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THE ALUMNI SPEAK...
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY has some 18,000 alumni outside the St. Louis area (and 15,000 within it). Of those who live at a distance, more than a thousand live in or near New York City—the largest concentration of alumni in any city other than St. Louis itself.

The following pages present interviews with a dozen of these New York alumni. There was no attempt to make a statistical sampling, but the group includes graduates ranging over half-a-century: engineers, writers, businessmen, a teacher, a television producer, an attorney. Some are close to the University and think well of it. Others are out of touch, and some have pointedly critical remarks to make. All of the remarks are relevant to what the University has been, what it is now, and what it hopes to become.

Each interview was conducted in terms of the national report on alumni activities that is the center 16-page section of this issue. The aim has been to contrast and complement the attitudes and opinions of Washington University alumni with those expressed by alumni of other institutions.

The consensus, such as it is, is for you, as the reader, to identify.

Two further points should be made:
In the first interview, Edward Pinney, now a New York psychiatrist, remarks on the "openness" and "frankness" of Washington University alumni in New York. Our experience of interviewing and imposing on some twenty alumni in what is often considered one of the more cold-blooded cities in America bears out Pinney's observation. High among the virtues of this group of people, immersed as they are in an atmosphere of pressure, tension, and impersonality, is a warmth and receptivity that speaks well for something—be it the University or the Middle West.

The second point relates to a single individual, whose picture you see at right. He is Paul Davidson, president of Washington University's New York alumni club. Let it only be said that we think the esteem of friends and fellow-alumni is important—and that Paul Davidson has it.

—RLP
Edward L. Pinney Jr. is a psychiatrist. His undergraduate work was done at Princeton. He took his first two years in medical training at West Virginia University and received his M.D. from Washington University in 1949. He spent his internship at City Hospital in St. Louis and his residency at Brooklyn (N.Y.) State Hospital. He conducts his private practice in Brooklyn and is a clinical instructor (in the Diagnostic Psychiatry and Psychosomatic Medicine Clinic of The Brooklyn Hospital) in the Downstate Medical Center of the State University of New York. His wife, Arline Caldwell Pinney, is also a psychiatrist. They have two children and live in an apartment on Central Park West.

The Washington University group is very different from the other groups in New York. They're more open and Midwestern and much more frank about things. This is much the same impression I had when I was in St. Louis. The attitude has much to recommend it—in New York things are much more organized and stratified.

Any other differences that you've noticed?

In New York people who are educated have interests in the arts and sciences—developed interests in areas outside their own professional activity. I think that is to their credit.

What is your reaction to the trend described in the national report on alumni activities?

I agree with what you've told me about it. Princeton has been doing this sort of thing for a long time. I've been to some Washington University alumni meetings because I've been interested in hearing the speakers. The speakers have been people more closely connected with the undergraduate areas, but I've enjoyed listening to them.

What is your impression of the academic quality of the University?

My work was all in the Medical School, so I can't say much about the other parts of the University. As for the School of Medicine, I haven't found any that I regard as better. I've been favorably impressed by the people I've met from the University, as I was with those I knew while I was there. The alumni activities at Princeton—have you been involved?

Yes, as much as I've been able to. They have seminars at reunion time that I would like to attend. Actually, there are many seminars, lectures, and other things going on in New York all the time. The only reason I'd become involved in Washington U. alumni activities is because of my interest in the University.

There has been a big change in alumni affairs since about 1952, and what has gone on has had a direct influence on my interest in the University.
Herbert Altman is a teacher in the fifth grade at P.S. 12 in Brooklyn, and has been for four years. P.S. 12 is classified as a "special service school"—a school where most of the children are slow learners or have emotional problems. Altman went to Washington University because he planned to study medicine, but military service interfered with that ambition and he changed his program to education. He had intended to become a pediatrician; when his plans changed he concentrated his interest on nursery school and primary school teaching. He believes that between 1947 and 1949 he was the only qualified male nursery school teacher in St. Louis. He holds an M.A. in education from Columbia as well as a professional diploma as a specialist in early childhood education. Married, he has two children and lives in Brooklyn.

I wasn't very active when I was a student at Washington University, but I was a founder of the Independent Party on the campus in 1947. We almost succeeded in getting a candidate elected, but the fraternities beat us out.

What has your experience been as borough chairman of the Alumni Fund?

When I contacted other alumni to help with fund raising, they all showed an eagerness to take part. They also indicated they would like to get together more often, if it were possible. They all seem to be friendly to the University, and they're interested in hearing about it.

My work with the Fund has been my only contact with other alumni in New York, although I've always kept up with what's going on there through the WU Magazine and other information I've received.

As a New Yorker by origin, what is your estimate of the University?

I've always felt that the University is one of the best in the country. My impressions haven't changed much, except in the sense that I feel stronger toward it as a center of learning as the years go by.

Does the continuing education idea interest you?

Yes, it does. Naturally, I'd be most interested if the content were related to the latest trends in education, since that is my field. It would give me an idea of how things are being done in school systems elsewhere—near the University, for example. It would probably be hard to set up, but it would give people some indication of happenings in other parts of the country.
Melvin L. Burni carries the ponderous title of Manager of Operations Research and Synthesis Consulting Service, defining an activity that puts on him responsibility for exploring certain long-range development interests of General Electric. His is a world of the future, of explicit statements of business objectives and functions, of business systems, of computers that may eliminate much stultifying mental work. An electrical engineer himself (1933), Burni is a charter member of the William Greenleaf Eliot Society of the University. His home is in Darien, Connecticut.

The University has been something in my past for years. The only reason I became even mildly interested recently was because the free private institution is in jeopardy and needs to be maintained.

What should the relationship between the alumnus and his institution be?

I don't think the University should be something in the past. A person's interest shouldn't just be self-stimulated. The University has the obligation to take the first step. After that, there should be a mutual reaching out. In any event, the University maintaining just a "gimme" attitude isn't enough.

Do you favor continuing education as an alumni activity?

Continuing education is an important area. There are tremendous social as well as technological changes taking place, and a person must have somewhere to turn to find out what's going on. The individual can't put himself in a position of devoting one period to learning and another to working—the two have to go together. But the questions are: "What's important?" and, "How do you teach adults?"

There is also an important area between the alumnus and the institution for the interchange of ideas. This is usually neglected at a distance from the campus, but some institutions manage to do it. The math department at Princeton, in its relations with former graduate students, is an example of what I mean. These people never really get away from school. There is a close liaison between faculty and alumni and a continuing exchange of ideas on current problems. An effort is made to provide seminars for alumni and others who are interested. The result is a freshness in their math department; they keep up with what's going on.

How else can this relationship be improved?

One area related to this is the utilization of the talents of particular alumni who have something to offer. Washington University fails to do this, I believe. The alumnus who is a scholar or specialist in his field could contribute something valuable to the University—in addition to money. The University should try to tap these people for their help. Such people could do a lot, particularly in the professional fields, to keep the curriculum in line with progress that's being made. It would help to vitelize the curriculum, and it would bring to bear for the University the advice of informed professionals.

There is a tendency to think of alumni only en masse, and not as specific individuals who could make a contribution to the University. There should be a deeper, more personal relationship. The University should begin to build a realization in the student's mind that Washington is a great university. Pride like this tends to maintain itself through the years.

How do you feel about the social emphasis on alumni activity, as opposed to the intellectual?

There should be a balance between the two. The University can help its alumni keep informed, by such things as distributing information about books published in a particular field. Not just a list of titles and authors, but a report that includes an abstract of the content.
Edward Beimfohr (AB 53, LLB 56) is a lawyer with Sullivan and Cromwell in New York, the law firm in which the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was formerly a senior partner. A varsity basketball player as an undergraduate, he worked for an accounting firm and at other spare-time jobs—and still managed an almost perfect grade average in his undergraduate years. He lives with his wife and two children in Great Neck, Long Island.

Like most alumni I feel an obligation to the University, and I suppose I’ve given more time to it than most. I’m student recruitment chairman in the New York City area. Along with homecomings and reunions, I feel the alumni should be doing something worthwhile for the University. The University should devote more of its efforts toward keeping the younger alumni close to the University. They are the ones who want to work, especially on rewarding things.

Have you enjoyed the student recruitment work?

It’s very interesting. When a student applies for admission to the University, we’re sent his name, and within a couple of weeks one of us calls on him. Many of these youngsters are confused and want to be helped. They need assistance and good advice. My own philosophy is not to try the “hard-sell” approach—you don’t need to, and it wouldn’t be proper for the University to do it that way. If they want an opinion, we give it. In some cases we may even advise against a student’s going to Washington. But when you find a good student with talent, you can help both him and the University by advising him to go there.

What kind of impression of the University do these prospective students have?

Some of them don’t know about it at all—and some of them, of course, aren’t really very interested in the first place. Their application may be superficial. Among the students who have heard of Washington, either through their parents or from friends, the attitude is very respectful. It is looked on as one of the top-notch universities in the Midwest.

The biggest feature of the University is its faculty. The faculty is first-rate and, moreover, makes itself available to the student body. Some of the large Eastern universities with famous professors have classes so large that the student may have no contact with the top men.

Some people say Washington University is a cold place—did you find it that way?

The University isn’t cold and indifferent. Quite the contrary. Both the faculty and the student body were quite friendly, as far as I was concerned. Here again, it seems much more friendly than schools in the East tend to be. The small class size helps; there’s a much more personal atmosphere. The administration was very liberal and flexible, too, in both attitude and policies.

I wasn’t a fraternity man, and I didn’t participate in a lot of activities, although I played basketball as an undergraduate. I always worked part-time while I was in school so that I was not intimately involved in campus life, but I was favorably impressed with the warmth and friendliness of the general atmosphere.

Does the idea of continuing education for alumni appeal to you?

Well, I’m not sure it can be worked out as a practical matter, but if alumni meetings are going to have any purpose at all, it should be to keep the alumni informed. We want to know what the faculty is doing, and about changes in academic philosophy and policy and improvements in the facilities of the University. The more the alumni knows about what’s going on the better.

It’s in the interest of the University and the alumni both that there be contact between the two. The institution has helped to put the alumni in the position he is in, and when you can broaden the relationship—make it mutually beneficial—you’ve gone a long way.

You have to keep the interest of people right after they leave. There’s a natural void to be filled when a student graduates, and the University could step in and maintain interest on a satisfying and profitable basis. Otherwise, the tendency is for the young alumni to forget the University and become too involved in his own affairs. It’s up to the University to retain and stimulate his interest.
George McCue majored in botany, took a bachelor's degree in 1950 and a master's degree in 1952. As outspoken now as when he was Student Life editor, he has been with Life Magazine since graduation. For the past year and a half he has been a reporter in the Military Affairs Department of Life. Unmarried, he lives in Manhattan.

I don't think much of the University as an educational institution because I wasn't really educated there. I don't think I was ever really challenged.

Was it your fault or the University's?

It isn't the fault of the student if he isn't made to work hard. What I should have had was a classic education—high standards and stiff discipline. I don't have a very high opinion of the University's academic program and philosophy, although when I was there I was sold on the kind of program the College was putting into effect.

Even with a mediocre faculty you could do a good teaching job if you had a sound philosophy to begin with. They'd make you learn basic facts and techniques. There are only four years of college, if you waste them they're gone. There's a great deal to learn, and you can't waste the time.

Have you kept in touch with the University since you left?

I haven't had any formal contact with the University as an alumnus. I've kept a lot of personal contacts that I made while I was on Student Life. I was Theta Xi, but I haven't seen any fraternity brothers for years. I've never been to a reunion—that money would be better spent on scholarships.

What about a continuing education program for alumni?

It would be wonderful for those who would take advantage of it, but the best time to get an education is the four years you're there. I admire the person who can get a degree by going to night school—I couldn't do it myself. Usually a student has to be made to work—to do the boring things. Hofacker [Professor Erich P. Hofacker, Department of German]—there was a professor who knew how. He gave you assignments, and if you didn't do the work it was reflected in your grades. A student won't do the work unless discipline is imposed on him to make him get it done.

Are you interested in what happens at the University?

I'm interested in news about the institution. The University is known in scientific circles outside the Midwest, but not much beyond that. It's short-sighted in its athletic policy. All they really have to do is divorce the athletic program from the academic program. They ought to subsidize the athletic program all-out. This way, without a big-time program, the University suffers. The University's approach now is wrong—it's unreal. If supporting a team would get endowment and recognition, then why not do it? A good part of the value of a degree is what it means to others, so recognition is important.
Alice Higgins is a staff writer for Sports Illustrated, responsible for covering horse shows (she's an experienced horsewoman) and the department called "sport in art." In addition to her study at Maryville College and Washington University, she did graduate work for two years at the Central Laboratory for Belgian Museums and at the University of Brussels. She has been with Sports Illustrated since 1955; before that she worked three years as a reporter for Life.

I don't really consider myself an alumna of Washington University. I did my undergraduate work at Maryville College, and only took my master's degree at Washington (art history, 1949). There was a group of us there who have kept in touch with one another ever since, but I've never thought of them as fellow-alumni, particularly. Contact with close friends from the University is the kind of relationship I'm interested in, anyway, rather than formal alumni activity.

You're an alumna of several institutions. Do you feel Washington University has an obligation to you as a former graduate student?

The University doesn't have any obligation to me. I don't know whether I have an obligation to it, or not. When you're a student, you pay tuition and take as much advantage of your education as you can.

I have a funny feeling about college. I went to City House before Maryville; when you compare that kind of education with that at a big university like Washington, there's a big difference. There is a totally different atmosphere. I noticed two things when I went to Washington—the lack of respect shown the teacher, and the lack of personal supervision on the graduate level. (In my first class meeting at Washington I jumped up when the teacher came in, and no one else did. I felt like a fool.)

If you missed a day at a university, at least as a graduate, no one cared. It was all right at the graduate level, but I don't know whether I would have liked it at 17. I was brought up in a fairly strict home, and to have been turned loose in a big university would have been terrifying. At 22 it was different.

Are you interested in the University now?

I'm fascinated with the new buildings and the other changes in the place. I get back to St. Louis every year—my mother lives there, and my brother Ed is with the Post-Dispatch. He went to St. Louis University, and my great-uncle was once president of St. Louis U. I'm the first in the family to break the tradition.

Washington is very good academically. It doesn't rank with some of the top schools in art history, but that's a matter of size rather than quality. I might contribute money to something of special interest at the University, but not just for general support.
My reactions to my alma mater are tinged with disappointment. From the day I left Washington University until Dr. Compton and then Mr. Shepley came along, there was estrangement. I made every effort to keep alive the tie, but it didn't survive. Even now, my ties with Dr. Compton and Mr. Shepley are personal ties, really. Beyond them, the fog.

For instance, Mr. Shepley did something so untypical of the University—when he learned that a large testimonial dinner was being given in my honor, he flew to New York to attend. That meant a great deal to me.

Do you get back to the University?

By a kind of magnetic pull, I do visit the campus when I go back to St. Louis, but once there, as is not too unusual for a returning native, I wander around forlornly. In my autobiography I emphasized that I was more or less an outcast as a student because of religious discrimination, but I don't castigate the University for that. I blame the fraternity and sorority system. I grant any club its selective rights. But in an educational institution, processes like this are unfortunate. ... Veil, in any event, it left a scar across the years that does not seem to entirely heal.

On the other hand, the University enriched me in many ways, and I did avail myself of the years on the campus. To be sure, no lifelong personal friendships with the faculty came out of it—no one leaned out to me as an individual, but neither, I suppose, did I as a student.

Should the University have exercised more discipline?

The University is neither a law-enforcer or a baby-sitter. I found as much as I put into it. It wasn't made as interesting as it might have been, and at that time there was very little encouragement of the student as an individual. There was no feeling that I had qualities or inherent values of special potential, nor had I a right to expect it. What I do cherish most from the University is the intellectual curiosity I developed there.

The first recognition I ever had in college came when an instructor said, "I received a theme today, and it is so good I might have written it myself."

Do you think the relationship between alumni and the University ought to change?

I certainly feel that alumni should be more articulate, and that the University ought to do more to maintain student ties. There is a reciprocal obligation between the alumnus and the institution, and there should be an ethic established in what the University's attitude toward its alumni should be. As it has been, the average student goes out of college and sheds the whole environment. This is regrettable.

It is essential that the alumni be kept sufficiently interested to want to come back. I never had that urge, and numerous graduates have expressed similar experience. A student who is to become an alumnus should begin to understand this relationship while he is still in school—not walk out as I did without being prepared to think in terms of being an alumnus. If I had, the ultimate relationship with the University would have been better.

The only time I have evidence of alumni activity is when money is mentioned. When it is, I'm afraid I'm cold to it. The feeling of attachment can die—however strong it may once have been.

But just the same, I have a strong feeling of pride in the University—in the calibre of men and women associated with it, as well as gratitude and admiration for Messrs. Compton and Shepley, who have contributed a new entente cordiale and added status and stature to Washington University.

Fannie Hurst's autobiography, Anatomy of Me, is the best place to start for those who want to know something more about this remarkable woman. A Liberal Arts alumna, Miss Hurst wrote the libretto for the first senior class musical, an event which became the annual Quad Show two years later. She took her graduate work at Columbia. In 1953, the University awarded her an honorary Doctor of Letters. Many of her works have become motion pictures (Humoresque, Imitation of Life, Back Street, to cite three), and her novels and short stories have been translated into sixteen languages. She lives in an apartment off Central Park, amid a collection of antiques and objects d'art gathered from all parts of the world.
Walter Lantz has been Director of Marketing for Wesley and Associates, an advertising agency, for the past two years. He was a vice president of Bristol-Myers for eight years. Prior to that he had been with The Lambert Company for more than twenty years, rising to the position of vice president before he left the company. He is a director of the Broadway Savings Bank in New York and a director and past chairman of the Audit Bureau of Circulation, the watchdog organization that examines the circulation activities of the leading subscription newspapers and magazines in the country. A native St. Louisan, Lantz holds a BS in Business Administration (1927) from Washington University and a master's degree in business administration from Columbia University.

There should be closer liaison between the University and the alumni clubs. Up to a few years ago, there was no conscious attempt to develop an alumni organization in New York. This is the hardest place to have an alumni club, of course—many alumni live in the suburbs, and it's a project for them to stay in town for dinner and an alumni meeting.

You were recently chairman of the Alumni Fund in New York. How did that work out?

Fund activity is very worthwhile. I spent a great deal of time organizing a team, and we all took it seriously. It's difficult to raise money here—almost all of it has to be done by telephone. You can't just walk into somebody's office in New York as you might somewhere else.

To get real activity in fund work we should do something like the Princeton people do. They organize by class and school and get a lot of people working. We must develop a larger group of fund raisers, and make them feel it is an honor to work for the University—which it is.

What kinds of club activities are you interested in? What should the University do that it isn't doing now?

Activities and meetings should be on general topics. No picnics—that's for the birds in New York. At meetings like that all you see is strangers. We want to hear something about the University at alumni meetings—new buildings, progress being made, new developments.

It would help, too, if closer liaison were possible between the University and alumni in the East. A staff member of the University's alumni office could report to the people here, and it would bring about a closer relationship than we have now. We lack knowledge of what's going on in the University, and we want to know about it.

A club activities committee in New York would be helpful, too. It could arrange for faculty visitors and plan topics for meetings that would be of general interest.
DON STRICKLIN received an AB in geology in 1939 and worked as a professional geologist for a brief time before entering service. After the war, finding there wasn't much opportunity for a geologist whose education stopped with an AB, he went into sales work. His first sales job involved selling soap door-to-door in East St. Louis. He is now vice president for sales for Playtex, a job which requires much travel and a sturdy sense of humor. Under his direction, the Alumni Fund in the New York area has experienced its most successful year.

Most of the alumni in New York have lost contact with the University. We have a lot of people here who are leaders in their field, but the University doesn't know about them. I was completely out of touch, myself, for twenty years, but that's probably because I moved around so much.

What got you interested in the University again?

I'm interested in the University because it's a private institution. Most of us realize the importance of private higher education and know that it needs our support. Costs are going up, and the University needs our help. . . .

You say the University has done more for serious feeling among its alumni in recent years. Have you discovered any resentment toward the University?

I've contacted 35 or 40 people, either by phone or in person, during the Alumni Fund campaign, and I didn't hear any of that. Only one worker in the campaign reported hearing an expression of ill-feeling against the school.

There's been more contact for all of us recently. The Alumni Fund has involved more people, both as workers and as contributors. It's how I got involved again. We're getting a feeling of comradeship in New York that didn't exist before. Things like the William Greenleaf Eliot Society, the club and Fund meetings—all these things help bring us closer to the University. Our biggest problem is one of distance. We're spread from Connecticut to Pennsylvania, and it's hard to get people together.

Special events don't mean too much. The turnout isn't too good. The same group comes each time, for the most part, and you can't get people to travel a long way for a social gathering. Our Fund meetings aren't strictly social. We usually have cocktails and then settle down to work. Just to get together and talk isn't enough. If we can encourage enough people to get involved in useful activities, we'll succeed.

I've met a lot of people and made quite a few friends through alumni work, and I've enjoyed it. I'm well-informed about the University now, although I wasn't for a long time. I get Student Life, the WU Magazine, and the Alumni News. Incidentally, I wonder if the Magazine is newsy enough. I'd like there to be an Alumni News committee of the club in New York, with class secretaries.

The committee would gather the material and put it together and send it in to the University. That way we'd all be better informed about other alumni.

After being chairman of the Fund for a while, are you pleased with the way things are going?

Yes, I am. I sent out 140 letters this year asking for volunteers to work on the Fund and got 35 people. That's a good response. This year we're going to run a mail survey of all of our alumni in New York and find out what they think we should do, which of them are willing to work, and how many contacts we should try to make on a personal basis.

One thing you should do, by the way. You should mention Otto Buettner in the Magazine. He's a member of the class of 1909—which means he's at least 70—and I asked him to help us on the Fund. He took nine solicitations and collected from all nine an average of $75. I haven't met him personally, but he really did a job for us. If we could get that kind of help from more of our alumni here, we'd really have something.
Ernest Havemann could start an alumni club of his own. His wife, Ruth Bohle Havemann, is an alumna, and her two brothers, Edgar (an executive with American Cyanamid) and Bruce (the editor of Theatre Arts), are both alumni. Havemann is now a free-lance writer, after seventeen years as reporter and feature writer for Time and Life. Although he has been a magazine writer through most of his career, he is currently adapting a play for television and has started work on a novel. He lives in New Jersey with his wife and son.

College is like a prison. It’s a place where they put you away for four years while you’re potentially dangerous to society. I don’t mean that, really. Actually, I have no special feelings of any kind about the University. After I left I had some reservations about it, but my feelings now are certainly not of antipathy.

Have you kept in touch with the University?

I’ve never gone to a reunion or an alumni meeting, and until this year I’d never given any money to the school. I’m against meetings, anyway. As a newspaperman you have to attend so many that you don’t want to go to any voluntarily. I’ve visited the campus once or twice, nostalgically.

I don’t see any practicable way to keep serious contact. The University sends a young man out, and there’s no further association. My own case is probably unusual, but I’ve learned a lot more since I left than I did when I was there.

What do you mean by “serious contact”?

There ought to be a major university press, or perhaps a combined university magazine. Mass publications have to go to a mass audience. Universities ought to gear their material to the intellectual minority in the country. The intellectual in America, unless he’s on a university staff, has no way of keeping in touch with intellectual life. It’s time for the intellectuals in America to get together, and if the universities won’t provide the leadership, who will? Did you happen to read Arthur Koestler’s piece in the Saturday Review a while back? He puts his finger on the problem I’m talking about.

Book publishers won’t do the job for the intellectual—at least not as long as they can make a pile out of something like Peyton Place. There’s no incentive for a profit organization in a mass market to pay attention to the intellectuals. Life does many things that are good, but they put them in on their own—not because they need to or have to.

What about the other side of the coin? Does the alumnus have something to contribute to the University?

Can the professional, the specialist, give something to the University besides money? Yes, I think so. For one thing, universities ought to get more of their former students back as teachers. There is nothing more honorable for a professional man than to spend his later years teaching. Archibald McLeish, Robert Penn Warren come to mind, but perhaps writing is particularly well-suited for this. Law might be, too, and perhaps science and engineering as well.

The faculty attitude toward alumni is based on the behavior of alumni at reunions. They think alumni are a bunch of drunks wearing blazers. That age is past. The relationship is better now. The University isn’t a social club for alumni anymore than it is a social club for students.
William R. Sugg Jr. (BSEE 45) (below) as a vice president and director oversees the complex operations of the Europe and Africa division of the Westinghouse Electric International Company from its headquarters office in New York. A football tackle under Jimmy Conzelman, Bill Sugg weighs less today (225) than he did as a player (238), and looks as though he could still make the team. With two sons and a daughter, he and Mrs. Sugg reside in Short Hills, New Jersey.

In 1947 I was president of the Alumni Association in Pittsburgh. As a matter of fact, I had the pleasure of helping to organize the club there. Although I have been able to attend some alumni meetings in Chicago, as well as here in New York, my fifteen years with Westinghouse have been extremely active ones and include nine different assignments in a variety of locations, including three years in London and Paris. Consequently, my job requirements and its performance have not allowed me to sustain a close association as an alumnus.

What's your impression of the University now?

Through the recently increased activities of the alumni, Washington University seems more aggressive and is expanding; however, the Engineering School does not seem to be as well known as when I was there. A dynamic athletic program would, it seems to me, be highly effective in establishing a national reputation which might attract active—as well as talented—young people. The advantage of any school offering a combined training program of competitive athletics and a high scholastic rating cannot be underestimated. The body as well as the mind must be served to enable young people to form well-balanced, integrated personalities. By contrast, St. Louis University has achieved fame of a kind because of the excellent public-relations device its basketball team has proved to be. When you think of St. Louis U. from an Eastern point of view, you are inclined to form a high opinion. This could be discounted as nothing more than confused unconscious association, but you cannot ignore the fact that it has earned St. Louis U. recognition.

The University could help itself by operating its fund-raising efforts at two levels. The Alumni Fund should continue to operate on a volunteer-collection basis from alumni, but the appeals for big money ought to be done by University-retained professionals who know how to promote the tax advantages possible in supporting higher education. The regional Alumni Fund chairmen also must have that kind of information; they should be well acquainted with the tax advantages available in the $25,000-and-over a year bracket. In addition, they must be aware of the large corporations which have matching-gift programs.

Are you active as an alumnus now?

No. I travel about a fourth of the time, budgeting four trips a year to Europe and Africa. Even if I were less transient, I'd still have to place my obligation to the University pretty far down the line. I'd like to do more, but a job, a family, hobbies, and social obligations must, of their nature, take precedence over work for the University.

I'd like to keep alumni activities social in nature—to develop personal friendships.
Ames (left foreground) at rehearsal of Cavalleria Rusticana; his next production will be Don Giovanni on April 12.
LOUIS AMES, a Liberal Arts alumni (1940), went to New York after graduation because "St. Louis didn't offer enough opportunity for the kind of thing I wanted to do." His career since then (with four years out for service in the Navy) has been spent in radio and television. In 1948, he helped found the New York Daily News station WPIX and was its program manager for three years. Now administrator of the NBC Opera Company and its series on television, Ames produced fellow-alumni Dave Garraway's Today show for two years, and the Arlene Francis Home Show. He majored in English and journalism as an undergraduate. His home is in Norwood, New Jersey, where he lives with his wife, actress Jetti Preminger, and their two sons.

I'VE NEVER BEEN INVOLVED with alumni activity. I've never been particularly interested. I'm not much of a joiner—although now that I'm married and have a family I've become a trustee of the board of education in my town. I keep in touch with some of my friends from the University, but there hasn't been much other contact.

How do you feel about the University?

My feelings aren't negative. The University was always an impersonal place to my mind. I wasn't a fraternity man; I pledged, but I couldn't afford it. Academically it was very good—excellent, even. I read about it now and then, and I have a good impression of the school and its faculty. It could do much more for the student as an individual—at least more than it did when I was there. There was very little guidance, although I always thought I could do what I wanted to do on my own. I didn't knock myself out as a student. I was more interested in other things. For a while I worked at an experimental radio station the Star-Times had then. Working there as announcer, writer, and programmer is what first got me interested in communications. In fact, most of the time I was too busy working to earn tuition to pay much attention to my education.

What about continuing education?

The University's responsibility to the student ends when he graduates. Some of the continuing education ideas are very constructive, though. I've done publicity and public relations work myself, and I think it would be to the University's advantage to publicize its graduates more effectively. If we want to keep the image of Washington University as a good university alive, this is one of the most effective ways to do it. The University is a major academic institution that isn't recognized as such.

You were a Liberal Arts student—how do you feel about that now?

I'm very much in favor of liberal arts training. If I had it to do over again I'd be back in liberal arts. It's been very good for me, even though I pursued my own liberal arts training on a very hit-or-miss basis.

Have you ever been to any alumni meetings?

I've studiously avoided invitations to alumni cocktail parties. I can't see that that sort of thing contributes very much either to the alumnus or the University.
THE UNIVERSITY
AND ITS
ALUMNI PROGRAM
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The relationship between Washington University and its alumni has changed dramatically in the last fifteen years—and may change even more in the next fifteen. Fifteen years ago, alumni relations were haphazard for the most part, with little guidance, alumni clubs across the country were chiefly social organizations, and reunions were parties where old friends met to talk about their jobs and their families. Today, with a full-time professional staff serving alumni relations and the Alumni Fund, and with others involved in publications, maintenance of alumni records, mailings and other details, the University is making a sustained effort to establish, re-establish, or maintain with each alumnus a relationship beneficial to both. (At Washington, as at most institutions of higher learning, the term "alumni" includes former students as well as graduates.)

From the University’s point of view, the concept of "continuing education" mentioned so often in this issue has taken a much more important place in alumni relations—supplementing, but not replacing, the social relationship of the past. This education works both ways: Alumni need to be made aware of the problems of the University, its policies, its educational philosophy; and the University needs to know what alumni think of such policies—needs to have their opinions and advice.

The student who lives at home while attending the University often does not establish the close personal ties that are so much a part of life in the residential college or university. Because of this he is inclined to be less closely identified with his alma mater when he becomes an alumnus. The personal ties that are the substance of the class reunion are much less strong, and the character of the alumni relationship generally is different in nature from that of the Ivy League schools (to cite the best known example).

Although this problem will change significantly with an increasing number of students living on campus in the new dormitories, many alumni today have little more than an educational tie to Washington University. This fact makes it difficult to encourage alumni interest in reunions, homecoming, commencement week, and other traditional alumni activities. At the same time it does not prevent the development of what the University considers to be a more constructive alumni program.

The geographical distribution of WU alumni presents obvious difficulties. Less than half of the University’s graduates and former students live in the St. Louis area, and although active alumni programs are under way in a number of cities with large numbers of alumni, the University has not as yet developed satisfactory ways of maintaining a close relationship with the thousands of alumni who are isolated from contact with fellow-alumni.

An incidental aggravation, but an important one, is the mobility of WU alumni: More than 20 per cent change address each year. Apart from the administrative difficulties this mobility creates, many alumni are "lost" to the University in the process. Once that happens, the only way contact can be re-established is through an effort on the part of the alumnus to notify the University of his new address.

Given this brief presentation of the problems and pur-
poses of Washington University's alumni program, the following points seem especially relevant:

(1) The University believes its alumni program should reflect its role as an educational institution—there must be a proper balance of educational and social activities. The relationship of the alumnus to the University must be mutually beneficial.

(2) The alumni program must be based on a realistic recognition (a) That many alumni do not feel close personal ties to the University; (b) that the University for many years neglected the interests and importance of its alumni; (c) that a sound long-range alumni program must begin at the student level; (d) that an informed, interested alumni can be a major asset—probably an indispensable asset—in the University's future; and (e) that the University, with an effective alumni program, can contribute substantially to the intellectual, cultural, and professional development of its former students.

(3) Essential to this relationship is an increasing depth in what the University knows about its alumni as individuals. As New York alumnus Melvin Hurni says in an interview in this issue, the University must better use the talents of particular alumni who have something to offer. Many alumni can help the University in specific ways, and this deeper, more personal relationship that Hurni envisions already exists on a limited scale. One way the talents of individual alumni are utilized, of course, is through advisory committees, the Washington University Council, and the University's Board of Directors. The Board of Directors has six alumni representatives from the larger alumni associations advising it; eight regular Board members (half the membership of the Board) are also alumni. The Washington University Council, a lay advisory group of about 250 persons, includes many alumni on its committees.

Washington University's alumni relations have in the last fifteen years become a comprehensive, sustained program which compares favorably with that of similar institutions; many activities have, like Topsy, "just grewed"—with a speed which at times causes problems but is always gratifying to those involved. When the University takes the first step, there does seem to be a strong, positive response on the part of alumni.

Underlying all of this is a conviction that alumni must be well-informed about the University's policies, problems, and purposes. Three publications attempt to provide this information:

(1) The Chancellor's Message, a quarterly four-page letter from the chancellor discussing important aspects of University policy, is sent to alumni, all full-time students and faculty, and a wide variety of other friends of the University.

(2) The Washington University Magazine, now a quarterly publication, was completely redesigned several years ago as a successor to the Alumni Bulletin. Distribution of the Magazine is similar to that of The Chancellor's Message. Its purpose is to reflect the University as an educational institution.

(3) The Alumni News, also a quarterly publication, is sent only to alumni and is designed to serve alumni interests. A newsletter in purpose and format, it contains personal news about alumni, reports on Alumni Federation and club activities, Alumni Fund reports and lists of contributors.

Alumni also receive mailings from the Alumni Fund—the "too much mail" complaint always seems related to these requests for money—and special mailings from the Alumni Relations Office (for example, announcements of the Downtown Luncheon series for alumni). By request to the Office of Information at the University, alumni can also receive the bi-weekly Calendar of Events, listing a wide variety of lectures, exhibits, special events, and other campus activities open to the public.

Supporting the over-all alumni program are the professional staffs of the Alumni Relations Office, the Alumni Fund Office, the Office of Information, and the staff which handles alumni records and reports. In recent years faculty and students have been increasingly active in various aspects of the alumni program, as the following pages reveal.
1. ORGANIZATION

WASHINGTON University alumni in St. Louis are organized into an alumni federation, in existence for four years. Before that, the University had an Arts and Sciences Alumni Association, formed in 1882, and separate alumni associations for several of the professional schools. A complete reorganization of these groups was begun about 1953. Under the reorganization, an association was formed for each school; each association has its own constitution and financing. The financing of the associations is handled in different ways: About half of the associations collect dues; the others are allowed an appropriation from the Alumni Relations Office based on the number of members who contribute to the Alumni Fund.

Since it is impossible to federate both individuals and associations at the same time, the organization became a federation of associations, with the individual alumnus belonging only to his own association.

On January 1, 1956, the Medical Center Alumni Lounge was established. One of the Alumni Office personnel, Miss Gwen Hixson, was placed in charge of this office under the direction of the School of Medicine, the Medical Alumni Association, and the Alumni Office. Through the establishment of this office the Medical Alumni Association has been drawn closer to the Medical School and to the other alumni activities in the University.

The Alumni Federation is composed of one or two representatives from each association, depending on the number of members of the association. It holds regular meetings the first Tuesday of every month on the main campus; all alumni of the University are welcome at these meetings.

The Alumni Federation handles the all-school alumni activities of the University—Homecoming, Founders Day, and Commencement week activities, including reunions and the traditional alumni-senior dinner. A federation such as Washington's can be an advisory, policy-making group only, meeting perhaps once a year, or it can be a working group. Since Washington's fits the latter description, it has been suggested that the out-of-town alumni clubs should be brought closer to the Alumni Federation and be made a part of the larger group. If alumni club presidents could be Federation members, the local character of the Federation would disappear.

At the present time there are sixteen WU alumni clubs actively functioning around the country; these clubs meet regularly and are aided by the University in arranging programs, getting speakers, etc. The presidents of these clubs are sent the names of newcomers in their areas; from time to time directories of alumni in the club cities are issued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni Association and Alumni Club Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni Federation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni Clubs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commencement is a focal point of many traditional alumni activities. Shown here are several of the more dramatic features of Commencement week.
2. ACTIVITIES

The three activities during the academic year with which the Alumni Federation is most actively concerned are Homecoming, Founders Day, and Commencement week.

Homecoming activities have followed a traditional pattern for some years: Set for a football weekend in the fall, the activities are climax by the crowning of the Homecoming queen, and include a bonfire-party on Friday evening to start the weekend for alumni and their children. Considerable emphasis during this weekend is on the social organizations, the fraternities and sororities to which the alumni may have belonged as undergraduates.

Founders Day has become over the past several years a major occasion, celebrating the anniversary of the founding of the University on George Washington's birthday. Activities have been extended to cover the entire weekend; for the first time this year prospective students from all over the country were invited to the campus to participate.

The extended celebration included a special address for the prospective students by Professor Leigh Gerdine, chairman of the Department of Music, tours of the campus, a choice of attending the St. Louis Symphony or a Thymus campus play production, a special luncheon, and the traditional chapel service honoring distinguished alumni and faculty members. Bearskin Follies, the student skit competition, was also presented during this weekend. The Founders Day speech given this year by Dr. Abram Sachar, president of Brandeis University and an alumna of Washington University, is reprinted in this issue on page 56.

Founders Day awards to alumni and faculty members have become one of the highest honors the University can bestow. The faculty awards are particularly important; as Bill Webster says in "Conversation in St. Louis" on page 53: These Founders Day awards protect the good teacher . . . they are "awards of the heart" and have nothing to do with how many books a faculty member may have published or how many degrees he has; this citation is a recognition by the alumni of the personal impact that professor had on his students.

Alumni activities during Commencement week are growing rapidly; to the traditional alumni-senior dinner and class reunions have been added a complex of educational programs and seminars for each school. A planning meeting for club presidents and fund chairmen from all over the country is held at the same time; this two-day meeting plans the activities and fund drive for the coming year.
3. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Plans for the future of alumni activities at Washington University include more emphasis on continuing education programs; alumni seem to agree that this is the most important phase of alumni activities today. To quote New York alumnus Melvin Hurni again, "There are tremendous social as well as technological changes taking place, and a person must have somewhere to turn to find out what's going on."

Within the last three years Washington University has begun two types of continuing education activities: the downtown luncheon series, and institutes and seminars for alumni. The downtown luncheons are not only continuing education for alumni; they also enable alumni and friends of the University to get to know outstanding administrators and faculty members.

The series this year is being held on Fridays, once a month. Speakers this year include E. H. Hopkins, vice chancellor for development; Dr. George Mylonas, chairman of the Department of Art and Archaeology; and Dr. Gustav Mesmer, director of Sever Institute, who have already taken part in the series. On March 25 Thomas H. Eliot, chairman of the Department of Political Science, speaks on "Politics and the Public Schools"; on April 29, Gray L. Dorsey, professor of law, will speak on "The Chinese Recognition Problem"; and on May 27, Alexander M. Buchan, associate professor of English, will speak on "What You Haven't Learned About Literature."

Alumni have brought interested friends to these increasingly popular luncheons; average attendance is more than 100 persons.

Three weekend resident institutes have been held under University auspices during the past three years. These educational programs are still in an experimental stage; different ways of organizing the institutes are now being planned. Of the three that have been held, one concentrated on a specific class (out of school 25 years); one school, the School of Medicine, held an institute which involved its faculty and alumni; the School of Engineering also held a weekend institute for its alumni.

More ambitious programs have been proposed, such as the year-long program which will begin in June at Southwestern University in Memphis. This will be an institute on public responsibility, for which each of 25 top universities in the United States have picked an alumnus in the Memphis area, someone under the age of 45 whom the institution feels is a potential leader. These 25 leaders will attend a week-long program in June, plus four weekend institutes throughout the year, with outstanding faculty members brought in from the 25 schools involved.

One-day seminars have been held on the day of the Alumni-Senior dinner during commencement week; plans are now being made to enlarge this program so that each school can hold a seminar on that day. Now that dormitory space is available for housing during commencement week, more educational programs for longer periods of time will be arranged during that period. Many of the annual meetings of alumni associations now concentrate on educational programs; for example, at the School of Dentistry alumni meeting, held in late March, three papers on dentistry were given by men outstanding in dental education.
As student, as alumna or alumnus: at both stages, one of the most important persons in higher education.

a special report
This is a Salute, an acknowledgment of a partnership and a declaration of dependence. It is directed to you as an alumnus or alumna. As such, you are one of the most important persons in American education today.

You are important to American education, and to your alma mater, for a variety of reasons, not all of which may be instantly apparent to you.

You are important, first, because you are the principal product of your alma mater—the principal claim she can make to fame. To a degree that few suspect, it is by its alumni that an educational institution is judged. And few yardsticks could more accurately measure an institution's true worth.

You are important to American education, further, because of the support you give to it. Financial support comes immediately to mind: the money that alumni are giving to the schools, colleges, and universities they once
attended has reached an impressive sum, larger than that received from any other source of gifts. It is indispensable.

But the support you give in other forms is impressive and indispensable, also. Alumni push and guide the legislative programs that strengthen the nation’s publicly supported educational institutions. They frequently act as academic talent scouts for their alma maters, meeting and talking with the college-bound high school students in their communities. They are among the staunchest defenders of high principles in education—e.g., academic freedom—even when such defense may not be the “popular” posture. The list is long; yet every year alumni are finding ways to extend it.

To THE HUNDREDS of colleges and universities and secondary schools from which they came, alumni are important in another way—one that has nothing to do with what alumni can do for the institutions themselves. Unlike most other forms of human enterprise, educational institutions are not in business for what they themselves can get out of it. They exist so that free people, through education, can keep civilization on the forward move. Those who ultimately do this are their alumni. Thus only through its alumni can a school or a college or a university truly fulfill itself.

Chancellor Samuel B. Gould, of the University of California, put it this way:

“The serious truth of the matter is that you are the distilled essence of the university, for you are its product and the basis for its reputation. If anything lasting is to be achieved by us as a community of scholars, it must in most instances be reflected in you. If we are to win intellectual victories or make cultural advances, it must be through your good offices and your belief in our mission.”

The italics are ours. The mission is yours and ours together.

Alma Mater . . .

At an alumni-alumnae meeting in Washington, members sing the old school song. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the institution to high school boys and girls who, with their parents, were present as the club’s guests.
The popular view of you, an alumnus or alumna, is a puzzling thing. That the view is highly illogical seems only to add to its popularity. That its elements are highly contradictory seems to bother no one.

Here is the paradox:
Individually you, being an alumnus or alumna, are among the most respected and sought-after of beings. People expect of you (and usually get) leadership or intelligent followership. They appoint you to positions of trust in business and government and stake the nation's very survival on your school- and college-developed abilities.

If you enter politics, your educational pedigree is freely discussed and frequently boasted about, even in precincts where candidates once took pains to conceal any education beyond the sixth grade. In clubs, parent-teacher associations, churches, labor unions, you are considered to be the brains, the backbone, the eyes, the ears, and the backbone—the latter to be stuck out, for alumni are expected to be intellectually adventurous as well as to exercise other attributes.

But put you in an alumni club, or back on campus for a reunion or homecoming, and the popular respect—yea, awe—turns to chuckles and ho-ho-ho. The esteemed individual, when bunched with other esteemed individuals, becomes in the popular image the subject of quips, a candidate for the funny papers. He is now imagined to be a person whose interests stray no farther than the degree of baldness achieved by his classmates, or the success in marriage and child-bearing achieved by her classmates, or the record run up last season by the alma mater's football or field-hockey team. He is addicted to funny hats decorated with his class numerals, she to daisy chainmaking and to recapturing the elusive delights of the junior-class hoop-roll.

If he should encounter his old professor of physics, he is supposedly careful to confine the conversation to reminiscences about the time Joe or Jane Wilkins, with spectacular results, tried to disprove the validity of Newton's third law. To ask the old gentleman about the implications of the latest research concerning anti-matter would be, it is supposed, a most serious breach of the Alumni Reunion Code.

Such a view of organized alumni activity might be dismissed as unworthy of note, but for one disturbing fact: among its most earnest adherents are a surprising number of alumni and alumnæ themselves.

Permit us to lay the distorted image to rest, with the aid of the rites conducted by cartoonist Mark Kelley on the following pages. To do so will not necessitate burying the class banner or interring the reunion hat, nor is there a need to disband the homecoming day parade.

The simple truth is that the serious activities of organized alumni far outweigh the frivolities—in about the same proportion as the average citizen's, or unorganized alumnus's, party-going activities are outweighed by his less festive pursuits.

Look, for example, at the activities of the organized alumni of a large and famous state university in the Midwest. The former students of this university are often pictured as football-mad. And there is no denying that, to many of them, there is no more pleasant way of spending an autumn Saturday than witnessing a victory by the home team.

But by far the great bulk of alumni energy on behalf of the old school is invested elsewhere:

Every year the alumni association sponsors a recognition dinner to honor outstanding students—those with a scholastic average of 3.5 (B+) or better. This has proved to be a most effective way of showing students that academic prowess is valued above all else by the institution and its alumni.

Every year the alumni give five “distinguished teaching awards”—grants of $1,000 each to professors selected by their peers for outstanding performance in the classroom.

An advisory board of alumni prominent in various fields meets regularly to consider the problems of the university: the quality of the course offerings, the caliber of the students, and a variety of other matters. They report directly to the university president, in confidence. Their work has been salutary. When the university's school of architecture lost its accreditation, for example, the efforts of the alumni advisers were invaluable in getting to the root of the trouble and recommending measures by which accreditation could be regained.

The efforts of alumni have resulted in the passage of urgently needed, but politically endangered, appropriations by the state legislature.

Some 3,000 of the university's alumni act each year as volunteer alumni-fund solicitors, making contacts with 30,000 of the university's former students.

Nor is this a particularly unusual list of alumni accomplishments. The work and thought expended by the alumn-
alumni—or does it?
the group somehow differs from the sum of its parts

Behind the fun

of organized alumni activity—in clubs, at reunions—lies new seriousness nowadays, and a substantial record of service to American education.

The achievements, in short, belie the popular image. And if no one else realizes this, or cares, one group should: the alumni and alumnae themselves. Too many of them may be shying away from a good thing because they think that being an "active" alumnus means wearing a funny hat.
DEAN! DEAN WINTERHAVEN!

TO SEE THE OLD DEAN

HERE IT IS, DEANS!
MY OLD ROOM!!

TO RECAPTURE YOUTH

I JUST HAPPEN TO HAVE YOUR TYPE OF POLICY WITH ME...

TO DEVELOP NEW TERRITORY

TO BRING THE WORD

TO RENEW OLD ACQUAINTANCE

FOR AN OUTING

AND THERE WILL BE TURBULENT YEARS!

HE WAS IN MY CLASS, BUT I'VE DARNED IF I CAN REMEMBER HIS NAME!

39 WILL BE DOERS AND TALKERS

REPENT!

WE BEAT CHOCTAW!

HOW ABOUT OUR FUND DREXEL?

39 WINS AGAIN!

39
back: The popular view

Charlie? Old Charlie Applegate?

TO PLACE THE FACE

Appearances would indicate that you have risen above your academic standing, Bethalter!

TO FIND MEM HALL

He says he's a FRAT BROTHER of yours!

TO IMPRESS THE OLD PROF

He wants to do something for his OLD SCHOOL!

TO CONTRIBUTE MATERIALLY

TO BE A "POOR LITTLE SHEEP" AGAIN
Money! Last year, educational institutions from any other source of gifts. Alumni support is

Without the dollars that their alumni contribute each year, America’s privately supported educational institutions would be in serious difficulty today. And the same would be true of the nation’s publicly supported institutions, without the support of alumni in legislatures and elections at which appropriations or bond issues are at stake.

For the private institutions, the financial support received from individual alumni often means the difference between an adequate or superior faculty and one that is underpaid and understaffed; between a thriving scholarship program and virtually none at all; between well-equipped laboratories and obsolete, crowded ones. For tax-supported institutions, which in growing numbers are turning to their alumni for direct financial support, such aid makes it possible to give scholarships, grant loans to needy students, build such buildings as student unions, and carry on research for which legislative appropriations do not provide.

To gain an idea of the scope of the support which alumni give—and of how much that is worthwhile in American education depends upon it—consider this statistic, unearthed in a current survey of 1,144 schools, junior colleges, colleges, and universities in the United States and Canada: in just twelve months, alumni gave their alma maters more than $199 million. They were the largest single source of gifts.

Nor was this the kind of support that is given once, perhaps as the result of a high-pressure fund drive, and never heard of again. Alumni tend to give funds regularly. In the past year, they contributed $45.5 million, on an annual gift basis, to the 1,144 institutions surveyed. To realize that much annual income from investments in blue-chip stocks, the institutions would have needed over 1.2 billion more dollars in endowment funds than they actually possessed.

Annual alumni giving is not a new phenomenon on the American educational scene (Yale alumni founded the first annual college fund in 1890, and Mount Hermon was the first independent secondary school to do so, in 1903). But not until fairly recently did annual giving become the main element in education’s financial survival kit. The development was logical. Big endowments had been affected by inflation. Big private philanthropy, affected by the graduated income and inheritance taxes, was no longer able to do the job alone. Yet, with the growth of science and technology and democratic concepts of education, educational budgets had to be increased to keep pace.

Twenty years before Yale’s first alumni drive, a professor in New Haven foresaw the possibilities and looked into the minds of alumni everywhere:

“No graduate of the college,” he said, “has ever paid in full what it cost the college to educate him. A part of the expense was borne by the funds given by former benefactors of the institution.

“A great many can never pay the debt. A very few can, in their turn, become munificent benefactors. There is a very large number, however, between these two, who can, and would cheerfully, give according to their ability in order that the college might hold the same relative position to future generations which it held to their own.”

The first Yale alumni drive, seventy years ago, brought in $11,015. In 1959 alone, Yale’s alumni gave more than $2 million. Not only at Yale, but at the hundreds of other institutions which have established annual alumni funds in the intervening years, the feeling of indebtedness and the concern for future generations which the Yale professor foresaw have spurred alumni to greater and greater efforts in this enterprise.

And money from alumni is a powerful magnet: it draws more. Not only have more than eighty business corporations, led in 1954 by General Electric, established the happy custom of matching, dollar for dollar, the gifts that their employees (and sometimes their employees’ wives) give to their alma maters; alumni giving is also a measure applied by many business men and by philanthropic foundations in determining how productive their organizations’ gifts to an educational institution are likely to be. Thus alumni giving, as Gordon K. Chalmers, the late president of Kenyon College, described it, is “the very rock on which all other giving must rest. Gifts from outside the family depend largely—sometimes wholly—on the degree of alumni support.”

The “degree of alumni support” is gauged not by dollars alone. The percentage of alumni who are regular givers is also a key. And here the record is not as dazzling as the dollar figures imply.

Nationwide, only one in five alumni of colleges, universities, and prep schools gives to his annual alumni
received more of it from their alumni than now education’s strongest financial rampart

fund. The actual figure last year was 20.9 per cent. Allowing for the inevitable few who are disenchanted with their alma maters’ cause,* and for those who spurn all fund solicitations, sometimes with heavy scorn,† and for those whom legitimate reasons prevent from giving financial aid,§ the participation figure is still low.

WHY? Perhaps because the non-participants imagine their institutions to be adequately financed. (Virtually without exception, in both private and tax-supported institutions, this is—sadly—not so.) Perhaps because they believe their small gift—a dollar, or five, or ten—will be insignificant. (Again, most emphatically, not so. Multiply the 5,223,240 alumni who gave nothing to their alma maters last year by as little as one dollar each, and the figure still comes to thousands of additional scholarships for deserving students or substantial pay increases for thousands of teachers who may, at this moment, be debating whether they can afford to continue teaching next year.) By raising the percentage of participation in alumni fund drives, alumni can materially improve their alma maters’ standing. That dramatic increases in participation can be brought about, and quickly, is demonstrated by the case of Wofford College, a small institution in South Carolina. Until several years ago, Wofford received annual gifts from only 12 per cent of its 5,750 alumni. Then Roger Milliken, a textile manufacturer and a Wofford trustee, issued a challenge: for every percentage-point increase over 12 per cent, he’d give $1,000. After the alumni were finished, Mr. Milliken cheerfully turned over a check for $62,000. Wofford’s alumni had raised their participation in the annual fund to 74.4 per cent—a new national record.

“‘It was a remarkable performance,” observed the American Alumni Council. “Its impact on Wofford will be felt for many years to come.”’

And what Wofford’s alumni could do, your institution’s alumni could probably do, too.

* Wrote one alumnus: “I see that Stanford is making great progress. However, I am opposed to progress in any form. Therefore I am not sending you any money.”

† A man in Memphis, Tennessee, regularly sent Baylor University a check signed “U. R. Stuck.”

§ In her fund reply envelope, a Kansas alumna once sent, without comment, her household bills for the month.

memo: from Wives to Husbands

• Women’s colleges, as a group, have had a unique problem in fund-raising—and they wish they knew how to solve it.

The loyalty of their alumnae in contributing money each year—an average of 41.2 per cent took part in 1959—is nearly double the national average for all universities, colleges, junior colleges, and privately supported secondary schools. But the size of the typical gift is often smaller than one might expect.

Why? The alumnae say that while husbands obviously place a high value on the products of the women’s colleges, many underestimate the importance of giving women’s colleges the same degree of support they accord their own alma maters. This, some guess, is a holdover from the days when higher education for women was regarded as a luxury, while higher education for men was considered a sine qua non for business and professional careers.

As a result, again considering the average, women’s colleges must continue to cover much of their operating expense from tuition fees. Such fees are generally higher than those charged by men’s or coeducational institutions, and the women’s colleges are worried about the social and intellectual implications of this fact. They have no desire to be the province solely of children of the well-to-do; higher education for women is no longer a luxury to be reserved to those who can pay heavy fees.

Since contributions to education appear to be one area of family budgets still controlled largely by men, the alumnae hope that husbands will take serious note of the women’s colleges’ claim to a larger share of it. They may be starting to do so: from 1958 to 1959, the average gift to women’s colleges rose 22.4 per cent. But it still trails the average gift to men’s colleges, private universities, and professional schools.
for the **Public educational institutions**, a **special kind of service**

PUBLICLY SUPPORTED educational institutions owe a special kind of debt to their alumni. Many people imagine that the public institutions have no financial worries, thanks to a steady flow of tax dollars. Yet they actually lead a perilous fiscal existence, dependent upon annual or biennial appropriations by legislatures. More than once, state and municipally supported institutions would have found themselves in serious straits if their alumni had not assumed a role of leadership.

- A state university in New England recently was put in academic jeopardy because the legislature defeated a bill to provide increased salaries for faculty members. Then the university's "Associate Alumni" took matters into their hands. They brought the facts of political and academic life to the attention of alumni throughout the state, prompting them to write to their representatives in support of higher faculty pay. A compromise bill was passed, and salary increases were granted. Alumni action thus helped ease a crisis which threatened to do serious, perhaps irreparable, damage to the university.

- In a neighboring state, the public university receives only 38.3 per cent of its operating budget from state and federal appropriations. Ninety-one per cent of the university's $17 million physical plant was provided by pri-
The Beneficiaries:
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vate funds. Two years ago, graduates of its college of medicine gave $226,752 for a new medical center—the largest amount given by the alumni of any American medical school that year.

Several years ago the alumni of six state-supported institutions in a midwestern state rallied support for a $150 million bond issue for higher education, mental health, and welfare—an issue that required an amendment to the state constitution. Of four amendments on the ballot, it was the only one to pass.

In another midwestern state, action by an "Alumni Council for Higher Education," representing eighteen publicly supported institutions, has helped produce a $13 million increase in operating funds for 1959-61—the most significant increase ever voted for the state's system of higher education.

S

OME ALUMNI ORGANIZATIONS are forbidden to engage in political activity of any kind. The intent is a good one: to keep the organizations out of party politics and lobbying. But the effect is often to prohibit the alumni from conducting any organized legislative activity in behalf of publicly supported education in their states.

"This is unfair," said a state-university alumni spokesman recently, "because this kind of activity is neither shady nor unnecessary.

"But the restrictions—most of which I happen to think are nonsense—exist, nevertheless. Even so, individual alumni can make personal contacts with legislators in their home towns, if not at the State Capitol. Above all, in their contacts with fellow citizens—with people who influence public opinion—the alumni of state institutions must support their alma maters to an intense degree. They must make it their business to get straight information and spread it through their circles of influence.

"Since the law forbids us to organize such support, every alumnus has to start this work, and continue it, on his own. This isn't something that most people do naturally—but the education of their own sons and daughters rests on their becoming aroused and doing it."
A matter of Principle

ANY WORTHWHILE INSTITUTION of higher education, one college president has said, lives "in chronic tension with the society that supports it." Says The Campus and the State, a 1959 survey of academic freedom in which that president's words appear: "New ideas always run the risk of offending entrenched interests within the community. If higher education is to be successful in its creative role it must be guaranteed some protection against reprisal..."

The peril most frequently is budgetary: the threat of appropriations cuts, if the unpopular ideas are not abandoned; the real or imagined threat of a loss of public—even alumni—sympathy.

Probably the best protection against the danger of reprisals against free institutions of learning is their alumni: alumni who understand the meaning of freedom and give their strong and informed support to matters of educational principle. Sometimes such support is available in abundance and offered with intelligence. Sometimes—almost always because of misconception or failure to be vigilant—it is not.

For example:

- An alumnus of one private college was a regular and heavy donor to the annual alumni fund. He was known to have provided handsomely for his alma mater in his will. But when he questioned his grandson, a student at the old school, he learned that an economics professor not only did not condemn, but actually discussed the necessity for, the national debt. Grandfather threatened to withdraw all support unless the professor ceased uttering such heresy or was fired. (The professor didn't and wasn't. The college is not yet certain where it stands in the gentleman's will.)

- When no students from a certain county managed to meet the requirements for admission to a southwestern university's medical school, the county's angry delegate to the state legislature announced he was "out to get this guy"—the vice president in charge of the university's medical affairs, who had staunchly backed the medical school's admissions committee. The board of trustees of the university, virtually all of whom were alumni, joined other alumni and the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors to rally successfully to the v.p.'s support.

- When the president of a publicly supported institution recently said he would have to limit the number of students admitted to next fall's freshman class if high academic standards were not to be compromised, some constituent-fearing legislators were wrathful. When the issue was explained to them, alumni backed the president's position—decisively.

- When a number of institutions (joined in December by President Eisenhower) opposed the "disclaimer affidavit" required of students seeking loans under the National Defense Education Act, many citizens—including some alumni—assailed them for their stand against "swearing allegiance to the United States." The fact is, the disclaimer affidavit is not an oath of allegiance to the United States (which the Education Act also requires, but which the colleges have not opposed). Fortunately, alumni who took the trouble to find out what the affidavit really was apparently outnumbered, by a substantial majority, those who leaped before they looked. Coincidentally or not, most of the institutions opposing the disclaimer affidavit received more money from their alumni during the controversy than ever before in their history.

In the future, as in the past, educational institutions worth their salt will be in the midst of controversy. Such is the nature of higher education: ideas are its merchandise, and ideas new and old are frequently controversial. An educational institution, indeed, may be doing its job badly if it is not involved in controversy, at times. If an alumnus never finds himself in disagreement with his alma mater, he has a right to question whether his alma mater is intellectually awake or dozing.

To understand this is to understand the meaning of academic freedom and vitality. And, with such an understanding, an alumnus is equipped to give his highest service to higher education; to give his support to the principles which make-higher education free and effectual.

If higher education is to prosper, it will need this kind of support from its alumni—tomorrow even more than in its gloriously stormy past.
The Art of keeping intellectually alive for a lifetime will be fostered more than ever by a growing alumni-alma mater relationship.

Whither the course of the relationship between alumni and alma mater? At the turn into the Sixties, it is evident that a new and challenging relationship—of unprecedented value to both the institution and its alumni—is developing.

If alumni wish, their intellectual voyage can be continued for a lifetime.

There was a time when graduation was the end. You got your diploma, along with the right to place certain initials after your name; your hand was clasped for an instant by the president; and the institution's business was done.

If you were to keep yourself intellectually awake, the No-Doz would have to be self-administered. If you were to renew your acquaintance with literature or science, the introductions would have to be self-performed.

Automotion is still the principal driving force. The years in school and college are designed to provide the push and then the momentum to keep you going with your mind. "Madam, we guarantee results," wrote a college president to an inquiring mother, "—or we return the boy." After graduation, the guarantee is yours to maintain, alone.

Alone, but not quite. It makes little sense, many educators say, for schools and colleges not to do whatever they can to protect their investment in their students—which is considerable, in terms of time, talents, and money—and not to try to make the relationship between alumni and their alma maters a two-way flow.

As a consequence of such thinking, and of demands issuing from the former students themselves, alumni meetings of all types—local clubs, campus reunions—are taking on a new character. "There has to be a reason and a purpose for a meeting," notes an alumna. "Groups that meet for purely social reasons don't last long. Just because Mary went to my college doesn't mean I enjoy being with her socially—but I might well enjoy working with her in a serious intellectual project." Male alumni agree; there is a limit to the congeniality that can be maintained solely by the thin thread of reminiscences or small-talk.

But there is no limit, among people with whom their
a new Challenge, 
a new relationship

education "stuck," to the revitalizing effects of learning. The chemistry professor who is in town for a chemists' conference and is invited to address the local chapter of the alumni association no longer feels he must talk about nothing more weighty than the beauty of the campus elms; his audience wants him to talk chemistry, and he is delighted to oblige. The engineers who return to school for their annual homecoming welcome the opportunity to bring themselves up to date on developments in and out of their specialty. Housewives back on the campus for reunions demand—and get—seminars and short-courses.

But the wave of interest in enriching the intellectual content of alumni meetings may be only a beginning. With more leisure at their command, alumni will have the time (as they already have the inclination) to undertake more intensive, regular educational programs.

If alumni demand them, new concepts in adult education may emerge. Urban colleges and universities may step up their offerings of programs designed especially for the alumni in their communities—not only their own alumni, but those of distant institutions. Unions and government and industry, already experimenting with graduate-education programs for their leaders, may find ways of giving sabbatical leaves on a widespread basis—and they may profit, in hard dollars-and-cents terms, from the results of such intellectual re-charging.

Colleges and universities, already overburdened with teaching as well as other duties, will need help if such dreams are to come true. But help will be found if the demand is insistent enough.

> Alumni partnerships with their alma mater, in meeting ever-stiffer educational challenges, will grow even closer than they have been.

Boards of overseers, visiting committees, and other partnerships between alumni and their institutions are proving, at many schools, colleges, and universities, to be channels through which the educators can keep in touch with the community at large and vice versa. Alumni trustees, elected by their fellow alumni, are found on the governing boards of more and more institutions. Alumni "without portfolio" are seeking ways to join with their alma maters in advancing the cause of education. The representative of a West Coast university has noted the trend: "In selling memberships in our alumni association, we have learned that, while it's wise to list the benefits of membership, what interests them most is how they can be of service to the university."

> Alumni can have a decisive role in maintaining high standards of education, even as enrollments increase at most schools and colleges.

There is a real crisis in American education: the crisis of quality. For a variety of reasons, many institutions find themselves unable to keep their faculties staffed with high-caliber men and women. Many lack the equipment needed for study and research. Many, even in this age of high student population, are unable to attract the quality of student they desire. Many have been forced to dissipate their teaching and research energies, in deference to public demand for more and more extracurricular "services."

Many, besieged by applicants for admission, have had to yield to pressure and enroll students who are unqualified. Each of these problems has a direct bearing upon the quality of education in America. Each is a problem to which alumni can constructively address themselves, individually and in organized groups.

Some can best be handled through community leadership: helping present the institutions' case to the public. Some can be handled by direct participation in such activities as academic talent-scouting, in which many institutions, both public and private, enlist the aid of their alumni in meeting with college-bound high school students in their cities and towns. Some can be handled by making more money available to the institutions—for faculty salaries, for scholarships, for buildings and equipment. Some can be handled through political action.

The needs vary widely from institution to institution—and what may help one may actually set back another. Because of this, it is important to maintain a close liaison with the campus when undertaking such work. (Alumni offices everywhere will welcome inquiries.)

When the opportunity for aid does come—as it has in the past, and as it inevitably will in the years ahead—alumni response will be the key to America's educational future, and to all that depends upon it.
alumni-ship

JOHN MAISEFIELD was addressing himself to the subject of universities. "They give to the young in their impressionable years the bond of a lofty purpose shared," he said; "of a great corporate life whose links will not be loosed until they die."

The links that unite alumni with each other and with their alma mater are difficult to define. But every alumnus and alumna knows they exist, as surely as do the campus's lofty spires and the ageless dedication of educated men and women to the process of keeping themselves and their children intellectually alive.

Once one has caught the spirit of learning, of truth, of probing into the undiscovered and unknown—the spirit of his alma mater—one does not really lose it, for as long as one lives. As life proceeds, the daily mechanics of living—of job-holding, of family-rearing, of mortgage-paying, of lawn-cutting, of meal-cooking—sometimes are tedious. But for them who have known the spirit of intellectual adventure and conquest, there is the bond of the lofty purpose shared, of the great corporate life whose links will not be loosed until they die.

This would be the true meaning of alumni-ship, were there such a word. It is the reasoning behind the great service that alumni give to education. It is the reason alma maters can call upon their alumni for responsible support of all kinds, with confidence that the responsibility will be well met.
4. STUDENTS

A S Fannie Hurst says on page 10, "It is essential that the alumni be kept sufficiently interested to want to come back... A student who is to become an alumnus should begin to understand this relationship while he is still in school—not walk out as I did without being prepared to think in terms of being an alumna."

Washington University has begun two programs which involve students with alumni: a series of student-alumni-faculty get-togethers; and the student recruitment committee now functioning with the alumni recruitment committees.

The student-faculty-alumni get-togethers began last year. Informal meetings are held in the homes of alumni on Sunday evenings. The topics discussed range from campus problems to world politics. Attendance is limited to twelve students, two to four faculty members, and any alumni the alumnus-host cares to invite. Student leaders are responsible for supplying the Alumni Relations Office with the names of students they think will be interested in the meetings; the students also suggest the faculty members they would like to have invited. One student who has been to a previous meeting is invited to act as moderator at each meeting. He or she keeps the discussion on the announced topic and tries to draw all those present into it. The meetings have proved very popular with all concerned.

The original purpose of the meetings was to give the three groups involved a better opportunity to understand and communicate with each other, but some interesting sidelights have developed. Foreign students have been invited to discuss the political or economic philosophies of their native countries; alumni have been invited to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of their professions, especially when they work in unusual areas which the average college student would not consider. The presence of outstanding visitors to the campus has been utilized for these get-togethers.

The alumni in such a program act as catalysts in the student-faculty relationship. They provide the meeting place where both groups can assemble to discuss problems of common interest. In addition, all three groups are benefited: The students learn that the faculty and alumni are interested in them; the faculty realize that alumni are willing to help advance the teaching program; and the alumni discover that their advice and opinions are highly valued contributions.

A special program at the School of Medicine involves alumni and students in a continuing relationship throughout the academic year. A welcoming party for the incoming freshman class is given by the alumni in the fall and alumni then keep in touch with individual students throughout the demanding years of medical education and training.

5. RECRUITMENT

It has been said that the alumni can help the University in three areas: with friends, with funds, and with freshmen. The latter has become increasingly important as Washington University becomes a national university; the new dormitories make it possible for the University to attract and accommodate students from all over the country.

Because of this, alumni have become very active in student recruitment. Alumni committees for student recruitment have been formed in eleven cities with the aid of the alumni clubs.

The most important work done by these committees is calling upon students who have applied to or been accepted for admission to the University. Also, committee members act as talent scouts and send to the University names of high school students whom they believe would make good Washington University students. At other times, committee members represent the University at local high school "college nights" in their areas and help host programs for prospective college students.

As an alumnus who has enjoyed student recruitment work says (Edward Beimfohr of New York): "These youngsters are confused and want to be helped. They need assistance and good advice. . . . When you find a good student with talent, you can help both him and the University by advising him to go there."

This organized effort for recruitment, utilizing alumni, has been in operation less than a year. It is under the direction of Mrs. Elizabeth Gentry Coleman of the University's Office of Admissions. She reports a marked increase in this year's freshman class in areas where the alumni have been particularly helpful—Chicago, Washington, New York. The chief purpose of the effort, of course, is not just an increased quantity of students; the University wants to recruit the best students in each area.

To be most helpful with recruitment work the alumnus must become as well-informed about the University as possible; he must be up-to-date and sympathetic with the University's aims. Recent graduates of the University have been particularly effective in recruitment work; they recognize that a contribution through recruitment work is often as important as direct financial support.

Alumni recruitment committees in some cities work with students now in the University who are part of the campus recruitment committee; during vacations these students recruit for the University in their home towns.

In cities where there is no alumni organization, an individual alumnus may act as a representative of the University. Such individual alumni have been asked, for example, to notify scholarship winners of their awards with a personal message, and to visit freshmen who have been admitted to the University.
6. ALUMNI FUND

Why do alumni give to their university? Alumni giving may be essentially a personal thing, as some alumni suggest in this issue. It may approach other personal giving—to churches, to charities. As Daniel Bartlett said recently at the kickoff meeting in St. Louis for workers in the Liberal Arts Alumni Fund campaign: “There has been a change in the attitude of people; it used to be that only the rich were supposed to contribute to higher education. Now it’s everybody’s University.” And at the same meeting Chancellor Shepley added to Dan Bartlett’s remarks and said, “The future of any institution of this kind is determined more by the attitude of its graduates than by any other factor. This is not to say that the faculty and student body are not as important as the alumni; they are. But the attitude of the alumni affects the kind of faculty and student body we have. The interest and loyalty of those who have graduated are indispensable to us.”

Whatever the reasons, alumni giving is now on the upswing. The 1960 Alumni Fund campaign at Washington University stands now 49 per cent ahead of the 1959 campaign at the same time. And in the last six years the increase has been overwhelming: from $20,000 to $126,000.

The goal for this year’s campaign is $150,000. Washington University must have more than $750,000 in annual giving of unrestricted funds if its budget is to balance; the goal of the Alumni Fund is to supply 20 per cent of the total need. Next year the goal may be set higher; the potential and the need and the interest are all there. Rarely does Washington University have a fund-raising drive for a specific project or building; the University feels it is not private education’s role today to seek fine structures from alumni. It is the unrestricted annual gift that is sought.

Washington University alumni give both time and money to their alma mater; this year almost one thousand workers all over the United States will ring the doorbells of at least five other alumni each in the drive. This personal solicitation campaign, in the St. Louis area and twelve other metropolitan areas, accounts for about one fourth of the Fund total. A mail campaign is carried out for Washington University alumni throughout the world.

In St. Louis a new angle for the personal solicitation campaign was added in March this year with “Operation Party-Line,” a concentrated telephone campaign by volunteers. For four nights these volunteers called alumni in the area who had never given to the University. Amount to be given was not as important as the giving; an increase in the number of donors is vital. Many foundations and corporations ask first what percentage of alumni give to an institution before they allot support.

An impressive list of businesses and corporations have a matching gift program which makes any contribution of an alumnus twice as valuable. These corporations match,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1960 Alumni Fund Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Wendell C. Scott, MD 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard C. Close, BSEn 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles L. Langsam, MD 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice H. Baumann, BSEn 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. H. Waddington II, BArch 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William R. Alstadt, DDS 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry M. Sarason, BSEn 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle J. Smith, DDS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald L. Stricklin, AB 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Ralph C. Morgan, AB 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Stamm, BSEn 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper C. Allan, AB 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis H. Renfrow, DDS 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond E. Lange, BSEn 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur E. Keelle, BArch 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome F. Bernoudy, BSEn 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Haverstick, AB 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edward F. Rose, DDS 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene G. Monnig Jr., BSEn 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott P. Koenig, LLB 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George J. L. Wulff, MD 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. J. C. Welsh, Nu 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Schmidt, MSW 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out-of-town club presidents and Alumni Fund chairman at annual June planning meeting.

At a meeting of seven alumni last October at the Chancellor's residence, Dr. Doyle J. Smith, chairman of the 1960 Alumni Fund drive in Memphis, proposed a plan for a society which would honor William Greenleaf Eliot, founder of Washington University. A resolution proposing formation of the society, unanimously approved by the University board of directors one week later, was signed by the seven alumni—Dr. Smith, Mrs. Richard A. Bullock, Mrs. Thomas S. Hall, Webb L. Kammerer, Dr. Wendell G. Scott, Hermann F. Spoehrer, and Dr. James Barrett Brown. The society, open to other friends of the University as well as alumni, is now formally organized, with an initial membership of over 50 families.

Members of the William Greenleaf Eliot Society, aware that the future growth of Washington University depends directly upon the availability of funds to implement a bold and imaginative program, have pledged themselves to a sustained effort to provide the University with the means to continue to offer education of the highest possible quality. Among the goals and objectives of the Society are higher salaries for the University's faculty, funds to attract to the University additional outstanding teachers, an increase in the financial aid available to worthy students, and all the necessary equipment and supplies needed to insure a program of continuing excellence in education.

Members of the Society not only take satisfaction in knowing they are aiding higher education; they also realize they are taking the leadership in showing others how they may be of assistance for one of the most crucial needs today.

Another organization formed last fall by alumni and other friends of the University is the Century Club, whose purpose is to encourage interest in varsity athletics by both the public and the student body. This club is working to create a greater interest in Washington University's athletic teams, to encourage outstanding prospective students to attend the University, and to establish a scholarship fund for students who have academic ability along with demonstrated athletic ability in high school or other collegiate competition.

The David R. Francis Scholarship Fund, created by annual $100 scholarship gifts to the Century Club, will be set up by the Century Club. This fund is governed by the same standards of academic performance and financial need as are all other undergraduate awards. The same committee which administers all University scholarships will administer the Francis scholarships. A goal of $15,000 has been set for May 1, 1960, when scholarships are awarded. It should be emphasized here that all candidates considered for these awards have already been declared eligible for scholarships from Washington University without regard to their athletic participation, and renewal of the scholarships is not contingent on varsity competition.

On February 9 an organizational meeting was held to revitalize the "W" Club for alumni who lettered in varsity competition. Purposes of the club include support of WU athletic programs, fund raising for scholarships, the encouragement of qualified athletes to attend WU, the promotion of greater attendance at athletic events— and to provide an organization through which former WU athletes can renew or maintain old friendships.

The next major effort of the "W" Club will be a barbecue at noon on Saturday, April 23, at Francis Field. This will follow the alumni-varsity football game, to be held at 10:30 a.m., and before the baseball game with the University of Wisconsin that afternoon.

Cost of membership in the "W" Club is $10 a year. Alumni lettermen are invited to join (as are other alumni and friends of the University who support WU athletics); they may do so by sending their membership fee to Harry Burrus, director of athletics.

Plans are being made to form or reactivate Century clubs in the various professional schools of the University. First to be reorganized is the Dental School Century Club; final plans for this group were formulated at a meeting last month. Dr. William M. Cloud, DDS 52, of Little Rock, was named chairman pro tem to reorganize the club.
A group of Washington University alumni in St. Louis consider the University and their feelings toward it. Do alumni in St. Louis differ from their counterparts in New York? Absence makes the heart grow fonder—or does it?

The pattern of this taped discussion follows that of the faculty discussion of the future of the College of Liberal Arts in the February issue. Involved this time were a dentist, a surgeon, a lawyer, a school administrator, a businessman, a former social worker who is now a housewife, and a school teacher.

The basis of the discussion is the national report on alumni activities in this issue—the same report which set the context of the interviews with Washington University alumni in New York City (see pages 2-17). The framework of the discussion was defined by the editor—moderator-cum-participant—this way:

"The main point of the national report is that there has been a significant change in the whole concept of the relationship of the alumnus to his institution. Until the last fifteen years, it was a social relationship; it has tended recently to become much more substantial—the real rise of alumni fund raising is a postwar phenomenon, for example.

"Washington University is deeply involved in this—much as are all universities—and it is a legitimate question to find out what intelligent alumni think about it. Do they think it is a trend in the right direction? Do they feel any sense of obligation to support the place where they received their education? Do they think the University has an obligation to them after they leave it?"

The discussion touches all these points, and some others as well. It reflects an intense interest on the part of these alumni in what the University is doing, how well it is doing it, and what its present policies, philosophy, and aims promise to bring.

Consider their statements, and reflect on your own. Where do you stand?
As the discussion opened, each person was asked to identify himself and to clarify his relationship to the University.

Walker: I went to undergraduate school from about 1940 to 43 and graduated from the Medical School in 1946. I took my surgical training at Barnes Hospital and have since been with the University as an instructor in clinical surgery and am engaged in the private practice of surgery with the Central Surgical Group.

Payton: Fred, your family has a very involved connection with the University, hasn’t it?

Hornor: Well, a very lengthy one. I have an AB and an MA from Washington. I spent some time in Greece in archaeology, came back to teach at Drury College and John Burroughs School; then I went in the Navy for four years. I taught in Boston for one year and then came back to John Burroughs School. I’ve been Assistant Director of that school for eleven years now, head of the high school division and chairman of the Latin Department. There is a long family history in the University. My grandfather, Frederic Aldin Hall, was chancellor from 1917 to 1923. My father graduated there, and my uncle. Mother didn’t graduate—she got married. They call her “X08,” or something like that. I have two brothers who also are graduates. My youngest brother went to the University of Illinois and then Missouri, and graduated there. My son Neil is now in the School of Business.

Webster: I went to Amherst for my undergraduate work, originally class of 1945, but the war delayed it to 1947. I went on to Law School here and got my LLB in 1949. I practiced law in St. Louis, except during the Korean War, until recently when I was appointed United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri. I was president of the Alumni Federation in 1957, and I am now vice president of the Law Alumni Association. I am also a part-time instructor of law at the University, although I’ve never taught a course. I was scheduled to teach this year, but they gave me a sabbatical so that I could learn how to do what I’m now getting paid for.

Reinhardt: Very few distinctions. I graduated in 1939 from the School of Business and since then have been em-
If you think that from 1935 to 1939 we didn’t have a ball on the campus, you’re mistaken.

—Reinhardt

ployed by several St. Louis business institutions. I’m now sales manager for a manufacturer of prefabricated homes. My relationship to the University is one that lacks the illustriousness of the previous three persons, and I have been as inactive in alumni activity as anyone could be. My points of view will be different, probably, if nothing else.

Bashford: I’m used to thinking of myself as just a mother of three teenagers, and it’s hard to think back, but I did my undergraduate work at Park College and at the University of Oklahoma. I got my social work degree at Washington University in 1939.

Lochmoeller: Well, I’ve been an alumnus for approximately eight months now, and I don’t know what it entails, as yet. I am currently teaching third grade in the Ferguson-Florissant R2 School District. That’s all, I’m afraid.

Rose: I’m a Dental School alumnus, graduated in 1938. I’ve spent about twenty years with only minor connections with the University, and those were more for selfish reasons than for help to the University. Loyalty to the University is through habit—father and brothers and uncles graduating over a period of time. Just in the last two or three years I’ve become interested again.

Payton: What prompted your renewed interest?

Rose: Professional men are still pretty independent people compared to other businessmen, but we are suddenly realizing that the regulations that are going to affect us are going to be quite severe in the coming years. We’re going to be regulated at a point where it will be difficult to maintain the professions we have or the standards we have unless we do something about the shortage of qualified men that we supply to the country. We are operating under a privileged franchise; we have a privileged monopoly given to us by law. It’s our obligation to see to it that we have enough qualified people to cover the entire area and to relieve this shortage, and it’s up to us to start supporting the schools that train them.

Payton: Are you involved in the Alumni Fund?

Rose: That’s primarily what I’m involved in, and our building fund is a good example of our needs. Our Dental School I think ranks very well with dental schools throughout the nation. But it’s been marking time—it hasn’t been growing, because of the lack of new facilities. Growth in the research department is becoming very important. Ours is an example of a school that has been turning out good technicians and is still turning out good technicians in limited numbers, but that isn’t enough. We have to have more than technicians; we have to have behind us a research organization similar to what the medical school has. We have to improve our school, and we have to enlarge it. If we don’t supply the type of service that we would like to supply, and in enough quantity, somebody else is going to come in and start another level of service.

Walker: Is there a diminution of the number of applicants for Dental School as there is for Medical School?

Rose: As near as I can gather, yes. Surprising as it seems, there is not a surplus of qualified applicants for the dental schools. That will be another problem for the alumni—selling dentistry to the kind of student we want in the school.

Walker: Well, the Medical School’s having the same difficulty. The number of good applicants has decreased.

Payton: Do you feel the alumnus has an obligation in this? Does this present a problem that an interested alumnus should be concerned about?

Walker: In general, you have to search out the reason for the decrease in the number of applications—and I think some are obvious—and then I suppose you have to go out and recruit, although I must confess I have never done this actively.

I doubt that money is the greatest reason for the diminishing number of applicants. Medicine is a long educational process. You can go to the School of Engineering, and at about age 22 you can get a reasonably good job. This is what is attracting many of the good students that would go into medicine. One of the other things is the threat of socialized medicine, which will probably make medicine less attractive.

Reinhardt: Is there a closer relationship between the graduate of a professional school and the University, and
the graduate of liberal arts, let's say? We've heard from a doctor and a dentist who have spoken about their feelings about the University and their responsibilities and the University's responsibility. Doesn't this make for a closer relationship than exists for the four-year student?

WEBSTER: Isn't this because the professional has an opportunity to make a very direct contribution to the standards of his school? He may go back to teach there, or he may be on a visiting committee. He is practicing what the professors in the professional school are teaching, so he is on a plane with them. The graduate of liberal arts may enter business; this doesn't promote any particular interest with his former political science professor. But a lawyer practicing law is interested in what the law school professors are teaching and the kind of law students that are coming into the practice. He is interested in making a contribution to that just as he's interested in contributing to the profession in other ways—through his bar association, for example.

DEFINING ALUMNI SUPPORT

HORNER: I'd like to get back to the main point we were talking about—supporting the University. Precisely in what ways?

PAYTON: It would include the areas where the University has indicated it would like to have support. For example, in the encouragement of students who are qualified to take advantage of what the University has to offer.

HORNER: We have this type of support, as I see it. In my school we have a number of students who do not wish to go away to college, and often that's a very good decision. You have the support of people in my position who recommend a university and actually help to see that enough qualified students do apply to colleges. We have other areas of support, such as people who give their time to help—and time certainly is money, these days. It seems to me, though, that essentially we are looking for people who will contribute funds or encourage others to contribute funds.

PAYTON: The University can't simply be in a "hands-out" attitude all the time. There has to be more to it. If alumni are going to give support—financially, through student recruitment, through helping communicate the purposes of the institution, rallying to it in times of pressure on the institution—that will depend on a pretty substantial relationship. If this relationship exists, then support will be forthcoming—whatever that kind of support happens to be. In other words, if we doubled our endowment tomorrow, I think the University would still want to encourage the support and understanding of its alumni.

WEBSTER: Isn't it true that the large grants that come from the foundations relate directly to the degree of financial support given by the alumni? The broader the base of support by the alumni the more friendly the foundation.

BASHFORD: I wonder if in using that word "support" you mean that the University wants approval from the alumni of what it is doing, or is it asking for a two-way kind of relationship? Is the University really interested in what the alumni think about what's going on?

PAYTON: An informed alumni is a good sounding board for what the University is trying to accomplish. We have
Is the University really interested in what the alumni think about what's going on?—BASHFORD

some 30,000 alumni, many of whom may be harboring grudges for slights real or imagined—slights we may know nothing about. The University, in order to do its job well, must have some kind of evaluation from its alumni.

HORNER: Well, I submit the thesis that there is a very small percentage of alumni who are harboring a grudge. The main word we are trying to find, and the thing I think hampers the relationship, is plain indifference. If you break it down, you'll see that the average AB alumnus got a good education and he knows it. Or he hasn't and wishes he had—that's not important at the moment. When you come right down to it, do the alumni feel they owe anything to the University? I think—and I'm sorry to say—that the answer is "No." The social alumni—the boys who come back to the five, ten, 25-year reunions—come back for a party. They may, of course, contribute in some material way. That's fine. But as I see it, if I had not been a native of St. Louis and had come to Washington University, spent four years here, graduated, and then pursued my own career, I might well not have had a real attachment.

THE NEED FOR COMMUNICATION

WEBSTER: I wonder if you can't take the word "indifference" and apply an overworked word like "communication." There's a breakdown in communication which I think has been largely repaired in the last few years. Local alumni have more opportunities to support the University than alumni who live in other areas. I think that what the University is trying to achieve can best be accomplished by getting next to the alumni. I don't think the alumni are ever going to get next to the University. The communication medium is here—you have the facilities, all the avenues of reaching the alumni. I think that the mountain has to go to Mohammed in this instance—and when it does, it carries a very significant message: The message is that education is a very important part of community life. It used to be that we had a few who went to school, a few who were interested. Those who went to school supported their institution, were loyal to it; this was "alma mater." Now we have something more important than that—everyone goes to school, and a substantial number of every graduating high school class goes off to college. The message we have to get across is that support of education is as important as any other form of support that we give—whether it's to our church or favorite charity or to any of the other avenues of community service that we like to think we support.

Education can be a very general thing; communication by the University can make it a very specific and important thing. The downtown luncheon programs help to do this. The week-end seminars with people who come from out of town and get together and talk about the University help to do this for out-of-town alumni. The alumni who is in business can interest his company in using the facilities of the University for research projects. There are a thousand different ways in which a person, once alerted to the importance of education, can support his University by making himself, his business, and the community and the University more closely related.

This starts with communication by the University, and I think you've done a whale of a job in the last few years in improving that. Most alumni are far more alert to the needs of the University and far more interested in contributing in all ways than they ever were before.
The old school tie, I think, carries very little weight anymore. Communication is better in terms of the present and the future than in terms of the past.—Webster

Payton (to Reinhardt): Is this applicable to you, Bob? If the University were to make a more effective effort to tell you what its problems and interests are, and attempt to re-establish a relationship, how would you react? Do you think that yours is just a matter of indifference, or is it something else?

Reinhardt: There are a number of problems that enter into my relationship with the University. In the first place, I wasn't out of the University for too many years when I became resentful, not of the University, but because I felt I had done the wrong thing. I had taken the wrong courses, gone in the wrong direction. This sort of thing happens to a lot of people. I took sort of a desperation course. Those were depression times; I took two years in liberal arts and then went aimlessly into the Business School. Quite a few people have done the same sort of thing, and they end up with the same feeling that "Those years were wasted for me." I feel strongly now that they were wasted. This is no indictment of the Business School—I just wasn't interested. And for that reason the attachment to the school didn't have the strength it should have had.

Bashford: You talk about the flow of information—but always from the University to the alumni. Coming back the other way, the graduates of a university are its product. If you were taking a scientific approach, you could ask how effective a student's education was—how did he use it after he got out? Perhaps some alumni might be helpful in thinking about such questions as "Should the University shift to a 3-2 plan?" or "Should there be a two-year general education program or a three-year one?" or "Is a four-year Business School program the best thing?"

Alumni would be interested in these things, and when people feel they have something to offer, as well as something to get, you have a relationship that's worthwhile.

Webster: It's the University's responsibility to establish and set the tone of the relationship. We are being told what the University is doing, what the great minds on the campus are thinking, what practical contributions to the community the University is making. We can identify ourselves with this far more than with personal news about other alumni.

If we would think of ourselves as alumni and not just as ex-students, and if we would constantly think of our role in terms of present educational requirements, present curriculum, present teaching standards, present plant facilities—we would do a much better job and it would be easier for us to make a contribution. The old school tie, I think, carries very little weight anymore. Those of us who have any of that are products of a bygone era. Communication is better in terms of the present and the future than in terms of the past.

Walker: Getting back to what Bob Reinhardt was saying, the esprit de corps in the Washington University undergraduate school has always been poor. It never seemed to me to have the same esprit as a residential college, a Princeton or an Amherst, where everybody lives together and the schools do things as a unit. At Washington University, after class the students go to the variety of 96 different communities around here and only a small core stay on the campus itself.

Lochmoller: I think you'll find that this has been changing. This is another problem of communication. If
There's no relationship between an individual's satisfaction with the education he got in the University and his support of the institution—none whatsoever.
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you haven't been on the campus in the last few years, you might not realize it—but now this is changing and will change even more with the new dormitories drawing more students from out of town. . . .

STUDENT EXPERIENCE AND ALUMNI ATTITUDES

REINHARDT: I should clarify one point. If you think that from 1935 to 1939 we didn't have a ball on the campus, you're mistaken. We had a great deal of fun. We had perhaps as good a year in the Quadrangle Club and football and all that as has ever been at the University. It was a great period for the University, I thought, from that standpoint. The University was small enough so that those of us who were involved in social activities knew almost everybody on the campus. The University was probably as close then as I can imagine it could ever be, for a big school. That isn't what I was referring to. When I meant was that, on sober reflection, I realized that I hadn't done what I should have done. I came ill-prepared to make a choice, and I got no help to make one, so I made the wrong choices. I know that I have gone in the wrong direction. Not that I've lived an unhappy life or anything—that isn't the point at all. It's just that my education is not what I would choose it to be if I were doing it over, and this colors my whole attitude toward the University.

WALKER: A number of students come to school in the same plight—they don't know what they want to do and what they want to be. I came to be a doctor, and that was what I was going to be. I came with that idea, and I just plodded ahead on the course. Many high school students would like to go to college, they think, but they don't know what they want to take. Engineering appeals to them; law appeals to them, but they are not sure of their goal in life, so they end up in liberal arts. Then they skip from course to course, wind up dissatisfied, and blame the College for it.

PAYTON: It is not an indictment of the institution to say that you majored in one area and are now active in another.

ROSE: That is a more alarming problem in medicine and dentistry, even in law. I don't know anything quite as disheartening as the man in medicine or dentistry who wakes up at 40 years of age and suddenly decides that he didn't want to be this in the first place. . . .

THE ACADEMIC IMAGE

PAYTON: One of the things I'd like to have you talk about for a while, if you will, is your impression of the University as an academic institution. In other words, do you think it is a good university?

HORNER: I think it is, yes. We've sent students to the University, and I made some studies and found that the education is first rate. I know quite well the University is determined not to take just anybody.

PAYTON: Does this fit with your general impression through the years? Has the University changed in its academic character?

HORNER: Yes, it has. But I think the change reflects the general change country-wide. Of course, I'm distressed to see the lessening in my field of classics, but most urban universities find that the subjects commonly called human-
Loyalty to the University is through habit—father and brothers and uncles graduating over a period of time. Just in the last two or three years I've become interested again.—ROSE

Ities tend at least not to increase percentage-wise. But there's no relationship between an individual's satisfaction with the education he got in the University and his support of the institution—none whatsoever. And there's little connection between an individual's support of the University and his feeling that he has been poorly guided vocationally. The big thing is that the problem is common to all universities where a goodly percentage of students are town people. That's the big thing. When you go away to college, they get hooks on you pretty fast. You are expected to support the institution.

PAYTON: What kind of impression do you have, Marilyn? You're the most recent graduate in this group.

LOCHMOELLER: Academically the University is good. They've been talking about raising standards, and I think that is definitely happening. Of course, there are the weak spots—as in every university—but I think they're striving to improve a lot of the courses—and have. I would say that Liberal Arts has the weak spots. I was quite interested in the last WU Magazine because of that, particularly where the faculty were talking about a tendency toward specialization even in liberal arts, and that distressed me terribly.

HORNER: Liberal arts is the weak spot in universities which have graduate and professional schools. Most people who want to get a liberal arts education tend to go to a college which offers only that. That's been true for some time.

BASHFORD: But does that mean that it is more difficult for a university with graduate schools to develop a good liberal arts school? I don't believe we're going into an age of specialists. It's from the liberal arts group that we're going to get the people who are going to be leaders. The quality of education they get is very important. We are all interested in the calibre of the College of Liberal Arts; we want it to be strengthened and not just considered a preparatory school for graduate work.

HORNER: I hope you're right, but my experience is that liberal arts is not improving in a university such as Washington. Remember the old story about the St. Louis Browns? "They've got to get more people to come to see the games." "How do they do it?" "Get some big players.
to play for the Browns." "How do they pay the players?"
"Get more people to come to see the games."

WEBSTER: I think there is possibly a growing recognition
in the business world of the importance of a sound liberal
arts education. Many of the firms hiring engineers, for
instance, are saying, "Give us a man who has had a lib­
eral arts background—we want a fellow who doesn't take
the drafting board home with him at night. We want some­
one who has a capacity for executive leadership at some
point beyond his technical training."

HORNER: There are actually two things you need to do. I
don't think our College of Liberal Arts is necessarily
weak; it may be weaker than it was thirty years ago—
that's hard to say. But you need to build it up and get it
to be a major part of the institution, and you want to keep
on increasing the percentage of those who come from out
of the city. Those two things, I think, would help a lot.

LOCHMOELLER: Liberal arts isn't poor generally, only in
certain places. The sciences put their good men in as
teachers for the freshman year. But it's the humanities
courses that used to be so important where you now get
graduate students as teachers. I realize they need the
experience, but for a freshman it's not too impressive.

REINHARDT: That was true twenty years ago, too.

WALKER: It takes a pretty good teacher to make an intro­
duction to literature interesting. I think sometimes the stu­
dent isn't prepared for it. We read Julius Caesar in high
school, but I wonder whether we are actually ready for
Julius Caesar or Macbeth then.

THE ALUMNUS AND THE TEACHER

WEBSTER: It's hard to tell where the spark is going to
hit; it doesn't necessarily hit in the classroom. This is
where the liberal arts school at a university is at a dis­
advantage from a residential college. The contact between
a professor and his student over a cup of coffee some­
times starts it off—where the student begins to generate
himself and do work that he otherwise wouldn't do unless
he were assigned it. Having the alumni support the Uni­
versity sufficiently to provide facilities where the professor
and the student could see each other on a non-classroom
basis—that would be a good thing.

PAYTON: The University is quite ready to accept such sup­
port these days.

HORNER: May I deliver myself of a little theory I have?
At Washington University, the faculty is supposed to
write, and in most other places it's supposed to write.

PAYTON: Publish or perish?

HORNER: Publish or perish. That's pretty important. But
we should find out whether in this University time is
spent in getting your name on the frontispiece of a book
to pass around to other universities—time which should
have been spent on refining your ability to teach.

WEBSTER: The college and the alumni, it seems to me,
have a duty to protect the teacher—the teacher as dis­
tinguished from the great researcher. If we don't protect
him, he'll be washed out in the competitive struggle for
appointments and salary and recognition. One of the small
steps that the alumni have made in that direction may
have helped a bit. It was kind of my brainchild, and so I
like to plug it—the annual faculty awards at Founders
Day. These awards are, as we call them, "awards of the
heart," and they have nothing to do with how many books
the faculty publish or how many degrees they have, but
it is recognition by the alumni of the personal impact
that these professors had on them while they were stu­
dents. We have got to remind the University constantly
that we are aware of these things. . . .

REUNIONS—FOR AND AGAINST

PAYTON: Another thing that I'd like to have you talk
about is the traditional alumni activity—reunions, home­
coming, the social relationship that has been the primary
basis of alumni relations for a very long time. Do you
have any interest in it? Have you ever been reunion-con­
scious or "class-conscious"?

ROSE: I'd say it's the key to the whole situation. We found
it to be true in the Alumni Fund in dentistry. We try one
class after another, and as soon as we find one man who
is willing to communicate between us and the class, who
knows the members of his class and how to approach them,
then we can start to get results from the class. Until we
find a man who can put it on a class basis, we get nowhere.

Class chairmen can tie it all in, by passing news around
about reunions and other activities. You can't go into it
People are more cooperative if you ask them to do something specific for you. But I'm sure they would never think to volunteer the service themselves.
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just on a basis of "We were in class together. Send me a check." It's been almost imperative in stirring up the older classes. We are also tying the alumni and the senior class together. We start educating the senior class and the alumni at the same time. The class then continues as a group.

WALKER: I take great pleasure in getting together with my classmates and seeing what they're doing and what they've accomplished and what their opinions are. And we have our annual alumni meeting at graduation time. Many contacts for alumni activity are made right there.

BASHFORD: It depends on the individual situation. My interest hasn't been particularly social. The social part of graduate school alumni activity didn't appeal to me, but if there was some job I could do as an alumna, I'd be glad to work. But that is my situation; my husband enjoys the reunions. I think, though, that if his school said we'd like to have a meeting and discuss the problems of business administration, I think that would interest him, too.

LOCHMOELLER: It seems to me that someone in Enid's situation could support the University by taking part in student recruitment. I'm really interested in that, although I don't know a good deal about it—I had nothing to do with the student committee on recruitment last year. This is a good way for alumni to do something for the University. I don't know how it works in St. Louis, but in other cities it seems like a good way for alumni to help. Student recruitment seems much more valuable to me than all this social business that goes on.

HORNER: We're going to have a lot of people who are not interested at all or who have a dozen other interests to occupy their time. But what about the alumnus out in, say, Wichita, Kansas? If you can reach that fellow and preserve his interest in the University, it's his one link with his academic or educational environment. If you provide him with opportunities to renew that acquaintance, whether by the reunion process or by an opportunity to participate in programs, you can keep him abreast of what's going on so that he can continue that identification.

WALKER: The opportunity to participate in programs has to be initiated by the University. That is of the utmost importance. I am sure that if you ask this man in Wichita to do something specific, he would give his utmost to do it.

PAYTON: That's one of the reasons the University doesn't want to make it just a matter of asking for money. It doesn't give the individual enough satisfaction even if he contributes the money—there should be something more substantial than just a financial relationship.

WEBSTER: The last three or four years you've had people come back from different parts of the country to meet with each other and with University officials. How has this seed flowered around the country?

PAYTON: It does very well. These are people from alumni clubs—there are clubs in about thirteen cities now. But we can only have a club where there are enough alumni to have a club meeting. The difficulty is the situation where we have only four or five alumni in one community. These four or five people may have no other interests in common at all, and it's very difficult to try to provide worthwhile activity for them.
Student recruitment seems much more valuable to me than all this social business that goes on.—LOCHMOELLER

WALKER: If you wrote this man in Wichita and told him that we'd like to have him contact the top seniors in the high schools there—I'd bet he would make an effort to do it. People are more cooperative if you ask them to do something specific for you. But I'm sure they would never think to volunteer the service themselves.

THE STIMULUS OF ALUMNI SUPPORT

REINHARDT: That brings up a point I've wanted to raise. Perhaps it's a little late in the discussion, but what are the motivating forces here? We haven't even discussed what impels an alumnus to support his university. What are these things? A while ago, Fred Horner said he didn't believe that the fact that you have been misguided or haven't guided yourself well had much to do with your support of the University. I will agree that that in itself is not the answer, but along with a lot of other things it can create the indifference mentioned earlier. How do you re-motivate people? I might say at this point, because it's applicable, that it was only a few weeks ago that my wife and I looked at something that came from the University and said, this year we're going to contribute and try to do something for the University. Something has motivated us, but I don't know what the motivation is. I don't know what it is that got me, after twenty years of indifference, to change my mind. I don't think that going back every five years to a reunion meeting would do it. That may have something to do with it, but you've got to have something behind that to make it pay off.

BASHERD: The conviction that you have is a motivation, and it's going to motivate for more than contributions. Not because of any particular feeling of loyalty, but because of the conviction that this is a good place to go for what you want. In the long run, then, it's to continue to build the school so that we have the conviction that it does have something to offer.

PAYTON: Ernest Havemann, one of the New York alumni we interviewed, said that the University is not a social club for alumni any more than it is a social club for students, and my personal inclination is to agree. I don't mean that we should exclude social activity, but why should the University change its relationship to the individual once he graduates? Why should the predominant thing in his life when he is a student be academic work and after he graduates be a kind of entertainment?

WEBSTER: More and more Washington University is becoming not only a great center of learning, but its impact is being felt in the economy and the business community and in the professional and cultural life of the community—through the people it brings to the campus, those on the campus who go out into the community, who speak, who perform, who participate. This is the growing role of the University, and I think it will bring a lot of the alumni into it as they realize what a tremendous part Washington University now has in the development of St. Louis. This is particularly true for the local alumni, but I think the out-of-town alumni also take pride in the growth of the University. They are beginning to recognize that education is vitally important and to think of giving to it in the same terms that they would think of giving to their church. Just as they give to their church, they're going to give to their school, if they're proud of it and have some reason to be proud of it.
debasing
the academic coinage

A distinguished alumnus appraises the decline of social commitment and its impact on society and education.
IT IS A PRIVILEGE to participate in a ceremony that honors distinguished alumni and faculty who have carried into their business and professional lives the basic lessons of their academic training. Our alma mater is a justly famous institution, and it has never been content with the mere transmission of skills and talents. It has linked learning with citizenship. Our teachers—humanists, social scientists, scientists—were, of course, all concerned with the discipline of fact and data; but they were fully as concerned with maturity and social responsibility. Too often a university coddles its students; they are treated as fragile vessels, easily burst if filled to the brim or subjected to extra pressure. Qualified Europeans who visit our country often level the criticism that we have a very high standard of very low living, that American education, like many aspects of American life, leans to the superficial. One of them deplored that American education is a process that leads from an infantile vacuum to an adolescent void. Dr. Kallen used to say that all too often a university education is the prolongation of infancy. To avoid these excoriations, the better schools have prodded their students, stretched them, following the goal which Pavlov, in his 87th year, set for the youth of his generation: "Be passionate in your work and in your searchings." As we look back upon our school days, I imagine that what elicits deepest gratitude is the knowledge that the faculty
set academic tasks that fully challenged latent capacity. There was no academic baby-sitting here.

The temptation to characterize the intellectual currents of one's time is always strong; at the start of a new decade it becomes irresistible. Some characterizations have caught the popular imagination more firmly than others. We all remember the "lost" generation of the '20s, in Hemingway's expatriate heroes and heroines, drinking themselves into unconsciousness in the cafés of the Left Bank; or Scott Fitzgerald's "beautiful and damned" flappers of the Jazz Age, who became the accepted stereotypes of a generation of Americans. Most of them had never heard of the Latin Quarter, and they would have fled in discreet revulsion from a bullfight. And yet the adjective "lost" was not purely a literary invention. It caught something of the disillusionment and the defeatism of the period immediately after World War I. What of the youth coming of age after World War II? What of your time, our time? It has already acquired its quota of tags and identifications which, if accurate, are profoundly disquieting. Some have described it as the "silent" generation, others as the "angry" generation. Yet even the angry young men of the British and American literary revolt are not rebels or dreamers. Their anger is sullen, a sign of withdrawal and not of protest.

Perhaps the best way to describe the contemporary state of mind is to label it as uncommitted. It is not a lost generation. If anything, it is too much unlost. It is withdrawn. Its restlessness is not a product of concern; it is a product of lack of concern. The retreat into a private world, the lack of commitment to larger issues that exceed purely individual pains and satisfactions are reflected in our younger writers. In their narcissistic exploration of the psyche of the hero, their concentration on childhood experience before the bonds with society are established, their drift to fantasy, we perceive indications of a sensibility aware of the self, selfish rather than social. The poet Yeats lamented,

The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

Today we might subscribe to the first half of the poet's bitter comment. The "best" in the intellectual sense do, indeed, appear to lack conviction, but even the "worst" are characterized by cynicism and cold malice rather than by any "passionate intensity." In the old days we used to worry about the reckless idealism of young people, their impetuousness and impatience. They no longer appear to require the restraining cautions and admonitions of their elders. It seems superfluous in most instances to urge them to be sensible and practical. They share the national obsession with personal happiness; they are an integral part of the cult of gratification at all costs. Corruption in politics, rigged TV shows, payola are alarming in themselves, but even more alarming is the good-natured acceptance of such developments with a kind of cynical affection. There can be no commitment to social needs when there has been such a marked shift from what an M. I. T. professor termed the Courage Culture that America used to be to the Creature Comfort Culture that it has now become.

How is one to explain this lack of commitment among our young people? One cause may lie in a kind of edge-of-disaster psychology when a whole generation is threatened by vast and incalculable disaster. Any day the robot of technology may push the last button and obliterate all of us in our mechanical apocalypse. The individual, therefore, feels dwarfed and helpless. What can he do then except construct his private shelter, make it as comfortable as possible, equip it with every gadget and luxury which our material wealth permits, and not bother about problems and questions outside of immediate concern? "To Hell With It" then becomes the compelling credo.

Yet the argument from despair is not wholly convincing. Recorded history is full of periods of menace—admittedly not as total as the present, because man's conquest of the physical universe had never before reached so baleful a degree—but periods of menace equally dangerous to the individual. Yet men built again on the ruins, not only efficiently, but in a generous faith for a future which transcended their individual destinies. The supreme scientific and technological miracle of our era, the harnessing of the atom, was achieved, as any account of the project will indicate, not by dispassionate calculators, but by men like our own Arthur Compton, and Fermi, and Szilard, and Bohr—men aglow with a dream of liberation.

The blame for our unspiritual climate, then, can be laid only partly to the fear of cosmic annihilation. Surely this generation's unprecedented regard for pension plans and guaranteed security programs is a curious way of expressing terror of sudden death. One of my heads of department told me recently that he was startled when young Ph.D.'s fresh from graduate school, not yet 25, inquired about the University's retirement system when applying for instructorships. Such prudence is, no doubt, commendable, but one cannot help wondering at the view of life of a youth who must see every paving stone in place before he ventures on so long a road. This is why I say that the argument from despair is not a true explanation. One must really look for other factors to understand our cool and uncommitted young. Has their education, in the wider sense, been at fault?

It is fashionable to point an accusing finger at the familiar villains of the piece—John Dewey and Sigmund Freud. Is not Dewey responsible for the undisciplined uninhibited bundle of appetites we call a child? Did not Freud with his "pleasure principle" and his exorcism of "repressions" compound the damage? Quite recently President Eisenhower, who before assuming the Presidency of the United States was, we should recall, the President of Columbia University, strictured John Dewey in no uncertain terms. In a letter to Life Magazine (March 15, 1959) President Eisenhower wrote, "Educators, parents, and students must be continuously stirred up by the defects of our educational system. They must be induced to abandon the educational path that, rather blithely, they have been following as a result of John Dewey's teachings." The charge is that our youth, the end product of Dewey's theories, is not only ignorant but
President Sachar's address, the high point of Founders Day ceremonies, followed the awarding of citations to outstanding alumni and faculty.
selfish and irresponsible as well. In addition to being woefully deficient in the traditional 3 R's, he emerges from the Dewey chrysalis with no concern for the fourth R, responsibility for the welfare of his world.

In truth, this is quite unfair to John Dewey. In his body of teachings he advocated no such escape from discipline and responsibility. The trouble lies in the fact that he has often been torn from context. He has suffered almost as much at the hands of some of his disciples as from his translators. His original educational theories have been vulgarized, his precious coinage has been debased, and all about us now we have the ill effects of this debasement.

Dewey was right to shift from traditional formal education, with its emphasis on particular subjects and disciplines, to the personality of the student. He brought us a stimulating and potentially fruitful revaluation. But the trouble began when regard for the child's individuality was erroneously interpreted as a need to pander to the child's whims and caprices. How far is the distance between the “child-centered” school and the self-centered individual? The student educated to believe that his impulses and desires were sacrosanct and that they constituted the sole meaningful standard for his mental and moral life was not likely to accept with adequate seriousness the prime obligations of service in the modern world. The youngster taught that there are no absolute sanctions was often likely to reject their validity altogether. Who is not familiar with the pious horror of our students as they shrink from making value judgments? They say, “Who is to presume to praise or condemn? Who really knows what is right or wrong? Why claim ethical merit for a going value when it is merely a matter of opinion?” Well, it is a short step from this kind of ethical relativism to complete cynicism, to the repudiation of all values which have come out of the Judeo-Christian heritage. Neither Dewey nor Freud, nor the forerunners of progressive education, nor the pioneers of psychoanalysis proposed such ethical nihilism. They insisted that the test of the free intelligence lies, not in its negation of values, but in its ability to choose wisely among values. But these cautions were often forgotten in the heady wine of revolt. The cult of gratification, the fear of “inhibiting” personality was bound to bring us to this sorry pass. All too many young people so nurtured have lost their concern for whatever is beyond themselves. They are flabby in aspiration, and hence there is no enduring fiber in their social concern.

Studies of the Korean War have shown that American soldiers taken prisoner by the enemy cracked more quickly under the stress of adverse conditions than prisoners of other nationalities. Why? Did their comparative softness result from the greater ease and comfort of life in America? Was it because they were less familiar with hardship and privation than soldiers of less fortunate countries? I think not. Was it not rather, though courageous soldiers in the heat of battle, because they were morally unprepared for long-term fortitude? Military authorities are so persuaded that this is the basic difficulty that they have begun studies in depth on appropriate solutions.

None of this is meant to imply that life in America
should become less abundant or less satisfying than we know it. I do not demean our comforts and our advantages. I love them and enjoy them as you do. As citizens of a prosperous and powerful democracy we are blessed with a happy lot. But we may well consider whether our morale is equal to our blessings.

As I was coming in by plane for these Founders Day exercises, I read in the current issue of a national monthly an interesting exchange of correspondence between Adlai Stevenson and John Steinbeck. Steinbeck had just returned from two years of work in England on a play dealing with the Knights of the Round Table. He confronted an America that he had not seen for quite some time. He was very much troubled by what he found, "a creeping all-pervading nerve gas of immorality which starts in the nursery and does not stop before it reaches the highest offices, both corporate and government." He asked what's wrong with Americans today. Isn't it that they have too many things? "They spend their hours and money on the couch searching for a soul. What a strange species we are. We can stand anything God and Nature can throw at us save only plenty... If I want to destroy a nation, I would give it too much, and I would have it on its knees, miserable, greedy, and sick." Steinbeck grieves over the deterioration of a once noble Courage Culture that is now so concerned with creature comforts.

I return to the problem of commitment. If the relativism of much current thinking, a relativism which hesitates to affirm or deny, is at fault, then as educators we have tougher problems than exploding population and spiraling costs. We have the overwhelming task, on every level, from the elementary school to the university, to challenge an intellectual position which condones moral neutrality, which encourages an escape to the Ivory Tower. Some of you will remember Archibald MacLeish’s magnificent little volume, *The Irresponsibles.* He was evaluating the tragedy that engulfed the Germany of the Weimar Republic. In the early days when Hitler was still a barroom hooligan whose appeal was mainly to rowdies and bullies, it was possible for the decent elements in society to contain the plague. But most of the professors in the universities, the writers, the philosophers, the intellectuals—most of these felt that this was not their responsibility. It was the concern of the politicians. They had no commitment to the hurly-burly of current issues. Their objectivity might be jeopardized if they took sides! They were so anti-septic in their neutrality that they became sterile. Only Thomas Mann and a few courageous spirits insisted upon commitment. Even Hauptmann, the brilliant interpreter of Goethe, would not besmirch his academic garments by passing judgment on evils which were then still no larger than a man’s hand and had not yet become a black and all-consuming cloud.

In our sensitively balanced world, we have learned that we cannot afford the laxity of spirit which searches for the comfortable port for one’s self, which sedulously avoids the problems that batter at one’s private peace. A time comes when we, too, must enter the fray. If we cannot rely on the men and women who are the custodians of our educational system, upon whom can we rely? If they remain armchair critics, or Monday morning quarterbacks, if they merely sit in the seats of the scorners, who will take up the cudgels? Let me remind you of the magnificent words of Milton, no mean excoriator himself, but always first among the doers: "I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unmarried and unbreathed, that ever sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat." How wise the poet was, and how thoroughly he understood the struggle for the immortal garland! Certainly the dour Puritan could never be charged with compromise or opportunism. But he knew that virtue is meaningless if it is cloistered and that the world of action in which the race is run is not without dust and heat. It is a great poet’s way of saying, "Pay for your convictions with service." You must all remember the ignominious spot to which Dante committed the neutrals, those whom both Heaven and Hell disdained. Contemptuously the Italian poet placed them just outside the gate in the antechamber of his Inferno—always outside, and always eternally damned.

Of course, commitment is not easy. It means aggravation, discomfort, sacrifice. But what good are the reservoirs of idealism unless they are channeled to enrich and fructify community life? What good are high-sounding, noble ideals that are encysted in a vacuum? Good intentions must be linked with stamina. Unless our most knowledgeable and most sensitive are willing to fight for their convictions, to slug it out, toe to toe, with the primitives and the Neanderthal men, their well-phrased intentions will survive only to mock and shame them. Real progress cannot come from the flashy verbalizers who speak brave words but whose timidity and impatience in relation to the tedious techniques of fulfillment lead in the end to futility and impotence.

Today we honor men who have buttressed their education by the determination to use it for the public welfare. There are many here, at the very beginning of their student days, who will want to raise such a flag for themselves. Remember how much we all count on you, not just for idealism but for participation, not just for precept but for example. You don’t always have to win. Indeed, you will surely not always win. William James well said: "The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause." The best of the past and the present count on you to salvage the future. Think of these most poignant words of André Gide at the end of a long crusading life: "At a time when I feel in such peril, so besieged on all sides... the fact of knowing that among the young, even if they are few and in no matter what country, there are those who take no rest, who keep intact their moral and intellectual integrity, who protest against all totalitarian commands and undertakings which would subordinate, lower, and subject thought or reduce the soul—for it is finally the soul, itself, which is at stake—it is the fact of knowing that these young people are there, that they exist, it is that which inspires confidence in us, the older folk; it is that fact which keeps me, so old now and so close to leaving this life, from dying without hope."
To the Editor:
The discussion of the future of education by seven members of the WU faculty, as reported in the February issue of the Magazine, is of such immense importance that I should like to circulate my copy, but do not want to part with it. The addresses to which I beg that copies may be sent are given on the attached page.

I am an alumna of the College, '06, and was once, for a few years, secretary and editorial assistant of the Alumni Bulletin, when it was first started, under the editorship of Professor Otto Heller. How far it has gone since then!

VINE McCASLAND

To the Editor:

As a Washington University alumnus, I was especially pleased to see the issue for February 1960 with its excellent report excerpted from the discussion held by the Liberal Arts faculty. This was a top-notch job of reporting that I am sure has interested many.

I was especially interested in it because of my own position and because the matters in the discussion are so much a part of the thoughts of all of us. Needless to say, many of these points of view have appeared time and time again in our own bull sessions around here. I like especially the professional consciousness and earnestness which pervaded the whole approach of the faculty members present; there was a good atmosphere and a liberal spirit.

Would you give your consent to my making a mimeographed copy of this article and circulating it as an item of general interest amongst faculty teaching here in the University College (sophomores and freshman years)? I note that there is no copyright upon the Magazine itself, but I should prefer to have your permission.

ROLAND G. USHER JR.
Director, University College
Butler University
Indianapolis

LETTERS

RARELY has an article in the Washington University Magazine prompted the discussion that followed publication of "The College Enters Its Second Century" in the February issue. Faculty and student response was considerable, as might be expected. What is perhaps more interesting is the range and depth of comment expressed by alumni.

Because this is a special issue devoted to alumni and their relationship to the University, it is particularly appropriate to reprint here some of the observations alumni have made about this article.

The article itself dealt with a number of critical educational problems, many of which directly relate to the teacher-student relationship and the problems of college teaching. In the next issue of the Magazine (June), we hope to present another viewpoint. Meanwhile, we think you will find these alumni comments of interest.

—Ed.

To the Editor:

I was especially pleased to see the issue for February 1960 with its excellent report excerpted from the discussion held by the Liberal Arts faculty. This was a top-notch job of reporting that I am sure has interested many.

I was especially interested in it because of my own position and because the matters in the discussion are so much a part of the thoughts of all of us. Needless to say, many of these points of view have appeared time and time again in our own bull sessions around here. I like especially the professional consciousness and earnestness which pervaded the whole approach of the faculty members present; there was a good atmosphere and a liberal spirit.

Would you give your consent to my making a mimeographed copy of this article and circulating it as an item of general interest amongst faculty teaching here in the University College (sophomores and freshman years)? I note that there is no copyright upon the Magazine itself, but I should prefer to have your permission.

ROLAND G. USHER JR.
Director, University College
Butler University
Indianapolis

To the Editor:

Please pardon these reflections from a testy alumnus of some 25 years’ standing, who has himself entered academic life, upon the remarks by your panel of seven rising faculty members in your last issue.

(1) The majority of your “rising seven” wanted to save the world and beat the Russians by “beefing up” introductory courses to the point of unintelligibility to the average student. The majority were clearly wrong, and the minority clearly right. “Beefing up” will keep people out of college altogether, or drive them to the Podunks and Si-washes, or start a rush to whatever Washington University departments resist the trend—speech, home economics, physical education, or what-have-you. To cite a variant of the economists’ Grimham’s Law: “Bad talk drives out good.”

First courses are to tempt student flies into departmental spiders’ parlors. “Beefing up” (and parenthetically the mixed metaphor) is for one or more second courses compulsory for majors, of whose existence the majority among the rising seven seemed blissfully unaware.

(1) Personally happen to believe that flies who wish to avoid any intellectual “beefing up” whatever should be able, as in Britain or Canada, to get “pass” degrees on what are essentially four years of survey courses with no major at all. But that is another issue.

(2) Your colloquium accepted without question the dictum that the present generation of Washington University students were better than our own depression generation. I happen to think that is completely wrong, and more so for Washington University than for the country at large. In fact, I am sure that any of the rising seven would have been challenged had any of the rising seven been depression alumni. But here are five more general points on my side of the question—three general for the country and two specific to Washington University:

(a) During the depression there was no royal elevator from Big Man on Campus to Executive Training Program to $25,000 a year. To get a job you had to be good—or even to get into graduate school. The only bums we had were athletes and their hangers-on, or rich boys and their mistresses. The ordinary student needed more than a smile and a shoe shine to get anything out of college, and he didn’t have money to hang around unless he did get something out of college.

(b) During the depression, with things headed for the demimonde bow-wows, there was some point to thinking about them even at the risk of “rocking the boat.” Now one rides the sacred curve, “keeps out of trouble, and waits for the guided missiles.”

(c) During the depression, students came to college with substantial backgrounds of academic courses from high school—sometimes badly taught, but more relevant for the academic side of college than “life adjustment” courses in social dancing or automobile driving.

(d) During the depression even the Ivy League was short of scholarship funds. So Washington University got a substantial proportion of the kind of students from the St. Louis area (and the whole Southwest) that it loses today to the Harvard-Oberlin-Chicago-Stanford varieties of competition. These kids stayed home, became leaders, and set the intellectual tone of the Washington campus.

(e) During the depression Washington University was lucky enough to have and hold the best corps of teachers for potential egg-heads that I have ever seen anywhere—even at Chicago under Hutchins. The University had men who specialized in making silk purses out of sow’s ears, and flat Beta Kappas out of middle-grade morons. Their successors teach huge thundering herds and never learn their students’ names, or are reserved for seniors and graduate students, or are administrators, or have full-time research assignments. In those days, the University was small enough for even non-majors to know these men. Let me just drop a few names which will mean something to my fellow-alumni if to nobody else (I had work with most of them; I only wish I had had sense enough to work with the rest as well): L. L. Bernard (Sociology), Lee DuBridge (Physics), Ralph Bigge (Economics), Caswell Grave (Zoology), Erich Hofacker (German), A. L. Hughle (Physics), A. J. Lien (Political Science), Paul R. Rider (Mathematics), R. G.
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Usher (History). They were in their prime; they got results singly and in combination.

But enough of this name-dropping. This letter is too long already.

**Martin Bronfenbrenner, AB 34**
Professor of Economics
University of Minnesota

"Professor Bronfenbrenner explains that "the 'demission bow-wows' was a pet phrase of some character in Dickens' Nicholas Nickleby—Lord Frederick Verisopht, I believe."—Ed.

To the Editor:

I have read with interest the round-table discussion of the future of the College of Liberal Arts. It stimulates me to send you and your fellow participants in that round table a little book, "The Mission of the University," by Jose Ortega y Gasset.

This is an old book. The lectures on which it was based were given in a much "simpler" year, most likely 1930. The point to note here is that the subject still seems to be a fresh one, and also the subject matter, if I have read the recent article correctly. This would, I hope, give us all a little pause. Perhaps we take ourselves and our efforts too seriously.

This observation, that we take ourselves too seriously, needs some explanation. To do this, it seems necessary to call attention to Ortega's conclusion that the University performs three functions: (1) the transmission of culture; (2) the teaching of professions; (3) scientific research and the training of new scientists.

I would like to note that in limiting the third function to scientific research and the training of scientists, I believe Ortega's view too narrow. This is a function of question-asking, searching, synthesizing, and training those qualified to do this work.

It is in respect to the matters of transmitting culture and teaching of the professions that I would like to make my explanation. Ortega makes the case for necessity, purpose, and method more eloquently than I could; I can only raise a few questions in respect to one idea which must have seemed of some less concern than it is today. This is the allegation that the frontiers of knowledge are expanding so rapidly. We hear this often today.

Yet, in the main, men are ordinary creatures rather than extraordinary. Their pace corresponds whether we like it or not. Consequently, the race learns slowly, but it does seem to learn. It hangs tenaciously to old beliefs and habits, but it does in time abandon them. Most of its members are most actively occupied with earning a livelihood, raising a family, seeking some little pleasure.

This makes me wonder what are the frontiers of knowledge, and how broad and how well consolidated an advance must be before it is truly a frontier. It also makes me speculate whether these frontiers advance quite as rapidly as our little research skirmishes, the seemingly stochastic activity at the fringes, would sometimes deceive us into believing.

I wonder, too, if these frontiers are determined by the researcher or by a larger mass of people who ultimately come around to reject or assimilate and adapt those findings as a part of their today's living. I realize this process is at our collective risk, yet it seems fortunate that enduring ideas must be capable of penetrating that dense and fine filter.

Somehow, I seem to that the round-table discussion described in the last issue of the Magazine was too concerned with only one function of the University—namely, training new scientists or their equivalent—and only lightly touched on the other two. The necessity of economy in education was, therefore, missed, and the subject—the ordinary student—lost in the shuffle.

In spite of these critical remarks, I am nevertheless heartened that this panel of younger members of the College faculty are so deeply concerned with teaching and how it may be accomplished. That these men find time to reflect on this matter despite the allurements of research and publication speaks well for them and the College.

M. L. Hurni, EN 33, SI 34
New York
(An interview with Mr. Hurni appears on page 6.)

To the Editor:

It is a continual pleasure to read the Washington University Magazine, with its harmonious blend of excellent content and handsome format. The presentation of the tape-recorded discussion by younger faculty members of issues facing the College was stimulating and very gratifying. As an alumna and neighbor of the University, I am interested in its future; as a parent and citizen I am interested in the education of the seven, for while their youthfulness lent special interest to their exchange, it also lent its special drawbacks. Their struggle to learn to be teachers, or teaching members of the University community, is still going on, so that there is a sense of wrestling with their own development just behind behind their words. Thus the discussion has the force and freshness of a focus on their problems, but omits a broad social view, a grappling with the great aims of education.

The tone of specialization is particularly disturbing. Have these young scientists forgotten wisdom, character, breadth, the enrichment of life as human goals? Some of them appear to feel that the humanities are something we ought to have been given in high school and weren't, so that unfortunately it is necessary to devote two years of college to it. One gentleman sees this as a way of weeding girls out, and no one challenges him; yet it is recognized that many who come to college lack motives of depth and an appreciation of work. No connection is made between these two points, but it begins to be made. As a Talmudic saying goes, "He learns best who learns first from his mother." We ought to be busy insisting upon, rather than discouraging, the education of women.

It is unfortunate that career-mindedness should prevail so much in the discussion. Some thought to the present directions of society should remind everyone that not only character and decision-making are to be prepared for in college, but that for an increasingly large segment of the population leisure is also to be prepared for. Are we not to get ready for an occasional choice between books and barbecue pits? Are we to forget to what extent women are cultural and economic arbiters of the modern world? Are we to forget that people live to be old? We should certainly all have in mind that many women at, say, 45 will be ready for careers or major interests as they retire from full-time parenthood and that many men at 65 will be in the same position. These people should be thought of as the consumers of art, music, literature, as the participants in current events, and as the observers of history who, as they retire, may well become creative artists, teachers, and leaders. The colleges have a chance, and perhaps a duty, to help them develop a lifelong interest in every branch of culture.

You young professors, can you envision your students at 60? Many will take directions that neither you nor they can foresee—thank goodness! However it is we reach it, all in our different ways, the most important thing college can do for us is to help us touch the highest.

Judith Saul Stix, AB 52
(Mrs. Ernest W. Stix Jr.)
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THE SERIES of interviews with New York alumni that open this issue were to have included the comments of Dave Garroway. A personal interview, however, left us with inadequate notes; these were supplemented by letter. Garroway originally remarked that "The fraternity system upset me a great deal. I wanted to play golf when I was in school, and I couldn't do that and afford to join a fraternity, too. I became a barbarian—a social outcast. It ostracized me, and it shaped the whole pattern of my life from that moment on."

Asked to elaborate on this, Garroway replied, "I hold the University responsible for the existence of the fraternity-sorority system—not only because it's a non-campus phenomenon, but because the school has control over whether or not the student belongs to such a system. I believe the system should be abolished."

Asked how he rated the University academically, Garroway said, "I had one or two good teachers. Most of them were mediocre. I did have two superb teachers—people who inspired me with some interest: L. L. Bernard in sociology and Fred Conway in fine arts." He also said, "I did not have to work hard enough; there was not enough work." His letter amplifies this last statement: "I feel it is a responsibility of the institution to provide a work-load to stimulate the student into believing that he is learning something important and vital—in volume as well as quality—and not feel that he is going to a continuation of high school."

Garroway continues: "How could the situation be improved? In 1935 when I went to Washington University, it could have been improved by employing competent educators. I'm not familiar with the school at this time. I have in no way been involved in alumni activity since leaving Washington University. I have been concise and not overly cordial in my relations with the University because, frankly, I shall never forget the quality of education which I purchased there. I hope it is much better today."

Garroway's first comment when the interview was proposed was, "You probably don't want to interview me. My comments won't be very favorable."

These last remarks reflect a common misconception among alumni. The worst thing one could say about a good university would be that it wouldn't benefit from—and welcome—constructive criticism.

The emphasis must be put on the word constructive, however, and this is why I have chosen to single out Mr. Garroway's relationship to the University for separate consideration. Although his career is hardly typical, and the pressure on his time and patience greater by far than most of us have to endure. Dave Garroway is typical of too many alumni who have criticisms of the University to offer. It helps no one, including the critic himself, if a criticism remains private or simply negative. Resentment, bitterness, disappointment—these are worthwhile reactions only if they lead somewhere other than to apathy or indifference.

Behind such a passive negativism may lie an assumption that seems to be held by a great many people, both inside the University and out of it: that the University belongs to those who happen to be there at the moment. However popular the notion may be, it seems to me not only invalid but threatening to the proper place of an educational institution in society. The burden of responsibility for administration lies with administrators, that of teaching with the faculty, that of support with the community at large (and the alumni community in particular). Responsibility in a university, however, does not imply that those who hold it are not accountable for what they do.

Accountability can be demanded by students who, if dissatisfied, may go elsewhere. Faculty who fail in their responsibility leave, or despair of promotion and recognition. Administrators, praise be, can always be fired. Students, equally imperiled, can always be flunked out. Alumni, dissatisfied, can withhold support; alumni, obstreperous or unreasonable, can be ignored.

These are all negative solutions of the problem—albeit essential at times. Constructive solutions, on the other hand, require reason, reflection, interest, and a recognition that the institution is a precious possession of all of us, worth the best we have to give it.

—RLP
DAVID P. WOHL, member of the Washington University Board of Directors, died Wednesday, March 2, after a long illness. He was 73 years old. One of the foremost philanthropists in the history of St. Louis, he was described by Chancellor Shepley as “the University’s greatest modern benefactor.”

Mr. Wohl’s philanthropy extended into almost every area of St. Louis life. Public health centers, a home for the aged chronically ill, a recreation center, the schools of medicine of both Washington and St. Louis Universities—in all, the Wohl Foundation set up by Mr. and Mrs. Wohl contributed more than $8,500,000 to municipal, charitable, and educational institutions.

The David P. Wohl Jr. Memorial Hospital and the David P. Wohl Jr.—Washington University Clinics buildings, both named in memory of a son killed in World War II, were made possible through gifts of almost $3,000,000 from Mr. and Mrs. Wohl and the Wohl Foundation. (In his will, Mr. Wohl left an additional $1,480,000 for the maintenance and other needs of these buildings.) In 1954, they gave the University $1,000,000 with the single restriction that the money not be used for construction. As endowment, this gift provides the University annual income of $50,000.

In a special issue devoted to alumni it is particularly appropriate to pay tribute to this man, whose formal education ended at age 14. No one could better exemplify the debts that alumni—present and future—owe to others. The quality of higher education in America is dependent in large part on the generosity of men like David Wohl, whose conviction of the importance of education was translated into substantial, meaningful support. Without the generosity of the non-alumni friends of higher education, no university in America would be much more than a shadow of what it has become with their help.

Named Wohl Center in recognition of David P. Wohl’s many contributions to the University, this building houses the cafeteria and lounge serving the new dormitories.