating within this framework, the Committee attempted to make specific recommendations that could lead to increased income or reduced operating expenses. The three subcommittees divided responsibility: one investigated tuition income and administrative and general expenses; a second, graduate school tuition and library expenses; and a third, income and expenditures of auxiliary enterprises and expenditures for the physical plant.

Early in its deliberations, the Committee learned that there were no easy solutions. Obviously, one quick way to cope with the current financial squeeze would be to relax academic standards. Many more students apply to Washington University than are finally admitted. As one member of the Committee put it, “An easy way out would be to open the doors to any student who shows up with a high school diploma in one hand and his tuition payment in the other.”

Another quick solution would be to give up the attempt to attract and keep first-rate faculty members. Faculty salaries could be frozen or cut, teaching loads could be greatly increased, and money would be saved, but eventually all the good teachers and researchers would be gone.

One faculty member of the Committee remarked, “I had to resist a great temptation to recommend taking an ax to anything that wasn’t strictly teaching or research, but when I stopped to think about it, I realized that teaching and research wouldn’t continue for long without the supporting services. Cutting out all the non-academic functions would be like throwing out the baby with the bath water.”

Places where the budget could be cut without risk were not easy to find because the budget-trimming process has been going on for several years already. In the end, the Committee came in with recommendations that would trim about $400,000 off an anticipated budget deficit for this year. The Committee arrived at this figure by combining very carefully thought-out suggestions for increased income with a host of delicate, judicious cuts in operating costs throughout the central budget.

The Committee’s findings and recommendations were then integrated into the whole body of budget information acquired through long discussions with the deans and academic department heads and the careful analyses of the University’s accountants and business experts. On the basis of all of this data, Chancellor Danforth, working with
"Drawing up a university budget is no different from preparing a budget for any other kind of enterprise."

Associate Vice Chancellor Joe Evans

Drawing up a university budget is no different from preparing a budget for any other kind of enterprise, according to Joe Evans. "First you add up all your estimated costs in one column and your anticipated income in another and then try to strike a balance. Your starting point in projecting the coming year's budget has to be the figures for the current year. Then, to your current operating costs you add those additional costs over which you have no control: increased postal rates; higher social security, workmen's compensation, and unemployment payments; increased utility rates; new union contracts; maintenance and operation of new buildings; necessary repairs and rehabilitation of old buildings and other facilities. Only after you have added in these unavoidable increases for the coming year, can you even begin to consider such matters as salary increases or the funding of important and desirable new academic programs.

"You soon find that you are automatically faced with a deficit, unless you can find sources of increased income or places to cut expenses in the existing budget. From that point on, until the new budget is approved and adopted, it becomes a continuous process of finding a few dollars of additional income here or shaving off a few dollars of operating expenses there until you finally arrive at a balanced budget or at least with a deficit that you think you can live with."

When the new budget proposal is finally hammered out, it is then submitted to the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees. The trustee committee, headed by Edwin S. Jones, a prominent banker with long and intimate experience with budgets, goes over the proposal in minute detail. In conference and consultation with the Chancellor and his staff, the trustee committee finally gives its endorsement of a budget proposal that can be submitted to the full Board of Trustees for approval. Everywhere along the line, from the proposals of the deans and department heads and the Priority Committee recommendations to the final approval by the Board, the new budget is subjected to constant revision. The final product is the result of months and months of intensive thought and effort by the faculty, student representatives, the administration, and the trustees.

The 1972-73 budget in its final form is a stringent budget, a lean and tight budget, but a budget that will permit operation of the University without compromising its standards of excellence. It is a budget that predicts a deficit, but a relatively slight one, and moreover a deficit that can be termed truly unavoidable.

The process is underway again this year. The Priorities Committee is meeting once more, although its name has been changed to the Budget Advisory Committee to reflect more accurately its real function. Next year, the 1973-74 fiscal year, the University will again be faced with the possibility of a deficit unless additional places to cut costs can be found and unless greater amounts of support are received from both government and private sources. But there are good reasons for optimism.

A most encouraging recent development was the passage by the state of Missouri of a bill providing state aid to private colleges and universities. At the 1972 Commencement ceremonies, Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, chairman of the University's Board of Trustees, said, "Passage of this foresighted legislation is concrete proof that the legislators of Missouri and our Governor are convinced that state support of private education is vital to Missouri both as sound business procedure and as necessary insurance for the future of the state."

There is hope, too, in greater federal aid to higher education in future years. Bills designed to aid higher education have passed both houses of Congress recently and there is good reason to believe that there will eventually be a program of effective federal aid to higher education in this country.

"Despite the many problems we now face and will face in the immediate future," Chancellor Danforth maintains, "I am confident that Washington University will survive and continue to grow as a first-rate university committed to excellence. We are determined to deserve support from our alumni and from corporations, foundations, and individuals. I am confident that if we deserve such support, we will get it."
For nearly 120 years, Washington University has been an important part of the St. Louis scene. Despite current financial problems, University leaders are confident that the institution will continue to flourish as a nationally recognized center of higher education.
STUDENT
ADMISSIONS
COMMITTEE

THERE'S SOMETHING genuine and old-fashioned about the Student Admissions Committee at Washington University. It's a group of people who work together because they care, because they think what they're doing is important, and because they like what they're doing.

The Committee is made up of a group of undergraduates who work closely with staff members of the University's Admissions Office on recruiting and admission-related activities. Many of its members and workers commit themselves to long, regular hours of University work.

Sue Milton, last year's chairman, put in eight to ten hours a week on committee work. Why? "I want to do something for the school, because I like it."

Bruce Millinger, next year's chairman, worked for the Committee as a sophomore whenever he was asked, even though his application for membership that year had been turned down. "It's just fantastic work. You can't describe the thrill of having some freshman hail you in the fall with 'Hey, Bruce. Don't you remember me? You were my tour guide last spring.'"

Barbara Krekeler spent an hour a week last semester taking visitors on tours of the campus and answering questions. "I really love Washington University and hope it rubs off. I might help get a good student to come here."

Ben Sandler, the admissions officer directly charged "vith Student Committee responsibility, says, "They do things that the professional staff can't. I can't tell prospective students what it is really like to live on campus. I can't see our publications from an undergraduate viewpoint. I can't evaluate a certain contemporary quality of an applicant's folder in the way that the students can."

But the wholesome, sincere, apple-pie-and-mother attitude which permeates the whole of the Committee and its operation is summed up in a tale involving a plan to pay students for services as tour guides.

Several years ago, having decided to try using students as regular guides for campus visitors, the Admissions Office recruited its first group without mentioning that it hoped to put them on the part-time payroll. When the students discovered that they were to be paid, most of them were upset. They told the Admissions Office that they weren't doing the job for money, but because it was something they had volunteered to do. When payday came, some of the students reconsidered and cashed their checks, but the majority decided to donate them to the University library fund. Now all the Committee members are unpaid volunteers.

Ted McDonald, associate director of admissions, suggested, "Ask some of the students now how they would feel about being paid for their time and services." One young man thought about it for awhile and then said with a grin, "I'm not too sure I could turn the money down, so I'm glad it's not being offered anymore."

A half-dozen students and questions later, this attitude begs the question of what inspires such loyalty. Maggie Dagen, who as a staff member works closely with Committee members, suggests one possibility: "There just isn't any make-work involved. What the students do is real, and they work hand-in-hand with us to see that what we do is real. We're all better off for the experience."

Ben explains that, although the primary purpose of the Committee is to interest secondary school students in Washington University, "We also try to plug Committee members into our decision-making. We haven't yet fully tapped their potential for constructive criticism of our practices."

STUDENTS SIT IN on Admissions Office meetings from time to time and are asked to give frank opinions of publications, design of the application, and other aspects of recruiting. They accompany admissions counselors to many high schools in metropolitan St. Louis and sometimes beyond. They meet almost all students and parents visiting campus to look over the University. They participate directly in recruiting by personal contact, letter writing, and telephone conversations, and contribute most directly to the admissions process by reading and evaluating application material submitted by prospective students.

In all of these activities, students say, they try to be frank and open and positive. During a morning tour, vis-
At Roosevelt High School, St. Louis, students crowd around to ask about Washington University. Answering are: (left, foreground to background) student Jim Harlan; Admissions counselor Maggie Dagen; and student Helen Wiener.

In mid-April, the Student Admissions Committee gave a Sunday party for St. Louis students accepted by the University and their parents. Above: Amy Lorenz (center), a McCluer High School senior, and Nancy Mack, a committee member, talk with History Professor Richard Davis.
itors might hear from their guide or guides (they sometimes try boy-girl teams or interschool teams to be ready to answer all questions) that dorm rules are lenient; that food is institutional, but not too bad; that the student-professor relationships can be great; that no one is going to hand you a social life on a silver platter. Prospective students, they say, ask questions about studying, about a particular school within the University and its programs, and about social life. Parents ask about rules and regulations and about academic standards.

"Sometimes," commented Bruce, "you might shock parents with open house regulations and co-ed housing, but they're mostly terrific people who bounce right back. The fabulous thing about guiding tours is the interaction with these terrific people.

"I think all of the other work is important, but guiding tours has got to be the Committee's most important activity. Nine times out of ten an applicant coming to look at the University takes a tour, and has his first direct meeting with a college student. That's it, right then. His whole impression of the campus and campus life is influenced by what he sees and hears. And the same thing is true of his parents."

The Admissions Committee is small, self-governing, and self-perpetuating. Its nineteen members interview perhaps forty student applicants to fill committee vacancies. Students may also apply for positions as tour guides, and the co-chairmen of this guide program are automatically full voting members of the general committee. Last year there were fifty-three guides and alternates, who, in addition to their regular tour schedule, helped with other committee work when needed.

"We had a period about two years ago," recalls Maggie, "when committee leaders saw their positions as potentially power-grabbing. They tried to restructure the Committee as a channel for restructuring the whole University. But the members weren't interested, and the Committee almost fell apart. Last year, Susan and Ralph Hargrow, with the utmost skill in leadership, really revived it."

Unlike many groups, the Student Admissions Committee isn't two or three chairmen dragging along apathetic followers. It's fifty-three students sharing the responsibility of showing up on time, three times a day, six days a week, nine months a year, to lead one or a dozen visitors across campus in rain, snow, zero temperatures, or sunshine. It's eight students working closely with admissions counselors to learn to evaluate admissions material and to spend long hours studying folders of individual candidates. It's five students taking time for a day-long trip to Columbia, Mo., to meet secondary school students from the area, or two students giving up a morning just before finals to visit a St. Louis high school. It's two dozen students spending several evenings during April on long distance telephone lines talking to students who during that month will have to make the choice between Washington University and some other university where they have been accepted. It's ten students planning every detail of a party for all admitted St. Louis students and parents and forty students putting in Sunday hours to attend the party and talk to the guests.

And it's more. Students often close their phone calls or personal contacts with an invitation to "write, or better yet, come to visit." And often an applicant does come and finds when he gets here that he already has one friend, at least, on the campus.

The Committee's activities for any year evolve from student-administrative planning sessions. Several years ago, Ben suggested to his administrative colleagues that students might add insight to the administrative responsibility of folder-reading—the evaluation of a candidate's credentials before an admissions decision.

"Students aren't clients of ours, they are members of a community," he explained. "In a sense they deserve just as much voice as we do in deciding who should join that community. But we find that good folder-reading requires
extensive training and much individual time."

Eight students were involved in folder-reading last year. Each carefully studied an application and its related materials—high school transcript, SAT scores, personal recommendations, student essays, etc.—and assigned a fractional number to it, in the same manner in which an admissions officer reads and assigns a number. One numeral represents the reader’s evaluation of academic strength, the other of extra-curricular, personal strength. Although a student reader’s judgment cannot admit or disqualify a student, it does influence the final decision. In cases of significant discrepancy between evaluations, the student and administrative readers confer to arrive at a joint decision.

Ben and Maggie say that this activity is perhaps the most innovative, as well as the most controversial, of the student involvement. "It bothers some high school counselors, who feel the confidential nature of their responses to us might be threatened," said Maggie. "But we drum into our readers the necessity of keeping all material confidential, and they understand and respect the need. We don’t select certain students to read certain files, except to see that an application from a student who is a member of a minority group is read by a student of that group."

Because the reading activity is so time-consuming, and because most reading takes place during February and March, the students actually evaluate only about 15 per cent of all applications. "Still, we think that is a significant number and that students make a meaningful contribution," Maggie adds.

The Committee encounters the same problem of logistics that annually plagues the Admission Office. Its work is most demanding in the three-month period preceding the May 1 deadline for student response to acceptance letters. The major push occurs during April, when most admitted students are weighing a final decision. The student administrative work load then usually plays against an academic calendar which includes spring break and then a final semester push before early May exams. Yet last April, students managed a heavy tour load, made 1500 telephone calls, gave a party, made high school visits, were available at Brookings Hall almost every hour of the working day and on Saturday morning to talk to students and parents who’d come for an interview with an admissions counselor, and met regularly to plan next year’s activities.

"This continuing contact produces some valuable side effects for us," says Ben. "It provides our staff with a point of contact with the general student body. We get to talk to undergraduates, and, after all, we have to know what’s going on on campus and what’s of concern to students."

"On the other side, I think many students today have a latent distrust of administration, but that feeling usually disappears when we have day-to-day contact on present business."

Maggie calls it "reality experience," saying, "They understand a lot more about the adult world at the University than most students, because they see and work on the nitty-gritty that makes the University survive."

It was Sue Milton who perhaps best expressed the student side of this experience when she said, "I can’t tell you how much my attitude toward administration has changed in the past year. The Admissions Office is an ethical place; its administrators are most concerned about people and about the University. They are very open to communication, and we all know that we are reaching each other. The best way I can describe the whole experience of being a member of the Committee is to say that it represents a Quaker consensus."

But it may be Ben Sandler who deserves the final word about the long-range value of the Committee: "We started in 1965 and over the years have worked with hundreds of students who will leave this University with a special kind of understanding of the institution and who will probably become very good, concerned alumni."
A team of six authors and analysts recently prepared an extensive report, printed in part below, which traces the factors that led to urban decay in St. Louis. The situation in St. Louis parallels the experience of other major cities, the report brings out with one difference, that of scale: “No major American city approached the proportion of St. Louis’s total population loss in the decade just ended.” Directed by Murray L. Weidenbaum, Mallinckrodt Distinguished University Professor, and Charles L. Leven, Director of the University’s Institute for Urban and Regional Studies, the study emphasizes that there is no single cause for urban decay. But the report also stresses some potent economic facts of life, which, if not faced by the public and private sectors, will inevitably lead to further decay. The study was made possible through a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Collaborating on the report with Weidenbaum and Leven were R. B. Read, a private consultant; Professor Hugh O. Nourse of the University of Missouri at St. Louis; Professor Leroy Grossman of St. Louis University, and Professors James T. Little and Judson T. Shaplin of Washington University.
URBAN DECAY IN ST. LOUIS

It was in 1876 that St. Louis took steps which have had profound and permanent impact on its internal development. With a population of roughly a third of a million people, the city had then comprised an area of 17.98 square miles, bounded on the west by Grand Boulevard, beyond which were open farmland and the estates of the wealthy. Taking advantage of provisions of the new State Constitution of 1875, St. Louis simultaneously extended its limits for the fifth time and, by adopting the nation's first home-rule city charter, separated itself from St. Louis County.

The long-range political effect of this action was to fix the city's boundaries permanently at the 1876 limits, a fact which has placed severe fiscal and jurisdictional constraints on natural change and the city's ability to cope with it. In the two decades of rapid regional expansion following World War II, the city has been "ghettoized"—that is, rigidly contained within arbitrary and irrational boundaries.

Exactly fifty years after separation from the county and the final fixing of the city limits, St. Louis missed an opportunity to have and eat its cake—that is, to retain jurisdiction and extend its limits in the direction of growth by incorporating the entire county within city boundaries. By the time of the annexation vote of 1926, defeated by the electorate, the course of development was clear, for in the decade 1920-1930 the county grew by 111,000 people while the city added only 49,000. In 1930 another opportunity at federation, under a state constitutional amendment, was also defeated. More recently, in the 1950s, another unsuccessful effort was made to establish metropolita- n-wide government.

Since 1950, flight to the outlying areas became so precipitous that while St. Louis itself experienced a gross population loss of 234,560, all six of the counties in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area gained and St. Louis County more than doubled its population. By 1970 the city had only 26 percent of the people in the SMSA and St. Louis County had 40 percent, with the remaining third spread among the other five counties, but predominantly in Illinois.

It is clear that out-migration from St. Louis between 1950 and 1970, far from being a mere "escape to the County," has contributed to the wide dispersal throughout the metropolitan region which has been the common post-war experience of American cities. But there is a difference, and it is one of scale: no major American city approached the proportion of St. Louis's total population loss in the decade just ended. But gross loss is only one aspect of population change in St. Louis.

While the age differential between population lost and population gained has been slight, there has been a very wide disparity in economic and social levels. The out-migrating whites have comprised largely middle- and upper-income families of high educational attainment able to purchase new housing in outlying areas, while in-migrating blacks have been concentrated in low levels of income and education.

We find that, relative to other major American cities, the black population of St. Louis is particularly disadvantaged economically. In this regard, although St. Louis is geographically a border state, we find that in fact it ranks among southern cities. Among nineteen major cities in 1960 the median income of black males in St. Louis was $3,029—ranking the city fourteenth. Considering the disparity between black and white male income, we find that in St. Louis the median black income was only 61 percent of median income for all males; and in this regard St. Louis ranks sixteenth among the nineteen cities, with a greater disparity shown only by Houston, Louisville and Atlanta.

To understand the developing St. Louis economy, it is necessary to focus on the growth of primary or manufacturing employment. A single industry—aircraft and parts—accounted for over 40 percent of total growth in manufacturing jobs in the St. Louis region in the decade 1958-1968. The remainder of the growth was scattered over a wide variety of industries—notably motor vehicles, fabricated metals and electrical equipment.

The nature of the dependence on the regional economy for new jobs becomes even clearer when the aircraft and
parts industry is examined. Unlike the area's other industries, one firm accounts for the great bulk of employment generated by the total industry: for the years in which data are available (1962-1968), McDonnell Douglas accounted for an average of 96 percent of total employment in aircraft and parts. To compound the matter, generally one product has accounted for most of the local employment of that firm—during the 1960s the F-4 Fighter Aircraft and more recently the F-15 Fighter Aircraft.

The dependence of a large metropolitan area on one product produced in one firm in one industry is a unique phenomenon in the American economy. The Detroit area, with its heavy dependence on the motor vehicle industry, is usually thought of in this regard; but four large companies there produce a diversified array of automobiles, trucks, appliances, electronic systems, etc. The strictures of the St. Louis dependence are particularly interesting when seen in the light of the historic role successively dominant modes of transportation have played in St. Louis's growth—the rapid development centered on the port facilities, the subsequent westward shift of the central business district to the area of Union Station (now almost deserted as twelve trains a day arrive and depart), the permanent demotion of St. Louis to a secondary, slow-growth position in the Midwest trade area as Chicago extended its hegemony as the transcontinental rail hub. The automobile, together with a highly articulated net of arterial and feeder access routes, has made possible the area-wide dispersal of both population and industries, and it now provides, after aircraft and parts, the second largest component of manufacturing jobs (and of recent manufacturing growth).

Clearly, had it been possible to locate the aircraft industry within the city, the municipal economy would have been very significantly bolstered. However, aircraft manufacturing must be located adjacent to a major airport, and the fixed city boundaries determined that Lambert-St. Louis International Airport be in the county. McDonnell Douglas recruits its labor force from the entire Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, with more than 20,000 living in St. Louis County, almost 5,000 in Illinois, and slightly over 3,300 in the city.

In summary, we see that the St. Louis Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area growth, in any case anticipated to be relatively slow, is rather precariously based. The implications of this are many, but they have peculiar relevance to the continuing rivalry between St. Louis County and the city, in which advocates of county growth appear to consider that development can proceed independently of the city's economic vitality and even at its expense.

Between 1950 and 1970 all categories of employment experienced absolute decline in St. Louis, but most rapidly between 1954 and 1958 when the city lost 11,800 manufacturing jobs in a basic shift of the productive structure from labor-intensive industries to more technologically advanced, skilled-labor industries. In the four years there occurred a mass exodus of textile, apparel, shoe, wholesaling and meat packing firms, most of which had been located in the city. This structural change, involving a significant drop in the percentage of unskilled jobs in the region and a very large numerical drop in such jobs in the city, has obvious bearing on the recently observed net out-migration of blacks. The City of St. Louis is no longer in any sense a locus of opportunity for in-migrants from rural areas.

The role of the central business district in the present-day metropolis is in part a symbolic one. It must have, if not the sweet smell, at least the look of success. In these terms St. Louis, in 1950, was particularly disadvantaged. It was old, and it looked old. There had not been a new office building in twenty-five years; it was interspersed with deteriorating warehouses and surrounded by decaying slums, both white and black, with no space for expansion.

Beginning in 1950, with selection of the Plaza Renewal Area, a remarkably successful transformation of the Central Business District and waterfront area has been achieved. This involved the investment of more than $700 million in private and public funds, and was assisted by federal slum clearance programs and tax abatements under the Missouri Redevelopment Law. The period has seen the appearance of new high-rise apartments, five major office buildings, a new stadium, Jefferson Memorial Arch and Park, two major industrial areas with new buildings, and handsome new structures of St. Louis University as the campus was extended eastward onto cleared, one-time slum acreage. Since 1965 alone 200 firms have either moved into or changed their location within the Central Business District.

These changes have been accompanied by a shift from blue-collar to white-collar workers in the Central Business
No major American city approached the proportion of St. Louis's total population loss in the decade just ended.

District area. But St. Louis's assumption of the financial center role typical of the present-day metropolitan core has been impeded by two factors: one is the relatively slow economic growth which has been noted, so that the pressure on land values in the downtown area observable in Manhattan, the Chicago Loop and San Francisco's financial district has failed to be maintained. Another factor is the Missouri law prohibiting the establishment of branch banks, which has had a two-fold effect. First, it has prevented older banks in the core from strengthening their position via branches in the rapidly expanding suburbs and thus from developing large headquarters in the Central Business District. Second, it has fostered the establishment of new banks in the larger suburbs and thus contributed significantly to development of what is in effect a secondary Central Business District in Clayton, the St. Louis County seat, seven miles distant from the metropolitan core.

The shifts in population and industry which we have noted for the past twenty-year period have left St. Louis with a disproportionately small share of the metropolitan area's high-income families, a disproportionately large share of the low-income groups, and a dwindling share of all sectors of industry. These shifts have meant that the city has an ever-smaller share of the tax base as well, at the same time as the costs of municipal services have greatly increased. The scale of services has risen almost as sharply, since the poor—who comprise a growing component of the population—require expanded city services. Thus, the city's ability to cope with the problems of blight and its efforts at renewal are burdened with mounting financial difficulties.

Much of the city's fiscal difficulties can be attributed to the paucity of aid from the State of Missouri. A study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of 69 cities showed that only thirteen received a smaller percentage contribution from their respective states than did St. Louis. And another recent ACIR study ranks Missouri 43rd, both in intergovernmental financial assistance and in intergovernmental expenditures as a percentage of state personal income.

These data not only indicate the stringent need for increased aid from the State of Missouri but also underscore the central role played by federal funds and programs in the city's effort to cope with its problems of blight, residential housing and urban renewal. However, many of these programs call for matching city funds; in 1971, for example, the city spent $302,430 in general revenue funds for demolition of 1,124 buildings—for which the federal grants totaled $746,000. Hence, the adoption of a program of sharing a portion of federal revenues with state and local governments would particularly benefit central cities such as St. Louis which carry a high tax burden.

White exodus and the spread of blight are reciprocally reinforcing. In the years following World War II a combination of factors made large-scale exodus of middle-class families from St. Louis almost inevitable. This would probably have taken place without pressure for housing from low-income groups, white or black. From the mid-1950s onward, when white exodus accelerated, the out-migration was involved in the circular process, but at its beginning it was a separate phenomenon, and as such the wholesale movement of middle class whites from the central city may be said to have initiated the blight cycle.

This movement was accelerated by a variety of reinforcing mechanisms as well as by its own momentum. The basic underlying motivation was a matter of simple household economics. Individual households are always faced with the question of choice of residential location, in principle, although at any given time relatively few families will be changing from one to another housing arrangement. This was not the case, however, in the period following World War II when property owners in large numbers had important decisions to make as between reinvestment or moving. One side of this decision—the decision to stay—had suddenly become an expensive option due to two decades of deferred maintenance. At the same time, the costs of opting for moving out of the old neighborhoods had become drastically cheaper.

A combination of widespread automobile ownership, the building of highspeed expressways, and the much more favorable terms for financing new suburban property under FHA and VA simply made suburbia a better buy, especially considering the rapidly rising incomes and income expectations of the early 1950s. The outward movement was accelerated by a number of additional elements, but it is important to recognize that the basic triggering cause itself was a coincidence of forces in the ordinary mechanism of the private housing market. It is significant, too, that the more massive exodus occurred in the 1950s,
before the sharp rise in inner-city crime rates and before blight had reached its peak of severity.

It was older, deteriorating middle class housing which became massively available in St. Louis during 1950-70. What caused severe dislocation within the housing market was that the only significant demand was for very low-cost housing. And there was a gross disparity in scale between supply and demand, evident in the basic data of net migration. In the twenty years during which over 400,000 whites left the city there was a net in-migration of fewer than 16,000 blacks. It is not surprising that at the end of the period—despite the loss of 24,596 city dwelling units, mainly through demolition—city vacancies had risen from 4,426 to 22,962. In the interim, a constantly renewed stock of devalued housing had been successively and systematically depleted in a cumulative process of economic exploitation. This cycle of depletion—a solely economic process—is the fundamental dynamic of blight. It is this process whose end-product is large-scale residential demolition not associated with expressway construction. Its operation is traced in the following.

**Given the Gap** between supply and demand, both quantitative and qualitative, the housing stock made available to the market by the departing whites was immediately in a distress position. Once it was sold rationalization ineluctably took the form of lower-level, intensified use—the effort to extract profit from low rents through crowding, doubling, conversion to multiple units, merger of small units to accommodate large families. With taxes fixed, as well as rates on insurance (if it was available), the only cost which owners could reduce to adjust to the reduction in rental income was maintenance. With minimal emergency maintenance, or none whatever, at the same time as intensified use of old housing would normally call for greater maintenance outlay, severe deterioration and eventual abandonment ensued.

The deterioration practices ensuing from devaluation and lower-level use lead to a loss of confidence on the part of insurance companies and lenders, who fear that the value of housing will decline faster than the value of mortgages (as indeed is often the case), and this produces a cumulative effect. First on a selective basis—particular houses, certain blocks on certain streets—then area-wide by blanket “red-lining,” insurance is refused and conventional financing is withdrawn. All of North St. Louis was thus red-lined in the 1960s, and the practice was extended to the suburbs in Wellston and in University City north of Olive. A normal real estate market then ceases to exist for the affected area. Speculators move in, acquiring houses at greatly distressed value for resale to the poor—usually at a price three to four times what was paid in cash—on a land contract basis, with third and fourth mortgages held privately (and, in common practice, anonymously).

This stage of the process, extremely deteriorative to neighborhood quality, has also been abetted by public policy. Although the incentive to maintenance is vastly greater with owner occupancy, a low income owner’s ability to support upkeep is no greater than if he were renting—perhaps less, since he may have strained his resources to the limit in order to achieve ownership. Section 235 of the Housing Act—which was designed, like the public housing effort, to help the poor find housing of standard quality—fails in this regard for it makes no allowance for maintenance costs. The subsidy given families under Section 235 covers only the difference between mortgage payments and some fraction of their income. (In recognition of this deficiency, special subsidies in the form of grants have recently become available to eligible purchasers of 235 housing for essential repairs reported before December 31, 1971. We have not been able to ascertain the extent or success of this program.) But there is no increment of the purchaser’s income left for maintenance. Hence, when a major emergency arises—affecting the furnace, plumbing, the roof or, worse, structural decay—the family is often without recourse, and must relinquish its ownership and move out. Payments then stop, foreclosure ensues, the house is abandoned to vandalism, and arson remains the speculator’s final opportunity to realize a further return.

A sequel of foreclosure would, in fact, seem to have been preordained by local administration of the Section 235 program, as documented by a June, 1971 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Selection of housing, advertisement to prospective buyers, and all dealings with purchasers were in the hands of real estate brokers, most of whom were reluctant to pursue the program since sellers had to pay all closing costs. No government office was responsible for counseling families in how to buy a home because the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (which had authority to set up such a
"... relative to other major American cities, the Black population of St. Louis is particularly disadvantaged economically."
service) assumed that voluntary groups would provide this function.

Yet when the Urban League attempted to provide counseling in St. Louis, the local FHA office refused to provide the list of builders in the County who had been authorized for new 235 housing. The sale of older housing under the program was made by speculators. Of the existing houses sampled in the St. Louis survey, 29 percent had been sold by a single speculator. He had solicited purchasers among Aid to Dependent Families resident in Pruitt-Igoe. This group was no longer acceptable as rental tenants in local public housing. That black purchasers of 235 housing in St. Louis were universally directed to segregated areas is documented by the report, but more to the point of the present study is the fact that they were sold unsound housing. A mortgage company employee indicated to the Commission investigators that no house selling for less than $15,000 in the St. Louis area could be up to FHA standards, yet the average selling price of Section 235 housing sampled was $12,890, and the average age of the housing was over 40 years.

Whether for rental or ownership, the central problem of the conversion of older middle class housing to occupancy by the poor is maintenance. The inability of either private or public policy to find a solution to this problem can be pinpointed as the immediate source of blight. Two devices that seemed to offer a possible solution and that sought to arrest the blight process through upgrading of the housing stock itself—a direct, frontal attack through code enforcement, and selective amelioration through a rehabilitation program—have both proved ineffectual.

Code enforcement—even if the city had the resources to apply it—does not provide a solution, since its successful operation has the effect of excluding the poor. Today's standards of housing adequacy as expressed in the building code are higher than in earlier periods. The cost of improvements to meet the code is similarly at an all-time high and the improvements necessary to meet code requirements is greatest for the old structures available to the poor, either for rental or purchase. This combination of factors precludes the possibility of code enforcement in housing for the poor and restricts its use to the preservation of residential quality in selected areas of middle- and upper-income occupancy.

The history of the city's attempt at code enforcement in the 1950s is revealing. In 1953, an official housing survey cited 57,000 specific family units in need of inspection for rehabilitation or reconstruction. By 1960, less than 39 percent of the units had been inspected. The record of limited follow-through on violations found and cited is documented in the report of the Code Enforcement Task Force of the Aldermanic Housing and Urban Development Committee.

The rehabilitation program has had considerable success in St. Louis, and offers promise of more. However, it does not offer a solution to the problem of converting aging housing to use by the poor. The terms of eligibility are such that, whether rehabilitation is carried through by owner-occupants or by landlords for rental units, it provides lower-middle to middle class housing.

The rehabilitation performance of the West End Urban Renewal represents the largest single program in the nation at this time, with 1,390 dwelling units in 570 residential buildings completed and another 110 units in process. It has been most successful when the restorations have been clustered along a single street, since the general upgrading of the neighborhood has proved also infectious, inspiring privately undertaken rehabilitation and even new construction.

None of the devices that have emerged to date for arresting the blight process—code enforcement, rehabilitation, occupancy permit—provides a solution to the problem of housing the poor. They may slow down the process of blight, but not contain it. In fact, as we have seen, these devices can operate successfully only by excluding the poor.

1. One implication of the facts for the city of St. Louis presented in this report is that other parts of the central city, as well as elsewhere in the metropolitan area, could go through a similar transition as the northwest corridor unless adequate preventative or corrective actions are taken. One example is the extensive white out-migration has taken place in the South Side of the city of St. Louis. Some of the nearby neighborhoods in the South Side have experienced out-migration of over one-fourth of their white population during the past twenty years.

In general the housing of the South Side was built before 1930. Also, we can see the extent of black movement into the area by the time the 1970 census was taken, and from our school study we know that it has been accelerat-

"In the twenty years [1950-70] during which over 400,000 whites left the city, there was a net in-migration of fewer than 16,000 blacks."
ing in the past two years.

2. In its work, the research group did not encounter specific factors that could arrest the spread of blight on the North Side of St. Louis.

We have already noted the hopeful aspect of federally sponsored rehabilitation programs, with dwelling units clustered on a neighborhood basis so that what is eventually achieved is restoration of an entire neighborhood. We would suggest that areas selected for this kind of rehabilitation be located at the boundaries of still-stable neighborhoods (the private streets, for example, or the areas of professional black occupancy) and extend either inward upon a blighted area or, ideally, toward another stable neighborhood. It would appear to be folly, for example, to locate even a large rehabilitation project in the middle of a blighted section so that it is surrounded by social decay.

3. The role of federal policy at this point seems ambivalent at best. If indeed it wishes to halt the attrition of central cities it would appear logical at least to terminate the policies that brought it about. More logical still, it could bestow upon central-city development those subsidies which would then be withheld from the suburbs. At times, the Federal Home Loan Bank—because of its concern with the safety of the assets of its member institutions—has taken action (such as increasing required reserves in connection with mortgages in certain areas) which have seemed to exacerbate the spread of blight in large areas of the central city.

That federal housing policy could reverse itself and apply its resources to reinvesting in the central cities is not a capricious suggestion. Here, ready at hand, are areas with utilities and accessibility on a large scale. Why not, in fact, mount a New Towns program within the central city?

The dilemma suggests the desirability of an alternative-costs study—or rather, not one but a series. What are the alternative risks in giving new developments viable size? And what represents viable size, minimal or maximal? Should not HUD review the totality of its piecemeal programs for revitalization of central cities against the cost of such an all-out program?

First, it obviates the problem of containment of the poor. In new public housing specifically for the poor, however widely it may be scattered throughout the city or the metropolitan area, there is inevitably a degree of concentration, an element of containment. By means of subsidized maintenance of rehabilitation units, however, the poor may be truly scattered in selected individual buildings dispersed throughout moderate-income areas. The onus of manipulation would also be avoided, since tenants would be able to choose the units, subject only to criteria of maximum income and family size.

What is proposed is minimal rehabilitation: that the structure be sound and that its heating and plumbing be maintained in working order. For the truly poor, these rudimentary amenities would represent an improvement in their housing condition, particularly if they existed in a non-slum environment, a moderate-income neighborhood. Throughout the city at the present time are structurally sound, vacant buildings which may be purchased for $1,000 to $2,000 or less. In areas not slated for Mill Creek-type renewal, it is proposed that these buildings be acquired and restored to two levels of occupancy: the major portion thoroughly rehabilitated for moderate-income use; the smaller portion brought to the minimal standard suggested above for use by the poor.

The problems of the 235 housing program would indicate that any such rehabilitation program should require someone to be accountable for the quality standard of any housing for the poor, or it simply will not be done. Someone needs to be responsible other than the poor household that cannot correct deficiencies if they appear. Furthermore, the value of such housing should not be based on what the poor family can pay after taxes and insurance. Rather, it should be based on what they can afford after allowance for taxes, insurance, and realistic estimates of maintenance and repair expenditures on older housing.

It is suggested that such a program, in contrast to new construction, could meet the poor’s housing needs more quickly, at considerably less capital investment and only slightly higher ongoing maintenance cost, and with considerably higher social benefit. It should also be borne in mind that demolition costs for these buildings are only slightly less than their purchase price.

The St. Louis Community Renewal Program’s constructive 1970-1980 program calls for construction of 45,000 new units in the ten-year period. In the twenty years between 1950 and 1970, only 6,964 units of public housing were constructed in St. Louis. We feel that a major program of housing rehabilitation is called for.
WEEKEND
IN THE WOODS

Bromwoods, the University's residential conference center tucked in the foothills of the Ozarks about sixty miles from St. Louis, is a perfect setting for a weekend away from home.

With this in mind, the Alumni Board of Governors and the School of Continuing Education planned a get-together for interested alumni and ten current students with three faculty members, who converged on Bromwoods the weekend of May 13-14. Purpose? To relax, enjoy each other and the rural setting, and to talk informally about topics that concerned the group—from the new college student and ecology to euthanasia, Missouri politics, and problems of a technological society.

Faculty members who led discussions—David Hadas (religion, English), Burton Wheeler (English), and Dr. Paul Lacy (medicine)—were 1972 recipients of Founders Day awards for outstanding teaching at the University. Participants were encouraged to keep in mind the general focus of the weekend: the adult learner.

Patrick Curry, a junior from Hazleton, Pennsylvania, said, "The weekend gave me new enthusiasm for true communication with others. This is the best experience I've had in the three years I've been at the University."

Bromwoods' attraction was remarkable, drawing alumni from St. Louis, outstate Missouri, Chicago, and Washington. It should be the first in a series of similar sylvan seminars.

Mike N. Newmark, past president of the Washington University Law Alumni Association, and his wife, Barbara, pause on the footbridge during a stroll around the lake.
Far left: Sunday dinner in the cozy paneled dining hall afforded weekend guests an opportunity to chat about questions raised in discussion groups, a particular horseshoe game, or the family back home. Left: A pre-dinner gathering.

David Hadas, assistant professor of English, at right with beard, illustrates a point during one of the group sessions. Differing student, faculty, and alumni viewpoints brought an uncommon new dimension to discussion that was enjoyed by all participants.
In 1955, at the height of the McCarthy era, Chief Justice Earl Warren spoke at Washington University on “The Blessings of Liberty.” This spring he returned to the campus as the principal speaker at the dedication of the new Seeley G. Mudd Law Building and Eugene A. and Adlyne Freund Law Library, and again his topic was our basic liberties and the need constantly to defend them. His address has since been hailed by the press as his most important and outspoken statement since he left the Supreme Court.
THE BLESSINGS OF
LIBERTY—1972

It is a great pleasure to be on the campus of Washington University and to participate in the dedication of the new Seeley G. Mudd building of your national School of Law. I have been impressed by the fact that the school's students come from thirty-eight states, from four foreign countries, and from 161 colleges and universities.

I am further impressed by the encouragement given to an interdisciplinary approach to the law. These two factors are essential, in my opinion, to the proper development of a lawyer. The mingling of students from every part of the nation and from the teaching of so many widely dispersed institutions of higher learning in the study of the laws of the dynamic social process is bound to give them an understanding of the pluralistic society in which we live and on which our legal institutions are premised. This is bound to instill in them a vision of the needs of society both today and in the future. The interdisciplinary approach is something long neglected and badly needed in many American law schools, both as requirement for admission and in the professional training.

The development of a lawyer results not only from the learning of sets of rules and techniques, which inevitably change in the course of time, but also from a knowledge of how legal principles came into being, why they became a part of the law, and how they can be used to meet the ever-changing conditions in society. It is in the disciplines of history, philosophy, and the other political and social sciences that these are to be discovered. To use one of the aphorisms of Mr. Justice Holmes in this connection, "A page of history is worth a volume of logic."

Applied to our basic liberties found in the Bill of Rights to our Constitution, no one can have a real appreciation of them unless he knows the suffering and travail that accompanied their emergence and development in Anglo-Saxon civilization as a right of free people everywhere and unless he is alerted to the dangers implicit in any erosion of them. The adherence to these liberties has been an undulatory process with wave-like elevations and depressions throughout the course of history.

My first visit to your campus was in 1955 in conjunction with the centennial celebration of your university. It was at a time of one of the deepest troughs of that wavy motion. It was in the heyday of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, who, through his demagoguery, made a mockery of the Bill of Rights to the extent of causing a substantial segment of Americans to question the wisdom of preserving them. I have always thought that it was because of its alarm about this condition that Washington University chose as the theme for its centennial, "The Blessings of Liberty."

I was one of many asked to speak on that subject. While thinking about what to say, I read a news item about an incident in my own state of California that actually chilled me to the bone. In each of our large state buildings there is a bulletin board on which may be displayed items of interest by both the management and the employees. In that year, 1954, for the anniversary of the Bill of Rights, President Eisenhower, in accordance with custom, had issued a proclamation declaring December 15 as Bill of Rights Day. In anticipation of the event, some of the employees displayed on the bulletin board a copy of the Bill of Rights. The superintendent, who was a retired Army general, ordered its removal for the stated reason that it was a controversial document. When it was removed, the employees replaced it with another copy, which suffered the same fate. They then appealed to the governor, and it was only after he instructed the general in writing that the Bill of Rights was not a subversive document that it was permitted to remain on the bulletin board. Nothing but sheer ignorance of the historical background of the Bill of Rights could have prompted any such action on the part of a retired Army general.

Fortunately, the hysteria of the McCarthy era wore off in time. But, the undulation continues and the downward motion is again in evidence. The right of the press to publish is being attacked. The rights of association and of dissent are being questioned. Detention without a warrant...
is being advocated. The rights of privacy in the home and in communications are being disregarded. The right against self-incrimination is being restricted. And, the rights of due process of law and equal protection of the law are in jeopardy for millions of minority citizens.

About two years ago, one of our principal television networks made a survey to determine the attitudes of citizens concerning the Bill of Rights. Some of its findings were indeed shocking. A majority of those interviewed said that they were willing to abridge the rights of free speech and freedom of the press and of the rights of a person to be informed of criminal charges against him and to be confronted by witnesses against him. A large number thought that it was not necessary for the defendant in criminal cases even to have a public trial. A substantial majority thought the right of peaceful assembly should be restricted, and a third of those questioned believed that police should be permitted to search a person’s home without a search warrant. Still others said that they believed that everyone should be permitted to vote, but that a Negro should not be permitted to be mayor of their city.

I am sure those responding in that manner would not have responded as they did had any of those rights ever been denied to them, but they answered the questions only in relation to the other fellow and without a realization that a denial of such rights to the most despised elements of our citizenry would be the authority for such denial to all others under changed circumstances. I also believe that the vast majority of those so answering did it in the honest belief that in that manner they would be protecting their homes and the security of society generally. But they failed to understand what life in America would be like in the absence of those rights.

Many other nations have written constitutions guaranteeing rights and liberties, such as our own, but they are totally ignored in practice, with the result that the people are ruled oppressively instead of being governed by civilized procedures. There are governments of that kind in all parts of the world, and in most of them the situation has developed from erosion resulting from the ignorance or apathy of the people. In this connection, it might be well to remember what our elder statesman, Benjamin Franklin, said years before our Constitution was
adopted: "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Now, it may be asking too much to expect every citizen to have a knowledge of the human suffering that was entailed in the acquisition of these rights for all our people, but there is no sound reason why any lawyer should not be mindful of it. These rights are the very essence of justice, and justice must always be the hallmark of our profession. Essential as a knowledge of the rules of our profession and a facility for handling them skillfully in any chosen field of the law may be, they are but tools with which to fashion justice. Used for a lesser purpose, lawyers are but artisans who can never derive the profound satisfaction acquired by pursuing a cause.

A young lawyer once asked the great British Prime Minister Disraeli how he could have an important satisfying career. Disraeli was said to have replied, "Adopt a good cause while you are young and pursue it diligently the rest of your life." What sound advice that is! There are so many good causes that lawyers might pursue in America that every lawyer could easily find one that would bring him satisfaction. And while pursuing that one cause, he would inevitably come into contact with others to add to that satisfaction.

It has been my privilege in the last eighteen years to participate in the dedication of many new law buildings and schools of law. In doing so, I always think of the ancient story of the wayfarer who was passing a building under construction. There were three men at work on the job. He asked the first one, "Friend, what are you doing here?" And the workman, without looking up, replied, "I'm making a living." He asked the same question of the second, who also replied without looking up, "I'm following my trade." But when he repeated the question to the third, the man rose to his full height, looked his questioner in the eye, and said, "Sir, I am building a temple."

I like to feel that whenever we construct a new school of law we are building a temple—a temple of justice. I am sure that Dean Lesar and the faculty of this law school believe that they have built such a temple in this structure. Men of the law do not devote their professional lives to the training of young people to seek and administer justice without considering the place where the legal truths are transmitted as being more than a mere building of girders, concrete, and stone. I am sure that the philanthropy of the late Dr. Seeley C. Mudd was intended to do more than make it possible for generations of lawyers to become prosperous by skillfully using the tools and the techniques of the law. His life and the careers of his family are evidence of his desire to improve the quality of life for all our people.

I am sure that the young men and women who have come here to study law will consider this building more than an assembly and arrangement of materials and space. The fact that today such great numbers of students are eagerly seeking admission to schools of law and to the other social sciences everywhere, and the fact that hundreds have enrolled in this law school from 161 other institutions of higher learning is ample evidence for me that they are searching for something of underlying value. I believe that the something they seek is justice. To them, therefore, this also must be a temple, where great truths will be revealed.

Youth is now more attuned to justice than ever before, and the public interest causes they have recently served have forecast the most wholesome development in our profession since the age of enlightenment which ushered our nation into being. Youth very properly recognizes the omissions of the past, the inadequacies of the present, and the necessities of the future. They may not yet have the answers to the dilemmas which we all face, but it must be remembered that neither do we. On the other hand, they are following the Biblical injunction, "Seek and ye shall find, knock and the door shall be opened unto you." I have the faith in them to believe they will find, that the door will be open to them, and that they will raise the standard of justice to a height not yet achieved.

So, in dedicating this building, I am sure we can look forward with confidence to many generations of lawyers who will honor it by learning here the basic principles of justice and then using them to fulfill the purpose of our system by making more meaningful the motto emblazoned across the entrance of the Supreme Court of the United States, "Equal Justice Under Law."
Photographer Pat Duncan:
“The tallgrass system is unique, but very few have gotten excited about saving it as they have the Everglades or redwoods, perhaps because so very few have experienced it.”

*Indian Grass, Winter, Johnson County, Kansas*

Indian Grass provided nourishment to the migrating buffaloes, who in turn helped plant the next year's grass by pounding the seed into the ground with their hoofs.
Years ago L. Frank Baum immortalized the Kansas prairie with his tale of Dorothy and the Wizard of Oz. Today, alumna Pat Dubose Duncan, BFA 54, is trying to do the same, but through photographs, not words.

A photographer with a studio in her home at Lake Quivera, Kansas, Pat is working with others to promote the creation of a national tallgrass prairie park. In past years, endless words have met with little success, but Pat, through her pictures of this nearly extinct natural tallgrass prairie land, has succeeded in making herself visible in Washington, D.C., where bills to create the park are pending.

An energetic woman, who speaks with conviction, Pat readily admits she entered the battle naively unaware of the complex politics involved in creating such a park and totally unprepared for her outspoken opponents, among them many Kansas cattlemen. But with facts and photographs, she presents a convincing argument for preserving a small vestige of the prairie tallgrass that once covered 400,000 square miles and was home to thousands of animals and plants.

Today, only isolated patches of tallgrass remain, and many of its inhabitants—including the falcon, prairie wolf, buffalo, and monarch butterfly—are in danger of becoming extinct. Proponents of the park, who fear that much of this land may become desert in the next 100 years, have selected a relatively untouched 30,000-acre tract in eastern Kansas. They predict that within ten years even this land may, through pipelines and roads, become unsuitable for a natural park.

Pat's photographs have been exhibited throughout Kansas and her slides will be presented at the Smithsonian in the fall.

*Indian Grass, Winter, Johnson County*
Colorful even in winter, Indian Grass grows to a height of nine feet, tall enough to hide a man on horseback.
The Flint Hills, Spring, Chase County
In this county park in Eastern Kansas, natural tall grasses are protected from grazing.

Daisy Fleabane and Tallgrasses, Summer, Johnson County
Daisy Fleabane usually grows on poorly maintained land. As the land heals itself, the prairie grasses take over.

Eastern Gamma Grass, Summer, Johnson County
Rarely seen today, Eastern gamma is called the "grandad" of all grasses. Scientists believe it is related to early corn.
Sunflowers, Winter, Johnson County
The brown, winter forms of the sunflower make a lace-like pattern against the sky. Some grow as tall as twelve feet.

Milkweed, Autumn, Johnson County
The milkweed has many variations. One variety, not pictured, is the nesting place for the monarch butterfly.
STRANGERS ON A CONTINENT

an American Indian's view of America

Since 1934—almost forty years ago—there’s been a continuous movement within the American Indian community to re-establish the basic ground rules of legal independence for the Indian. This movement has been thwarted a number of times in a number of ways. Probably the most tragic is what has happened in the last two or three years. From about 1961 to 1967, we worked extremely hard to bring the ideas of the modern Indian community to the people in government and to the American public. Just as we were about to catch on in making some substantial gains, the media grabbed hold of what had been a rapidly growing Indian movement and, in my opinion, totally demolished it.

The minute we began to raise significant ideas about what American society is, a book called Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee came out and immediately close to 400,000 Americans grabbed it. The people who read the book were sorry about what happened to the Cheyenne Indians a hundred years ago, but would not confront the very real problem that the same thing is happening right now on the riverbanks of the state of Washington. Indians are being shot and brutalized in the state of Minnesota, Indians are being deprived of their water and land in Arizona and Nevada. There has been overwhelming recent brutality in South Dakota, California, and Nebraska.

Following Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee, there has been an almost deliberate effort by the media to cover up what we are doing in the Indian movement. It’s significant that Memoirs of Chief Red Fox, which was simply a thirty-year-old book that had been copied on a Big Chief Tablet to give it authenticity, could have gone for almost two years without anyone in American society challenging the reality of Red Fox. The media snapped this up and the “author” went all over the country telling about his experiences as “Buffalo Bill’s Indian,” and alleging to be a living remnant of the people who had been at Little Big Horn. I mention these two books for a specific reason: to show the reception they received when they tried to raise issues that are of fundamental significance to American society.

Let’s take the reception the Indians have received when they have tried to raise issues and transfer it over to the Black experience. Let’s suppose that after the controversy in Little Rock, the Birmingham bus boycott, the efforts of
Vine Deloria, Jr., whose books Custer Died For Your Sins, We Talk, You Listen, and Of Utmost Good Faith have awakened many Americans to the feelings and problems of American Indians, was born on a Standing Rock Sioux reservation in South Dakota. He is a graduate of Iowa State University and the Lutheran School of Theology and holds a law degree from the University of Colorado. Executive director of the National Congress of American Indians from 1964-67, he later served on the faculty of Western Washington State College and is presently executive director of the Southwest Intergroup Council. In this article, based on his campus Assembly talk in April, Mr. Deloria gives an American Indian's view of America and Americans.

Martin Luther King and other Black leaders to raise issues, the American public had turned away to put all their attention on a book called “Bury My Heart at Jamestown,” which recited all of the brutality against slaves from 1607 to 1609. At this point, all the whites in the country promptly vow that should they ever come to Jamestown in 1609, they're going to raise the issue with Captain John Smith. Meanwhile, out comes “Memoirs of Chief Field Hand,” who claims to be Nat Turner's nephew and who has copied 13,000 words of Uncle Tom's Cabin. The American public takes him to his heart, asks him all about the problems in Little Rock and Birmingham, and promptly says, “Well, let's get on to Women's Lib.”

I think that you can see that American Indians and the civil rights movement received quite different receptions. What does this difference mean? I think that it reveals a fundamental difference between the things the Indians are saying and the issues they are raising from what the rest of America considers social movements. I don't think that the American people are ever going to listen to the Indian, not because they're guilty about what happened one hundred years ago, for they'll recall we got in some pretty good licks, too, but because what we are saying challenges two fundamental laws of the American people. One is the firm belief that the American people are the natural product of what God intended evolution to be—that all previous civilizations coming before America had value only as they helped to produce American civilization.

The other is that the American people have not been able to relate to this continent in any meaningful way. They are still strangers on this continent. As soon as Arizona, New Mexico, and the Rocky Mountain West are turned into a stripped wasteland, the desecration of continental America will be complete.

There is no way, in terms of the present social movement, that the American people or the American government can justify what it was all for. The usual interpretation is that the resources of the land had to be developed and the American people were God's chosen people to do it. When you look at the Comstock Lode, where only 25 per cent of the silver was recovered, at the early oil fields, where only 13 per cent of the oil was recovered, at the destruction of the forests, you realize that what has been done in America has not been the most intelligent natural
"... the American people have not been able to relate to this country in any meaningful way. They are still strangers on this continent. As soon as Arizona, New Mexico, and the Rocky Mountain West are turned into a stripped wasteland, the desecration of continental America will be complete."

development of man's evolution, but a series of acts that can be categorized as criminal—if not crimes against the people of this country, certainly crimes against the earth.

When I look at the social movement in this country today, I find that little substantial progress has been made in terms of understanding American society. I see the last twenty years as a series of fluctuating backlashes and front lashes, in which an emotional pitch has to be maintained either for or against certain ideas. Consequently, we have set up an ebb and flow discussion, primarily of white against Black. Every time the Black community has communicated an issue, the white community has promptly thrown out or blocked the issue. The other minority groups that have tried to get into this discussion have almost always been categorized as sub-groups of the Black community. We have been told consistently that our problems are just the same as the Black man's. Consequently, there has been no dialogue in terms of American society.

From the collapse of the community development program have come three new basic movements: the ecological movement, the "Jesus" or religious movement, and the John Gardner-Ralph Nader "Let's be good citizens" movement. If we take these three strands and wind them back into the civil rights movement, there's no way that the civil rights problem can be solved, if part of that problem refers to the way man treats the earth he lives on. Consequently, if there is to be a social movement in this country any time in the future, I think that we have to recognize the constituent ideas that are going through American society in the smaller streams of social movement today. We have to find a general over-reaching principle within which we can understand how all the other movements relate to one another. We must ask, "What is man's citizenship role with respect to his society and his government, what is his religious role, and how does he relate to the universe?"

Christianity has long told us that this world is not the real world, but a testing place for another world. All we have to do is to follow the doctrines and orders of a certain group of people and understand that whatever appears to happen in this world isn't really happening and has no real significance because we are preparing for another world. Now, this is the fundamental difference between the Indian community and all other groups of American society. American Indians have not rejected this world as the real world. Whether there be another world or an infinite series of worlds is not our concern, but since
this world has been created, it is our responsibility to have a relationship with everything in this world.

In the film *Little Big Man*, there is a scene where Dustin Hoffman asks the Indian chief about the difference between the white man and the Indian, and the chief answers, "To the white man, everything is dead, and for the Indian, everything's alive." It is impossible to talk of social movements, political governments, economic systems, any of the problems we think we're attempting to solve today without tracing our own thoughts and emotions back to what kind of universe we think we're living in. What is its nature and how and what demands and responsibilities does it place on us?

*During the* four hundred years of struggle between the white man and the Indian, the Indian has often said, "This is our sacred valley. Our people are buried here, our spirits are here. If you push us off this land and destroy us, you will never become inhabitants of this ground in the same way we have. You will never know peace and rest."

The white man has replied, "What are you talking about? We have to build a dam here so that we can send thousands of kilowatts to Rochester so people there can use their electric toothbrushes. God wants us to have electric toothbrushes."

That has been the difference. The civil rights movement, the Black community, has had to fight out from under the Christian concept of history and man. At least the American Constitution gave the Black man three-fifths of humanity; for many centuries, Christianity gave them no humanity at all. What we have been doing for the last four hundred years is attempting to emerge to some conception of what a society should be and why the particular society that is on this continent has certain responsibilities to act in certain ways. As you go through American history, you don't see a group of brilliant philosophers sitting down in Independence Hall to write the document of the ages; you see instead a group of landed people with strong material and economic investments trying to compose a document to protect their property rights. At each period that the document must be interpreted to include more of humanity, the American people run away from that document as fast as they can. If you look at the last twenty years, you will see that every time the Constitution has been mentioned as something the American people should live up to, there is an incredible scurrying around to avoid having to do so.

Every indication we have in terms of modern science and the work done on the frontiers of thought seems to indicate to us that the Indian conception of the universe as a living thing is the correct interpretation. The present ecology movement is not about the inherent right of the river to exist because it's a river. It is not concerned about man's responsibility to the creation of the universe. In the American tradition, today's ecologists are seeking only the further transformation of existing resources and are not attempting to have a relationship with those resources themselves. You can clean up the Columbia River or the Hudson River, but unless you understand what that river is and your responsibility to it, you are merely balancing the cost benefits of using the river one way against the cost benefits of using it another.

I see no meaningful way either for American Indians to enter the modern social movement or to solve the basic problems of America. The white man, and sometimes the leaders of the Black community, cannot bring themselves to the reality of humanity. Every time the Indian tries to raise the concept of land or the concept of a community, he is buried in the white man's fantasies. To re-examine the experience of mankind in terms of a universe that is alive and not dead is asking too much of the American people.

However, it may not be asking too much of the present generation of young Americans because, for better or for worse, they are on one of the paths I have described. They have chosen to get into ecology or into religion or into political action. I think that young people today are willing to work hard in terms of self-examination, to throw away all the preconceptions, and to create a new conception for their generation of what they think the universe is and their place in it.

I want to leave you with one message. You can slip and slide all you want on definitions, but you better take a very close look, a very honest look, at your religion, your political system, the way you treat the immigrant, the way you treat the land. The day is coming when your definitions are going to fall apart. The longer we avoid social problems by redefinition, the longer the problems will continue to get worse and worse. As I look at America today, I feel that we are bringing on the apocalypse, that we are the chief agents of destruction. I see no way to stop it.
Alumnus Trebor Jay Tichenor is a many-faceted talent. Gifted pianist, musicologist, collector, and scholar, he is an authority on ragtime music which captivated America from the end of the “Gay Nineties” to around the time of the first World War. The outstanding composer of classic rags was Scott Joplin, a Black genius, whose “Maple Leaf Rag” sparked a musical career which culminated in an opera “Treemonisha,” recently revived and critically acclaimed in Atlanta after having been neglected for sixty years.

Trebor Jay Tichenor, whose first name is “Robert” spelled backwards, is a ragtime pianist who can also play great traditional jazz. He is one of the mainstays of the St. Louis Ragtimers.
Trebor Jay Tichenor is the pianist in a floating saloon on a registered national historic landmark, the Gold­

ebrod Showboat moored at the St. Louis levee. The ves­

sel, built in 1909 and now restored to rococo splendor, is an original and so is Tichenor.

Casual tourists, however, who wander into the second­

floor bar where Tichenor plays with his fellow musicians, known collectively as the St. Louis Rag­timmers, generally listen and leave after a few sets without ever realizing that the 32-year-old man hunched over the old, cable up­

right is something more than an extraordinarily gifted pi­

ano player.

It is not that they don’t notice Tichenor. A man of blimp-like proportions, he looks from the rear rather like a costumed Buddha resplendent in Gay Nineties satin vest, sleeve garters, and derby. But the back view is all that the audience ever sees until he lumbers out on breaks, for Tichenor’s manner is that of the reserved concert pian­

ist, rather than that of the easy-going popular entertainer. Intense and self-contained, he loses himself in the music and leaves the banter to Al Stricker, the banjo player of the Ragtimers’ ensemble.

His fellow band members call Tichenor “the professor,” a title traditionally bestowed on pianists in turn-of-the­

century musical groups because the piano player was sup­
pposed to have a little more education than his colle­

agues, but in Tichenor’s case it is an apt appellation, for he is a first-rate scholar of a type of music currently en­

joying a renaissance—ragtime.

Tichenor is, in fact, a man obsessed by ragtime, with a house on the fringes of Carondelet Park bulging with some seven thousand piano rolls (800 to 1000 of them rags); a major collection of sheet music, including the original publications of all the important composers of this type of music, and even a swinging door from the old Rose Bud Cafe on Market Street, where some of the rag­
time greats used to play. A self-educated musicologist, who graduated from Washington University in 1963 with a major in French rather than music, Tichenor is, according to Rudy Blesh, co-author of the ragtime bible, They All Played Ragtime, a “Joplinophile.”

For the uninitiated, “Joplinophile” means one who is a Scott Joplin devotee, and there are quite a few of such people around these days, thanks to a dramatic resurgence of interest in Joplin, a ragtime great who died in 1917 and whose genius was largely unappreciated until fairly recently. What distinguishes Tichenor from so many other Joplinophiles, however, is that he has been totally dedi­
cated to Joplin, and, indeed, the whole subject of ragtime since he was thirteen years old. In this important respect, he differs, for example, from Harold C. Schonberg, The New York Times music critic, who did not discover Joplin until January of 1971, and then wrote a rhapsodic article about his newly found hero entitled “Scholars, Get Busy on Scott Joplin!”

Trebor Tichenor is too polite to say he was amused when he read this admonition, but “getting busy on Scott Joplin” is exactly what he’s been doing ever since 1953 when, as he vividly recalls, he heard Joplin’s celebrated “Maple Leaf Rag” and “all the lights went on.” At that time, interest in ragtime had not yet caught on with the Eastern music establishment, and those like young Tiche­

nor, who were captivated by Joplin, acknowledged “King of the Ragtime Composers,” were regarded as the equivalent to today’s “freaks,” wasting their time on “honky-tonk trash.”

Indeed, in the beginning, Tichenor himself refused to listen to leaders of the fast and flashy school of ragtime such as “Knuckles O’Toole,” and insisted on concentrating on what the purists still call “classic” ragtime. This was the kind of ragtime which reached its zenith in the com­

positions of Joplin who, as the brilliant Juilliard-trained Joshua Rifkin has written, “transformed the rough vibranc­

y of his forebears into subtle and polished art.” Interest­

ingly enough, Joplin cautioned on some of his music, “Do not play this piece fast. It is never right to play ‘ragtime’ fast.”

It is these works and others like them which Schonberg has characterized as “enchanting,” and which Winthrop Sargeant, The New Yorker music critic, has praised “as part of America’s artistic heritage and no mean examples of the art of writing for the piano.”

Why has ragtime, a musical phenomenon which emerged in the late 1890s in the United States, exploded into a craze which peaked about 1910, and then virtually
disappeared at about the time of World War I, suddenly become the center of attention again in a variety of musical circles? Tichenor credits a record by Rifkin called “Scott Joplin Piano Rags,” released in 1970 on the Nonesuch label, with having had a major influence on the revival of interest in ragtime. “I think it took someone with Rifkin’s credentials and his knowledge to bring this music to a wide audience of classical music lovers,” Tichenor explained. “There are some people who disagree with the way Rifkin plays,” he continued, “but you can’t fault the record technically. I think it one that Joplin would enjoy. Remember, it was the first such recording to be released nationally.”

Tichenor’s theory makes sense when one recalls that it was this Rifkin recording which first focused Schonberg’s attention on Joplin. After hearing it, Schonberg told his New York Times readers that “the syncopations—and ragtime is based on syncopation—were as idiomatically applied as the rubatos in a Chopin mazurka. Joplin was a real composer.”

Just how talented a composer Joplin really was became evident with the release early this year of a two-volume compendium, The Collected Works of Scott Joplin, edited by Vera Brodsky Lawrence with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Nearly all of Joplin’s fifty-three pieces for piano, as well as his opera “Treemonisha” are among the entries in this tremendous collection. Tichenor was one of those who helped Mrs. Lawrence, a former concert pianist, with the compilation of this work. “I bundled up all my original Joplin rags and sent them to her because the Library of Congress copies were generally in such bad shape,” he said.

That Joplin should have suddenly come into his own, however, does not surprise Tichenor. “I’m amazed it didn’t happen sooner,” he said. Even he was a bit astonished, however, when after sixty years of gathering dust on library shelves, “Treemonisha” finally made it to the stage at Atlanta’s Memorial Arts Center in January of this year.

Down to the Peachtree State went the Times’ peripatetic Schonberg. He found parts of the opera amazing—particularly the “Real Slow Drag” that ends the work. Schonberg exclaimed: “Harmonically enchanting, full of the tensions of an entire race, rhythmically catching, it refuses to leave the mind. Talk about soul music!”

For a variety of reasons including illness, bad weather, and the fact that showboat musicians are not so affluent as rock stars, Tichenor missed the Atlanta premiere. “It is incredible that I wasn’t there,” he admitted. “Incredible!” But he did make it to New York in mid-May for a Ragtime Jamboree in Brooklyn College’s Gershwin Theatre, where he was one of six pianists who performed there. Trebor played two compositions by S. Brunson Campbell, a protegé of Joplin’s, and two of his own works, “It’s a Long Way Back Home” and “Bucksport Stomp.” Brun Campbell had an infectious folk rag style reminiscent of Tichenor’s own technique, and representative compositions by both composers are included on a recording called “Mississippi Valley Ragtime” which Tichenor made in 1966 for Scroll Records.

Ragtime—good ragtime—is not easy music to play, Critic Sargent made this point cogently when he observed: “The right-hand rhythmic patterns of ragtime, in fact, represented the most complicated rhythmic structures ever written down by American popular composers. Polyrhythm and syncopation, subsequently features of jazz, were elaborated to an extraordinary extent, and the right hand of a good ragtime writer scarcely knew what his thumping left hand was doing.”

Tichenor’s preparation included ten years of intensive classical training, begun when he was but five years old. Several times he started and stopped, but encouraged by
Eubie Blake, 89 years young and still playing rollicking ragtime, was one of those featured with Trebor Tichenor at a recent Brooklyn College concert. Blake, seen occasionally on the Dick Cavett show, was once part of the famous team of Sissle and Blake which brought the musical “Shuffle Along” to Broadway in 1921.

Trebor Tichenor’s basement is a treasure trove of ragtime memorabilia. Thousands of piano rolls are squirreled away there, together with a large and extremely rare collection of ragtime sheet music. The RCA Victor dog, symbol of the “Victrola” era, guards the “irreplaceables.”
The golden days of jazz on the Mississippi come to mind when the St. Louis Ragtimers swing into action on the Goldenrod Showboat, their official home. Makers of the foot-tapping, soul-grabbing music are, left to right: Don Franz, tuba; Bill Mason, cornet; Al Stricker, banjo; and Tichenor. Glennon J. J. Meyer, clarinetist, another regular, was not present for the photograph.

The villain still stalks the stage of the Goldenrod Showboat as old-time melodrama plays to a full house on the first deck. Two alumni, Frank Pierson, A.B. 1955, and Don Franz, B.S.I.E. 1955, M.S.I.E. 1960, formed a corporation and restored the boat, built over sixty years ago, to its former splendor.
his mother, who herself had once had her own band, called "Letty's Collegiate Syncopators," he persevered.

"Ragtime's complexity is attributable, at least in part, to its heterogeneous background. It represents, according to Rifkin, a special mix of diverse musical strands: "Marching-band music; dances such as the polka, quadrille, and schottische, sentimental songs, and salon music, bound together with the vital syncopated rhythms indigenous to black music in Africa, the Caribbean, and the United States."

"Ragtime's early practitioners, most of them Black, could find jobs playing only in saloons and bordellos with the result, as Rudi Blesh has written, that "America both accepted and rejected ragtime. It met fanatic opposition from an informal entente of the moralistic prudes, the Europe-oriented culture snobs, and an Academy that felt suddenly challenged. . . . The real trouble with ragtime was not that it was no good but that it was too good, and it had, so to speak, been born out of wedlock, with at least a part of its parentage Black."

Tichenor is quite familiar with such opposition. Various teachers tried along the way to steer him in another direction; even his parents worried when it became apparent that he wanted to play such music professionally. "But by the time I graduated from Washington University," Tichenor recalled, "it was hard to concentrate on anything else but music. It just sort of took over. The music really got me. I was so interested in it that I really didn't need any encouragement."

Down on the showboat these days, the St. Louis Ragtimers play both rags and traditional jazz. Their mastery of a wide variety of music is one of the reasons why they are such a viable group, with a history of playing together since 1961. Tichenor himself, unlike many other ragtime pianists, can also improvise, which explains why he is able to play traditional jazz piano so well.

But intellectually and emotionally his musical commitment is to ragtime. Joplin, of course, is Tichenor's idol. "He had more subtlety and depth," Tichenor explained, "but a couple of other men—James Scott and Joe Lamb—were almost as great. You can listen to other composers—there are some 4,000 published rags and at least another thousand which were never copyrighted—but you always come back to these three."

Currently, Tichenor and Dave Jasen, a ragtime zealot in New York, are working on a ragtime encyclopedia. Another dream which Tichenor intends to make a reality is the establishment of a ragtime study center in the St. Louis area. In one sense it will be a museum, even though Tichenor hates that word. There he intends to make available his enormous holdings so that St. Louis, which was once a great ragtime capital, will again be the undisputed center and clearinghouse for this type of music.

Meanwhile, Tichenor, one of the founders of the Ragtime Festival, an annual event on the Goldenrod which attracts several thousand fans from all over the country each June, is preparing for this year's event. He is also struggling to meet deadlines for another in a series of analytical ragtime articles which he continues to write for scholarly journals.

Sandwiched between all of these efforts, Tichenor does the commentary on a radio show devoted to ragtime, aired over KDNA-FM each Tuesday evening from eight to nine. At first, Tichenor found this a formidable task, but in recent weeks he has lost his mike fright and does the show live with only a few notes as a guide.

Asked if he ever became bored with ragtime, Tichenor replied thoughtfully, "Sometimes you have the sense that you are working in a corner, but there's a lot more there than people realize. After all, ragtime was a widely creative thing for some twenty years. Somehow I manage to keep it fresh, and there's always something that needs to be done. We're still trying to find one Joplin piano roll, 'Pleasant Moments.'" As for those who still don't understand what he sees in ragtime, Tichenor shook his head ruefully and confessed, "I never was able to understand why they couldn't hear what I hear."
THIS JUNE saw the first Washington University commencement ceremonies in a decade that were not presided over by Thomas H. Eliot. Dr. William H. Danforth did the honors this year as successor to Chancellor Eliot, and his maiden voyage as master of ceremonies at the various commencement affairs was blessed by perfect weather, large and enthusiastic crowds, and several truly outstanding guest speakers.

The Reverend Jesse Jackson was the featured speaker at the Eliot Honors Day convocation and lived up to his reputation as a fiery, impassioned, and eloquent spokesman for the poor people, the little people, the oppressed people of the world. Jackson, who is founder, national director, and president of Operation P.U.S.H. (People United to Save Humanity), called on the graduates to go out into the world "not just to make a living, but to live."

Lady Jackson (no relation to the Reverend Jesse), who is better known as the economist and writer Barbara Ward, joined with her namesake in warning that the United States and other nations of the world must make greater efforts to solve grave problems stemming from inequalities among peoples, if our civilization is to endure.

Predicting that the world has only a short time to solve the problems it is now facing, Lady Jackson said, "If we cannot complete the ending of political colonialism with full world-wide economic and social responsibility and justice, we face a world as endangered as the end of Rome."

At the School of Medicine commencement exercises, Dr. John A. D. Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges, was the chief speaker, calling for the establishment of a Cabinet-level agency to deal with national health problems. Raymond H. Witcoff, president of Transurban Investment Corporation, was the speaker at the annual certificate awards program for students of the University's School of Continuing Education. Mr. Witcoff was first chairman of the Human Development Corporation in St. Louis, a former president of Downtown St. Louis, Incorporated, and one of the leaders in establishing educational television in St. Louis.

All told, some 2384 persons received degrees at the various ceremonies, including 1173 undergraduates and 1211 graduate and professional students.

Winston Forrest, who has probably become known personally to more alumni than any other staff member in Washington University's history, is leaving the University.

Win, who has been chosen as the new president of the American Alumni Council, has been director of alumni relations at Washington University since 1964. We feel strongly that only a position that offered the prestige and opportunity of AAC's presidency would ever have lured Win Forrest away from an institution he has served so well and with such loyalty and enthusiasm.

The American Alumni Council is composed of 1600 member institutions—colleges, universities, and secondary schools—throughout the United States and Canada. Its membership includes more than 3000 representatives of these institutions: alumni administrators, fund-raisers, editors and publications people, and public relations and information specialists. In his new position, Win will head this vast and influential organization and direct its efforts toward increasing alumni involvement in, and support of, our institutions of higher learning. AAC could not have chosen a better man for the job.

A native Texan, Win came to Washington University as a freshman in 1955 and received his A.B. in 1959. While an undergraduate, he worked in the University's news bureau, showing then an aptitude for publications and communications that has remained a most important part of the talents he has shown in his job. He has won numerous national honors for alumni programs, but perhaps the most significant was the Time-Life Direct Mail Award he received at the AAC national conference two years ago. It was the first time in AAC history that the coveted Time-Life Award was given for a complete program of direct mail communications with alumni.

During Win's eight years as director of alumni relations, there has been a radical transformation of the role of the alumnus at Washington University. It was during Win's administration of alumni affairs that the old Alumni Federation was transformed into today's Alumni Board of Governors, which gives alumni for the first time direct representation on the University's Board of Trustees. It was during Win's tenure that strong and active alumni councils were established or rejuvenated throughout the country. And of course, as anyone who has attended Founders Day or the Alumni Senior Dinner-Dance and class reunions in June can attest, it was Win Forrest who has done most to make both events the outstanding occasions they have become.

It is a remarkable tribute to Win Forrest that he has been chosen to be the national representative of some 3000 of his peers and colleagues. It is a tribute also to Washington University and to its alumni with whom Win has worked these past eight years. We're sorry to see him go, but we're proud both for Win Forrest and for Washington University.

—FO'B
College tennis has never been a big box-office draw, but those who watched the Bears varsity work out this spring found it especially easy on the eyes thanks to three coeds who made the team. Slim, lithe, and fast—they moved like dancers on the court—this trio more than held its own as these young women players defeated the majority of the opposition, male players from neighboring colleges in dual matches. Their victories brought them no special feeling of elation, however, but rather a sense of sympathy for their foe whom they uniformly characterized as “really sweet guys.”

Differing in temperament and style, the threesome—Carol Weston from Cincinnati, Karen Quackenbush from St. Louis County, and Mary Stohn from Duxbury, Mass.—all came from tennis-swinging families, and all had a trophy or two back home as shining proof of their prowess on the court. None of them is of Amazonian proportions—senior Stohn, in fact, weighed in at 103 after a double-malt, but all of them exhibited a form honed by hours of practice based on lessons learned from pros. Still, they displayed certain idiosyncrasies. Karen Quackenbush, for example, her honey-colored pony-tail waving in the breeze, used a Pancho Segura two-handed grip to bring her backhand around, but followed through with a single-armed stroke. Accepted by their fellow netmen because, as Coach Michael S. Kessler explained, “they were good competitors, the girls made the Bears tennis squad this year a team well worth watching.”