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Speak:  **TELL IT LIKE IT IS**
‘It’s an old man’s Congress, but a young

WHAT is the “Student Rebellion”? Who are the rebels, and against whom is the “revolt” directed? How does today’s college student really feel about life in America today—Vietnam, the draft, the new “sexual freedom,” respect for authority, civil rights and, for La Salle students, about the College itself?

Oddly enough, apparently many colleges and universities—each surrounded by hundreds, even thousands of young people—have seldom thought to ask these questions of those who should know best—their own students.

Five leaders of the La Salle student body—all but one elected to his post—were chosen for this interview, which of course reflects only their personal opinions. Hopefully, however, they do represent a cross-section of La Salle’s 6,000 day and evening students, since each in his position contacts many other student leaders daily.

Engaging in the conversation are James A. Kopaz, 21, president of the day school’s student council; John F. X. Roadfuss, Jr., 28, president of the evening student congress; William J. McGinnis, Jr., 21, president of the student organizations commission; Mark P. Connaughton, Jr., 20, president of the residence hall council, and Richard Tiedeken, 20, editor of the student newspaper, The Collegian. All but Tiedeken, a junior, are seniors.

LA SALLE: Gentlemen, what’s bugging you? What single problem of today’s world concerns you most?

TIEDeken: It’s the idea that in this modern society, where we have made so many technological advances, there are still so many people who are left in poverty, hunger, disease, being killed in wars, and things like that—that we haven’t made, I suppose you might say, social advances to the same degree that we’ve made technological advances.

MCGINNIS: Probably, apathy. There are certainly many problems today, but the big problem I see is that people complain and gripe, but they won’t do a darn thing about it. A lot of people will say, ‘well, it’s always been this way,’ but I think it’s worse today than it has ever been. People care less, they’re more individualistic than ever, at least in their own concerns—they just don’t care, don’t want to get involved, but at the same time they gripe and complain. We have to get a more united effort from people to solve our problems or we’re not going to solve them . . . whether they be problems of the city or what-have-you. Our large urban areas are experiencing many problems, and the big push now by people in government is to get more people involved in solving these problems. But they’re having great difficulty doing that.

ROADFuss: I think I’ll fight the young man’s fight now. I’m pretty well dissatisfied with legislative indifference when it comes to heeding the voice of the youth of this nation. I don’t feel that all of the recent publicity about Berkeley, picketing, protests, the present draft status—I don’t think it’s being heard. I think that the young people, although they constitute the majority, actually are in the minority when it comes to forming legislative opinion. They do not receive adequate treatment when it comes to (legal age for) voting, drinking, the right to make the laws. Rather, it’s an old man’s Congress, and an old man’s legislature, but a young man’s world when it comes to solving the problems and doing the work.

I’d agree with Bill, too, of course. I think this apathy comes from the fact that when you have old men making your laws, these people are basically concerned with far-fetched problems, generalities. They don’t make the laws
anymore to specifically, clearly define rape on the streets, abandoned autos, etc.; they just worry about the large group of young people in general terms, while concerning themselves specifically with such things as oil depletions, tax deductions. The legislation is completely oriented toward the elderly man in the wealthy group—the top middle class family. I don’t think youth is given an opportunity to voice its opinion. There isn’t a law written today that gives young people a right to say what we’d like to see 25 years from now. The laws are written for 25 years ago.

CONNNAUGHTON: I certainly agree with Rich. This technological society we live in certainly makes it more and more difficult for a person to be a human being. It’s the depersonalization and dehumanization by the machine we’ve built that seems to have made us forget how to live. Our progress seems to have pushed us back further into ourselves, rather than unleashing what I think of as the possibilities for further human development and achievement. It just seems like with all the energy we spend on building piles of money, big machinery and things like this, we seem to have lost sight of something more important—just living and enjoying life.

LA SALLE: We hear much of the “new student freedom”—what is it? Have you seen it? Does it exist here at La Salle?

KOPAZ: Something along those lines has developed here during my four years at La Salle. Students have at least been recognized much more—their thoughts about many different matters have been recognized by the administration. This may be part of the new student freedom; the students are being given a chance to talk about what’s on their minds. Whether or not they’re being heeded is another point. I think the student newspaper is a great
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Connaughton: "I'm more willing to experiment"

Connaughton: "I'm more willing to experiment. Four years ago the paper was four pages of not too much, while today there is six or eight pages of good opinion and criticism. They have a free hand in expressing the students' viewpoint, and often create some type of movement by the administration on some of the things that appeared in the paper.

La Salle: Well, why has there been a so-called student revolt?

Tiecken: I think it has been because the student has come to realize he has a certain amount of power—that by staging a sit-in or protests he can make the officials of his administration bend somewhat toward his viewpoint. As to why he's doing this now rather than before I think it's because all of today's young people are coming to accept responsibility, to think in a responsible way; I guess you might say, to grow-up faster. I think you see this everywhere. Whether this is good or not, I'm not sure. I think so, in the long run—although it poses a lot of problems along the way, for our society in particular, because people in the older generations, who didn't grow-up as fast, aren't ready to accept this younger generation growing-up this rapidly.

Roadfuss: This is the premise I started on. I don't think there's enough heed being given to some of the cries of the young student, and the young man. I think that at (age) 28 I have a right to voice my opinion on the laws I'd like to see for the years to come—not just for today. I don't only want to solve problems of today; I want to create opportunities for tomorrow.

I think that we're starting to see on our campus something that Vatican II began—an up-dating or search for ways to make our campus and the world around us aware that we want to have a voice in the things that are done. I think Rich's comments are well-taken; I think young people are responding in a responsible way. This thing at Berkeley was an isolated incident; the reason we're here now is because somebody thinks our opinion is worth something. I'd like to see more of this, because I think our main problem is communication. Until I met Jim, I don't think I'd met one day school president in six years. We don't have enough communication between the evening and day students; we don't appreciate their problems, and they don't appreciate ours. This is a problem all over the country. Young people for the first time have decided they want to have a say. Some are far to the left, others to the right, but somewhere in between you'll find responsible young people between the ages of 18 and 30.

Somewhere, these young people will get together and decide that rather than have a lot of 60 and 80 year olders decide what kind of laws suit them, why shouldn't we have as much right to decide what goes on at La Salle, in
decided they want their say’

our city, in Pennsylvania, in the U.S. After all, the norm is about 30 years of age. It's our country and if we're not good enough to support it, the laws they're writing today won't help a bit. I'd just like to see young people listened-to a little bit more.

La Salle: Apparently many young people have already been alienated. Do you trust any one over 30?

Tiedeken: I guess it's old fashioned, but I'd say I do.

Kopaz: I trust people over 30, once I get to know something about them. I don't doubt anybody until I have cause to.

Tiedeken: There's a big difference in trusting somebody, looking at them and knowing they're playing it square with you, and taking everything they say at face value. I know a lot of people over 30 whose opinions you have to look at within the perspective of the fact that they're in an older generation, and that they may not be viewing things as objectively, perhaps, as those with their fingers on the pulse of society.

Connaughton: I think that we're a little bit more ready to question an adult, say 30 years old or older. In the past, it seems like youth were a little more willing to have the answers given to them. Now, we're a little more interested in finding the answers for ourselves. I think we're still willing to listen to those older than us, but we're a little more ready to question, a little more prone to criticize, and to strike out on our own. I think the lines of communication are still there, and I think this situation is more healthy than just blind acceptance of authority.

La Salle: Do you feel that the values your parents hold are as valid for you as they were for them?

Connaughton: I think I'm looking for my own value structure, whereas, it seems those of my parents and other adults are set. I'm not too sure right now; I think I'm a little bit more willing to experiment, rather than just accept them.

McGinnis: People over 30-35 have values that are set and tend not to question them; whereas, we answer, 'you say this is so, but why is it so.' Many of these people have never asked themselves why, it just is, accept it and go along with it. Today, we're more interested in why is it, and if it is such, is it necessary to go along with it. Sometimes the younger person goes too far one way or the other — either he doesn't challenge it at all or he challenges it too much, and you get this revolt and conflict.

La Salle: Is it possible to challenge values too much?

Tiedeken: I don't think an individual can challenge values too much—not in the sense Bill mentioned, continually asking 'why, why,' and if there isn't a good reason then let's not bother with it . . . let's forget it, if it's useless. I think you reach a point where there is an answer to that 'why' and, if you can come up with it, you've reached a point where you're starting to discover values for yourself. If we stop asking why we're doing something, we cease to be a member of this new youth generation and become another person.

Roadfuss: That's the point. When do you become the other person?

La Salle: Yes, when does one become the "other person." When did you, John? Or have you?

Roadfuss: No, I don't think I have. I'll stick with youth, for the time being, because I haven't reached the point where I'm satisfied with my own values. Nor am I satisfied with the society I live in, nor am I satisfied with our campus as it is. I think there are too many things to be done to suddenly 'retire.' I don't think it's time to retire. I'm still asking why, and I think it's the most important question to ask.

Tiedeken: I think to some degree that this question of seeking answers and asking why, has been a factor of the youth group for generations. I suspect that an important feature of the 'new youth,' if you will, is the activist question—today's youth is more and more wanting to go out and do something to correct problems. They're seeking, asking why, but at the same time they feel an impulse to do something to correct problems. At times, this is responsible for some situations that people suggest may have gone too far.

La Salle: Well, where does protest and demonstration end and anarchy begin? That is to say, what authority, finally, are you to respect and what are you going to reject?

Tiedeken: Ultimately, I think it must be one's own conscience. This would be the position of the major religions in the world today. And I think basically it is the position of our social and political structures, too. At the same time, you have to consider the individual and the society. He must consider the role he plays as an individual, connected with other individuals in society, and balance-out that individual conscience against his role in society.

La Salle: Do all of you think your conscience should be heeded above what is considered to be the law of the land?

Kopaz: I'd say my conscience should be heeded so long as I can convince a majority of the people that my conscience is right. But if I'm in the minority and after protest they don't agree with me, I should not interfere with their rights, as long as I have the right to speak my own mind.

Tiedeken: If there is a law of the land that counteracts something in your conscience, then your obligation is to your conscience.
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—continued
If you stop questioning, you've really

KOPAZ: Fine, but just because a minority of the people are against something, legitimately or not, I don't think any law we're presently following should be changed just because the minority is speaking out against it—unless they can convince the majority that they are correct.

ROADFUS: Ethically, a man has to follow his own conscience in speaking out against an unfair situation, law or apathy. If a man witnesses apathy, I think the man who does something about changing it has a right, then, to make a statement about those who stood by and allowed it to happen. He has to be true to his own self; he has to follow his conscience. If he doesn't, he can't live with himself and, at this point, I'd say he joins that group who stop thinking and start reacting to things around them almost mechanically.

KOPAZ: I think a person can stop asking the question, why, at a certain point and still not be non-thinking. You should be able to ask the question, 'why,' and be able to answer in two ways: first, getting the answer if it can be gotten, or secondly, if you've tried your best and are happy with what you have, examine the information you have and make up your mind to look into something else. I don't think you continually have to pursue something from birth to death.

TIEDEKEN: I think you do, Jim. I think that's one of our problems right now in Vietnam. There are some people who have made-up their minds and are satisfied with a situation for which we just don't have enough information to get an answer. I don't think you can be complacent like that, if for no other reason than the world is made-up of individuals and situations that are constantly changing. To make-up your mind, to become complacent, you're going to miss-out on a change and you're just not going to be with it any more.

CONNAUGHTON: The system is stacked against behavior like you're talking about. It seems as if it is. John has been talking about the inability of our youth to influence law making, and so-on, and I think that's a very cogent point. It's awfully easy to get discouraged, because you're one person and you're up against the system; it's the old story about city hall. You bat your head against the wall just so many times, then decide you're only a voice in the wilderness—and, unfortunately, a lot of times it turns out to be that.

I disagree with Jim. I think you have to keep questioning your values, but I think the real problem lies not in just questioning, but whether you're ready to do something about it. You can give-in to the system and still question it, but whether you're ready to try to change it—this is where most of us fall down.

KOPAZ: I'm not saying you should stop questioning everything, but I don't think you should have to follow everything in life right down the line. Obviously, there will be so many things in life to which you can't find an answer. You should be happy with the fact that you're going to question it, but maybe not get an answer.

TIEDEKEN: I'm not saying you should let your personality be torn apart because you can't get the answers to all of the questions in the world. I'm saying that if you stop questioning, then you've just stopped living, really. I don't think you can be satisfied, because I don't think it's possible to be satisfied with an answer, unless you feel you've gotten all of the facts and grasp the situation completely. I don't feel that way about anything.

ROADFUS: Jim, wouldn't you agree that the only thing permanent is change? You must decide, 'how long will a judgement last?' Today . . . tomorrow . . . next week? KOPAZ: Now-a-days, not very long.

ROADFUS: That's exactly my point. I don't think we're thinking the way our law makers should. They should write laws for today to solve problems, but their responsibility lies in making laws that will be good 10-15 years from now. You have to provide the flexibility in the laws to be able to change, when the situation presents itself.

TIEDEKEN: I feel one has to make a decision, but you have to constantly be re-evaluating it. You can't be satisfied. That's the biggest thing I objected to, really.

KOPAZ: I think you can be satisfied with a decision. I think you can be.

LA SALLE: Does any one of you feel there is an external person or body which you don't question—such as your parents, the state, the Church?

McGINNIS: I will question just about anybody; I'll question the rationale of just about any group, above or below you. You have to, as an individual. You may question some people 20% of the time, others 90% of the time, depending upon your respect for the individual or group. I would personally feel I could question—and do—most groups. I can't think of any I wouldn't question.

TIEDEKEN: For practical purposes, there are times that you put yourself under an authority, for one reason or another. In a practical situation, in a matter that's not of too much importance to your conscience whether you do it one way or another, you accept the word of that authority. Say, for example, you're working on a job and you have to make a decision—where the question isn't a moral one, perhaps it's a profit and loss one—and your boss tells you it should be done one way, and you feel it should be done another way. You may speak-out against it, but you'll do it his way, because that's the way a business has to work.
CONNAUGHTON: One may have a personal goal and he also has his own principles. I'd say as long as your own principles, your own integrity as a person, is not challenged, then you're willing to accept that authority. If you have strong feelings about it, though, I think it would be very unauthentic if you were to accept that authority. I can't think of any sources of authority that I don't question at one time or another.

KOPAZ: Until recently, the last few years, I never really questioned things too much—my parents said this, my government said this, and my Church this. But within the last 3-4 years, I've started questioning—for example I'm questioning my religion, my government, but I haven't gotten to the point where I'm questioning my parents, yet. Do I question every source of authority? I'd say no. But I am starting in these two major areas. I haven't started questioning parental authority, yet; I guess, in this aspect, I'm still from the old school.

ROADFUSS: I think the only time you start to question that (parental authority) is when you become a parent yourself, Jim. I, myself, always thought my father was never wrong. I think that's an image you build-up of your own parents; in fact you hope for it. When you become a father, you begin to change your mind; there may be a better way to raise a child or run a household a little differently. I think you do have to question almost every established authority for, after all, the only authority that we know of that can't be questioned is the Divine authority—and this only in faith and morals. And even those we'll question, in our own minds, silently. I'm sure we all do. I think we have a tendency to want authority, because we need authority in order to have a society. Without some authority, where is society? It becomes a mass of anarchists, everyone running around making his own laws.

All of us will agree with the time-lag theory, that it takes time for youth to finally get its voice and, by the time it does, it's in the middle-age bracket. Eventually, that time-lag is going to be reduced to the point where young men will have to have some say in their local society, in religion, etc. After all, where do your marriages, your new families, come from? Not the older groups.

LA SALLE: Is there a new "sexual freedom" among young people today, compared with values held by your parents? KOPAZ: I'd say, no, we just know more about what's going on; we didn't know about it in the past.

TIEDEKEN: I can only venture a guess, because I don't have the perspective on things as they were before, but I would suspect that there really hasn't been that much of a change in our sexual mores. It's just that things are becoming more overt—people aren't hiding that much or trying to conceal as much.
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"It's nothing against you personally, sir. Our generation doesn't trust anyone over thirty."

Courtesy Saturday Review Magazine and the artist
Roadfuss: I don’t think there’s any more promiscuity than there ever was; it’s only a matter of people looking into it more and they’re publishing more about it. They’re letting the youth of the nation know some of the facts, which I think, in turn will have a good effect. Again, we get back to this matter of questioning: if you want to know what to do about a problem, you first must know all of the facts. And I think that when I was 19 or 20, while in the service, sex was a pretty misused thing—the term itself. It was thrown around in the Marines like it was going out of style, and at the time I had no appreciation for either the term nor laws that regard sex, because then I could care less. Now, of course, I do appreciate this more, since I’m a father and have a little girl of my own; now I’m starting to think like the other generation. I’d like laws to be more stringent, but at the same time, I don’t think they’ll have to be, because I think our youth know more of the facts now—that it does go on, and it’s up to them to see that it’s stopped. If they want to indulge, okay. Again, it’s their own conscience; they’re going to have to rule themselves. No one can make any law that a man has to live by. In my opinion, there isn’t one fact that proves there’s more (promiscuity), but rather there has been a change in our society.

Tiedeken: I’d venture a stab that there’s another application of this. In terms of sexual prohibitions, people are no longer willing to accept prohibition, per se; in other words, just because somebody says ‘this is wrong,’ that you must not do it. This questioning attitude is starting to ask, ‘why is it wrong. What is it actually doing; is it hurting anybody’?

It seems to me that there is a big dichotomy here. (Playboy Magazine publisher) Hugh Heffner’s side is saying, ‘sex is fun, okay, as long as it’s not hurting anybody, let’s go ahead and do it,’ ignoring the fact that it perhaps becomes nothing more than a mechanical pleasure-satisfying device. While on the other hand, some people are saying, ‘well, is there actually something good in it; is it getting us some place; is it something that improves the relationship between two people; and, at the same time, does it really do any damage outside of marriage? Then why not pre-marital sex?’ And then, in the middle of the road, I think there are people who are re-examining the traditional sex mores from a different point of view, perhaps.

Connaughton: I tend to think a lot of this talk about sexual freedom is feed-back, though. I would think that there’s a lot more emphasis, a lot more publicity on questions of morality and sexuality than there has been in the past; it’s an ‘in’ topic now-a-days. As far as more freedom
been a lot of change in sexual mores’

I, ROADFUSS, have been a lot of change in sexual mores’ has been my experience with people in my work. I definitely feel this way for many varied reasons, and I think young people today are less inhibited, but I think that’s the only change. They just didn’t talk about it, or discuss it openly, as we do now. We are less inhibited, because we question and discuss things more maturely.

I think that the youth of the nation are finally asking themselves the questions. I’ve heard young fellas and girls around the evening school talk openly about it, and not feel that it’s a dirty word; they didn’t have to go hide in a corner and whisper.

LA SALLE: Do you feel that you’re less inhibited than were your parents.

ROADFUSS: Most definitely.

KOPAZ: We’re probably less inhibited today, because we’re more free to talk about these things than our parents were, but I think that’s the only change. They just didn’t talk about it, or discuss it openly, as we do now. We are less inhibited, because we question and discuss things more maturely.

McGINNIS: I’d like to issue the minority report. I think that in general young people today are less inhibited, but I think that they are also more sexually promiscuous. This has been my experience with people in my work. I definitely feel this way for many varied reasons, and I think it’s on the increase. I think it’s going to become a great problem.

First of all, let me say I think young people are getting involved with sexuality younger than ever before. I think that young people today are carrying things a lot further in regard to pre-marital relations. And I think that it’s less checked and more accepted than ever before, and this is a climate that’s going to foster this.

I’m basing this on the problems I’ve had to handle in my own work, and on problems they’re beginning to have in the school system, even in the seventh and eighth grades, with which I have a lot of contact through teachers. Many of them have been teaching for awhile and haven’t had these problems before—where these young girls and fellas in 6th, 7th and 8th grades are getting involved in some problems we never had before. I think the inhibitions are going and that this is fostering this climate. Thirty years ago, a mini-skirt would have been unthinkable.

TIEDEKEN: I suspect that for human beings, in general, there really hasn’t been a lot of change in sexual morés, as far as actual practice is concerned.

KOPAZ: We’ve been talking about high school students, rather than age, as our guideline. Years ago, you left school when you were 16, so kids are doing things now, in high school, but the kids who were not in high school years ago were doing the same thing. Many were already married. The difference now is that more people are going to school longer.

TIEDEKEN: I think that’s a crucial point, Jim. A person who’s going to finish four years of college, then get drafted, and then maybe go back for a year of graduate school, is really 24-25 years old before he’s in a position to marry and raise a family without taking on an appreciable burden. By the same token, he’s been ready since he was 14, physically. Perhaps it’s the fact that we’ve got this continuum of people in school that’s making kids grow up, in a sense, earlier and earlier, because they just see other students a few years higher than them. Formerly, there was a break: you quit school, became an adult, went out to work, and everybody else was a school kid. Now, plenty of adults are students.

LA SALLE: Are La Salle students interested in drugs, LSD for example?

KOPAZ: I’d say, no, because I’ve never seen any interest by people I’ve talked to.

TIEDEKEN: I would say for the average student, no. As far as a few specific examples, I’d probably have to say, no comment. It’s only hearsay, so I can’t account for it, but I have heard of La Salle students using both marijuana and LSD.

CONNAUGHTON: Most likely, there has been some experimentation, but this would be a very, very small minority.

KOPAZ: I’m sure that out of 3,000 students there would be several who have tried it. But I haven’t heard it discussed with any interest.

LA SALLE: Why do you think that’s true? Are our students better adjusted than others?

TIEDEKEN: The atmosphere here is different, I think, than at schools like Penn or Temple, for example, schools where they certainly have a problem with this. We’re not in the downtown environment, we’re away from it a little bit. You have the religious angle, too. Also, most of our students have come up through the diocesan high schools, where this particular sort of immorality, I would say, —continued
would tend to be discouraged as immorality out-of-the-
ordinary. It's something new and strange that some evil
man is coming along to corrupt you with.
ROADFUSS: I've never, in my own experience, heard of
anybody using or testing drugs in the evening division. To
me, LSD has been presented in such a glamorous light.
I've heard discussion about 'what is it or how do you make
it'? The only kind of curiosity I've heard on campus has
been sort of an academic one.
LA SALLE: What is your opinion about the state of our
laws vis-a-vis the Supreme Court and Congress? Has the
Supreme Court "gone too far?"
TIEDEKEN: No, I don't think its gone too far.
McGINNIS: Yes, I believe that the Supreme Court is inter-
preting the law in the minds of nine men, and, many times,
in the minds of only four or five men. These men may not
be in the mainstream of public opinion, and may not have
the proper attitude toward these laws.
To give an instance, Justice Warren—who, by the way
is not an attorney—spoke in Bolivia and expressed the
viewpoint that fewer attorneys should be appointed as
judges. And yet his decisions on the Court have been to
the contrary. His personal opinions are one thing, yet his
decisions are another. I wonder sometimes how a man can
believe one thing, but decide another.

Also, I think many times the Court ignores, or refuses
to hear, many cases I think they should hear and often
takes jurisdiction over cases where they really don't have
jurisdiction.

CONNAUGHTON: I don't think the Court has gone too far,
but I do think the Court's involvement in many things,
which in the past have been regarded as political, points
out a problem in the system, in that Congress has not
moved into areas that are its own sphere of influence. The
Court has moved into areas of authority where Congress
has allowed it to (move in). The blame lies with the Con-
gress and, ultimately, with the American people. We're
willing to let Congress operate with very antiquated pro-
cedures and principles. We haven't really seen fit to change
the situation.
ROADFUSS: I feel they have gone too far, and I feel they've
gone too far because no one else has taken action. I think
it's a matter of Congress having taken so long to investigate
the feasibility, the questioning of proposals, getting them
on the floor, and getting them to a point where people want
to act. In the interim, we've had test cases presented by
minorities long before the Congress could consider all the
issues and put it to a referendum. I think the Congress has
to learn how to think more quickly and act more effi-
ciently, in which case we'll have no need for Supreme
Court decisions; they'll come from the people, via their
representatives in Congress. Now, it's up to Congress,
which is supposedly becoming more youthful. I think
they'll take the message more quickly to the floor, debate
it, and come out with action before we get such questions
'should we pray in school' before the Court.

KOPAZ: That's one subject I really don't have any opinion
on; I've never really followed it. I don't know what the
latest decisions have been on any particular case.
LA SALLE: Could we quickly get your opinions about
whether the Warren Commission did an adequate job? Are
you satisfied with its investigation of the Kennedy assassi-
nation?

McGINNIS: No. I basically think it wasn't conducted very
effectively and certainly not properly in its investigative
technique. The people charged with the jurisdiction over
this rarely, if ever, were ever even there. This theory
that
the Commission's whole position is hinged on, the one
bullet theory, was formulated basically by one man and on
rather flimsy evidence—a sketch, which is the whole key.
The questioning of witnesses was extremely haphazard.
ROADFUSS: No, I don't think that they tried to disclose all
the facts, nor did they try to investigate all the circum-
stances. As far as the one bullet theory goes, it's prepos-
terous. There's a photograph which shows the hand (of
Gov. John Connally) on the outside of the automobile at
the time the shot was supposed to have struck Kennedy
and Connally's hand.

KOPAZ: I'm afraid I have to say, yes, I am satisfied (with
the Report). I think they did exhaust a lot of energy in
examining a lot of testimony. I think we'll just have to go
with the conclusions they came to, with the facts that they
had. Now, if someone should come up with some sub-
stantial facts in the future, I would unquestionably agree
that this should be re-opened. But now, I don't think I
could question the investigation's validity.

CONNAUGHTON: I'm not entirely satisfied with the Report,
either. I would think that as long as there are valid ques-
tions that can be asked about the assassination—and I
think there are, such as the one bullet theory—then I think
they should be answered. All considerations of the Ken-
nedys, and the emotional problems that they've gone
through, to the contrary; the questions should be answered.
I think that the Commission tried to arrive at an answer as
quickly as possible and, I think, a little too quickly.

TIEDEKEN: I'd probably be willing to accept the idea that
Lee Harvey Oswald shot the President, or at least fired
shots at him. I'm not sure about the one bullet theory; I
haven't followed the technicalities too closely. But I do
think that they shut the door too fast. There are too many
to go too far'

problems that really haven't been tied down properly, as I can see.

**La Salle**: Do you think that the Negro civil rights movement has moved too rapidly in the last few years?

**Tiedeken**: I don't think so; no.

**McGinnis**: No, I don't think so.

**Kopaz**: I think it has. I think they've tried to do in 15 years what they had the chance to do in the last 100-150. I think they're moving too quickly. They want to receive recognition as quick as they can, without really gaining the respect of the people. My main argument is that they've been free for 100 years, and it's only in the last 15 years that they made the effort.

**Tiedeken**: Have they been free? Have they had the opportunity that other people have had?

**Kopaz**: Have they ever tried in the past to do anything? I think the answer is no.

**Tiedeken**: I don't think the Negro in America has been free in the sense of the word that he has had as many opportunities as the white race has had. To this point, I still don't think he has the opportunities and I think that until he achieves equality in every sense of the word, there's no way he can possibly go too fast. It's been too long that he hasn't had (equality) that he should want to put it off any longer.

**Kopaz**: I'm not saying he should put it off, just do it a little more slowly, a little more carefully. No one is going to gain my respect if they're going to try within 10-15 years to gain recognition that they've had 100-150 years to gain. No one's going to force themselves on me.

**Roadfuss**: I don't agree that it has gone too quickly. In fact, I thought that they had started out going quickly and I thought they had the admiration of the white community when they marched on Washington. Then, I think they lost the point. Now they've gone astray. At the time they marched on D.C., I think they had our admiration, and any good white man would have stepped aside to make room, would say, even if there isn't a spot right now, we'll step aside and share it with you. Then, all of a sudden, they took these divergent attitudes in these marches through the South. I think if they had just gone on making constant strides, they would have gotten there more quickly than by trying to subvert local rule, as such. You just don't change human nature that quickly.

**Connaughton**: I guess I'm the only person here who is from what is known as The South. My own impression of the civil rights movement is that I was very enthusiastic about it up 'til I guess about a year or so ago. I sort of lost that idealism I had about it, particularly in the face of what is called the Black Power movement. It seems to me,
"We must be ready to"

as John said, they've gotten off the track somewhere along the line. The movement isn't something I can identify with quite as much as I did in the past.

McGinnis: Although I agree that it hasn't gone too fast, I do think it's gone off the track, it's lost direction in the sense that they're still demanding things of the white community and the power structure, but they're no longer passing down to people in their lower ranks—helping these people to accept the responsibilities that are going to be expected of them if these demands are met. Perhaps some of the leaders have become complacent; they no longer have this communication with the rank and file. They're fighting for causes that I don't think the man in the street is really interested in. The man in the street doesn't really care if Cecil Moore runs for Mayor. Is he (Moore) one of those 'rights' they were going to get?

Tiedeken: You have to be very careful when you talk about all this, so that when you speak of the Negro becoming free and equal, you don't speak about the Negro becoming white. I think we have to be ready to accept the black man as a black man, as a brother really, not try to make a black man a white man. I think there's a lot of good in the Black Power movement for that reason: the black man is saying, 'look, baby, I'm black. I want the same as you, but I don't want to become you.' There's a certain amount of reasonableness to this, in my point of view.

La Salle: Have the ghetto riots diminished your concern for the Negro?

Kopaz: Yes, they have.

Roadfuss: Yes, they've reduced my concern for the whole movement.

Connaughton: I'd say, yes. Particularly this last summer, when there was a riot in one section of Washington. The D.C. commissioners decided that one section of the city needed a swimming pool; two nights later, another section of the city rioted for a swimming pool. Perhaps this is emotional, but that turned me off.

McGinnis: The outside-of-Philadelphia riots diminished my respect but the riots in Philadelphia, I think, had a little bit of justification. These people have been victimized for years by a lot of the people they rioted against—I've seen it personally. These people think nothing of selling Negroes dog food for meat. I can see rioting when there is no real grievance committee for redress for these people. They've gone to City Council, so who're they going to go to? (Councilman) George Schwartz? He's the councilman for the district, and happens to own most of the stores. These people really don't have any voice politically, which is really the big problem. Who are they going to go to?
accept the black man as a black man

Those people who are elected by the power structure? They might be so-called civil rights advocates, but they’re just as bad as some segregationists.

I don’t think they’re moving too fast and the riots are a symptom of it. I don’t think the riots can be isolated as just a civil rights problem. It’s a political problem. It could happen in white areas if they had as many problems as in Negro areas. You can’t imagine, unless you’ve been down there, some of the problems these people have. It’s a terrible thing to go to everybody and say ‘this is wrong and this is wrong’ and be right, and then be told by the people who are supposed to represent you, even of your own color, ‘you’re wrong.’ What do you do? Where do you go? I think just as many white people would go out and riot.

Tiedeken: The riots have definitely intensified my concern. As Bill points out, these riots are manifestations of the economic problems of segregation. The black man is in a position now where he’s so frustrated, so much tangled in poverty and governmental red-tape, he’s either being forced to live in poverty—to bring-up his kids in a rat-infested hovel, or on the other hand maybe he’s in on relief, being forced to live off the government. This is an awful quandry for a man to be in—it breeds frustration and social problems that really make me wonder about our big cities in the future.

Kopaz: There are more white people in poverty than black people. Why is it we should be more concerned about a minority than the majority?

McGinnis: The problem here is that a lot of white people who are poor are congregated in rural areas, where they’re not together, really.

Tiedeken: Jim, you’re right, because we should deal with poverty for everybody; we should abolish poverty all over the country without regard to race. But be careful that in saying this you’re not trying to absolve the white man of guilt in putting the black man down.

La Salle: If you were President of the U.S., what would you do about the war in Vietnam?

McGinnis: First, I’d look into the situation and decide if we have a civil war there, where we’re never really going to win. Is it possible for us to win the war; is it even worthwhile winning the war, or are we just going to get involved in another conflict after it’s done? If it’s not a civil war, and the people of South Vietnam really don’t want to be united with North Vietnam, then I would say we have to push the war—if necessary we have to bomb Hanoi, we have to mine Haiphong harbor. If I decided it isn’t worth it, that we’re involved in a civil war, and this would turn into another conflict in Thailand or Laos, then I’d say we have to negotiate a settlement there as best we can and get out. I’d say now that we’re not involved in a
civil war; it’s Communist aggression. We should stay in there and, if necessary, we should step-up the war.

Tiedeken: The first thing I would do is stop the bombing and express a desire to re-establish the truce we’ve had at several stages on holidays. The basic problem is a lack of trust. North Vietnam has been continually oppressed by Western governments, starting with France, and they see us now as a continuation of this. I don’t think they trust us in any way, shape or form, and we don’t trust them. We need some sort of dramatic gesture to establish confidence. I would take-up Ho Chi Minh’s offer to the President to fly to Hanoi for talks, with perhaps U Thant and a representative of a neutral power, and then talk it over and work-out some sort of established peace in Vietnam, which would allow the citizens of Vietnam—both North and South because it really is an artificial division—to choose a unified leadership to rule their country. Once they’d done that, supervised by some sort of a mediator organization—preferably the U.N.—then withdraw U.S. forces from South Vietnam.

Connauton: I can’t get involved in arguments about the morality of our being there, because I think it’s sort of irrelevant, because we are there.

I think that everything should be done to ensure that there is a chance to negotiate. If this involves, as Rich just suggested, going to Hanoi and meeting with Ho Chi Minh, I think this should be done. I don’t think the President has gone far enough. I don’t think he’s demonstrated our determination to carry the war out; he’s stymied by the situation, or seems to be. A decision has to be made, and I think fairly soon, as to just which direction we’re heading. If it can be negotiated fairly, then I think it should be done, all questions of victory to the contrary. I think we’re in a situation where we can’t really be victorious—it’s a matter of the lesser of two evils.

Roadfuss: I believe there is a possibility for peace: I think it is inevitable. I think the only obstacle is a willingness to believe the other guy. This is a war that could continue for generation after generation with no resolution, because I think the Vietcong have demonstrated that, even though we’re superior mechanically, you can’t beat people who have a cause by strength alone.

I think that now is the time, and I think it is becoming very evident that all nations will have to accede to some other authority—whether it be a world government, the U.N., a committee of one or a committee of 50.

Tiedeken: But how can you justify the statements we made before, about the individual conscience being uppermost, with the view that we’re there (in Vietnam) and therefore we can’t question the morality of it?
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‘We’ve got to consider the morality of our

ROADFUSS: Because I don’t think this is our question to answer. It belongs to the Vietnamese. We’re there because they could not decide. If the Vietnamese people had decided to go Communist, both North and South, they would be Communist now; if they had decided to be democratic, they would be democratic.

TIEDEKEN: We are over there now, bombing and killing people. Therefore, we are acting. I don’t think killing a person can be a morally indifferent act; it’s either a moral evil, or it has to be justifiable. We’ve got to consider the morality of our actions over there.

ROADFUSS: I believe we’re there to protect the rights of some persons, who in their personal conscience couldn’t accept Communism. I hope this is the truth behind the matter; I hope we’re there because they want us, because if we’re not, we’re fighting a war that we can’t win anyway.

TIEDEKEN: Certainly, some people want us, but others don’t!

ROADFUSS: Then we’re there protecting their rights.

TIEDEKEN: But others don’t. By the same token, in Cuba for example, there are some people who would welcome us to come in there with our B-52’s and troops and free Cuba from Castro. Therefore, should we do it, because there are some people there who would want it?

ROADFUSS: Again, we get back to questions of majorities and minorities.

TIEDEKEN: It’s morality, I’d say.

KOPAZ: I would agree with the way they’re conducting the war. I think we should have more bombings and less soldiers, because I don’t think the U.S. Army is trained to fight that kind of a war. However, if it should ever come to light that the people we call the South Vietnamese do not want us there—regardless of the ramifications in Asia—I would say let’s get out. But, if they do want us there, we’re committed—but I don’t know how we let ourselves get into the position, whether we think ourselves the protector of the world against Communism, or what.

TIEDEKEN: I still object and see a massive contradiction in what seems to be the basic position of all of you; that since the U.S. is there, therefore we need not consider the moral ramifications of being there. I think that’s really your duty to actually consider that.

LA SALLE: Do you think the present selective service system is fair?

McGINNIS: I don’t think that, as it is presently constituted, it is fair. I think some of the suggested revisions would make it much better. I think it would be much better to be drafted when you’re young. Now you can be drafted anytime between when you’re 18 and 26. My personal theory is that we would be much better off with a professional army, although I do think there should be some national service, but not necessarily in the Army. I think everyone should contribute in some manner to their government, some time in their life. I don’t think it’s necessary to have this draft situation, because we’re always going to be involved in wars for the next 20 or 30 years. It would be far better for us to have professionals.

TIEDEKEN: I think you have to look at it on two levels. On a personal level, it’s grossly unfair that the kid in my 12th grade class, who didn’t go on to college after high school, should be drafted and sent to Vietnam—in a position to be killed—and not have the same happen to me. There’s nothing my mother can say to his mother to convince her that it’s fair, and rightly so. On a general level, I can see that if they drafted people out of college, where would the country be, say, 10 years from now with no teachers, engineers, scientists, etc., especially if this war in Vietnam continues on a limited basis. If we’re going to be in there for 8-10 years—and I think that’s a reasonable estimate—the lack of college-trained people would cripple the country.

CONNAUGHTON: I agree with Rich’s comments. Sometimes I feel guilty that, simply because I’m a college student, I’ve been allowed to avoid the situation. Some of the people I was in school with, friends of mine, are in Vietnam right now. If this were peacetime, I don’t think this would mean much, but the ramifications are quite different with an actual shooting war going on. I’d have to say, though, that I think some student deferments must be continued. But I do think a person should be liable to the draft at some definite place in his life. Now, you have a situation where we’re not sure.

ROADFUSS: I think every man should serve within his capabilities, and particularly if he has a special capability. However, I’m torn between the idea he should serve the system he owes his allegiance to, and the other idea that you can’t build a constantly increasing economy, a technological society, by taking the brain power and putting it into a military system, where it becomes wasted.

I think that the problem lies in our educational system and not in our draft. If we had a system like the European lyceum system, where people are put through the process of selecting their careers by elimination, I would think we could arrive at deferments based strictly on national need.

KOPAZ: I disagree with the present draft system, because I think it best that the person be subjected to the draft as soon as he graduates from high school. I have guilt feelings; three of my friends were killed in Vietnam. I feel my country was being unjust to me by not drafting me when I got out of high school, when I could have served my obli-
actions in Vietnam’

gation, then gone to college. Now, I’m going to have to serve, perhaps go to Vietnam; I may be killed, and all this has been for nothing.

Tiedeken: I think that when a man graduates from high school is the best time, rather than an age limit. When he graduates from high school, his name ought to be in the lottery and he should either get picked or not. If he doesn’t, he’s free. But it should be regardless of whether or not you’re going to go to college, because looking back on it now—when I would like to go to graduate school and go into teaching—I would much rather it had come after high school, before I started college. But, if we’re going to have deferments, I think it should go right on through until you finish your education.

La Salle: Why did you choose La Salle College? Would you make the same choice again?

Kopaz: I’m happy I’m here and if I had it to do over again, I’d choose La Salle. I chose La Salle because it’s a local college and because I was counseled that the College had a very fine business program. I’m very happy with La Salle; I feel I’ve received a very good education for my potential. I’m also glad I came here, because it’s small, but of course I wasn’t aware of this importance then. I’m very happy with my choice.

Roadfuss: I chose La Salle because it was recommended by an acquaintance, a La Salle graduate. He suggested I attend the evening school, since my family obligations made day school financially impossible. Like most people, I had the impression all evening schools were like a machine shop or some evening institute. But as I asked around, more and more I found that La Salle’s evening division had a very good reputation for a local college. I investigated, and was counseled on how I could manage my job, my marriage, and my education.

I think it was at the end of the first year that I realized that I had as much potential as any day school student did, that it was simply a matter of the time of day I was going to school. As I became involved in La Salle, and started giving of myself back to the school, I found that the school meant more to me than I had ever hoped for. I’d choose La Salle over any school in the Philadelphia area. Now that I’m about to graduate, I’m proud to be associated with La Salle.

Connaughton: To be perfectly honest about it, I pretty much backed-into attending La Salle. I received a scholarship and I came because it was financially the best offer. Since then, I’ve come to appreciate the benefits of La Salle College quite a bit. There’s a spirit here; there’s a lot of talk about the ‘La Salle Family,’ but I think it really means something—you feel that you are a part of the institution.
There's a tremendous opportunity here to learn and it's on a par with any institution, as far as I can tell from talking to friends of mine elsewhere. You can get as good an education here as almost anywhere else. I can kick myself now for not taking advantage of some of the things that are available here. I wish I were coming into La Salle now, rather than four years ago, however, because I think there have been many improvements and a lot of things that look good that I won't be able to take advantage of now.

**Tiedeken:** I was pretty sure of what area I wanted to go into—English. We had a professor from the College faculty who was an athletic coach at La Salle High, and he brought me here to speak with some of the members of the English department. I was tremendously impressed with the caliber of the men in the department who were actually doing the teaching. There may be men with more advanced degrees and with bigger reputations at some other institutions, but they're probably working with graduate students and teaching in huge lecture halls with 200 people or over closed-circuit TV. But here we have some excellent men who are excellent teachers, and are actually in contact with the students in small groups. I've been extremely satisfied; I think my experience here has borne that out. There are some poor teachers, but I'd say they're in the minority. The courses I've had have been quite good, and I'd do it all over again.

**La Salle:** Do you think there's a need today for Catholic colleges and universities?

**Tiedeken:** I think they serve a good function, yes. I think rather than to indoctrinate a person into his religion, they serve as an ideal atmosphere for a person to question his religion and engage in dialogue with men who have experienced the same questions. Whereas, if you're on a secular campus and experience the doubts and questions that you do, you really don't have as many people to turn to.

**Roadfuss:** That's a good analogy between the religious and the secular school.

**Connaughton:** There's one thing lacking here, though. I think that La Salle students could benefit by being a little more a part of the secular city, coming into contact a little more with people who are going to challenge some of their beliefs—now, while they're in a position to get some answers, or to work-out their own answers. I don't think enough of our students, and this includes myself, see the real value of the theology courses that we have and the opportunities we have.

**Tiedeken:** You're right, there, but I think that the secular city atmosphere can be achieved outside the College, in your dealings with people outside the College. Of course,
an absolute necessity'

a lot of students don't experience it; they isolate themselves too much within the protective arms of the College, and that's a mistake.

ROADFUS: I agree that the Catholic colleges are absolutely necessary to maintain a controlled atmosphere, wherein you will bring in outside people who will raise questions. The student is in a situation where he is able to question his faith, but also able to ask someone.

LA SALLE: What complaints, suggestions for improvement about La Salle College can you offer?

ROADFUS: Communication. From my own point of view, being an evening division student, I would like to see a break down in the so-called 'barrier' between the two. That can go in any direction you want to take it: in an academic adventure, the student newspaper, and sharing experiences between people of different ages. The College itself should initiate the action, because they're the people who can do it. The administration should listen to the students, whether they be day or evening, and I would hope that through this communication their voices would be one, instead of many.

Basically, as far as the campus is concerned, anybody can criticize facilities. I think if I were to try to measure the efficiency or the competitiveness of our cafeteria or bookstore to an outside activity, a profit-making activity, they perform a very poor service. They do not give the student, equitably, what he deserves.

KOPAZ: As much as the administration does offer itself to take care of the problems of students on the campus, I think they should get more concerned with their problems. I don't think they're adequately concerned about some of the problems, which are primarily facilities at this point.

I think the administration is starting, again, to get away from the students. The last two years, at least, it appeared they were very close to the students; this year, it appears they're starting to go away from them again. I think this should be corrected.

I have to praise the school on one aspect, that the decision was made to keep La Salle a local college of limited size, with concern for quality rather than quantity. This philosophy has permeated almost every department on the campus, and I think it's going to affect the teachers and, through them, the students. I think they're starting to give a darn good education to the students here.

CONNAUGHTON: One problem that has always bothered me has been La Salle's lack of initiative in taking advantage of some of the resources right here on the campus for intellectual fulfillment of the students. We've been fairly complacent that we have a lecture in fifth period on Wednesday and Friday, say, a movie or two, and a play or so each semester. There are a lot of untapped resources as far as chances for people to just sit down in a situation just like this and talk, trade ideas, and perhaps have their horizons broadened. Too much of the time, a lecture is an hour's experience that is much too structured, it's a one-way communication. Someone comes in, you listen to them and have questions on your mind, something you want to talk-over, and yet you're not able to. I think there have been some steps taken in the right direction, coloquias, things along this line, but there's quite a bit more that could be done. In other words, a little more education outside the classroom.

In another area, the College needs to broaden facilities, and it needs to take advantage of what it already has. The cafeteria services are just so-so, the library could also be improved. La Salle could also be a little more a part of the community than it is right now. It could be involved in its activities, bring the surrounding area in, be a little more socially conscious of its surroundings. The students could become a little more involved in the community surrounding the College.

TIEDEKEN: I generally accept what has been said so far. There's one area within the academic environment, between 8:30 and 4:30 P.M., where the College probably could achieve a little better balance in the departments. There are some that are probably among the best undergraduate teaching staffs in the East; there are others that are probably a little bit weaker.

I think Jim has a point about the administration. I don't think they're always as a-tuned to the student body as they should be. Perhaps this is just a factor in the generation gap, but I think their ears ought to be a little more to the ground, their fingers to the pulse of the students a little more. There are probably certain elements in the administration that, while they served a great role in keeping the place going during the War and the like, probably are holding it back a little bit, in the matter of up-dating that John spoke of before. There's need for a little bit more of a flair, a zest, if you will, in administrating a College. You have to be a little more adaptable than we are; a little more ready to try new things, to branch-out maybe a little bit further than we should, in order to really achieve excellence in education. Fordham University, for example, is branching out into a completely new campus, designed to be a small college on the Oxford type, completely self-sufficient. Within it, the students will more or less structure their own scholastic environment for four years. This is something La Salle could probably do, on a smaller scale.

LA SALLE: Thank you very much, gentlemen. This has been a most rewarding and interesting interview, as we hope it will also be for our readers.
A distinguished La Salle professor examines the U.S. economy during the 1960’s and ventures an estimate of the shape of things to come.

It seems to me that sometimes we are too apt to take ever-growing prosperity for granted and that the better off we become, individually and collectively, the more frenetic we become over any evidences of slow-down.

The accomplishments of our economy in the past half-dozen years or more have been truly impressive. As President Johnson put it in his Economic Report to Congress in January, “In purely material terms most Americans are better off than ever before. The fact expands our responsibilities as it enlarges our resources to meet them.”

Last year, we had an average of 74 million people employed, two million above 1965. Gross National Product rose to $740 billions of dollars, $58 billions higher than 1965. This was an 8½% gain over 1965, or a 5½% gain after correction for price rises. Disposable Personal income, the single most meaningful measure of consumer economic well-being rose 3½% or $89 for every man, woman and child—a smaller rise than in 1965, but still larger than the average yearly gain in the 1950’s. The rate of unemployment has fallen from seven percent in early 1961 to under four percent. White adult males now have only a two percent rate of unemployment as compared with five percent in 1961; Negro men have dropped from a 12% rate of unemployment in 1960 to five percent last year. Corporate profits after taxes were $26.7 billions in 1966, $4 billions more. The new twist is that this represents an increase of only five percent over 1966, whereas, in 1956, capital expenditures rose eight percent over those of 1965. It means that U.S. companies have just about made-up the investment ground lost in the slow growth years of the late 50’s and early 60’s and are entering a new phase of continued high investment, but not the spectacular gains of the past three years.

Marketing away from the consumer and his intentions to spend, we come to business plans for capital spending. The McGraw Hill 1967 capital spending survey seems to indicate that the great capital spending boom of the sixties shows no signs of coming to an end, but it is entering a new phase. For instance, the major corporations surveyed plan to spend this year $63.82 billions for new capital—a five percent increase over 1966, and in actual volume $9 billions more. The new twist is that this represents an increase of only five percent over 1966, whereas, in 1966, capital expenditures rose eight percent over those of 1965. It means that U.S. companies have just about made-up the investment ground lost in the slow growth years of the late 50’s and early 60’s and are entering a new phase of continued high investment, but not the spectacular gains of the past three years.

Still another indicator signalling caution is the growth of inventories. The inventory-to-sales ratio in November was at its highest point since the end of 1962.

The Department of Commerce reported a sharp rise in business inventories for the fourth quarter of 1966—$14.4 billion increase compared with a $9.9 billion rise in inventories during the third quarter. This hinted at possible economic complications ahead. Increasing inventories have frequently in the past preceded economic downturns.
Still another cautionary signal on the economic horizon is industrial production, which has risen 58% in the past decade—this index of physical product has leveled off also. After rising strongly the first eight months of last year, this key economic indicator has shown little net increase since August, even though 1966 shows a nine percent increase over 1965.

We should bear in mind that in many of these cases of decline, and also in the third and only other way in which we can spend, namely governmental spending, there is to be no decline. In fact, the administrative budget for the next fiscal year will be $8.3 billions above that of the current one.

Still another signal of a different nature was the rapid rise in prices in the past year. Consumer prices rose 2.9% during 1965 and another 3.3% during 1966, as compared with approximately one percent a year from 1961-1965. A rise at this rapid rate simply cannot be tolerated—it amounts to slow encephalitis of all creditors and holders of fixed assets, which is just about all of us who expect to retire some day and have our retirement income bear at least some relation to the effort we put into earning it.

Certainly, if in 1966 the economy was expanding at a rate far too fast to be sustainable without inflation of the 3.3% magnitude of this past year, then it must slow down if we are not to have wider inflation. We have already reviewed some evidences of such slowdown in the consumer and business sectors of the economy. Note again, the moderation in the rapid rate of growth, not an absolute decline. Thus, the President's Council of Economic Advisors projects an overall rate of growth in the Gross National Product of four percent for 1967, as compared with 5½% this past year. This is real growth after correction for price levels. That is still considerably higher than we were achieving back in 1960, when candidates Kennedy and Nixon were debating each other on growthmanship. At this rate, the Gross National Product in 1967 will be $787 billions as compared with $740 billions in the past year. Of the $47 billions increase in Gross National Product this coming year, $27 billions will be real gain and $20 billions in price raises.

If you question to what degree we can rely on these predictions of the Council of Economic Advisors, it should be remembered that although they erred somewhat in predicting the Gross National Product, the error is usually on the underside rather than the overside. And, incidentally, the econometric model in the computer at the Wharton Graduate School is within $1 billion, or one-half a percentage point of the President's economists on most of its predictions. The econometric model assumes no six percent surtax in 1967 while the Council of Economic Advisors' projections include the surtax.

If consumer and capital spending are to grow at smaller rates in 1967 than in the immediate past, certainly this is not true of the federal budget. For instance, the administrative budget shows a deficit of $8.1 billions, the cash budget a deficit of $4.3 billions and the national income accounts budget a deficit of some $2.1 billions. Both the cash and national income account budgets show smaller deficits than the administrative budget. Economists generally believe that budget policy based on the administrative budget alone, as it was for many years, could lead to an over-restrictive fiscal policy. The heart of the matter here is that in the year to come we must so interrelate monetary and fiscal policy that no part of the private sector of the economy will be made to carry a burden such as the housing construction industry did this past year, and so that we will have adequate but not excessive supplies of money for all productive projects.

The money supply from June 1960 through April 1966 rose more than $30 billions and at the end of the period was rising at an annual rate of 6.2%, more than double the three percent growth rate in the money supply that many economists consider “normal” for the American economy. Since last April, however, the money supply has actually declining at an annual rate of 1.7%. It appears that the Federal Reserve may have overreacted somewhat. Yet, in the context of 1966, some over-reaction on the part of the monetary authorities was almost inevitable, since monetary policy was left almost alone to bear the burden of providing both massive economic growth and stability at the same time. While it is true that in 1966 some fiscal measures were used to balance the strains imposed by a rapidly expanding economy, nevertheless one questions whether eight or nine months ago might have been a more appropriate time for imposing a six percent surtax on incomes, rather than relying almost alone on a monetary policy that produced the highest interest rates in 40 years.

Fortunately, there seems to have begun already a welcome monetary thaw in the face of a relaxation of some of the pressures on the economy, which we discussed earlier. As we all know, monetary policy (general overall control of the supply of credit) seems to have shifted to a somewhat less restrictive posture. The 91-day Treasury bill rate declined from 5.5% in September to 4.75% in late December, the sharpest decline in this pivotal rate since early 1960. More recently, some of the largest banks (and some not so large) have reduced the prime rate of interest. While money is by no means easy (and perhaps rightly should not become so in a hasty movement of over-reaction to what has gone before)—it is moving in the right direction to begin to take up whatever slack may have been developing in some of the private sectors of the economy.

In recent weeks, steps have been taken to give some stimulus to the housing industry, which has been a casualty of the tight money situation of the past half year. In his State of the Union Message, the President announced the release of an additional $1 billion by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to federal savings and loan associations for mortgage loans. It is also important that the interest rate charged by FHLB for advances to S and L's was dropped to 5.3%. Leon Weiner, president of the National Home Builders Association, recently saw a reversal of the

—continued 19
'Continued growth, but a slower pace'

downward trend, which existed in 1966, and a steady upward movement in 1967 that would continue through 1968. Total housing built in 1967 may not be too much greater than in 1966 but the turnaround and gradual upward trend is the significant thing.

Perhaps now it might be worthwhile to take a brief look at development in consumer credit. Consumer credit continued to expand in 1966 but at a slower rate than in 1965. Installment credit, other than auto credit, remained strong in 1966. It is significant that personal loans increased in each quarter of 1966, while credit conditions were generally becoming more stringent.

One way of evaluating the current volume of installment credit is to compare it with the flow of income. At the end of August 1966, installment credit totaled $72.6 billions and constituted some 14.3% of the third quarter 1966 disposable personal income. This ratio has recorded virtually uninterrupted increases over the recent economic expansion, and although it is now at a record, it appears to be approximately in line with the long-term growth over the post-war period.

When repayments are netted against extensions it appears that for approximately 3 1/2 years net advances in installment credit as a percentage of disposable personal income have fluctuated in a rather narrow range centering around 1 1/2%. This is in sharp contrast with the performances recorded in both the expansion of 1955-57 and that of 1959-60. The comparative stability of this ratio in the current expansion suggests that consumers have succeeded in adjusting installment debt and responsibility to steadily growing incomes. If this be true, then might we not expect the growth in installment credit this year of 1967 to be in close relationship to the predicted overall rate of growth in personal income?

One last facet of the current economic picture remains now for comment. It is that of price stability. The Council of Economic Advisors predicts a 2.5% rise in 1967 as compared with 3.3%. Even 2.5% seems intolerable, but is probably unavoidable if we are to get a gradual return to stability and to avoid overreacting fiscally this year as we overreacted (however necessarily) with monetary policy last year. The prospect of a smaller price increase this year has already been indicated by a slowdown in the pace of price increases in the past several months. Commissioner of Labor Statistics Arthur Ross reports that in the fourth quarter of 1966 prices went up (seasonally adjusted) 0.5% in contrast with 0.9 of one percent for the first quarter, 8/10 of one percent for the second quarter and 1.1% in the third quarter alone.

The president has proposed a six percent surtax for both personal and corporate incomes to take effect July 1. Taxes are unpleasant both for individuals and businesses and, as Walter Heller, professor of economics at Minnesota, has pointed out, it will probably be best for us to stay as fluid as possible on this question until we see how the economy will develop in the first and even the second quarter of 1967 — ready to use it if the inflationary forces seem stronger than the deflationary, or not to use it if the opposite situation ensues. But even if the surtax is used with the object of allowing an easing of monetary policy, so that monetary policy alone will not have to bear a disproportionate share of the burden of achieving stability, and even if the surtax becomes a reality, the total tax for a family of four with $5,000 income will still be $130 less than they paid in 1963, for one with $10,000—$190 less than they paid in 1963, and for even a $20,000 income, $450 less than they paid in 1963. A corporation with $100,000 profits before taxes still pays $2.510 less than 1963 and one with profits of $1 million will pay $12,590 less than 1963.

We must remember the whole thrust of this type of policy is to balance aggregate demand with aggregate supply in the economy, for, if we don't pay the tax in another way — namely in higher prices. It certainly makes sense to have slightly fewer dollars remaining after taxes (although in all ranges more than in 1963) and have those dollars worth more because prices have not risen at as fast a pace. Perhaps at no time in the recent history of our economy has it been more true that the economy must steer a perilous course between the Scylla of inflation and the Charybdis of recession — just as when ships pass through the narrow straits of Messina between Sicily and Italy they face the danger of being dashed against a rock known as the Scylla on one side, or sucked down into a whirlpool known as the Charybdis on the other.

To summarize then, we have surely proved over recent years that economic progress does not need to be interrupted by frequent or deep recessions. The outlook seems to be one of another year (the seventh) of continued expansion in the nation’s economy. Heavy military requirements superimposed on a continued uptrend in civilian outlays by Federal, state and local governments are likely to overcome whatever soft spots may appear in the private sector, which incidentally has for the most part slowed down rather than turned down.

The economy for 1967 should have a continued growth but at a slower pace, which will allow for a correction of some of the distortions that developed in the past year and one-half. Would it be too much to suggest our mood in this early part of 1967 be one of cautious but reasonable optimism, a year of adjustment, of transition. We simply could not continue to expand at the rapid rate we had been going; but expand we must and all indications are, we will.

Dr. Flubacher, who next year marks his 30th year on the La Salle faculty, has served as chairman of the economics department and as an influential member of various College committees. He is today a member of the new Faculty Senate. After earning his bachelor's degree from La Salle in 1935, he received masters' and doctoral degrees in economics from Temple University. This article is adapted from his address to the Philadelphia Credit Managers Association earlier this year.
Much has been written and said of the new "student freedom" sweeping colleges and universities across the nation, and this issue of La Salle is a case in point.

Mushrooming faculty "freedom" on the U.S. campus, however, has received scant attention—with the notable exception of the recent turmoil at a large urban Catholic institution—compared to the student "revolt," of which Berkeley has become a symbol.

And yet, particularly at Catholic colleges and universities the professor's status as a full participant in campus decisions and policy-making has the dual significance of the role played by the emerging layman in the post-Vatican II Church.

But the Vatican Council did not start the emergence of laymen on Catholic campuses. Rather, it intensified and accelerated a crisis that became inevitable the day the ratio of laymen to religious changed at most of the 309 Catholic colleges and universities in the U.S. today.

At many such schools, like La Salle, laymen now exceed the number of religious by some five-fold—a dramatic change since just two or three decades past, when the layman was the exception not the rule. Obviously, under the latter conditions, his voice was barely audible in administrative decisions.

Today, however, the layman is not only more numerous, but his influence is being felt on nearly every Catholic college campus in the land—from St. John's to St. Louis, from La Salle to Los Angeles Loyola.

The "revolution" has many ramifications, not the least of which involves money to compete for competent lay faculty members, and just how much "control" will be retained by the still largely religious administrations of Catholic institutions. One college, Webster Groves, has already announced it would become a secular school while two other large universities—Notre Dame and St. Louis—have decided to at least nominally relinquish control to a lay board of trustees.

La Salle has followed the pattern from religious to lay numerical predominance. It is extraordinary, however, to note the vision and apocryphal manner in which the Christian Brothers have conducted La Salle since its inception and, particularly,
Brother Bernian (second from left) with vice presidents and deans.

over the past decade.

One surprising element in La Salle's history is the fact that the College has always had laymen on its board of managers—since the board was formed in 1869. This would not be nearly so surprising were it not that a host of "name" Catholic institutions are now rushing to name their first laymen to their boards!

The earliest recorded lay members of La Salle's board were Dr. William Keating, J. P. O'Neil, and James McBride, who were named to the first board. Most Catholic colleges have skirted the problem by organizing separate lay "advisory" boards.

Today, La Salle's board is composed of six Christian Brothers, a priest, and four laymen. Brother James Carey, F.S.C., provincial of the Brothers Baltimore District, is chairman, and Brother Daniel Bernian, F.S.C., president of the College, is president of the board.

Not unlike several other schools which had laymen on their boards for some years, however, La Salle's board is now studying an increase in members and in the proportion of its lay members.

Although the reorganization of trustees has largely dominated the headlines in recent months, the most significant changes in life on the Catholic college campus have resulted largely from lay involvement on the day-to-day faculty and administrative level.

It is in the latter that La Salle has perhaps led the way for Catholic schools in the entire nation. Not the least of these innovations have been the appointment of two laymen to the College's four vice-presidential posts and the formation of a faculty senate last year.

It is usually difficult if not impossible to attribute such new directions to any one person, but at La Salle it is rather clear that Brother Bernian has pioneered the moves, which began with his appointment of John L. McCloskey and Dr. Joseph L. Sprissler as vice presidents for public relations and financial affairs, respectively, in 1960.

The McCloskey and Sprissler appointments were part of a reorganization of La Salle's administration into four distinct organizational segments—academic, student, and financial affairs, and public relations. Brother Daniel Burke, F.S.C., Ph.D., and Brother Calvin Paul, F.S.C., Ph.D., were named to the academic and student posts, respectively.

But perhaps the most boldest step is the most recent innovation, the initiation of a faculty senate last fall.

Comprised of 15 senators—six full professors, five associate and four assistant professors—the faculty senate was formed to provide a basis for faculty recommendations on every aspect of life at La Salle. Three senators are members of College Council, the president's principal advisory body.

The senate's officers are Professor Charles A. J. Halpin, Jr., Esq., president; Associate Professor Charles V. Kelly, vice president, and Assistant Professor Joseph P. O'Grady, Ph.D., secretary.

Other senators are Professors E. Russell Naughton, Ph.D.; Robert J. Courtney, Ph.D.; Brother Gregory Paul, F.S.C., Ph.D., and John S. Penny, Ph.D. Also, Associate Professors Michael A. De Angelis; Brother Hugh Albright, F.S.C., Ph.D.; Francis J. Guerin, and Francis J. Nathans. Assistant Professors represented are Bernhardt G. Blumenthal, Ph.D.; Leo D. Rudynsky, Ph.D., and Gabriel J. Di Federico.

"The involvement of the lay faculty in determination of La Salle policy has been firmly established for some years," according to Senate President Halpin, professor of industry. "Faculty recommendation on salaries, core curriculum, teaching load, tenure, and College objectives have—in the past seven or eight years—been accepted with little or no modification.

"It should be noted," Halpin adds, "that although such involvement appears to be something new on the campuses of Catholic colleges and universities, such is not the case at La Salle. The recent establishment of a faculty senate with elected representatives from the faculty, merely formalizes what the faculty has been doing for many years through ad hoc committees."

"The real significance of La Salle's senate, however, is that the faculty now has an official voice—accepted by the administration—not only in recommending policy, but at the policy determination level through its three elected representatives who serve on College Council," Halpin continued.

"Another significant aspect," Halpin said, "is that the administration saw the value of utilizing the professional competence and dedication of its faculty. This important step, it should be added, was effected without fanfare, strife or bitterness, and without destroying the excellent rapport that exists between the lay faculty and Christian Brothers."

How and why has La Salle been in the forefront of the movement toward increased lay involvement. Senate Secretary Dr. O'Grady said in his report on "Faculty Participation in the Administration of La Salle College," that in recent years: . . . La Salle College has possessed an administration that wanted both to decentralize power and authority, and be responsive to faculty needs and desires.

Although this latter point may have existed in the minds of certain administrators prior to 1958, the real shift came only with the appointment of Brother Bernian and his creation of four Vice Presidential areas. Following this pattern, the Vice President for Academic Affairs piloted the work of the Academic Development Committee, the (Academic) Self Study, the Committee of Department Chairmen, and the Curriculum Committee. All of these utilize lay faculty members to the fullest extent possible. At the same time, the administration responded to faculty requests for higher salaries, increased fringe benefits, and many other suggestions.

A second reason for success rested in the nature and tone of faculty leadership. The majority of these leaders were home-grown products of the institution for which they worked. Secondly, they were, relatively speaking, senior men with many years of service to the College. In the comfort of their rank and tenured status, they had not grown into "yes" men, as has happened so often on church-related campuses.
Third, these outspoken, senior members of the faculty acted in a reasonable fashion with demands that could hardly be described as radical or revolutionary. They constantly and successfully created the impression that they were willing to build upon the existing administrative structures at La Salle and not tear it down.

Another factor was the ability of the La Salle community to avoid the kind of religious-lay split that has characterized so many Catholic campuses. At every stage of development, the Christian Brothers on the faculty actively participated in debates and discussions, and in all of this many were more vehement about administrative policies than were the laymen.

The Faculty Senate fulfills this one fundamental need to increase communication between faculty and administration . . . to give both sides some means of gaining a representative view or reaction to a policy on its implementation.

But Brother Bernian characterized the developments in perhaps the most succinct manner, when asked about the emergence of the La Salle layman:

"It's something we had to do, not because others were doing it, but because it was the only right way to conduct the College. La Salle needs the dedicated layman more today than ever before."

### Danforth, Wilson Winners

**Two La Salle College seniors have received prestige graduate fellowships for 1967-68. One, James A. Butler, won two coveted awards, the Woodrow Wilson and Danforth Foundation grants.**

Butler, an English major, and Paul C. Brophy, who majors in economics, each received Woodrow Wilson Fellowships for advanced studies.

The first La Salle senior to receive both of the coveted awards in one year, Butler was among the 124 winners of Danforth awards selected from among some 2,000 nominees from colleges and universities across the U.S.

La Salle nominated only nine students for the Wilson Fellowships; three of these received honorable mention recognition by the Foundation, which selected 1,259 winners from the 13,596 nominees representing 1,022 schools. Honorable mention recognition was given to Brother James P. Sterba, F.S.C., and Thomas J. Jennings, both psychology and Edward J. Quigley, philosophy.

Butler, a graduate of Pittsburgh's Central Catholic High School in 1964, has achieved an academic index of 3.88 (of a possible 4.0) at La Salle. He hopes to pursue advanced studies at either the University of North Carolina or Cornell University. As an undergraduate, he has served as treasurer of the Gavel (debating) Society, features editor of the campus newspaper, and president of Lambda Iota Tau honor society.

Brophy, a 1963 graduate of Cardinal Dougherty High School, plans to attend either the University of Pennsylvania or Columbia University. At La Salle, he has been secretary of the Economics Club and was active in the Liberal Club and St. Gabriel's Club.

Danforth Fellows are free to matriculate at any U.S. graduate school in their respective fields of study, and may concurrently hold any other national fellowship, such as the Wilson, Rhodes, or Fulbright awards.

Other colleges and universities in Pennsylvania to have 1967 Danforth winners are Haverford; Pittsburgh; Swarthmore; Bryn Mawr; Franklin and Marshall; Allegheny, and Villanova. Nationally, other Catholic schools are Villanova; St. Mary's (Ind.); Notre Dame; Marquette; Fordham; Dayton; Boston College; Georgetown; Fairfield; Iona; Providence, and St. John's.

Woodrow Wilson Fellows receive one academic year of graduate education with tuition and fees paid by the Foundation, plus a living expenses stipend of $2,000 and allowances for dependent children. Some 14,000 Fellowships have been awarded through the program, which has been supported since 1953 by $52 million in grants by the Ford Foundation.
Vietnam Dialogue

U.S. POLICY in Vietnam received praise and condemnation during a debate and a lecture on the campus this semester.

Participants in the verbal foray were, David Schoenbrun, former CBS Radio news analyst in France and Asia, who delivered a lecture early this year, and a debate between William R. Symser, of the State Department's East Asia Office, and Dr. Edward S. Herman, associate professor of finance at the University of Pennsylvania, who engaged in a debate on campus last semester.

"I'm not sure what I propose is right," Schoenbrun asserted. "I'm only sure that what my government is doing is wrong." He then asssailed virtually every aspect of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

"Communism won't be stopped by guns, only by Christian democratic values," he stated. "You can shoot Communists, but not Communism. Western, Christian civilization has failed to support the national interests of small countries, which the Communists have supported.

"Our policy is forcing the Vietnamese into accepting the aims of the Chinese—whom they have always hated," Schoenbrun charged. "Our bombing is futile; even the State Department admits it hasn't stopped the influx of supplies from the North."

Symser has been a frequent official visitor to Saigon and previously had been attached to the U.S. Embassy there. Dr. Herman recently co-authored a book entitled, America's Vietnam Policy: The Strategy of Deception.

The speakers' opposing views ranged over many aspects of the complex problem. Dr. Herman insisted that the Viet Cong guerrillas are "a forced response" to U.S. military "intrusion," while Symser called the VC "controlled and directed U.S. military "intrusion," while Symser called the VC "controlled and directed U.S. military "intrusion," while Symser called the VC "controlled and directed."

Dr. Herman attacked what he called "U.S. hypocrisy. "We are now fighting to establish freedom that we didn't care about when we were in complete control in South Vietnam," he contended.

Master Plan Assailed

THE MASTER PLAN for Higher Education in Pennsylvania came under fire at a panel discussion sponsored by the Commission for Independent Colleges and Universities (CICU) held at La Salle College last semester.

Four prominent civic leaders were members of the panel which discussed the topic. "The Master Plan: Can Private Colleges and Universities Survive?" Some 550 representatives of CICU member schools attended the conclave.

Panelists included the Hon. James J. A. Gallagher, then chairman of the State Legislature's Committee for Higher Education; Charles G. Simpson, former chairman of the State Council on Higher Education; Dr. Theodore A. Distler, president of the CICU, and William D. Valente, professor of law at Villanova University. Peter H. Binzen, assistant city editor of the Evening and Sunday Bulletin, was moderator.

Rep. Gallagher offered five criticisms of the Plan, among them the need for a state Commissioner for Higher Education.

"The main concern of the present Superintendent of Public Instruction," he stated, "has been for elementary and secondary education. The real need now is for a Commissioner of Higher Education."

Gallagher also called for a State Council for Higher Education that would be free of political influence, clarification of the plan's requests for capital funds to private colleges, emphasis upon the role of community colleges, and a better scholarship program.

Simpson asked increased aid to Pennsylvania's private colleges and universities.

"If you want to get some place fast," Simpson said, "you first make use of your existing facilities. We must make use of our 118 existing private institutions. I am strongly in favor of such aid to private colleges and universities.

"I renounce and denounce the Master Plan," Simpson added. "The State Board is pussyingfooting and you should know about it. The Plan is a kind of gerry-built thing, thrown together this spring with pressures from above."

"Pennsylvania must give aid to private schools, as does the federal government, and we need to do this desperately and do it now," Simpson added. "We must make this Master Plan a balanced equili­brium for education in the future. This includes a revision of the State Constitution, if necessary."

Dr. Distler, perhaps the least critical of the Plan, called it "a step in the right direction . . . it's not as good as it should be, neither is it quite as bad as its critics would have us believe."

He added, however, that more state scholarships are needed because, "students cannot now really make a free choice between public and private institutions. If the Constitution needs to be changed, then so be it."

Valente discussed the constitutionality of state aid to private and, particularly, church-related schools. He asserted that the State Constitution denies aid to any school "not under the absolute control of the Commonwealth."

"Does this mean," he asked, "that no appropriations may be given even to state colleges and universities, some of which have only token representation on their boards of trustees, without a two-thirds vote of legislature?"

"If the State Board had only looked 90 miles north to New York," Valente charged, "which created an authority to administer public loans to all colleges and universities. The New York Dormitory Authority doesn't use tax funds—it uses bonds for loans to colleges and universities. Its advantages are that no tax appropriations are needed and there are no limitations upon borrowing resources."

Rodden Returns

Dan Rodden, founder and managing director of La Salle's summer Music Theatre since its inception in 1962, will return to the helm of the unique venture this season after recuperating from serious illness last summer.

Rodden will stage "110 in the Shade," the Tom Jones and Harvey Schmidt musical as the opening production, July 7 through 30th, and the Meredith Willson classic, "The Music Man," Aug. 4 through Sept. 3.

Alumni and friends of the College may obtain pre season subscription discounts and arrange theatre parties at reduced rates by writing Music Theatre '67, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Penna. 19141.

Holroyd Fund Report

Some $18,451 has been pledged to the Roland Holroyd Fund to establish an endowed lectureship in biology, it was announced by John Helwig, M.D., '50, chairman of the Fund committee.

At the end of March there were 395 contributors to the campaign, to which some $12,967.20 in cash payments had been made. The committee anticipates that the Fund will exceed its goal with strong support from the Alumni Medical Society.

The lectureship is being established to honor Dr. Holroyd, founder and past chairman of the biology department at La Salle. He has taught some 6,000 students since joining the faculty in 1921.
Fr. Dougherty Dies

REV. JOHN W. DOUGHERTY, S.T.D., a diocesan priest and assistant professor of theology at La Salle, died suddenly Mar. 17 on the campus. He was 51 years old.

Father Dougherty had been a member of the theology department since 1963. He previously taught Latin at Cardinal Dougherty High School, St. James High School in Chester, and Allentown Central Catholic.

Ordained in 1942 after earning a bachelor of philosophy degree from St. Charles Seminary and a bachelor of sacred theology degree from the Lateran Seminary in Rome, Father Dougherty also received doctoral degrees in sacred theology and in canon law from the Catholic University in Washington, D.C.

MacLeod's "Skin"

"THE SKIN OF OUR TEETH," Thornton Wilder's prize-winning comedy, will be the spring production of The Masque of La Salle College, Apr. 28 through May 7, in the College Union Theatre.

Directed by Sidney MacLeod, the drama is the last in a series of works by the Pulitzer Prize playwright. The "Thornton Wilder Festival" included "Our Town" last fall and three one-act plays earlier this year.

Guild Gives Books

THE LA SALLE College Guild, an organization of the mothers of La Salle students, this spring donated $1,000 in arts books to the College library.

Mrs. Edward J. Flood, Sr., general chairman of the 1966 Card Party held to purchase the books, presented the check to Brother Thomas Warner, F.S.C., librarian. A plaque recognizing the Guild's gifts totaling $5,000 since 1962 will be placed in the library this year.

Spring Innovations

THE MAJOR INNOVATION on the La Salle campus during the spring semester is some 190 of its new evening students.

La Salle, a men's college since its founding by the Brothers of the Christian Schools in 1863, welcomed its first women students to the evening division for the spring term. The coeds are among some 400 new freshmen.

Some 22 new courses and three new faculty members were added for the spring semester. The day college has two new fine arts courses, History of the Opera and Choral Music, and five new philosophy elective courses — Eastern Philosophy, American Philosophy, Analytical Philosophy, A History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy, and Philosophies of God. Also added to the day curriculum is Russian Literature of the 19th Century.

Three new independent study courses were introduced by the honors program, directed by Brother Patrick Ellis, F.S.C. New offerings are Analytical Philosophy, by guest lecturer Dr. J. Robert Cassidy, of Temple University; Plato, by guest lecturer Paul Desjardins, of Haverford College, and Joseph Beatty, of La Salle, and Roman Civilization, by Brother David Kelly, F.S.C., assistant professor of classics at La Salle.

The Development of Jewish Religious Thought, a course taught by Rabbi Bernard S. Frank and sponsored by the Jewish Chautauqua Society and the Archdiocesan Commission on Human Relations, will be repeated during the spring semester, according to Brother Robert Doran, F.S.C., dean of arts and sciences. Initiated last fall, the course is the first of its kind at a Philadelphia Catholic college or university. Other colleges sponsoring such courses are Fordham, Xavier, St. Louis, Notre Dame, and Portland (Oregon).


'Tinkerbell' Revisited

"ONE OF THE TRAGEDIES OF OUR TIME is that young people have dreams they gradually give-up as they grow older."

Robert Manry, the Cleveland newsman who crossed the Atlantic in his 13-ft. sloop, The Tinkerbelle, thus decried the inability of many young people to fulfill their ambitions. His talk, accompanied by color slides, was given on the campus last semester.

Manry's 78-day voyage from Falmouth, Mass., to Falmouth, England, received international attention in 1965, and is the subject of his recently published book, Tinkerbelle.

"I guess it looked like a publicity stunt," Manry said, "but that was the farthest thing from my mind. Believe me, I was amazed by the reaction." He called the voyage a boyhood dream inspired by a high school speaker, who had made a similar trip.

Manry sailed with 28 gallons of water —continued
and eight bags of food; when he reached England, 13 gallons of water and a month's food supply remained.

"I was very surprised to learn I had lost 40 pounds, despite having little exercise," he mused. "I'm thinking of writing a book entitled How to Lose Weight by Crossing the Atlantic."

Manry saw about 60 ships on the trip, which he calls "much safer than driving to work each morning on the freeway." The most hazardous part, he added, was while still in the shipping lanes. During this period he missed three nights' sleep, which began a series of hallucinations.

"Many ship captains wanted to rescue me, and seemed quite disappointed when they learned I didn't want to be rescued," Manry said. He recalled being awakened one morning by the blasts of a horn, which he learned came from a U.S. submarine "so close to the Tinkerbelle I could have jumped aboard."

Does he want to return to journalism, to which he had devoted 15 years prior to his Atlantic adventure?

"Not at all," Manry says with a broad smile, "I'd much rather just keep doing this sort of thing—sailing, writing books, and giving lectures."

Dr. Roland Holroyd received the 1967 President's Medal for distinguished service to La Salle.
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"Many ship captains wanted to rescue me, and seemed quite disappointed when they learned I didn't want to be rescued," Manry said. He recalled being awakened one morning by the blasts of a horn, which he learned came from a U.S. submarine "so close to the Tinkerbelle I could have jumped aboard."

Does he want to return to journalism, to which he had devoted 15 years prior to his Atlantic adventure?

"Not at all," Manry says with a broad smile, "I'd much rather just keep doing this sort of thing—sailing, writing books, and giving lectures."

Coach Heyer Resigns

JOSEPH W. HEYER, '60, resigned as La Salle College's basketball coach April 12.

Heyer, who had coached the Explorers the last two years, was offered a full-time coaching position at a considerable increase in salary, but felt that it would be "in his own best interests to resign," according to Brother Daniel Bernian, F.S.C., president.

Brother Daniel said that the position of head coach is "wide open" and that the college faculty athletic committee would be given the responsibility of recommending a successor.

Heyer, who guided La Salle to 10-15 and 14-12 records in two years, plans to continue teaching and coaching. He is presently on the faculty at Cardinal Dougherty High School.

Protest Not Enough

"People are learning that integration without preparation can only equal frustration," a civil rights leader told a La Salle College audience last semester.

The Rev. Leon Sullivan, founder and director of Philadelphia's Opportunities Industrialization Center, addressed La Salle students and faculty in the last of a four-part series on "The Urban Crisis."

OIC was founded, he said, "when we decided something had to be done on a massive scale to take advantage of gains made by the civil rights movement. The old training programs screened-out the very people who needed help most."

"Protests and demonstrations," Rev. Sullivan added, "were just not sufficient. We needed preparation and productivity. These were people without hope, people who were mad at the world. They came to OIC not because they wanted a handout, but because they wanted a helping hand up."

Of the phrase 'black power,' he said, "Black power means strength, and my people need strength. But let's give the phrase meaning. Instead of saying, 'Burn, baby, burn,' let's say, 'build, brother, build.' We will rebuild our own houses, our own blocks. We will build pyramids, entire new neighborhoods, with the help of those who support us."

Rev. Sullivan said OIC training has added $6.5 million in buying power to the city and has saved the state some $1.5 million in relief funds. He added that OIC has placed 2700 persons, 98% from the poverty category.

Summer Workshops

La Salle College's psychology department will sponsor a two week counseling workshop for religious superiors of women, Aug. 14-25, on the campus. A second workshop for religious superiors of the Brothers of the Christian Schools will also be held at La Salle, June 12-23.

Directed by Brother Austin Dondero, F.S.C., Ph.D., chairman of La Salle's psychology department and author of No Borrowed Light, the workshops will consist of daily lectures and discussion groups.
T. Peter Clancy died in February.

Joseph J. Kelley, Jr., was appointed executive secretary to Pennsylvania Gov. Shafer. He was named to the cabinet-level post after serving as a research man and speech writer for Shafer during the campaign last fall. He formerly taught at Drexel Institute and was held Sunday afternoon, April 2. John J. Guerin has been appointed controller of Sylvan Pools in Doylestown, Pa. Myles S. McDonnell has been promoted to assistant vice president of the University of Massachusetts economics at the University of Massachusetts and a visiting lecturer at Smith College.

Frederick Bernhardt is now a representative of the hospital equipment division of The American Seating Company. James T. Harris was recently appointed vice president of the African-American Institute. He will continue as a consultant to Corning Glass Works.

John E. Barry was promoted to executive vice president at the Lancaster County Farmers National Bank in Lancaster, Pa. H. Peter Gillingham was chairman of the alumni association's annual Spring Reception, which was held Sunday afternoon, April 2. John J. Guerin has been appointed controller of Sylvan Pools in Doylestown, Pa. Myles S. McDonnell has been promoted to assistant to the operating vice president at the Reuben Donnelley Telephone Directory Co. John F. Morass is assistant vice president at Camden Trust Co. Raymond B. Reinh was elected vice president of the Alumni Law Society.

John F. Finnegan is a civilian supervisory auditor for the Army in Seoul, Korea. Norman Haider is English department chairman at Cherry Hill (N.J.) High School West. He recently had his second book Structure of Sentences published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Joseph F. O'Callaghan, Ph.D., associate professor of history at Fordham University, delivered the annual King lecture in Yonkers, N.Y., under the auspices of the U.S. Catholic Historical Society. His topic was "Christian Life Under Moslem Rule in Mediaeval Spain." Edward A. Warren is program director of WABC-TV in New York City.
Michael Flach, comptroller of the Jewish Home for the Aged in Philadelphia, recently addressed the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania Auxiliary. Thomas J. Gola, now representing the 170th district in the Pa. House of Representatives, has been named secretary of the Committee on Higher Education. He participated in an Alumni Association-sponsored panel discussion on the Master Plan for Higher Education in Pa. in February at Holy Family College. George I. Haggerty has been named advertising account supervisor for the College of Art at the University of Pennsylvania. Anthony Guerrelli received the "outstanding young man of the year" award from the Suburban Bucks Co. Jaycees in January. Paschal J. La Ruffa, M.D., was awarded a fellowship by Harvard University and is studying adolescent medicine at Children's Hospital Medical Center in Boston. Mass. Joseph E. Martin was promoted to the rank of major in the Army Engineer Corps in S. Vietnam. William F. McGonigal has been named assistant manager of the Houston, Texas, office of Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co. Maurice F. O'Neill was elected executive vice president of the Reuse Consulting Corp. in Philadelphia. Births: To Robert P. Galante and wife, Joy, their third son, Richard J., to Kenneth G. Hager and wife, Bonnie, their second daughter, Dana Michele.

Robert R. Davis has joined the placement staff of I.B.M. Corp. in Armonk, N.Y. He was formerly a technical recruiter for the R.C.A. Service Co. Joseph J. Francis has been named district manager of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association Insurance Co. Thomas P. Haggerty has been awarded a National Science Foundation fellowship to complete his studies toward a Ph.D. degree in mathematics at Georgetown University. Francis C. (Connie) Newman has qualified for membership in the "Million Dollar Roundtable" for his life insurance sales during 1966 for the Frank Blatcher ('56) Agency of the Indianapolis Life Insurance Co. Robert J. Peculski has been named advertising promotion manager of the Philadelphia Daily News. He had been assistant advertising promotion manager for the Saturday Evening Post. George F. Reading has been appointed medical service representative by J. B. Roerig and Company, a pharmaceutical division of Pfizer. Robert W. Sutter, Esq., has been named counselor for the "U-Haul II" Co. Joseph P. Stark has been appointed credit administrator of Menley and James Laboratories, a manufacturer of proprietary pharmaceuticals. Birth: To John Metz and wife Ruth, a son, John Patrick.

Charles A. Agnew, president of the Washington, D.C., area alumni chapter, has been named director of training for college relations. U.S. Civil Service Commission.

La Salle Auxiliary

Alumni learning of the death of another alumnus or a member of his immediate family are requested to notify the Alumni Office (Victor R. S. 8300), so that the deceased may be enrolled in the St. La Salle Auxiliary.
M.D.'s Accept D.O.'s

The Alumni Medical Society voted to accept alumni who are Doctors of Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.) into their ranks. A poll of the membership resulted in an overwhelming vote in favor of admitting the osteopathic physicians to membership.

The Society's Speakers Bureau, which provides guest lecturers for students preparing for the study of medicine, is under the chairmanship of Lawrence Goldbacher, '42, M.D. Sidney Orr, '42, M.D., spoke on February 15 about "Common Surgical Problems" illustrated with slides. Henry P. Close, '33, M.D., lectured on "Veteran's Medicine" on March 10. On April 21, 1967 at 12:30, Oscar Corn, '38, M.D., will speak on "Orthopedic Surgery".

The annual Medical Society Reception, to which alumni who are medical students, interns or residents were invited, was held on Sunday, April 16. James C. McLaughlin, '48, M.D., was chairman.

The Society will again offer an exhibit at Open House, April 30. Philip Nolan, '51, M.D., is chairman.

Also on Open House day, the Society will elect officers for the coming year and present the fourth annual gift to the Biology Department. Michael Etzl, '38, M.D., is chairman of the Gift Committee. Candidates for office are: for president, G. Russell Reiss, M.D., '53; for vice president, Charles G. Heil, M.D., '49; for secretary, John Gostigian, M.D., '52; for treasurer, Robert Smith, M.D., '52.

The fifth anniversary reunion of the Class of 1962 will be held in the College Union Ballroom on the evening of Saturday, May 20. Cocktails will be served at 7:00 p.m., dinner at 8:00. Dancing after dinner until 1:00 a.m. Tickets are priced at $15.00 per couple and includes the cocktail hour and dinner for two. Drinks after dinner will be moderately priced. Tickets may be procured through the Alumni Office. Thomas J. Lynch and John P. Lavin are co-chairmen of the 5th anniversary Dinner-Dance. Others on the committee include: Anthony J. Clark, Thomas A. Cotton, John F. X. Fenerty, Philip H. Heuchert, Nicholas J. Lisi, Charles J. Mahon, and Richard L. O'Connor. William M. Massopulo, an accountant with Arthur Anderson and Co., has been appointed associate director for the Philadelphia chapter of the National Association of Accountants. William A. Pearman, a member of a graduate faculty of Fordham University, recently received his Ph.D. degree in sociology from the University of Pittsburgh. Marriage: Robert J. Houlihan to Paula A. Hopkins.

John A. Heller has been appointed general plant supervisor of Commonwealth Telephone Co. in Dallas, Pa. David J. McDonnell has been named professional sales representative for Pfizer Laboratories in Buffalo, New York. William J. O'Brien of the Law firm of Pepper, Hamilton, and Scheetz, co-authored an article in Pennsylvania Medicine entitled "Hospital Libs of Charitable Immunity Protection May Mean Fewer Malpractice Suits Against Physicians." First Lt. Louis Oswald is an aerospace munitions officer in Vietnam. Birth: To Frank Daly and wife Maureen, a daughter, Patricia Maureen.

Oscar Corn, '38, M.D., lectured on "Orthopedic Surgery." Henry P. Close, '33, M.D., lectured on "Veteran's Medicine." James C. McLaughlin, '48, M.D., was chairman.

The Society will again offer an exhibit at Open House, April 30. Philip Nolan, '51, M.D., is chairman.

Also on Open House day, the Society will elect officers for the coming year and present the fourth annual gift to the Biology Department. Michael Etzl, '38, M.D., is chairman of the Gift Committee. Candidates for office are: for president, G. Russell Reiss, M.D., '53; for vice president, Charles G. Heil, M.D., '49; for secretary, John Gostigian, M.D., '52; for treasurer, Robert Smith, M.D., '52.

The fifth anniversary reunion of the Class of 1962 will be held in the College Union Ballroom on the evening of Saturday, May 20. Cocktails will be served at 7:00 p.m., dinner at 8:00. Dancing after dinner until 1:00 a.m. Tickets are priced at $15.00 per couple and includes the cocktail hour and dinner for two. Drinks after dinner will be moderately priced. Tickets may be procured through the Alumni Office. Thomas J. Lynch and John P. Lavin are co-chairmen of the 5th anniversary Dinner-Dance. Others on the committee include: Anthony J. Clark, Thomas A. Cotton, John F. X. Fenerty, Philip H. Heuchert, Nicholas J. Lisi, Charles J. Mahon, and Richard L. O'Connor. William M. Massopulo, an accountant with Arthur Anderson and Co., has been appointed associate director for the Philadelphia chapter of the National Association of Accountants. William A. Pearman, a member of a graduate faculty of Fordham University, recently received his Ph.D. degree in sociology from the University of Pittsburgh. Marriage: Robert J. Houlihan to Paula A. Hopkins.

John A. Heller has been appointed general plant supervisor of Commonwealth Telephone Co. in Dallas, Pa. David J. McDonnell has been named professional sales representative for Pfizer Laboratories in Buffalo, New York. William J. O'Brien of the Law firm of Pepper, Hamilton, and Scheetz, co-authored an article in Pennsylvania Medicine entitled "Hospital Libs of Charitable Immunity Protection May Mean Fewer Malpractice Suits Against Physicians." First Lt. Louis Oswald is an aerospace munitions officer in Vietnam. Birth: To Frank Daly and wife Maureen, a daughter, Patricia Maureen.

'62

JOSEPH MCCARTY

Frank M. Kaminski, Jr., has been elected an assistant treasurer of The First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Co. Marine Capt. James J. Kirshke was seriously wounded in action near Da Nang, S. Vietnam. Friends and classmates may write to him c/o the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. Joseph McCarty has been commissioned a Second Lt. in the Air Force at Lackland AFB, Texas. David A. Partridge has joined Provident National Bank as manager of Advertising. Paul M. Whetcarr has been appointed professional sales representative for Pfizer Laboratories in the Washington, D.C. area. Marriage: Edward J. Golden to Roberta Ann Gromlong. Richard B. Paul to Faith Clare Bugno. Birth: To Rowland F. Rodgers and wife Carol, a son, James.
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John A. Heller has been appointed general plant supervisor of Commonwealth Telephone Co. in Dallas, Pa. David J. McDonnell has been named professional sales representative for Pfizer Laboratories in Buffalo, New York. William J. O'Brien of the Law firm of Pepper, Hamilton, and Scheetz, co-authored an article in Pennsylvania Medicine entitled "Hospital Libs of Charitable Immunity Protection May Mean Fewer Malpractice Suits Against Physicians." First Lt. Louis Oswald is an aerospace munitions officer in Vietnam. Birth: To Frank Daly and wife Maureen, a daughter, Patricia Maureen.
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Frank M. Kaminski, Jr., has been elected an assistant treasurer of The First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Co. Marine Capt. James J. Kirshke was seriously wounded in action near Da Nang, S. Vietnam. Friends and classmates may write to him c/o the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. Joseph McCarty has been commissioned a Second Lt. in the Air Force at Lackland AFB, Texas. David A. Partridge has joined Provident National Bank as manager of Advertising. Paul M. Whetcarr has been appointed professional sales representative for Pfizer Laboratories in the Washington, D.C. area. Marriage: Edward J. Golden to Roberta Ann Gromlong. Richard B. Paul to Faith Clare Bugno. Birth: To Rowland F. Rodgers and wife Carol, a son, James.

'65

William Baldino is teaching English at the William Tennent High School in Warminster.
Among the many ironies of man's futile battles with his fellow man is the suffering often incurred by innocents, the children, and that later the fighting man is often the principal bearer of assistance to his inadvertent victims. Army Capt. Gabriel J. Zinni, ’63, like millions of soldiers in hundreds of wars gone-by, became involved in the vicious cycle while serving in the Mekong Delta area of Vietnam until early this year. He was wounded in combat three times and received the Purple Heart. “The realities of war,” he states, “seldom offer opportunities to derive satisfaction from being constructive, rather than destructive. But, in keeping with the maverick nature of the Vietnam war, many constructive programs are operating.” Shown here with children from a small village in the Delta that was destroyed by Vietcong, Zinni helped Army Chaplain Father Alvin Campbell to build a small village, with financial assistance by U.S. forces in the Can Tho area. The occasion for this photograph was the distribution of Christmas gifts donated by dependents of U.S. military personnel at an installation in Germany. “I was ecstatic the day I returned home,” he adds, “but the satisfaction of helping a needy people was truly rewarding.” Active in the College Union Committees while an undergraduate, Zinni is now assigned to an Army installation near Philadelphia.
“If you’re not trying to help people, if you don’t like people, then you don’t belong in either.” Thus, the Rev. John M. McDevitt, ’56, draws a parallel between political life and the priesthood. The recently-ordained Father McDevitt should know, too, having spent over six years in Philadelphia’s City Council before entering the seminary in 1963. A Democrat, he had given 16 years of his life to a political career by which he became one of the city’s most formidable and popular political figures. He was elected to City Council in 1955, while still an Evening Division student. Since Father McDevitt was ordained at the start of his fourth year in the seminary, he has returned for another year of study and hopes to continue work on his master’s degree at Catholic University. During the year, his ministry will be limited; he is able to celebrate Mass daily, but cannot hear confessions or preach, except in emergencies. The priesthood, he contends, holds a great advantage for public service: “In politics, one can easily become disgusted with people. The chances are greater of becoming a cynic. As a priest, through prayer and spiritual life, you are constantly evaluating yourself. I’ve learned to become a little less disappointed when things don’t work out. Perhaps I’ve come a little closer to reality.” A member of the Oblates of St. Francis De Sales, Father McDevitt hopes to teach political science after earning his master’s degree.
The New York office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is wealthy in talented graduates of many of the nation’s finest colleges and universities, but La Salle may well lead the pack in representation. Would you believe five? From Leo Kelly, ’49, longest in service with the Bureau, to Francis Kehoe, ’48 and Phillip Carr, ’54, (left and right above, respectively), and William J. McDevitt, ’51 and John F. Ricks, ’52, La Salle has a noteworthy contingent in the nation’s biggest—and probably busiest—FBI office. All are special agents with varying specialties — Carr, for instance, is an accountant. They tend to play-down the dramatic side of the job and to the casual observer resemble dashing business execs more than Eliot Ness’ men. But each must qualify monthly in small arms fire under a variety of conditions, so it’s not all 9 to 5 dictation work. If they could discuss the more exotic aspects, which they can’t, all of the dramatizations—from the old radio program to the current TV version—would no doubt pale by comparison, especially at the New York Office, where many of the Bureau’s biggest cases have broken (e.g., the Nazi Hell Gate Bridge plot in 1942 and the Rosenberg case in 1953).
Lay Involvement: Advise and Consent