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Washington University undergraduates, like students everywhere, are a mixed bag of people. But, they all share roughly the same experience—the never-to-be-repeated undergraduate years. For a student’s view of those years, see page 14.
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New Approach to Biology Education

By Roger Signor

In 1973, Chancellor William H. Danforth announced the formation of the Division of Biology and Biomedical Sciences, which encompasses the Biology Department on the Hilltop campus and seven preclinical departments on the Medical School campus. Under this innovative approach to biology education, 150 professors from both campuses may teach undergraduate and graduate students in an organizational setting that encourages interdisciplinary collaboration.

Science seldom proceeds in the straightforward, logical manner imagined by outsiders,” James D. Watson wrote in his book, The Double Helix, an account of how he and Francis Crick had done their Nobel Prize-winning work on the chemical structure of deoxyribonucleic acid—DNA—in 1951-53. Their discovery, or model, of how the cell’s basic hereditary molecule is constructed, was one of the major advances in biology during the past twenty-five years. Along with many other fundamental revelations about genetics, it helped to attract increasing numbers of outstanding students to the field. The student, however, does not always know where or how his talents may be best put to work.

In Watson’s own case, his route to DNA was anything but logical. He wrote in The Double Helix: “In graduate school at Indiana University, it was my hope that the gene might be solved without my learning any chemistry. Briefly the Indiana chemists encouraged me to learn organic chemistry, but after I used a bunsen burner to warm up some benzene, I was relieved from further true chemistry. It was safer to turn out an uneducated Ph.D. than to risk another explosion.”

Finally, after a false start in postdoctoral work, he ended up at the Cavendish Laboratory of Cambridge University, where he collaborated with Francis Crick on the DNA model.

Although a lot has happened in biology and biology education since the early 1950’s, institutions of higher learning still are not best known for making life more simple for ambitious young scientists. Two critical questions face most educators: Are students aware of the options open to them? Is the institution free enough from disciplinary barriers so that a student in pursuit of an answer can cross into neighboring fields?

In an attempt to create an educational environment which provides students with these opportunities, Washington University in 1973 formed the Division of Biology and Biomedical Sciences, which includes the Department of Biology on the Hilltop campus, seven preclinical departments of the School of Medicine and a number of other selected faculty members.

Dr. Ralph A. Bradshaw, chairman of the Division’s Graduate Admissions Committee, said at a 1975 meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools that the Division was a natural outgrowth of well established trends in biology. “It is not unusual,” he pointed out, “to find the biochemist utilizing the electron microscope while the experimental pathologist is preparing hormones with radioisotopic labels.” The main incentive behind the Division, he noted, is that “the well prepared scientist needs to be adept in several areas and should not be held back in his search for incisive experiments by limited experience as a graduate student.”

Florence Moog, chairman of the Biology Department, observed, “for many years, Washington University has enjoyed a large community of brilliant and successful scientists. The Division provides a means for bringing them together with all biology students.” The resources of the entire faculty of the Division—more than 150 professors—are pooled, in the sense that they all may teach both undergraduate and graduate biology students.

In the Division, all graduate students are recruited by a single Admissions Committee into one of five major areas: plant biology, evolutionary biology and ecology, molecular biology, cellular and developmental biology, and neural sciences.

To consider the graduate student first, it is interesting to examine the experiences of William A. Frazier, recently appointed by the Division as an assistant professor of biochemistry and neurobiology. As an undergraduate student at Johns Hopkins University in 1969, he had no clearer idea than James Watson had about where he could do his best graduate work.

“It was purely fate that I entered Washington University’s Biochemistry Department,” he said. “I thought that it might not be best for me to stay at Johns Hopkins after four years and do my graduate work there too, but I really had little to go on in weighing the relative merits of various schools.”

The slight edge in helping Frazier decide in favor of Washington University was provided by Roy Vagelos, former head of the Biochemistry Department and the first director of the University’s Division of Biology and Biomedical Sciences, who brought Frazier to St. Louis for an interview. Although Vagelos, now senior vice president for research of the Merck, Sharpe and Dohme Laboratories, had an outstanding reputation in biochemistry, Frazier did not learn until after he enrolled in Vagelos’s department that Washington University had the freedom or flexibility that was required in order for him to do his best work.
Dr. Ralph A. Bradshaw, chairman of the Division's Graduate Admissions Committee, center, confers with M.D./Ph.D. candidate Robert E. Silverman and Ph.D. candidate Linda M. Keefer.

The University's tradition of an informal interdisciplinary atmosphere led to Frazier's making an outstanding contribution in basic science. He more clearly defined the essential nature of a critical protein, nerve growth factor, discovered in the early 1950's by the University's eminent developmental biologist, Professor Rita Levi-Montalcini. She had opened a new line of research by showing that the protein had a dramatic effect on the growth of certain nerve cells, or neurons.

"Again, my ultimately working on NGF was purely chance," Frazier said. "I had been on the campus a year when Ralph Bradshaw brought me together with a postdoctoral fellow in his lab, Ruth Angeletti, who was determining the amino acid sequence of NGF. She had done excellent work, resulting in the elucidation of NGF's amino acid sequence, at a time when this information was badly needed for further progress. After you know the amino acid sequence of a protein like NGF, the next thing is to see if it resembles other proteins.

"This step was very important in understanding NGF because no one knew what kind of growth-controlling agent it was. When I chose my doctoral research thesis, Angeletti had compared the structure of NGF to a few proteins in terms of size and other factors, but found no convincing similarities." Acting on data from Levi-Montalcini's laboratory that showed that the insulin molecule also had an effect on neurons, Frazier eventually was able to show that the structure of NGF was related to the structure of insulin and that the action of NGF at the surfaces of sympathetic nerve cells is similar to the way insulin binds with neurons in order to produce its metabolic effects. His work indicates that NGF belongs to a class of insulin-like regulators which act on many different kinds of tissue during the formation...
of the embryo.

"Several human disorders of the nervous system may in time be elucidated by a better understanding of NGF, but so far collaboration with clinicians hasn't provided proof that NGF is involved in any specific defect," Frazier said. "It won't be too many years, though, before a number of disciplines get together and make a meaningful clinical contribution."

In carrying nerve growth factor research forward another big step, Frazier pointed out that he had collaborations in the laboratories of five University divisions: Computer Sciences Laboratory, Pharmacology, Physiology, Anatomy, and Laboratory Medicine. "I actually went into the labs of people in these departments, set up experiments, and followed their leads," said Frazier. "It was genuine collaboration, not just conversation. There is great mobility here in crossing departmental lines and not nearly as many interdepartmental barriers as are usually found in an institution this size. That's why I returned to Washington University after two postdoctoral years elsewhere.

"This is a point that I've tried to make in talking to some potential graduate students for the Division. In general, you find two broad approaches in research. One is that a lab group says in effect, 'we know how to do this special technique better than anyone else and we will apply the same technique over and over.' The other, and I think much healthier, approach is to pursue your own science as far as you can yourself and then collaborate with people in as many different disciplines as your work carries you. It is relatively easy to do this at Washington University and that is the great strength of the Division."

Dr. W. Maxwell Cowan, director of the Division since February of 1975 and head of the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology for the past eight years, pointed out that the Division's scope of research ranges "all the way from molecular and developmental research like Frazier's at one end of the spectrum to ecology and plant biology at the other. The effect of forming the Division has been to open this diversity to all students because the efforts of more than 150 faculty members are now potentially coordinated."

The departments encompassed by the Division are Anatomy-Neurobiology; Biological Chemistry; Biology; Genetics; Microbiology; Pathology; Pharmacology, and Physiology-Biophysics. Graduate students, Cowan pointed out, normally enter one of five general interdepartmental programs. After a year of rotating in various laboratories they select a research project which they carry out in the laboratory of one or another member of the faculty.

Professor Cowan said, "I am convinced that Washington University will soon be one of a small group of major national centers for graduate education in biology and the biomedical sciences.

"The University traditionally has had its greatest strength in biological research, going back to Nobel Laureates like Carl and Gerty Cori, Joseph Erlanger, Herbert Gasser, and Arthur Kornberg. It has continued to produce outstanding scholars and the Division, in that sense, has not had an impact on the quality of research—the quality was already here. But the Division is certainly having a significant influence on both the quantity and quality of incoming graduate students. In 1975, we had 500 applicants for twenty-eight graduate student openings. Their average advanced Grad-

Jean Graham, a Ph.D. candidate in the Division's Neural Sciences Program, studies the visual system of the mammalian brain.
Graduate Biology education at this level in the United States is financed by both private and federal support. Washington University has a total of 180 biology graduate students, all of whom receive full tuition remission and an annual stipend. There are from eight to twelve openings each year for students working for the combined M.D./Ph.D. degree within the Division. This program, called the Medical Science Training Program, is significantly underwritten by a National Institutes of Health training grant. About twenty-three applicants compete for each of the M.D./Ph.D. openings annually. About half of the other twenty-eight graduate students entering the Division each year are financed by the University’s central budget.

“While we are doing as well as any other school in securing federal training grants that are available,” Cowan said, “graduate education is very expensive and we will need continuing and substantial support from private donors and foundations.”

The Division also has created ten new faculty positions to build its strengths in certain areas. The salaries for these positions are underwritten by the University, but the greater part of the individual research costs will have to be supported by research grants from the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation.

“The Division, as an administrative entity, has not been in existence long enough to have had much impact on undergraduate education,” Cowan continued. “But we are making good progress. Professor Dale Purves and I teach an introductory course in neurobiology for undergraduates and several Medical School professors collaborate with biology professor Oscar Chilson in teaching the introductory course in biochemistry. There have been about seventy to ninety undergraduate students in each of these courses and both courses received rather good student evaluations.”

Professor Cowan, who began his graduate studies in neurobiology at Oxford at the age of 21, went on to say, “My colleagues and I have been privileged to live through the exciting heydays of research in molecular biology. Naturally that field has attracted the lion’s share of new biology students, but we are now seeing a comparable influx of students into the neurosciences. Understanding the way in which our brain functions and how the nervous system is put together is an exciting prospect, but one which will depend on advances in molecular biology.”

The application of molecular biology to studies of plant cells is also one of the most popular areas with today’s students, Cowan pointed out. “They see considerable relevance in solving basic problems in plant growth and plant genetics as possible means of feeding the world’s expanding population. Washington University’s Biology Department has one of the nation’s largest laboratory groups examining the fundamental cellular mechanisms that protect plants under stress.”

The Plant Biology Program, as one of the Division’s five broad areas of graduate student specialization, should attract increasing numbers of students. The Division’s Evolutionary Biology and Ecology Program may also eventually become one of the more popular areas of graduate specialization. It has at its disposal the University’s 2000-acre Tyson Research Center, an ecological preserve twenty miles west of the Hilltop Campus. Ecology research however, may take students as far afield as the Rocky Mountains. One Ph.D. candidate studying under Owen Sexton, professor of biology, is identifying environmental factors that cause wildlife to choose quite different routes of adaptation. The student, John Bizer, is doing both field studies of a salamander in the Rockies and is raising the same species in his laboratory to determine why in some instances it spends its adult life in the water after being hatched, but under other circumstances becomes a terrestrial animal. Hormones are critical during such adaptations, Professor Sexton pointed out, and as a result such studies are of interest to endocrinologists who are investigating hormonal action.

Washington University has had traditional strength in the area of Cellular and Developmental Biology, in which Levi-Montalcini, Moog, and Hamburger, former Biology Department chairman, have made outstanding contributions in teaching and research. With Hamburger’s retirement and Moog handling administrative duties, however, new faculty will be added in this very challenging field.

“One of the outstanding unsolved problems in this area,” said Moog, “is how groups of different cell types associate with one another in order to construct tissues on up through development of an entire organ. Part of this question will be solved by better understanding the changes that take place in the cell’s surface before various critical stages of development. Because of the importance of knowing more about the cell surface, many students are interested in doing research in this field.”

Professor Frazier is one of those recent converts to the field of cell surface biology. “I don’t work on NGF now, but I’m going to look at the broader question of cell interactions which might regulate development,” Frazier said. To do this, he is examining cell surface interactions in one of the simplest organisms, a strain of slime mold. His hopes for progress with this new line of research illustrate both the imagination of young faculty members in Washington University’s new Division and their desire to be a part of meaningful interaction of biological disciplines.

When someone has done a basic piece of work on a simple organism well enough, it often can be applied to higher organisms. As Frazier put it, “The day I’d certainly hope for would be when I felt we could go over to our colleagues in neurosciences and apply this model to a nerve cell.”
Golden Anniversary

By Dorothy Brockhoff

The George Warren Brown School of Social Work is observing its fiftieth birthday this year. In preparation for the celebration, Social Work Professor Ralph E. Pumphrey and Philip R. Popple, a candidate for the doctoral degree in social work, did intensive research on the School's history. Without their scholarship, this article could not have been prepared.

Almost two years ago, a petite, young woman with a giant-sized name—Chloe Constantinopoulou—landed at Lambert St. Louis International Airport. As a Greek Cypriot from Nicosia, she had come from almost half a world away to study at Washington University's George Warren Brown School of Social Work.

Fifty years ago, when what is now called GWB by all its alumni, was established, she would have seemed as exotic as an orchid blooming on the Brookings quad. Today, as one of twenty-six students from eighteen foreign countries enrolled at GWB, she attracted attention but little curiosity in a school of social work which courts its cosmopolitan milieu.

GWB's United Nations flavor is no accident. It is working hard to become No. 1 in terms of foreign-born enrolled in the more than eighty graduate schools of social work in this country. It has also made a determined effort to grow (GWB is now ninth in size among comparable schools) and to rank high academically (Change, the national "Magazine of Higher Learning," placed it among the top ten professional schools of social work).

For these and many other reasons (2500 alumni in forty-nine states—all except Alaska—and in twenty countries), GWB has reason to celebrate its Golden Jubilee this May with a gala program featuring some of the most prominent social workers in the country—all of them graduates of GWB. This event is sponsored by the School and its Alumni Association.

After the celebration, Chloe Constantinopoulou will head back home with her M.S.W. degree. That she came to Washington University in the first place was due partly to the influence of her former teacher, Orietta Exarchou, a GWB alumna '61. Equally important, she recalled not long ago, were the letters of encouragement she received from Professor Richard J. Parvis, director of the foreign students program at GWB. "When I applied to other schools, I received printed and mimeographed materials. But Professor Parvis's replies related directly to my concerns. I felt that this was a warmer kind of environment, and I thought, 'Gee, I'd like to study there.'"

Professor Parvis handles every foreign student's application to GWB with the same courtesy. His thoughtfulness even includes making sure that someone is on hand at Lambert Field to greet each new student from abroad. He was there personally to welcome Miss Constantinopoulou.

The School of Social Work at Washington University, which Miss Constantinopoulou entered in the fall of 1974, was very different from the modest training program from which it developed in the mid-1920's. Today, with an enrollment of some 400 students (forty-five of them candidates for the Ph.D. degree) and a curriculum of almost eighty courses, GWB is a vigorous institution with a proud record of achievement. This reputation is responsible, in large measure, for the hundreds of ap-
Without the loyal support of GWB alumni, the 50th anniversary celebration of the founding of the GWB School of Social Work would never have taken place.

Meeting with Dean Shanti K. Khinduka (far right) are: (from the left) Pearlie Evans, district assistant to Congressman William Clay; George Eberle, Jr., executive director, Consolidated Neighborhood Services, Inc.; Homer C. Bishop, associate director of Hull House, Chicago; and Ronda Richardson O’Farrell, president of the GWB Alumni Association and school social worker, O’Fallon, Illinois, Grade District 90.
plications for admission which GWB receives annually. From this number, GWB accepted 213 students as candidates for the master's degree (the second largest class in history) during the 1975-76 academic year.

This flourishing school is the outgrowth of a fledgling entity called the Washington University Training Course for Social Work which opened in 1925 as a part of the Department of Sociology in the University's College of Liberal Arts. It owed its existence, in large measure, to J. Lionberger Davis, who headed a special advisory committee formed by the newly created St. Louis Community Council "to consider plans for social work education in St. Louis." After prolonged negotiations with Washington University, this committee recommended to Chancellor Herbert S. Hadley in 1924 that a chair of applied sociology be established and suggested that Frank J. Bruno of the University of Minnesota be hired to direct it. The Committee guaranteed his salary at $7000 per year for three years—a princely sum in those days—and equal to that earned by Otto Heller, then Dean of the University's Graduate School.

Such a major investment was predicated on the idea that this social work program should be of exceptional quality. Earlier efforts to introduce social work education in St. Louis, beginning with the founding of the School of Philanthropic Work in 1903 as a training arm of the St. Louis Provident Association, had not been successful. As a Board member of the Provident agency, Davis was painfully aware of the School's desperate struggle to survive.

Over the years, it became a sort of institutional foundling. Known successively as the St. Louis School of Philanthropy and then the St. Louis School of Social Economy, it was adopted at various times by both the University of Missouri and Washington University. In 1924, it finally closed its doors. Today, two of the institution's former teachers, Roger Baldwin, a former board member who went on to found the American Civil Liberties Union, and William Marion Reedy, the gifted editor of Reedy's Mirror, are much better known than the defunct school itself.

In view of this rather sorry record, it is not surprising, then, that Chancellor Hadley was less than enthusiastic when he accepted the Community Council's proposals and appointed Professor Bruno to the faculty on January 1, 1925. Acutely aware that only ten years earlier his predecessor, Chancellor Frederic A. Hall, had summarily dropped the School of Social Economy from the University for "lack of interest," Chancellor Hadley made it quite clear that he would not guarantee support of this program beyond the three-year period.

His caution contrasted sharply with Professor Bruno's spirit of optimistic determination. As one anonymous admirer has written appreciatively: "He saw this School whole as it might become, even when it had little wherewithal for continuing." It was fortunate that he was a man of such vision and vitality, because, as he observed: "St. Louis until 1923 was backward with respect to the progress it has made in the matters of social work technique in comparison with American communities of similar size and wealth." Essentially conservative, it has tended over the years to drag its heels when confronted with anything new. And social work was relatively new. It had its beginnings in the panic of the 1890's, which brought with it the muckrakers' clamor for reform.

The result of a melding of the charity organization movement with the settlement house movement, social work developed as a response to human needs. Broad, expansive, and impossible to define, it has always had trouble deciding, as Ralph and Muriel Pumphrey have pointed out in their book, The Heritage of American Social Work, "whether its primary obligation was to serve individuals or to promote the good of the society in general." Concentrating on one or the other (or at times, both) of these objectives, its practitioners, in turn, have had trouble sorting out their precise purposes.

Perhaps Mary Richmond, one of the pioneers of social work thought and a former teacher of Professor Bruno, expressed it best when she commented around the turn of the century: "What an inestimable gain to humanity when those who are doctoring social diseases in many departments of charitable work shall have found a common ground of agreement, and be forced to recognize certain established principles as underlying all effective service! Not immediately, of course, but slowly and steadily such a common ground could be established by a training school for our professional workers."

In New York, Boston, and Chicago, where such training schools had been successfully organized by 1919, social workers did begin to hammer out a set of general concepts. But in St. Louis, where such early training schools had aborted, it proved more difficult to forge a consensus on fundamentals.

It was to this problem that Professor Bruno addressed himself as director of the program of social work education at Washington University. Ten years after coming to St. Louis, he published a book, The Theory of Social Work, which attempted to systematize the scientific base on which he believed the profession of social work should be built. "His emphasis on these dual attributes of social work, professionalism, and science, were the major factors which shaped the development of social work training at Washington University," according to graduate student Philip R. Popple, a thorough student of this historical period.

At the same time that he was giving much thought to theory and principles, Professor Bruno was also preoccupied with practicalities. Only a few months after arriving on campus, he learned that Isidor Loeb, the new dean of the University's School of Commerce and Finance, was eager to broaden the scope of his domain by annexing social work. Professor Bruno was fearful of such a union because of the problems it had created at other universities where such a marriage was already a fait accompli.

Nevertheless, during the 1926-27 academic year, Professor Bruno himself opted for a transfer to the School of Commerce and Finance after his social
Evelyn Bonander (center), Director, Department of Social Work, Barnes Hospital and WU Medical School, GWB 66, confers with (left) Trudy Wright, head nurse of the WU Chromalloy American Kidney Center, and (right) Patricia McKeveit, GWB 69, at the Center.

Wayne Hess, right, GWB graduate student, does his field work at the Seventh Police District, St. Louis. Specializing in police department social work, he confers here with ambulance drivers who have just brought in a sick prisoner.
work program, because of its emphasis on specialization and field work, encountered strong opposition in the College of Liberal Arts. He insisted, however, that “responsibility for the development of the Training Course should be left in my hands.”

With the addition of social work, the School of Commerce and Finance changed its name to the School of Business and Public Administration. It turned out to be an amicable arrangement as Professor Bruno acknowledged on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Training Course, when he paid tribute to Dean Loeb “as one of the three men deserving special recognition.” Social work remained a part of the School of Business until July, 1945, when the George Warren Brown School of Social Work was made an autonomous unit during a general reorganization of the University.

The freedom that Professor Bruno insisted upon permitted him to shape the curriculum of the new Training Program into the structure prevailing at many of the other leading schools of social work of that era. Philosophically, as Popple has noted, Professor Bruno advocated “blending the traditional sociological approach with the psychiatric emphasis that was becoming increasingly influential in the social work profession.”

Practically, he stressed the importance of casework. According to Homer Bishop, MSW ’48, a former faculty member at GWB and now associate director of Hull House in Chicago, “Professor Bruno never taught a class that was psychoanalytically oriented, but he was influential in helping to direct the entrance into casework of the whole psychoanalytic theory.” It came as no surprise, then, when GWB played a prominent role in persuading Dr. E. Van Norman Emery to come to St. Louis in 1936. The first psychoanalyst to take up residence in the city, he joined the GWB faculty as professor of social psychiatry.

For a time during its early formative years, GWB was plagued with money problems. Davis and his friends provided a Band-Aid type of assistance at several critical periods, but no one, it seemed, was willing to make a substantial investment in GWB’s future.

Then, suddenly, help came from a totally unexpected source. A half-million-dollar gift from assets of the estate of the late George Warren Brown, a well-known shoe manufacturer who had died in 1921, was made to the University by his widow in 1928 for the establishment and endowment of the George Warren Brown Department of Social Work. It became an independent unit of the School of Business and Public Administration. When Mrs. Brown died six years later, she bequeathed one half of her estate to the University for a major expansion of the social work program.

With its dedication in 1937, Brown Hall became, according to Chancellor George R. Throop, “the first building erected in this country solely for the purpose of social work.” On that ceremonial occasion, Professor Bruno announced the elimination of GWB’s undergraduate curriculum, and stated that henceforth GWB would focus only on a two-year graduate program. (Professor Pumphrey has noted that an undergraduate “junior-professional” program was revived during World War II and remained a part of the curriculum until 1952).

For one period during Professor Bruno’s tenure, GWB had satellite teaching units in outstate Missouri at such places as Moberly, Canton, St. Joseph, Hannibal, and Warrensburg. These were phased out during World War II, when the tire shortage made travel difficult. GWB also maintained a somewhat larger facility in Kansas City at about the same time. Homer Bishop recalls that he and some of his colleagues made the round trip from St. Louis to Kansas City regularly for awhile. Eventually, the Kansas City operation became a part of the School of Social Work at the University of Kansas.

Among Professor Bruno’s many talents was the ability to persuade persons of exceptional ability to join the GWB faculty. Such a man was Benjamin E. Youngdahl, who came to GWB in 1939, after having served nearly seven years as director of public welfare for the State of Minnesota. A member of a prominent Minnesota family, Professor Youngdahl had ten brothers and sisters, many of whom were noted for their leadership in law, religion, politics, and education.

Professor Youngdahl left the faculty for two years during World War II to serve on General Dwight D. Eisenhower’s staff with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Upon his return in 1945, he was named Dean of the newly created George Warren Brown School of Social Work.

Writing of his contributions recently, Professor Ralph E. Pumphrey said of him:

A friend of Roger Baldwin’s and an outspoken advocate of civil liberties, one of the accomplishments of which he was most proud was that he opened the doors of GWB to black students, the first school on the Hilltop campus to take this step. He was forceful, yet gracious, and his administrative responsibilities had projected him into the national arena. His leadership was recognized with the presidencies of the three major social work organizations: the American Association of Social Workers, the National Conference on Social Welfare, and American Association of Schools of Social Work.

For his many contributions in the area of public policy, Dean Youngdahl received the Florina Lasker Award in Social Welfare in 1963.

As Dean of GWB, he strengthened the curriculum which Professor Bruno had introduced. Emphasis on psychiatric social work tended to overshadow other forms of casework, thanks to the flood of training grants and stipends from the National Institute of Mental Health, created in 1947. Among his most important innovations was the establishment of one of the first social work doctoral programs in this country. As its director, in 1951 he imported Professor William E. Gordon from the Nashville School of Social Work. Primarily concerned with the quality of education, this young professor, with Dean Youngdahl’s encouragement, made empirical research the focus of the GWB doctoral program. Presently celebrating his twenty-fifth anniversary with GWB, he long ago turned over the lea—
Students on camera in the GWB Learning Resources Center in Brown Hall make a stimulus tape for classroom teaching. The audiovisual program is directed by Professor David Katz.

ership of this doctoral program to a colleague, Professor Aaron Rosen.

But the purpose and direction of the programs remain the same—"To train students how to engage in scientific work in order to contribute to the body of professional knowledge." Forty-five graduates have been awarded the D.S.W. degree. Beginning in 1970, the twenty-four students successfully completing the GWB doctoral program have been awarded the Ph.D. degree. Oriented toward the social sciences, this Ph.D. program at GWB is administered by an interdisciplinary committee headed by Professor Rosen.

In 1962, after having served as dean for seventeen years, Youngdahl retired as head of GWB. Collectively, he and his predecessor, Frank Bruno, had spent almost forty years as leaders of the school. Men of vastly different temperament (Bruno was gentle and philosophical; Youngdahl, dynamic and forceful) both were endowed with the sound judgment which enabled them to choose faculty wisely and well.

Wayne Vasey, Dean Youngdahl's successor, paid tribute to a few of them some years ago when he wrote: "GWB to many of you suggests the wit and wisdom of Louis Towley, the gentle compassion and dedication to service of Mary Hester, the timeless contributions of William Burke, Ruth Lewis, Helen Hayden, and others who are no longer with us." Many other names come to mind, for GWB over the years has had the good fortune to number among its faculty men and women remarkable for their devotion to the profession of social work and the students they have inspired.

Dean Vasey's tenure at GWB was comparatively brief, characterized by a growing demand for change. Except for one year (1964-65), which he spent organizing St. Louis's anti-poverty program as the first general manager of the St. Louis Human Development Corporation, he was embroiled in a controversy between those who wanted a rigidly structured curriculum and others who advocated more self-expression. He responded by introducing one elective into the curriculum—much to the consternation of some who were determined to resist innovation.

In the midst of this struggle, Dean Vasey resigned in 1967 to accept a professorship at the University of Michigan School of Social Work. Ralph Garber, from Rutgers University, arrived in mid-August of 1968 to assume the position of dean. Professor Pumphrey recalls that "after an initial period of good will," the situation was strained. He added: "Some of the decisions reached were less than perfect, but, on the whole, they represented the best thinking of substantial majorities of both students and faculty." Flexibility and independence characterized the curriculum, including the field work. Students were free to make their own arrangements for field study after consultation with their advisers. Some viewed these new developments as constructive innovations; others regarded them as dubious responses. Tension mounted, aggravated and exacerbated by the escalation of the war in the Far East and the violence at Kent State.

Nevertheless, Dean Garber, a patient mediator, managed to avert both a breakdown in communications and a suspension of school activities. Day-to-day operations and negotiations were never interrupted. Ultimately, in 1973, however, Dean Garber resigned to become Dean of the School of Social Work at Rutgers.

Among his most important accomplishments was his part in the creation of three joint-degree programs involving the cooperation of the Schools of Law and
Architecture and the Graduate Institute of Education. Believed to be unique in this country, each of these programs has a common purpose: to provide students with degrees in two separate but increasingly interdependent disciplines. The joint program with law leads to a J.D. degree and a master of social work degree; the joint program with architecture to graduate degrees in both architecture and social work; and the social work-GIE program to master’s degree in education (counseling) and social work.

Ralph Garber was succeeded in July, 1974, by Shanti Khinduka, a native of Jaipur, India, who, at the time of his appointment, was professor of social work and assistant dean of the School of Social Service at Saint Louis University.

Dean Khinduka carefully and cautiously moved to restore a sense of balance to GWB, which, like many other institutions, had been sorely tried during the past several decades. One of his early moves was to hire David Cronin as director of GWB’s practicum (field work) program.

Cronin’s first major objective has been to provide direction for a program which involves coordinating the efforts of 110 different agencies, 185 instructors, and some 237 students. He views himself as a “kind of monitor to guarantee quality education for the student.” His task is made easier because he is building on a firm foundation cemented over the years by close ties between town and gown. He pointed out that there are sixteen different areas of service from which GWB students can choose. All candidates for the master’s degree must devote at least 750 hours to field work in order to fulfill graduation requirements. During the fall semester last year, GWB students contributed 49,500 hours of volunteer service to groups and institutions in the Greater St. Louis Metropolitan Area.

Dean Khinduka, in formulating new plans, procedures, and policies, has sought the cooperation and counsel of the faculty. He has also encouraged student involvement in the decision-making process by meeting from time to time with the members of their governing board: Jeannie Costin, Richard Goldstein, Debra Isroff, and Terry Jablonski-Polk. These leaders, in turn, have worked hard to involve the student body at large through the creation of various student-faculty committees.

Dean Khinduka is also concerned with introducing what he calls a core curriculum at GWB next fall. All students will be expected either to complete or test out of four basic courses deemed essential. “On this base,” he explained, “we will build three areas of concentration—direct social service, community organization and development, and social administration.” Other areas will be added later. Such a program, he believes, will continue to permit GWB students a large measure of flexibility coupled with enough structure to assure competence in whatever specialty of social work they choose.

Also in the planning stages is another joint degree program involving cooperation with the School of Business and Public Administration. Its purpose will be to provide social work students with administrative and policy skills and business majors with the insights and techniques of social service professionals.

Dean Khinduka also hopes to link the School of Social Work into an interdisciplinary health consortium and to establish two named professorships within the next few years. Meanwhile, architects are now working on the blueprints for a $140,000 renovation of Brown Hall’s basement which would make possible the expansion of GWB’s Learning Resources Center.

Soon after arriving on campus, Dean Khinduka invited Robert Wintersmith, a specialist on law enforcement and social work, to join the faculty. Recently, he has added four additional new faculty. They are: Martha Ozawa, a respected authority on social security and psychiatry; Duncan Lindsey, trained in sociology and psychiatry; Eloise Rathbone-McCuan, an expert on geriatric day care; and Paul Stuart, completing his work for a Ph.D. degree at the University of Wisconsin in both social work and history. Dean Khinduka emphasized that recruiting outstanding faculty is one of his preeminent goals, and added that he expects to continue his search for distinguished teachers.

It is fortunate that GWB is experiencing a revitalization, for if current projections are correct, there will be increasing demand for the professionals trained here. Said Dean Khinduka: “As long as injustice exists, social workers will be needed to raise their voices against it and to help comfort the victims. In countries which don’t have the basic amenities,” he continued, “social workers will continue to focus on basic problems of survival. Some leaders of such beleaguered nations believe, erroneously of course, that you can afford to ignore immediate social and interpersonal problems because even existence is at stake. But problems of everyday living become matters of special concern when the fundamental needs of people have been met.

That is why, he explained, “the United States will need more social workers in the future than a country where starvation is the problem. Today, a large number of social workers are providing increasing service to the middle class, and a number of them are entering private practice.”

“But,” he concluded, “the fundamental purpose of the social work profession remains unchanged. As practitioners, we are keenly aware of our commitment to institutional reforms for improving the conditions of the poor, the handicapped, and all the other vulnerable segments of our society who are in need and require our help.” For these as well as many other reasons, Dean Khinduka believes that GWB’s responsibilities will increase as it expands its resources to train the social workers for the years ahead.
Elizabeth Knoll, a sophomore from Lincoln, Nebraska, is a George E. Mylonas Scholar in the humanities. She is majoring in the new joint program in literature and history and serves as arts editor of Student Life. At present, she is wavering between following the traditional Ph.D. route toward a career in university teaching, or “more realistically, in dishwashing and journalism.” Here are a sophomore’s impressions of the quality of education and life on this campus.
Somehow every student who comes to Washington University suffers some culture shock; adjusting to what is a strange place to everyone is the most demanding thing required of us at a demanding school. The New Yorkers have to adjust to St. Louis’s lack of immediately available “culchuh” and the quiet of the self-enclosed campus; the Midwesterners and Southerners have to adjust to the New Yorkers. Some give up and transfer to colleges nearer home; the more successful keep their sense of humor up front and their backs to the wall at all times.

One Iowan announced gleefully at the end of her freshman year that she had at last learned to say “cwafer wit’ sugah,” while a senior from New Jersey, whose ignorance of grain was made up for by her sincerity, looked forward to visiting Nebraska to eat “a corn.” After Israeli Awareness Week—several days of dances, food and speakers, sponsored by the Office of Campus Programming—one disgruntled Italian Catholic demanded equal time. On the underpass, the semi-official graffiti board, he painted an announcement of “Goy Awareness Week,” complete with appearances of Billy Graham, Pope Paul, and St. Thomas Aquinas.

Most of us get used to the new environment on our own and create our own groups of friends that go their own way. Freshman year, the dorm floor can be a good home to run to at the end of the day. If your neighbor’s door is ajar, you knock; if it’s wide open, you know open house is being held and wander in to share the cookies in your CARE package, complain about your psychology lab, or play literary trivia until two in the morning.

The Resident Advisors—upperclassmen or grad students in charge of floor activities and arbiters of floor conflicts—vary in their styles. Some are mother figures, some more or less efficient administrators, some pals; some are best at private conversation (known in Counseling Service language as active listening skills), while others run their floors like Scout camps, with songs and cheers in well-organized pandemonium. As one RA pointed out, “Even if the people on your floor aren’t your best friends, you always wind up with a special tie because you lived together freshman year.”

Other floors house mixed freshmen and upperclassmen, and though the sense of we’re-all-in-this-together is less strong, often a ragtag cohesiveness grows up from chatting in the halls, watching TV, hunting for lost toothpaste in the bathroom. (The bathrooms, as a matter of fact, turn into the social centers of the floors as we fill hot pots or wait for showers.) The opposite of a freshman floor on the South Forty is Lee, a quiet dorm for upperclassmen where compulsive students leave their coffee in the library, or the high rise quiet floors where even the parties are quiet and where no stereo blasts from dusk to dawn.

Life on the South Forty is dominated by freshman frenzy and sophomore slump. (If the present crowding in the dorms is any sign, the usual junior exodus to apartments has slowed slightly in the last year or so. The girl who lived for a semester in a closet may simply have been ahead of her time.) A few rooms are cells where the occupant clearly doesn’t bother with repainting or memo boards or the inevitable window boxes and Toulouse-Lautrec posters; others are palatial, with complete pantries, doorbells, and stereo equipment enough to make a dorm sound like Carnegie Hall.

Despite the yogurt and/or beer in the refrigerators and the crackers on the shelves (the Coop stocks every variety in the Western world), we are all on meal plans and, willy-nilly, must go to Wohl Center sometimes. Each of the four cafeteria lines has its own character and own adherents, and once a routine is set it’s hard to drop. For instance, jocks and fraternity boys rumble into Line A at six o’clock, while vegetarians on the Spartan meal plan (breakfast and dinner only) appear in D at four-thirty. Except that D has the vegetarian line, the food in each is, depressingly enough, exactly the same.

Meals are a good opportunity for socializing as it’s possible to spend more than an hour over a bowl of lettuce and cottage cheese and endless glasses of Tab. If the conversation about classes runs out, there’s always ritual bitching about the food. Anything with a fancy name—chicken a la king, beef bourguignon—is likely to be gravy; the chicken, now fried, clearly died of starvation; the rolls are hard and the apples soft. And if the mailbox has been empty for a week, it all tastes even duller.

It’s no wonder, then, that snacktime begins as soon as it does. For all of us reared by conscientious mothers who insisted on adequate nourishment, food is of paramount importance and makes for a good study break as well. The Coop, the South Forty’s grocery; Fat Albert’s, the well-named coffee shop where there is nothing on the menu less than 300 calories; and Catcher in the Rye, at the bottom of Shepley dorm, all supply the minimum daily requirements of carbohydrates. The general diet leans heavily on Dannon yogurt, crackers, ice cream, and bagels. An English major planning a novel about college life has decided, after two years on the South Forty, to describe all emotions with oral imagery, concluding, like Shaw, that “there is no love sincerer than the love of food.”

Such dubious nourishment gives us
energy enough to go back to work, perhaps to Olin Library, where, as the evening wears on, more people can be found gossiping on the stairs than buried in the carrels, or perhaps back to the dorms. The elevator riders in the high-rises stare at the floor indicator panel to avoid staring at each other; while the low-risers puff up their flights of stairs, grousing that those living on the third floor ought to get a unit of PE credit. The network of phone lines, stretching from room to room, is charged with interdorm calls (or long-distance after eleven). Sometimes, you can look out your window and see someone in another dorm talking to you: “What result did you get in yesterday’s lab? How did your harpsichord lesson go? Can I borrow your copy of Donne? Want to go to Fat A’s?”

Friends are made during freshman and sophomore years, from the dorm, from classes, even from seeing the same faces at meals day after day, but the rite-of-passage junior year is the move to apartments off-campus. Second-semester sophomores spend as much time looking for roommates and for apartments as they do studying, and Student Life’s classified ads teem with calls for either or both. Simply being able to leave the campus helps people escape the insularity of class pressures. They can get mail out of real mailboxes, cook their own meals in their own kitchens, wash dishes, call the plumber, and pretend to be real people—the highest ambition of any full-time student. They run into dorm friends in Holmes Lounge or Olin Library and, if they look peaked enough, invite them home for supper. Somehow, a hamburger in an apartment tastes better than what one freshman calls Surrogate Veal Parmesan in Wohl. The dormies will be suitably impressed, vow to move out as soon as possible, and thus the tradition perpetuates itself.

Some people live in fraternity houses—the WU sororities have only meeting rooms—but only 15 per cent of the student body goes Greek. One girl hesitated to join because, said a friend in all seriousness, “she wasn’t sure she wanted the stigma of belonging.” All the same, the fraternities and sororities are not the snobbish social clubs they can be in some places. They seem to be mostly loose groups of people having fun, building their communities around their clubs.

Some students, but not many, build their communities around campus activities. Certainly there are places, whether in Student Union, Congress of the South Forty, dorm councils, various judicial boards, Student Life, for anyone who cares to try. Not too many have in the past few years. It sometimes seems as if the same half-dozen people hold all offices in rotation, simply because they’re industrious and are the only ones interested. Thanks to the general apathy toward campus government, there is no sense of cliquishness and practically no Big Men (or Women) On Campus. The percentage of students who don’t know who the president of Student Union is could be equalled only by the percentage of U.S. citizens who think the Declaration of Independence is a subservive Communist document. The high school yearbook editors and Key Club presidents and Future Physicians of America treasurers who make up the WU student body now want and need only to study and live their private lives.

There’s no 1950’s style school spirit, no ‘60’s style political activism—the grandiloquently named Revolutionary Student Brigade comprises six tense Maoists at WU, whose exhortations to battle racist imperialist American capitalism elicit cynical groans. If there is any ruling passion, it is academic. “Harvard: Washington University of the East,” claim the T-shirts, and the mixture of self-mockery and hyperbole sums up the general attitude. We may go through feckless stages, especially when spring begins, and declare that school is driving us crazy and all we want to do is lie in the Quad and watch the WU dogs make love and war. Yet, somehow we are pulled back to classes, back to the library. That fecklessness is constantly threatened by interest (which we darkly suspect to be neurotic) in our work.

It’s hard not to become interested in a subject when the professor teaching it is enthusiastic, as most of them are. “Where else could I get paid for doing what I love?” asked one, who expansively invited over for a beer anyone in a class of one hundred who wanted to talk more about biology and the ecosystem in no other way does he resemble the English professor whose excitement about a lecture on Jude the Obscure can be measured in the rate of her cigarette consumption, or the elderly comp. lit. professor whose eyes light up and who peppers a description of Goethe’s Faust with “fantastic” and “incredible,” or the history professor who relates scandal about George III as if he were a neighbor, but they all have in common that fascination with their subject.

Perhaps because many faculty members live near the campus and near each other, perhaps because some husbands and wives are both on the staff, or perhaps because they simply have the dedication of a secular clergy, they make themselves very accessible to students, even appear to like them. Almost all professors keep regular office hours, and almost all are willing to talk when flagged down in a hallway or on a path. It’s easy to be a little in awe of them when you first come to WU, but soon you realize
that the preoccupied frown on a professorial forehead is not caused by the difficulty of proving a theorem but by the difficulty of getting a TV repairman. Chances are that some professor you like becomes your adviser, officially or unofficially. They all have experience with the role of mentor.

Departments vary widely, of course, in size and style: 100-level chemistry has nothing in common with 400-level German. In one class may be found multiple-choice midterms and finals, in another short papers and tests, in another one gigantic term paper. One class may be a lecture in a crowded hall, another a discussion in a closet-sized seminar room. Science classes tend to be the largest, with some social sciences close behind—hardly surprising in a University where the most popular majors seem to be biology, political science, and psychology.

Contrary to popular myth, not everyone is pre-med (some are pre-law), but it's sometimes hard to tell from the intensity with which everyone studies. On the day of the first Biology 101 exam last year, I went from my dorm to breakfast to my first class (which was, thank heaven, political science), and heard no one talking about anything but the test. As we all know from Doonesbury cartoons, pre-meds lurk in libraries with crazed glints in their eyes as they memorize their genetics textbook, and that glint is catching. During midterms and finals, all roads lead to Olin Library. Those with a literary bent spin elaborate comparisons of its five floors with the circles of Dante's hell; the lighter-minded observe that the fact that the reading room is actually the talking center and the lounges the quietest places in the building make it much more like Alice's Wonderland.

The conversations, of course, are about classes, assignments, term papers, lab writeups. The opening line is not "How are you?" but "How's your work?" There's a melancholy one-upmanship about work: the closer you profess to be to nervous breakdown, the more status you have. One freshman with a macabre sense of humor drew up an informal list of all possible places to commit suicide, but doubted that he'd ever use them: "After all, killing myself might hurt my chances of getting into med school."

The humanities students are the lucky ones, with their small classes, their proximity to the Quad and to Holmes Lounge, with its inspirational Renaissance ceiling, and their realization that in the total economic impracticality of what they are doing they are being classically educated. As one cheerfully fatalistic comp. lit. major remarked, "It's only fair that the chemical engineers get the jobs, when we've had all the fun for four years." But the tension of midterms and finals makes a camaraderie among even a pre-med behind on his lab writeups, a chemical engineer required to duplicate life as a final project, and a French major looking for Biblical symbols in the stories of Camus. At the worst moments they can go to Fat Albert's together, eat mocha chip ice cream with butterscotch sauce, and cry.

Such evenings can be very grim indeed, despite the soothing nature of food, but fortunately they—and the tests, the flu epidemics, the weeks of rain, or of lack of mail which inspire them—don't last long. Sooner or later—and this year it's certainly sooner—spring and good humor return. The T-shirts and Scholl's sandals are unearthed, kites float above the intramural field on Saturday afternoon, bikers escape to Forest Park; in the Quad, the air is dark with frisbees. Olin's doors are open, so it's easy to run inside, check out Volume I of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, and run out again to read on the lawn. The dogwood outside Graham Chapel, confused by the warm weather, begins to bloom in February and a few frustrated interior decorators break off branches to put in empty coke bottles in their rooms, as if to remind themselves that time passes and beauty stays.
The principal speaker at the 1976 Founders Day banquet of Washington University was David Brinkley, the veteran of thirty years with the National Broadcasting Company. The Huntley-Brinkley Report, on the air for fourteen years, won ten Emmy Awards and two Peabody Awards. Brinkley began his NBC career as a White House correspondent after World War II. In 1956, he and Chet Huntley covered the political conventions and began an association that lasted until Huntley’s retirement in 1970. “David Brinkley’s Journal” is now seen five times weekly on the nightly news. Below is a slightly condensed version of David Brinkley’s Founders Day address.

This is, of course, our political year.

I would like to recall to your minds the most totally, utterly, insignificant piece of modern American political history, because I know you’ve forgotten it. In Miami Beach in 1972, when they nominated Spiro Agnew for Vice President, I came in second. He got 1485 votes and I got one. That is not a close second but it is second. So when Agnew resigned for cheating on his income taxes, I stayed by the telephone a few days thinking that, in the unlikely event there was any justice in American politics, since I came in second, they would call me. Needless to say they didn’t.

My only reason for bringing this up is to make a little self-serving announcement that during those years when I stood two heartbeats away from the Presidency, I accepted no bribes. But, I have to tell you, nobody offered me any. I am sure you will all join me in the hope that this year’s political campaign is somewhat cleaner than 1972’s, when as you will recall, there were a great many scurrilous charges against the various candidates circulated anonymously in the mail. One of them was that Hubert Humphrey was involved in some kind of illicit, amorous relationship, which I thought was absurd, because Hubert would talk all the way through it.

I probably should save this until last, but I want to get a rather unattractive fact out of the way early. The other day I saw in a magazine devoted to academic affairs an estimate that in an average year the alumni of all of this country’s institutions of higher education give approximately $2 billion, which is excellent. Nothing like that occurs in any other country in the world, and you and I and all of us who give as often as we can have every right to take pride in being able and willing to do it. But, in the last several years, the cost to our colleges and universities of abiding by, responding to, and filling out the forms for all of the dozens of HEW programs affecting higher education is now about $2 billion.

That is, of course, not to say that what we give as alumni goes merely to pay the cost for all the mess and the bother and the time wasting required of our schools by HEW and others, since of course, if we didn’t give, the schools would have to find the money elsewhere. What it is to say is that the Washington establishment, in my opinion, has become an absolutely intolerable burden to the people in this country, in the academic field and everywhere else. And it is not just the money which, of course, is a burden. It is also the time, the bother, the constant hastling and harassment of people who should be left alone to do their work.

A friend of mine is chancellor of a small university that shall be nameless for reasons shortly to be obvious. A few months ago, he told me two gumshoes in the U.S. Office of Education came to his campus to check on his compliance with the various laws on racial and sexual balance in the student body and faculty, and of course he was complying with them, and of course he had already sent in fourteen pounds of reports saying he was complying with them, as he was, and unless they had some reason to believe he was lying, which they did not, there was no reason for the inspection, but it makes work for them or, rather, it makes jobs for them. And so here they came to his campus to see if he was lying, and they spent two or three days at it and, of course, found nothing out of order, and they came to his office to tell him that which he already knew.

Then they said they wanted to inspect the university library. They have absolutely no legal right to inspect a library but he was eager to get rid of them and so he told them to go ahead. They spent.
another two days in the library poking around and then came back to him and said that they found the library to be all right except for one book which had to go. He asked what book. And they said *Huckleberry Finn*. He asked why. And they said because it contains a racial slur. He said, "Well, what do you want to do with *Huckleberry Finn*, burn it?" There was a little pause, a little whispered conference, and they backed off. In the opinion of Ernest Hemingway, among others, *Huckleberry Finn* is the greatest American novel. There is, as you know, a word in it that would be a racial slur today, but was not when the book was written in the nineteenth century. So these HEW gumshoes, in addition to being pests, wasting everybody's time and money, and overstepping their legal authority, were semiliterate.

Again in my view, the Washington establishment has become an insufferable burden to the American people. It's too big, too expensive, too insensitive, too arrogantly persuaded that it knows all of the answers to all questions, including questions nobody ever asked. Washington is often described, and accurately I think, as ten square miles surrounded on all sides by reality. Everyone knows many other examples like those I have mentioned and I could provide a hundred more. Add to these the fact that we have not yet recovered from a war carried on for seven years with very little public support, followed by an episode of corruption and lying in the White House without equal in American history; a Vice President and a President resigning in disgrace, in each case escaping punishment; the CIA, the FBI, and Internal Revenue opening our mail, tapping our phones, reading our telegrams, and even burglarizing our houses; members of Congress maintaining themselves in a regal style that now costs us about a million dollars a year per member and is rising, allowing themselves perquisites and benefits they are not willing to allow to the American people, and maintaining a tax system so complex, so unfair, and indeed so gross, it can barely be described.

Seeing all this and much more, is it any wonder that the American people are embittered and disillusioned about their political process? Is it any wonder that they reserve their deepest scorn for politicians? It may be a tragedy, but we can certainly understand why it happens. About three years ago, the psychology department of the University of Connecticut took a survey and handed a number of people a list of twenty occupations and professions and asked them to say which they admired the most and which the least. Among the list of twenty, politicians ranked nineteenth; just ahead of used car salesmen. About a year ago they took the same poll again and there was only one change. Used car salesmen moved up one notch and politicians down. Fewer and fewer of our people even bother to vote, feeling it makes no difference, feeling that however they vote, nothing changes. But politicians promise bread and when elected, deliver a stone in the form of a smile and a handshake and a form letter explaining why nothing can be done. I have been in forty-seven states in the last year or two talking to and listening to all kinds of people, and everywhere I have been I have encountered cynicism and embitterment, and a feeling of helplessness. In our bicentennial year we are entitled to great pride in what we and our ancestors in this country have done. Perhaps we can't take too much credit for the fact that when they arrived here they found a continent so rich in soil and moisture and minerals that it could be developed as it has been. But this country over all has done as well as any and better than most. Other countries equally well endowed have not done nearly so much with their endowment. The Soviet Union, for example, still can't even feed itself. A young Russian worker in Moscow picked up the morning paper and read on the front page of *Pravda* a long story detailing the great virtues of cabbage, saying that cabbage was inexpensive, plentiful, nutritious, easy to cook, and that everybody should eat more cabbage. He read all of this and then said, "Ah ha, the wheat crop has failed again." Ours, meanwhile, is the only country able to maintain a whole industry devoted to dieting.

But our great achievement, of course, is that we have brought more freedom, of all kinds, to more people than any other country in the history of the world, and it is certainly worth being proud of. So in view of that, why do we find the embitterment and disillusionment and cynicism around us now? Everyone may have his own opinion and one may be as good as another. Mine, for what it's worth, is that people are embittered because they feel in a general way that government takes too much away from them and gives them too little in return, that it does not listen to them, that it never asks what they want. It tells them what they are going to get; then it tells them what they have to pay for it. Then it tells them how, if they don't pay, they will go to jail. You might say that all of this began in the days when Washington discovered, to its intense pleasure, that under the pressure of war the American people were willing to put up with a withholding tax: a way of taking enormous amounts of money from them, without much public protest because, since they never saw the money, they didn't realize how much they were paying. And so, government rather suddenly became a huge industry. In one generation, it be-
came a huge industry with stratospheric amounts of money and great power.

One result was the production of a whole generation of a new breed: the professional, full-time, lifetime career politician, who has no idea of doing anything else ever if he can help it, and Congress is half full of them. We have had career politicians in the past, of course, but not to the extent we have them now, and almost no other country has anything like it. Since politics is now seen as a lifetime career, but without tenure, without a union, without civil service job protection, the political careerist sees that the way to keep his job is to say yes to everybody. Whatever they ask, give it to them. Avoid trouble. Avoid conflict. Avoid argument. Keep a low profile and vote the money. And when taxes, debt, and inflation reach the dangerous point they have now reached, arrange to blame it on somebody else. Allow the bureaucracies to spend money as if it were wastepaper after first taking excellent care of themselves. Because if you, as a politician in Congress, tried to stop it, you would be accused of such hideous crimes as denying milk to hungry children or medical care for older folks. False of course, but the accusation will be made, and who wants to get into that? Nobody! If, for example, you talk of reducing the spending at the Pentagon, you will be accused not of cutting down on golf courses, officers clubs, swimming pools, household servants, and chauffeured cars, you will be accused of weakening the country in the face of its enemies, and who wants to get into that?

If you are in politics as a career and want to stay there and collect the pension, living rather well in the meantime, the answer is that nobody wants to get into all of that and generally nobody does. So government swells like a mushroom and there is nobody to stop it. The result is that the American people increasingly feel they are being taken for a ride. In my opinion, they're right. I am not sure that the answer is to put a limit on how long anyone serve in Congress, though I do think it is worth thinking about. Most of the states have limits on their governors. It may be useful now to think about limits on the tenure of members of Congress, because they are responsible for most of the mess. None of it could happen until they voted to approve it, and none of it would last unless they voted to support it. Congress has been a neglected and misunderstood branch of government.

In the current campaign for President, the candidates talk about busing; but the fact is there is very little any President can do about busing. They talk about abortion; there is nothing a President can do about that. They talk about cutting the federal budget; a President can do a little about that but not much. It's Congress that spends the money. It is Congress that sets up all the HEW programs that cost our higher educational institutions two billion dollars a year, that sends inspectors around offering ignorant literary judgments about *Huckleberry Finn*. If it is stopped, Congress has to do it. But politicians in it for life, who have no idea of ever doing anything else, aren't going to stop it. It is too easy just to let it run on, and so it does.

I wish I could, but I cannot, offer any quick, easy, and effective solution to the public anger and embitterment in our country now reaching a level that is disturbing and even frightening. The majority of our people now don't even bother to vote. If our country is to avoid permanent damage, this public attitude must be dealt with. Again, I can't offer any quick easy answer. We know the first step toward solving any problem is to understand, with some precision, exactly what the problem is. In my view, the problem is Congress. It is nice to say yes, but once in awhile it needs to say no, and it can't.

*Some time ago when I was doing a news program every night with Chet Huntley, I was walking through an airport terminal, and a woman stopped me and said, "Aren't you Chet Huntley?" And I said yes, partly because it was a polite answer. If I had said, "No, I'm Brinkley," she would have been embarrassed and felt it necessary to apologize, and I would have said, "It's quite all right ma'am, I've heard this a hundred times before. Don't worry about it." During all of this conversation, I would have missed my airplane. So I said "Yes." And she said, "I think you're pretty good, but I don't know how you put up with that idiot Brinkley."
ADEQUATE EARTH

SIX YEARS ago, Donald Finkel, Washington University poet-in-residence and professor of English, visited Antarctica at the invitation of the National Science Foundation. From that experience grew Finkel's long poem *Adequate Earth*, dealing with Antarctica and man's conquest of that strange and beautiful world. In February of this year, the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra presented the world premiere of *Adequate Earth*, a Symphonic Setting of Seven Poems by Donald Finkel, written by Robert A. Wykes, professor of music at Washington University and a composer of international renown. The symphony orchestra was augmented by the Washington University Civic Chorus and the University's chorus and Madrigal Singers, under the direction of Orland Johnson, professor of music. Solo baritone was alumnus Sam Timberlake, and the narrator was William Warfield. In the words of one reviewer, "The effects were often brilliant, in musical terms and moving as a poetic statement about Antarctica and man." Another commented, "The Finkel poem deals with Antarctica and man's conquest of that bleak but fascinating region. Wykes's music skillfully evokes that terrifying ambience and gives added power to Finkel's words."

THE POEM, actually a cycle of seven poems, is described by the poet as "not a work of scholarship, but of the imagination. These precious scraps, culled from sledding journals, memoirs, histories, and technical articles, are intended simply as lights in a constellation in which my own observations form an integral part." The composer commented: "After months of struggling to make my initial thoughts concrete by committing them to paper in musical notation, I began to recognize that *Adequate Earth* did not easily fit into any of the traditional categories we use for classifying works for chorus and orchestra. At times it seemed to become more than an oratorio, more than a piece for narrator and soloist, and certainly more than the typical chorus-and-orchestra work. At times it seemed to become an unstaged opera! Now, in its final form, it seems to be a unique species . . . ."

WYKES'S prelude is based on the poem "One Last Resort," inspired by the early attempts to reach the South Pole by Ernest Shackleton. The composition continues with "Angels and Fools," an exposition of two central themes—humankind's quest for knowledge and the Genesis myth retold as the Gospel of the Penguins; "Won't It Be Fun," a scherzo commenting on the division of the vast continent among the great powers, and "Pole Business," on Admunsen's finally reaching the pole. It concludes with "Some Time," on Scott's disappointment at reaching the pole one month after Admunsen; "How Little," a portrayal of Admiral Byrd's loneliness and isolation; and "Adequate Earth," a recapitulation of the various themes and a resolution in which "The people sing: Be glad . . . for a place to go round."
Adequate Earth

Members of the Washington University Chorus at rehearsal of the Wykes work.

Solo baritone Sam Timberlake, master of music, 1971, at rehearsal.

Studying the score; from left: Orland Johnson, director of the choruses and singers; George Semkow, conductor; Robert Wykes, composer, and poet Donald Finkel.
At rehearsal, the poet concentrates on the composer's interpretation of his work.

At the same rehearsal, the composer ponders the performers' interpretation of his work.
Edward T. Foote, Dean of the School of Law, came to Washington University in 1970 as vice chancellor and general counsel. A graduate of Yale University and of Georgetown University Law Center, he was a member of the law firm of Bryan, Cave, McPheeters and McRoberts before joining the University. He served for two years on the Human Subjects Research Committee of the School of Medicine and as general counsel, worked with the Medical School on many legal problems. In this short discourse, Dean Foote touches on the similarities and the differences between law and medicine and discusses such difficult medicolegal problems as malpractice, abortion, and euthanasia. This paper originally appeared in The Pharos of Alpha Omega Alpha, Volume 39, April, 1976, and is reprinted with permission of that medical honor society.

I would like to express some thoughts about the role of law and lawyers in medicine, and, in passing, some of the similarities and differences between the two professions. In these times of soaring medical malpractice insurance, allegations of increasing ambulance chasing, new legal efforts at the federal and state levels to regulate—some would say intrude upon—the world of medicine, an evaluation of the interests served in society by doctors and lawyers seems appropriate.

Lest you think I am without portfolio, or with only half of one, I hasten to say that I was raised in a doctor's family and even considered medicine as a calling before I went bad. In addition to these impressive medical credentials, I spent several years as Vice Chancellor and General Counsel of Washington University and, in that capacity, I had many occasions to work closely with member of the Medical School faculty and staff on legal difficulties. My already high regard for the Medical School was increased by those associations, but I will say this in retrospect: when doctors have a legal problem, it's bound to be a dilly.

Before turning to the role of law in medicine, it may be helpful to examine briefly the role of law generally in our society. Without getting too overblown about it, that role can be very simply defined: it is to resolve human and institutional conflict, either actual or potential.

In our democracy, a new statute is forged in the heat of political passions. Our legislators seek those points of accommodation between the conflicting interest of the individuals and groups affected. It is well to remember during this bicentennial year that the founders of our country began with the fundamental proposition that no one had a corner on wisdom. Thus, it is safe to say that no statute that has ever been passed in this country has satisfied anyone completely. As Winston Churchill observed, "It has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time."

The point to emphasize is that, beginning with the glimmer of a new legislative thought in the mind of a senator or a lobbyist or a citizen, there is inherent conflict between the individuals or groups that may be affected by the legislation. This essence of law, the resolution of conflict, is more apparent in the courts. People don't go to court unless they have a problem with someone or something. In an orderly society, courts perform the role discharged in earlier days, when all else failed, by violence. As unsatisfying, tortuous, time-consuming and expensive as litigation is, most of us would probably agree that it beats killing one another.

There is, then, a profound irony in American law. We give up a lot in order to gain something. With every statute passed, with every case decided, somebody loses some freedom, and we put up with that, even in a society that prides itself on maximizing the freedom of its citizens, because the final result is more freedom for all of us.

In a democracy, those who usually are forced to give up the most are the most powerful. In the jungle, and in some other forms of government, that is not so; the most free are also the strongest. But in a democracy, those conflicts which I have described are often between individuals or groups whose actual power, whether physical, social, or economic, varies tremendously, and the strong are often the short-term losers, at least in the sense of giving up the most. We pass antitrust laws to control the power of General Motors or
Standard Oil. We revise the tax codes to redistribute wealth from the rich to the poor in one way or the other. At a less sophisticated level, we pass criminal laws to keep the physically strong from preying on the weak.

And we pass laws and adopt judicial standards to control professions, like that of medicine, because, in the name of the common good, we perceive a need to restrict the freedom—yes, and the power—of those who practice the professions. All of the professions are affected one way or another, but probably none more dramatically than medicine.

**WHAT, THEN, is the role of law in medicine? To suggest an answer, I must presume first to describe something of a doctor’s role. A doctor, like any other citizen, has countless rights and obligations, depending upon his many different relationships with other people or institutions. As a citizen, the doctor must obey the laws that apply to everybody: pay taxes, drive safely, and all the rest. In addition, because a doctor has unique training, and responsibility and power over life itself, he is subject to expectations, privileges, and controls in society that do not apply to everybody else. The same, of course, can be said for lawyers or any other professionals.**

At the risk of oversimplification, these special medical responsibilities can perhaps be divided broadly into three categories: first, those which are strictly within the world of the science of healing (I will call them doctor-patient responsibilities); second, those which are specific to the medical profession but which are clearly the business of society at large (I will call them doctor-society responsibilities), and third, those which are not so clearly one or the other, but partake of both (I will call them doctor-patient-society responsibilities).

I will give a brief example of each, as the law would see it. In the first category of responsibilities, those purely medical, would be the decision whether to administer a sulfa drug or penicillin. Within broad parameters, the law will not second-guess the doctor on his own hallowed ground.

An example of the second set of responsibilities, those falling specifically upon the shoulders of the medical profession but directly affecting society at large in addition to each patient, would be the maintenance of cleanliness in hospitals and doctors’ offices. Doctors, although they certainly know a lot about cleanliness, do not have the same kind of monopoly on that sort of knowledge that they have about the administration of drugs. Therefore, the law has no qualms about requiring of doctors that they meet specific antiseptic standards. The “parameters” allowed a doctor’s judgment are much more restrictive.

The third category of medical responsibilities, that which partakes of the first two, is obviously the most complicated and troublesome. There are many examples of this kind of doctor-patient-society responsibility. Take the raging issue of abortion. The historic Supreme Court decision of three years ago was an effort to strike a balance between the interest of the state in protecting life and the interest of the patient. The doctor was caught in the middle. Under that decision, the doctor’s professional autonomy and discretion were diminished each trimester of pregnancy. As you know, that decision has not met with approval from every quarter. To the contrary, there is probably no Supreme Court case in recent history, perhaps none ever, which touched so deep a chord in the American psyche, both pro and con. Nevertheless, it is an excellent example of the effort of nine Justices to reconcile the enormously complex and fundamental rights and responsibilities involved in abortion among doctor, patient, and society, and to define who can do what under what circumstances.

I mentioned earlier that in the first of his three arenas—the doctor-patient relationship—a doctor is allowed by the law the widest, but not an unlimited, discretion. I used the word “parameters.” The “parameters” generally applicable to the doctor-patient relationship are those simply defined in terms of “negligence.” So long as he is not negligent, a doctor is free to exercise his best professional judgment.

**NEGligence** is the basic concept underlying American tort law. “Tort,” meaning “wrong” in French, refers to a wrong done another person, whether voluntary or involuntary, in breach of a legal duty. It may seem incongruous that a doctor can do any wrong in that sense. He is, after all, trying to help another person get well, and how could that be wrong?

It can be wrong in the law if the doctor does not fulfill his responsibility of reasonable care, which is his legal duty. The “reasonable man” standard is the heart of the law of negligence. If a reasonable person acting under the same circumstances would have done what was done, then the action, although harmful to another, is not a tort. There is no liability. Doctors, of course, are held by the law to a standard of what is reasonable for other doctors performing medical services under similar circumstances. The circumstances may vary, and the standard will vary accordingly. Thus, a doctor practicing in a rural area without the kind of modern, sophisticated equipment available at the Washington University Medical Center may not be held in every instance to the same high standard of care.
The key, of course, is the word "reasonable." It is axiomatic in the law that reasonable people can differ about what is reasonable. No two people, including doctors, view the same situation in precisely the same way. So the law asks twelve citizens, the jury, to resolve this critical question in light of the evidence presented to them and under the instructions on the law given them by the judge. A mistake in judgment made by the doctor will not in itself establish liability, so long as other competent doctors diagnosing the same patient or prescribing treatment might have erred within reason the same way.

If, however, the mistake would not have been made had the doctor performed one more standard test or kept abreast of recent journal articles about the disease, or whatever, then protestations of good faith error will not prevail. There is simply no very persuasive explanation when a sponge is discovered sewn up inside the patient after the operation.

This, of course, is oversimplified and only the briefest summary of the law of "torts." It will give doctors small comfort to know that freshman law students spend months narrowing and refining and, I hope mastering the subtleties of these broad concepts. What I have sketched, however, does outline the standards against which a doctor's performance will be measured when he is acting in that first category of responsibilities: the pure doctor-patient relationship.

In the second category, the doctor-society relationship, the same negligence standard is often applied, but with much less latitude. And in some cases, the law specifically defines what is negligence and what is not. For example, the city fire code may establish minimum requirements for hospital or office equipment, and if these are not met, the law may say that there is per se negligence, which means that there is no argument about reasonableness. The minimum reasonableness has been established by ordinance.

It is in the third category of a doctor's responsibilities, those pertaining to procedures that are partly medical but partly ethical or philosophical, that the analysis of a doctor's rights and responsibilities under the law becomes most perplexing. I have mentioned the example of abortion. Another is research on human subjects.

I served for two years on the School of Medicine human subjects research committee, charged with the responsibility of reviewing all medical research that affects or may affect the rights or health of people. I know many doctors who dislike this procedure intensely. They consider it an intrusion on their professional preserve, and, in some cases, that is certainly true.

Doctors who feel that way, however, often fail to understand the difference between the first category of their responsibilities, which is purely doctor-patient, and this third category, in which society, too, is a party. The point is that when a doctor performs any medical act that is not strictly diagnostic or therapeutic, the doctor moves from the sanctity of his doctor-patient relationship into another world, a world much more strictly regulated.

That other world, in this case research, involves a quite different relationship between the doctor and the patient, because the doctor's motivation is no longer limited strictly to treating an injury or illness. It now includes the desire to expand knowledge, surely a laudable goal, but one which society feels much more comfortable regulating. Once the doctor moves from the doctor-patient relationship into the researcher-subject relationship, he is no longer on hallowed ground. Indeed, his research interest may even be in conflict with the best interests of his patient. Society says to him, you have no special expertise in evaluating the price society or the individual patient may have to pay for the additional knowledge, and we will tightly regulate your activities in this second relationship, and we will hold you to the highest standard of care and caution.

Current publicity about euthanasia highlights another classic instance of doctor-patient-society problems. As the doctor's relationship with his patient moves from diagnosis and treatment closer to ultimate questions of life and death, society, through the law, allows the doctor less leeway. Doctors, for all their knowledge, are not considered by the law to have any more expertise or wisdom about when a life should be taken or allowed to expire than laymen. Thus, pulling the plug of the life-supporting machine, albeit done for the most humane reasons, is a crime in the eyes of the law. Perhaps it shouldn't be. Perhaps new standards governing such agonizing decisions will be evolved. Indeed, as you know, there is now a great deal of debate in law and medicine on this very subject.

The point to remember, however, is that if the standards governing euthanasia do change, it will occur in our democracy through the same rough, painstaking resolution of conflicting philosophical and social interests that I described earlier: the interests of the doctor, the patient, and the patient's family, but most importantly, the collective interest of all of us who may face death in a similar way. That judgment about when death should come, or at least the standards under which the decision of its coming should be made, is one the law leaves to the people under our constitutional system.
I wish to turn now briefly from the role of law in medicine to the difference between the professions of law and medicine. The similarities need little clarification. Both professions require extensive and continuing education. Both deal with complex, often insoluble human problems. Both demand the highest kind of integrity, because people depend absolutely upon the honesty and competency of lawyers and doctors.

In one fundamental respect, however, the professions are very different. That difference is not so much in the relationship between the lawyer or doctor and his client or patient, although there are differences. The significant difference is based on the presence or absence of conflict between the person served and one or more third parties.

In the case of the patient, the problem ultimately is his alone, although others are affected. The culprit is a disease or an injury. Nobody is on the side of disease and injury. The doctor spends his time doing honorable battle with unloved spectres: cancer or heart disease or a fractured pelvis. Everybody, most especially including the patient, cheers him as he fights the good fight.

The relationship between doctor, patient, and problem, therefore, might be described as linear. Everybody is moving in the same direction, opposing the same evil force, working toward precisely the same goal: health. Society applauds the doctor's efforts as it should. There is no dissent.

For a lawyer, however, the applause is usually muted, if even audible. This is largely because lawyers become involved with people's problems only in the context of third parties, and always under a shroud of conflict. People don't have legal problems except with other people or other institutions. Whether the client has been hit by a car, or needs assistance before the Internal Revenue Service, or has strayed allegedly to the wrong side of the criminal law, that client has an adversary. Even with problems as seemingly innocent as estate planning or a real estate closing, there is always a potential, if not an actual, opponent: the government, which may try to take more than its fair share of the estate, or heirs with conflicting views about what is rightfully theirs, or the seller of the house, or the buyer, or the driver of the car that did the damage.

The relationship, then, between the lawyer, the client, and the problem is always triangular, not linear. And the lawyer spends his professional life trying to resolve the differences between his clients and those third parties. The lawyer's attention is focused always on his client's human or institutional adversary, even enemy, to use the martial analogy.

Equating the operation of law with war may seem overstated, but it is not, at least at essence. Veneer stripped away, the difference between a lawyer in a courtroom and a medieval soldier with a lance is one of tools only. Any lawyer, whether he tries cases or advises clients in his office, is ultimately an advocate on his client's behalf, an advocate against another party. The law now demands that we solve our differences according to the rules of civilization, rather than by combat, but the underlying human instincts have not really changed very much, if at all.

Until they do, the role of the lawyer in civilized society will be seen with suspicion, fear, and even hatred sometimes, in part because lawyers occasionally do a bad job, but mostly because lawyers deal with elemental emotions in conflict, emotions that would elicit these same responses whether they were there or not.

I fear I have painted too gloomy a picture. That was not my purpose. Actually, lawyers have a lot of fun. We even laugh occasionally. We don't go around agonizing over the despair of the human condition. Certainly our lot is no tougher than anyone else's, and I prefer to think that this continually evolving process of resolving differences without swords or cannon needs no apologies. And when the process works, it is a noble thing. That it doesn't always work, and sometimes fails miserably, should not detract from the good that is done through the law, imperfect as it usually is.

There are few "right" answers, if any. Paul Freund, the distinguished Harvard law professor who is a graduate and emeritus trustee of this university, has summarized eloquently the role of law at the constitutional level, where many of the doctor-patient-society problems are eventually resolved:

"The great constitutional issues which come before the court reflect not so much a clash of right and wrong as a conflict between right and right."

Ultimately, of course, the rule of law is in the hearts of people. I recently read a speech by former Senator J. William Fulbright, who expressed this very well. He said,

The essence of that (the American social) contract is a measure of voluntary restraint, an implicit agreement among the major groups and interests in our society that none will apply their powers to the fullest. For all the ingeniousness of our system of checks and balances, our ultimate protection against tyranny is the fact that we are a people who have not wished to tyrannize one another.

I agree with that, and I trust we as a people will continue in that wish.
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The whole man must move together"—explaining the relevance of this proverbial wisdom to my career and goals as a Professor of German Literature in the United States will take me far back to my beginnings.

The basic experiences to which I attribute much of my intellectual attitudes were manifold. Social and political unrest was endemic to my environment. Growing up in a middle class family in truncated Austria between the wars meant facing economic disaster constantly, both on a national and individual level. Next to this threatening instability, the racial question reached poisonous intensity in the Vienna of the twenties and thirties. A child with a Jewish background had to cope daily with this particular brand of irrationalism. But beyond that, the more general menace from Hitler in neighboring Germany pervaded my childhood. How all efforts to keep him out failed is a matter of historical record. On March 11, 1938, his troops marched across the borders and enforced, no doubt with the enthusiastic acclaim of vast masses of Austrians, the union between the two countries. As expected, Hitler and I proved instantly incompatible. Since he was the stronger, it was I who had to give way.

I left my native Vienna at the age of sixteen, commuting from one European country to the next, often encouraged by the local authorities. But I was clearly destined to move up in the world. One bright morning in March, 1939, I found myself on its very top, in a train circling into La Paz, at 12,500 feet the highest capital on earth. I spent the next ten years in the exotic hinterlands of Bolivia, Chile, and Ecuador as a refugee and migrant worker. In mines and workshops, as a clerk, carpenter, translator, furrier, bookkeeper, electrician, construction and textile worker, I contrived to keep mind and body together.

It was the former that distinguished me from my fellow proletarians among whom the latter was moving, subject to the same needs and discomforts as theirs. But my consciousness was distinctly Viennese, already infected by the "culture bug," by the value system inculcated during six years of Gymnasium, by memories of Homer, Ovid, and Vergil. What sustained me most during those times was my early passion for language and literature. I learned languages easily. As an adolescent, I read voraciously and indiscriminately any printed matter in German, French, Spanish, and English I could get hold of. I was usually the first to pay my respects to new arrivals from Europe. I remember putting on my absurd-looking Sunday suit, introducing myself and, after the barest preliminaries, bursting out with the crucial question: Excuse
me, did you bring any books? In my early and mid-twenties I was a practicing poet.

I managed to come to this country in 1949, tired of autodidacticism and starved for intellectual discipline. While teaching full time at a small college, I earned a B.A. and an A.M. degree at Ohio State in two years. My training was eclectic in method, but those were the years of New Criticism, the most interesting professors were adherents of that approach, and it soon dominated my thinking and feeling. My first teaching position after receiving the Ph.D. from the University of Washington was at Harvard. This proved a valuable complement to my academic experiences at state institutions. I have been associated with Washington University since 1961.

The transition from graduate school to teaching on the college level is jolting in most cases. It left me with a special intellectual problem. My personal destiny, which had been eminently "historical," and my new-critical outlook, which was "aesthetic," remained unreconciled. The sudden shift from the baroque splendor of Vienna to the Indian villages of the Bolivian Altiplano had not been merely geographical. It imprinted an indelible lesson in my mind, the conviction that man is the plaything of social forces defying both his will and his lethargy. On the other hand, the savoring of metaphors and the heartening to poetic rhythms, the centrality of the literary text postulated with quasi-religious fervor by the New Critics, disdainfully shuts out history, the emphasis clearly being on timelessness. This separation of my biographical from my professional self caused me a marked malaise. Bridging the gap took two decades.

My first attempt at achieving a rapprochement between my halves was through comparative literature. I sensed that any legitimate comparison of literary works from different societies must take into account their peculiar origins. A Guggenheim grant helped me lay the foundation for my studies of Hispano-German relations, no longer purely literary, but rather broadly "cultural" in character. In the context of these researches I wrote the book *Hofmannsthal and Calderon* with a built-in historical dimension, which was recognized by the critics. A Belgian scholar wrote that mine was the first work on Hofmannsthal that permitted the reader to place this writer within the framework of the social history of Europe.

* I give here the English titles, but many of these publications are in German.

But I desired to achieve a closer interpenetration between literature and its socio-historical background. Thus began my long studies of German history and politics. The result are my two books *A Nation Divided* and *Banishment*. In the first I tried to confront and to expose the two German traditions, the humanistic and the rabid, and in the second my intent was to present the reader with a phenomenology of German exile from Hitler's Germany. When Rolf Hochhuth's play *The Representative* appeared in 1963, causing an egregious scandal by implicating Pope Pius XII in the Nazi crimes and unrolling the whole question of German guilt, I wrote an article for the first time in my life about a work that the literary establishment unanimously regarded as being of dubious artistic merits.

Since then I have become more sure of my approach. Because the main emphasis in my teaching and research falls upon modern literature, the economic and social forces making up the background of this literature clamor for my attention with inescapable urgency. It is not difficult to recognize that secularization, modernization, and democratization are the basic facts determining everything within our age. It can be said that modern cultural history consists of the manifold responses men have made to the successive stages of industrialization. Without relating everything directly to these dynamics, I still attempt to gain an ever deeper understanding of them, as the basic model for my understanding of literature. My lecture courses, "Fascism and German Literature," my book on politics and poetry in Rilke, an essay on the theoretical consequences to be drawn from the reception of Hermann Hesse in America and Germany, an anthology on exile and inner emigration from the National Socialist state, all point to these interests in their very titles.

My conscience is clear because of the consideration that Germanistics as a field has never balked at borrowing from other disciplines, from anthropology to zoology. This can also be expressed differently: like a volatile substance, Germanistics is seldom to be encountered in a natural state; it has an unmistakable tendency to combine with other, sometimes even less solid, substances to form new compounds. The same people who today throw up their hands in horror when we turn to the social sciences for aid found nothing amiss as long as we turned toward theology and aesthetics for our orientation.

But let us have a glance at this "Germanistics" with which I was grappling as a scholar and teacher. Like all things, it has its own telltale history. Before we can say how a subject ought to be taught, we have to know what it is. The customary definition of Germanistics as the study of German literature cannot be considered an adequate one because of the great variation in meaning of the concepts "German" and "literature." Germanistics does not always mean the same thing. There was a time when it encompassed everything from Gothic to Goebbels, from the saber-rattling of the Teutons to the esoteric problems of the most recent lyric poetry. In those days, Germanistics was knowledge concerning all things German and was consistent with Germany's self-evident role as a world power zealously promoting all these disparate things for ideological reasons. These dreams have long since vanished and have given way to a new reality.

When the Second World War was over, Germany resembled
a vast heap of smouldering ruins. Nothing seemed to have survived from the old order, with the exception of one institution: the university. It continued to be held in high esteem by the general public and proceeded to resume its venerable business with unabated conservatism. But this amazing sturdiness, this seeming impenetrability, turned out to be an illusion. Beneath the ivy, the walls had sustained the same fatal cracks as other institutions. In the sixties, they began to topple with altogether German thoroughness. What took place under the eyes of the fascinated observer was the transformation of an elitist academy into an instrument of higher learning at the service of a modern mass society. These upheavals, of course, also destroyed the old ideology. Most remnants of an aristocratic romanticism which had dominated Germany longer than other nations were swept away and made room for a pluralistic thinking more commensurate with the democratic order that had belatedly but firmly established itself in the country.

Germanistics did not remain unaffected. By becoming more pragmatic and less nationalistic, oriented more toward the enlightenment than romanticism, this largest and most prestigious field of learning adapted itself spectacularly to the present-day situation. The canon was changed to include more progressive writers, the emphasis shifted from abstruse poets to popular literature, the works of the exiles from the Third Reich merited special attention, entire movements that had been anathematized by the Nazis, like modernism and expressionism, were reinstated, maligned authors like Heine were rehabilitated in seminars, conferences, and monumental editions, and the critical tradition of the intellectual left, exemplified not only by Marx and his successors, but even more by the members of the Frankfurt School of social thought, such as Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, and Max Horkheimer, were incorporated in the mainstream. There was little patience with metaphors and rhythms. But the New Criticism in its German version was discredited for another reason as well, since it had been used by the professors of the immediate post-Nazi era, who had paid their allegiance to, or made their compromises with, the regime, as a shield against intrusions of history, against the new generation's demand for a “coming to grips with the past.”

All of this had profound repercussions in American German departments which, in spite of their special task of conveyors of things German to an American student body, form a professional whole with their colleagues abroad and are understandably susceptible to the intellectual winds blowing from the countries which, after all, produce the primary materials to be studied and taught. But these developments had a special significance for me personally. Hadn't I also rejected the ideology of National Socialism and the reactionary heritage on which it drew? hadn't I, too, been exposed, albeit in reverse order, to historical experiences and the influence of an aesthetic approach to literature? Very soon I found myself cast in the role of mediator between the German and the American scene as well as between those for whom literature is an art and those who see it as a reflection of history. I can now begin to formulate some of the insights this involvement afforded me.

**First of all, I should like to put in a strong word for close reading.** I have observed that suddenly there are students coming to our department from Germany who are no longer able to read. Supposing themselves in the possession of immutable truths, they constantly apply handy, preconceived theories to everything they encounter, without being willing to submit their judgment to the concrete test of a specific text. In this way, the methodological gains of decades threaten to disappear. I thus find myself at the very beginning compelled to speak up for a certain continuity.

We have seen why the intrinsic approach to literature of the New Criticism has fallen into disrepute. But we must make our students understand that there is a difference between a method and the ideology of its practitioners and that we needn't stop eating with a knife and fork just because Adolf Hitler also used these utensils. Those who scorn
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careful, style-conscious reading are doing exactly what they reproach their rejected predecessors for: they are ignoring the historical context which gives the isolated detail its meaning. A method which was used under specific circumstances for specific purposes can, when the situation has changed, be adopted for quite different goals.

In order to make clear the implications for literary studies resulting from the refusal—and therefore the inability—to come to terms with the smallest unit of our material, the text, let me draw what I hope is a useful comparison with something whose nature has predominantly to do with play. I have chosen chess because of its long history, its popularity, and its aesthetic qualities. Of course, it would be possible to study the sociology of chess, from its first introduction in Europe to the modern tournaments with masses of spectators, television, press, lawyers, special functionaries, economic and national implications. The changes within the game itself also call for investigation: its obviously feudal origin expressed in the pieces themselves, which consist of the king and his grand vizier (it was in gallant Europe, with its tendency toward women's emancipation, that this piece was rechristened a “queen”), the lower nobility in its castles, and finally the pawns, where the real carnage occurs; the changes in the rules and strategic customs in the course of time; and the ever clearer streamlining with the distinct transition from a more “romantic” to a more “technical” manner of play, recently expressed in the attempts to set up computers as chess players. The study of all these aspects would be a thorough legitimate attempt to understand a widespread phenomenon, and there is no doubt that interesting insights could be gained here. Whoever wants to get to the bottom of the matter, however, cannot avoid analyzing the single game between masters; the heart of chess remains as always what Bogoljubow's twentieth move was and how Tartakower responded to it.

I shall leave to my readers the application of this little parable. There are many similarities to literature in it, especially in its less socially determined aspects, for we should not overlook the fact that not all literary works are equally responsive to history. At the same time, however, we must not forget the great differences as well. I shall mention only the most important one here. Let us leave aside the question of the degree to which a chess game can claim to be seen as a non-mimetic work of art, somewhat in the manner of a musical composition. What it lacks, in any case, and what distinguishes literature to such a great extent—indeed forms its essence—is a medium which is also valid outside of its circumscribed world, one with a substantial life of its own. Of course I mean language, which society and literature share and which gives the literary work its character of communication. Since it is written for a public, disseminated by an organization which is part of the prevailing economic system, and assimilated by a public, it is, in a quite different sense from the chess game, bound with a thousand threads to historical reality and dependent upon it. Even if it is thus first of all necessary to recognize, in the case of every literary work, its form and its character of self-reference, we cannot leave it at that.

To wish to explain a matter simply in terms of itself is a Münchhausen-like attempt—as ridiculous as it is vain—to pull oneself out of a swamp by one's own hair. In order to understand a thing it is not sufficient to submerge oneself in it; rather, one must take a conscious position outside of it, observe it in its environment, take into account the perspective from which one is looking at it—in other words, one must explain it from a sphere foreign to it. Natural scientists have been aware of this principle for a long time. A biologist does not rest until he has reduced a living phenomenon to its chemical principles; the chemist is not satisfied until he has expressed a problem in terms of physics. Let me illustrate by an extreme example how a linguistic text reveals its true meaning only when the historical context is made clear.

After the Second World War, there was found in a Nazi archive a letter in which a young officer was praised by one of his superiors for his unshakeable devotion to National Socialism. Eager de-Nazification officials took this recommendation at face value and were all ready to have the young man sentenced. Upon closer investigation, however, the situation turned out to be entirely different: the officer had fallen under suspicion for critical remarks he had made about the regime, the secret police threatened his safety, and that apparently incriminating letter had been written only to protect him from political persecution. The text by itself thus offered an inadequate, indeed totally misleading, picture of the truth. Only the pursuit of the reality behind the letter revealed its true meaning. The lesson to be gained from this example can, mutatis mutandis, be applied to every literary text.

I am now in a position to develop more clearly the premises contained in embryo form in what I have said thus far. I am of the opinion that literature is imbedded in concentric circles and can best be understood by retracing them. Naturally, I am not trying to establish here a scheme valid for all time, but merely a simple heuristic model that every-
one may modify as he sees fit. The innermost circle is taken up by the literary work itself, and primary attention must be paid to it. But soon our view will broaden and take in the other works of the writer in question as well as his whole intellectual development—that is the second circle. The third circle is made up of other contemporary writers, not only in his own but also in related languages. As soon as we have taken all this into consideration, the author's epoch automatically comes into view, with its aesthetics, its contradictions, and its social conditions. Thus, the progression leads from the work to the author to art to the whole culture and to history.

There would be no point, of course, in applying this plan mechanically and without differentiation on every occasion. In our practical work, constantly changing routes, shortcuts, and cross-connections will always be advisable. In general, the problem of competence will soon arise. There is justification in asking whether one person can have at his disposal the tremendous specialized knowledge which such a total treatment presupposes. In practice it turns out differently: one encounters a problem and simply borrows from more exotic, distant fields the special knowledge which contributes to its clarification. In the last analysis, it is impossible to keep to a straight path which leads through all the concentric circles. Usually the mere awareness that they exist suffices to lend the object under examination the necessary dimension of depth and to awaken a feeling for the larger contexts.

AND ANOTHER thing: growing older, I have gotten into the habit of asking myself quite naively not only how I stand personally vis-à-vis the subjects I deal with, but why I take that particular posture. In other words, I have tried to trace my opinions as far back to their origins as possible. With the growing conviction that there can be no objectivity free of personal perspective and that we necessarily see things from that point where life has placed us, I try more and more consciously to give myself some account of my own motives, of the distortions and blindness inherent in my defective vision. Half facetiously, half seriously, this might be called the autobiographical approach to literature. The end result, of course, betrays no trace of the personal element. But self-examination is, in my opinion, the first step toward true objectivity, a state which can hardly be reached by the arrogant yet impractical postulate of a disinterested, valueless scientific attitude.

The goal, as in all the humanities, is the better understanding of human beings, their possibilities and impossibilities. The locus of interest is literature in the German language. Because of its magnitude and significance, this usually means the literature of West Germany, but we shouldn't disregard the fact that the literature of Austria, German-speaking Switzerland, and more recently of the German Democratic Republic (whose works have been written under quite different circumstances) also lay legitimate claim to the attention of our guild. Our task, as I see it, is to make students at American universities familiar with these literatures and the cultures surrounding them, taking into consideration the special milieu to which these students are accustomed. Naturally, teaching and cultivating the German language is one of the prerequisites of this program. Without this, the more ambitious program of literary study is unworkable. Perhaps our students will learn most of all from our example, from our attitude and commitment. When the clever remarks which we formulated with such great pride are long forgotten, something of our enthusiasm, our dedication, and particular bent of mind may still affect those students.

I am thinking not only of the activity in the classroom. Our professional labors fall into two clear categories. Handling on accumulated knowledge and prevailing perspectives—that is teaching. But without continual review, examination, rejection, and renewal, it would soon stagnate. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that our profession is well rounded only if we concern ourselves both with teaching and research. These two branches do not by any means always have to be cultivated by the same people, but Germanistics, like every other field of higher learning, must include them both.

I am writing these sentences at a peculiar moment in history, at a moment when the very subject I am talking about is agitated by turbulence and plagued by self-doubt in Germany, the country of its origin. At the same time it has lost in popularity at American universities which, for their part, are undergoing severe cutbacks. And yet I think Germanistics is teachable. To be sure, teachable does not mean indispensable. Even if Germanistics were to disappear from the scene, we would lose, it is true, an interesting area of knowledge, but nothing essential for our understanding of the world; especially not in America, where at best—and at the moment we are far from “at best”—we play only a marginal role. Thus, those of us who hope for the continued existence of our field of study should work all the harder to present it in as attractive, as interesting, and—I hope to be forgiven for employing this overused word in what I hope is a context where it will not be misunderstood—as relevant a fashion as possible.
James Lee Johnson, Jr.

James Lee Johnson, Jr., who has been an active, involved member of the Washington University Board of Trustees since 1970, comes by his interest in the University and its affairs naturally. His family has a long tradition of benefactions to the University and the family name is perpetuated in several key facilities of the Washington University Medical Center.

In 1929, his grandmother, Irene Walter Johnson; his uncle, Oscar Johnson, Jr.; and his father, James Lee Johnson, Sr., provided the funds for the establishment of the Oscar Johnson Institute of Research and Teaching in Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology. In 1959, Mrs. Johnson's benefactions provided for the establishment of the Irene Walter Johnson Institute of Rehabilitation. Johnson attended Princeton University, where he majored in history and received the A.B. degree in 1955. He joined International Shoe Company (now Interco) after graduation and remained there until 1959, when he joined Reinholdt and Gardner brokerage firm as an account executive. He was made a partner in 1966 and a member of the Executive Committee in 1969.

While Johnson has been active for more than fifteen years in the United Fund and other civic organizations, his main outside interests have centered around education. For six years, he served on the Education Committee of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce. He was an active member of the Princeton Club of St. Louis, serving as treasurer and board member for three years. He has also been an active member of the Board of Trustees of Mary Institute since 1969 and is currently chairman of that board.

At Washington University, Johnson has been an extremely active board member, serving on many committees, attending university functions, meeting and getting to know faculty and staff members, and students.

In 1974, he became a member of an ad hoc Student-Trustees Relations committee. "For all practical purposes," he recalls, "I was the committee." What he set out to do in that role was to bring students and trustees together in situations where both could benefit. He set up a meeting with students and fellow-trustee Morton D. May, where May showed samples of his photography and discussed painting and his many other art interests. "It was an enjoyable and profitable evening for all concerned," Johnson remembers. Johnson also arranged for similar student gatherings with trustees and met with the students himself at the Campus Y for an informal session of conversation.

One of Johnson's most important board committee jobs was another that began as an ad hoc group. He was asked by the chancellor to chair a committee to look into the renovation and rehabilitation of campus facilities. In 1973, this group became a formal committee with Johnson as chairman. Among its first recommendations was the modern lighting of campus parking lots, driveways, and walkways—a badly needed improvement.

"Serving on the Buildings and Grounds Committee," Johnson says, "gave me a good insight into the practical, daily operations of a major university, and it offered the chance to work with many interesting people, including Robert W. Reinhardt (Assistant Vice Chancellor) and Robert W. Vickery (former campus architect)."

One Johnson contribution to the campus was the result of his conviction that every professor should be provided with an office, a situation that did not prevail at the time he came on the Board. His committee recommended strongly that somehow offices be found for all professors and it was accomplished. In 1975, he turned over his chairmanship of the Buildings and Grounds Committee in order to devote more time to three other Board committees: Budget, Student Affairs, and the Executive Committee.

The Budget Committee has given him a real insight into the University and how it operates, but he enjoys his work with the students most of all. Jim Johnson has done a great deal to convince students that trustees are human, too.

Johnson and his wife, the former Bettie Schroth, have three children: two daughters, 16 and 14, and a son, 11. When he's not working for Reinholdt and Gardner, Washington University, Princeton, or Mary Institute, Johnson likes to play golf and paddle tennis and he's an ardent baseball, football, and hockey fan.

The name Johnson is an important one in Washington University history. James Lee Johnson, Jr., is helping to maintain the tradition.
Edwin S. Jones

Edwin S. Jones is a man who believes in the role of chance in determining one's fate, which is strange to say of a man who seems to have left little to chance. "I was very fortunate to have been at the right place at the right time," he says of his career with First National Bank in St. Louis, which has culminated fortune. I have seen men who work hard and diligently get cornered or side-tracked," he continues.

If the right place was First National, the right time was just after World War II. Relying upon the business savvy of friends and his own instincts, Ted Jones returned to St. Louis determined that he would not re-enter the wholesale dry-goods firm he had left to become an Air Force Captain. He was in New York looking for the right business opportunity, when the late David Calhoun, a friend and half-uncle, called to tell Jones he should return to St. Louis and join First National.

"He said, and I saw that he was right, that First National desperately needed new blood. The bank was formed in 1919 with a three-bank merger. All of the officers had come from those banks. They were all the same age and were either soon going to move out or be kicked out." Jones joined the bank as a management trainee, except that the bank had no management training program, so he made his own. He also began his own personal business development campaign calling upon companies around town. "People would ask me about all kinds of things including loans. I didn't know anything about lending money, but I learned. In a short time, I was in every area of the bank and I learned I had every opportunity in the world to get ahead if I wanted to work hard and could get along with people. These older fellows were always looking for an assistant and soon I was going to New York and Chicago and all over."

"I have to realize now," he says wistfully, "that I'm the one who's been with the bank the longest." When Jones retires, he will leave the bank in the hands of younger men he has trained. Friends say that he is a man who knows how to delegate authority and responsibility and to get things done that way. Perhaps that is why he is able to hold down dozens of directorships of major St. Louis corporations and a handful of major civic responsibilities, not the least of which is as a trustee of Washington University, and why the St. Louis Globe-Democrat last year named him Man of the Year.

One of his business friends commented that Ted Jones is always a working director. Since he became a member of the University's board in 1969, he has served as chairman of the budget committee and a member of the executive committee.

"I'm somewhat limited in education myself, so my knowledge of academics is very light. I am involved in budget problems and in helping to raise money where I can. I'm encouraged by what is happening on both counts. I feel that the Danforth Grant and the response to it in matching gifts has done more to stabilize the financial future of the University than anything we could have hoped for. I honestly believe that the University is so important to St. Louis and its growth that it is worth every man's efforts.

"I know that nothing, no institution, no business, no city, state, nor federal government can go on deficit spending unless it has a planned recovery well in hand. The University is now dedicated to balanced budget operations but we have to look for new solutions to problems that just won't go away."

Steadily rising educational costs are among those constant problems, Jones says. He believes that the University may have to take a harder, more practical look at educational programming, and that faculty, which has already been willing to share the problems, may have to take on extra burdens. "I know the idea is way out, but we may also have to ask students to pitch in with part of the work of keeping the University going. Eventually, we may have to ask them to help maintain the premises, even to do some of the teaching as tutoring. There are no ordinary solutions to these problems, so we have to entertain extraordinary ideas."

A native St. Louisan, Jones attended Yale, but decided to go to work sooner rather than later and left after two years. He explains that the country was just coming out of the depression and that his parents were borrowing money to send him to school. "I wasn't on a scholarship, so I figured that I'd done everything I wanted in the first two years—I had a wonderful time—and I'd better get to work." He says he would not advise young people to do the same today. "But, I don't ever regret what I did. I got out in the world and began learning what I needed to know."
to live up to his reputation without being either pompous or overbearing.

"At 8:45," he continued, "I met with W. Allen WALLIS, chancellor of the University of Rochester. He wanted to tell me about his school's new program in medical education which is being financed by the Commonwealth Foundation. He wasn't here to ask for money. He also wanted me to know that Sterling Wortman, vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation, had been given the first Joseph Chamberlain Wilson Award, an honor accorded to the individual who has contributed the most in international affairs. Joe Wilson was chairman of the board of Xerox when he died suddenly in 1971.

"Finally, he informed me that the first Frederick Taylor Gates Lecture at the University of Rochester (named after the clergyman who encouraged John D. Rockefeller to become a philanthropist) was given by Robert Swain Morison, M.D., Richard J. Schwartz Professor of Science and Society at Cornell University. He was on our staff for many years. I meet very frequently with various heads of universities," Dr. Knowles explained, "not because they are here to get funds, but because we can exchange views and keep each other informed."

"One of the great problems of running a foundation like this, and I'm sure it holds true for others who head large organizations, is that we are isolated. People fawn on you. They won't tell you the truth. When I was running Massachusetts General (Dr. Knowles was a director of Boston's Massachusetts General Hospital from 1962-1975) everybody and his brother would tell me all day and all night what a clunk I was and how the place was mismanaged. That is what you want to hear. Half of what they said was trash; the other half I did something about."

The Knowles' schedule that morning also included visits with Willard Wirtz, former Secretary of Labor under President Richard Nixon; George Bonham, editor of Change magazine, and Wally (Waldemar) Nielsen, author of a book called The Big Foundations. Last year, Dr. Knowles and Bonham organized a meeting on the past, present, and future of the humanities. Change magazine later devoted an entire issue to the papers presented at that conference. Dr. Knowles is concerned about the humanities because, he said, "They enjoy an abysmally low source of support at a time when we are worrying about ethics, morals, and values. The fundamental decisions that we must make about science and technology are ethical and value choices. That's where the humanities come in, and they have been left far behind." Under Dr. Knowles's guidance, the Rockefeller Foundation substantially began to increase its support of the humanities in 1974.

After a sandwich at his desk and still another visitor, Dr. Knowles settled down to work on an article the editors of Time magazine had requested on the subject of health during the past 200 years, complete with a prediction about the future. Dr. Knowles does all his own research and writing. "I would no more ask somebody to write my material than Maria Callas would let somebody sing for her," he said. A game of doubles squash after work and then dinner at the Knowles family's Fifth Avenue apartment found him ready to lose himself in the literary supplement of The London Times. "They use language so beautifully," he said with admiration.

D R. KNOWLES was not always of such scholarly bent. "At Harvard (A.B. '47) my marks were awful—I spent all my time playing baseball, hockey, or squash and writing the words and music for the Hasty Pudding show with Jack Lemmon" [John Uhler Lemmon, who has also achieved a measure of fame]. Somehow, despite his "awful record," Knowles was accepted by Washington University School of Medicine (eleven other medical schools turned him down) and graduated first in his class. Eleven years later he became—at 35—the youngest General Director in the 150-year history of Massachusetts General Hospital. In 1972, Dr. Knowles became the Rockefeller Foundation's eighth president. As a Washington University trustee and recipient of an honorary degree in 1970, he frets about not making it to every Board meeting. Fearful that he was what he disparagingly calls "window dressing," he considered resigning, but changed his mind when Chancellor William H. Danforth convinced him that he was a valuable adviser who was readily accessible by telephone. That matters very much to Dr. Knowles because, he said firmly, "I'm indebted to Washington University for taking a chance on me and letting me develop a career."
Donald E. Lasater

TRUSTEES don’t run universities,” declares WU Trustee Donald E. Lasater. “They provide support and help to give direction and decide policy, but their real job is to help management—the administration and the faculty—achieve the institution’s goals.

Lasater has been on the Washington University Board of Trustees since 1970. Several years before coming on the WU board, he had been a member of the board of Saint Louis University. He is proud to have served both institutions and he is proud of both institutions.

“The presence of two major universities in St. Louis is a tremendous asset to the strength and development of this community,” he says. “Both are dedicated to excellence in education and both offer invaluable continuing education and research resources for companies with headquarters in this area or to those who are contemplating settling in St. Louis. It is also extremely fortunate for the people of this area to have two great university-connected medical centers.”

Don Lasater is a native St. Louisan. He attended Southeast Missouri State College, the University of Iowa, and the University of Southern California. After service with the Navy during World War II, he returned to Southern California, earning his law degree there in 1948.

A member of both the California and Missouri bars, Lasater practiced law for ten years before entering the banking business. He served as Assistant Prosecuting Attorney of St. Louis County for two years and an additional two years as First Assistant County Counselor. He joined Mercantile Trust Company, where he is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer, in 1959.

The transition from law to banking was a natural one, Lasater recalls, as he came into the banking business in the trust area, which is basically concerned with estate planning, pension plans, profit-sharing plans, tax law, and other matters where legal training and experience is invaluable.

“My experience as Assistant County Counselor also gave me considerable experience in administration,” he recalls. “In that position, I spent a great deal of time with boards, commissions, and department heads on budget, personnel, and administrative problems, all of which proved of great help in working within a large business organization.”

Lasater became an assistant vice president of Mercantile Trust in 1960, a vice president in 1963, and president in 1967. He was elected to his present position in 1970.

Most of my outside interests involve working with young people,” he observes. He is a director of Boys Town of America and has long been active with Junior Achievement of Missouri, Inc. He has also served as president of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, as treasurer of the Missouri Public Expenditures Service, and as a director of the United Fund and of the St. Louis Municipal Theatre. He is a vice president of Civic Progress, Inc., and chairman of the board of the Civic Center Redevelopment Corporation.

His interest in young people is quite evident in his close ties with his own five children. He and his wife, the former Mary McGinnis, have four boys and one girl. Four of the five Lasater youngsters will be in college this fall.

When Don Lasater joined the Washington University board in 1970, it was toward the end of the antiwar protests that disturbed this campus, as well as virtually all others. Looking back on these troubled times, Lasater observes, “In a way, the troubles were a good thing in that they taught students to accept more responsibility, and they led to the schools giving up some restrictions that had existed for no reason except that they had always been there.”

Before joining the Washington University Board, Lasater served with a committee of the the St. Louis chapter of the American Bar Association, formed to look into the problem of Washington University law students who were unable to complete their bar examinations satisfactorily.

“It was my conviction then, and it is my conviction now, that it is not the responsibility of the working bar, but of the School of Law, to provide refresher courses for law students,” Lasater states. “Under Dean Edward T. Foote, that responsibility is being met readily.”

Lasater feels that not only the Law School, but the University as a whole, has shown great improvement in recent years, especially in the area of making the professional schools self-supporting and giving them a far greater degree of self-administration. “Under the present budgetary system,” he points out, “the deans of the various schools are encouraged to seek funds to develop programs of their own that will enhance education in that particular school. It gives each dean more authority, but also more responsibility.

“There has been a tremendous improvement in funding in recent years, especially with the Ford and Danforth matching grants. Many schools did not handle matching foundation grants as well as did Washington University. Others used the funds to expand their physical plants and programs and then found themselves saddled with greatly increased operating costs. At Washington University, funds from matching grants have been mainly used to underwrite essential operations.”

Looking back on his six years of service as a trustee, Don Lasater remarks, “It has been a great experience meeting and getting to know the people of the University, especially the faculty and students. I may not have agreed with all of them on some points, but I’ve enjoyed every minute of it.”
Comment

ON A BUSY APRIL AND AN HONORED MAY

April has always been one of the busiest months at this university. During the entire academic year, this is a busy place, but the pace quickens in April. This year saw a remarkable blossoming of April special events: seminars, conferences, symposia, colloquia, conferences, many national and even international in scope.

Just to touch a few of the highlights: The month opened in the midst of the Sixth Annual Martin Luther King Symposium. The eight-day program brought together distinguished speakers and artists from throughout the University community, the St. Louis area, and the nation. Sponsors were the Association of Black Students, the Black Studies Program, and the Special Educational Service Center.

The Martin Luther King Symposium was followed by an international symposium on “Jews and Germans at the Turn of the Century.” Sponsored by the Department of German, the meeting brought to the campus many outstanding scholars, including Gershom Scholem, past president of the Israel Academy of Social Sciences and Humanities, and Professors Joachim Bieber of the University of Hamburg and Peter Pulzer of Oxford.

In mid-April, Washington University was host to the annual international meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, held in honor of Dr. Mildred Trotter, professor emeritus of anthropology at the School of Medicine and one of the founding members of the Association. Among the many noted anthropologists who participated in the meeting were: S. L. Washburn of the University of California, who has won renown for his research on non-human primates and fossil man; Raymond Dart of the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, discoverer of the earliest fossil man; and John Buettner-Janusch, New York University geneticist and primate taxonomist, whose work has received international recognition. Nine Washington University faculty members and undergraduate students participated in the conference, which focused on the newest discoveries of fossil man and the latest research on population biology, nutrition, primate behavior, anatomy, and genetics.

The list of major events could go on for pages: the Women in the Arts Weekend, sponsored by the Feminist Coalition; the Center for Archaeometry’s symposium on “Aesthetic Problems in the Conservation of Outdoor Monuments”; and many other gatherings, large and small, formal and informal, at both the Hilltop and the School of Medicine campuses. April this year at Washington University produced a bumper crop of important, interesting, and often exciting events.

The William Greenleaf Eliot Society Award for 1976 was presented this spring to a man who has been a long and close friend of Washington University. The award, presented annually to a member of the Washington University community in recognition of outstanding service to the University, was made to Morton D. May, Life Trustee of Washington University, Director and past Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of May Department Stores Company, art collector and patron, amateur painter, semi-professional photographer, and intrepid fisherman.

In making the award, Trustee Alfred Hayes, new president of the Eliot Society, said: “Tonight’s recipient is a man who has already left an enduring and significant mark on Washington University, as he has on the entire St. Louis community. His close and warm involvement with the institution has enriched the University and those who have had the opportunity of working with him. A Life Trustee, he has been a member of the Board since 1958. He has become a trusted friend and valued adviser to four Chancellors. He has come to know countless members of the University faculty and staff and to count many of them among his personal friends. Most of all, he has come to know, and in turn has come to be known by, many, many students through the years in his variety of roles as adviser, benefactor, patron, and friend.”

Morton May’s Eliot Society Award was long overdue, but it had to wait until this year, because since the inception of the award, he has had to present it as president of the Society for the past eleven years. Now that he is no longer president, it was possible for the Society’s anonymous committee to select him for the honor and for him to receive the silver replica of Heikki Seppa’s sculpture, “The Search,” that he had presented to all earlier award winners. This year, Morton D. May finally received his Seppa sculpture, symbolizing the Eliot Society Award. It was richly deserved.

One of the stone markers for the 60-yard dash event in the 1904 Olympic Games, held at Washington University’s Francis Field, will be on permanent display in the Track and Field Hall of Fame in Charleston, West Virginia. Site of the first Olympic Games held in America, Francis Field was named after David R. Francis, president of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, the famed St. Louis World’s Fair. The stadium, and for that matter, the entire Washington University Hilltop campus, were part of the World’s Fair grounds.

Jack W. Rose, executive director of the Track and Field Hall of Fame, has informed us that a copy of the article about the 1904 Olympics which appeared in the Summer, 1967, issue of the Washington University Magazine, will also go on display at the Hall of Fame.

Trustee Morton D. May, recipient of the 1976 William Greenleaf Eliot Award for outstanding service to the University.

—FO’R
The traditional oak walk running west from Brookings Quadrangle has a new look, with rows of powerful streetlamps alternating with trees. The new lighting is part of a campus-wide program to provide better illumination of walkways and parking lots.