On July 15, a letter was sent to all alumni and other friends of Washington University announcing that the University had surpassed its $120 million development goal two years ahead of schedule. The $60 million challenge grant, made to Washington University by the Danforth Foundation, has been matched by $61.6 million in gifts and pledges from private sources.

This is truly a remarkable achievement, especially in an era when voluntary support of higher education throughout the country has shown a decline. According to a recent report from the Council for Financial Aid to Education, total voluntary support declined 3.6 per cent in 1974-75 (the most recent year for which figures are available). It marked only the second time since 1957-58 that voluntary support recorded a decrease and, like the previous drop in giving in 1969-70, it coincided with a recession in the nation’s economy. Even more significant, most of the decrease in support in 1974-75 was reported by the major private universities and all classes of private institutions received less as a group. The private colleges and universities reported a decline of 6.4 per cent.

At the time of the announcement, Charles Allen Thomas, chairman of the University’s Board of Trustees, stated: “We are deeply indebted to our generous alumni and friends for their recognition of Washington University’s unique value. I know that they will continue to support us at new and higher levels of giving because of their conviction that Washington University is one of the excellent institutions of higher learning in the nation.”

Thomas also paid tribute to the Board’s Major Gift Committee, its chairman, George H. Capps, and his predecessors, Maurice R. Chambers and the late David Calhoun, who “gave the program tremendous momentum and have earned our enduring gratitude.”

George Capps commented on the exceptional commitment to Washington University that exists in the St. Louis community and in the wider, national community. “In light of today’s economic uncertainties, which have caused a slight downward trend nationally in voluntary support of independent
higher education," he said, "the willingness to support this university is a strong indicator of its quality and value to society, and an equally strong indicator of the strength of the metropolitan St. Louis area."

The response from alumni was especially gratifying. Over the past three years, the number of alumni making annual gifts increased from 5900 to more than 11,000. Commenting on that record, Chancellor William H. Danforth pointed out that at the same time "more and more alumni have volunteered their talents in a number of vital areas, such as the recruitment of students."

"That is strong evidence," he added, "that Washington University is held in high esteem by those who benefited most directly from its programs and, as a result, merits the support of the wider, national community."

Although meeting the Danforth Foundation challenge grant two years ahead of schedule was a tremendous achievement, this is no time to rest on our laurels. Several major University objectives remain unfunded, including $20 million for endowment, $5 million for restoration of major buildings, and $5 million for scholarships. In addition, the inexorable advance of inflation continues to force operating costs higher and higher. In the words of George Capps, "Our new and higher level of annual giving must be sustained to keep our regular academic programs excellent and our budget balanced."

When the Danforth Foundation challenge grant was first announced in March, 1973, Chancellor Danforth stated clearly what was at stake. He pointed out that the Ford Foundation matching grant had ended in 1970, that the National Science Foundation Center of Excellence support was coming to an end, and that federal support of research programs and graduate education was being drastically reduced. Despite the $15 million five-year Danforth Foundation grant made to the University in 1970, large deficits appeared in the 1971 and 1972 budgets, even with increased tuition rates and a vigorous effort to hold down expenditures.

In announcing the challenge grant, Chancellor Danforth (Continued on page 40)
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Our American System: Can It Endure the Present Threats?

By Clark M. Clifford

As our country prepares to celebrate our 200th Anniversary, and a sense of pride and gratitude prevails, there exists a curious paradox. While we hail the wisdom and prescience of those who founded this nation, and note the remarkable benefits we have derived from the system of government they established, the fundamental principles on which that system was founded are being seriously eroded.

The gravity of the situation that exists today is to me inescapable. Yet I do not sense the degree of alarm and concern among our citizens that the present circumstances would seem to warrant. I shall discuss in some detail the dangers I perceive because the major responsibility for helping preserve what we have held to be so dear is naturally shifting from my generation to the generation of those who are now entering a new period of stewardship.

The undermining of our democratic concept threatens both fundamental rights of the individual as well as basic tenets of our economic system and comes from both ends of the political spectrum. In order to appreciate fully the magnitude and gravity of this attack, it would be useful for us to go back and review briefly the genesis of our country which we so proudly celebrate during this anniversary year.

In 1787 in Philadelphia, there gathered an assembly charged with the task of drafting a constitution for the new American nation. Both the composition of that group and the concept of free men gathering to establish a system under which they would be governed were of an unprecedented nature. At that time, the generally accepted theory of government was that all the power lay in the Crown; none lay in the people. The king was thought to rule by divine right, and was therefore answerable only to God. The people owed absolute fealty to the sovereign and had only those rights that the sovereign granted.

Our Constitutional Convention launched a radical and unprecedented theory of government—the theory that the authority of a government derives solely from the consent of those it governs, and that a government shall exercise only those powers granted to it by the people. The concept of a government of limited powers became the cornerstone of our Constitution, and was specifically set forth in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which provides that all the rights not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people.

This concept of a government of limited powers was expressed in a more general way through the division of governmental authority among several branches. The American colonists had suffered through a period of unbridled and uncontrolled exercise of power by the British monarch. Their homes had been invaded and searched without permission and without judicial warrant. They had been forced to quarter British troops in their homes. They had been subjected to arbitrary taxation. Their economic affairs had been regulated and disrupted for the benefit of the Crown. This experience engendered a deep and abiding distrust of absolute and unchecked governmental power.

Thus, the powers of government were divided among three co-equal branches: the legislative branch established under Article I, the executive branch under Article II, and the judicial branch under Article III. A system of checks and balances was created so that no one division could become stronger than the
others, and no one individual or group of individuals could gain control of our country and then violate the basic principles set forth as the Constitutional law of our land. In order to prevent the exercise of excessive power by the federal government, power was further divided between that government and the governments of the several states.

As part and parcel of this whole concept, in addition to giving the people the right to set up their own government, our founding fathers offered the hitherto unknown concept that the dignity of the human individual constituted the basis of law, and that the rights of the individual were the most paramount concern of a government. Thus, the people are not only guaranteed certain fundamental rights, but the government, under the Constitution of the United States, has the positive, unequivocal responsibility of protecting the rights of its people.

After the adoption of the Constitution, the First Congress proposed in 1789 specific limitations on the power of government to protect individual rights and prevent the dangers that they believed were inherent in the concentration of power. The states ratified these restrictions as the first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights. The First Amendment is deemed of particular importance. That amendment prohibits the government from abridging freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. Although men had asserted these freedoms before, for the first time they were expressed as basic limitations on the power of government rather than freedoms to be granted or denied as the sovereign chose.

Viewed from the perspective of these founding principles, we must regard the recent conduct of our government with grave alarm. The fundamental rights of our citizens have been consistently and systematically violated. One reads with a deep sense of shock and alarm that the last five or six administrations have repeatedly ignored the Constitution and have violated fundamental rights of our people. This has nothing to do with politics. I am referring to the fact that your government has shown itself to be guilty of repeated transgressions in violation of the sacred law of our land. This must concern every one of us.

One of our prized inheritances is that of individual privacy. Our Constitution and the laws of the last two hundred years guarantee us that right. Yet, we now know that this right has been violated with increasing impunity. We find that individuals in and out of government have had their telephones tapped for weeks and months at a time. Citizens' homes and hotel rooms have been bugged. Agents have trailed our people and have reported on their activities. Information of this kind has been obtained systematically and used for political and other ulterior purposes.

I did not know Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., during his lifetime. I do know he was an American citizen, active in civil rights, who had not been charged with any crime. Now it is disclosed by a Select Committee of the Senate, conducting a study of U.S. intelligence activities, that the FBI ruthlessly and premeditatedly attempted to destroy Dr. King in violation of the law and fundamental human decency. Telephone taps, hotel bugs, poison pen letters, anonymous telephone calls, were all perpetrated with the intent to destroy his standing in the community and even in an effort to induce him to commit suicide. The Senate Committee found that such activities were carried out "against hundreds of lesser-known American citizens." Thus, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the agency of the federal government that is charged with protecting our rights and enforcing the law, is now shown to have embarked on a course of action calculated to destroy the people the agency is charged with protecting.

We have learned from the Senate's investigation that for approximately twenty years the Central Intelligence Agency conducted a program of indiscriminately opening citizens' first class mail. Officials of the CIA knew these activities were illegal but nevertheless continued the program. Frequent wiretapping of American citizens without the benefit of a judicial warrant, as well as hundreds of warrantless break-ins—burglaries—have occurred.

This course of action proves again the accuracy of the comment by Lord Acton: "Power tends to corrupt. Absolute power corrupts absolutely." These Americans who have been hounded and persecuted were not guilty of any criminal offense. Oftimes they were only guilty of differ-
ing with those views held by the particular administration which was then in office. Thousands of Americans' rights were violated when their only transgression, for instance, was to differ with the administration on its policy in Vietnam. If we fail to appreciate the significance of this gross misconduct on the part of our government, then we have lost something very valuable that our forefathers gave to us.

The First Amendment of the Constitution, as noted earlier, guarantees the right of freedom of speech and of the press. Here again, examples abound which demonstrate that persons in control of our government really did not believe American citizens should be free to exercise these rights. We have thus learned of governmental actions designed to restrict the freedom of the press and to threaten retaliation for critical comment.

I hold no brief for the press. The press and other forms of the media make mistakes just as mistakes are made in other areas of human endeavor. Despite occasional errors and excesses, however, a free press is essential to our form of government. In this regard, Thomas Jefferson once said the following: "Were it left to me to say whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate for a moment to prefer the latter." What he was suggesting is that our form of government, a free democratic government, cannot endure —given the frailties of human nature—unless there is a free press that will constantly keep the people of this country informed of what their government is doing. We have seen what a valuable service the media has performed these last years in exposing unlawful conduct by officials and agencies of the government.

The concept of a press free of government control has been under serious assault in recent years. A few illustrations are sufficient. When the newspaper Newsday printed an article critical of a recent administration, agents of the IRS descended upon them and remained there for weeks. When Daniel Schorr commented unfavorably over television regarding a certain incident, he was subjected to a full field investigation by the FBI. When the Washington Post started its Watergate articles, applications were filed at the Federal Communications Commission by groups covertly sponsored by the Administration to take away from the Post two of its valuable television channels in Florida. These and other governmental actions created a sinister climate of fear that I had not been conscious of since those dismal and terrifying days of Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin. You could feel it. You could sense it. The telephone was used with a new sense of concern. Ominous rumors of retribution were circulated at daily intervals.

You will recall those brave words of Voltaire when he said: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." At one time, not too long ago, an administration sent forth a message that might be paraphrased as follows: "We disagree with all that you say, and if you say it again, we will destroy you."

The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution has a long and honorable history that goes back to the sense of outrage felt by our forefathers when their homes were invaded by soldiers looking for contraband. The Amendment reads, in part, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. . . ." This language is so clear that no one could possibly misunderstand it; yet, recently, it has been prejudicially and, in my opinion, criminally violated.

When an American citizen is charged with a crime, he is not only protected by the Fourth Amendment but by other constitutional safeguards designed to ensure that he will receive a fair and impartial trial. Several years ago, Daniel Ellsberg was charged with violation of a federal criminal statute and was to be brought to trial in a federal court in California. During the course of that trial, agents of the United States government, acting pursuant to a conspiracy conceived in the White House itself broke into the office of a certain Dr. Fielding. Mr. Ellsberg's psychiatrist, to obtain the record of Mr. Ellsberg and photograph it for the purpose of using the contents in a campaign to discredit him. The government's misconduct in this instance was so flagrant that it caused the judge to dismiss the case.

I don't know what the impact of this was on our people. I fear that many of them did not connect the violation of Mr. Ellsberg and Dr. Fielding's constitutional rights to the possibility that their own rights may be in jeopardy.

Let me read you just a part of the famous poem by John Donne and see if it doesn't bring the lesson home:

"No man is an island entire of itself
Every man is a piece of the continent
A part of the main
Any man's death diminishes me because
I am involved in mankind
And therefore, never seek to know
For whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."

When Dr. Fielding's office is violated, your office and my office are violated. When Mr. Ellsberg's rights are violated, your and my rights are violated. So, when you hear the funeral bell tolling under circumstances such as these, you need not ask for whom the bell tolls, the bell tolls for all of us.

I confess I am mystified that the incidents to which I refer seem to have led to some debate between liberals and conservatives. My experience teaches me that when individual and property rights of our people are violated, those who are likely to be the greatest losers are those persons of property who usually constitute the conservative core, and yet, for some arcane reason, many conservatives deprecate the significance and importance of these unfortunate developments.

The line between a democracy and a totalitarian government is curiously fragile. If you take away the rights of one citizen, you take away the rights of all citizens. History teaches us that those nations that have gone from democracy to totalitarianism have first gone through a period of the gradual erosion of individual rights. I do not fear the loss of our freedom to an aggressor from without. I fear the erosion and disintegration of our democratic principles that have occurred from within.

When citizens' phones are tapped, their houses invaded, the press is terrorized, lists of enemies are prepared within the White House itself, the government begins to take on characteristics of totalitarianism instead of our own beloved country. Have we learned from these experiences? I am not sure. The Senate has conducted a detailed investigation
and reported its findings. But I don't sense a reaction of shock and outrage on the part of our people. There is a curious apathy that seems to prevail. I have been disappointed that the Congress itself has not reacted with more firmness and determination.

The flagrant use of wiretaps for political purposes indicates to one that existing federal law, which grants the President a broad exemption from the general requirements that wiretaps be initiated only upon prior judicial consent, should be amended to subject all wiretaps to prior judicial scrutiny. I am disturbed by the failure of our law enforcement officials to discipline those guilty of an unlawful deprivation of the rights of our citizens. I would like to see a stronger and more unequivocal reaction by the Congress, the courts, and the public against the assertion by a recent administration that the President possesses certain "inherent powers" which thus place him above the Constitution and laws of our country. We should react sharply when the argument of "inherent power" of the Presidency is used to justify executive action. This doctrine is wholly at odds with the fundamental tenet of our governmental system: that ours is a government of limited and specifically delegated powers.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1787, "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." What a wonderful prescient man he was. Later he wrote: "Timid men prefer the calm of despotism to the boisterous sea of liberty." Have we grown so timid we are no longer willing to fight for our most precious heritage? Is the struggle for our rights that was conducted with such heroism two hundred years ago too much for us now?

There is another equally fundamental principle of our American system which I feel is in serious jeopardy: the principle of free, private enterprise. Again, I feel it would be helpful to discuss briefly the economic system contemplated by the drafters of our Constitution. In 1776, the year of our independence, Wealth of Nations, a seminal work in economic theory, was published by Adam Smith. That work advanced an economic theory as innovative as the political theory which underlies our Constitution. In a reaction against the prevailing theory of mercantilism, which involved active regulation of economic affairs by the sovereign, Adam Smith argued that the world of economics is separate and apart from the world of politics or the government and that this economic world is governed by certain immutable laws, such as the law of supply and demand and the law of diminishing returns. Under this economic concept, every individual should be permitted to engage in that activity which he construes to be in his own economic self-interest. The collective pursuit of self-interest by each individual would, it was argued, lead to the general prosperity of all.

Under such an economic system, the function of government is extremely limited. The government need only enact reasonable laws and provide reliable courts in order to ensure the discharge of private contracts, debts, and obligations, and to protect life and property. Beyond this, governments should not interfere with the working of a free economy.

This theory exerted a tremendous influence over the leaders of the new American nation. The concept of economic freedom complemented and strengthened the individual liberties embodied in our Constitution. Guided by these two fundamental principles, our country has grown and prospered over the past two hundred years.

As we survey the present structure of our economy, it is obvious that we have departed considerably from the pure laissez faire economy envisioned by our founders. The role of government in the economy is substantial and pervasive, and this role has grown at an alarming rate over the past fifteen years. The degree of government involvement in the economy and the apparently inexorable growth of that involvement have led many to question whether our free enterprise system can survive, or whether we are gradually but irreversibly moving toward a centrally controlled economy not unlike that of the communist nations.

I believe that the manner in which we resolve this issue is as crucial to the survival of our democratic heritage as is the preservation of our individual liberties. Obviously, we cannot return to the economic world of 1776. If we review the history of government involvement in the economy, we will find that every substantial expansion of governmental power was prompted by a perceived inequality or distortion in the free market economy. For example, the first major regulatory statute, the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, resulted from political pressure generated by farmers and others who were powerless against the exercise of unfair practices by the railroads. Similarly, the Sherman Act of 1890 and Clayton Act and Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914 were passed in response to alarming growth of monopolies and trusts and the destructive influence which such organizations had on the nation's economic well being. The wave of legislation enacted during the New Deal resulted from similar distortions in the free market economy.

In general, the expansion of government regulatory power has resulted from two related causes: the emergence of economic conditions adverse to the general welfare, and the responsiveness of legislators to pressure from persons disadvantaged by those conditions. Although the merits of many of these regulatory measures are debatable, the process which produced them is a salutary one. In a democracy, the laws of economics must be subject to the will of the electorate. What our citizens have demanded, and what the government has attempted to do through the enactment of regulatory legislation, is to relieve the inequalities created by free enterprise while preserving the essence of a free economy.

I don't believe it is fruitful to discuss in the abstract the size of government or the need for regulation. Very few of our citizens advocate either a return to a pure laissez faire economy, or the emergence of total government control over the economy. We must accept the role of both government and free enterprise in our economy. In each instance, the inquiry should focus on whether the general welfare will be better served through
private or public control. In addressing this issue, I believe that certain guiding principles should be applied. We have grown and prospered under a largely free economy, and thus a presumption should exist that free enterprise is the method most conducive to our continued growth and prosperity. Applying this presumption, we should evaluate both existing and proposed regulations in terms of the burden which regulation will impose both on business and on the public as compared to the benefits which regulation will confer. Finally, we should rely to the greatest extent possible on the market mechanism and the law of supply and demand rather than on governmental intervention as a means of allocating resources.

Although these principles would, I believe, elicit support from the majority of Americans, they have been systematically ignored, particularly over the last fifteen years. We have reached a point where free enterprise is in danger of extinction. Several years ago the government imposed a comprehensive wage/price control program on the country in an effort to control inflation. The program finally ended after several years of operation, though there were those who argued strenuously for its continued operation. Such programs are obviously well-intentioned but they intrude dangerously on the mechanism of the free market and threaten to destroy it.

Federal regulation has become pervasive throughout the economy. Regulatory agencies and federal advisory committees continue to proliferate. Business is confronted with an enormous amount of federal forms and paper with which it must contend. This becomes an especially critical problem for small business. I believe that we must continue to balance the benefits that flow to the public from this government regulation against the cumulative effect of these programs on business and the extent to which they substantially increase the cost of operations.

I do not suggest a dismantling of our massive government regulatory apparatus. I am concerned when government becomes so big, so complex, and so expensive that it threatens the continued well-being of the system. I believe that regulation is used too frequently as a panacea for economic ills with the effect that we now protect and encourage inefficiency and mismanagement by shielding industries from competitive forces.

In addition to this slow strangulation of competitive forces that comes from over-regulation by government, I note with serious concern several legislative measures that have been proposed which go beyond mere regulation and seek to restructure entire industries. We have recently seen in the Congress that legislation has been proposed which seeks to break up the oil industry. Each major oil company is engaged in four phases of activity—production, refining, transportation, and marketing. The legislation, if enacted, would require each oil company to select one of these four operations and to engage in that business alone. The remaining three segments of the company would be spun off or divested. Similar legislation has been proposed to break up industries that are deemed overly concentrated. To allow government to intrude to this extent on our free economic system is a dangerous theoretical concept. If enacted, the legislation would be a practical disaster. The unquestioned effect of such legislation would be so greatly to change our economic system as to jeopardize its future success.

There are now several regulatory reform measures pending in Congress. One bill would require almost all government programs to be reauthorized by Congress every four years and programs not reauthorized would be terminated. I support the theory underlying such legislation. Periodic review of the need for the continuation of our various agencies would be valuable.

The people of this country are beneficiaries of the most successful economic and political system that has ever been created. Our success goes back to those two major principles that formed the basis of our concept of government two hundred years ago. Our political system and economic system have complemented the other and strengthened the other. I fear there is a lack of appreciation for the enormous benefits that flow from our system.

For so many years, the continued success of the system has been not only the hope of our people but also the hope of the free world. Your hopes for the good life, for a life of freedom from fear and freedom from want will depend upon your ability to preserve our political system and our economic system. Both are faced with dangerous threats that cannot be overcome by passive indifference. It is our duty to respond to those threats.

In this view may I leave you with some stirring words that I hope will come to mean as much to you as they have to me over these past years. Permit me to repeat the following statement of President Theodore Roosevelt:

"It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man tumbled or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who comes short again and again, who knows the great enthusiasm, the great devotion, and spends himself in a worthy cause, who at the best knows in the end the triumph of great achievement, and who at the worse, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place will never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."
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Although this institution was not founded until 1853, the Washington University community is participating in the nation's Bicentennial celebration with great enthusiasm. It is true that there was no Washington University in 1776, but the school bears the name of one founding father, George Washington, and owes the very ground it stands on to another, Thomas Jefferson.

The generally accepted version of why Washington University bears the name it does today is that the principal founder, William Greenleaf Eliot, modestly refused to lend his name to the institution. Casting around for an alternative, the founders chose Washington University because the school's charter was granted on Washington's birthday. While conceding the accuracy of the story as far as it goes, Professor David T. Konig of the history faculty feels that there is much more to it. His research seems to indicate that the founders also wanted to express their high regard for George Washington and his ideals and, above all, to indicate in those uneasy days preceding the Civil War the dedication of the new university to a strong, unified nation.

The tie with Thomas Jefferson is more direct. The University stands today on ground that Jefferson's imagination and foresight acquired for the United States through the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. The celebration of that remarkably astute real estate deal in the great St. Louis World's Fair of a hundred years later helped to establish the Hilltop campus and to put the University on a solid financial base. The University delayed the start of classes on the new campus for a year in order to rent the grounds and the first buildings to the Fair. The proceeds shored up a dangerously strained budget and permitted the erection of several new buildings. Every
institution of higher learning in this country has ample reason to celebrate the nation's 200th birthday, but Washington University has some special additional reasons.

The Bicentennial birthday party at Washington University began on September 19 of last year, when Bonnie B. McAfee, regional deputy for the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (ARBA), presented an official Bicentennial flag to Washington University. Chancellor William H. Danforth accepted the flag on behalf of the University, Senator Thomas H. Eagleton of Missouri made an address, and then, quite appropriately, everyone adjourned for a hot dog and soda pop picnic sponsored by the University's Women's Society.

Named by Chancellor Danforth to head the University's Bicentennial Committee were Professor Richard W. Davis, chairman of the Department of History, and Mrs. John Drescher, past president of the Women's Society. Theirs has been the gigantic task of coordinating the individual and collective contributions of University people to the Bicentennial celebration and of providing liaison with local, regional, and national organizations.

One of the major cooperative enterprises was "The World of Thomas Jefferson," a series of fifteen programs sponsored by Forest Park Associates, an organization which includes the University and ten other cultural and educationa...
Another panel discussion in the Bicentennial Series was sponsored by the University’s Center for the Study of Public Affairs” and focused on “Education for the Public Service.” Moderated by Robert H. Salisbury, director of the center and professor of political science, the panel’s participants were John P. Roche, professor of history at Tufts University and a former special consultant to President Johnson, and Murray L. Weidenbaum, director of the University’s Center for the Study of American Business and Mallinckrodt Distinguished University Professor, who served as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy from 1969 to 1971.

The most unusual and colorful program in which University people participated was the Bicentennial Horizons of American Music and the Performing Arts, or BHAM. The only national festival of the arts scheduled in the United States this year, BHAM presented more than 250 individual performances and workshops over a three-week period. Co-sponsored by the St. Louis Spirit of ’76 and the National Park Services, BHAM offered many events on the Washington University campus and many others in which University faculty, staff, students, and alumni participated.

BHAM was conceived by Elizabeth Gentry Sayad, AB 55, who took the idea of a great festival to the city fathers and civic leaders and managed to build and maintain enthusiasm and support for a project that ultimately involved 1500 volunteers, cost $1,250,000, and brought
an estimated one million visitors to St. Louis.

At BHAM's official grand opening, held June 14 under the Gateway Arch on the St. Louis riverfront, an electronic composition, "Arch Aire," by Thomas Hamilton of the University's Department of Music, received its world premiere. Hamilton also composed and performed in "No Single Thing Abides," an electronic audiovisual work presented in the Star Chamber of the McDonnell Planetarium.

Hamilton and Robert Wykes, professor of music, were among the composers featured in BHAM's Midwest Composers Concert. On June 24, the St. Louis Symphony orchestra gave the world premiere presentation of Wykes's special composition "Fanfare for BHAM." On July 1, a group of musicians from the Symphony gave the premiere performance of "After A Silence—Alpha," by John M. Perkins of the WU Music Department.

Another outstanding musical event incorporated into the BHAM extravaganza of music was the twelfth annual National Ragtime Festival, which featured the St. Louis Ragtimers, with Trebor Tichnor, AB 63, instructor in music, on the piano, and Don Franz, BSEng 55, MS 60, on tuba. The Ragtimers also played two afternoon concerts under the Arch on July 2.

In addition to performances of all kinds, BHAM's program included workshops in a wide area of the performing arts. Among these mini-courses was a workshop on Black American music since 1865, co-directed by Tilford Brooks, chairman of the University's Department of Music. Under the Arch, the WU choruses, directed by Orland Johnson, joined the St. Louis Symphony in a composition of Olly Wilson, who received the A.B. degree from Washington University and did graduate work here. Felicia Weathers, internationally known soprano who attended the University and received an honorary degree in 1971, was the featured soloist.

The Washington University campus was the scene of one of the major BHAM programs: the American Poetry-Prose Reading Series. Five nationally prominent writers appeared on the program, including Howard Nemerov, Edward Malinckrodt Distinguished University Professor of English and winner of an Academy of American Poets fellowship and the Theodore Roethke Memorial Award for poetry, and Stanley Elkin, professor of English and noted novelist and short story writer, whose latest novel, The Franchiser, is winning wide acclaim. A former faculty member, Mona Van Duyn, winner of the 1969-70 Bollingen Award and the 1971 winner of the National Book Award in poetry, was another of the featured writers in the series.

Presented in cooperation with the Women's Society of Washington University, with Mrs. George Fonyo, MA 74,
Pulitzer Prize poet Richard Wilbur came to campus for the American Poetry-Prose Reading Series.

Also in the series was Howard Nemerov, Edward Mallinckrodt Distinguished University Professor of English.

of the Office of Admissions, as coordinator, the Series brought to campus two Pulitzer Prize poets, Maxine Kumin and Richard Wilbur, who received an honorary degree from Washington University in 1964.

The list of Washington University faculty involved in the Bicentennial celebration is a long one and it would take a nationwide poll to discover how many alumni are part of Bicentennial observances throughout the country. While this account has concentrated on events on campus or in the St. Louis area, a few other contributions do deserve special mention, however, even if they are somewhat further afield.

Buford L. Pickens, professor emeritus of architecture, has a series of his original drawings of architectural designs based on Jefferson's plans and written notations on display this summer at “The Eye of Jefferson” exhibit at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. A painting by Robert Jordan, professor of art and archaeology, is included in the Bicentennial exhibition at the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, and Professor Robert Wykes's music was part of the “Sound and Light at the Old State Capitol” presentation in Springfield, Illinois.

The long-distance record for a Bicentennial observance by a Washington University faculty member, however, was set by Raymond Arvidson, assistant professor of earth and planetary sciences, who is one of the members of the Viking Lander team, which put the spacecraft on Mars in July. While the purpose of the Mars landing obviously is not to celebrate the Bicentennial, it did make a rather spectacular climax to a nation's 200th birthday party—and Washington University was part of it.

Mona Van Duyn, past winner of both the Bollingen and the National Book awards.

Thomas Jefferson's design for a chapel as drawn by Buford L. Pickens, professor emeritus of architecture. Several of Pickens' drawings are on display in “The Eye of Jefferson” exhibit at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C.
Women's Studies: A Personal Re-View

By Kathryn Guberman
Assistant Professor of English and Chairperson of the Administrative Committee for Women's Studies

Re-vision—the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new critical direction—is for us more than a chapter in cultural history: it is an act of survival. Until we can understand the assumptions in which we are drenched, we cannot know ourselves.

Adrienne Rich

My pet pastime these days is browsing through Who's Who and Where in Women's Studies. This volume as its title suggests, is a directory; it merely lists all the faculty members who taught Women's Studies and all the Women's Studies courses they taught between 1969, when a central clearinghouse began keeping records, and 1974. You can see how such a reference would be handy; you may wonder how it could be interesting. Well, if nothing else, the sheer number of courses it lists is bedazzling. Just flipping the pages brings home the inspiring (and humbling) fact that our efforts at Washington University belong to a movement larger than we can perceive.

With a closer reading and a little tallying, the outlines of that movement start to emerge. First, we see that Women's Studies has grown prodigiously fast. In the five years covered by Who's Who and Where, American colleges and universities introduced 4500 new courses and instituted 110 new programs in the field. Second, we see that Women's Studies courses not only increased numerically, but also spread across the curriculum. In 1969, we find them clustered in just three departments—history, literature, and sociology; by 1974, we find them spread, if unevenly, through every department from anthropology to zoology. Third, and perhaps most significant, we see that they have spread vertically as well as horizontally. In 1969, we find mainly introductory courses, surveys with titles like "Women in Literature" and "Women in American Society." By 1974, we find an intriguing variety of specialized courses as well—"Black and White Women in the Civil War," "Joan of Arc in Literature," "Sexism and Civil Rights," "Women in Scripture," "Women in Film," "Women in Industry." The list could go on for pages and still not depict how dramatically Women's Studies diversified in just those five years. And then the Women's Studies Newsletter tells us that in the next year, between 1974 and 1975, at least fifty more new programs were born. We can only imagine how many new courses.

How can we define a field that already embraces such diverse topics? How can we presume to delimit a field that is not merely expanding, but evolving so fast? When I started writing this article, I combed the standard references, including Who's Who and Where, looking for an authority to assume the burden. I could not find one, perhaps because authorities know better. Nevertheless, we may venture a few generalizations. We can say, with some security, that Women's Studies is interdisciplinary; in other words, it integrates concerns that have traditionally characterized separate academic disciplines (or departments), and it applies their characteristic methods of research and analysis in order to answer questions about women. We can say that Women's Studies combines efforts to recover women's experience in the past, to comprehend their experience in the present, and to chart such directions as may make their future more fulfilling. Though it sounds grandiose, we can truly say that Women's Studies involves finding out what we do not know and reassessing what we believe about the nature and achievements of half the human race.

If course, the trouble with such generalizations is that they have to remain vague to remain accurate. If we really want to understand Women's Studies, we should leave definitions and turn instead to origins. In the late sixties, then, women from many walks of life began gathering together in what they came to call consciousness-raising groups. They met because they wanted to become conscious of sexism and to find the strength to confront it, but their means concern us here as much as their ends. They talked about themselves: they actually treated their daily frustrations and dreams and fears as subjects worth studying. And as they discovered that they shared experiences each of them had thought peculiar to herself, they began constructing the common life of women.

They also began to criticize their education for keeping them ignorant of the life they shared and, inevitably, they began to imagine a better curriculum. Of course, when the women meeting were faculty and students, imagining soon turned to planning and planning to acting. I have no way of knowing how
many of the earliest Women's Studies courses were actually designed in consciousness-raising groups. My point is rather that consciousness-raising groups themselves were, by their very nature, the earliest form of Women's Studies, and that, as such, they prepared women faculty and students to criticize the traditional curriculum amply, acutely, and with alternatives in mind.

Basically, they leveled two criticisms, one at history courses and a second at literature and behavioral science courses together. The former, they said virtually ignored women; the latter treated stereotypes of women as truths. Now, both these criticisms imply the aims, methods, and materials of many Women's Studies courses, so we need to examine them more thoroughly. But since blanket criticisms always raise hackles, let me use my own experience to illustrate and leave you to judge how well it matches your own. I remember my American history text pretty well. Its long chapter on the Progressive Era ended with three-quarters of a page on the Women's Suffrage Movement (and a photograph of Susan B. Anthony). A movement that had enfranchised half the American population, a movement that had absorbed the energies and demonstrated the abilities of several millions of women for over seventy years was, in my text, a postscript. The same chapter had a photograph of Jane Addams at Hull House, but otherwise it ignored the women who had participated in the reform movements it stressed. For example, it recounted not only the achievements, but the boyhood and growth of Samuel Gompers. It did not even mention Mother Mary Jones, whose brigades of women, armed with buckets of water and brooms, hollering and beating on their dishpans, routed scabs every day until Pennsylvania mine owners realized they would have to deal with their striking workers. Come to think of it, the chapter did present one woman reformer after all, Carry Nation, caricatured as crudely as the cartoon it substituted for a photograph.

In short, I learned American history without its heroines. More fundamentally, I learned an American history without women—a history of my country that was not mine, because its events registered no impact on women's lives. My text had an enormous chapter on the Industrial Revolution, a triumphant catalogue of the machines men had invented. It did not remark, let alone assess the fact, that many of those machines took out of women's hands the tools for skilled labors traditionally their own—labors that had made housewifery economically productive and dignified. Incidentally, it also attributed to Eli Whitney the cotton gin Catharine Greene invented. Of course, before Women's Studies, I did not know that my text was partial and distorted. Though women's rights interested me, I had no reason to doubt the historians who thought them less important than dirty meat. I had no way of knowing that such "lost" heroines as Mother Jones existed. And though I could have known that major events would affect women, perhaps even have guessed how, I never did. For nothing in my education led me to conceive that women might have a history.

Though of course I knew that some women wrote, nothing in my education led me to conceive that women might have a literature either, because nothing led me to consider the obvious and important fact that most of the literature I studied was men's. You probably find it easier to see why history courses should pay attention to women than why literature courses should pay attention to the fact that male authors are men. So let me give you just one instance of what can happen when they don't, using a poem I first encountered in high school. *Idylls of the King*, I was taught, depicts the rise and fall of civilization, the soul's quest for perfection, the tragedy of genius in our mundane world—or things to that effect. The journeys the knights take figure forth psychic development; their battles represent the eternal conflict between good and evil. Now, this interpretation restates Tennyson's intent reasonably well, but it altogether ignores his sex bias. Purveyed to me as a monument of human intellect, his poem could only teach me to think myself an alien creature who would have to divorce her sensibility from her subjectivity in order to read.

You see, women do not sit at the Round Table, though it is "a model for the mighty world"; and women do not take those meaningful journeys, let alone fight those battles. They can inspire journeys, their helplessness calling forth the knight's heroism and their love rewarding it. They can delay or divert journeys, their indifference or jealousy subverting the knight's pure zeal. Or they can fail to delay journeys and die heartbroken. In short, they can be either Maidens in Distress or Bitches, stereotypes in either case. They certainly cannot be citizens of Camelot, since they are not even members of the human race. Thus, when my teacher let Tennyson equate male with human, she effectively asked me to find my own experience writ large in a poem that contained fewer women than my American history text. But again, before Women's Studies, I had no grounds to doubt the poet's vision. I did not guess that growing up male in a patriarchy might have warped his perspective because I did not know that his society (or ours) was a patriarchy. I did not recognize stereotypes because I had never heard of them.
You can probably infer the nature of most early Women's Studies courses from the experiences I have just related. They traced the Women's Movement from its origins to the present, pausing to mock its shriller opponents; and they re-viewed the classics, identifying stereotypes and contrasting them to female characters created by women. Often one course did both, and almost every course also read Freud, in those days the *bête noire* of feminism. When I think of the first courses I taught, I shudder at how much they presumed to cover. But the reasons they surveyed such wide expanses can tell us something about the state of Women's Studies then. For one thing, neither I nor the historian with whom I taught had any formal training in the field. How could we? So we were learning together with our students and avidly exploring everything we could lay hands on—one week the school newspaper's archives, the next week Margaret Mead. Then too, we did not have all that much material to choose from. We had no access to the many documents now reprinted or microfilmed. We had almost no anthologies to focus us and no comprehensive bibliographies to direct us to articles we might use. Indeed, much of the research that now supports intensive courses had not yet been published.

And finally, we tried to touch so many bases because we were teaching the only Women's Studies courses in the school and somehow felt obliged to supplement the whole curriculum.

Typically, early Women's Studies courses were, like ours, compensatory education: Formed in reaction to the traditional curriculum, they took their shape from its gaps. No one believed they would last long, not even the faculty teaching them. And here we can see another relation between Women's Studies and the political Women's Movement. Most women in the political movement then believed that, with a few legal reforms, the economy would integrate them and that those reforms would come quickly because present inequities were so flagrant. Likewise, most Women's Studies faculty believed that, with a few legal reforms, the economy would integrate them and that those reforms would come quickly because present inequities were so flagrant. Likewise, most Women's Studies faculty believed that, with a few legal reforms, the economy would integrate them and that those reforms would come quickly because present inequities were so flagrant.

Like women in the political movement, Women's Studies faculty found the Establishment more obdurate than they anticipated, reader to let them build an annex than to remodel the existing structure. It is symptomatic that when traditional courses did introduce material on women, they usually did so by simply tacking a new unit onto the old outline—Ladies' Day in the classroom. Thus, when Women's Studies grew by proliferating separate courses and then separate programs to coordinate them, it was following the path of least resistance. But even if unsought, it was separateness that made evolution possible. Kept on the fringes of the traditional curriculum, Women's Studies could grow freely according to its own internal logic. And it did grow, to the point that it became too large and too distinct to integrate.

Let me just suggest how it grew by returning to history and literature. Historians rediscovered more "lost" heroines than Mother Jones and rehabilitated more heroines than Carry Nation, but they soon came to grips with the fact that no conspiracy of silence had suppressed a history of women comparable to the textbook histories of men. True, one woman had planned Lincoln's Civil War battles, but no women (excepting a few queens) had declared wars or signed treaties or made laws. Women's history would have to be something different: the history of all those anonymous women who raised families while their husbands and sons were off raising monuments. Public records would just hint at that history, and so, with as much ingenuity as industry, historians began to construct it out of diaries, letters, marriage manuals, fashion plates, and the other treasures old attics afford. They had begun, in Virginia Woolf's phrase, "to think back through their mothers."

Now, literary scholars did not face a dearth of heroines, not at least from Jane Austen's time forward. Nevertheless, they too rediscovered some "lost" women, and we might say they rehabilit-
tated many, since they found fresh, sometimes revolutionary, insights in works reputedly conventional and sentimental. They also gave new life to women writers never ignored or derided; the Charlotte Brontë we read today is a different woman from the Charlotte Brontë I met in high school. But the main point is that they arrived at such re-visions because, like historians, they had reoriented themselves. They had ceased protesting anti-feminist literature and had set themselves to reconstructing a tradition of women's literature—a literary history of and for women. Yet their early catalogue of stereotypes proved a legacy of questions: What roles can and should women actually fulfill? Do women really have a different nature from men? Why have women always been “the second sex”? Sociologists had addressed these questions from the outset; other social scientists, philosophers, and biologists now joined them. And thus, by 1970, a few seemingly transitory courses had become a field which some “lost” woman had named Women's Studies.

Two years later, flowing inland from the coasts with the political movement, Women's Studies arrived at Washington University. In late spring of 1972, more than 1100 students signed a petition proposing “an interdepartmental program of women's studies” that could lead eventually to “an interdepartmental major.” The College of Arts and Sciences had already offered an occasional Women's Studies course through General Studies; indeed, the students who drafted the petition were enrolled in one at the time. Thus, they obviously wanted more than a Women's Studies course; now and then, and yet less than a separate program would probably have contented the majority. What they really wanted were courses taught in departments instead of, or as well as, in General Studies. They wanted specific Women's Studies courses available regularly. They wanted some courses more advanced than those that had whetted their interest. And they wanted appropriate courses to grant them credit toward their majors. A testing ground for experiments, General Studies could not offer courses that met any of these criteria. In fact, the petition meant that General Studies had fulfilled its purpose; that under its auspices, Women's Studies had proved itself on this campus and had outgrown its experimental phase, or at any rate, the students who signed the petition meant to say something to this effect.

The following fall, Dean Burton Wheeler convened some women faculty and students to discuss the petition, and they soon zeroed in on the problems it overlooked. First, the College offered no courses a program might coordinate, and second, it could not even identify systematically the faculty who might teach them. In a field so new as Women's Studies, faculty could not have received formal training, let alone degrees, and very few would yet have submitted papers to the special journals and conferences then just beginning. Undoubtedly, the College did have faculty who could—and would—translate their expertise into Women's Studies courses if they thought their departments would offer the courses and knew students wanted to take them. But no one knew straight off who those faculty were or any easy way to find them.

So the group that originally met with Dean Wheeler, now the Women's Studies Planning Group, launched a four-pronged campaign: it sought out faculty qualified to teach Women's Studies, encouraged them to propose Women's Studies courses, persuaded (or tried persuading) department chairmen to adopt Women's Studies courses when proposed, and asked departments to hire faculty qualified to teach Women's Studies if they had none already. The next year the College offered ten Women's Studies courses, the year after ten new courses, and the year after, an interdisciplinary program empowered to grant a B.A. in Women's Studies—even more than the petition had dared ask.

Hindsight makes the campaign seem dramatic; in reality, it so lacked fanfare or fireworks that only insiders like myself remember it at all. The Planning Group sponsored monthly colloquia, which brought faculty interested in Women's Studies together and, at the same time, showed the rest of the University the kinds of research Women's Studies could entail. The Planning Group printed semi-annual leaflets which listed all upcoming Women's Studies courses, including the courses in the program already established by the George Warren Brown School of Social Work. It also printed descriptions of a special major in Women's Studies—a Women's Studies version of the interdisciplinary majors Arts and Sciences students may design for themselves. It collected and disseminated enrollment figures for Women's Studies courses, and bibliographies and syllabi as well. It held and sent representatives to more meetings than any of us wants to remember. But, however unexciting, its campaign paid off. When students first petitioned for a program, they were really asking departments to give them some courses. When the Planning Group reiterated their proposal three years later, it was merely asking the faculty to recognize a program that virtually existed already. Indeed, many faculty members who favored it seemed surprised they had to vote for it.

We will not, I think, detract from the Planning Group if we go on to observe that events outside its sphere made its task easier. To begin with, academic re-
form movements of the late sixties had paved its way; for even when they did not effect the reforms they sought, these movements did unfreeze the traditional structure. They left behind procedures and precedents for change, including precedents for new interdepartmental units. More fundamentally, they left behind a general predisposition to respect students’ requests for courses relevant to their lives—a predisposition hardly attenuated by the fiscal crisis of the seventies.

Moreover, national and local events had converged to make women a live topic. The same year our students petitioned, the Equal Rights Amendment went to state legislatures, the St. Louis chapter of the National Organization for Women published a survey of sexism in local school textbooks, and the University adopted its Affirmative Action Plan. At the same time, Women’s Studies boomed nationwide. For years there were courses scattered here and there; suddenly there were departments, degrees, journals, grants, conferences, even publishing houses—all the insignia of an established field. The Planning Group drew strength from the national movement. Knowing they belonged to that movement, its members felt more hopeful and, frankly, more consequential. Through an elaborate network of correspondence, they learned from the experience of older groups. If they had to explain Women’s Studies, they could quote publications. If they sometimes had to argue that Women’s Studies existed, they could remark that, at any rate, many people thought it did—including the directors of the Ford Foundation. In short, the time for Women’s Studies had come, and the Planning Group forged ahead because it knew it.

Today, like most Women’s Studies programs, ours aims for a curriculum that will both present the full range of issues Women’s Studies includes and probe select issues intensively. While some programs use introductory courses to span the field, ours relies upon a revolving sequence of specialized courses—some scheduled every year, some every other year. Officially just nine months old, the program already coordinates twenty-four courses offered by eleven different departments and areas.

Just to suggest their diversity, let me describe a few. My own course “Women and Fiction” tries to relate the lives of some English women novelists (mainly Victorians) to the novels they wrote about women. Thus, in addition to novels, it also reads some social history and many autobiographical materials—letters, journals, personal sketches, and the like. In essence, it analyzes literary and historical documents together in order to compare a different society’s views of women with the actual experience of women who lived in that society. In mode, though not in substance, it resembles some other courses in the curriculum—for example, “Woman and Women in Classical Antiquity” and “Words and Works of German Women.” Laurily Epstein’s “Women, Law, and Society” represents a different type of course. It examines the roles contemporary American women play with special regard to the laws that shape those roles; and it reads not only general texts on American women, but also Department of Labor data, Supreme Court cases, and proposals for legal reform. Naturally, the curriculum includes other courses on women here and now—some general, like “Changing Sex Roles,” and some on specific problems, like “Women, Crime, and Society.” Professor Joyce Trebilcot teaches courses of a third type, courses that evaluate the ways of life women might choose. Her “Sex and Value,” for example, analyzes modern theories about the nature of women—theories that range all the way from Goldberg’s view that women must endure oppression until biology changes to Johnston’s view that women can and should live without men. Needless to say, her classes do not merely study these theories; they debate them.

The curriculum also includes two tutorial courses, one for directed reading and one for field work in community projects designed to better women’s lives. Last semester, for example, one student read lesser-known women novelists, another counseled women on parole, and a third investigated the agencies that enforce equal opportunity laws. These tutorials are an important component of our program. They allow students to work closely with faculty and also to participate in the St. Louis community; both intimacy and commitment matter a great deal to us. So do the future lives of our students, and tutorials help them find careers in which they can use what they have learned in Women’s Studies. The student who counseled parolees is applying to law school. The student who investigated the agencies is an intern in Washington learning how to lobby.

When I re-view the brief history of Women’s Studies, I often think back through our mothers to Virginia Woolf. In 1928, she looked in vain for a book that would tell her how the average Elizabethan woman lived, a book that would tell her how women’s psyches differed from men’s, a book that would tell her why men opposed women’s emancipation, why society valued chastity, why women drank water while men drank wine. Earn five hundred pounds a year, she told women undergraduates: get a room of your own, and write such books. Today in Women’s Studies, a collective room of our own, she would find the walls lined with them.
Springboard To Learning

Washington University—its campuses, classrooms, laboratories, and other teaching and research facilities served this spring as a field study area and workshop for seventh grade students from St. Louis's Stix School in a “Springboard to Learning” program.

The Springboard to Learning program originated more than a decade ago as an effort to help students of St. Louis inner city schools to broaden their experience and expand their vision. The director since the inception of the program is Elise Schweich. With the support of the Missouri Arts and Education Council, the Danforth Foundation, local business firms, and many concerned individuals, the program next year will include all St. Louis schools.

Springboard teachers at Stix School, located in the west end of St. Louis near the School of Medicine, this year were Joy Guze, for the first semester, and Charlotte Kleffner, for the second.

This past spring semester, a Stix seventh grade class, taught by Patricia Bowolak, visited the medical and dental schools, Central Institute for the Deaf, the Edison Theatre, Olin Library, and the Tyson Research Center. The University faculty and students who acted as hosts seemed to enjoy the experience almost as much as the seventh-graders. The program will be repeated next year, and it is hoped, for many years to come.
Nancy Cole, assistant professor of drama, gives a practical demonstration of theatrical makeup, backstage at the University's Edison Theatre.

At the mighty Graham Chapel organ, David Huntsberger, graduate music student pulls out all stops explaining the workings of a pipe organ console.
How to Quit Smoking in Four Hard Lessons

By Ellen Farley

Employing "rapid smoking" as a form of aversion therapy, the Washington University Smoking Control Project produced highly impressive results. The free anti-smoking clinic was directed by Patrick Sobota, St. Louis psychologist and candidate for the Ph.D. degree in counseling psychology from the Graduate Institute of Education, as a dissertation project. Although the volunteers found rapid smoking a harrowing experience, it apparently works. Eight weeks after the sessions, the "mean reduction rate" in cigarette smoking for the three groups involved ranged from 74 to 92.6 per cent.

It was like the sinking of the Titanic," an awestruck observer said of the scene he witnessed in Wilson Hall last February. One hundred and ten volunteers who hoped to free themselves forever of the smoking habit were puffed away like addicts run amok, taking drags every six seconds at the cue of a buzzer and registering increased revulsion as the evening wore on. Down the hall from the auditorium, the Red Cross unit set up for the occasion found itself flush with clients needing canvas cots and orange juice. Rapid-smoking session No. 1 of the Washington University Smoking Control Project was going only too well.

Giving up cigarettes can be a devastating experience. The fact that 110 volunteers were willing to subject themselves to the headaches, dizziness, and nausea that the project originally promised is a clear indication that people will try anything to quit. Ten million Americans have quit smoking in the last five years. Smokers are discovering their habit is not only hazardous to their own health, but offensive, unattractive, injurious, and intolerable to others. "Thank You for Not Smoking" signs have become commonplace, and legislators are being pressured to enact anti-smoking regulations in more and more public places. The heightened public awareness of the smoking problem has given rise to a proliferation of programs to help smokers quit, but none of the treatment methods have produced results successful enough to satisfy researchers in the field. Most treatments are initially successful, but relapse is still the rule, according to Patrick Sobota, the 33-year-old St. Louis psychologist who originated the Smoking Control Project.

"We’re now in the midst of the slow and tedious process of finding out what works," he said. Much of the research is being done by clinicians like Sobota doing dissertation work in university settings. A doctoral candidate at Washington University’s Graduate Institute of Education, he is a frequent advocate of the behavioral school of psychology derived from learning theory. "In any sort of therapeutic treatment, the ideal is to turn responsibility for behavior back to the individual," he said. "In a healthy society, I believe, there is a responsibility for leaders to help individuals to be in control of their minds and bodies."

Sobota dismisses the actual physical withdrawal from cigarettes as a negligible and inconsequential factor in a smoking control program. "It’s not the physical addiction to cigarettes that keeps people from quitting," he said. "In fact, I don’t even call it an addiction. It’s a behavior pattern, an habituation. People smoke for many reasons. Smoking with a drink, when you’re talking on the telephone, or are anxious about being in an unfamiliar situation—a myriad of social and environmental cues are so linked with cigarettes that they are much more important to the smoker than the tars and nicotine."

Sobota’s project employed a number of techniques already proven somewhat successful in previous studies. What made it unique was the combination of methods used and the large scale on which the research was carried out.

"Because I believe that society has so many remedial needs, I’m interested in engineering large-scale programs. There aren’t enough therapists to serve society well on a one-to-one basis," Sobota says, adding, "Actually, my long-range goals aren’t remedial, but preventive. I feel that most of the problems of a complex society can be prevented through humane and intelligent child rearing. That’s what I really want to get into."

Phase one of this experimental dissertation project consisted of rapid smoking or "stimulus satiation," and was designed to alter the smoker’s perception of smok-
ing from that of a pleasant to an unpleasant experience. Participants were instructed to inhale at six-second intervals, lighting one cigarette after another, until the experience became intolerable. For even the most hard-core smokers, it was an impressive lesson in the poisonous effects of cigarettes.

 Derived from the general treatment system popularly called "aversive therapy," rapid smoking has been tried in about forty studies at other universities, but usually on a one-to-one basis between the experimenter and the subject. "The largest group I've heard of previously had twenty-five persons," Sobota said. The problem with rapid smoking and other laboratory techniques, he explained, is the difficulty of generalizing positive results from laboratory to everyday environment.

**Generalizing** the smoking cessation to the smoker's natural environment has been the main focus of researchers in the past several years. That was the business of phase two of this project. It consisted of two different self-administered maintenance methods, each devised to reinforce the laboratory rapid-smoking lesson and encourage continued abstinence on the part of the smoker during the period when most smokers relapse. Groups trying one of the two methods would be compared with a control group to determine which of the maintenance methods, if either, could heighten the success of the laboratory program.

The logistics of the project were staggering. Questionnaires were prepared to gauge the volunteers' motivation and reveal information about their smoking patterns, self-confidence, home environment, etc., and assistants hired to collect and sift through the data. In all, 164 bits of information were to be collected on each individual. Sobota enlisted the aid of fellow psychologists to observe and help conduct the meetings. Nurses were hired to assist casualties at the rapid-smoking sessions and Red Cross cooperation enlisted. Five volunteers in a pilot project were confirming that rapid smoking makes people very sick indeed, and Sobota put in an order for the airline bags that are always within arm's reach of airsick travelers.

In January, the call for volunteers for a free smoking treatment clinic was eagerly broadcast by the St. Louis media. Soon, the project phone in Sobota's home office was swamped with calls from those wanting to participate. Phone screening yielded 260 would-be volunteers. A graphic description of the discomfort rapid smoking causes weeded out the squeamish at an orientation meeting, and dropouts were legion as people decided they didn't want to devote the time to meetings and record-keeping that would be required of them. More fell away when their doctors refused to sign the physician's consent form for rapid smoking, which each participant had to bring to the first meeting.

"I wanted to end up with basically healthy people between the ages of 25 and 40, smoking between fifteen and forty cigarettes a day, and having a high motivation to quit," Sobota said. "People in this study were all at least reasonably well motivated or they wouldn't have gone to the trouble to make phone calls, visit their physicians, and come to the meetings. One of the things that research shows is the higher the motivation, the better success the individual is likely to have. But motivation is not the crucial determinant in and of itself."

One hundred and ten volunteers began the project in earnest. For the first two weeks, smokers kept a record of when and under what circumstances each cigarette of the day was smoked. Despite Sobota's caution not to cut down during this period, most individuals reduced consumption anyway. Record-keeping was already accomplishing one goal. Once the individual becomes aware of the dimensions of his habit, he is better fortified to begin the wearing habit of breaking it, Sobota believes.

**The atmosphere** at the first rapid-smoking session was surreal. Volunteers were instructed to quit smoking as soon as it became convincingly intolerable and distasteful, but about half of them became convincingly ill, too. Monitors assigned to groups of about ten smokers each were supposed to stop overly enthusiastic participants, but it was difficult to gauge the precise moment at which a person had had enough. Even some observers were driven from the room by the cloud of smoke that produced raw throats, watering eyes, and headaches. The presence of nurses and the Red Cross unit proved to be a fortunate precaution.

Throughout the session, psychologist Norman Katz, Ph.D. 75, who assisted in the study, alternated his sympathetic and supportive pattern with gentle admonishments. "We're not asking you to do anything that you're not doing to yourselves every time you light up," the volunteers were told. Smokers were also told that some aversive therapy treatments combine rapid smoking with fans blowing hot, smoky air in the subjects' faces. The very idea was enough to elicit moans from the already stricken.
Wilson Hall auditorium became a disaster area with the first rapid smoking session in the WU Smoking Control Project.

Leaders of the project, from left: Director Patrick Sobota, Norman Katz, PhD 75, and Larry Kiel, graduate assistant.
By the third rapid-smoking session, the Red Cross unit was deserted, procedures were smooth enough to please even a parliamentarian, and the volunteers had adopted a curiously festive air as they greeted fellow survivors. "It's been fun," said Mary Ann Sedey, a 29-year-old attorney trying to break a two-pack-a-day habit. "By fun, I mean coming and sitting with the same people and talking to them about how you're doing. Everyone in this group is in this together."

Tom Capelli, a 27-year-old who had smoked nearly a pack a day, agreed. "There are about five of us in my group and we're very close," he said. "We help each other. I got much sicker than I thought I would at the first session. It's a bad experience, but nowhere near as bad as the thought of continuing smoking for the rest of my life."

Between bouts of smoking, volunteers were encouraged to ask questions or problems. Some of these took the form of testimonials, as the quitters proclaimed success with religious fervor. Others lamented failure and asked for encouragement. Complaints of sleeplessness, increased dreaming, and nightmares struck a responsive chord, but the similarity of withdrawal symptoms seemed to reassure participants.

Since some volunteers were rapid-smoking away from the sessions, the social discomposure it causes was a big subject of discussion:

"People think I'm crazy, chain-smoking cigarettes when I say I want to quit." "I get so dizzy I can't find my second cigarette to light it." "I need to smoke only when I'm upset about a problem, but after I rapid smoke I'm so dizzy I've forgotten the problem." "Now I'm afraid I'm going to start liking rapid smoking."

"I've quit!" declared an enthusiastic Fred Perkins, a ruddy and rugged individual with a Texas style of dress and an accent to match. "I got so ungodly sick after the first session it killed my taste for cigarettes. I haven't had one since." A two-pack-a-day man, Perkins said he had been smoking for twenty-five years.

"The method's been very successful for me, but not in the way it was intended," confided Joe Erlanger, a seriously looking young man. "I have a rational mind and I know the unpleasantness they're asking us to associate with cigarettes is artificial. I'm sure I could still get pleasure from smoking, but I've quit."

Rapid-smoking sessions were held twice a week for two successive weeks, with three optional walk-in sessions arranged for those who needed the extra dose. Anyone who had smoked since the last rapid-smoking session was asked to show. "Drop in, say hello, and have a few smokes with us," Katz offered. Of the ninety-six persons still with the program, thirty smokers came to each walk-in session. Once smokers were separated into the three maintenance groups, all volunteers were sworn to secrecy about the methods each group practiced. Spouses were kept together, but, other than that, selection was made randomly.

Group One members were given tiny timers. As the urge to smoke became too strong to ignore, the smoker was to consult the list of numbers he had been given, varying from five to sixty. If the next number on the list was twelve, the timer was set for twelve minutes. At the cue of the buzz, the smoker had several choices: attempt to ignore the urge, rapid smoke three cigarettes, or smoke a cigarette in regular fashion but pay a small pre-set fine.

Group Two members followed a strict rapid-smoking regimen. Those who broke down and had a cigarette were to rapid-smoke twice a day, mornings and evenings, for the next three days. If the smoker weakened and took even the tiniest puff of a cigarette in leisure fashion, it was three more days of rapid smoking for the offender.

Group Three was the control group, a discovery that made many of its members understandably unhappy. Those who were still smoking felt abandoned despite Sobota's assurance that they had already received as much treatment as the average anti-smoking clinic provides.

At the end of four weeks of mainte-
nance, and eight weeks into the entire project, the figures were as follows. In Group One, the mean reduction rate was 92.6 per cent, meaning that for every 100 cigarettes originally smoked, only 7.3 per cent were still being smoked by the group as a whole. Eleven of the thirty persons who started in the group were no longer sending in records. Nine people had quit smoking completely.

In Group Two, fifteen of the thirty-two persons who started as members had quit smoking. Six persons were no longer reporting and mean reduction rate was 89.3 per cent. In Group Three, seven persons had quit smoking and nine of the thirty-four persons in the group were no longer reporting. The mean reduction rate was 74 per cent.

Since total abstinence is the goal in any smoking program, Group One showed the best reduction rate, but it also had the highest dropout percentage. Since those people had to carry around a clutter of coins, timers, numbers, and envelopes, Sobota theorizes that perhaps their instructions were just too complicated for any but the highly motivated to bother with.

Sharon Eisenhardt, a Group One member who followed the program faithfully but didn't succeed in quitting, said she would still recommend the treatment to a friend. "Rapid smoking did kill my taste for cigarettes at first," she said. "I thought I had quit. But the longer I was away from the sessions, the more I wanted a cigarette. It was a continual battle and, when maintenance was over, I gave in. From forty cigarettes a day, I'm down to ten. I've heard it takes four major efforts for most people to quit. This is my first, so maybe there's hope."

Group Two member Tom Capelli was down to one cigarette a day during maintenance, but crept up to five after the maintenance program was over. "I feel pretty good about having cut down this much, but I still really want to quit," he said. "The problem is, cigarettes never really lost their attraction for me. The rapid-smoking and maintenance program helped, but I still feel it's basically a matter of will power."

Joe Erlanger of Group Three was still off cigarettes despite having no maintenance program. "I have to say this treatment is as effective as any I've heard about. I've tried to quit before, but this is the first time I've actually succeeded. I did smoke two packs a day and I'd been smoking for fourteen years. I still haven't lost my taste for cigarettes, but, having come this far, I'm pretty sure I'll never smoke again."
DECORATIVE BRICK

The First Exhibition of the St. Louis Vernacular Builders' Style

A n exhibition of the decorative brickwork employed by St. Louis vernacular builders in the late nineteenth century was presented on campus in May by James Stokoe, who received the Master of Architecture degree this spring. The exhibit, held in Givens Hall, consisted of hundreds of photographs of decorative brickwork, catalogues of the brickmakers, and samples of the actual bricks and the molds used in their manufacture.

In his master's thesis, Stokoe points out: "Decorative brickwork in St. Louis is a relatively unknown chapter in late nineteenth-century vernacular housing activity in the United States, which seems to parallel the amazing work in wood that is prevalent in and around other cities."

Stokoe attributes the wide use of ornamental brick in St. Louis to the local development of a new and revolutionary method of making bricks, a dry press process that led to St. Louis becoming the world's leading brick producer in the nineteenth century. He also feels that the love of ornamentation that the predominately German and Irish immigrants brought to the city played an important part. Mansions and public buildings boasted stone and terra cotta decoration beyond the means of the average home-builder, but he could achieve somewhat the same effect by picking out various patterns of the mass-produced decorative bricks from the catalogues. The same type of brick could serve as an element of an arch, part of a cornice design, or an elaborate panel.

With the purchaser and the builder collaborating on the design of a house, without benefit of architects, the readily available decorative bricks provided opportunity for artistic expression.

The photographs in the exhibit, a few of which are reproduced here, were taken by Jim Stokoe in many hours of exploration of old St. Louis neighborhoods. Jim received an A.B. degree in architecture from Washington University in 1973 and worked for a year for architect Charles Moore before entering graduate training. He hopes to become a licensed architect, but first he plans to publish a book of his photographs and observations of the vanished art of St. Louis decorative brickwork.
A splendid example of the use of decorative brickwork by the vernacular builders of St. Louis is this residence on the South side.

Above and right are examples of the imaginative use of various kinds of decorative brick to create new and unusual patterns.
Constant repetition of one type of brick was a popular device, as in the decoration on this gable.

A complex assortment of decorative brick is used to form a graceful arch. Various types of decorative brick could be ordered from catalogues and used at the owner's or builder's discretion.

Right: a niche in an otherwise plain brick wall serves to display a wide variety of decorative bricks in various patterns.
A Gallery Of Trustee Profiles

Gladys W. Levis

Imagine a university trustee saying, “I used to read about student riots in Latin America, Europe, and the Far East and wonder what was wrong with American students.” Imagine then, Gladys Levis, who would rather see a healthy scrap than indifference. “Who will be idealistic, if not the young?” she asks. “Who is going to question the Establishment, fight for the rights of the underdog, seek justice, if young people don’t?” She asks, “Don’t you think we need a lot of complacency into our children?,” adding, “that worries me a great deal.”

A little bit of a woman, standing about five feet tall in barefeet and pulling down not much more than one hundred pounds, Gladys Levis is as feisty as she would have the young be. Some of that feistiness and a good portion of wisdom she contributes to the workings of the Washington University Board of Trustees.

“I’m a token female on the board,” she says with a smile. “Bueah Stamper and I, that is.” Would she have more women on the board? “Why not? The student body’s at least a third women and the alumni body, too. But then I enjoy my almost solitary splendor.”

Levis joined the board five years ago, succeeding Betty Outwin, her roommate when both were WU students in the early 1940’s. She served one of the board’s four-year alumni terms and has now been re-elected for a regular six-year term. She is a member of the student affairs, the honorary degree, and the development committees.

“The student affairs committee is the most interesting. I feel that it can serve an important function as a sounding board of the joys and sorrows of life at Washington University. We should be student advocates to give students a strong voice to the administration. Although there hasn’t been the great pressure for such since the late 1960’s, it is important that the mechanisms for student dialogue with the board is there for groups who wish to use it.”

At home in Alton, Illinois, Levis is the mistress of a huge stone house set amidst twenty acres of woodland ravine and hilltop, a member of a pioneer Alton family, and a community leader with special interests in the Jennie D. Hayner Library Association and the Illinois Children’s Home and Aid Society. She has been actively working for both these organizations for thirty years.

But the Alton “senior leaguer” is hardly recognizable in her other life. For at least three months of every twelve, she and her husband and daughters turn from absentee landlords to North Dakota ranch hands. The Levises own two ranches, one north of Bismarck and one in Illinois, and, increasingly, as their children leave home, they spend their lives in the open spaces. As Buffdale Farms Inc., for many years they have raised their cattle in North Dakota and fattened them for market in Illinois.

As their breeding experiments have succeeded, however, they have been able to send beef to market straight from the North Dakota grasslands. They raise and cross-breed Herefords and Simmentals, a Swiss beef-milk animal. “We’re now getting a good grass-fed, salable animal at the end of one year.” Levis explained, “Most beef comes from two-year-old animals. We are working for a tender, tasty, more healthful—because of the lower fat content—beef from grassfeeding.”

On the 12,000-acre ranch, Gladys Levis is cowpoke, field hand, gardener, barn cleaner, “the whole bit,” she says, and she loves it. “When we started though, we were in the middle of nowhere. Mandan, which is twenty miles down the Missouri River, had the closest industry. Now there are high-tension lines everywhere and a power plant is going up within sight of the ranch. It is a mixed blessing.

A native of Alton, Levis grew up within shouting distance of her present home, which was built by her husband’s grandfather. She attended Washington University, graduating with a bachelor’s degree in 1942 and entering medical school on an accelerated wartime program. “I didn’t make it through because I was married in October, 1943, and went with my husband to North Carolina, where he was in the Marine Corps. Actually, I was already to go back to school when I had my second set of children.”

What their mother calls her first set comprises Gladys, a 1969 WU liberal arts graduate who is now on the education faculty of the University of New Mexico, and Jenny, AB 73, who is married to WU graduate Mark Sadow and is in graduate school in biology at New York University. Daughters, Sarah, 17, and Robin, 16, are in private school in the East. Husband Robert, in addition to being a rancher, is chairman of the First National Bank and Trust Company in Alton.

Does Gladys Levis ever regret dropping out of medical school? “Always. But I’ve used what I did learn. No knowledge is ever excess knowledge.”
Six years ago, when David S. Lewis became chairman and chief executive officer of General Dynamics, that company was foundering on the financial rocks, with losses of over $6.5 million for the year. Today, the future is considerably brighter for General Dynamics, a highly diversified multinational corporation which produces everything from jet fighter aircraft, missiles, and submarines through communications equipment and tankers, to concrete and coal.

The company recorded its best earnings year in 1975, and now has a business backlog of over $6 billion. Traditionally known as one of the nation’s leading defense contractors, the company’s many non-government divisions are flourishing as well.

Taking over the direction of a firm which had not produced a new military aircraft since the F-111 of the early 1960s, Lewis played a key role in the design, development, and marketing of a new fighter, the F-16, which last year won an intense competition to become the U.S. Air Force’s new Air Combat Fighter, and this year was chosen by four NATO nations in what has been described as the “arms contract of the year.”

Dave Lewis has been described by both his colleagues and his rivals as a dynamo, but a “warm, friendly, unflappable dynamo.” He brought to the General Dynamics challenge a wealth of experience and background in both aeronautical engineering and in corporation management. Born in South Carolina, he received an engineering degree from Georgia Institute of Technology. He majored in aeronautical engineering because he has “always been interested in airplanes.” After college, he went to work as an aerodynamicist for the Glenn L. Martin Company, makers of the B-26 bombers and the PBM flying boats of World War II fame.

In 1946, Lewis first came to St. Louis as chief of aerodynamics for McDonnell Aircraft Company. At McDonnell, his rate of climb was almost as fast as the airplanes he was helping to design and build. In 1950, he entered the design department and two years later was appointed to chief of design in the airplane engineering division. Then he was promoted successively to manager of sales, project manager for the Demon fighter plane, and overall project manager. After moving up to manager of projects and vice president of project management, he was elected senior vice president in 1959, executive vice president in 1961, and president in 1962.

When McDonnell merged with the venerable Douglas Aircraft Company in 1967, he continued to serve as president of the new organization and subsequently as chairman of Douglas Aircraft as well.

With the Douglas company, a financially weak firm that was having trouble finding financing and meeting production schedules on its commercial airliners, Lewis gave a preview of what he was to do later with General Dynamics. With Lewis at the helm, Douglas got back on its feet and back in the black.

At General Dynamics, Lewis moved swiftly to centralize control over the sprawling empire of enterprises that comprised the firm. He brought in a new management team, created a new management concept with a troika of executive vice-presidents, and immediately took a strong personal role in day-to-day operations. He also moved corporation headquarters from New York to St. Louis.

As chairman, chief executive officer, and president of the huge corporation, Lewis demands the best of his more than 64,000 employees. He also demands a great deal of himself: arriving at his office at 7:30 in the morning or earlier, taking a working lunch at his desk, working until 6:30 or later every day. His personal interest in every phase of the business takes him all over the country and to many distant parts of the world. He has been averaging about one hundred days a year out of the city on business.

Regardless of his intense pace, Dave Lewis does find time to be with his family and friends, to follow football, and to grab brief vacations, with a little golf, at the Lewis place on Sea Island, Georgia. His wife is the former Dorothy Sharpe. Married in 1941, they have four children.

Since coming back to St. Louis, he has managed to find time for more civic commitments, including his membership on the Washington University Board of Trustees. Elected to the board in 1971, he is currently a member of the budget committee.

Last fall, in an address before the Sustaining Associates, an organization of area business supporters of Washington University, Lewis gave an insight into his philosophy of business.

Speaking about unethical business practices, in the wake of disclosures of bribery and payoffs by some firms to obtain government contracts or foreign business, Lewis said, “The cardinal rule under which a business firm should conduct its activities . . . is to be willing to lose business if that business means compromising your standards.

“I believe,” he added, “that recognition by your customers and employees of the high ethical standards demanded by you will, in the long run, pay off many times over.”

Deploiring bad business practices by some firms, which have “plunged the image of American business to what is probably its lowest point in history,” he hailed the establishment at Washington University of the Center for the Study of American Business.

“This is certainly a most worthwhile development which we hope will be an inspiration to other universities,” he said.
Lee M. Liberman

In November, 1945, Lee M. Liberman, newly discharged from the Army Air Corps, was looking for a temporary job to tide him over until he could enter law school in the spring semester. When he visited the St. Louis branch of the state employment office, he was given two leads: Union Electric Company and Laclede Gas Company.

Heading west on Olive Street from the employment office on Broadway, he went first to Laclede Gas, because at the time its offices were on Eleventh Street and Union Electric's were on Twelfth. When he arrived at Laclede Gas, the young chemical engineer was hired on the spot. He never got to Twelfth Street and the electric company.

From the start, he liked the work at Laclede and, when, shortly afterward, he met and married the former Jeanne Hirsch, AB 49, then a student at Washington University, he decided to forget about law school and to make Laclede Gas Company his career. Today, Lee M. Liberman is Laclede’s Chairman and President.

Born in Salt Lake City, Lee Liberman has lived in St. Louis since he was ten. He received a degree in chemical engineering from Yale University in 1943. His father and his brother are both alumni of Yale and two of his children are currently enrolled there: his son, James, who is in graduate architecture, and a daughter, Celia, who has just finished her freshman year. The Libermans also have a married daughter, Mrs. Alise Ries, who graduated not from Yale, but from Duke University.

After receiving his degree, Liberman worked for a short time at Lockheed Aircraft Company and then entered the Army Air Corps as an aviation cadet. With a backlog of cadets waiting to get into flight training, the war ended before Liberman made it. During his sixteen month wait, however, he worked on the newly developed electronic automatic pilot.

“While I never got to flight school,” he recalls, “I flew about a hundred missions over the Los Angeles area checking out the new automatic pilot equipment.”

During Liberman’s career with Laclede Gas Company, he has worked in nearly every phase of the business. Starting out as a chemist, he was soon put in charge of a gas manufacturing plant. When the company converted to natural gas in 1949, he became a design engineer. Subsequently he served as a development engineer, as assistant to the vice president of operations, and assistant to the president.

After an interval in New York with the firm’s financial consultants, in order to learn more about the financial side of the business, he became successively superintendent of distribution, assistant vice president of operations, vice president of planning, and vice president of marketing. In 1968, he became executive vice president; in 1970, president and chief operations officer; in 1974, president and chief executive officer, and in April of this year, chairman and president.

Being head man of a utility company in these days of inflation, energy shortages, and the consumer movement has been a challenging occupation, Liberman admits. “Laclede Gas Company and its customers are fortunate in that we have not yet had locally, nor do we anticipate, a serious gas shortage,” Liberman states. He credits the company’s relatively strong position to its long-standing policy of building large storage stocks of natural gas and propane and to its active program of exploration for new supply sources.

Through the years, Liberman has been active in many civic and cultural organizations, particularly Civic Progress, Inc., the United Fund, and the Arts and Education Council. He served on the board of Webster College for eight years as one of the first lay board members who helped to direct the transition of Webster from a Catholic college to a secular institution.

While he joined the Washington University board just over a year ago, Liberman has worked closely with the University as chairman of the board of Jewish Hospital, one of the participating institutions in the Washington University Medical Center.

“I have had a long and enjoyable working relationship with Chancellor William H. Danforth, Vice Chancellor Samuel Gaze and Dean Kenton M. King in the formation and development of the Medical Center,” he says. “I see the integrative planning of the member institutions in the Medical Center to avoid redundant facilities to be of extreme importance to each institution, to the people of the St. Louis area, and to medicine in general.”

Liberman has also been actively involved with the University’s School of Business, where he has participated in seminars and short courses, and with the School of Engineering and Applied Science, where he was instrumental in establishing a scholarship for Laclede Gas Company employees.

Through his experience on the boards of both Webster College and Washington University, he has gained a great deal of insight into how institutions of higher learning operate. A member of the board’s investment and development committees, he observes that “trustees should be involved in broad policies and financial support, not in the day-to-day operations of the institution. As in any other organization, the purpose of the board is to see to it that there is sound and intelligent management of the enterprise and then give that management all possible support.”
EVERY INCH of John Lynch's 73-plus is oilman and every inch is Texan. But it wasn't always that way. The grandson and son of Missouri farmers, he went to school in Pleasant Valley, Missouri, eight miles south of Pacific, and graduated from Pacific High School. The year was 1929, not a very good one for even bright young men to enter college. So he didn't.

Lynch took a job as a roustabout with Shamrock Oil and Gas Corporation and moved around little Texas towns digging ditches and running pipe on lands under oil-producing leases. From roustabout, he moved to work on the drilling rigs as a roughneck. "It was sort of a side-ways move," he comments. But off and on during those depression years, he would leave the job and come back to Missouri to attend Washington University School of Engineering. "The education I got was very good. There just wasn't enough of it. I quit before I finished a degree," he says.

After ten years with Shamrock, Lynch joined Fletcher Oil Company in Los Angeles to run a refinery and, in 1944, he joined the La Gloria Corporation. Two years later he was vice president and in another year, president. In August, 1957, through an exchange of stock, La Gloria became a wholly-owned subsidiary of Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation. Lynch became a director of Texas Eastern and senior vice president. Although he chose to retire early from the latter position, he remains a director, a member of the finance and executive committees, and a consultant. He is also the second largest individual stockholder.

Home for Lynch is now an apartment in Houston and a 1,000-acre ranch forty-five miles from the city. There, for the past twelve years, he has raised Santa Gertrudis cattle, a breed developed by Texas's King Ranch. He spends weekends on the ranch and, when he is not traveling "on about half business, half pleasure," Lynch is found at his office at Texas Eastern.

For more than twenty-five years, Lynch has been associated with institutions of higher learning as a board member and officer, and for six years he was a member of the Texas Commission on Higher Education. He was chairman of the board of Texas College of Arts and Industries at Kingsville for thirteen years, and is a member of the board of St. Stephen's Episcopal School in Austin, Kinkaid School in Houston, South Texas College of Law, Prairie View A & M, Southern Methodist University, and Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, as well as Washington University. He comments, "I am simply a great believer in higher education. I do think that some of today's college students should be going to good craft schools instead, but I don't know how to separate them out."

ALTHOUGH Lynch admits that he is much more Republican than Democrat, he is Texan first, and solidly supported his friend Lyndon B. Johnson in political campaigns. "I knew Richard Nixon pretty well and I'm reasonably well acquainted with Gerald Ford."

Lynch's two daughters live in Texas. Mrs. William Wyatt lives in San Antonio with her husband and sons, John, 10, and William, 7. Mary Lynch is an interior decorator with a townhouse in Houston five minutes from her father's apartment. "I do enjoy having both girls in the same vicinity," their father says.

One suspects that John Lynch is a bit of a sentimentalist. He still owns the family farm in Missouri, which was a diversified farm fifty years ago, but, as has happened to many other farms, it now "just raises hay."
"A Ruffians' Game Played by Gentlemen"
IT HAS been said that “soccer is a gentlemen’s game played by ruffians, while rugby is a ruffians' game played by gentlemen.” If we follow that definition, there were forty gentlemen playing this ruffians' game last semester at Washington University. The University Rugby Club, in a season that ran from February through May, played a twelve-game schedule as part of the Missouri Rugby Union, competed in tournaments at the University of Missouri-Rolla and at the Easter Ruggerfest in Forest Park, and finished the year with a cliff-hanging 13-12 loss to Saint Louis University in a benefit for St. Louis Children's Hospital. The team ended the season with a record of ten and nine.

The Rugby Club includes only members of the “Washington University community,” and all officers must be full-time students, as are most of the players. This year, the squad included one alumnus, Carl Mulfinger, AB 74, and a prospective freshman on a campus visit appeared in one game. Founder of the Club, coach, and a star player until sidelined by an injury in March, is Duane Goddard, who is currently a history major in University College. Goddard played one year of football at Washington U. and three years of rugby at Saint Louis University. The scrum captain is Carl Kaercher, BSBA 76, and the backfield captain is Rich Conti, a Notre Dame graduate now doing pre-med studies here.

FOR THOSE unfamiliar with rugby, let's just say that it's sort of a mixture of soccer and football with a few special features all its own. It began at Rugby School in England in 1823, supposedly when a soccer player picked up the ball one day and ran with it. The opposing team fell on the runner, the runner's team mates fell on the other team, and in the ensuing melee, a new sport was born. While rugby somewhat resembles American football, there are important differences: In rugby, there is no forward passing and no blocking, although there's plenty of tackling. The players wear shorts and jerseys, with no padding, no helmets, no facemasks. The game consists of two forty-minute periods with no substitutions and no times out except for the two minutes allowed to remove an injured player from the field. There are fifteen men on each side (at least when the game starts; if and when players are injured, the number goes down). There are no professionals in rugby and commercialism of any kind is forbidden. The coaches are unpaid, the officials are volunteers, the players wear no sponsors’ names on their jerseys. The WU Club receive some funding from Student Union but the players pay the rest of their expenses out of their own pockets. There is only one official on the field to watch for illegal plays or unnecessary roughness, so that players are on an honor system. Maybe that's why this rough, rugged, and ruffianly sport is really a gentlemen's game.
The ball comes out after a set scrum. The scrum is the device in rugby to put the ball back in play after it has gone out of bounds.

The ball squirts loose just beyond the reach of players on either team in the Washington University-Saint Louis University benefit game.
Above: Rich Conti, backfield captain of the Washington University Rugby Club, takes a quick breather after a strenuous play. At left: Rugby can be considered a contact sport.
Comment

(Continued from page one)

said, "If private universities of excellence are to continue a useful national role, they must be supported and supported generously. There are no bargain basement solutions. A clear responsibility remains to preserve excellence in teaching, scholarship, and research. We must ask the maximum of ourselves and expect it of our colleagues."

Raising more than $120 million in three years from private sources in these times is a magnificent achievement worthy of great jubilation and deep satisfaction on the part of everyone concerned. Unfortunately, inflation shows no signs of abating and the maintenance of excellence in higher education becomes more costly each year. The same spirit that met the Danforth Foundation challenge will have to meet the less dramatic but equally important need for ongoing annual support.

"Even under the best of economic conditions," Chancellor Danforth emphasizes, "a steady infusion of new money is essential. And because higher education benefits all of society, it is unfair and ultimately prohibitive to establish a pricing structure which would place the full cost of our service on the student. Historically, the American system of independent higher education has counted on voluntary gift support to help underwrite its costs.

"The challenge in recent years," he added, "has been one of combating unusual inflationary pressures. Deficit budgets have become common—not as a result of thoughtless spending to become all things to all people, but as a result of simply trying to keep pace with spiraling costs."

Stressing that the hallmark of our very best universities is the ability to grow and to respond to change, he declared, "We must now plan intelligently and imaginatively to meet these new requirements, while at the same time maintaining the fiscal integrity of our existing operations. That is an immense task and we can accomplish it only with the continued dedication of our trustees, alumni, and friends."

If those same alumni, trustees, and friends who met the Danforth Foundation challenge continue their commitment and enthusiasm, that immense task will be accomplished. —FO'B
Focus on Commencement

Commencement is a time of happiness for the graduates, their relatives, and friends, as these random scenes at the 1976 Washington University ceremonies portray. It is also, obviously, a time both to pose for photographs and to take them.