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Honorable & Mentionable...

Howard Mumford Jones, Abbott Lawrence Lowell Professor, Emeritus, of Humanities at Harvard, once described the university as "the principal agency by which we endlessly push back a little farther in each generation the frontier of ignorance." He saw alumni attachment as "support of an institution essential to the well-being of the nation and of mankind."

We are firmly convinced that alumni are concerned with the problems confronting higher education today. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that the image of an alumnus is that of a raccoon-coated, pennant waving football fan of the "perpetual sophomore" variety. Such spirit is a part of the alumni picture, to be sure, and a part we would not want to see eliminated. We agree with Prof. Jones, however, that alumni support goes much deeper.

It is with this view that we present in this issue of Alumnus the text of an interview with President Delyte W. Morris concerning education. A teacher and educator for almost four decades, Dr. Morris has proved an able spokesman—one who is listened to by supporters and critics alike. We believe you will find his views well worth your time.

—R.G.H.
Morris As president of Southern Illinois University since 1948, Delyte W. Morris has become thoroughly acquainted with the strengths and weaknesses of education, particularly in Illinois. He speaks frankly on the subject in an interview conducted by historian Paul M. Angle, beginning on page 2.

Moonshooter "Life With Uncle," the multi-billion-dollar 'partnership' of American colleges and universities with the federal government, is the subject of the 1967 "Moonshooter" report from the American Alumni Council’s Editorial Projects for Education. The report begins on page 12.

NIT Review The sweet taste of victory—born of the Salukis’ National Invitational Tournament championship in basketball, nurtured by a third NCAA gymnastics team title in four years, and seasoned through a repeat national title by the SIU women gymnasts—is relived in a special sports picture section. Turn to page 29.
we asked
Delyte Morris
about education

an interview by
Paul M. Angle,
noted Illinois historian

Angle: I'd like to ask you first, Mr. Morris, if you are willing to define the term, "education."

Morris: You can approach education as a process or you can approach it as an accomplishment. In the latter case you are speaking of what happens to the individual. For instance, education as an accomplishment would be implied in the term "an educated man," or "a well educated man," or "a poorly educated man." You can use these modifiers, but I like to think of education as a process—a process by which we use every means now at our command, and any new ones which we can devise from time to time, to help people reach the limit of their own capacities, to realize their own potentials.

This may be the potential of becoming a great musician, or becoming a writer or an artist. It may simply be becoming a person who understands better than anyone else the nature of human beings and how to work with them, or the way the world works and how to work with it. The single, most obvious characteristic of people, I suppose, is the almost infinite differences that you find among them. There's never been one person just like another, and so you have to define what you are trying to do in education in terms of what a given person is able to do and what his limits are. Then you are limited in the accomplishment of your aim both by your own capacity as an educator, and by the individual's desire to be educated. That would be a definition, looking at education from the point of view of the educational process. Now to look at what we mean by education, looking inside out from the individual. I suppose that what we mean when we think of what happens to a person by way of his learning processes both in the abstract
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and in the development of skills and techniques is what happens to him from the time he is born until he dies, as he grows as an individual through the development of his intellect and any special talents he has which may add to the accomplishments of mankind.

ANGLE: I think you have handled a rather hard question very well. I wish you would evaluate what you consider to be the importance of education, by either of your definitions, in the world of the present and of the future.

MORRIS: Let me take the second one first. Let's think of what happens to individuals by way of each person developing to his utmost capabilities. Any society would be a richer, stronger society—and any person within that society would have a richer and fuller life—if each person were developed to the limit of his own capacity, rather than just running, as it were, half-throttled. For instance, a town would be a better town if it had the creative, intellectual talent of all its residents developed fully. Illinois would be a better state if all of its citizens realized to the utmost limit their own capabilities. Our nation would be a stronger and fuller nation, and the world would be a better place in which to live, if persons, instead of growing only to half-mast of their abilities, would become fully functioning human beings. In the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, we saw a major shift in the broad base of society. We saw a large social segment of people lifting themselves from one level of development of their capabilities to another. They didn't get better brains between one century and the next—they simply used them more fully. This made a change which is still one of the bright marks in the history of mankind. Now in terms of the educational process, the resulting change in people is really the utilitarian base of formal education. Our colleges, our high schools, and our elementary schools are not ends in themselves, but have value only as they relate to what happens to people—people individually, and people collectively.

ANGLE: Yes.

MORRIS: Granting that the realization of talent and intellectual growth in individuals is advantageous to society, we still must say that all the university can do is to encourage the process. A good university does achieve certain things. It adds momentum to individual development of talent, bringing together persons who have special interests, special talents, and unusual capabilities in all the fields of man's learning. When you have these people nibbling away at the edge of the unknown, pushing back the limits of our ignorance and pushing forward the limits of our knowledge, then you have a massive contribution to the life of mankind.

ANGLE: To be sure.

MORRIS: It would be fair to say that our hope and expectation is that the university will produce human beings with more knowledge and more wisdom than they would have if it were not for the developed educational process, and that an aggregate of people with more knowledge and more wisdom is our best insurance for the future of the state, the future of the country, and the future of the world.

ANGLE: Might we say that the most challenging objective in education as a process would be to do the job so well that some day we wouldn't need education as a process?

MORRIS: (Laughs) I think you're right about that.

ANGLE: In history we've seen this occur. Probably you'd have had Leonardo da Vinci whether he had been...
in any educational institution or not.

MORRIS: If we could ever get far enough along in the development of our collective brain power as human beings—and we have pretty good reason to believe we're not nearly reaching the total limit of our capacities as people—if we ever get far enough along so that the learning process can become self-generating from generation to generation, our universities then might become places for reflective contemplation rather than for teaching masses of young people.

ANGLE: I can see that, except that it seems to me the physical facilities of universities, libraries, laboratories, and so on, have become more and more necessary, so that collective education has to persist.

MORRIS: That is true. But taking libraries, for instance, these things can change. I believe that within another generation, and maybe sooner, a scholar sitting in Timbuktu can call forth on a screen in front of him any book, any page in any book in any library in the world, in minutes, and not many minutes at that.

ANGLE: I'm skeptical of this myself. I don't doubt the technical feasibility of it except that you cannot take out what hasn't been put in, and I wonder how long it will take to put the contents of billions of pages into computers.

MORRIS: Ah, yes. It's going to be a tremendous job to feed raw material into the computers, and I am by no means certain that it can be done in a generation, but I don't share your pessimism. Maybe every book in every library is going to be a little too far, but somewhere we're going to have in this world a collection of the great mass of all mankind's documentation, subject to recall, subject to transmission, and available to scholars everywhere. Some have called this a "world brain." And it could literally be that as to storage of knowledge.

ANGLE: There is no question in my mind that we're going to move in this direction. I am simply pessimistic about the speed with which it can be done.

MORRIS: We are hoping to make a move in this direction at SIU. You see, we have two campuses here—one where we're sitting and another 115 miles away—and we have been working to make it possible for our libraries to make available materials from one campus to the other. Also, we are developing the means of carrying speech from any of our places of instruction to all others, or such ones as are desired. Now, there's no substitute literally for books, but the point I'm making is that if we don't realize that there are enormous technological changes taking place, and even more revolutionary ones possible that we don't even know about yet—if we don't appreciate this, and if we don't anticipate what there is ahead of us and be prepared to proceed, the educational establishment is going to fall behind and not do the kind of job it ought to do.

ANGLE: And fall short of its own potential. I'd like to ask you, Mr. Morris, your opinion on this subject. When I was a young man—which is a long time ago—a great many boys and girls considered that their education was complete—or sufficiently complete—when they got out of grade school. And even when I graduated from high school, four years after emerging from elementary school, a relatively small fraction of high school graduates thought it was desirable to go on to college. What is the situation today? Is a high school education—and let's assume that most youngsters in the state of Illinois achieve that—is that sufficient today in any occupation? Is what we call "higher education" essential for almost everyone?

MORRIS: The question you've asked leads to an area in which sometimes we say one thing and do another. This particular area is one of my greatest concerns in the whole field of education.

ANGLE: Let me interrupt now and ask you exactly what you mean by "higher education." Is that education beyond the high school level?

MORRIS: That's the way I was using the term. It's really the other side of the coin in your question, "How about after high school—is high school enough, and if it isn't what comes afterward?" Some people would want to rule out certain types of post-high school activities, but it's very convenient just to say "after high school." But to answer your question in a practical sense, I'd have to go back to the comment I made a while ago about what we are working toward in the educational process. Are we going to narrow down what we're doing in certain ways, or are we willing to take people as far as they can go with their talents, their intellectual capacity, and whatever motivation and drive they may have? Now if it's the latter that's valid, I'm profoundly concerned about higher education because we seem to be moving in a direction in which, in many colleges and universities today, it's become a kind of status symbol to exclude students—to set admission requirements higher and higher, to freeze up and make rigid the curriculum so that individual differences aren't provided for, to, as it were, put a person through a mold. If you'd say "yes" to your question, you would
have to accept my generalization. The world is developing very rapidly to a point where high school education simply isn't enough for functioning in the world in which we live, either in a job or otherwise, because of the complexity of society and the demands that are put upon persons as human beings. How many of these people are we going to exclude? Where you draw that line is immensely significant, not only for the persons but for society. For the individual, it's pretty clear that if he finishes high school and has intellectual capacities that he has not developed to the fullest extent, or if he is undeveloped in some of his special talents, such as art, or music, we will not have yet achieved our objective. This means that if he is to receive additional education, there must be a practical means of his achieving it. There must be a place he can go and be received as a student, a place where he can go within the limits of his financial capacity, and a place where he can go in terms of his social and emotional background. Yet today, with the press of increasing numbers of students that we have, with the increasing demand for higher education, with the necessity to choose for sheer financial reasons, and with prestige as an element as far as the institutions are concerned, we are working in the direction of denying to many people the very thing that we say is of great importance to them. Turn that around and look at its importance to our society. Illinois, for instance, will progress in its development as a state only to the extent that it profits by the combined brainpower of all of its citizens. To the extent that we limit the intellectual accomplishments and talent of the people of Illinois, we depress our potential as a state. It has been my position—and I sometimes feel very lonesome in the point of view that I'm developing now—that neither Illinois nor any other state of the union can afford to fail to develop each person to his own limit of capability. In the long run, although the individual profits from such development, society profits even more, all the way from not having to support a person to receiving more support from him in such an area as taxation. Now, did I get to the point?

ANGLE: Yes, you got very definitely to the point, and I'd like to pursue it a little more. I infer, perhaps unjustly, that you do not believe that the state of Illinois is at present providing adequate facilities for these people who are not in the higher ranks of their high school classes but still have potentials that need to be developed. Am I correct in that.

MORRIS: Oh, yes. That's incontestable.

ANGLE: Do you know of any state that is providing such facilities?

MORRIS: California is coming close. But, institution by institution in Illinois we're withdrawing educational opportunities. That's unequivocally true. At SIU we tried to keep the open door for all high school graduates, and did until some four or five years ago. We find that fewer students in the lower levels in their high school class are able to finish college than those in the upper, but we also find that there are always persons in the lower group who do finish and do quite well. Some very good students simply didn't get around to doing the job in high school, but do in college. This gets back to the question, "How important is it to the state and to individuals?" If you start with, say, the lowest third of the high school class, your percentage of persons who will finish college is less than if you start with the top third. But some will finish. Now the individual cost per capita will run higher for the lowest third. Can we af-
ford not to pay it? I don’t think we can as a state. I don’t think we can as a nation, because, outnumbered as we are and becoming more and more outnumbered in the world, we simply can’t hold our position as the outstanding industrial giant of the world unless we depend on quality. This has been my feeling, my argument. Now in SIU we’ve done all sorts of things to try to give educational opportunities to more students. We’ve been teaching classes on the Carbondale campus from 8 o’clock in the morning until 9–10 at night and on Saturdays. We have stretched the school day and the school week, and we can handle thereby twenty-five to thirty percent more students than we otherwise could in the same buildings. Instead of having a short summer session we now have a full quarter summer session so that we use our buildings an extra month. Our present admission policy is to limit enrollment in the fall quarter to Illinois students in the upper half of their graduating class. During the winter quarter we accept students in the upper two-thirds of their class. All Illinois high school graduates are eligible to enroll during the spring and summer quarters. The entrance requirement for out-of-state students is higher. All of our state institutions have been raising the barriers and I see no sign of lowering them.

A N G L E : Is yours the only state institution that is following this procedure?

M O R R I S : There is considerable variation among the six state universities. I have acquired a number of critics in private as well as public institutions of higher education for advocating the admission of students from the bottom as well as the top of high school graduating classes.

A N G L E : So, in effect, educational opportunities are being denied over the state to thousands.

M O R R I S : This is what troubles me. Obviously the lower level students present a harder job. You mentioned Leonardo da Vinci. You don’t need to spend a lot of time with a person like that if he’s motivated—you just point out the direction for him to go. But when you get someone who has less ability, but who should develop the ability he has, working with him takes more time and becomes a heavy burden indeed. Then people say you don’t have any standards, any admission criteria of significance. These comments can be hurtful. Our feeling has been that the important thing is not to try to achieve quality by whom you admit, but to achieve quality by what you do with those you let in. Whoever comes to an institution gives quality to it only by his accomplishments; therefore, we have tried to be lenient on the admission side and have insisted on strength on the retention side. If we could get all of our institutions to see this point of view and adjust themselves accordingly, I believe we would come closer to bringing each person up to his own potential.

A N G L E : Do you think that the junior colleges in existence today and in prospect will help take care of this need?

M O R R I S : Oh, yes, they will help, surely. The junior colleges now in existence are helping. There are junior colleges from Harrisburg to Chicago and SIU has been working with them and for them for many years. These junior colleges are doing outstanding work and I am sure that the new ones will do the same. The new law is an excellent one. It’s going to do a great deal of good and it will go far towards correcting the situation that I’m complaining about. But I don’t see the junior colleges as a total solution. I am, I guess, in disagreement with the existing admission policy of the state as exemplified by the Master Plan of the State Board of Higher Education. Are you familiar with that Master Plan?

A N G L E : Yes, I am.

M O R R I S : One feature of that plan is that if, because of lack of facilities or finances or anything else, it should
become necessary to curtail enrollment, it must be done by taking the most promising students first. How do you define promising? Do you mean those who score highest on the tests, who rate highest in their high school classes, or some combination of the two? Another policy is that the junior colleges are to be built in population centers, as are any future four-year colleges. In other words, the junior colleges are to be built where the young people are as an economy measure. The intention is that all high school graduates will be admitted to the junior colleges and that there'll be two channels, one a comprehensive college preparatory program and the other a technical or terminal program. The "comprehensive" program assumes that the student will stay at home and go to junior college, at least so far as state institutions are concerned. Now here's where my disagreement comes in. It is my observation that not infrequently a high school graduate more than anything else needs to be away from home. Many students of ability, who have done poorly in high school, have had a poor home adjustment. To get them out of that environment and into a new one is the only hope that they will do well at the college level. This is why I don't think the junior colleges will take care of the problem. I have argued and utterly vainly (laughter) that the universities ought to share the burden of these lower level students with the junior colleges and if it's an advantage to have them we ought to have our share of the advantage. Suppose we have 100,000 persons graduate this year in Illinois.

ANGLE: From the high schools, you mean?

MORRIS: Yes, from the high schools in the state of Illinois. Let's take the lower half—assume we have 50,000 lower half students. The way things are going, it appears that these lower half students within a few years will not be able to get into state universities. Let's assume that they can't. They will either have to stay in the junior colleges or go to private institutions, which means many won't be financially able to go. These we're most worried about, the ones who can't get away to college for economic reasons, can't get scholarships because those depend upon performance. It's self-defeating at every point, you can see, for this lower half. My argument is, why not divide up this lower half and let them go where they want to go to the extent of our capacity to take them? Let the universities take about half the students from the lower half. After they finish their two years of junior college the students who graduate in good standing, under the same Master Plan that makes them go to junior colleges, can be transferred to any of the state universities as a junior. So we exclude them as freshmen and bring them in as juniors, and in the process we are going to filter out a substantial num-

ANGLE: I'm glad you talked about it because it leads right to my next question, which is quite relevant. Does Illinois have the requisite number of higher educational institutions today? Could we take care of the 400,000 high school graduates in this state, or even that proportion of them who would find it possible to go to college? For example, there are some of those youngsters who will have to pitch in and help support the family. There are others who do not have the money, even for higher education at its lowest cost level, which is going to be a junior college in their home town. Could we take care of the remainder with the facilities we have in the state today?

MORRIS: Are you relating this to the observation I just made?
Morris: I don't believe we can retreat from the needs of higher education, not in the world we live in now. We've got to find the means of support. The wealth is here; there's no question about that. We've got more people, and we also have more income, much more income.

Angle: Education has become a recognized function of the state government ever since the Illinois State Normal University was founded in 1857.

Morris: Yes, ever since then Illinois has committed itself to the support of higher education. SIU was chartered in 1869. There seems to be good reason to think that the people will continue to support education if the need is made clear.

Angle: Let me sum up this part of our discussion, if I may, and ask you to comment on it if I am not correct. You may think that what we need in this state is a better break for students who are not in the top rank of their high school classes because they have a potential that can only be realized if they are exposed to the educational process on a higher level. Second, in order to do that we will need to increase our educational facilities. And third, we will also need to provide more money because the greatest proliferation is going to come in state-supported institutions. Does that sum it up?

Morris: Yes, that's unquestionably correct. I ought to add that I believe that in our universities we are going to see a major shift in the mixture of enrollment in terms of grade levels. We are going to see fewer freshmen and sophomores, and more juniors and seniors. Junior colleges will take away from the freshman and sophomore enrollment, yet add to the total enrollment by sending many more juniors and seniors to us than we would otherwise have. We'll see a definite enlargement in the number of graduate students. In this interim period while we have large classes of freshmen and sophomores in the universities, we'd be in a more defensible position as educators if we shared opportunity for lower level students who show signs of promise. We could offer an opportunity for these students to be away from home, and more important, we would counteract the tendency to downgrade the junior colleges.

Angle: What do you think about the future of privately supported institutions, with particular reference to this state?

Morris: I attended Park College, a private college in Missouri. I felt then, and I have felt ever since, that the privately supported colleges and universities have
made and will continue to make very important contributions to higher education. It's very important that they be retained and strengthened. In Illinois we are especially fortunate in the number and quality of our private institutions of higher education. Private universities such as Loyola University, The University of Chicago, and Northwestern, and private colleges such as Lake Forest, Knox, and Augustana are assets to be treasured. Our private institutions make important contributions through the whole spectrum of higher education from undergraduate instruction to advanced graduate study, advanced research, and professional and technological training including medical and related fields, law, and engineering. The real dilemma for private colleges and universities is that costs are going up and their endowment income is not going up correspondingly. They are caught in a terrible financial squeeze.

In a very real sense private institutions have been citadels of academic freedom. They have their own problems about academic freedom, of course, because a heavy donor to a private school may be a highly reactionary individual and he may throw blocks on freedom of speech, let's say by an economics professor, just as a political figure might attempt to throw blocks on the remarks of a political science teacher in a state institution. But by and large our private colleges and universities, particularly the great ones, have really been bastions of academic freedom and they have given meaning to the concept by demonstrating what it really is, the freedom of a professor to speak his mind about the intellectual subject he is dealing with. And this has made it more easily possible for state institutions to do likewise. We have today in Illinois, for instance, a very high level of academic freedom. I know of no infringement of academic freedom in our institutions and I foresee none.

ANGLE: And this you consider to be the greatest contribution of the privately supported college and university?

MORRIS: Certainly, I would put it at the head of the list of their contributions. If you don't have freedom of inquiry and freedom of expression in the university, you really don't have a true university. It is only in an atmosphere in which the unlikely can be explored with freedom and without censure that you have hope, real hope, of finding answers, because all too frequently the answer to an unknown is over in the realm of the unlikely.

ANGLE: What about education outside the classroom—extension services, for example? Aren't those a pretty important part of the whole educational organization and setup?

MORRIS: Of course! Here we have a very warm question. As our educational institutions become more burdened one hears the comment that we had better stop all the things we are doing besides teaching students in the classroom. On the face of it, this sounds pretty sensible. If the comment isn't scrutinized very carefully it may do a great deal of damage. The reason is that in our society today we have more need for education for persons who are not in school than we have ever had before. It's not uncommon now for a person to have to retool himself two or three times in the course in his lifetime; and this may soon step up to four or five times because of mechanization, the new demands of an urbanized instead of a rural society, and the increasing internationalization of life and functions of people in the United States. For instance, when I was in school in the 1920's I could see no reason, other than intellectual curiosity, for learning a foreign language. Today, one university, Stanford, has some 1,600 students in the course of a year studying abroad in five or six different nations, spending one semester out of the four-year course abroad.

ANGLE: This "retooling," as you call it, can be done through extension courses?

MORRIS: Well, it can be done that way, or it can be done through special programs on the campus. For instance, we have a Language Laboratory on this campus. One can be trained in a number of different languages by highly automated techniques. With guidance in programmed learning, a person can pretty well learn a minimal useful knowledge of a language in eight to twelve weeks time, if he can spend six or eight hours a day.

ANGLE: Suppose he can't spend that much?

MORRIS: Then he's going to have to stretch out the time, and he may have to learn in his own home. He can do that through a number of the universities in the state. We have businesses in Illinois operating around the world, and we have numerous economic contacts around the world, and income from foreign shipments rates very high. If we want to keep this kind of stance, and if we want the state to develop in this direction, we will be asking our educational institutions to give people what they need for the functions that they are going to carry on. Also, new industries come into the state. New kinds of employee training are needed for the beginner. The most effective way to get training is through our

(Continued on page 33)
News of the Campus

H. O. (Fritz) Crisler, University of Michigan athletic director, was the first of three prominent consultants on the future of SIU athletics to visit the University. The other two are Charles (Chick) Evans, onetime amateur golf star and now a Chicago businessman, and John Ashton, retired dean of the Indiana University graduate school.

International Studies

To help meet the need for broader instruction in international education, the Education Division (Edwardsville campus) has launched an expanded International Field Studies Program.

Five three-week field seminars, offering four to eight hours of academic credit, will be held this summer in Europe and Latin America: "Southern Europe," June 7-28; "Latin America," June 12-July 2; "Eastern Europe," July 12-Aug. 2; "School Supervision (Europe)," July 19-Aug. 9, and "Instructional Materials (Europe)," Aug. 3-24.

Seminar costs range from $771 to $875, including air transportation from either St. Louis or Chicago. The program is under the direction of Prof. Henry T. Boss, who said those interested in any of the seminars should contact him immediately for further information.

Boss said the seminars are designed to allow teachers, administrators, and senior college students an opportunity to combine professional study in foreign countries with enjoyable experiences of travel and culture.

New Center Opened

A public open house was featured in ceremonies opening the new, multi-purpose University Center on the Edwardsville campus.

Designed to help make study and leisure cooperative factors in education, the building has cafeteria and dining room capacity for some 5,500 persons, bowling lanes, browsing lounge, art gallery, barber shop, and campus store. There also are patios, a sunken garden, and areas for dancing and other student activities.

The $5,000,000 center is the fifth building to be occupied on the Edwardsville campus. Others are the Peck Classrooms Building, Lovejoy Library, the science building, and the newly-opened communications building.

Robert W. Handy, center director, said the new facility will serve as a "living room" for the campus, providing "services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the University community need in their daily life on the campus in getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom."

"As the center of community life," he added, "it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in our society."

Harmonizing with other structures in the academic core of the 2,600-acre campus, the center is built of deep plum-colored brick, quartz aggregate, pre-cast panels of concrete, and vast expanses of tinted glass.

LA&S Requirement

A combination package of mathematics and foreign language will be a requirement for graduation from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, starting in September.

As of then, bachelor's degree requirements in LA&S will include two years of mathematics and one of foreign language, or the reverse. At present, LA&S students are required to complete only one year of foreign language in addition to the underclass General Studies program required of all students.
The College also will offer a revised undergraduate minor in religious studies in the fall, consolidating religious studies within the University itself for the first time. Such studies have been available only through various off-campus religious foundations.

Architects Retained

Philadelphia architect Robert Geddes, master planner for the $80,000,000 "Penn's Landing" project there, has been retained by the University to design a classroom building complex on the Carbondale campus.

He was one of five architects named for proposed new buildings by the board of trustees, acting on recommendation of the University's board of architectural consultation.

Others are Ralph Rapson, Minneapolis, for a student recreation development near Campus Lake; Nikolaus Morgenthaler, Chicago, for a graduate student housing project; John Reid, San Francisco, for a Center for the Advanced Study of Physical Sciences, and Gunnar Birkerts, Birmingham, Mich., for a VTI classroom and office buildings group.

The architectural consultation board consists of Joseph Passoneau of Washington University, Charles Moore of Yale, and Lawrence Anderson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. They were appointed last year to advise SIU Architect Charles Pulley on such things as master planning, building design, and selection of architectural firms.

New Business Program

A new executive-in-residence program in the School of Business will bring graduate students and faculty members in contact with distinguished leaders in the business world.

Dean Robert S. Hancock said the new program is a response to the increasing need for educators and businessmen to work together to develop social, political, and economic guidelines.

He said the program will place emphasis on the responsibilities of business in modern society and the role of business in the national and international economy.

Prickly Research

Graduate student John Sutton undoubtedly has the prickliest research project now underway at SIU.

What he has, in short, are five full grown porcupines. That's about 150,000 quills, according to what literature there is on porcupines.

Sutton, in his second year of study for a master's degree in zoology, decided to do a thesis on porcupines because knowledge of their food preferences and overall behavior is somewhat scanty.

He brought five of the animals from Wisconsin, his home state, and placed them in two cages in his laboratory-office.

"That's when the action started and I got my first surprise," he said. "They got a bit violent with each other. The books say they aren't that way."

Among other things, Sutton is determined to learn the delicate art of picking up a porcupine. He is resigned to the thought that his first lessons may be painful ones. His one consolation is that the animals are becoming tamer each day.

HARRY GALLATIN, former SIU and professional basketball coach, has been named assistant dean of students for the Edwardsville campus. He served as Saluki coach from 1959 through 1962.
In 1966, outside grants and contracts to Southern Illinois University totaled approximately $12,000,000—an increase of some $10,000,000 in five years. Most of this money came directly or indirectly from agencies of the federal government. Campus construction budgets are soared by federal dollars. SIU, like other colleges and universities in America, is deeply involved with Uncle Sam.
America's colleges and universities, recipients of billions in Federal funds, have a new relationship:

Life with Uncle

What would happen if all the Federal dollars now going to America's colleges and universities were suddenly withdrawn?

The president of one university pondered the question briefly, then replied: "Well, first, there would be this very loud sucking sound."

Indeed there would. It would be heard from Berkeley's gates to Harvard's yard, from Colby, Maine, to Kilgore, Texas. And in its wake would come shock waves that would rock the entire establishment of American higher education.

No institution of higher learning, regardless of its size or remoteness from Washington, can escape the impact of the Federal government's involvement in higher education. Of the 2,200 institutions of higher learning in the United States, about 1,800 participate in one or more Federally supported or sponsored programs. (Even an institution which receives no Federal dollars is affected—for it must compete for faculty, students, and private dollars with the institutions that do receive Federal funds for such things.)

Hence, although hardly anyone seriously believes that Federal spending on the campus is going to stop or even decrease significantly, the possibility, however remote, is enough to send shivers down the nation's academic backbone. Colleges and universities operate on such tight budgets that even a relatively slight ebb in the flow of Federal funds could be serious. The fiscal belt-tightening in Washington, caused by the war in Vietnam and the threat of inflation, has already brought a financial squeeze to some institutions.

A look at what would happen if all Federal dollars were suddenly withdrawn from colleges and universities may be an exercise in the absurd, but it dramatizes the depth of government involvement:

- The nation's undergraduates would lose more than 800,000 scholarships, loans, and work-study grants, amounting to well over $300 million.
- Colleges and universities would lose some $2 billion which now supports research on the campuses. Consequently some 50 per cent of America's science faculty members would be without support for their research. They would lose the summer salaries which they have come to depend on—and, in some cases, they would lose part of their salaries for the other nine months, as well.
- The big government-owned research laboratories which several universities operate under contract would be closed. Although this might end some management headaches for the universities, it would also deprive thousands of scientists and engineers of employment and the institutions of several million dollars in overhead reimbursements and fees.
- The newly established National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—for which faculties have waited for years—would collapse before its first grants were spent.
- Planned or partially constructed college and university buildings, costing roughly $2.5 billion, would be delayed or abandoned altogether.
- Many of our most eminent universities and medical schools would find their annual budgets sharply reduced—in some cases by more than 50 per cent. And the 68 land-grant institutions would lose Fed-
A partnership of brains, money, and mutual need

eral institutional support which they have been re-
cieving since the nineteenth century.

- Major parts of the anti-poverty program, the new
GI Bill, the Peace Corps, and the many other pro-
grams which call for spending on the campuses would
founder.

The Federal Government is now the “Big
Spender” in the academic world. Last year, Wash-
ington spent more money on the nation’s campuses
than did the 50 state governments combined.

The National Institutes of Health alone spent more
on educational and research projects than any one
state allocated for higher education. The National
Science Foundation, also a Federal agency, awarded
more funds to colleges and universities than did
all the business corporations in America. And the
U.S. Office of Education’s annual expenditure in
higher education of $1.2 billion far exceeded all
gifts from private foundations and alumni. The $5
billion or so that the Federal government will
spend on campuses this year constitutes more than
25 per cent of higher education’s total budget.

About half of the Federal funds now going to
academic institutions support research and research-
related activities—and, in most cases, the research is
in the sciences. Most often an individual scholar,
with his institution’s blessing, applies directly to
a Federal agency for funds to support his work. A
professor of chemistry, for example, might apply to
the National Science Foundation for funds to help pay
for salaries, tuition, research, construction, and operat-
ing costs that any significant decline in Federal sup-
port would disrupt the whole enterprise of American
higher education.

To some educators, this dependence is a threat to
the integrity and independence of the colleges and
universities. “It is unnerving to know that our sys-
tem of higher education is highly vulnerable to the
whims and fickleness of politics,” says a man who
has held high positions both in government and on
the campuses.

Others minimize the hazards. Public institutions,
they point out, have always been vulnerable in this
sense—yet look how they’ve flourished. Congress-
men, in fact, have been conscientious in their ap-
proach to Federal support of higher education; the
problem is that standards other than those of the
universities and colleges could become the deter-
mning factors in the nature and direction of Federal
support. In any case, the argument runs, all aca-
demic institutions depend on the good will of others
to provide the support that insures freedom. Mc-
George Bundy, before he left the White House to
head the Ford Foundation, said flippantly: “American
higher education is more and not less free and strong
because of Federal funds.” Such funds, he argued,
actually have enhanced freedom by enlarging the
opportunity of institutions to act; they are no more
tainted than are dollars from other sources; and the
way in which they are allocated is closer to academic
tradition than is the case with nearly all other major
sources of funds.

The issue of Federal control notwithstanding,
Federal support of higher education is taking its
place alongside military budgets and farm subsidies
as one of the government’s essential activities. All
evidence indicates that such is the public’s will.

Education has always had a special worth in this
country, and each new generation sets the valuation
higher. In a recent Gallup Poll on national goals,
Americans listed education as having first priority.
Governors, state legislators, and Congressmen, ever
sensitive to voter attitudes, are finding that the im-
provement of education is not only a noble issue on
which to stand, but a winning one.

The increased Federal interest and support reflect

Every institution, however small or remote, feels the
effects of the Federal role in higher education.

DRAWINGS BY DILL COLE
The haves and have-nots

concentration of funds. When the war ended, how-
ever, the lopsided distribution of Federal research funds did not. In fact, it has continued right up to the present, with 29 institutions receiving more than 50 per cent of Federal research dollars.

To the institutions on the receiving end, the situ-
a
tion seems natural and proper. They are, after all, the strongest and most productive research centers in the nation. The government, they argue, has an obligation to spend the public's money where it will yield the highest return to the nation.

The less-favored institutions recognize this ob-
ligation, too. But they maintain that it is equally important to the nation to develop new institutions of high quality—yet, without financial help from Washington, the second- and third-rank institutions will remain just that.

In late 1965 President Johnson, in a memorandum to the heads of Federal departments and agencies, acknowledged the importance of maintaining scientific excellence in the institutions where it now exists. But, he emphasized, Federal research funds should also be used to strengthen and develop new centers of excellence. Last year this "spread the wealth" movement gained momentum, as a number of agencies stepped up their efforts to broaden the distribution of research money. The Department of Defense, for example, one of the bigger purchasers of research, designated $18 million for this academic year to help about 50 widely scattered institutions develop into high-grade research centers. But with economies induced by the war in Vietnam, it is doubtful whether enough money will be available in the near future to end the controversy.

Eventually, Congress may have to act. In so doing, it is important to consider the concentration of Federal re-
search funds on relatively few campuses and in certain sections of the country.

The problem grew out of World War II, when the government turned to the campuses for desperately needed scientific research. Since many of the best-known and most productive scientists were working in a dozen or so institutions in the Northeast and a few in the Midwest and California, more than half of the Federal research funds were spent there. (Most of the remaining money went to another 50 universities with research and graduate training.)

The wartime emergency obviously justified this

The fact that Federal funds have been concentrated in the sciences has also had a pronounced effect on colleges and universities. In many institutions, faculty members in the natural sciences earn more than faculty members in the humanities and social sciences; they have better facilities, more frequent leaves, and generally more influence on the campus.
The government's support of science can also disrupt the academic balance and internal priorities of a college or university. One president explained: "Our highest-priority construction project was a $3 million building for our humanities departments. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act, we could expect to get a third of this from the Federal government. This would leave $2 million for us to get from private sources."

"But then, under a new government program, the biology and psychology faculty decided to apply to the National Institutes of Health for $1.5 million for new faculty members over a period of five years. These additional faculty people, however, made it necessary for us to go ahead immediately with our plans for a $4 million science building—so we gave it the No. 1 priority and moved the humanities building down the list."

"We could finance half the science building's cost with Federal funds. In addition, the scientists pointed out, they could get several training grants which would provide stipends to graduate students and tuition to our institution."

"You see what this meant? Both needs were valid—those of the humanities and those of the sciences. For $2 million of private money, I could either build a $3 million humanities building or I could build a $4 million science building, get $1.5 million for additional faculty, and pick up a few hundred thousand dollars in training grants. Either-or; not both."

The president could have added that if the scientists had been denied the privilege of applying to NIH, they might well have gone to another institution, taking their research grants with them. On the other hand, under the conditions of the academic marketplace, it was unlikely that the humanities scholars would be able to exercise a similar mobility.

The case also illustrates why academic administrators sometimes complain that Federal support of an individual faculty member's research projects casts their institution in the ineffectual role of a legal middleman, prompting the faculty member to feel a greater loyalty to a Federal agency than to the college or university.

Congress has moved to lessen the disparity between support of the humanities and social sciences on the one hand and support of the physical and biological sciences on the other. It established the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—a move which, despite a pitifully small first-year allocation of funds, offers some encouragement. And close observers of the Washington scene predict that

The affluence of research:

the social sciences, which have been receiving some Federal support, are destined to get considerably more in the next few years.

Efforts to cope with such difficult problems must begin with an understanding of the nature and background of the government-campus partnership. But this presents a problem in itself, for one encounters a welter of conflicting statistics, contradictory information, and wide differences of honest opinion. The task is further complicated by the swiftness with which the situation continually changes. And—the ultimate complication—there is almost no uniformity or coordination in the Federal government's numerous programs affecting higher education.

Each of the 50 or so agencies dispensing Federal funds to the colleges and universities is responsible for its own program, and no single Federal agency supervises the entire enterprise. (The creation of the Office of Science and Technology in 1962 represented an attempt to cope with the multiplicity of relationships. But so far there has been little significant improvement.) Even within the two houses of Congress, responsibility for the government's expenditures on the campuses is scattered among several committees.

Not only does the lack of a coordinated Federal program make it difficult to find a clear definition of the government's role in higher education, but it also creates a number of problems both in Washington and on the campuses.

The Bureau of the Budget, for example, has had to

wrestle with several uncoordinated, duplicative Federal science budgets and with different accounting systems. Congress, faced with the almost impossible task of keeping informed about the esoteric world of science in order to legislate intelligently, finds it difficult to control and direct the fast-growing Federal investment in higher education. And the individual government agencies are forced to make policy decisions and to respond to political and other pressures without adequate or consistent guidelines from above.

The colleges and universities, on the other hand, must negotiate the maze of Federal bureaus with consummate skill if they are to get their share of the Federal largesse. If they succeed, they must then cope with mountains of paperwork, disparate systems of accounting, and volumes of regulations that differ from agency to agency. Considering the magnitude of the financial rewards at stake, the institutions have had no choice but to enlarge their administrative staffs accordingly, adding people who can handle the business problems, wrestle with paperwork, manage grants and contracts, and untangle legal snarls. College and university presidents are constantly looking for competent academic administrators to prowl the Federal agencies in search of programs and opportunities in which their institutions can profitably participate.

The latter group of people, whom the press calls "university lobbyists," has been growing in number. At least a dozen institutions now have full-time representatives working in Washington. Many more have members of their administrative and academic staffs shuttling to and from the capital to negotiate Federal grants and contracts, cultivate agency personnel, and try to influence legislation. Still other institutions have enlisted the aid of qualified alumni or trustees who happen to live in Washington.

The lack of a uniform Federal policy prevents the clear statement of national goals that might give direction to the government's investments in higher education. This takes a toll in effectiveness and consistency and tends to produce contradictions and conflicts. The teaching-versus-research controversy is one example.
Fund-raisers prowl the Washington maze

President Johnson provided another. Last summer, he publicly asked if the country is really getting its money's worth from its support of scientific research. He implied that the time may have come to apply more widely, for the benefit of the nation, the knowledge that Federally sponsored medical research had produced in recent years. A wave of apprehension spread through the medical schools when the President's remarks were reported. The inference to be drawn was that the Federal funds supporting the elaborate research effort, built at the urging of the government, might now be diverted to actual medical care and treatment. Later the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, tried to lay a calming hand on the medical scientists' fevered brows by making a strong reaffirmation of the National Institutes of Health's commitment to basic research. But the apprehensiveness remains.

Other events suggest that the 25-year honeymoon of science and the government may be ending. Connecticut's Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario, a man who is not intimidated by the mystique of modern science, has stepped up his campaign to have a greater part of the National Science Foundation's budget spent on applied research. And, despite pleas from scientists and NSF administrators, Congress terminated the costly Mohole project, which was designed to gain more fundamental information about the internal structure of the earth.

Some observers feel that because it permits and often causes such conflicts, the diversity in the government's support of higher education is a basic flaw in the partnership. Others, however, believe this diversity, despite its disadvantages, guarantees a margin of independence to colleges and universities that would be jeopardized in a monolithic "super-bureau."

Good or bad, the diversity was probably essential to the development of the partnership between Washington and the academic world. Charles Kidd, executive secretary of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, puts it bluntly when he points out that the system's pluralism has allowed us to avoid dealing "directly with the ideological problem of what the total relationship of the government and universities should be. If we had had to face these ideological and political pressures head-on over the past few years, the confrontation probably would have wrecked the system."

That confrontation may be coming closer, as Federal allocations to science and education come under sharper scrutiny in Congress and as the partnership enters a new and significant phase.

Federal aid to higher education began with the Ordinance of 1787, which set aside public lands for schools and declared that the "means of education shall forever be encouraged." But the two forces that most shaped American higher education, say many historians, were the land-grant movement of the nineteenth century and the Federal support of scientific research that began in World War II.

The land-grant legislation and related acts of Congress in subsequent years established the American concept of enlisting the resources of higher education to meet pressing national needs. The laws were pragmatic and were designed to improve education and research in the natural sciences, from which agricultural and industrial expansion could proceed. From these laws has evolved the world's greatest system of public higher education.

In this century the Federal involvement grew spasmodically during such periods of crisis as World War I and the depression of the thirties. But it was not until World War II that the relationship began its rapid evolution into the dynamic and intimate partnership that now exists.

Federal agencies and industrial laboratories were ill-prepared in 1940 to supply the research and technology so essential to a full-scale war effort. The government therefore turned to the nation's colleges and universities. Federal funds supported scientific research on the campuses and built huge research facilities to be operated by universities under contract, such as Chicago's Argonne Laboratory and California's laboratory in Los Alamos.

So successful was the new relationship that it continued to flourish after the war. Federal research funds poured onto the campuses from military agencies, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. The amounts of money increased spectacularly. At the beginning of the war the Federal government spent less than $200 million a year for all research and development. By 1950, the Federal "r & d" expenditure totaled $1 billion. The Soviet Union's launching of Sputnik jolted
Even those campuses which traditionally stand apart from government find it hard to resist Federal aid.

the nation and brought a dramatic surge in support of scientific research. President Eisenhower named James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to be Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was passed. Federal spending for scientific research and development increased to $5.8 billion. Of this, $400 million went to colleges and universities.

The 1960's brought a new dimension to the relationship between the Federal government and higher education. Until then, Federal aid was almost synonymous with government support of science, and all Federal dollars allocated to campuses were to meet specific national needs.

There were two important exceptions: the GI Bill after World War II, which crowded the colleges and universities with returning servicemen and spent $19 billion on educational benefits, and the National Defense Education Act, which was the broadest legislation of its kind and the first to be based, at least in part, on the premise that support of education itself is as much in the national interest as support which is based on the colleges' contributions to something as specific as the national defense.

The crucial turning-points were reached in the Kennedy-Johnson years. President Kennedy said: "We pledge ourselves to seek a system of higher education where every young American can be educated, not according to his race or his means, but according to his capacity. Never in the life of this country has the pursuit of that goal become more important or more urgent." Here was a clear national commitment to universal higher education, a public acknowledgment that higher education is worthy of support for its own sake. The Kennedy and Johnson administrations produced legislation which authorized:

- $1.5 billion in matching funds for new construction on the nation's campuses.
- $151 million for local communities for the building of junior colleges.
- $432 million for new medical and dental schools and for aid to their students.
- The first large-scale Federal program of undergraduate scholarships, and the first Federal package combining them with loans and jobs to help individual students.
- Grants to strengthen college and university libraries.
- Significant amounts of Federal money for "promising institutions," in an effort to lift the entire system of higher education.
- The first significant support of the humanities.

In addition, dozens of "Great Society" bills included funds for colleges and universities. And their number is likely to increase in the years ahead.

The full significance of the developments of the past few years will probably not be known for some time. But it is clear that the partnership between the Federal government and higher education has entered a new phase. The question of the Federal government's total relationship to colleges and universities—avoided for so many years—has still not been squarely faced. But a confrontation may be just around the corner.

The major pitfalls, around which Presidents and Congressmen have detoured, is the issue of the separation of state and church. The Constitution of the United States says nothing about the Federal government's responsibility for education. So the rationale for Federal involvement, up to now, has been the Constitution's Article I, which grants Congress the power to spend tax money for the common defense and the general welfare of the nation.

So long as Federal support of education was specific in nature and linked to the national defense, the religious issue could be skirted. But as the emphasis moved to providing for the national welfare, the legal grounds became less firm, for the First Amendment to the Constitution says, in part, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion...."

So far, for practical and obvious reasons, neither the President nor Congress has met the problem head-on. But the battle has been joined, anyway. Some cases challenging grants to church-related col...
leges are now in the courts. And Congress is being pressed to pass legislation that would permit a citizen to challenge, in the Federal courts, the Congressional acts relating to higher education.

Meanwhile, America’s 893 church-related colleges are eligible for funds under most Federal programs supporting higher education, and nearly all have received such funds. Most of these institutions would applaud a decision permitting the support to continue.

Some, however, would not. The Southern Baptists and the Seventh Day Adventists, for instance, have opposed Federal aid to the colleges and universities related to their denominations. Furman University, for example, under pressure from the South Carolina Baptist convention, returned a $612,000 Federal grant that it had applied for and received. Many colleges are awaiting the report of a Southern Baptist study group, due this summer.

Such institutions face an agonizing dilemma: stand fast on the principle of separation of church and state and take the financial consequences, or join the majority of colleges and universities and risk Federal influence. Said one delegate to the Southern Baptist Convention: “Those who say we’re going to become second-rate schools unless we take Federal funds see clearly. I’m beginning to see it so clearly it’s almost a nightmarish thing. I’ve moved toward Federal aid reluctantly; I don’t like it.”

Some colleges and universities, while refusing Federal aid in principle, permit some exceptions. Wheaton College, in Illinois, is a hold-out; but it allows some of its professors to accept National Science Foundation research grants. So does Rockford College, in Illinois. Others shun government money, but let their students accept Federal scholarships and loans. The president of one small church-related college, faced with acute financial problems, says simply: “The basic issue for us is survival.”

Recent federal programs have sharpened the conflict between Washington and the states in fixing the responsibility for education. Traditionally and constitutionally, the responsibility has generally been with the states. But as Federal support has equaled and surpassed the state allocations to higher education, the question of responsibility is less clear.

The great growth in quality and Ph.D. production of many state universities, for instance, is undoubtedly due in large measure to Federal support. Federal dollars pay for most of the scientific research in state universities, make possible higher salaries which attract outstanding scholars, contribute substantially to new buildings, and provide large amounts of student aid. Clark Kerr speaks of the “Federal grant university,” and the University of California (which he used to head) is an apt example: nearly half of its total income comes from Washington.

To most governors and state legislators, the Federal grants are a mixed blessing. Although they have helped raise the quality and capabilities of state institutions, the grants have also raised the pressure on state governments to increase their appropriations for higher education, if for no other reason than to fulfill the matching requirement of many Federal awards. But even funds which are not channeled through the state agencies and do not require the state to provide matching funds can give impetus to increased appropriations for higher education. Federal research grants to individual scholars, for example, may make it necessary for the state to provide more faculty members to get the teaching done.
Last year, 38 states and territories joined the Compact for Education, an interstate organization designed to provide “close and continuing consultation among our several states on all matters of education.” The operating arm of the Compact will gather information, conduct research, seek to improve standards, propose policies, “and do such things as may be necessary or incidental to the administration of its authority.”

Although not spelled out in the formal language of the document, the Compact is clearly intended to enable the states to present a united front on the future of Federal aid to education.

In a typically pragmatic fashion, we Americans want our colleges and universities to serve the public interest. We expect them to train enough doctors, lawyers, and engineers. We expect them to provide answers to immediate problems such as water and air pollution, urban blight, national defense, and disease. As we have done so often in the past, we expect the Federal government to build a creative and democratic system that will accomplish these things.

A faculty planning committee at one university stated in its report: “... A university is now regarded as a symbol for our age, the crucible in which —by some mysterious alchemy—man’s long-awaited Utopia will at last be forged.”

Some think the Federal role in higher education is growing too rapidly.

As early as 1952, the Association of American Universities’ commission on financing higher education warned: “We as a nation should call a halt at this time to the introduction of new programs of direct Federal aid to colleges and universities. ... Higher education at least needs time to digest what it has already undertaken and to evaluate the full impact of what it is already doing under Federal assistance.”

The recommendation went unheeded.

A year or so ago, Representative Edith Green of Oregon, an active architect of major education legislation, echoed this sentiment. The time has come, she said, “to stop, look, and listen,” to evaluate the impact of Congressional action on the educational system. It seems safe to predict that Mrs. Green’s warning, like that of the university presidents, will fail to halt the growth of Federal spending on the campus. But the note of caution she sounds will be well-taken by many who are increasingly concerned about the impact of the Federal involvement in higher education.

The more pessimistic observers fear direct Federal control of higher education. With the loyalty-oath conflict in mind, they see peril in the requirement that Federally supported colleges and universities demonstrate compliance with civil rights legislation or lose their Federal support. They express alarm at recent agency anti-conflict-of-interest proposals that would require scholars who receive government support to account for all of their other activities.

For most who are concerned, however, the fear is not so much of direct Federal control as of Federal influence on the conduct of American higher education. Their worry is not that the government will deliberately restrict the freedom of the scholar, or directly change an institution of higher learning. Rather, they are afraid the scholar may be tempted to confine his studies to areas where Federal support is known to be available, and that institutions will be unable to resist the lure of Federal dollars.

Before he became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner said: “When a government agency with money to spend approaches a university, it can usually purchase almost any service it wants. And many institutions still follow the old practice of looking on funds so received as gifts. They not only do not look a gift horse in the mouth; they do not even pause to note whether it is a horse or a boa constrictor.”

The greatest obstacle to the success of the government-campus partnership may lie in the fact that the partners have different objectives.

The Federal government’s support of higher education has been essentially pragmatic. The Federal agencies have a mission to fulfill. To the degree that the colleges and universities can help to fulfill that mission, the agencies provide support.

The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, supports research and related activities in nuclear physics; the National Institutes of Health provide funds for medical research; the Agency for International Development finances overseas programs. Even recent programs which tend to recognize higher education as a national resource in itself are basically presented as efforts to cope with pressing national problems.

The Higher Education Facilities Act, for instance, provides matching funds for the construction of
academic buildings. But the awards under this program are made on the basis of projected increases in enrollment. In the award of National Defense Graduate Fellowships to institutions, enrollment expansion and the initiation of new graduate programs are the main criteria. Under new programs affecting medical and dental schools, much of the Federal money is intended to increase the number of practitioners. Even the National Humanities Endowment, which is the government’s attempt to rectify an academic imbalance aggravated by massive Federal support for the sciences, is curiously and pragmatically oriented to fulfill a specific mission, rather than to support the humanities generally because they are worthy in themselves.

Who can dispute the validity of such objectives? Surely not the institutions of higher learning, for they recognize an obligation to serve society by providing trained manpower and by conducting applied research. But colleges and universities have other traditional missions of at least equal importance. Basic research, though it may have no apparent relevance to society’s immediate needs, is a primary (and almost exclusive) function of universities. It needs no other justification than the scholar’s curiosity. The department of classics is as important in the college as is the department of physics, even though it does not contribute to the national defense. And enrollment expansion is neither an inherent virtue nor a universal goal in higher education; in fact, some institutions can better fulfill their objectives by remaining relatively small and selective.

Colleges and universities believe, for the most part, that they themselves are the best judges of what they ought to do, where they would like to go, and what their internal academic priorities are. For this reason the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has advocated that the government increase its institutional (rather than individual project) support in higher education, thus permitting colleges and universities a reasonable latitude in using Federal funds.

Congress, however, considers that it can best determine what the nation’s needs are, and how the taxpayer’s money ought to be spent. Since there is never enough money to do everything that cries to be done, the choice between allocating Federal funds for cancer research or for classics is not a very difficult one for the nation’s political leaders to make.

"The fact is," says one professor, "that we are trying to merge two entirely different systems. The government is the political engine of our democracy and must be responsive to the wishes of the people. But scholarship is not very democratic. You don’t vote on the laws of thermodynamics or take a poll on the speed of light. Academic freedom and tenure are not prizes in a popularity contest."

Some observers feel that such a merger cannot be accomplished without causing fundamental changes in colleges and universities. They point to existing academic imbalances, the teaching-versus-research controversy, the changing roles of both professor and student, the growing commitment of colleges and universities to applied research. They fear that the influx of Federal funds into higher education will so transform colleges and universities that the very qualities that made the partnership desirable and productive in the first place will be lost.

The great technological achievements of the past 30 years, for example, would have been impossible without the basic scientific research that preceded them. This research—much of it seemingly irrelevant to society’s needs—was conducted in universities, because only there could the scholar find the freedom and support that were essential to his quest.

If the growing demand for applied research is met at the expense of basic research, future generations may pay the penalty.

One could argue—and many do—that colleges and universities do not have to accept Federal funds. But, to most of the nation’s colleges and universities, the rejection of Federal support is an unacceptable alternative.

For those institutions already dependent upon Federal dollars, it is too late to turn back. Their physical plant, their programs, their personnel are all geared to continuing Federal aid.

And for those institutions which have received only token help from Washington, Federal dollars offer the one real hope of meeting the educational objectives they have set for themselves.

Some people fear that the colleges and universities are in danger of being remade in the Federal image.
porations, and alumni continue to rise steadily, but the increases are not keeping pace with rising costs. Hence the continuation and probably the enlargement of the partnership between the Federal government and higher education appears to be inevitable. The real task facing the nation is to make it work.

To that end, colleges and universities may have to become more deeply involved in politics. They will have to determine, more clearly than ever before, just what their objectives are—and what their values are. And they will have to communicate these most effectively to their alumni, their political representatives, the corporate community, the foundations, and the public at large.

If the partnership is to succeed, the Federal government will have to do more than provide funds. Elected officials and administrators face the awesome task of formulating overall educational and research goals, to give direction to the programs of Federal support. They must make more of an effort to understand what makes colleges and universities tick, and to accommodate individual institutional differences.

The report on this and the preceding 15 pages is the product of a cooperative endeavor in which scores of schools, colleges, and universities are taking part. It was prepared under the direction of the group listed below, who form Editorial Projects for Education, a non-profit organization associated with the American Alumni Council. Naturally, in a report of such length and scope, not all statements necessarily reflect the views of all the persons involved, or of their institutions. Copyright © 1967 by Editorial Projects for Education, Inc. All rights reserved; no part may be reproduced without the express permission of the editors. Printed in U.S.A.
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NIT: sweet taste of Victory

By Fred Huff

They call it a “prestigious” tournament. It's the nation's oldest, and tradition rich. Yet the championship trophy is just thirteen inches tall and sixteen inches around.

So what is the value of winning the National Invitational Tournament, a feat the SIU Salukis recently pulled off in New York City's Madison Square Garden?

We sought some opinions from people around the country.

Dick Grills, a top official in the Walt Disney Studios at Burbank, Calif., said the Salukis “had a lot of people around here pulling for them even though they had seldom heard of the school before the NIT. Chuck Keehne, a former Midwesterner like myself who now heads our make-up department, has been helping me carry the Southern banner for years out here. It won't be quite so difficult now. The fans loved what they saw on TV, and realize SIU is one of the great basketball teams of the nation.”

Three other Californians, brothers Gene, Mil, and Melvin Wyman (all reared in DuQuoin, Ill.), also had interesting comments.

Gene, a lawyer and the state's national Democratic committeeman, felt the NIT victory was the “greatest thing that could happen to SIU.”

Mil, an associate professor at the University of Southern California and a private practitioner in cardiology and internal medicine, said, “We've been out here for quite a while and nothing has made us so homesick as SIU's success in the NIT. It seemed as if everyone around the office and hospital was talking about the 'small college' from Illinois winning the NIT.”

Melvin, an experimental psychologist with North American Airlines, is the best informed sports expert of the family.

“It was great,” he said. “I had no idea SIU was playing such high quality basketball. Please try to get them to come out here so we'll have an opportunity to see them.”

Saluki Coach Jack Hartman feels the title “helped in many ways, but specifically in improving our image and acceptance. Our students, faculty, and alumni—even Southern Illinoisans not connected with the University—can associate themselves with SIU and hold their heads up high.”

The Salukis came in for some high praise even from the opposition. “I've never known our players to be so high in their praise of an opponent as they were of the Salukis after our semi-final game,” said Les Unger, sports information director at Rutgers University.

“They specifically pointed out Southern's defensive skills and ability to apply pressure without fouling.”

SIU President Delyte W. Morris said the team's success throughout the season had increased the desire of many to know more about the University, to find out “where, what, how, who these giant-killers were.”

“As thousands watched (the NIT) in Madison Square Garden and millions throughout the nation by television,” Morris said, “the basketball team put the University into the spotlight.
"It follows that there will be increased interest in our other successful fields of endeavor: the University's accomplishments of excellence in research, teaching, and service."

Athletic Director Donald Boydston said the exposure given the team by various media "has given us national acceptance, transforming us from the 'in-between' limbo of intercollegiate athletics to major university status."

The NIT win helped make Clarence Dougherty, University Center director, one of the most popular persons at a recent conference in Philadelphia.

"Practically everyone, after glancing at my identification badge, would say, 'Oh, yes, you're from that Illinois school with the fabulous basketball team,'" Dougherty said. "It made me very proud, especially after they went on to say so many complimentary things about other aspects of the team and the University."

John Goldner, booking agent for Madison Square Garden, admitted he knew little of SIU until the team came up for consideration as an NIT entrant. He feels the most important contribution the tourney made to SIU was "the fact that it exposed it to thousands of people across the country."

Prior to the championship game, Illinois Governor Otto Kerner, attending a conference at the White House, jokingly offered to bet President Johnson "a new interstate highway that the Salukis will whip Marquette." The governor revealed his wager while on campus to present Coach Hartman with the United Press International's trophy for the top-rated college division team of 1967. (The President, he said, turned down his offer.)

The New York area press, while cautious and uncertain prior to Southern's awesome 103-56 win over St. Peter's on opening night, was extremely kind to the Salukis. Jerry Isenberg, sports columnist for the Newark Star-Ledger who also has a fourteen-page year's review in the 1967 World Book Encyclopedia year book, got in one of the first licks following SIU's acceptance of its NIT invitation when he wrote:

"Princeton has its Tiger; B.C. has its Eagle. Rutgers is the Queensmen, a title truly regal. But from frigid New York City to Kentucky's old Paduachee, "There's just one burning question—what the hell is a Saluki?"

A six-column headline in the March 8 issue of Newsday read, "NIT Warning: Those 'Small' Salukis Can Bite."

The New York Post's March 9 issue blared across all five columns of its tabloid page with, "Salukis Bite Worse Than Bark." Gene Roswell's story opened with, "Now that the dribble-pop-swish world of NIT knows what a Saluki is, the next question is: How do you handle it? In Egypt, this is no problem because all they have to do to a Saluki, which is a racy hunting hound there, is feed it dog biscuits. But in the Garden, it's a poser, because the only Salukis of the Western Hemisphere are the Southern Illinois basketball team which hounded St. Peter's out of the NIT and into oblivion last night. The Salukis are the slickest, quickest college bunch to hit the Garden this season and perhaps the only way to appease them is hand them the NIT trophy now and hope you get your hand back. The way they chewed up St. Pete's 103-58 for the largest winning margin—45 points—in, NIT history, somebody should have called the ASPCA."

Norm Miller, writing in the New York Daily News following Southern Illinois' hard-earned win over Duke, said:

"The spunky Salukis of Southern Illinois, the nation's No. 1 small college team, bounced Duke's glamor boys out of the NIT last night... Until Duke sagged in the final four minutes, it was a beautifully played
game in which the score was never more than four points apart. . . Southern Illinois did a remarkable job battling Duke's height and size. The Salukis shot only 38.2%, but they threw 68 shots, their slick-feeding offense produced 19 assists, and they canned 20 of 26 free throws. Most important, they hustled."

Don't try to convince any one of the 100-plus newsmen, radio and TV sportscasters who covered the New York City classic, or any of the 61,000 fans who saw the games in the Garden, or any of the hundreds of thousands who viewed the game on national television that the 30th NIT title belonged to any team other than Coach Hartman's outfit.

Perhaps the New York World Journal Tribune's March 19 account of the championship game, written by Sam Goldaper, summed it all up: "Southern Illinois came to conquer and did. The disciplined Salukis from Carbondale, Ill., (population 22,000) came to the big city to make a reputation. They turned their No. 1 small college ranking into a National Invitational Tournament title before a sellout crowd of 18,499 at Madison Square Garden. It was more than basketball ability that Southern Illinois showed while wallopine Marquette, 71-56. The Salukis proved patience is a virtue."
The taste of victory was made even sweeter by the third NCAA title in four years won by the Saluki gymnastics team, coached by Bill Meade (top right) and led by Paul Mayer, national long horse champion (right). Then, the women gymnasts of Coach Herb Vogel (left) repeated as national collegiate team champions, with Donna Schaezner (below left) winning the all-around title.
Morris
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educational institutions. And there is, of course, the continuing situation of one type of business closing down and a new one opening up.

ANGLE: Retraining?

MORRIS: Retraining. Horseshoers, for instance, are not much in demand today.

ANGLE: I'm not sure that's true.

MORRIS: Yes, you're right. We have one student who worked his way through the University by shoeing horses, and it didn't take much time. He had his own trailer with all his tools, including his forge. He'd haul that out to where his clients were scattered around Southern Illinois, and he'd work a half day, maybe every week or two at a time, and earn what he needed for school.

ANGLE: You know, it's amazing, but everybody would have said the carriage painter would have no occupation. Well, we don't have enough of them around. Do you know what they're used for? Signs on trucks.

MORRIS: Isn't that amazing?

ANGLE: If you order a fleet of a hundred trucks, you will have the company's name painted on by stencil; but if you only want two trucks, you have to use the carriage painter.

MORRIS: There's still another element in education beyond the campus. Whatever our aim is, we have not yet come anywhere near to carrying many people to their potentials in the universities in the time they spend there. Many individuals don't want to be there for more than the four years of the undergraduate course. But in four years, a person may not be at the limit of his capability. Now what's the responsibility of the state in such a case? Does it end with the classroom and the campus, or is there a need to continue to take to people, wherever they may be, the kind of special training that they want and need? At SIU, we've been offering instruction to from 8,000 to 15,000 people a year, scattered over the southern thirty-one counties, teaching them everything from very low level skills to very high types of training and activity.

ANGLE: Can that be said of the University of Illinois as well?

MORRIS: Yes, of course.

ANGLE: And perhaps other state universities as well.

MORRIS: Yes, extension work can be for college credit, or it can be specialized training that we don't even give a course in. Let me give you an example. For years, through our Vocational-Technical Institute program, we have been offering a program for junior executives in banks. This is highly specialized work. You don't find a course in it in the usual school of economics. We take a person at the beginning level and prepare him for the next step. Every year we have classes four or five different places, for thirty or forty people who fit this category, and for them and for the banks and for the people who use the banks this is a pretty important thing.

ANGLE: Yes, I would think so.

MORRIS: We're going to be doing much more of non-traditional education rather than less, and I predict we're going to be moving over into the humanistic fields and fine arts, because as people get more time with a shorter work week what are they going to do with it? Would it not be wiser for them to develop interests in music, in art, and all kinds of constructive activities for spare time rather than to move off into odd and bizarre directions because they have no leadership or instruction?

ANGLE: Education for personal development, personal enrichment would certainly make society much richer.

MORRIS: It would make better people of more value to themselves and society.

ANGLE: Yes, which leads me to ask you a question which I think you've already answered, but I think I'd like to put it more explicitly. I've frequently heard parents say about a girl, "There's no use in sending her to college—she's only going to get married in a few years." What do you think of that attitude?

MORRIS: Well, of course there are practical as well as philosophical reasons for higher education for women. It is increasingly true, and perhaps much more than it should be, that the wife is important to the man.

ANGLE: She has to make some part of her own living?

MORRIS: Even in a professional sense, because in any
company a young man is very limited in his career if his wife does not measure up to the tests that are put to her, informal tests in many different types of functions. If a wife cannot mix on even terms with the wives of the community, it's a handicap for a man, and more so as more women get college level training. This very point of children needing higher education is a good reason why the wife should have such education to lead them along the way. And I don't think anyone as yet has come up with any argument that a college education is a handicap for a mother.

ANGLE: I've never heard of it.

MORRIS: I've known good mothers who have not gone to college, but I've also known many who seem to be more thoughtful and helpful and more constructive in following the careers of their sons and daughters because they have had higher education.

ANGLE: We were talking about extension work. Don't the universities perform another important function in their various institutes? You mentioned the planning institute, which does or does not perform the teaching function. Then we have the Agricultural Experiment Station at the University of Illinois. This is the kind of thing that I would call education outside the classroom.

MORRIS: Currently our whole Community Development program would fit into this category. We have a corps of individuals with a rather broad social science background who have been for twelve or fifteen years working with people in various communities. In this activity we have groups going out into the community and working with people, studying their problems, showing them how to improve their communities, how to make them more attractive to other people, how to make them better places for people to live in. This has been a very fruitful program, very helpful. In our institution we encourage our faculty to orient themselves to the society around us and to be helpful, speaking in communities and taking cultural programs out to the people or helping make arrangements for them to come into the university. Whether the staff members are going out to the people or the people outside are coming in, they are engaging in a learning process by coming in touch with specialists in fields they want to know more about. It seems to me these are legitimate basic, critical functions of state universities. I can see that private institutions, according to their sources of funds and their commitments, could quite properly withdraw from relations to society in the direct sense that we're talking about. But a state university, supported by all the people of the state, with the immense concentration it has—of brainpower and resources, is seriously lacking in its responsibility if it doesn't relate to the society that's supporting it with its tax dollars. The young student comes in as a freshman and stays four years and goes out, and you think, "Well, we've educated him." Of course, we haven't. We've just started him on his way, and his maturing process will go on for the rest of his life. Why should we forget about him? Why should the state forget about him? The more we can enrich him, the more we enrich our state; and whether we're dealing with these students on an intensive basis during a four-year period, or dealing on a less intensive basis over a lifetime, it seems to me that the process really is all of a piece and that we ought to think of it as two different approaches to the same thing.

ANGLE: Whether it be done in the classroom or... 

MORRIS: As a matter of fact, the more we can get the job done out of the classroom, the less expensive it should be to the state. We should get more return on the dollar spent because we're not building expensive buildings and maintaining those buildings and operating them. We're going out where the people are.

ANGLE: Well, Mr. Morris, you have indicated that the higher educational system in the state of Illinois leaves quite a bit to be desired.

MORRIS: Yes. But I'm going to put it positively and say that in Illinois we have a very challenging and large job ahead of us. We've gone a long way towards meeting that challenge. The pattern that has been set up for the development of the junior colleges is proving to be a sound one. If it doesn't achieve its objective of total coverage in the state, the ground rules can be changed enough to achieve such coverage. I'm a little worried about the adequacy of coverage in the field of technical education in the junior colleges. There are two ways to do it. One is through the junior colleges as comprehensive schools and the other way is to set up special technical colleges. We've had quite a little experience in this at our university. We have a Vocational-Technical Institute which has, I think, about 1,450 students now. It's operated as a separate campus at Carbondale, but the people who operate it feel that its presence within the framework of the University is quite helpful. By moving it away, physically, it has become acceptable to the academic element of the University, which was very concerned about it as long as it was on the same campus. Some feel that the presence of a Vocational-Technical Institute within the University gives a kind of relationship with their faculties which makes it easier to understand their students and makes for a richer ex-
experience. Vocational students can take some courses with the regular student body and a number of courses required on the program for technical training are applicable for credit towards the undergraduate degree. I think that it's doubtful whether all vocational-technical training can be handled in comprehensive junior colleges. Vocational-technical education is more costly, and since college preparatory work is more prestigious, vocational-technical training may not get sufficient emphasis in the junior colleges. I hope this doesn't happen. If it does I think there will have to be additional and separate vocational-technical colleges. But one way or another, either with comprehensive junior colleges or if that doesn't work, with vocational-technical schools, I believe we are moving the way we should go. My only concerns are the ones I expressed to you: the possible lowering of prestige of the junior colleges which can be hurtful to the self-esteem of those who attend them, and the tendency to limit enrollment in the universities so that we do not get a full mixture.

The state board is now looking at the need for additional four-year institutions in this state and I think they will set a pattern for developing some. We're beginning to think about cutting back or having some kind of limitation on enrollment in our state universities. There is a direct relationship between how large existing institutions grow and how many new ones we need. I have always felt that we could do better to agree upon some figure which could be readjusted if need be as time goes on, and say this is as large as we'll grow, and after this let's build another institution. One of our interests in moving into the Edwardsville area was to keep Carbondale from getting too much larger.

ANGLE: But would it be fair to say that you think that on a whole the future of higher education in Illinois is promising?

MORRIS: Yes, sir, and I think the State Board of Higher Education has added a major assist to the development of higher education in the state of Illinois.

ANGLE: Would it also be fair to say that as things stand today a young man or young woman can obtain adequate education for almost any career of his or her choice in existing institutions in this state?

MORRIS: That's almost true, but we have a serious problem ahead of Illinois in professional training. We do not have adequate facilities in medicine or law. We are going to be inadequate in other professional schools, too, and there's got to be a multiplication of professional training to take care of additional students and to spread throughout the state the advantages that come from the presence of professional schools.

ANGLE: In the metropolitan Chicago area we have these schools now, so I take it you mean those areas in the rest of the state.

MORRIS: That's right. Professional training is concentrated almost entirely in Chicago and Urbana, principally in Chicago. Chicago enjoys a constellation of medical treatment, research and training centers, scientific and engineering research and training, and other professional educational opportunities in institutions such as the University of Illinois, Chicago and Northwestern universities, and the Illinois Institute of Technology. Outside Chicago there is little in Illinois except for the extensive, mature development in scientific and engineering fields and in the various professions at the University of Illinois at Urbana and the emerging developments in these areas at SIU. There is a very great need for the same kind of pervasive influence that comes from such centers of teaching and learning in the southern part of the state. Actually the centers in Chicago serve a very substantial area in the state, but Chicago has half the population and has eight or nine tenths of the professional training, doesn't it?

ANGLE: I would think so.

MORRIS: Perhaps more than that.

ANGLE: Yes, I would think so.

MORRIS: Of course, this is disproportionate. When we started looking at the matter of vocational-technical training, I asked the dean of our College of Education to make a survey of two sorts. First, what are the needs in the southern counties of the state in technical training? We found there was an extreme shortage of technical training. Some high schools were offering limited programs. There were no private vocational-technical schools. At that time I counted in the yellow pages of the Chicago telephone directory something like sixteen to twenty pages simply listing technical schools in Chicago. The other question I asked the dean was, what are the universities around the country doing about technical training? We found that about half of them felt this was high school stuff; this was the kind of thing you didn't waste time with in a university. The other half felt it was something universities should get into because of the trend of the times. Our technical institute is entirely post-high school; that is, it is a residential program with the same requirements for admission.

ANGLE: Perhaps I can ask you and perhaps you will
be willing to answer a final question. What is your opinion of the criticism so often voiced that large universities are becoming factories or educational mills in which the student loses any kind of personal contact with professors?

MORRIS: I can't give you a simple, pat answer. There is really no reason why students should be lost in a large institution if we were just smart enough to program the institution in such a way as to prevent it. In proportion to the students, you have as many faculty people as you do in a smaller institution. (I believe one would have to except some of the very small institutions which have a very high proportion of faculty, uneconomically high.) But it is difficult to develop a program structure in a large institution which results in close teacher-to-student relationships. Many approaches have been tried. Efforts are continuing in the large universities. You may be interested in one of the efforts we have made. It involved the first major housing project we developed. The project was on a lake shore, just at the edge of the principal academic buildings. Here we worked with the architectural firm and we tried to develop a plan which would answer the question, how do you provide a home base for a student in terms of his personal feelings, a relationship sufficiently close so that he won't feel lost? What we ended with was a series of dormitories, each of which contained 120 students. The rooms are arranged to provide room and bathroom facilities for groups of four students. Students are expected to provide the housekeeping for these units. Ten units of four per floor results in a group of forty per floor, with the thought that there could be a close relationship between the students. Three floors to a building made possible a less closely knit group of 120. In each of these buildings is a classroom on the first floor for the use of the person in charge of the dormitory, who teaches half-time and supervises half-time. The eleven dormitories in the area provide for a total group of 1,353, including resident fellows and dormitory supervisor-teachers. All the students in the area come to a common building for eating, for the post office, for sending off or receiving dry cleaning and laundry. There is a snack bar, some game rooms, and a library and a reading lounge where they can study. It is very interesting to note that in terms of supervision this area has presented almost no problems.

The idea was developed in the early fifties. Since then Michigan State has taken up and developed this idea. In their latest plans they've gone beyond our concept and are developing areas for around 3,000 or 4,000 students in which they have classroom structures and a library. They are making the area almost a separate entity, yet with access to the central library and laborato-
1905 Mr. Clyde C. Hall, 2, retired from his position as a high school principal in 1936. He and his wife, Elsie, now make their home in Santa Monica, Calif. They have been married 55 years and have one son.

The new east side school in Centralia has been named Jordan School in honor of Roy Vail Jordan, 2, '14, who was superintendent of Centralia Schools from 1921 to 1948. After leaving this position, Mr. Jordan came to SIU as an assistant professor of education and then became curator of the Clint Clay Tilton Library of Lincolnia and Americana at SIU. Since his retirement, he and his wife, Grace Brandon, '05-2, have resided in Carbondale.

1909 Barteo is the home of Miss Flora Ethel Maddux, 2. She received an A.B. degree from the University of Chicago in 1919 and an A.M. degree from the same institution in 1925.

1914 J. Milton Milligan, ex, is an accountant for an oil producing firm in Miami, Fla., where he makes his home.

1920 Mrs. John Crain (Velma Hamilton Bevard, 2) is vice chairman of the School Problems Commission of Illinois. She makes her home in Springfield, where her son, John, is an attorney.

Miss Floriende E. Templeton, 2, now makes her home in Pinckneyville. She received a Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago in 1929 and an M.A. from Columbia in 1940. Miss Templeton was a campus visitor in January.

1923 Mrs. Anna Mae Waller Allen, 2, '34, M.S. '39, is a primary teacher in Alton. Now widowed, Mrs. Allen is the mother of four, two of whom are SIU graduates—Bette A. Corsa '50, and Robert P. Allen '40. Springfield is the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ray E. Hamilton, 2. He is retired from work with the U.S. Weather Bureau. They have two children: Charles, who works with International Business Machines, and Mary Jo, a registered nurse.

Robert C. Verhines is Director of Reference and Research for the Illinois Reference and Research for the Illinois State Library at Springfield. He received a Ph.D. degree from the University of Illinois in 1931. Mrs. Allen, who has been a school administrator in Alton, is now making her home in Santa Monica, Calif.

1924 Dr. Ellis R. Crandle, 2, '26, has been named Man of the Year for 1967 by the Carbondale Chamber of Commerce. He has been a resident of Carbondale for fifty years and has served the community as a doctor for three decades.

Mr. and Mrs. Harley Long (Margaret Frances Hill, 2) live in Quincy, where he teaches at Quincy Junior High School. They have two sons: Stephen, who teaches biology at Brainerd State Junior College in Brainerd, Minn., and David, a paratrooper in the U.S. Army.

1928 Ted R. Ragsdale, '25-2, is a professor in the elementary education department at SIU. He received an M.A. degree from the University of Illinois in 1931 and a Ph.D. degree from St. Louis University in 1942. Mrs. Ragsdale is the former Lydia Dietrich, who also received an M.A. degree from the University of Illinois in 1931. She is a junior high school teacher in Carbondale.

1932 Coffeyville, Kans., is the home of George Beryl Campbell, ex, and his wife, Edith. Mr. Campbell is a refinery warehouseman. The couple has one son, George Bryan, who is a Christian Church minister in Waxahachie, Tex.

Mrs. Helen Dudenbostel Jones, ex, is head of the Bibliography and Reference Correspondence Section in the Library of Congress. Mrs. Jones received a Ph.B. degree from the University of Chicago in 1930. She lives in Arlington, Va.

1935 Mr. and Mrs. Arthur E. Newman live in Yakima, Wash. He received an M.A. degree in 1950 from Washington State University and is music supervisor in the Union Gap school district. The Newmans have a daughter,
Gretchen, who is a junior at the University of Washington in Seattle.

1937 Gary, Ind., is the home of Mr. and Mrs. MAX REA, ex, (Anna Lee Moore, ex). He is employee relations manager with the Mobile Oil Co.

1938 G. Warren GLADERS, ex, is president of the Martin Oil Company. Mrs. Gladers is the former Jean Emily Martin, ex. They make their home in Ladue, Mo.


1939 Marion is the home of Paul J. Houghton, ex, and his wife, Louisa, since his retirement. He was superintendent of Niles Township High Schools. The Houghtons are frequent campus visitors.

1940 Houston, Tex., is the home of Mrs. Geneva Madden Lloyd. She is a technical data proofreader with the Federal Electric Corp., Manned Spacecraft Center.

1941 Samuel W. Davis is a teacher in Los Angeles, Calif., where he makes his home. He received an M.S. degree from Loyola University in 1948.

Mr. and Mrs. Carl C. George make their home in Clear Water, Fla. Mr. George is a technical drawing teacher in Dunedin, Fla., and Mrs. George (Cleona Rea George) is a kindergarten teacher in Ozona. They have four children, including a son, Derek, who is now enrolled at SIU.

Mr. and Mrs. Theodore A. Plummer, ex, (Ruby Nelle Plummer, ex) live in West Frankfort, where he is a mine inspector with the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals.

1942 Mr. and Mrs. Alden E. Becker live in Galesburg, where she (Marjorie Jane Jones) is a junior high school art teacher.

Mrs. L. W. Bell (Rachael Irene Bost, '27-2') is a fourth grade teacher in the Tullahoma, Tenn., city school system.

Lloyd V. Mitchell is a research meteorologist with the U.S. Air Force Environmental Technical Applications Center in Washington, D.C. He and his wife, Thelma Gregory Mitchell, ex,

'Rick' Talley Named Journalist of Year

Warren D. "Rick" Talley '58, former Saluki basketball star and now executive sports editor of two Rockford newspapers, has been named SIU journalism alumnus of the year.

The award is made annually to a journalism graduate who has distinguished himself in the professional field. Last year's winner was Robert Poos, Associated Press correspondent in Vietnam at the time.

Talley was captain and most valuable player of the 1958 Saluki basketball team and was sports editor of the campus newspaper, The Egyptian. He also served as president of the SIU chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society.

He has been executive sports editor of the Rockford Morning Register-Republic since 1963. Before that he was a sports writer for the Decatur Herald Review, sports editor of the Menlo Park (Calif.) Recorder, a reporter for United Press International, and a sports writer for the afternoon Rockford paper.

At Rockford he has won five Associated Press sports writing awards, including two firsts. At Menlo Park his sports page placed second for general excellence in state-wide competition.

The Rockford papers feature national sports coverage, and Talley annually reports such events as the Rose Bowl game and the Kentucky Derby.

A veteran of fourteen months of military service in Korea, Talley is married to the former Frances Jane Herr, also a 1958 graduate. They have two children.

have two children. Melba, a junior at Oklahoma Baptist University, and Gregory, who attends high school in Bladensburg, Md., where the family makes their home.

St. Louis is the home of Mr. and Mrs. E. J. Prill. Mrs. Prill is the former Virginia Tate. She teaches English and business at St. Joseph's Academy.

Mrs. Thomas W. Williams (Katherine Gaines) is an adjudicator for the Veterans Administration in Indianapolis, Ind., where she and her husband make their home. She was last on campus in 1942, but writes that a visit is planned "possibly on Alumni Day, 1967."

1945 Mrs. Monette E. Malone Vaughn, ex, is a remedial reading teacher in the Egyptian Community Unit School District 5. She lives in Tamms. Mrs. Vaughn has been a widow since last August.

1946 Bill F. Green, ex, is a partner in Feirich and Feirich law firm in Carbondale. He makes his home in Murphysboro with his family, which includes his wife, Frances Wisely, ex, and children, Richard, Phyllis, and Mary Kay. Mr. Green has a law degree from Washington University.

1947 Now retired from active military duty, Army Lt. Col. Clifford J. Souther is working with the U.S. Department of Army as a civilian. He and his wife, Jeanne Etherton, ex, live in Glen Burnie, Md., with their children, Stephen, 15, and Linda, 13.

1948 Edward H. Aikman is president of United Manufacturer's Service in Marion.

1949 George W. Beltz, M.A. '50, and his wife, Dorothy Sager Beltz '49, M.A. '50, live in Kirkwood, Mo., with their children, Jay, 14, and Jessica Katherm, 10. Mr. Beltz is principal of East Ladue Junior High School.

Woodland Hills, Calif., is the home of Mr. and Mrs. Charles V. Brockett. Mr. Brockett is a manager with the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. The family includes: his wife, Jeri, and children, Eric, Cindy, and Charles.

1950 Robert Child, M.A. '52, is one of fifty-two educators from throughout the United States participating in the Mott Foundation Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program for Educational Leadership in Flint, Mich. Mr. Child is on leave from the Community Development Department at SIU to participate in the 12-month program, which combines classroom study in one of seven Michigan state universities
Charles Raymond Heinz, M.S. ’59, has completed work on his Doctor of Education degree at George Washington University, Washington, D.C. Mr. Heinz has served as high school teacher, coach, athletic director and assistant principal. Since 1961 he has held a teaching and coaching position in Fairfax, Va.

Crawford, received a master’s degree in 1957 from the University of Oklahoma in Col., where his wife, the former Frances Ann Andrew ’51, are living in Flint for the one-year period with their children, Chanda, 14, Jeffrey, 11, and Teressa, 7.

Robert E. Smith is vice president of Copper State Machinery in Phoenix, Ariz. He and his wife, Barbara, live in Tempe, Ariz., with their children, Ron and Terri.

Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Azar (Barbara Azar, ex) live in Paducah, Ky., with their children, Arthur, Phillip, Mary Ellen, and Lee Alexander. Mr. Azar is self-employed.

The five-member Jack L. Jenkins family lives in Bloomington, where Mr. Jenkins is an internal auditor for FS Services, Inc. The family includes his wife, Janice; and children, Janet Lee, Judith Ann, and Jean Ellen.

KPLR-TV, St. Louis, employs Ralph E. Becker as general sales manager. He and his wife, Jane Mulholland Becker, ex, live in Baldwin, Mo., Nancy, one.

Both Dr. and Mrs. Richard J. Crawford, M.A. ’58, (Jan Marie Figley ’59) hold teaching posts at Colorado State College in Greeley, Colo. Dr. Crawford is an associate professor and director of forensics, and his wife is a speech instructor. Mrs. Crawford received a master’s degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1965. Dr. Crawford received a Ph.D. from the same institution at the same time.

William C. Clem is a senior sales representative for International Business Machines Corp. in Windermere, Fla. He and his wife, Janelle, were married in 1965.

Mr. Prospect is the home of Mr. and Mrs. Earle G. Cromer, Jr. (Evelyn Eileen Draeger). Mrs. Cromer received an M.Ed. degree from the National College of Education in 1963 and is on leave from the Elk Grove School System. The family includes a one-year-old daughter, Susan Leslie.

Maury L. Bynum is an instructor at Florissant Valley, Mo., Community College. He and his wife, Beth Ellen, have two sons, Ricky, 12, and Leo, 10. The family lives in St. Louis.

Victor E. Brandenburg, VTII, is a design draftsman for the Blaw-Knox Co. in Mattoon. He and his wife, Sheryl, were married in 1965.

Robert D. Kimber is a bank examiner for the State of Illinois. He lives in Dongola.

Jack Drda has been named assistant to the Edwardsville campus director of business affairs. Prior to this appointment, he was supervisor of service enterprises there. Mr. Drda and his wife, Micky, live in Edwardsville. They have a nine-year-old son.

Donald L. Newman is an assistant manager with Swift and Co. in Griffin, Ga. He and his wife, Kathryn Sue Newman ’59, have two daughters, Donna Sue, six, and Denise Kay, four.

Robert G. Ream is a Personnel Management Branch chief for the U.S. Army in the North Bavaria District, Germany.

Victor C. Betta is a zone manager for International Harvester Co. He and his wife, Marianne, live in Collinsville.

Mr. and Mrs. Larry K. Conaway, VTII, (Mary Ann Toler Conaway ’62) live in St. Louis, where he is a technician for McDonnell Aircraft.

Doris E. Files is an accountant for the Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis. She lives in Hazelwood, Mo.

Decatur is the home of Richard E.
Deaths

Mrs. Winifred Mofield, ex '30; and Mrs. Mary Ann Shryock, ex '33.

1907 Ernest T. Hiller, 2, Tucson, Ariz., is reported deceased by his wife, Eunice. He was a retired University of Illinois professor. Dr. Hiller received A.B. and A.M. degrees from Northwestern University and a Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago.

1924 A retired school teacher, Mrs. Ella Jane Pickles Sanders, 2, died January 23 after an eight-month illness. She had taught freshman English in the Anna-Jonesboro Community High School for 44 years. Among her many students was Frank Willard, the creator of the "Moon Mullins" comic strip, whom she persuaded to take up cartooning as a career. The teacher in the comic strip is named Miss Pickles in her honor. Mrs. Sanders' husband, Karl, died in 1932.

1947 Retired Air Force Colonel Malcolm C. Hamby, Norfolk, Va., died January 6. Prior to his retirement, Col. Hamby served as an administrative staff officer at the Armed Forces Staff College. His decorations include the Air Force Commendation Medal, American Defense Service Medal, and the U.S. Presidential Unit Citation with two oak leaf clusters. Col. Hamby leaves his wife, Veloth, and two children.

1956 Travis Mason, M.S., Lonejack, Mo., was reported deceased by his wife, Lois. He received his B.S. degree from Abilene Christian College in 1938 and was superintendent of the public schools in Lonejack.

1958 Mrs. Henrietta Smith Vincent, M.S. '65, died August 11 from a heart ailment. She was an instructor in the SIU Vocational-Technical Institute business department. She leaves her husband, Raymond Vincent '66, and a daughter, Patricia.

1962 Mrs. Hazel Swaney Brown, Alton, died in February. She was a teacher in the Roxana School District. Mrs. Brown was a member of the American Association of University Women, National Education Association, and Illinois Education Association. She leaves her husband, Ladee, and three children.

The Alumni Office has also been notified of the following deaths:

Mrs. Frances Gorelik, Carbondale, wife of Prof. Mordecai Gorelik, theatre department.

1897 Robert B. Templeton, 2, Du Quoin.

1912 Mrs. A. D. Plasters (Florence M. McCree, 2), Marion.

1914 Mrs. Frances Entsmlenger Schmidt, 2, Carbondale.

1919 Mrs. Alfred E. Crepin (Virginia Nellie Colp, 2), Albuquerque, N.M.

1926 Mrs. Louise Owen Nonweiler, 2, Salem.

1934 Ella Powell, Buchanan, Mich.

1946 Lowell H. Taylor, ex, Golconda.

1947 Miss Lyla H. Parker, ex, Mounds.

1962 John J. Hough, M.S. '65, Muncie, Ind.
Honorable & Mentionable . . .

After fourteen years and more than 700 columns, John W. Allen '22-2 has called an end to his newspaper series, "It Happened in Southern Illinois."

Main purpose of his "retirement," Mr. Allen says, is to allow more time to work on a couple of new books. One manuscript is ready for final polishing, another well into the-planning.


During the years since it first appeared, the Allen column has been carried in more than 200 newspapers. Most used it as a regular feature.

Mr. Allen never found his column a chore. "There always is someone interesting to talk to," he once said, "some implement in a barnyard, a stone in a graveyard, or a place on a map that is good for a story."

Born in a log cabin in Southern Illinois and educated as a youth in a one-room country school appropriately named "Hardscrabble," John Allen has won a list of honors which offer proof enough of his distinction as a historian.

He has served as president of both the Southern Illinois Folklore Society and the Illinois State Historical Society. Both have cited him as "Historian of the Year." He was an Alumni Achievement Award winner in 1962.

In 1964 SIU conferred upon Mr. Allen its coveted Distinguished Service Award. McKendree College made him an honorary Doctor of Laws the same year. In 1965, the Southern Illinois Editorial Association named him "Mr. Headliner."

He has collected folklore for the Library of Congress, was asked to help locate the famed Lincoln Memorial Highway, and was appointed to the Illinois Civil War Centennial Commission. Allen Hall on the Carbondale Campus is named in his honor.

The Allen view of history, however, has always been a little different from that of the conventional historian. "I'm more interested in what the pioneers ate and wore," he once explained, "than how they voted."

His lively tales from the unrecorded history of the pioneer people of America have been in great demand. *Legends and Lore* is a collection of some of his earlier columns. Allen fans are numerous, and the book's first printing sold out in a matter of months.

Technically retired since 1956, John Allen really hasn't slowed down much.

"Since an eightieth birthday shortly will be nearer than the seventy-ninth one," he wrote in his last column, "it appears only logical that the actual work of arranging, revising, and editing be given undivided attention. It also is my belief that these manuscripts in final form would be of greater value than a few more articles.

". . . Clarifying, correcting, supplementing, and attempting to preserve the gleaning of a lifetime lived principally in Southern Illinois will keep alive in the heart of this old provincial his cherished memories of the region. If the public accepts any future book as kindly as they have his *Legends and Lore of Southern Illinois*, he shall be happy.

"It is not easy to quit."
June 3
is
Alumni Day
1967
will we see you there?