“If private universities of excellence are to continue a useful national role, they must be supported and supported generously. There are no bargain basement solutions . . . We are embarked on a $120 million campaign which will last five years. The Danforth Foundation has already pledged $60 million, provided the remainder can be raised. Washington University is a healthy community of talented and lively people. There is much for which to be thankful. We can look to the future with confidence.”

— Chancellor William H. Danforth, March 9, 1973
An $80 million Danforth Foundation grant to two universities in St. Louis was announced at a news conference March 9 at the downtown Alumni Center. From left: Charles Allen Thomas, chairman of Washington University's Board of Trustees; Dr. William H. Danforth, chancellor of Washington University; Daniel L. Schlafly, chairman of Saint Louis University's Board of Trustees; Paul C. Reinert, S.J., president of Saint Louis University.
THE DANFORTH FOUNDATION GRANT

On March 9, Chancellor William H. Danforth made the following comments about the Danforth Foundation's $60 million matching grant to Washington University. In this message, the Chancellor reviews the background of the grant, discusses its aims and purposes, and stresses the vital necessity for the future of the University that the grant be matched.

I SHOULD LIKE to comment about the Danforth Foundation offer of a $60 million grant to Washington University, as announced and accepted at today's meeting of the University Board of Trustees. It is important to be clear about what the grant means and what it does not mean in the context of Washington University's history and future.

First, I shall review the background. In 1962 a committee chaired by Dean Joseph Passonneau of the School of Architecture recommended an ambitious program of growth and improvement for the hilltop campus of Washington University. The committee examined the financial underpinnings of the University and found that the approximately 35 per cent of the total University endowment available to the schools in the central fiscal unit was inadequate to support the improvements suggested. Chancellor-Elect Thomas H. Eliot met with the committee on a number of occasions. The report of the "Passonneau Committee" formed the backdrop for Chancellor Eliot's inaugural address. In the nine years of his chancellorship many of the recommendations became realities, despite the fragile financial base.

The accomplishments of the 1965 to 1970 period had to be financed. They were—by major support from outside sources, including $15 million from the Ford Foundation, $7 million from the National Science Foundation for a center of excellence, $1.5 million from the Danforth Foundation, and large amounts of unrestricted support from many generous donors. In addition, gifted faculty members found that federal support was readily available for research and graduate education. Finally, when income did lag behind perceived need, it was possible to borrow from the University reserves.

The academic accomplishments were considerable. Able and imaginative persons joined the faculty. Applications for the undergraduate programs increased. The student body became geographically more diverse. Graduate programs were strengthened. Washington University was described as having "the steepest trajectory" of any university in the country.

In those heady days it was easy to overlook the fact that enterprise and talent could not forever substitute for an inadequate financial base. During the 70 By '70 Campaign only about $4 million was added to the endowment of the hilltop campus. Washington University became increasingly dependent on outside sources of funding that could not be expected to continue. By 1970 the Ford matching grant was ended. The National Science Foundation Center of Excellence support will be exhausted by the end of this academic year. Cutbacks in federal support of graduate programs and academic research have added to the financial woes. On the plus side, in 1970 the Danforth Foundation made a $15 million five-year grant to Washington University. Of that amount, $2 million per year was available to support the operating budget of the hilltop campus. Nonetheless, large deficits appeared at the end of fiscal years 1971 and 1972, despite rising tuition and a stringent effort to hold down expenditures.

Some of our sister private universities facing the same national pressures but with larger endowments were able to balance income and expenditures within a relatively short time. At Washington University the weak financial base and dependence on diminishing outside funds made this approach hazardous. Cutbacks were made, but Chancellor Eliot and, later I, felt that to make the slashes necessary to balance the income and outgo threatened to unravel the fabric of excellence built up so painstakingly. For example, further diminution of faculty size might well cause a decrease in applications, thereby further lowering income. Other institutions have experienced this unfortunate downward cycle.

A number of other private universities, financially weaker than Washington University, have slashed programs and even whole schools and campuses in response to relentless economic forces. Institutional survival must take precedence over individual programs no matter how worthy, no matter what the degree of excellence. Fortunately, the grant from the Danforth Foundation, prudent budget cutting, the courage of the Board of Trustees in allowing perilous dips in our reserves, plus a bit of luck have together provided time for Washington University to assess carefully what the new fiscal problems meant.

THIS ASSESSMENT led inexorably to the conclusion that Washington University could not hope to maintain the national stature achieved by the Schools of Architecture, Business, Engineering, and Fine Arts and by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences on its present financial base. Nor, on careful analysis, would dropping of any one or several of these schools solve the financial problems. Although dropping a school would decrease outgo, so would it decrease income. The net savings would be small. Expiration of the Danforth Foundation grant in the academic year 1974-75, without renewal, would lead to the unraveling of much of the excellence of the hilltop campus. In brief, Washington University's excellence became dependent on
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the Ford Foundation between 1965 and 1970 and then on
the Danforth Foundation between 1970 and the present.

The Danforth Foundation has come to recognize this
fact. After careful study, it has offered a gift of $60 mil­
ton to endow the $3 million per year Washington Uni­
versity has been receiving under the current grant, which
will be discontinued. This gift is conditional on the Uni­
versity’s acceptance of the challenge to raise $60 million
in matching private gifts in the next five years. The Board
of Trustees of Washington University has accepted this
challenge for the University. Income from the Danforth
Foundation endowment will be unrestricted, and the Uni­
versity will make provision equitably to meet the commit­
ment to the Medical School that remains from the 1970
Danforth Foundation grant. This endowment income will
make possible the balance of income and outgo in the
central budget: Simultaneously, a grant of endowment is
being offered to St. Louis University on similar terms.

Since $2 million of the current Danforth grant is going
into the operating budget already and since the annual
deficit has been over $1 million, it is unfortunately true
that faculty and students will notice no change. The in­
crease in endowment will, in essence, stabilize the gains
of the 1960’s. Washington University will still be faced
with inflationary pressures; all must still labor to bring in
a balanced budget. The increase in endowment will pur­
chaseno new programs; it will not pay the salary of one
new faculty member; it will not provide one new scholar­
ship. What it will do is to prevent deterioration. Wash­
going University can continue to play in the league to
which it has become accustomed.

On the bright side, the Washington University Board of
Trustees has accepted the challenge. We are embarked on
a $120 million campaign which will last five years. The
Danforth Foundation has already pledged $60 million,
provided the remainder can be raised. Washington Uni­
versity is a healthy community of talented and lively peo­
ples. There is much for which to be thankful. We can look
to the future with confidence.

As CHAIRMAN of the Board of the Danforth Founda­
tion, I was obviously involved in both sides of the equa­
tion. It was evident to the Board of the Danforth Founda­
tion that universities are expensive institutions and that
the current financial crisis in higher education cannot be
solved by more conferences, studies, or books, however
valuable these efforts may be. If private universities of
excellence are to continue a useful national role, they
must be supported and supported generously. There are
no bargain basement solutions.

It is also evident that the successful operation of both
St. Louis University and Washington University is vital to
the health of the St. Louis community. The institutions
are educational and cultural resources of incalculable
value. They are important employers. Not to be over­
looked is that both these universities and their related
medical centers are on the main east-west axis of St. Louis
that must be preserved if the community is to solve its
serious urban problems.

No foundation, however large, can solve the problems
of all private universities or of every city, but for an
educational foundation located in this city not to face the
problems would have seemed to be a mistake—not to try,
a dereliction of duty.

This is not the first time that Washington University
has received a major endowment grant from a foundation.
In the post-Flexner era, from 1910 to 1920, the General
Education Board made grants totaling $4 million to en­
dow departments in the School of Medicine. Eventually
the General Education Board gave away all its money, but
one of the great medical centers of the world is a testi­
mony to the wisdom of its policies. In 1955 the Ford
Foundation made a grant of $3 million for endowment,
also to the School of Medicine.

DESPITE MY conviction that the course of the Danforth
Foundation was right, I realize that there will be
those who will criticize. Arguments can be made about
the relative worth of universities and foundations; some
will consider the grant unimaginative. In addition, there are
those who will criticize the ties between the Danforth
Foundation and Washington University. I have discussed
this last issue frankly with Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, the
wise Chairman of the Washington University Board of
Trustees. I offered to resign as Chancellor if it were felt
that my service in the dual capacity would embarrass the
University. The project at hand must be considered larger
than any individual. Dr. Thomas appointed a committee
of Washington University trustees, charged with evaluat­
ing whether any considerations, either legal or ethical,
might suggest conflict of interests or cause embarrassment
to the University. The committee, consisting of Mr. Clark
Clifford, Professor Paul Freund, Mr. John Peters Mac­
Carthy, and Mr. Robert H. McRoberts, reported to the
Chairman that there was no issue and that no cause for
concern existed. The matter has also been considered with
care from the standpoint of the Foundation. I feel com­
fortable that these matters have been adequately exam­
ined.

The large endowment grant will help, but it will not
do our work for us. Washington University must raise $60
million in the next five years. The University is blessed
with a strong Board of Trustees and many loyal alumni
and friends. The institution is dependent on these people
for their support. New income will not relieve us of the
responsibility to operate frugally. The resources available
to us will not permit a return to the style of the 60’s or
perhaps even a continuation of the style of the early 70’s.
Traditional ways of doing things are being questioned.
We should be the ones doing the questioning. A clear
responsibility remains to preserve excellence in teaching,
scholarship, and research. In the present financial climate
an extra responsibility rests on those of us who care about
higher education. We must ask the maximum of ourselves
and expect it of our colleagues. Private universities must
justify themselves by quality programs.

William H. Danforth
Chancellor
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For many years, clinic patients at the Dental School had to wait their turns in a crowded hallway. Today, one of the features of the renovated facilities is the bright, comfortable waiting room off the main entrance.
Five years ago, the entire electrical supply of the Washington University School of Dentistry depended on five fuses in a box in the basement. Every summer, an electric fan was turned on the box, but on extra hot days, the fuses would pop anyway and the lights would go out, the drills in the clinic would stop, and the X-ray machines would quit. The power failures had no effect on the central air-conditioning because there wasn’t any.

This spring, the School of Dentistry was rededicated with the completion of a $3 million renovation that, in effect, created an entirely new facility within the shell of the old. Today, two gigantic 4500-volt transformers have replaced the old fuse box; there is all new heating, plumbing, and lighting; the entire building is air-conditioned, and the very latest in teaching, research, and patient care equipment has been installed.

These splendid new facilities did not come about without heroic effort. Five years ago, Washington University's dental school, like most other similar institutions throughout the country, was facing financial disaster. Rising costs had already forced many of them, including the city’s only other dental school, St. Louis University’s, to close their doors. There was a period when it looked as if Washington University's Dental School might have to follow suit.

When the crisis seemed most acute, however, the School’s faculty and alumni rallied to the cause, determined that the School had to survive for the good of the University, the community, and the health of the nation. Presented with the enthusiasm and determination of the faculty and hundreds of alumni and with the massive documentation they assembled to prove that the School was viable, the University's Board of Trustees made the firm
decision not only to continue the School but to work to make it one of the best in the nation.

The Washington University School of Dentistry, one of the pioneering schools in the dental profession, was established in 1866 as the first dental school west of the Mississippi. It was the sixth dental school established in the United States and is now the fourth oldest in continuous operation. Since its founding, the School has produced more than three thousand dentists.

The School has occupied six different buildings, moving to its present site in 1927. A critical need for additional research facilities was met in 1961 with the dedication of the Carlyn H. Wohl Research Center adjoining the main building, but as the School moved into the 1960's, the increasing inadequacy of that main building began to be critical.

A report prepared in 1965 warned, "The present building and equipment are disgraceful and simply cannot qualify in a comparison with the majority of dental schools. ... The usual maintenance and repairs are no longer adequate, as the structure and most of the equipment are beyond such remedies." The report stated that the physical facilities were destructive to faculty and student morale, and that continued accreditation was in jeopardy. A new building was out of the question. The Dental Education Review Committee of the National Institutes of Health recently stated that the baseline estimate for building a new dental school is $250,000 per student in the freshman class. Therefore, a school of the size of Washington
The School that Refused to Die

University's with 63 freshmen would cost a minimum of $16 million. "We had no choice," Dean John T. Bird said. "We had either to restore the present building or close down the School." The plan to provide a whole new facility by renovating the old structure at a cost of only $3 million was met at first with widespread skepticism, but it finally won the approval of the National Institutes of Health, which granted most of the funds. Alumni and other friends of the School also contributed handsomely.

Dr. David A. Bensinger, associate dean for planning and development, rode herd on the renovation and had an exciting if often harrowing five years. Somehow, the School continued to train dentists, do important research, and provide vitally needed dental care while the interior of the building was

As part of a special program, students from Forest Park Community College train as dental assistants at the School of Dentistry. Here, a trainee assists a student dentist in the School's clinic.

'Students begin working with patients, under close faculty supervision, in their freshman year. Throughout their training, they combine theory and classroom and laboratory work with actual practice in dentistry.'
taken apart and put back together again as a completely modern, fully equipped facility. There were bad moments—when key equipment did not arrive on time, when the sound of jackhammers drowned out the lecturers, when rain came through the roof when the old skylights were being removed and shorted out one of the new transformers. "It was hectic," Dr. Bensinger remembers, "but it all worked out despite the fact that we had to budget everything down to the last penny."

The new facilities will enable the School to increase its community health and preventive dentistry care, and to expand its satellite clinics in the inner city, the juvenile detention center, and the county's special district for handicapped children.

The spacious, beautifully appointed main lecture room and auditorium is equipped with the latest audio-visual teaching devices, including closed circuit television. A soundproof, folding partition permits use of the space for two lecture or meeting rooms or as one large auditorium, seating 128.
Most important, the new facilities will make it possible to continue to produce badly needed dentists.

"Our curriculum has become more flexible and is tailored more closely to the needs of the individual student," Dean Bird said. "If a student can complete the required work in less than four years, we will let him graduate sooner." The facilities are attracting more students from throughout the country, and this year's classes are filled to capacity with 248 students.

Five years ago Washington University's School of Dentistry, in hopelessly inadequate facilities, was facing extinction. Today, gleaming new facilities have risen phoenix-like from the old, and the outlook for the School is as bright as its rejuvenated, rededicated building.

The School's Administrative Council: Dr. David A. Bensinger, associate dean for planning and development; Galen V. Campbell, president of second-level class; Dean John T. Bird; Dr. Peter A. Pullon, director of clinics; John V. Caron, first-level class president; Allen H. Vean, third-level president; Dr. Richard W. Brand, assistant dean for student affairs; Dr. Hugh G. Berry, assistant dean for academic affairs; Dr. John R. Ring, director of admissions.
Washington University alumnus Kenneth J. Rothman is a genial giant of a man who is a "mover" and "doer" in Missouri politics. Now in his sixth session as a state legislator and his first as Majority Floor Leader of the House of Representatives, Rothman, for a good part of each year, divides his time between the State Capitol in Jefferson City and his law offices in the heart of Clayton. Working grueling hours and many weekends, Representative Rothman has fought vigorously for vital legislation, including two important drug control bills. Ten other Washington University alumni currently serve in the Missouri legislature. Senators Earl R. Blackwell, A.B. '49, J.D. '51, and A. Clifford Jones, J.D. '48, and Representatives Keith J. Barbero, B.S.B.A. '60; Ronald M. Belt, A.B. '52, J.D. '57; E. Thomas Coleman, J.D. '69; Joseph S. Kenton, B.S.B.A. '41; George E. Murray, B.S.B.A. '48, J.D. '48; Gary Rust, B.S. Ret., '57; Murray Stone, J.D. '65; and Steve Vossmeier, A.B. '67.
MAJORITY LEADER

A murk sky shrouded the barracks-like motel, which sprawls atop a steep promontory on the fringes of Jefferson City. At 6:30 a.m. on a raw, cold Valentine’s Day morning, the place was still mostly somber and quiet, with only an occasional light from an early riser’s room brightening the silhouetted scene. Among those already up and girding for action was Kenneth J. Rothman, lawyer, Democrat, state assemblyman from the 77th District, recently elected Majority Floor Leader of Missouri’s House of Representatives, and Washington University alumnus.

Rothman, a 37-year-old behemoth of a man from Clayton, Missouri, who measures six foot one (when he remembers to stand up straight) and weighs in at 25.5 despite a regular luncheon diet of yogurt and Weight Watchers root beer, had a 7:30 breakfast date. He and the other leaders of the state legislature, both Democrats and Republicans, “were to be the guests of Missouri’s new Republican governor, Christopher S. (Kit) Bond.

Talking politics before most people have brushed their teeth has become a habit for Rothman, now in his eleventh year as a legislator from a district which includes Washington University and encompasses parts of Clayton, University City, and a small tip of Wellston, with a total constituency of some 29,000. “You can get more legislative work done in a breakfast meeting than any other time,” he once told a newspaper reporter. “I’m fresh, my head isn’t cluttered with details, and I haven’t had my brains beat out on the House floor.”

Reminded of this conversation recently, Rothman, with his perennial pipe in his mouth, leaned back in his oversized chair and chuckled. “When we were working on the drug bill a few years back, a group of us used to meet for steak and eggs at Oscar’s Steak House every morning. A regular at these sessions was Joe Simeone, then an associate dean of the St. Louis University School of Law and now Judge Joseph J. Simeone of the Missouri Court of Appeals, St. Louis District. Long a legislative adviser, he was staff counsel, on an expenses-only stipend at his own insistence, for the House Judiciary Committee, which I headed at the time. Joe wrote a lot of legislation on Oscar’s napkins.”

Breaking bread with the Governor at the official mansion is a bit more formal than dunking doughnuts at a roadside restaurant with close associates, but the experience is something that Rothman takes in stride. An affable, easy-going fellow with a droll sense of humor, Rothman has mastered the skilled politician’s art of getting along well with people. Perhaps Judge Simeone summed it up best when he said: “Kenny Rothman is a jovial, lovable, warm-hearted, liberal, kind, gentle, roly-poly guy. He is sincerely interested in trying to do a good job for many people in all kinds of areas.”

Establishing this kind of reputation as an able legislator is not easy. A typical Rothman working day often stretches into sixteen or seventeen hours. On February 14, for example, after meeting with the Governor and his fellow legislative leaders, Rothman headed straight for the Capitol. There he took care of a few urgent office matters, conferred hurriedly with House Speaker Richard J. Rab Witt, and then rushed into the legislative chamber.

One of Rothman’s duties as Majority Leader is to decide “when the legislature goes to work and when we quit.” Accordingly, at about 9 a.m. he signaled the clerk to convene the session by ringing a bell whose shrill clanging reverberated throughout the statehouse. Then Rothman took his seat at the rear of the chamber, where he was expected to advise the Speaker whenever a point of order was raised.

Over the years Rothman has acquired “a lot of savvy on the floor,” and this knowledge appears to be standing him in good stead as he proceeds to serve his first term as
Rothman confers with fellow legislators, all of them Washington University alumni, at the imposing podium in the House of Representatives of Missouri's handsome statehouse. Left to right, Rothman, AB '57, JD '58, E. Thomas Coleman, JD '69, Steve Voismeyer, AB '67, and Keith Barbero, BSBA '60. Far right, the House of Representatives in session. Majority Leader Rothman prefers to sit in the middle of the back row of this chamber.

Majority Leader. "In debate when you're sponsoring a controversial bill, you get shot at, but you somehow survive. You do pick up a certain amount of scar tissue, though, along the way," he observed philosophically. Such experience develops poise, a trait Rothman regards as indispensable in the House. It, together with patience and a refusal to allow personal feelings to dominate debate, are the three essentials he recommended that a freshman legislator develop for survival as he counseled unobtrusively in the gallery while a colleague spelled him on the floor.

Giving advice when he thinks it is needed is but one of a variety of duties associated with being Majority Leader. Other responsibilities range from helping draft tricky amendments to lending the weight of his office in support of a bill he deems of major significance. In addition, the Majority Leader traditionally decides the calendar of business for the House each day and the order in which it shall be considered.

During the first few months of this current session, the House met for floor discussion and debate each morning, and then split into committees for afternoon and evening hearings. On this particular Valentine's Day, Rothman ordered the House to break for lunch at 12:45 p.m. He himself hurried back to his office where he raided his tiny office refrigerator of assorted yogurt flavors, and then dashed off for a round of meetings and interviews that lasted until late afternoon.

These completed, Rothman loped back to his office "to see what new emergencies had developed. This place," he confided, "has a great tendency to create not one but several little crises every day." Rothman managed to resolve these a few minutes before 6:30 p.m., when he was scheduled to address the members of Sigma Delta Chi, a journalism group. It was 9 p.m. when he left this affair and returned to the Capitol to work until shortly before midnight.

The wonder of it all is that Valentine's Day was not atypical of his schedule. Nor is Rothman the only legislator to put up with such a marathon agenda. Judge Simeone remembers that Rothman's Judiciary Committee used to meet regularly from 8 p.m. until midnight and sometimes even later. "One particular evening back in 1969 after working on the drug control bill until the early morning hours," Judge Simeone continued, "I turned to Kenny as he was driving me back to the hotel and said grimly, 'This kind of life just isn't worth it. Let's give up on the drug legislation. It's just crazy to work this hard.' That's the only time I can remember that Kenny ever got upset with me. He replied tartly, 'You be down there (at the Capitol) to testify tomorrow morning and get that bill going or I'll have the Highway Patrol come and get you.'"

Unfortunately, however, Judge Simeone added ruefully, most citizens have no idea that many legislators work such grueling hours. "The average voter who has never had any dealings with the state legislature thinks of the lawmakers in Jefferson City as just a bunch of young fellows having a good time drinking and playing politics all the time. He does not believe that his legislators are interested in the general welfare of the people. Nothing could be further from the truth, and it is time people discarded these myths. Actually, most of the legislators are sincere, dedicated people," the Judge continued, "who get very little money ($8400 a year and ten dollars per diem when the legislature is in session). Most of them have to supplement their income with other jobs which they carry on during weekends and when the legislature is not in session. How they keep going is a mystery to me," he concluded.

Strident and irresponsible carping against the state legislative process worries Judge Simeone because, he says, "you can come to the point where there is too much criticism and then nobody but bums will want to run for office. Then you really are in trouble," he warned.

Still other observers, however, see the indifference of
the general electorate rather than the bitter barbs hurled at the legislators, largely by disenchanted journalists and scholars, as the major cause for concern. Time magazine, for example, commented not too many years ago that "despite the fact that the vast bulk of the laws under which Americans live are passed not on Capitol Hill but in the state legislatures, probably not one voter in twenty can name the state assemblyman in his district."

Why, then, in view of the low pay, the abuse, and the downright indifference should men of goodwill and intelligence, nonetheless, continue to run for state legislative office? Undoubtedly, each man would answer differently. Kenny Rothman put it quite simply. "You really have to love this kind of work—you have to believe in the importance of public service, and you have to be dedicated to it. I think that you give up more than financial gain. You also lose precious time with your family. They make a little bit of a sacrifice of their own for your public service."

Actually, legislators forego considerable family life. During the annual sessions which run from the first part of January for five and one-half months during the odd-numbered years, and for four in the even-numbered years, they spend Monday through Thursday living out of a suitcase in Jefferson City.

Rothman, however, was raised on politics. Both of his parents were precinct workers. When he was twelve, he began handing out ballots and generally making himself useful at Democratic headquarters. At about the same time, the idea of one day serving in the state legislature became a persistent dream. That ambition was kindled when young Rothman and his father were on what he calls a "working vacation." Traveling from town to town in an old truck selling auto supplies, the two pulled up one night in front of the brilliantly lighted State Capitol. "I jumped out and ran up the steps to read the inscription on Thomas Jefferson's statue," Rothman reminisced. "My father remarked, 'Son, someday I'd like to see you run up those steps and really belong there.' His wish came true in 1962 when I was elected to the House for the first time at the age of 26."

Actually, the senior Rothmans took a more active role in that campaign than the youthful candidate himself. Those were the tense days of the Berlin crisis, and Kenny Rothman, as a member of the Missouri Air National Guard, 131st Attack Fighter Wing, suddenly found himself called up for active duty and sent to France. For three years previously, however, he had been making something of a name for himself as the youngest assistant prosecuting attorney on Norman Anderson's staff in St. Louis County. Accordingly, it was decided that Sergeant Rothman should toss his military cap in the ring, and Herman Rothman proudly filed for his son. Meanwhile, Anna Rothman stumped the district for her offspring.

Kenny Rothman wasn't able to do any campaigning in his own behalf until he returned from duty abroad just a few weeks before the Democratic primary, which was tantamount to election. "The joke around headquarters was that if I had returned any earlier I would have lost," Rothman recalled with a grin.

In those days, Rothman remembers, it didn't take a lot of money to run for the House, which was fortunate because, he explained candidly, "I was still poverty stricken." Rothman, in fact, had to hustle to make ends meet the whole time he was in school. "I still remember my first day at Washington University," he recalled with a smile. "Once again my father and I drove up in the old truck—this time in front of Brookings Hall. I had a beat-up, secondhand briefcase in one hand, and exactly fifty cents in my pocket."

Because the senior Rothmans had a daughter enrolled at the University in the School of Fine Arts, their son Kenny did his best to earn his way. Somehow, despite the necessity to hold down a variety of off-campus jobs, Rothman managed to complete his education in five and one-
Much work of the legislature is accomplished in committee. Here, the Committee on Legislative Research, headed by Hardin C. Cox (seated behind desk) gathers for an important meeting. Before being elected Majority Floor Leader, Rothman was chairman of the important Judiciary Committee.

half years by earning a bachelor of arts degree in 1957 and his law degree a year later.

Because he had been something of a cutup in the classroom, there were some who refused to take Kenny Rothman seriously at first when he embarked on a political career. But he has confounded the skeptics. “He’s sort of a combination of the old and new politics,” a colleague observed. “He plays the game in the time-honored style, where personal relationships count a good deal. But at the same time, he’s a young progressive who has pushed for bills that are in the public interest.”

A $A$ $RESULT$, the Rothman record in the House is an impressive one. “Kenny has good political antennae,” Jack Schramm, a former associate in the House of Representatives, emphasized. “He has a knack for picking something whose time has come. And, to his credit, what he picks up and pushes are legislative measures which are extremely important and valuable.”

Of his political career, Rothman himself says matter-of-factly, “I stayed with the House because I felt that there were certain goals which I wanted to achieve as a legislator. Most of what I set out to do I have accomplished.” Rothman, for example, was the first legislator whom the leaders of the Kidney Foundation of Eastern Missouri and Metro East, Inc., turned to back in 1968 when they were seeking support in their efforts to help those suffering from chronic kidney disease. Treatment is expensive, but even if a patient had the funds, medical help in Missouri was hard to come by five years ago, because few hospitals had any facilities for renal dialysis. Rothman saw the need for “seed money” to get the kidney machine program off the ground in his home state. Accordingly, he and the then Representative David Rolwing (Dem.) from Charleston, Missouri, pushed for a $100,000 appropriation, and with the help of a colleague in the State Senate who had had first-hand experience with kidney disease, it squeaked through in the final hours of the seventy-fourth General Assembly.

Sixty thousand dollars went to the Washington University-Barnes complex, $40,000 to Kansas City General Hospital, with all state funds administered by the Missouri Regional Medical Program. Each year since the appropriation has been increased. “We expect it to reach a million dollars this year,” Rothman said. The money, used in a variety of ways including the training of personnel and the purchase of equipment, has literally meant the difference between life and death for hundreds of persons.

Rothman’s interest in the health field also led to his support of legislation pertaining to the battered child. He sponsored a bill which made it mandatory for anyone engaged in child care for pay to report suspected cases of child abuse either to a county welfare or juvenile officer. Failure to do so is characterized as a misdemeanor. Another important section of the bill established a central registry of battered children in Jefferson City, which doctors could check if they suspected that a youngsters’ injuries had been deliberately inflicted by an adult. Rothman worked closely with Dr. Moisy Shopper, a St. Louis child psychiatrist, in drafting this legislation, which became law in 1969.

$O$ $NE$ $OF$ $ROTHMAN’S$ $proudest$ $achievements$ $was$ $the$ $passage$ $of$ $two$ $key$ $drug$ $control$ $bills$ $in$ $1971$. He fought for the drug code for four years, and it was an uphill struggle all the way. The new laws as enacted were quite detailed, but basically Rothman says the legislation had three thrusts. “One part assisted the police in their law enforcement work. It increased search warrant authority, scheduled all the drugs, and made penalties more realistic.” The law, in fact, in prescribing sentence, distinguished between a person found guilty of marihuana possession and one caught with heroin. Moreover, it provided that a person arrested for the first time on a drug charge
could get a suspended imposition of sentence which might, in due course, be expunged. "Our purpose," Rothman explained, "was to wipe out an arrest record if a person successfully completed his probation period. What we wanted to do was really give the individual another chance to make the most of his capabilities unhampered by the stigma of a conviction in the court files."

The second phase of the bill was educational in scope. It required all grade schools (both primary and secondary) to provide courses demonstrating the dangers of drugs and alcohol. "In this way we hoped to alert young people to the potential harmfulness of drugs," Rothman emphasized. Finally, the bills provided for treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts. "The drug user," Rothman said with feeling, "not only breaks the law but destroys himself at the same time."

Equally controversial when it was first proposed was the public defender bill, passed last session, seven years after Rothman first introduced it. Under this measure, a public defender system providing full-time state-salaried lawyers for poor persons accused of major crimes was set up in all judicial circuits of 75,000 population or more. Previously, the state had depended on random selection of defense lawyers for the poor with the result, Rothman explained, "that all too frequently, inexperienced and incompetent lawyers were called on to defend individuals charged with crimes." Often, Rothman said in urging support for the bill, corporation lawyers were assigned to criminal cases, which he compared "to having an eye surgeon operate on your brain."

Rothman, of course, has actively battled for a great deal of other legislation, but he regards the measures summarized here as the milestones of his career. Now that they have been approved, he is attempting to make Missouri’s General Assembly more efficient. Indeed, it was this desire to modernize the legislative procedure which led him to seek the job of Majority Floor Leader. He is especially anxious "to beef up the legislative staff with competent professionals."

"Nowadays," he explained, "some 1500 new pieces of legislation are introduced in the General Assembly each session as compared with three or four hundred a decade or so ago. The whole business of running Missouri has become increasingly more complicated, with the result that the state’s operating budget is now over a billion dollars as compared with $500 million eleven years ago. Yet the state spends only forty-six hundredths of one per cent on the entire legislative branch of government. "Such a budget is abysmally low," Rothman declared. "It’s simply an impossible situation. We can’t be as productive as we’d like because we end up doing so many things ourselves." As a remedy, Rothman would set up a tripartite legislative research team able to draft bills, do pure research, and handle budget and fiscal work. "The best investment of tax dollars that could be made would be to give these tools of the trade to the legislator," Rothman concluded.

These are sweeping reforms which Rothman proposes, and he realizes that approval of the complete program may not come quickly. Rothman has learned the hard way that it takes time to effect change. But when he suffers a setback or even a defeat, "the gentleman from St. Louis County," as the Speaker traditionally refers to him on the floor, neither gives up on the system or on himself. All of which is not to imply that Rothman never becomes discouraged. "I get what I call flat spots," he admitted. "These are periods when my dobber is down," Rothman explained in the lingo of the born fisherman that he is. "But then I remind myself that ideas take time to gain acceptance." Recognition of this fact has paid off for Kenny Rothman, the voters of the district he represents, and, indeed, for all of the citizens of Missouri whom he serves.
THE GREEK SYSTEM:

Anachronism or Alternative?

Throughout the turbulent decade of the sixties, while colleges and universities themselves were in upheaval with student protest, one of the elements of student life which suffered constant attack was the Greek system. The condemnations of social fraternities and sororities as "immoral, dehumanizing, and discriminatory" had begun in the late fifties, almost as a vanguard of the revolt that was to spread from that system to The System. To those charges, some students of the late sixties added their own greatest condemnation—"irrelevant."

Today, the uproar has subsided. On many campuses, the Greek system is experiencing a resurgence. At Washington University, no one is yet sure that the storm has taken its full toll, but there are still fraternities and sororities on campus, many of which are vital; if limping.

With few exceptions, the students who are fraternity and sorority members today sincerely believe in their organizations as they experience them—as small groups of friends willing to work and play together and to work and play with others. They acknowledge that since they have no personal basis for comparison, they feel little regret for the loss of power and status the system once embodied.

Gary Norton, a senior in engineering and a Sigma Chi, says philosophically, "Any organization, including a fraternity, has to respond to the needs of its members or it ceases to exist. You have to sell a product. What fraternities were in the past had to be what students wanted, and what they are today is what today's student wants."

Many alumni, however, are less comfortable with the present and, in the system's struggle for survival, alumni moral and financial support is a crucial factor. Among those who have worked closely with their campus chapters through many rough years, feelings are ambivalent.

Harold Thomas, former national president of Theta Xi and a staunch local supporter, exudes optimism. His faith in the entire system is little shaken by its recent setbacks. "There are always high and low tides; the system will always come back. It is the kind of organization that people need. It's coming back on many campuses; the cycle simply may not have come fully around here."

"I wish I could get hold of it and make it work, but today I'd say fraternities are going at Washington University," says Ray Flint, alumnus and Sigma Chi board member. "There's been too much anti-Greek feeling on the campus. Some nationals themselves have evaluated the campus to decide if it is an environment in which a fraternity or sorority can or should exist. I'm rather discouraged, because, although we can weather the storm as we have weathered it for years, the question is now: Are enough people interested to make it worthwhile?"

It is this discouragement among students and alumni which again and again comes through in conversations, yet also present is a glimmer of optimism that things have been worse and that they will get better.

There are at present ten national fraternities and eight national sororities with chapters at Washington University. Their total membership of about 480 represents 12 per cent of the undergraduate student population. Fraternity chapters on campus include Beta Theta Phi, Kappa Sigma, Tau Kappa Epsilon, Sigma Alpha Mu, Sigma Nu, Sigma Chi, Theta Xi, Phi Delta Theta, Sigma Epsilon, and Zeta Beta Tau. Sororities are Alpha Chi Omega, Alpha Epsilon Phi, Delta Gamma, Gamma Phi Beta, Kappa Alpha Theta, Kappa Kappa Gamma, Pi Beta Phi, and Sigma Delta Tau.

Although several of the fraternities are in financial difficulty, all seem to be determined to remain active; but, by fall, the number of sororities will drop to six, possibly five. Among those who have fewer than ten members and will close their doors this year are Delta Gamma, and Kappa Alpha Theta. Sigma Delta Tau may also close.

Local alumnae and national headquarters have generally supported the decisions made by the women in these chapters, although one alumna commented, "I think many alumnae have found both alternatives very difficult to take, and I know the girls have felt pressure both ways."

One other small group—Alpha Chi Omega—has been heartily supported for several years by both local and national alumnae in its desire to stay together as a sorority.
In the late 1960's, fraternities and sororities on many college and university campuses experienced a sharp decline in membership and influence. Many students at the time questioned tradition and authority in the light of what they termed the new values of youth culture and rejected the Greek system, among other structured activities, as an anachronism. Today on some campuses, the tide has turned for fraternities and sororities. For new members, the Greek system offers an alternative—a life style they wish to elect. At Washington University, the system experienced a decline that appears to be near or past its low point (depending upon who is viewing the situation), but what remains? Where do fraternities and sororities stand at Washington University today?

About 100 women began formal sorority rush last fall and sixty pledged. Spring rush, opening here in the Pi Phi room, is much smaller and less structured.
Although the drawing power of the fraternities' on-campus housing option is a distinct advantage, most houses on fraternity row place considerable financial drain upon resources of today's smaller chapters.

It now has five pledges and looks as if it can make a comeback. The four other chapters seem to be gaining in membership; two have thirty actives and pledge classes of about fifteen. Smallest of the fraternities is Sigma Chi, with a present membership of nineteen. Two other chapters are small; the remaining seven have from thirty to thirty-five members.

“We hit the absolute low in numbers and morale two to four years ago,” says Pam Benitez, this year's president of Panhellenic Association. “Today you feel you can talk to your friends about your sorority without being put down. It wasn’t always that way. There was open hostility among many students and faculty. Most fraternity and sorority members were afraid to wear pins to class. Now that fear is still in us, but some of us have decided that we were wrong to give in to it and we are ready to stand up and be counted.”

The first chapter of a national college social fraternity was organized by Washington University men long before the turn of the century, but the period from 1900 to 1930 saw the greatest expansion of the Greek system here. It is difficult to estimate what percentage of the undergraduate student body affiliated with these organizations during the years before World War II, but the fraternity influence on the University's small, local student body seems to have been considerable. Eight of the nine houses on Fraternity Row were built during the 1920's.

With the influx of veterans following World War II, the system swelled. Existing fraternities nearly doubled in membership and new chapters were brought to campus, yet in 1947-48, only one of every four full-time undergraduate male students belonged.

The Greek system hit its peak at Washington University during the decade from 1947 to 1957. During most of this period more than half of the women entering as freshmen pledged a sorority and two of five men pledged a fraternity. Overall sorority membership ranged above 40 per cent of the total undergraduate female population; one of every three undergraduate males was a fraternity man.

The influence that this tightly organized minority exercised on the Washington University campus was pervasive. Student activities and social life were dominated by the fraternity system. In 1948, Student Life reported that elections for class officers had resulted in fourteen seats won by the major fraternity-sorority party, five seats by a splinter group, and one by the independents.

This strength began to erode in the early sixties. The University was in the midst of its transition from an in-town to an out-of-town undergraduate student population. Its huge residence complex, building since 1958, was almost completed. As the University constructed residence halls, it strove to build a residential community with increased programming within the Forsyth Houses. A House Program, similar to that of the Ivy League schools, was established to create a living-learning community.

“The need that fraternities and sororities supplied was being met by life in the residence halls,” says Don Polkinghorne, assistant director of student affairs, staff adviser to fraternities, and a 1959 alumnus. “For hundreds of in-town students, the Greek system had served as their only out-of-class tie to the University. The chapters served as friendship and activity groups. The houses and rooms were places to hang your hat, leave your books, gather for lunch, meet your friends, entertain dates. They were

During rush, sorority women wear pins which are otherwise seldom seen. One reason is that pins are still not worn with blue jeans—today's student costume.
a campus focal point, as no other."

By 1965, more than half of the University's undergraduate students came from outside of the St. Louis area. Forsyth Residence Halls housed nearly 2000 students, and for those students, the South Forty, its facilities and organizations, took over roles traditionally filled by sororities and fraternities.

If this change alone was not enough to send the Greek system skidding downward, a second change began to manifest itself at Washington University as at many other colleges and universities throughout the country—a change in student attitude which rejected the Greek system.

"One thing that happened throughout the youth culture on the 1960's is what, as a sociologist, I would call deauthoritization," says James Laue, vice chancellor for campus affairs. "Respect for tradition and authority became subject to questioning. Many students now reject the drawing of more-or-less rigid boundaries regarding membership in social clubs or activities. They are less comfortable with a system as based on tradition and exclusivity as the Greek system. This attitude is pervasive among students of the caliber attracted by Washington University, and it applies to the spectrum of activities, including even a decline in the practice of formal dating."

By 1965, the fraternities and sororities had begun to change. When, in December, 1964, Chancellor Thomas H. Eliot announced a University policy aimed at eliminating discrimination within campus organizations, only two fraternities still had national restrictive clauses. Today none of the chapters on campus selects exclusively along lines of race, religion, or national origin. But by then, the atmosphere on many campuses was hostile to the principle of the system. Many Greek students and alumni felt that a pressure to stifle the system emanated from students, faculty, and administration.

With the increase in out-of-town students, the freshman orientation program was expanded, and sororities and fraternities found it encroaching upon a time which had been traditionally devoted to rush periods. Although fraternity and sorority members, as campus leaders of other groups, took part in the orientation process, they were asked not to wear pins nor to mention their Greek affiliations.

Sorority members and alumni became alarmed in September, 1966, when they learned that the basement of the Women's Building had been remodeled during the summer for use as administrative offices and that the snack bar would be replaced by vending machines. Women's Panhellenic Advisory Council, an organization of advisers to undergraduate chapters, protested not only the move, but that it should be made without their counsel, since they were the primary tenants of the building.

The feeling that the University did not welcome the system aroused concern among fraternity alumni regarding the leases by which their houses occupied University ground. The fifty-year leases were to come up for renewal in the 1970's, and alumni repeatedly asked for early renewal so they could put much-needed money into house renovations with some assurance of permanence. Chancellor Eliot explained that he could not negotiate early renewal which would bind a future administration to his commitment.

The tension which existed in the late sixties is summarized in an excerpt from a letter from members of Panhellenic Advisory Council to the administration: "The fraternity system pays its own way, serves the entire campus (by campus leadership, building school spirit, promoting good public relations . . . and sponsoring social activities open to the entire University) and is at present undervalued and often under-cut on this campus. We think we are a useful and meaningful addition to the University. If the Administration thinks we are not, it would help us all if we knew the reasons. If the Administration agrees with our evaluation, it is rational for us to expect that a concerted effort be made to build a healthy system; since it is not, many of our members assume we are merely tolerated, not welcomed. This has made most sorority women apprehensive and some cynical about the University."

One fraternity alumnus says more directly, "At that time, we were constantly sabotaged by anti-fraternity groups on campus. Time and again we asked the administration to be open with us, to say that they did not want us, if they did not, so that we could close our doors, rather than be beaten down till we'd slink away."

With generous moral and financial support from national and local alumni, most of the chapters limped into the seventies. Today, some feel more at ease.

"Our chapter is healthy," says Mrs. James Gamble, who has worked with Gamma Phi Beta and Panhellenic for many years. "Several years ago we realized that we would have to change our programming so that everything the chapter did was involved somehow in rush. Watching a chapter getting smaller and smaller is like watching a body lose its vital signs. It will give up one function, then
This 1949 Alpha Chi formal dance scene seems to capture spirit of that period when the Greek system was at its peak at WU and elsewhere. Today formal dances may be coming back. Since last year, at least one all-school dance is back on the social calendar.

another, to preserve the core, until finally the core itself is exposed.

"It has been painful for those girls whose chapters became so small. They have worked very hard, but some found they just couldn't make it."

Within each of today's chapters is a nucleus of devoted members and alumni attempting to rebuild. They face many problems, including what they still regard as hostility among some members of the University community, but they recognize that their greatest problem is student apathy.

For fraternities, the houses are both an asset and a liability. Since the houses represent a living situation which is both less expensive and less restrictive than the residence halls, they offer an attractive alternative to rushies. Yet the old houses were built to serve about twenty residents and twice that many non-resident members, and today rental from residents will not cover maintenance costs. Nor can the large old kitchens be operated economically for such small groups. Four of the houses have closed their kitchens. Their residents either eat at the Forsyth Residences cafeteria or buy food from a neighboring chapter. The administration has offered to deliver meals to Fraternity Row at regular dining room prices, but no chapter chooses that option.

"The fraternities need non-resident members who remain active," explains Don Polkinghorne, "but they haven't been very successful in attracting them. Men tend to live in the houses as sophomores, then move to apartments and deactivate. Deactivation of upperclassmen is an overall problem of the system."

A senior who has deactivated explains his reasons:

"You join a chapter, as I did, for friendship, and by the time you're a senior, you need to get out of that tight circle. Besides, sometimes because the circle changes, it no longer offers you the same feeling of brotherhood as when you pledged. Then you have no feeling of loyalty."

Gary Norton firmly disagrees: "It is an intangible thing, but if a chapter has that cohesive feeling of brotherhood, you can sense it when you walk in the door. If you live in the house, you can't escape it. If you don't, you may have to work harder at that and maybe you can't be as much a part, but the possibility of developing deep and lasting friendships is still there for the taking."

Although many sorority women live in the residence halls or in apartments, they express the same feeling of close friendship resulting from sorority affiliation. "Anyone who says the dorms are a living community isn't being realistic," says Pam. "But you can't get lost there if you are a sorority member. There is always someone to call on, someone who cares about you."

Members of the fraternity system have begun a concerted effort to rebuild a united Greek front through a strong Panhellenic Association and Interfraternity Council. Former Panhellenic Association president Martha Harbison says that one recent discovery of sorority women is that they are very much in the feminist movement. "When you work closely with other women, you begin to value your sisterhood and to realize how much a group 200-women-strong can accomplish."

"Sororities and fraternities offer a rare kind of student leadership training," says Susan Vedemeyer, assistant director of student affairs and staff adviser to sororities. "They consciously train younger members to take over positions of responsibility. In my experience working with students, I find this kind of continuing leadership infrequent and prized."

Peg Gamble adds: "That should be true. We believe that this leadership training benefits not only the campus at large, but through the alumnae, thousands of communities. Sororities today, however, hardly have the energy to carry on the leadership training they should. They have had to turn too much inward."

Yet even through the leanest years, sorority and fraternity members have been among the outstanding student leaders of other organizations. Although many of the traditional Greek-run activities no longer exist, Bearskin Follies and Thurtene Carnival remain activities organized and largely participated in by the fraternity system, and members participate in numbers and as identifiable groups in intramural athletics. In their darkest hour, fraternities began a student symposium featuring many nationally known speakers, and although the financial burden was too much to continue to carry alone, the symposium is now an annual event with major financial support from the University.
And strangely,” says Don Polkinghorne, “the fraternities still are the party-givers. Almost every weekend there are parties in the houses with bands and refreshments. These aren't closed anymore; they are open, with the chapter playing host and footing the bills. In light of their financial problems, we have tried to get them to arrange a non-member cost-sharing, but they won't. They say, ‘These are our friends. We want them to come.’”

Last fall, a small amount of Student Union money was allocated to PanHel and IFC to help support their campus-wide activities. A proposal now before student government advocates a special allocation of student funds to assure ongoing support of several specific groups, including IFC and PanHel.

“The University does not believe it should directly subsidize fraternities any more than it should subsidize students living in dorms,” says Vice Chancellor Laue. “On the other hand, we give them support in the form of services, including two staff members. They also use the services and staff of the Office of Student Affairs in scheduling, programming, and leadership development, as do many other student groups.

“I think it is unlikely that the system will ever occupy the central position it did fifteen years ago on this campus, for we are a different university and our students are different. Rather, the Greek system offers one of a number of viable life styles from which a student may choose. Our aim is to create as strong and diverse a group of programs, resources, and life styles as possible, so a student can create his own out-of-class experience.

“We also recognize that fraternities and sororities offer the prospect for inter-generational contact, which is a crucial thing that college students need and miss if they live in the dorms or if they work within almost any other student group. A great deal of learning takes place across generational lines, and it is hard to keep that kind of learning context going in college.

“The system also provides a ready-made structure for development of close friendships and interpersonal skills. If you look at the charter of a fraternity, it could, with little change of wording, be the creed of the youth culture—it addresses itself to creating a small group in which members care for and take responsibility for one another.

“I also see the fraternity houses as offering the best 'turf' on campus to develop a living-learning community. They represent the perfect place for small, self-contained communal living situations. They are different from any other living situation offered here.

“For these reasons, the University is not anti-Greek, and we aren’t really neutral. We're pushing and pulling for them. We believe, however, that there is no way we can make students do something or make an operation succeed without the drive being there internally. It just may be that the Greek system is not where student culture is any more.”

“Washington University would have been a very lonely place for me without my sorority,” said a Theta, “but we have tried so hard and we simply can't find enough girls interested. It just wouldn't be fair to ask a few to go on that way.”

“I don't care what other people do, but not only don't I need a sorority, I'm opposed to the ethics of the system,” said her close friend.

Though such outspoken opposition is not typical of today's WU student, it is still present. Perhaps more significant is simply indifference.

“And that's almost worse,” sighed an alum.
Lyndon Johnson was bitterly opposed on college campuses throughout the country for his prosecution and expansion of the war in Vietnam, yet he probably did more for education than any other recent President. Dr. Coor, from the viewpoint of a political scientist and a university administrator during the height of the opposition to the war, examines the impact of the Johnson years on higher education in general and on Washington University in particular. He concludes that Mr. Johnson's ambition to be known to history as the “Education President” will eventually be justified, and that “in an interesting way,” he was one of Washington University's greatest benefactors.
LBJ REVISITED

By LATTIE F. COOR
Vice Chancellor

The overshadowing of Lyndon Johnson's death by the announcement of peace in Vietnam seemed somehow the final irony in the ill-fated relationship between President Johnson and that war. The war, and its enormous drain on the nation's attention and resources, took such complete possession of the Johnson Administration that the other accomplishments of the man and his administration have been largely eclipsed. With his death and the promise of peace in Vietnam, it seems a fitting time to reassess those accomplishments, especially as they affected higher education and Washington University.

Lyndon Johnson was not a popular President at Washington University. The reason, of course, was the war. Beginning with the teach-ins early in 1965, the sentiment against LBJ and his policies on Vietnam was harsh, implacable, and as nearly unanimous as any issue ever to come before the University community.

But Lyndon Johnson had a domestic policy as well, one heavily oriented toward education, and as we look back on his Presidency, five years later, there appear to be abundant reasons why Washington University should view his domestic policies favorably. Lyndon Johnson said, early in his Presidency, "I would like to be known as the Education President." He fulfilled that hope, in his five years in office, more effectively than any President who had gone before him.

With the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, he set the stage for opening education opportunity more broadly than ever before in the history of this country. With the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, he got direct federal support into the hands of financially strapped school districts throughout the country, steering successfully through the obstacles of the familiar opposition to federal aid in general and parochial school aid in particular. Just four years before, in 1961, John F. Kennedy had failed with a much less ambitious bill. By the time President Johnson left office, more than one and one-half billion dollars in federal funds were being pumped directly into elementary and secondary schools throughout the nation.

President Johnson's elementary and secondary school program also brought federal support for the first time to school libraries, supplementary education centers, handicapped children, bilingual education, and drop-out preventive programs. Given the long history of unsuccessful campaigns for federal support for elementary and secondary education, Johnson's accomplishment was truly of historic proportions. As well, the Johnson program produced significant support for vocational education, adult and basic education, training for teachers, and the institution of the teachers corps.

As for colleges and universities, while federal support of higher education had existed in various forms before the Johnson years, President Johnson took the initiative on several significant new programs. He brought to fruition the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, breaking the log jam of the Kennedy years, providing significant support for campus construction. He introduced the Higher Education Act of 1965, the passage of which provided many new programs for colleges and universities. Federal scholarships for needy undergraduates, called educational opportunity grants, were authorized for the first time and amounted to over $130 million a year by the time President Johnson left office in 1969. Federally insured student loans were introduced to supplement the available loan money in the existing National Defense Education Act Loan Program.

Included as well in the 1965 Higher Education Legislation was federal support for university-run community service programs, aid to developing colleges, basic grants for library books, "upward bound," and work-study programs which had originally been part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, and construction grants for classrooms—all of which added up to about $1.4 billion by 1968. It was in 1965, too, that the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities came into being under President Johnson's leadership.

The legislative momentum for higher education, begun at the outset of the Johnson Administration, continued right through to his final year as President. Important new legislative advances were enacted in 1968 as part of the administration's sponsored amendments of that year. Included among the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 were special services for disadvantaged students, Networks for Knowledge, Education for the Public Service, improvement of graduate programs by encouraging training at the Ph.D. level, a law school clinical experience program, support for cooperative education programs among colleges, and an extension of the International Education Act of 1966. Symbolically, and importantly, many of the programs authorized in 1968 were never funded; they were permanently eclipsed by the demands of the Vietnam War.

All in all, it was a massive accomplishment in enacting and funding new programs for education, achieved largely through the President's initiative and his skill in marshaling congressional support. Washington University, like other colleges and universities across the country, derived significant benefit from the new programs.

But important as these basic programs were, there was another facet of the Johnson program that was particular-
ly important to Washington University: the little-known commitment of his administration to building across the nation a selected number of new centers of excellence in research and graduate study.

From the very beginning, the Johnson administration seemed to have a special interest in the advancement of science. Support of science was one of the policies of the Kennedy administration which he carried forward and expanded with conviction. Crucially for Washington University, this meant strengthening the universities that trained scientists and conducted advanced scientific research. President Johnson’s commitment to university science was best exemplified in a policy statement he made to the Cabinet on September 13, 1965, entitled “Strengthening Academic Capability for Science.” In that statement and in an enabling memorandum he sent to federal agency heads the next day, he said U.S. policy “in support of the advance of science would have a decisive role in determining the extent to which we fulfill our potential as a nation—and as a free society.”

He enunciated a policy that had two very important characteristics for academic science: first, and most importantly for Washington University, he asked that federal research monies be especially directed toward emerging centers of academic excellence. ... Since World War II, the number of institutions carrying out research and providing advanced education has grown impressively,” he said. “Strong centers have grown in areas which were previously not well served. It is a particular purpose of this policy to accelerate this beneficial trend since the funds are still concentrated in too few institutions in too few areas of the country. We want to find excellence and build it up wherever it is found so that creative centers of excellence may grow in every part of the nation.”

A second feature of the Johnson policy was a commitment to the view that federal research grants should not only accomplish the federal mission but, in the process, should avowedly strengthen the research capacity of the institution. “Research supported to further agency missions,” said the President in his September 14, 1965 memorandum to agency heads, “should be administered not only with a view to producing specific results, but also with a view to strengthening academic institutions and increasing the number of institutions capable of performing research of high quality.” Specifically, the President instructed agencies to “provide research funds to academic institutions under conditions affording them the opportunity to improve and extend their programs for research and science education and to develop the potentialities for high quality research of groups and individuals, including capable young faculty members.”

An important feature of this concept was a direct statement by the President that wide latitude for basic research should be given the university and the individual faculty investigator. “Under this policy,” said the President, “more support will be provided under terms which give the university and the investigator wider scope for inquiry, as contrasted with highly specific, narrowly defined projects.”

Here, then, was a presidential policy that said federal research monies spent in universities—$1.3 billion in 1965—should be used to develop research and training strength in the universities receiving the grants and that these monies should be especially directed at newly emerging research centers.

The Johnson policy of using federal research support for universities had been given strong impetus in a report prepared by a special presidential task force and presented to the President in November, 1964. The task force was chaired by John Gardner, then president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and later President Johnson’s Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. While the Gardner report endorsed many ideas that were being considered as the basis for the Higher Education Act of 1965, it contained a special section entitled “Centers of Excellence” that set the stage for the President’s 1965 policy of research support for university development.

A high priority, said the Gardner report, “is to create new centers of excellence at the graduate level. All federal agencies providing funds to graduate and professional schools should have in mind the desirability of expanding the number of university centers of strength,” said the report, recognizing “that eventually every major region of the country should have one or more such centers.”

The Johnson call for concentrating federal support at “emerging centers of excellence” had its greatest immediate impact at the National Science Foundation, where a major new program in science development grants was just getting underway, at the National Institutes of Health in the Health Sciences Advancement Award Program; at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, through its multidisciplinary research grant program; and in the U.S. Office of Education as it moved to a significant new level of graduate student support in the National Defense Education Act Graduate Fellowship Program and the National Defense Foreign Language Training Program. Project Themis, a program in the Department of Defense to broaden the distribution of its research funds, also resulted from the presidential directive. The Science Development Program of the National Science Foundation offers the best example of how the Johnson policy was interpreted and implemented at the agency level.

Citing the need for an increase in the number of high-quality graduate centers in the United States, NSF launched the Science Development Program in 1965 with grants to thirteen universities, totaling $47.3 million. In its November 26, 1965, report to the President, NSF said the purpose of the Science Development Program avowedly was “to help a limited number of good institutions move rapidly forward to a higher level of quality in an appreciable segment of their science activities. ... Only a few institutions combine the attributes of distinguished faculties and excellent physical plant which make a truly outstanding center of education and research in the sciences. This program is directed toward the improvement of potentially strong universities to increase their capabilities for high-quality research and education in the sciences.”

In making its Science Development grants, the Foundation considered not only the merits of the institution’s proposal but, as well, “the quality of the existing scientific capability; the extent of expected improvement; the abil-
ity of the institution to sustain a continued growth in its scientific potential; the existing and potential effectiveness of the institution's science programs in serving the needs of the surrounding regions; and the institution's ability to attract outstanding undergraduate and graduate students in the region.”

The concept of the presidential policy at NSF as well as at other federal agencies was not one that froze out support of existing centers of excellence, for the most prestigious universities continued to receive major and diversified federal support. Rather, the notion was one of bringing along a well-developed second team that would be able to join in big league play and would spread the league franchises more evenly across the land.

The “emerging centers of excellence” concept could not have come at a more propitious time for Washington University. The commitment to national stature launched by Chancellor Compton in 1945 and accelerated by Chancellor Shepley in 1953 had begun to bear fruit by 1965. The student body moved to a national base in the early 1960’s, pushing up the average SAT score into the 600’s, an improvement of over 100 points. Key new buildings were on line, crucial among them the residence halls and Olin Library, and an aggressive campaign had been undertaken in 1962 by the new Chancellor, Thomas H. Eliot, to recruit a faculty, expand facilities, and develop financial support worthy of a university of national stature.

The pace of change was dizzying: the budget was leap­

George Bundy, then Special Assistant to President Ken­

nedy, wrote in Harpers that a few new universities were joining the ranks of the established giants. “Yale and Princeton have not vanished from the mountain tops as Washington, Vanderbilt, and Brown have joined them,” he wrote. And in May, 1963, Time magazine cited Wash­

ington University, along with Rochester, Western Reserve, and Tulane, as one of the “take-off” universities. “Today ‘unknown’ urban universities are blossoming across the land,” wrote Time, “and if none of them is yet another Harvard, Chicago, or University of California, some of them are poised for take-off in that direction.” In offering a description of the four take-off universities, Time said they “have now outstripped their regional reputations and stand ready for national recognition.” McGeorge Bundy was quoted in that same article as saying Washington University “has the steepest trajectory of any university in the United States.”

This new-found national attention did not go unnoticed in the nation’s capital, converging as it did with President Johnson’s policy of support for emerging centers of excellence. While key accomplishments were being made in the private sector—the $15 million Ford Challenge Grant that spurred the successful $70 million fund drive dominant among them—major developments were beginning to fall into line with respect to federal support.

U
nder the leadership of Chancellor Eliot, the Universi­

ity searched out and applied for every major sup­

port program for which it conceivably could qualify. Under the careful direction of Provost George E. Pake, Wash­

ington University applied for and was awarded a $3.9 mil­

lion Science Development grant from the National Science Foundation, one of the first four awards to be made. The three-year grant to Washington University was for faculty development, facility improvement, and the purchase of equipment for four programs: chemistry, physics, biology, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science. Of this grant, over $2.5 million was spent on the construction of the George F. McMillen Laboratory of Chemistry, Bryan Hall Engineering and Applied Science Building, and for major renovation of Rebock Hall of Biology. More than $400,000 was spent on faculty development in engineering and chemistry, and almost $800,000 was spent on new laboratory equipment for physics, chemistry, and biology. A supplemental grant of $3.1 million was made in 1968 by NSF for additional renovation, equip­

ment, and faculty development, bringing the total NSF Science Development support to $7 million.

Washington University also received, in the years of the Johnson Administration, $2.75 million in Health Sciences Advancement Award support to expand the University’s capability for research in the health sciences and $1.6 million from the NASA Sustaining University Research Program for a multidisciplinary research program. The NASA grant provided faculty and student support and equipment purchase funds for new University multidisciplinary efforts in space and planetary science; materials and radiation; systems, instrumentation, and structures; and technology and man. Project Themis in the Depart-
ment of Defense provided $1.5 million in support for research projects in physics and engineering.

While support from each of these programs alone was a major boost to the scientific capacity of Washington University, it was their combined effect, coming as it did at a crucial moment in the University’s development, that give the impact of the Johnson policy special significance. Interestingly, Washington University was the only one of the “emerging universities” to get support from all of these programs.

As the University’s reputation in the sciences grew, more resources became available for other branches of learning, and the whole academic endeavor moved upward with renewed confidence. Evidence of this was the marked expansion of support for the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences during the Johnson years. It was in 1965, following the Johnson directive of concentrating graduate and research resources at emerging centers of excellence, that Washington University was awarded the maximum number, ninety-five, of new National Defense Education Act Fellowships for graduate study, the smallest university in the U.S. to be awarded the maximum number. The value of the program at full maturity, maintaining the ninety-five new starts each year, was expected to be over $1.4 million per year, clearly a monumental boost for graduate education at Washington University. Similarly, the University received other major graduate fellowship and traineeship awards, including over forty National Science Foundation traineeships and thirty NASA traineeships, bringing with them an additional $400,000 in graduate support each year.

In 1963, the University had applied for and received some 2000 acres of a surplus government ammunition dump in St. Louis county for development as a research center—an action that certainly lent weight to the argument that the University was deeply committed to the advancement of research. During the Johnson years, federal dollars for research continued to come in. While government grants and contracts at Washington University had gone up from $5.5 million in 1960 to $11.5 million in 1964, before the end of Johnson’s term they totaled $20.6 million, almost four times the 1960 total.

The Johnson years brought other benefits to Washington University, among them, one-third of the cost of the new law and social science building, Educational Opportunity and work-study grants for undergraduates, and a significant increase in funds for the National Defense Student Loan Program. But these programs, while important to the growth and development of the University, were no different in nature for Washington University than for other colleges and universities. What was different in a crucial way was the special support designated for the handful of universities across the country like Washington University that were just coming into their own as institutions strongly committed to high quality instruction and research. At that stage of the University’s development, a strong shot in the arm was needed, both in dollar support to build the costly base for graduate training and research and in affirmation brought by the recognition that the University was indeed becoming a national center of academic significance. The Johnson policy provided that shot in the arm.

The agenda in Washington for college and university support seems somehow to have changed greatly in the five years since Lyndon Johnson left office. If the current attitude had prevailed then, Washington University could not have received the boost it did for quality graduate and research development. The campus disorders, the alleged glut of Ph.D.’s on the market, the faltering commitment to scientific research and training, and the belief in some quarters that universities are badly managed have all taken their toll in federal support for higher education, especially for graduate training and research. The NDEA graduate fellowship program is dead, resulting in the loss of one million dollars in annual graduate student support at Washington University. NSAS traineeships, once worth $175,000 a year in graduate support at Washington University, are gone, and NSF graduate support has declined from $225,000 a year in 1967-68 to $88,000 this year, and will drop to $40,000 next year. The NSF Science Development Program has come to an end for Washington University, with no prospects for comparable support in the future.

While Washington University research dollars have continued to grow, the trend exemplified in President Nixon’s latest budget has been away from the Johnson policy of grants for basic research, where wide latitude for conducting the inquiry is left to the faculty investigator, to task-oriented contracts, where the parameters of the research problem are very specifically defined in a contract. The new emphasis is on the specific mission to be accomplished, with little or no attention paid to the residual benefit to the educational program of the contracting university.

But perhaps even more important over the long haul has been the conceptual shift in federal programs away from avowed support of centers of excellence in higher education to a concept of support for “post-secondary education” at all levels without discriminating among the differing types or quality of institutions. The new Educational Amendments of 1972, enacted but not funded, make no distinction among institutions in the formula allocation of support.

Programs of high quality, with a heavy post-baccalaureate and research component, cost much more than those without it. For universities committed to such programs, the LBJ years come increasingly to cast a golden glow.

What an irony it is that the President most reviled on the Washington University campus was, in an interesting way, one of its most important benefactors.
Noted political historian William N. Chambers, in this analysis of the 1972 elections, points out that President Nixon was re-elected in one of the four "super-landslides" of American history. It was the only one of the four, however, where the President did not also win striking victories in the Congressional elections. It was, Professor Chambers writes, "the loneliest landslide in history."

By WILLIAM N. CHAMBERS
Edward Mallinckrodt Distinguished University Professor

THE LONELIEST LANDSLIDE

The presidential victory of Richard M. Nixon in 1972 was one of four major landslides in the American experience. Complete returns show a sweeping triumph in the popular and electoral votes over his Democratic challenger, George McGovern, and over John Schmitz, the candidate for the attenuated American Party.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Popular Vote</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Electoral Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>47,169,905</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>29,170,383</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitz, Other</td>
<td>1,394,042</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77,734,330</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the fifty states and the District of Columbia, the President carried every voting unit except two, which went to McGovern—Massachusetts with fourteen electoral votes and the District of Columbia with three.

There is no established, precise criterion for a landslide; but most observers agree that any election won by a margin of 55 per cent of the popular vote or better is a landslide. If we use this standard, we can call the following presidential elections landslides: Andrew Jackson, 1828 (56.0 per cent); Ulysses S. Grant, 1872 (55.6); Theodore Roosevelt, 1904 (56.4); Herbert Hoover, 1928 (58.2); Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1932 (57.4); and Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1952 (55.1) and 1956 (57.4)—a total of seven.

But we have also experienced four instances of what we may call "super-landslides"—elections that were won by 60 per cent or more of the total popular vote. These instances come with Warren G. Harding in 1920 (60.3 per cent), Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936 (60.8), Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1964 (61.1), and Richard M. Nixon in 1972 (60.7). Taking landslides and super-landslides together, we have a total of eleven out of the thirty-seven presidential elections since 1828, when a mass popular vote first began to determine the outcome of presidential contests.

Thus landslides have occurred in nearly one-third of all elections from 1828 to 1972. But super-landslides are rare, and all of them have occurred only in our own century.

Let us compare the super-landslides of 1920, 1936, and 1964 with the Nixon landslide of 1972. In 1920, Warren G. Harding won 37 of the then 48 states and 404 of the 531 electoral votes. If it were not for the then still-solid Democratic South, Harding might have carried every state but one. In 1936, Franklin Roosevelt did carry every state but Maine and Vermont (precisely as Jim Farley predicted) for an electoral vote total of 523 to eight.

In 1964, however, Lyndon Johnson lost six of the fifty states to Barry Goldwater, his Republican challenger—Goldwater's own Arizona, and Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina. It was the beginning of the end of the Democratic "Solid South." This result left Johnson with 486 electoral votes to 52 for Goldwater. Thus the greatest sweep in states carried, and in electoral votes, remains Franklin Roosevelt's triumph in 1936. Yet Nixon in 1972 comes in a close second in such calculations, almost matching FDR with 60.7 per cent of the popular vote, but falling behind Johnson's record of 61.1.

National elections in the United States, however, are more than just presidential contests. Here, 1972 deviates from the pattern of past landslides on several counts. In previous instances, presidential landslides have been correlated with striking victories in congressional elections for
the President’s party too. Thus in past landslides from 1828 through 1964, voters have also generally elected majorities for the President’s party to both the Senate and the House of Representatives, often by wide majorities in the House. (The Senate, with only about one-third of its members up for election in any given year, changes more slowly.)

The only past exceptions to this congressional “landslide rule”—as the accompanying table shows—came with Dwight Eisenhower. After the 1952 elections, he had a margin of only 221 Republicans to 213 Democrats in the House, and only 48 to 47 in the Senate. In Ike’s second victory in 1956, his party elected only 201 members of the House to 234 Democrats; and the Senate was composed of 47 Republicans to 49 Democrats.

Congressional Election Results: Landslides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1828 Jackson</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872 Grant</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904 T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 Harding</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928 Hoover</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936 F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952 Eisenhower</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 Eisenhower</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 L. Johnson</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Nixon</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Nixon landslide of 1972, the discrepancy between presidential and congressional results was even more striking. The Democrats elected 244 members to the House as compared to 191 for the Republicans. This outcome marked a Republican gain of only eleven seats, as compared with the results of the 1970 congressional contests. But eight of these eleven seats went Republican mainly as a result of reapportionment following on the results of the 1970 census. Broadly speaking, the transfer of seats was from the East to the South and West, especially Florida and California—in effect, to the “Sun Belt.”

Even so, the net gain for the Republicans in the House of Representatives amounts to slightly less than 3 per cent of the 435 members of the chamber.

In the Senate, the Republicans actually lost two seats on balance. The line-up after the 1970 mid-term election was 55 Democrats to 45 Republicans—if, to simplify matters, we count James Buckley (Conservative, New York)
"In effect, 1972 marked a sweeping, personal, presidential triumph for Richard Milhous Nixon, and very little else."

with the Republicans and Harry F. Byrd (Independent, Virginia) with the Democrats. On this basis, the results for 1972 show 57 Democrats to 43 Republicans. Moreover, President Nixon did not achieve what he once called an "ideological majority" in Congress. If anything, the new—and younger—Congress elected in 1972 is likely to be somewhat more liberal and assertive.

Another register of the electorate may be found in the results of contests for governorships in the several states. There were eighteen gubernatorial elections in 1972. Of the eighteen, the Republicans won only seven, to eleven for their Democratic rivals. Of the seven Republican victories, three were by incumbents (in West Virginia, Iowa, and Washington). Two other victories involved new faces, replacing retiring Republicans (in New Hampshire and Indiana); and two more victories were won by candidates who replaced retiring Democrats (in North Carolina and Missouri).

The Democrats, meanwhile, re-elected incumbent governors in four states (Arkansas, Kansas, South Dakota, and Utah), and also held governorships with new men in four states (Rhode Island, Montana, North Dakota, and Texas). In addition, they replaced Republican governors in three states (Vermont, Delaware, and Illinois). The final balance showed 31 governorships filled by Democrats to 19 for Republicans. After the 1970 elections, there were 29 Democrats to 21 Republicans. Thus, in the face of Nixon’s presidential sweep, the Democrats in 1972 achieved a net gain of two governorships as compared with 1970.

A further measure of underlying Republican weakness may be found in the contests for the state legislatures. The outcome after the 1970 elections was 56 houses Democratic to 43 Republican—the total is 99 because Nebraska has a single-chamber legislature. The balance after the 1972 elections shows the Democrats with 57 chambers to 40 for the Republicans, with the two parties apparently tied in the upper houses in Michigan and California. Challenges and recounts may alter the results in these states and in South Dakota. But once again the Republicans are on the deficit side of the ledger.

What all of this adds up to is a very “thin” landslide compared with past performances. In effect, 1972 marked a sweeping, personal, presidential triumph for Richard Milhous Nixon, and very little else. His campaign apparatus was called the Committee to Re-elect the President. The very title was a stroke of genius, which conferred all of the majestic trappings of the highest office on candidate Nixon; and the title was in itself a slogan. But the result was the loneliest landslide in American history. Moreover, the President (much less Mr. Nixon) turned out to have virtually no coat-tails at all in other contests.

But the President did win, overwhelmingly. How did he do it? First of all, according to early and not altogether reliable poll data, he won an across-the-board edge in one segment after another of the electorate in much the same way as Eisenhower did in 1952 and 1956. Thus demographic groups that had usually voted Democratic for forty years, since Franklin Roosevelt’s first victory in the critical election of 1932, went to Nixon. Every section of the country, including the once Democratic South, came through with a Nixon majority. He also won the bulk of blue-collar workers and Roman Catholics—by about 57 and 52 per cent, respectively—along with white-collar employees (64 per cent), and even most union members (54 per cent). He took about 58 per cent of the votes in the nation’s cities, though there were exceptions such as Boston and St. Louis; and he generally did as well or better in the suburbs. His sweep included such ethnic groups as Polish-Americans and Italo-Americans, although he carried only about 39 per cent of the Jewish vote. In short, he held the basic core of the Republican vote and also won many Democrats to his side. There were, however, some exceptions. First-time voters in the age range of eighteen to twenty-four went to George McGovern by a margin of about 52 per cent; and students preferred McGovern by about the same proportion.

Among voters who were under the age of thirty but were not students, however—about 70 per cent of the “under thirties” all told—the President had a margin of about two to one. Black Americans, heavily Democratic since the Roosevelt years of the 1930’s, voted for McGovern by about 87 per cent to 13 per cent for Nixon. Yet even this result marks a decline from 1968, when about 97 per cent of black voters supported the Democratic nominee. Again, it must be emphasized that these data are preliminary; and we will have to wait for more reliable survey research before we can feel confident about the precise demographic profile of the electorate.

Meanwhile, it appears that some 75 per cent of voters who supported George C. Wallace and his American Independent party in 1968 went to Nixon in 1972. Pundits have played with the Wallace legacy, adding his 13.5 per cent of the total popular vote in 1968 to Nixon’s 43.4 per cent that year, for a total of 56.9 per cent—about four percentage points below Nixon’s actual share of the 1972 popular vote. Surely, a substantial number of former Wallace voters went for Nixon in 1972; and indeed, the President had bid for the Wallace vote as far as he could through such appeals as his attack on busing and support.
of "quality schools." It is possible that the American Party of 1968 will prove to be a half-way house for many voters in transit from the Democratic to the Republican ranks, especially in the changing South and among blue collar workers. Yet once again, we must wait for more detailed research to confirm this hypothesis. Much, of course, will depend upon what the two major parties have to offer in 1976 and what may happen with Wallace.

Another salient aspect of 1972 was a sharp decline in voting participation. After a low of 53.0 of the voting-age population in 1948, voting turnout ranged from 63.3 in 1952, 60.6 in 1956, a peak of 64.1 in 1960, 62.0 per cent in 1964, and 60.6 in 1968. Out of a total of about 139,642,000 citizens who were eighteen years or older in 1972, 77,734,330 went to the polls. In the result, voting turnout dropped to about 55.6 per cent. Thus voting participation fell off by about 8.5 percentage points from 1960, and by about five percentage points from 1968. If we compare these results with the turnouts of approximately 90 per cent in the 1972 elections in the Federal Republic of Germany and in New Zealand, the result is shocking. So it is again if we compare the American results in 1972 with such American elections as 1840, 1860, and 1876, all of which showed turnouts of 80 per cent or more of the eligible electorate.

We must await further research in order to explain the decline of participation in 1972. The result may be, in large part, attributable to widespread apathy, as poll after poll predicted that Nixon would win easily. Again, many voters may have been alienated by their perceptions of Richard Nixon or George McGovern, or both. But there may have been still other factors. Some 25 million new, potential young voters were eligible for the first time. Of these, about 11 million were newly-enfranchised voters in the age bracket of eighteen to twenty; the other 14 million were young men and women who had reached the age of twenty-one since the 1968 elections. In short, the increment of youthful potential voters was unprecedented.

In the past, from the enfranchisement of Negroes after the Civil War to the granting of national women suffrage in 1920, newly enfranchised blocs of potential voters have been slow in taking up their right to vote. Survey results, moreover, show that young people in recent years have had a poor attendance record at the polls; and preliminary data for 1972 indicate that turnout among citizens under thirty was about 40 per cent of those eligible. There may have been still other institutional factors that involved the young in 1972, such as the difficulty many college students away from home had in getting registered or in securing absentee ballots.

Finally, unlike other modern nations, the American registration maze remains an obstacle course to the polls despite court actions to limit residence requirements to thirty days. Only meticulous survey research, however, can provide us with a reliable analysis of the decline of voting participation in 1972.

Let us look at some possible explanations for the Nixon landslide and the McGovern debacle. First, it is clear that the big winners, along with Richard Nixon, were the ticket splitters. These were the people who voted for Nixon and then went on to support Democrats for governor, Congress, the state legislatures, and other offices—or the "super-splitters," who picked and chose all the way down the list of candidates. Probably no national election before 1972 has marked such extensive ticket-splitting; and this aspect of 1972 is another indication of the deterioration of political parties as we have known them from the Golden Age of politics in the nineteenth century through the Silver Age of Franklin Roosevelt. Just as the President held himself above parties in 1972, so did millions of voters.

Next, it appears that Richard Nixon and his advisers judged the prevailing temper of most of the electorate accurately and planned their campaign accordingly. Let us look back to the 1960's, to the driving appeal of John F. Kennedy's "New Frontier"—"ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." Look back to the striving exhortations of Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society"—"let us continue ... " we shall overcome!" The decade was one of constant calls for greatness, movement, broad horizons, progress, action, change—in short, exhortation upon exhortation. All of this led to a massive outpouring of domestic legislation unparalleled since the years of the New Deal in the 1930's, and much of it had great promise. But in the end, too much of the legislation of the 1960's misfired or failed to work out in practice, down in the towns, cities, and neighborhoods. The price was growing disillusionment.

Meanwhile, the deeply divisive issue of black and white, or black versus white, broke through the surface with a roar. It was the era of freedom marches, civil rights rallies, cries of Black Power; and of riots, looting, destruction, bloodshed, and death in the ghettos of city after city. At the same time, more and more whites feared "black invasions" of their neighborhoods or suburbs. This fear was particularly strong among blue-collar workers and marginal white-collar groups who had fought their way out of the depression and "made something of themselves"—and for their children.

In sum, a sharp backlash had set in. It ran through the
North as well as the South; and George Wallace dramatized it all in political terms, at the expense of college-bred liberals and Democrats and their condescending ways. "There are more of us than there are of them," Wallace snarled. To all this, add the burdens of the apparently interminable war in Vietnam, with its draft calls, death, horrors, and destruction; and add again the sharp, incessant controversy between "Doves" and "Hawks" as the war dragged on. Add peace marches and the siege of the Pentagon; student protest and student riots; new lifestyles among the young, from long hair to abortion and pot; the so-called "New Politics," and Eugene McCarthy's "Children's Crusade" for peace now.

Nearly all of these cross currents were displayed in the brawling Donnybrook of the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago—strike and disorder in the convention hall, tear gas in the streets, and the interminable chant, "The whole world is watching! the whole world is watching!" Much of Middle America was watching, and it didn't like what it saw.

In sum, America in the 1960's was a scene of strenuous exhortation and demand in politics—and also a period of intense conflict, confrontation, and turmoil. It was a period of crisis politics, one of the most severe the nation has experienced since the Civil War. To many Americans, their national society seemed less "great" than it was troubled or sick; and politicians from Lyndon Johnson down suffered from a widening credibility gap. In this context, millions of Americans feared for the middle-class and blue-collar virtues of work, decency, stability, patriotism—and reward and success. "Change creates turbulence," Ramsey Clark remarked later, "and turbulence creates fear." All of these questions and fears made up the deeper, underlying social issue of the 1960's in its larger sense. That larger social issue provided the backdrop for the 1972 election.

With the stage thus set, enter President Nixon. In 1920, after the high moral striving of Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom and the crusade for a league to keep world peace, Warren Harding intoned, "Not heroism, but healing, not nostrums, but normalcy"—and won by a landslide. In 1972, Richard Nixon also offered stability, reassurance, comfort, peace at home and abroad. But he offered competence too; and action, but only when it was clearly necessary or reasonably sure of success. He offered these qualities, moreover, in his presidential role and style—not exhorting, not demanding, but as a man of flexibility and strength.

In effect, he appeared as the ultimate Chairman of the Board. Had he not, after all, broken with Republican precedent to combat inflation through his New Economic Policy? blazed new trails in foreign policy in the face of "Cold War" dogma, in his rapprochement with the People's Republic of China and in the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty with the Soviet Union? offered the prospect of "peace with honor" in Vietnam? broken Republican precedent again by silently adopting what amounted to Keynesian economics, and by providing revenue sharing with the states and cities? All of this, finally, was offered in an appropriately chairmanly way, without fatiguing demands for high striving from the citizenry. Indeed, Chairman Nixon hardly even campaigned in 1972 except for a few forays; and even in these appearances he did little beyond offering his presidential presence.

On the Democratic side, by contrast, the inherently benign and thoughtful George McGovern committed himself to a slashing campaign, in effect as an urban, twentieth-century populist. Despite damaging ambiguities and contradictions at the outset, from his ill-fated $1000-a-month welfare proposal to his anguished vacillations as to whether he would keep Senator "Tom Who" Eagleton as his vice-presidential choice, he settled on his ultimate style. Perhaps his early bloopers may be attributed to the fact that McGovern had never before been at the center of big-time politics. But what he repeatedly called for in his campaign was new ventures, new reforms, new legislation, new policies, new exhortations to make America over—in short, more effort, more striving, more demands. McGovern asked the voters to lift up their eyes to a greater, more equitable future—while the President offered a reassuring present. Thus, for too many voters, McGovern was too "radical," albeit in style more than in substance. He was, in effect, too strenuous in his call to greatness. Meanwhile, in the White House, Chairman Nixon offered a safe, conservative passage down the middle of the political road.

Again, however—unlike Harding in 1920—Nixon's position was not to stand pat in the face of McGovern's challenge. He had acted, and would act, when he deemed it necessary. Thus his stance was not only one of moderate conservatism: it was also one of conservative concern. Throughout his rare appearances, and in his conduct of affairs at the Executive Mansion, he projected the twin themes of conservative concern—whether he was talking about the economy, buying and "quality education," Vietnam, crime rates, or world peace.

In the end, apparently, this note of conservative concern was the right note for the time, at least for the President's basic constituency and the 47 million people who voted for him.
The 1973 St. Louis Marathon runners take off from the gates of Francis Field, starting point of the 1904 Olympics Marathon run.

Dr. Robert Fitts, winner of the 26-mile-385-yard race, is a physiologist doing postdoctoral research at the School of Medicine.
RUN FOR YOUR LIFE!

"For the average guy who runs I have nothing but respect." (Frank Shorter, 1973 Olympic Marathon Champion.)

Sedentary citizens: Run for your lives! A St. Louis track club wants to show the public why there is truth in this advice. Its members also want to make the point that running can be both healthy and fun. Admittedly, the last point is difficult to get across to a public which is saturated by the mass media with the excitement of contact sports.

One way to get the public's attention, the group reasoned, would be to hold the ultimate in track and field events—the marathon race. At 8 a.m., Sunday, March 4, they did just that, starting the 26-mile-385-yard race at Washington University's Francis Field and following a course similar to that of the marathon in the 1904 Olympic games in St. Louis. Fortunately, this year's race differed in many respects from the 1904 event. A major difference was that the race was run in cool weather over a much improved course. One of the minor changes was that the race ended at the downtown YMCA, where the sponsoring group—the St. Louis YMCA Track Club—could provide some finer touches for the runners, including rubdowns, good food, and ample time to relax.

The winner of the March 4 marathon was Dr. Robert Fitts, who is doing postdoctoral research at Washington University's School of Medicine. His victory wasn't a great surprise; he was the national marathon champion in 1970. More important to the sponsors was the varied interest in the event: eighty-four participants, ranging in age from 15 to 66 years, including one young woman, Teri Anderson, who finished not far off from the women's world record. It was significant, too, that none of the runners who crossed the finish line was in bad shape. In fact, one St. Louisan, 53-year-old Lorn Gwaltney, skipped rope after completing the marathon.

The publicity surrounding the event stressed the good condition of the runners and the friendly relationships among them; undoubtedly this did much to further the cause of running as a healthful exercise. Dr. Fitts emphasized, "Who won the race was not the point. We simply wanted to draw attention to running, which if done properly can be a big factor in maintaining good health as you grow older. It's true that I am competitive, but I compete against myself. The most important thing is that I know I feel better, I'm in better health, and I have more stamina when I'm in training for running. What we want people to understand is that they can run a small fraction of what I run and achieve the same results."

Publicity and legends which have evolved from the time of the first marathon, however, probably haven't done much to stimulate the average, sedentary American to go out and do long-distance running. Legend has it that in 490 B.C., Pheidippides, one of Greece's finest runners, was ordered to run from the Plains of Marathon to Athens to tell the City Fathers the good news that the Greeks had repelled an invasion by a huge Persian army. Pheidippides...
supposedly ran the twenty-two miles back to Athens, gasped the phrase, "Rejoice, we conquer," dropped to the ground and died. Athens revived the modern Olympic games in 1896 and included a "marathon" event to commemorate Pheidippides.

The marathon held as part of the 1904 Olympic games in St. Louis did little to help the image of long-distance running in the Midwest. The race began and ended at Francis Field, which was built by the World's Fair administration for the Olympic games. A native of England, Thomas Hicks, who was entered by a Cambridge, Mass., athletic club, won the 24.85-mile race in the understandably slow time of three hours and twenty-eight minutes. As a result of sweltering August heat and the choppy, dusty roads of the west county area, he was so exhausted at the finish that he couldn't stand up to receive his trophy.

Until last March's race, there had not been a marathon in St. Louis since 1904. The humid midwest summers are a big factor contributing to this area's generally low level of interest in track events, or in any form of running. Still, the worst heat occurs within a two-month period; so apathy probably is another key factor. The St. Louis Track Club is doing its best to combat apathy about running by planning sensible and imaginative programs.

The idea for an annual marathon came from the imagination of Dr. Donald E. Beckman, a St. Louis family doctor and enthusiastic member of the St. Louis Track Club.

A dedicated runner at the age of 47, he also did most of the planning and fund-raising for the marathon. Dr. Beckman said that his main goal was to foster interest in running as a convenient means to physical fitness. "One of the most gratifying results of the marathon was the unusually large number of young people who competed," he commented. Aside from the physical benefits of running, Dr. Beckman feels that the self-discipline and achievement of personal goals in long-distance running are factors in improved mental health. "I've seen endurance training become one of the turning points in improving the attitude and emotional stability of kids who had been drifting," he added.

Exactly what is the training that Dr. Beckman and his associates advocate? Very generally, it is physical endurance fitness, as opposed to the exercise in doing short-term activities such as intermittent weight-lifting or occasional tennis matches. This doesn't mean that the Track Club members are putting down the benefits one gets from "non-endurance" exercise. "Almost any exercise above the minimal level of rest is good—and is more than most Americans get," Dr. Fitts said.

Endurance fitness, however, can be attained only if someone has worked up to a level of running or jogging two or three miles a minimum of three or four times a week. Before a non-runner even considers doing this, Dr. Fitts advises that an individual should have a thorough medical evaluation. If a medical go-ahead is given, it is equally important for a person to work up very gradually.

Now with the lead completely to himself, Fitts picks up water on the run without coming in for a pit stop.

On the last lap, Fitts makes the turn in front of Brookings Hall on the Washington University campus.
to the two or three miles over a period of months. It is helpful to be in a supervised program such as that offered by the St. Louis YMCA Track Club, which provides basic tests for individual capability and progress.

But why endurance training? What's the difference between the quality of exercise in an occasional game of tennis and in running or jogging several miles? Dr. Fitts points out (as have many physicians and researchers) that the difference is in the demonstrable effect of endurance exercise on the cardiovascular system: the heart, the major arteries, small arteries, and capillary veins.

Data lending support to the physical benefits of endurance training have come from a number of studies, including work done in the Exercise Research Laboratory, where Dr. Fitts is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow (he received his Ph.D. in human physiology from the University of Wisconsin at Madison). The laboratory, headed by Dr. John Holloszy, is part of the department of preventive medicine, and its researches range from the biochemical to the broader physiological effects of exercise. Observations in Dr. Holloszy's laboratory show that endurance exercise increases the work capacity of the heart: the heart gets bigger, stronger, and can pump more blood per minute. The laboratory also has shown that endurance exercise increases the capacity of muscle tissue to "oxidize," or to utilize fats and carbohydrates. Dr. Holloszy and his associates have demonstrated that this is a result of an increase in the size and number of key cellular units called mitochondria, which are responsible for cellular oxidation.

These basic measurements of metabolic processes, of course, don't prove that endurance fitness produces healthier bodies. But they are very interesting observations when considered along with the findings from surveys in the field of epidemiology—the branch of science which attempts to pinpoint the factors contributing to a disease within a given population group. The latter studies indicate that individuals who do regular and vigorous exercise have roughly one-third the number of heart attacks recorded among sedentary individuals. In addition, the same studies show that persons who take endurance exercise have improved chances of surviving a heart attack.

Dr. Fitts notes that endurance exercise can be achieved through several activities other than running or jogging. For example, a sustained program of swimming or bicycling can provide the same benefits. "I'd like to do other exercises in addition to running—more swimming, for example—but there are just so many hours in a day," he continued. Admittedly, Dr. Fitts runs for more than the sheer fun and health involved. As former national marathon champion he is hardly an average runner.

Dr. Beckman summed up the attitude of the "average guy" who runs. He entered the marathon race strictly for the fun of it. "Look," he said, "I know I'm never going to win. Again, the race wasn't the point for me. I get satisfaction from the certain amount of self-discipline it takes to stay in good shape. And I know that it is a good investment in my health."
Howard J. Morgens is a 1931 arts and sciences graduate of Washington University and served on the University's Board of Trustees for ten years. He is chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Procter & Gamble Company, widely regarded in the business world as one of the best managed corporations in the country. In his 1973 Founders Day address, Mr. Morgens called for mutual understanding between business and the universities and pointed out that both are great forces for change in our society and at the same time represent vital continuity.

BUSINESS AND THE UNIVERSITIES—

A Call for Mutual Understanding

By HOWARD J. MORGENS, AB 31, LLD 58
Chairman of the Board and Chief
Executive Officer, The Procter
& Gamble Company

Everybody who is interested in rational progress will agree that there is a real need today for people in business and people in our universities to understand each other better. They are often quite antagonistic. Yet, to a considerable degree, each is dependent on the other. If we are to have an orderly society and one that moves steadily toward a more perfect state, our institutions of higher learning and our business enterprises must find some way to achieve a greater mutual understanding.

My credentials may be briefly stated. From the standpoint of business, I've spent forty years pursuing a business career; have been the chief executive officer of a fairly large enterprise for almost sixteen years; and have served as a director of several other companies. Yet I can't possibly pretend I know all about business. Business is tremendously varied and fast-changing and it reflects a very large share of the dreams and hopes and problems of the people of this country. No one man can speak for all of it. From the standpoint of the universities, my credentials are even more meager. I have spent six years as a student, seen three children through three different colleges and graduate schools, served ten years as a trustee of Washington University, and served on various committees at other universities. Essentially, however, I have been a businessman observing university faculties and students and administrators.

My approach is to point up some of the similarities between the business community and the academic community. The differences between the two are more obvious and always receive more emphasis than the things they have in common. Some stress on their similarities might help to put things in better balance.

First of all, we should realize that both the business community and the academic community are great forces for change in our society. Business is often thought of as quite conservative or even reactionary. Actually, it is a major instrument for change. It has probably brought about more changes in our society during the last hundred years than any other element in our social structure. Let me illustrate this statement very briefly.

In the final third of the last century, business pushed railroads across the continent and brought the electric light and the telephone to the people of this country. In the first third of the twentieth century, business brought us the automobile, the piston airplane, and the radio. In the second third of this century, business brought forth television, the jet engine, and the computer. Incidentally, it also brought about the liberation of women in the sense that it relieved them of much household drudgery through the development of such things as modern detergents, home appliances, and convenience foods.

Throughout this hundred year period, business also pioneered many human benefits. It increased standards of living, shortened the work week, developed retirement plans, offered both opportunity and security to many millions of people. My own company is one example. Procter & Gamble started profit sharing in 1887, sick and death benefits in 1915, guaranteed employment in 1923, the forty-hour week in 1932, and made all these plans work before the government or the unions were thinking in such terms. In countless ways, business has dramatically changed all of our lives. One may not like all these changes, but, whatever one may think about them, it is clear at least that
business has been a driving force for innovation and change in our society.

The academic community, too, has been a great force for change. From Socrates teaching in an Athenian grove through Karl Marx writing in the British Museum, the capacity of scholars and thinkers and teachers to influence our society has long been evident. In more recent times, all of us know what our modern universities have contributed to the physical sciences and to medicine and how much these contributions have affected us all. What is perhaps not so generally understood today is the capacity of the social scientists in our universities to bring about great changes.

Anyone who follows closely our governmental processes knows that social scientists are a powerful influence in the formation of public attitudes and public policy in this country. Their thought and their writings are often adopted by politicians in search of a program and in this way they find their way into legislation and government regulations. Politicians, of course, seldom search for a program which doesn't call for making some changes in the way things are. Therefore, they tend to bypass the views of those economists and political scientists who are more conservative in their outlook and to turn instead to those who hold views which are more dramatic and which can attract more attention from the public. Social scientists in our institutions of higher learning have great power to bring about change—whether for good or for evil—through their influence on the political process. Furthermore, year after year they teach the young and in this way, too, they influence the attitudes of the voting public.

I don't ask you to accept only my own observations on this point. Let me give you three quotations from more authoritative observers of this process. The first is from William J. Baroody, president of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. He makes the stark statement that "most governmental programs enacted in the past four decades did not originate either in the mind of a politician or come from the overwhelming demand of the people or from the planks of a party platform. They were born in and can trace their origin to the thought and writings of some academicians whose view of the world and the organization of society may not necessarily coincide with yours and mine."

Another is former President Lyndon Johnson, who, in a speech at Princeton, pointed out that "the 89th Congress passed bill after bill, measure after measure, suggested by scholars." He was referring, of course, to the Great Society programs. John Maynard Keynes also indicated that he clearly understood the role of the so-called intellectual class when he said that "the ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood." He went on to say, "Indeed the world is ruled by little else." That last may be going too far. Again, we may not like all the ideas and teachings of the social scientists but, whatever we may think of them, we must recognize that they are often a major force for change.

Another point of similarity between our business system and our universities is that each is a force for continuity in our lives. That is important, too. If sweeping change were the only factor, our society would lose its balance. We need a sense of continuity in all that we do. Without it, our social structure would have no roots, would lose its stability and destroy itself as free societies have done before.

While our private enterprise system can create great changes, it also assures us that these changes come in a reasonably ordered fashion. If it didn't do this, we would have chaos; we would achieve little; and the various business enterprises themselves could not survive. It takes time to create new products and services, to develop the new processes and methods for supplying them, to train people, to test and experiment and probe the markets. Massive investments and many jobs are at stake, and the changes simply must be made in a rational and orderly way. Business cannot, for example, respond instantly to the cries of the environmentalists, or the consumerists, or those who want to see many members of the minority races in high executive positions. To do the job right—to do it at all in fact—requires an orderly transition. It requires continuity.

The universities, of course, also provide continuity. They concern themselves with history, with the wisdom of the past, and with our cultural heritage. The scholars and teachers who do this fulfill a vital role. They enrich our lives. And they provide us with badly needed perspective on today's thought and on today's events—a perspective which many critics of the passing scene often lack.

Both business and the universities have a great stake in preserving the essential balance between change and continuity. It is important that they both understand each other's role in maintaining this balance which is a basic requirement of any healthy society. Our business and university communities have something else in common. Both are large and diverse and the people in them fall into the familiar human categories—good, bad, and indifferent.

There are approximately 12 million different business enterprises in the United States today. They represent a cross section of our society—both the good and the bad. Certainly some business practices by some business enterprises are deplorable. But it is neither helpful nor accurate to hold them up as typical of the entire private enterprise system.

The same can be said of the universities. Within their walls are many excellent faculty members and a number of poor ones. I personally owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to some of the professors who taught me at Washington University. In every university there are many fine teachers who can give their students some of the enlightenment which they are not likely to receive in any other way. On the other hand, there are some faculty members who are not genuine seekers after truth. They appear to be partisan, misguided, and careless advocates of this or that idea. But again, I don't think it is fair to condemn a whole institution because of them.

It would be helpful if businessmen looked more at the whole university and its role in society and less at certain individual faculty members whom they do not admire. And it would also be helpful if some faculty members spent more time trying to understand the private enterprise sys-
tality to all of our citizens and is moving in a sound and
determined way toward this goal. And this, too, is being
recognized more and more. Another cause for concern
about business goes under the name of consumerism. Here,
too, business is making a substantial effort to remove any
legitimate targets of the consumer movement. Perhaps as
a result, the voices of the most strident consumerists are
gradually becoming somewhat less persuasive.

Business, of course, is working at all these tasks in re-
sponse to the demands of the public. It would be nice if
we could say that business anticipated these demands—
just as it would be nice if we could say that government
anticipated them or that college administrators and faculty
members anticipated the emotional upheavals that struck
us all in the late 1960’s. However, one of the miracles of
the private enterprise system in this country is its flexibil-
ity—its ability to adapt to new circumstances and to new
social goals. It is adapting to the new goals and new val-
ues. As this fact becomes increasingly apparent to the
American people, I think public confidence in business—
which reached a rather low ebb—will be largely restored.

These are some of the things that the business commu-
nity and the academic community have in common. To
sum up, both are great forces for change in our society.
Both help to provide continuity in our lives. Neither is per-
fected or perfect. Both have lost a good deal of public
confidence. And both are struggling to correct their weak-
nesses and to justify a return of public confidence.

I would urge that businessmen continue and expand
their efforts to understand our colleges and universi-
ties—the good that they do, the problems they have, and
how they, too, are evolving. They should remember, also,
the many, many activities of our universities which busi-
nessmen can only applaud, such as the study and teaching
of the physical and biological sciences, medicine, literature,
languages, history, and many other subjects. They should
remember, too, that the colleges and universities contain
many sound economists and political scientists and sociolo-
gists and that they tend to hear only about those with
whom they disagree. Above all I would urge that business
continue its financial support of our institutions of higher
learning and, hopefully, increase its support. For the col-
leges and universities are educating our children and our
future employees and they cannot improve the quality of
that education without such support.

I would also suggest that the universities make a greater
effort to understand the private enterprise system in this
country. Particularly, I would urge that more be done to
give students a sound understanding of our business sys-
tem—how it works, how it is evolving, and how its benefits
compare to those of the economic systems in other coun-
tries and in other times. Business is such a dynamic and
pervasive element in our society that no one emerging from
our colleges and universities can be adequately prepared
for the world without some genuine understanding of the
American private enterprise system.

As business and the universities learn to understand
each other better, I am confident that our mutual respect
will grow and that new benefits will flow to the society we
both serve.
This issue of the Magazine opens with comments by the Chancellor about the Danforth Foundation’s $60 million challenge grant to Washington University. There is little that can be added here to the Chancellor’s discussion of the background of the grant, the opportunity it offers, and the vital necessity that the grant be matched. In addition, all alumni and other readers of this publication received full details of the grant in special mailings last month.

The central message in all this material is plain: the Danforth Foundation grant offers a major challenge and an unprecedented opportunity. Raising $60 million in private gifts over the next five years will not be easy, but it can be done. The Danforth Foundation issued the challenge on the basis of its very carefully considered conviction that the money can be raised, and Washington University’s Board of Trustees and administration accepted the challenge with the same conviction.

A recent study by the American Council on Education gives solid statistical evidence of the crucial importance of voluntary support of higher education. In 1971-72, the report shows, private donors made more than 3.8 million separate gifts totaling more than $1.5 billion to higher education. The report, based on survey data from 302 institutions, adjusted statistically to represent gifts to 1080 institutions, showed that private gifts came to about 10 per cent of the institutions’ expenditures—a vital 10 per cent.

The importance of large gifts cannot be over-estimated, and Washington University is starting off on a $120 million fund campaign with one enormous gift: the $60 million pledged by the Danforth Foundation if its grant is matched in five years. But small gifts are important, too. As reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education, the Council’s study shows that about 95 per cent of last year’s private gifts to colleges and universities were less than $5000 each, accounting for about 25 per cent of the total voluntary support. Following this pattern, to raise $60 million in private gifts will require 25 per cent, or $15 million, in gifts of under $5000 each.

The one-to-one matching provision of the Danforth Foundation grant offers an unusual opportunity for the donor. Most matching grants will provide one dollar for each two or three dollars raised, but the Danforth Foundation grant will match gifts from private sources dollar for dollar. This unusual matching provision provides a unique opportunity for the small donor to make his gift count. For every dollar he contributes, the University will receive two. In instances where an alumnus is employed by a company which matches an employee’s contribution to his institution, the alumnus can provide four dollars for the University for every dollar he contributes personally.

The Danforth Foundation challenge grant is just that: an unprecedented challenge for everyone concerned about the University and its future.

Shelby Jordan, the 6-7, 270-pound linebacker who sparked the Battling Bears to one of their best recent seasons last year, will be going to the Houston Oilers training camp this summer as their seventh-round draft choice. Shelby is the first Washington University player to be picked in a National Football League draft, although there have been other Hilltoppers who went into professional football, most notably Wilson “Bud” Schwenk, who went from the Washington University Bears to the then Chicago Cardinals to become the NFL Rookie of the Year in 1942.

A pre-med student during his brilliant career here, Shelby plans to work toward his M.D. while playing professional football. That sounds like a large order, but Shelby Jordan looks like just the man who can do it. An excellent student here, he won all defensive line and line-backing awards since the second of his four letter-years. He was named to the all-College Athletic Conference team after his junior season, and this fall received honorable mention in the Associated Press Little All-American choices and was named to the first team of the Kodak-Coaches Small College All-American.

On the subject of Hilltop sports, the article in the last issue on the University’s club hockey team brought in quite a flurry of mail—including a few writers who suggested that the editors spend some time in the penalty box for stating that the current club squad is the first ice hockey team ever fielded by Washington University. It turns out that in the late thirties, a Washington University entry was part of a four-team league that played regularly at the Arena. We checked the matter with Robert L. Burnes, sports editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, who confirmed the fact that there was indeed a spirited college ice hockey league here in the thirties. Burnes added that a great many Washington University and St. Louis University football players went out for the ice hockey team "because they liked the extra opportunity to bang people around."

—FO’B
Among the many historic and valuable items in Washington University's George N. Meissner Rare Book Department is George Washington's personal copy of a volume on Alexander the Great, published in 1767 and autographed by Washington on the title page.

Reported to be the only copy in the United States, the book itself is a rarity, but recently Roger Mortimer, head of the department, discovered between the pages of the book a spy report in Washington's handwriting.

The document, dated May, 1782, records the strength of the English forces during the closing days of the Revolutionary War. History records that on May 5, 1782, General Guy Carleton arrived in New York to take command of British forces in North America. The report details the additional soldiers who arrived with Carleton—700 English troops and 3300 mercenaries, and lists other forces already in the country.

The University's Rare Book Collection includes many other important items pertaining to the Revolutionary War, including twelve other autograph letters or documents of Washington and books from his library. There are also important letters of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson.