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Life with out Uncle?

By John L. McCloskey, M.B.A.,
Vice President, Public Relations
& Director of Development
A companion article to this issue’s Editorial Projects for Education supplement, which examines the full range of federal support for higher education and its implications for schools who do and don’t receive such aid.

The G.I. Bill might be called Uncle’s first

Since the Blaine Amendment was rejected by Congress in 1875, groups advocating absolute separation of church and state, as well as many others with varieties of professed justification, have taken pot-shots at federal legislation designed to aid education. Despite these efforts, some to completely eliminate federal aid, others to restrict it to public institutions, federal appropriations to education soared beyond the $10 billion mark in 1966. Over $4 billion of this amount went directly to higher education.

Uncle Sam’s “educational gusher” has not, however, meant proportionate royalties to all institutional relatives. One hundred of the larger universities receive about 90% of the federal money available. The liberal arts college finds itself hard-pressed to qualify for many of the programs in research and not qualified for support directed to the graduate programs.

During the post-war ‘50s and early ‘60s, colleges like La Salle missed-out on federal support by meeting their needs before the enactment of federal programs recognizing these needs on a national level. La Salle’s library constructed in 1952 and Science Center (1960) would qualify under facilities grants today, but had to be financed privately when constructed.

The G. I. Bill, which enabled approximately 3.5 million veterans to attend college in the late ‘40s and early ‘50s, might properly be listed as Uncle’s first visit to La Salle. True, this was not direct aid, but the influx of veterans sent the war ravaged enrollment of under 500 in 1946, soaring over 2,000 in 1950.

La Salle’s nine residence halls, representing facilities for some 800 students and a combined cost of $2.5 million were financed through the sale of U. S. Revenue Bonds. In addition, the College Union construction was similarly financed in 1958. These self-amortizing loans represent a significant portion of the post-war financing for physical expansion to date.

La Salle has received matching grants for physiology laboratory equipment and from the Atomic Energy Commission for biology laboratory equipment. Summer workshops in biology have been supported by the National Science Foundation and numerous individual grants have been received by faculty members.

Brother Thomas Warner, F.S.C., director of the library, recently received a grant of $25,494 for library materials. This in addition to $5,000 received a year ago for the same purpose.

To keep pace with the growing package of federal aid to students, La Salle established the Office of Financial Aid in 1965. Brother Martin Stark, F.S.C., was its founding director, succeeded by Brother Francis McCormick, F.S.C. this July. This office administers all student scholarship and grant programs, which include the National Defense Student Loan Program begun in 1958 and the Educational Opportunity Grants Program. In 1966-67, some 700 students were assisted by funds provided under the NDSL at La Salle.

The career planning and placement center administers the College Work Study Program, which during the past year gave 54 needy students 15 hours-a-week employment on campus during the school year. Each student may work 40 hours-a-week during vacation periods. The college provides 25% of the cost of this program, while 75% is federally financed.

In view of the growing importance of government support programs and with the realization that the U.S. Office of Education alone has nearly 90 higher education programs, the Board of Managers of the College approved a feasibility study in March 1967 to determine the means of funding the ambitious plans for the 1970’s and 80’s. Tamblyn and Brown, Inc., of New York City, consultants for support programs in higher education, were engaged to conduct the study.

Capital funds from all sources in the amount of approximately $6.5 million will be needed to implement the expansion program projected for 1970. A preliminary table prepared by Tamblyn & Brown, to highlight potential government support, appears below:
Dr. Rita J. Smyth, vice president of the Institute for Educational Planning, has completed a preliminary report relating to government support programs in conjunction with the Tamblyn and Brown study. Excerpts from the study’s recommendations appear below:

A. The Urban Study Center, approved by the College Council in April, may well be the single most important bond between La Salle and government agencies. Its value to the College and to the community are obvious; its future value to development activities are inestimable, particularly with involvement of La Salle professors and area leaders in the fields of business, marketing and industry.

Planners should bear in mind that the 89th and 90th Congresses, as well as the executive branch of the federal government, are increasingly creating educational legislation that will bring higher education’s skills to bear on social welfare problems. Community involvement is the key to successful government funding. With its new Center, La Salle is at the threshold of significant programs. Not only Title I of the Higher Education Act and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but programs in many other agencies will be applicable.

B. Government programs funding construction projects are usually predicated on expansion of enrollment. Projection of La Salle’s day session enrollment shows a slight decline in 1967-68 and 1968-69. (Evening and summer sessions’ projected increases, however, result in projected total enrollment increases).

C. To facilitate the first and second recommendations, it is suggested that there be established a coordinating committee, comprised of selected administrators and department chairmen, for government support programs.

D. Formalize and stress a program of government relations in the public relations department, with the assignment of government relations to the new development officer working out of the office of the vice president for public relations.

E. A concerted effort should be made by the College—where in keeping with its academic goals—to engage in inter-institutional cooperative projects. Federal funding may be available, and benefits for the College and higher education in the area may be derived.

F. A thorough study should be made of the following potential sources of funding for La Salle College. These sources have been selected from hundreds of possibilities in various agencies as ones that may particularly fit La Salle’s programs.

1. Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329, funds community service programs, such as may
Alumni should be aware of the

Delegation to a single member of the administrative staff the responsibility of outlining academic needs throughout the institution for audio-visual needs and preparation of a comprehensive proposal would be beneficial for the College's academic program.

7. La Salle officers should begin to establish dialogue with the National Foundations on the Arts and Humanities. In view of Congressional analysis of their programs, it is not known now what the status of their funding abilities will be in the future. As a liberal arts college, La Salle, however, may find future possibilities here—particularly for its drama offerings.

8. Middle States evaluators recommended additional scientific research by faculty, and faculty-student groups. As is known to administrative officers, these may be funded by the many programs of the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, National Institutes of Health.

9. At this point, it appears that the International Education Act, Public Law 89-698 again will not be funded. Nevertheless, the College is well advised to continue its liaison with the Division of Foreign Studies, Bureau of Higher Education.

10. The National Science Foundation also supports programs in atmospheric research. Contact, if not already made, should be established with the mathematical and physical sciences division of the National Science Foundation for the program in astronomy.

11. La Salle's excellent school of business would be well advised to establish close contact with the Department of Commerce and the Business and Defense Service Administration's bureaus of industrial analysis and marketing and services.

The foregoing are but a few of several programs which La Salle may wish to study and/or process in the near future. It is recognized that capital funding programs are extremely important to the future of the College; at the same time, funding programs for operating purposes that will free money for capital purposes and that meet academic goals are worthy of consideration.
need and rights of the church-related college

The establishment of the financial aid office; the opening of an Urban Study Center; the study conducted by Tamblyn and Brown, and the strengthening of the development department of the College through addition of more staff personnel, should combine to assure a more full participation in the federal aid programs for higher education.

The going will not be smooth and easy, however. Continuing attempts will be made to deprive the church related college, through legislation, of at least institutional participation in federal programs. In this regard we should become acquainted with the fact that the first amendment does not prohibit grants to the church related college where the primary effect fulfills the secular purpose.

Some state constitutions will continue to present obstacles to aid on the state level, but as in Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Commissioner of Education is given the power to by-pass these obstacles.

Fully exploited, the federal programs solve only a small percentage of the budget problems of the church related liberal arts college. When we rush off to Washington after finding that the grant is not too expensive to accept; when we find that accepting the money does not call for major adjustments in our programs; we note that changes in the objectives of philanthropic foundations may have just altered the source of the money rather than the amount. The philanthropic foundation has more important uses for its largess than to duplicate federal support programs.

Our alumni should be acutely aware of the needs and the rights of the church related college. They should be called upon to exert a much greater support effort, starting with their own contribution. Followed by their influence to encourage all other sources of support.

Uncle does like us—he's not about to disown his church-related relatives. This nation's brain power and security depend upon the total educational system—not merely on one segment.

One thing should be remembered, however: there are too many of us for Uncle to visit—we must go to him. Otherwise, "life without uncle" will have been largely of our own making.

Mr. McCloskey, who joined the La Salle staff in 1946, was named assistant to the president of the College in 1955 and has been vice president for public relations and director of development since 1959. He is also an associate professor of marketing, and holds degrees from La Salle and Temple University.
Jim Butler, Revisited

FAMILIAR TO all is the TIME Magazine cover story jinx, and who can forget the famous SPORTS ILLUSTRATED cover whammies—the Phillies in 1964 and the Dodgers in the 1966 World Series.

So it was not without some trepidation that LA SALLE chose to run a cover story on an incoming freshman in the 1963 fall issue.

True, we had chosen a ‘real winner’ in James A. Butler, an English honors student in high school with lofty College Board scores. But didn’t Mauch have all the ‘tools’ in ’64—didn’t the Dodgers have Sandy Koufax? We worried a lot!

Well, we shouldn’t have. Jim Butler is the rule who proves the exception, for not only was he an extraordinary scholar—third in his class with a near-perfect academic average—but also a leader in campus life.

Moreover, as if to contravert all of the journalistic Fates, he became La Salle’s first double winner of both Woodrow Wilson and Danforth graduate fellowships. He plans graduate studies this fall at Cornell University, where he and his new bride will make their home.

What has Jim to say of his four years at La Salle? He puts it this way:

In the first four years of its second century—the years that La Salle and I have shared—the College itself has undergone a tremendous change. In just four years, a vibrant Honors Program has been created. The College is changing to a more-than-Philadelphia-area school: three more dormitories in these four years. In these four years, it has been fashionable to say that La Salle is a good school on the verge of greatness—someplace in the last four years, it may well have passed from good to great.

In four years at the College, I too have changed: from a Republican to a Democrat, from a conservative to a liberal Catholic, from a person unsure of what he wanted to do in life, to a person who now wants to teach college because he has seen the tremendous influence good teachers can have.

As I finish this particular four-year relationship with the College, I can’t help but think that someday I’ll be back—hopefully as one of those dedicated faculty members—for I too love the place.

The following photographs—juxtaposed with some that appeared four years ago—give a glimpse of the closing days of an excellent undergraduate career.

La Salle, Summer, 1967

—continued
Jim Butler the freshman was shown taking frosh orientation exam (left), as a senior makes a debating point (center), receives award for work on Collegian (below), attends basketball game with then-fiancée Joanne Buck, and accepts academic awards from Brothers’ Provincial, Brother James Carey, F.S.C.
Jim received assist as frosh from librarian Brother Warner (below), while senior conducted English seminar for high school students (left), delivered a thoughtful valedictory address at commencement (lower left), and assists Joanne with traditional cake cutting at their June wedding.
Around Campus

Even Grandma Would Have Demurred

Record-holding Gwaltneys: New wrinkle on the horizon?

BEHIND EVERY successful man, there may well be a "good woman," like the book says.

The "self-made" men boil at the suggestion, but the most hardened among them will relent when the feminist slogan is applied to family men attending college.

It takes a good deal more than intelligence and physical stamina—the primary ingredients—to support a family and earn a college degree.

Above all, the feat requires that this extraordinary student have an extraordinary wife. For, as every scholar knows, the intellectual life is not to be fettered by such household preoccupations as shopping, junior's broken bike, that clogged rain spout, *ad infinitum*. Nor is the paternal vocation to be brooked by such academic concerns as term papers, final exams or long hours in the library's research department.

It's at this point of inner conflict that his wife becomes crucial to the college student's success or ultimate failure. She must be more than "understanding"—understanding alone will merely permit household duties to accumulate until hubby inevitably collapses under the herculean burden.
What is needed and frequently given is a determination equal to dad's, and a willingness by mom to fulfill the role of both parents for the academic "duration"—four years for day school students, six years if dad's an evening college student.

This dual role can and often does involve mom in chores that even grandmother would have thought unlikely (she may have scrubbed clothes on a washboard, but would have shrank from patching roofs and minor plumbing repairs).

It's not surprising that colleges and universities didn't get around to honoring mother's part in dad's achievement until just after World War Two, since the family-man-turned-student was a new phenomenon on the post-war campus.

La Salle was among the first in the nation to single-out the ladies for special recognition when the College held its first "Ph.T.—Putting Him Through" ceremony in 1955. Many schools have since adopted the annual event.

The ceremony held for the 14th annual time this spring is a carbon copy of the commencement exercise at which dad has his day: Brother Daniel Bernian, F.S.C., La Salle's president who was instrumental in the ceremony's inception when he was dean of students, confers the "degrees" on each wife, who proudly accepts her "diploma."

All this may sound slightly mawkish to every bachelor, but the girls love every moment of it and no husband has yet objected.

The La Salle recipients have ranged from Mrs. Bernard Gwaltney (who holds the Ph.T. record for siblings, 13) in 1962, to this year's honorary awardee, Mrs. William D. McDermott, whose husband must hold the mark for years in school (would you believe 20?).

"Take each semester as it comes, exam by exam, instead of looking at the whole thing and despairing," is how one wife suggests surviving the ordeal.

"I'd do it over again; the only bad thing about it is that it's kind of lonely," said another, bravely.

Perhaps the most characteristic comment, however, is that of a young day-student's better half: "I want whatever he wants, and he wants to get ahead."

Although the number of recipients has understandably declined since the post-Korean years (and ever-younger evening students bode fewer married night students), the idea will no doubt thrive as long as young marriages persist.

One new wrinkle may be on the horizon, however. Will the husband of the first female graduate—not far off now that coeds attend the evening division—receive a "Ph.T.—Putting Her Through"?

**Sciences Need Goals**

*A LEADING PSYCHIATRIST has called upon the public and its leaders to provide directions and goals to guide today's scientists.*

Dr. Daniel Blain, superintendent of the Philadelphia (Byberry) State Hospital and past president of the American Psychiatric Association, gave his remarks to 800 graduates at the College's 104th annual commencement exercise attended by some 10,000 parents and friends in Convention Hall in June.

Dr. Blain and the Rev. Bernard Haring, C.S.S.R., professor at Yale University, received honorary Doctor of Laws degrees at the ceremonies. Brother Daniel Bernian, F.S.C., Ph.D., La Salle president, conferred the bachelor's degrees upon the graduates and the honorary degrees.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony L. Ostheimer, Ph.D., pastor of Holy Child Church, delivered the sermon at the Baccalaureate Mass held in McCarthy Stadium on the campus, and was presiding officer at the commencement.

Twenty-eight graduates received U.S. Army Commissions at swearing-in ceremonies conducted by Col. Stephen Silvasy, professor of military science at La Salle, during the commencement. Two U.S. Marine Corps commissions were also given.

Dr. Blain cited the "explosion of knowledge" and the "population explosion" as key problems facing mankind today.

"We (psychiatrists) have concluded" he said, "that as an organized science and profession we have a responsibility and some interest in skills that can be applied as we join other like-minded people in trying to solve these problems. It is my thesis that all of us here today have a similar responsibility and much to contribute.

"It is hard to see how the patterns of society, in peace and war, getting and spending, health and adjustments, can change without fundamental changes in the nature of man," Dr. Blain asserted. "As yet there appears little hint as to even the directions we should go. The medical and social sciences need the help of all other disciplines and leaders in society to solve these problems.

---continued
"There is no single way," he continued. "Our responsible leaders—and I would broaden the base from the U.S. Chief Executive to our elected members of Congress, our Governor and state legislature, City Council and others—must do what the humblest individual citizen must do . . . that is, examine our position, our goals, our resources, our responsibilities, our opportunities, our fundamental desires, in the cold light of day, and I mean in the realistic atmosphere of objective, unbiased information, as well as with the enthusiasm of romantic idealism."

"In our reappraisals," he added, "we must have the fortitude, courage, good judgement, and political independence to change our direction, our speed, our goals and even reverse ourselves when careful considerations of all these things demand that we do so."

Msgr. Ostheimer called for a "re-emphasis on personal responsibility" and decried those who "would claim freedom for themselves but deny it to others."

"In our day," he stated, "when more and more we move toward a depersonalized society, when individuals are submerged in the 'in' group, when more and more emphasis is being placed upon group action and interaction, there is need for a re-emphasis on personal responsibility."

"Despite all the talk of freedom of thought and independence of action," Msgr. Ostheimer continued, "are we not in a strait-jacketed generation? The clothes we wear, the shows we see, the books we read, the company we keep, the way we think, and act, and live—are we not forever following the crowd?"

"And even those who believe themselves to be rebels, and independent, are they not following their own leaders?" he asked. "Ours is a so-called 'new generation'—carefree, disrespectful, so often irresponsible, so boastfully independent, and yet so craven in imitation."

"So many today would claim freedom for themselves but deny it to others," Msgr. Ostheimer concluded. "They criticize most cruelly, but resent the least criticism of themselves. We have the would-be intellectual, proud and arrogant, forgetful of the fact that humility and respect for truth are basic ingredients of sound scholarship. Self confidence is one thing; intellectual pride, another. Learning is not necessarily wisdom. All too many have not learned to associate responsibility with freedom, and this becomes a root source of so many problems facing the Church today in this time after Vatican II."

---

Protest Charitably

The president of Swarthmore College decried "civil disobedience being used indiscriminately to promote almost any cause" during his address to a La Salle audience.

Dr. Courtney C. Smith, president of Swarthmore, gave his remarks to some 400 honor students, faculty and parents during the annual Founder's Day honors convocation in May.

Dr. Smith and the Rev. Charles F. Gorman, pastor of St. Francis of Assisi Church, Springfield, and first full-time chaplain of La Salle (1948-52), received honorary Doctor of Law degrees conferred by Brother Daniel Bernian, F.S.C., Ph.D., president. Some 35 student prizes for academic excellence were also given at the convocation.

Three awards for "distinguished teaching" to day faculty members, made possible by a $1500 grant by the Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Foundation, and an evening faculty award were given at the traditional Founder's Day Dinner.

Recipients of the 1967 Lindback Awards, which included a $750 stipend were Ugo Donini, professor of history; Joseph P. Cairo, assistant professor of economics, and Brother Gregory Paul, F.S.C., Ph.D., professor of chemistry and a former president of La Salle (1945-52). Brother Paul, as a member of the Christian Brothers, received a medal in lieu of a cash award.

Gerald A. Tremblay, an English professor in La Salle's evening college and chairman of La Salle High School's English department, received the evening school's "distinguished teaching" award, presented by Brother Emery Mollenhauer, F.S.C., Ph.D., evening division dean.

"With the matter of protest, I agree," Dr. Smith said, "but often its techniques carry pressure or force not very different from violence . . . such as efforts to break-up speaking engagements at places like Harvard, Berkeley, Dartmouth and Howard, to name a few. I'm not talking about student riots over food or panty-raids or row-bottoms."

"Today," he continued, "civil disobedience is being used to promote almost any cause. The key word in these protests is 'demand'—this says, in effect, that only one idea or point of view is acceptable."

—continued on page 29
America's colleges and universities, recipients of billions in Federal funds, have a new relationship:

Life with Uncle

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

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

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

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

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

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

► The nation's undergraduates would lose more than 800,000 scholarships, loans, and work-study grants, amounting to well over $300 million.

► Colleges and universities would lose some $2 billion which now supports research on the campuses. Consequently some 50 per cent of America's science faculty members would be without support for their research. They would lose the summer salaries which they have come to depend on—and, in some cases, they would lose part of their salaries for the other nine months, as well.

► The big government-owned research laboratories which several universities operate under contract would be closed. Although this might end some management headaches for the universities, it would also deprive thousands of scientists and engineers of employment and the institutions of several million dollars in overhead reimbursements and fees.

► The newly established National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—for which faculties have waited for years—would collapse before its first grants were spent.

► Planned or partially constructed college and university buildings, costing roughly $2.5 billion, would be delayed or abandoned altogether.

► Many of our most eminent universities and medical schools would find their annual budgets sharply reduced—in some cases by more than 50 per cent. And the 68 land-grant institutions would lose Fed-
eral institutional support which they have been receiving since the nineteenth century.

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

The federal government is now the “Big Spender” in the academic world. Last year, Washington spent more money on the nation’s campuses than did the 50 state governments combined. The National Institutes of Health alone spent more on educational and research projects than any one state allocated for higher education. The National Science Foundation, also a Federal agency, awarded more funds to colleges and universities than did all the business corporations in America. And the U.S. Office of Education’s annual expenditure in higher education of $1.2 billion far exceeded all gifts from private foundations and alumni. The $5 billion or so that the Federal government will spend on campuses this year constitutes more than 25 per cent of higher education’s total budget.

About half of the Federal funds now going to academic institutions support research and research-related activities—and, in most cases, the research is in the sciences. Most often an individual scholar, with his institution’s blessing, applies directly to a Federal agency for funds to support his work. A professor of chemistry, for example, might apply to the National Science Foundation for funds to pay for salaries (part of his own, his collaborators’, and his research technicians’), equipment, graduate-student stipends, travel, and anything else he could justify as essential to his work. A panel of his scholarly peers from colleges and universities, assembled by NSF, meets periodically in Washington to evaluate his and other applications. If the panel members approve, the professor usually receives his grant and his college or university receives a percentage of the total amount to meet its overhead costs. (Under several Federal programs, the institution itself can request funds to help construct buildings and grants to strengthen or initiate research programs.)

The other half of the Federal government’s expenditure in higher education is for student aid, for books and equipment, for classroom buildings, laboratories, and dormitories, for overseas projects, and—recently, in modest amounts—for the general strengthening of the institution.

There is almost no Federal agency which does not provide some funds for higher education. And there are few activities on a campus that are not eligible for some kind of government aid.

Clearly our colleges and universities now depend so heavily on Federal funds to help pay for salaries, tuition, research, construction, and operating costs that any significant decline in Federal support would disrupt the whole enterprise of American higher education.

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

Others minimize the hazards. Public institutions, they point out, have always been vulnerable in this

Every institution, however small or remote, feels the effects of the Federal role in higher education.
sense—yet look how they’ve flourished. Congressmen, in fact, have been conscientious in their approach to Federal support of higher education; the problem is that standards other than those of the universities and colleges could become the determining factors in the nature and direction of Federal support. In any case, the argument runs, all academic institutions depend on the good will of others to provide the support that insures freedom. McGeorge Bundy, before he left the White House to head the Ford Foundation, said flatly: “American higher education is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds.” Such funds, he argued, actually have enhanced freedom by enlarging the opportunity of institutions to act; they are no more tainted than are dollars from other sources; and the way in which they are allocated is closer to academic tradition than is the case with nearly all other major sources of funds.

The issue of Federal control notwithstanding, Federal support of higher education is taking its place alongside military budgets and farm subsidies as one of the government’s essential activities. All evidence indicates that such is the public’s will. Education has always had a special worth in this country, and each new generation sets the valuation higher. In a recent Gallup Poll on national goals, Americans listed education as having first priority. Governors, state legislators, and Congressmen, ever sensitive to voter attitudes, are finding that the improvement of education is not only a noble issue on which to stand, but a winning one.

The increased Federal interest and support reflect another fact: the government now relies as heavily on the colleges and universities as the institutions do on the government. President Johnson told an audience at Princeton last year that in “almost every field of concern, from economics to national security, the academic community has become a central instrument of public policy in the United States.”

Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education (an organization which often speaks in behalf of higher education), agrees. “Our history attests to the vital role which colleges and universities have played in assuring the nation’s security and progress, and our present circumstances magnify rather than diminish the role,” he says. “Since the final responsibility for our collective security and welfare can reside only in the Federal government, a close partnership between government and higher education is essential.”

The partnership indeed exists. As a report of the American Society of Biological Chemists has said, “the condition of mutual dependence be-
tween the Federal government and institutions of higher learning and research is one of the most profound and significant developments of our time."

Directly and indirectly, the partnership has produced enormous benefits. It has played a central role in this country's progress in science and technology—and hence has contributed to our national security, our high standard of living, the lengthening life span, our world leadership. One analysis credits to education 40 per cent of the nation's growth in economic productivity in recent years.

Despite such benefits, some thoughtful observers are concerned about the future development of the government-campus partnership. They are asking how the flood of Federal funds will alter the traditional missions of higher education, the time-honored responsibility of the states, and the flow of private funds to the campuses. They wonder if the give and take between equal partners can continue, when one has the money and the other "only the brains."

Problems already have arisen from the dynamic and complex relationship between Washington and the academic world. How serious and complex such problems can become is illustrated by the current controversy over the concentration of Federal research funds on relatively few campuses and in certain sections of the country.

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

The wartime emergency obviously justified this concentration of funds. When the war ended, however, the lopsided distribution of Federal research funds did not. In fact, it has continued right up to the present, with 29 institutions receiving more than 50 per cent of Federal research dollars.

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

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

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

Eventually, Congress may have to act. In so doing, it is almost certain to displease, and perhaps hurt, some institutions. To the pessimist, the situation is a sign of troubled times ahead. To the optimist, it is the democratic process at work.
**compete for limited funds**

on research and on the teaching of undergraduates.

Wisconsin's Representative Henry Reuss conducted a Congressional study of the situation. Subsequently he said: "University teaching has become a sort of poor relation to research. I don't quarrel with the goal of excellence in science, but it is pursued at the expense of another important goal—excellence of teaching. Teaching suffers and is going to suffer more."

The problem is not limited to universities. It is having a pronounced effect on the smaller liberal arts colleges, the women's colleges, and the junior colleges—all of which have as their primary function the teaching of undergraduates. To offer a first-rate education, the colleges must attract and retain a first-rate faculty, which in turn attracts good students and financial support. But undergraduate colleges can rarely compete with Federally supported universities in faculty salaries, fellowship awards, research opportunities, and plant and equipment. The president of one of the best undergraduate colleges says: "When we do get a young scholar who skillfully combines research and teaching abilities, the universities lure him from us with the promise of a high salary, light teaching duties, frequent leaves, and almost anything else he may want."

Leland Haworth, whose National Science Foundation distributes more than $300 million annually for research activities and graduate programs on the campuses, disagrees. "I hold little or no brief," he says, "for the allegation that Federal support of research has detracted seriously from undergraduate teaching. I dispute the contention heard in some quarters that certain of our major universities have become giant research factories concentrating on Federally sponsored research projects to the detriment of their educational functions." Most university scholars would probably support Mr. Haworth's contention that teachers who conduct research are generally better teachers, and that the research enterprise has infused science education with new substance and vitality.

To get perspective on the problem, compare university research today with what it was before World War II. A prominent physicist calls the pre-war days "a horse-and-buggy period." In 1930, colleges and universities spent less than $20 million on scientific research, and that came largely from private foundations, corporations, and endowment income. Scholars often built their equipment from ingeniously adapted scraps and spare machine parts. Graduate students considered it compensation enough just to be allowed to participate.

Some three decades and $125 billion later, there is hardly an academic scientist who does not feel pressure to get government funds. The chairman of one leading biology department admits that "if a young scholar doesn't have a grant when he comes here, he had better get one within a year or so or he's out; we have no funds to support his research."

Considering the large amounts of money available for research and graduate training, and recognizing that the publication of research findings is still the primary criterion for academic promotion, it is not surprising that the faculties of most universities spend a substantial part of their energies in those activities.

Federal agencies are looking for ways to ease the problem. The National Science Foundation, for example, has set up a new program which will make grants to undergraduate colleges for the improvement of science instruction.

More help will surely be forthcoming.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Congress has moved to lessen the disparity between support of the humanities and social sciences on the one hand and support of the physical and biological sciences on the other. It established the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—a move which, despite a pitifully small first-year allocation of funds, offers some encouragement. And close observers of the Washington scene predict that the social sciences, which have been receiving some Federal support, are destined to get considerably more in the next few years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So successful was the new relationship that it continued to flourish after the war. Federal research funds poured onto the campuses from military agencies, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. The amounts of money increased spectacularly. At the beginning of the war the Federal government spent less than $200 million a year for all research and development. By 1950, the Federal “r & d” expenditure totaled $1 billion.

The Soviet Union’s launching of Sputnik jolted
Even those campuses which traditionally stand apart from government find it hard to resist Federal aid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So far, for practical and obvious reasons, neither the President nor Congress has met the problem head-on. But the battle has been joined, anyway. Some cases challenging grants to church-related col-

A new phase in government-campus relationships
Is higher education losing control of its destiny?

Leges are now in the courts. And Congress is being pressed to pass legislation that would permit a citizen to challenge, in the Federal courts, the Congressional acts relating to higher education.

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

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

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

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

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

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

To most governors and state legislators, the Federal grants are a mixed blessing. Although they have helped raise the quality and capabilities of state institutions, the grants have also raised the pressure on state governments to increase their appropriations for higher education, if for no other reason than to fulfill the matching requirement of many Federal awards. But even funds which are not channeled through the state agencies and do not require the state to provide matching funds can give impetus to increased appropriations for higher education. Federal research grants to individual scholars, for example, may make it necessary for the state to provide more faculty members to get the teaching done.

“Many institutions not only do not look a gift horse in the mouth; they do not even pause to note whether it is a horse or a boa constrictor.”—John Gardner
Last year, 38 states and territories joined the Compact for Education, an interstate organization designed to provide "close and continuing consultation among our several states on all matters of education." The operating arm of the Compact will gather information, conduct research, seek to improve standards, propose policies, "and do such things as may be necessary or incidental to the administration of its authority. . . ."

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

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

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

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

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

The recommendation went unheeded.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Colleges and universities believe, for the most

Some people fear that the colleges and universities are in danger of being remade in the Federal image.
When basic objectives differ, whose will prevail?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

However distasteful the thought may be to those who oppose further Federal involvement in higher education, the fact is that there is no other way of getting the job done—to train the growing number of students, to conduct the basic research necessary to continued scientific progress, and to cope with society’s most pressing problems.

Tuition, private contributions, and state allocations together fall far short of meeting the total cost of American higher education. And as costs rise, the gap is likely to widen. Tuition has finally passed the $2,000 mark in several private colleges and universities, and it is rising even in the publicly supported institutions. State governments have increased their appropriations for higher education dramatically, but there are scores of other urgent needs competing for state funds. Gifts from private foundations, cor-
corporations, and alumni continue to rise steadily, but the increases are not keeping pace with rising costs.

Hence the continuation and probably the enlargement of the partnership between the Federal government and higher education appears to be inevitable. The real task facing the nation is to make it work.

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

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

THE TAXPAYING PUBLIC, and particularly alumni and alumnae, will play a crucial role in the evolution of the partnership. The degree of their understanding and support will be reflected in future legislation. And, along with private foundations and corporations, alumni and other friends of higher education bear a special responsibility for providing colleges and universities with financial support. The growing role of the Federal government, says the president of a major oil company, makes corporate contributions to higher education more important than ever before; he feels that private support enables colleges and universities to maintain academic balance and to preserve their freedom and independence. The president of a university agrees: “It is essential that the critical core of our colleges and universities be financed with non-Federal funds.”

“What is going on here,” says McGeorge Bundy, “is a great adventure in the purpose and performance of a free people.” The partnership between higher education and the Federal government, he believes, is an experiment in American democracy.

Essentially, it is an effort to combine the forces of our educational and political systems for the common good. And the partnership is distinctly American—boldly built step by step in full public view, inspired by visionaries, tested and tempered by honest skeptics, forged out of practical political compromise.

Does it involve risks? Of course it does. But what great adventure does not? Is it not by risk-taking that free—and intelligent—people progress?
“It is tragic,” Dr. Smith asserted, “that this point of view has found a home in our colleges and universities. The new protest says that the idea is not enough, force is necessary. This is alien to the idea of academic life.”

“Visual and physical protest, while having a constitutional basis in public life, is anti-thetical to the nature and function of an academic community,” he added. “Reason must be our approach to every major problem. Our decisions must be informed. One cannot forget about the manner of protest, even when the matter is good.”

“Our protests must also be compassionate and charitable,” Dr. Smith said, “not just for the underprivileged, but the more difficult kind—for those who appear to be the obstacles to our aims.

“Colleges must have a commitment to the rational process and orderly behavior,” he concluded. “We must defend and strengthen the right to dissent, but the means should not be force or violence but reasonable and rational expression... intelligence governed by conscience informed by intellect.”

**New Lot Acquired**

**La Salle College** has acquired a 3.4 acre property near the college’s 20th and Olney ave. campus.

The land adjacent to the historic Belfield Estate was acquired in May for $175,000 from the estate of the late Sarah Logan Wister Starr.

The property is the largest acquired by La Salle since 1957, when the College purchased the six-acre tract that lies between Olney ave. and the land acquired this spring.

“La Salle plans to use the property to carry out its campus development plans, which will involve a $25 million expansion program over the next 15 years,” said Brother Daniel Bernian, F.S.C., president. Details of the campus master plan are expected to be ready late this year, he added.

The 148,000 square feet of land is bordered on the west by Wister st., on the east by 20th st., and by Cottage Lane (intersecting with Olney ave. at 20th st.) on the north.

On the property’s southern extremity lies the Belfield Estate, which has been designated an historic site and is rich in U.S. colonial history. It is now the home of Dr. and Mrs. Daniel Blain. Mrs. Blain is a daughter of the late Mrs. Starr.

The U.S. Department of the Interior named Belfield an historic landmark in 1966. Charles Willson Peale, the distinguished American painter, made his home on the estate from 1810-1826. Mrs. Blain’s great-great-grandfather purchased the tract from Peale in 1826. The total area, which lies between La Salle and Germantown Hospital, consists of 14 acres—much of it gardens, boxwood hedges and an orangery planned and planted by Peale.

“In its plans for the area,” Brother Daniel stated, “La Salle will give full consideration to the attractiveness of the adjacent historic site.”

**Court Coach Named**

**James F. (Jim) Harding**, who has led every high school and college team he has handled to its greatest record in history, was named head basketball coach at La Salle this spring. He was signed to a four year contract.

The 38-year-old University of Iowa graduate replaces Joe Heyer, who resigned after serving as head coach for two years.

Harding’s collegiate head coaching record includes one year at Loyola University (New Orleans) and three years as coach and athletic director at Gannon College in Erie, Pa.

His Loyola team finished with a 16-9 record in 1957-58. That team finished third in the Sugar Bowl Tourney and lost to Oklahoma State in the first round of the NCAA Tournament.

At Gannon, Harding’s three year record (1963-66) was 57-12 including consecutive 20-3 seasons his last two years. His 1964-65 team ranked sixth among the nation’s small colleges. He was chosen “Coach of the Year” in Pennsylvania colleges the following season, as Gannon finished seventh nationally. Two of his Gannon teams finished in the nation’s top ten, defensively.

Harding resigned from Gannon in 1966 to accept an executive business position in Milwaukee. He remained active in basketball this past season, however, as a scout, clinic speaker and television commentator.
Brother Martin, a native of Cumberland, Md., has served as the College’s Financial Aid Director since joining the La Salle staff in 1965.

A graduate of La Salle College (1940) and Villanova University, where he received a master’s degree in 1943, Brother Martin became a member of the Christian Brothers—the teaching order which conducts the College—in 1932. He has also pursued advanced studies in school administration at Boston College and the Catholic University.

Urban Center Launched

La Salle has established an Urban Studies and Community Service Center, which will seek to “aid the surrounding community in developing proposals for self-help.”

The center will also aim to “focus the development of the other educational, health, religious and welfare institutions in the area,” according to John McNelis, executive director of the new center.

The center has as its principal areas of interest the East Germantown, Oak Lane, West Olney and Logan sections bordering the college campus.

A series of community workshops was among the first projects initiated by the center. The workshops were held each Saturday through June 10 on the campus.

The center is conducting a special program for underprivileged children this summer at the Stenton Child Care Center, Tulpehocken st. near Stenton ave.

Sponsored by a $30,939 federal grant, administered by the Philadelphia Public School District and Philadelphia’s Department of Public Welfare, the 10-week program began June 26.

The project, entitled “Stenton Explorations,” is one of eight special programs being sponsored by the school district throughout the city this summer.

Three other La Salle professors—Dr. Thomas M. Coffee, chairman of the sociology department, and Richard T. Geruson and John J. Dall, assistant professors of economics—planned the subject matter of the program.

Sixteen college students serve as tutors in three major areas of instruction. “Cultural Enrichment,” “Arts and Crafts,” and “Languages.” Three La Salle professors—Dr. Leo D. Rudnytsky, associate professor of history, Dr. Bernhardt B. Blumenthal, assistant professor of German, and Peter Frank, English instructor, supervise the programs.

Ten of the students are La Salle undergraduates, five are students at Immaculata College, and another is from Clark College in Atlanta, Ga.

“One of the purposes of this program,” McNelis said, “is to provide attention for these children by young adults. This attention is imperative if they are to have the proper motivation and attitude toward education and an understanding of themselves and what is going on around them. It will also give La Salle an opportunity to learn how it can better serve the community.”
Managing Director Dan Rodden, '41, confers with Music Theatre '67 staff (clockwise) Dennis Cunningham, '58, Anthony Mecoli, Sidney MacLeod, and Jean Williams on new season, which concludes with “The Music Man” Aug. 4 through Sept. 3.

Fr. Wrigley To India

THE REV. JOHN E. WRIGLEY, Ph.D., chairman of the history department at La Salle, this June departed on a State Department educational exchange program in India.

Father Wrigley, who is among some 50 educators taking part in the program, will spend eight weeks in India. Enroute home, he will also visit the Soviet Union for 10 days.

The basic purpose of the program, which is sponsored jointly by the State Department and the U.S. Educational Association, is to “increase mutual understanding between peoples of the U.S. and India through the exchange of students, teachers, lecturers, and research scholars.”

Father Wrigley and other scholars will visit several cities in India, while studying the land and people, social problems and institutions, education, modernization and industrialization, democratic processes, and the arts.

New Dean Named

BROTHER CHARLES GRESH, F.S.C., instructor in English at the College, has been appointed dean of men.

He succeeds Brother G. John Owens, F.S.C., who held the post since 1963. Brother Owens retains the position of director of rostering, a post he held consecutively while dean.

Brother Gresh became a member of the Christian Brothers in 1951. He earned master’s degrees in English from La Salle (1955) and the University of Pittsburgh (1962), respectively. He also holds a master’s degree in theology from La Salle (1955).

H. E. W. Library Grant

La Salle’s library has received a $25,494 grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it was announced by Brother Thomas Warner, F.S.C., director of the library.

The grant, awarded under the Higher Education Act of 1965, is one of more than 4,000 totaling some $24 million given this summer to college and university libraries across the nation.

Brother Warner said the grant will enable the College to purchase some 3,000 new volumes, based upon an average cost today of approximately $8 per book.

“Basically, La Salle’s grant will be used to strengthen our reference and periodicals collections,” Brother Warner added.

MOVING?

If your mailing address will change in the next 2-3 months, or if this issue is addressed to your son and he no longer maintains his permanent address at your home, please help us keep our mailing addresses up-to-date by:

1 PRINT your full name, class year and new address on the opposite form, and

2 Attach the label from the back cover of this issue and mail to the Alumni Office, La Salle College, Phila., Penna. 19141.

ATTACH LABEL HERE
'01
Charles W. Naulty, M.D., died in Perth Amboy, N. J., in March. He had been honored earlier this year by the Alumni Medical Society as its oldest living member.

'26
Francis J. Brackland, M.D., distinguished psychiatrist of the Institute of Living, Hartford, Conn., has received yet another honor. He was given the 1967 Jefferson Medical College Alumni Achievement Award this spring. The past-president of the American Psychiatric Association has received an honorary degree from La Salle, the college's Centennial Medal, the Alumni Association's Signum Fidei Medal and the University of Notre Dame's Laetare Medal.

'28
Angelo D. Guglielmelli, M.D., was honored recently by the private duty nurses in the Trenton, N. J., area at their seventh annual awards dinner. Dr. Guglielmelli is chief surgeon at Hamilton Hospital there.

'36
Thomas P. Callan, lab head at the Philadelphia plant of Rohm and Haas Company, has been certified as a quality engineer by the American Society of Quality Control. Joseph A. McTeer, Esq. died in April.

'48
William A. Dondero

'49
Andrew Corea has been appointed City Purchasing Agent in Camden, N. J. by Mayor Alfred R. Pierce. He resigned from the Camden City Council to accept the position. William A. Dondero has been appointed director of industrial relations at the Pomona, N. J. plant of the Lenox China Co. William F. X. Coffey, M.D., has been elected president of the Catholic Philopatrian Literary Institute. James M. Gallaagher, vice principal and athletic director at Central Bucks (Pa.) High School, was appointed principal of the new Central Bucks High School-East to be constructed in Buckingham Township.

'50
William J. Brophy has been named director of the department of police in New Castle Co., Del. Joseph R. McDonald recently addressed the Notre Dame of Bethlehem (Pa.) Women's Club on "The Role of the Catholic Layman". Thomas J. Shusted, Esq., a member of the Camden County, N. J., board of freeholders was guest speaker at the Knights of Columbus, Lindenwold Annual Communion Breakfast.

'51
L. Thomas Reifsteck

L. Thomas Reifsteck, director of career planning and placement at the College, has been elected vice president of college relations for the Middle Atlantic Placement Association. Samuel M. Winnephore has been appointed sales engineer of the TRW Electronic Components, Camden, N. J.

The annual joint reunions of classes; class of '17 in foreground.
Kane Elected Alumni President

Daniel H. Kane, '49, was elected president of the Alumni Association in the spring balloting.

Kane, who lives in suburban Drexel Hill, with his wife Anne and two of their three children (their oldest son is in the Air Force), is principal of the Stephen A. Douglas School in Philadelphia. The founding secretary of the Suburban West Alumni Chapter, he holds a M.Ed. degree from Temple University. He has served on the Alumni Admissions and the leadership conference committees and was chairman of the last year's Signum Fidei committee.

Elected with Kane were incubent vice president Harry J. White, '54, and incumbent treasurer, Nicholas P. Dienna, '56.

Kane's early appointments include James J. Kenyon as general chairman of Homecoming Week-End, Raymond P. Loftus, chairman of the Stag Reunion, J. Russell Cullen, Jr., chairman of the Homecoming Dinner-Dance, and H. Peter Gillingham, chairman of Signum Fidei selection committee.
by the American Board of Internal Medicine. Sterling has been appointed an associate in medicine at the University of Pennsylvania. Birth: Venard A. Haubert and wife, a son, Paul.

'57

John J. Adair was promoted to senior data processing officer at the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Co. Victor D. Johansson was promoted to assistant vice president of the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Co. and appointed manager of the bank's Harbison Avenue office. Robert Romano was named assistant business administrator for the Centennial School district in Bucks County, Pa. Arthur W. Simmons has received a grant from the National Science Foundation for graduate studies in biological and earth sciences at Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Ore. John A. Smith, assistant professor of psychology at the College has been named head coach of the soccer team. Army Major Anthony C. Spodobalski is serving with the Fifth Transportation Command in Viet Nam. Births: Patrick Bannigan and wife, Barbara, their third child and first son, Christopher. Joseph Mahon and wife, Barbara, their sixth child, Nancy Cecelia.
Army Capt. Matthew A. Bowe is serving in Vietnam with the Fourth Infantry Division. Thomas J. Fitzgerald has been named sales promotion manager of Automatic Retailers of America. Paul Horton has been appointed chairman of the Beverly City, N.J., planning board. Martin F. Nev has been named administrator of the principal of the Chesterfield elementary school, in Willingboro, N.J. Thomas J. Schneider, M.D., is serving with the Air Force at Nha Trang AB, Vietnam. Marriage: James R. Fogacci to Renee Paula Breaux.

Nicholas Casullo has been appointed assistant director of Bucks County (Pa.) Opportunity Council. Capt. John J. Murray has received his M.S. degree in industrial management through the Air Force Institute of Technology's Minuteman Education Program at Minot AFB, N.D., and has been promoted to the rank of Capt. William R. Petraitis of Levittown (Pa.) has been promoted to group leader in the development laboratory of the Rohm and Haas Philadelphia plant. Rev. Salvatore J. Petrosi was ordained to the priesthood by His Eminence John Cardinal Krol, on May 20. Robert J. Schreiber received his M.B.A. degree from Temple University in June. Robert Watson has been named to the Pan American soccer team and to the 1968 U.S. Olympic Team. Birth: Anthony C. Murdocca and wife, Lorraine, a son, David Antony.

George H. Benz received his M.D. degree from the University of Pittsburgh and has accepted a surgical internship at Presbyterian University Hospital in Pittsburgh. William G. Cochran, Jay H. Holtzman, John C. Incarvito, Jr., Elliot Menkowitz, Paul E. Petit, and William J. Wishner were granted their M.D. degrees from Temple University Health Science Center. Cochran will intern in the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Norfolk, Va. Holtzman will go to Highland General Hospital in Oakland, Calif. Menkowitz will intern with the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Baltimore. Petit will intern at the U.S. Naval Hospital in St. Albans, N.Y. Incarvito and Wishner will remain at Temple Hospital. Richard R. Cavanaugh, Thomas J. Hallinan, John J. Di Pietro, and Manuel M. Luz were granted the doctors degree in dental surgery at Temple University School of Dentistry. William J. Kutogiis, Jr., has been promoted to Capt. in the U.S. Air Force. William P. Logan has been awarded U.S. Air Force pilot's wings upon graduation at Vance AFB, Okla. Richard W. Serfass, First Lt., USAF, is serving in a Minuteman ICBM system unit at Whiteman AFB, Mo. Marriage: George H. Benz to Joann Senmiller. Richard W. Serfass to Theresa A. MacIliwraith. Birth: David Swankowski and wife, Barbara, a son, Steven Gerard.

Howard C. De Martini has been named an economist on the staff of the Hudson River Valley Commission in New York. Joseph Di Norscia was elected to the board of directors of Mushroom Transportation Co., Inc., and named secretary-treasurer of the corporation in West Chester, Pa. Vincent Erbecke recently returned from service in Vietnam, where he was awarded the Bronze Star. Paul Gallagher has been appointed head basketball coach at Msgr. Bonner High School. Thomas J. Gaul received his M.B.A. degree in marketing and international marketing from Seton Hall University. John J. Guerin has been appointed controller of Sylvan Pools, Doylestown, Pa. Charles N. Hug, territory representative at Xerox Corp.'s Philadelphia-West branch, was graduated recently from the company's national sales development center in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Steven G. Kelsen is vice president of the undergraduate research society at Hahnemann Medical College. James J. Kirschke, a double amputee, was awarded a Bronze Star at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, for heroic achievement in Vietnam. Peter C. Moore was promoted to Army Capt. near Nha Dal, Vietnam. Ralph F. Perkins is serving in Vietnam as a military advisor. William G. Scott has been promoted to procedures & methods coordinator in the systems development and industrial engineering department at the Rohm & Haas Philadelphia Plant. William J. Simpson, a Capt. in the Marine Corps, recently completed a tour of duty at Da Nang, Vietnam. Walter H. Van Buren is an associate of Reese and Company, Inc., agency of the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. Joseph F. Wederman has joined the operations staff of Sealtest Foods' Philadelphia data center. Birth: Ralph F. Perkins and wife, Jean, a son, Michael.

Albert C. Banfe was awarded silver wings upon graduation from the U.S. Navigation School at Mathers AFB, Calif. James B. Hennessy completed a helicopter pilot
'66

RICHARD BATER had a story entitled "North" published in the November 1966 issue of Catholic Boy Magazine. The editors of the magazine chose the story as their best of the year and entered it in the Catholic press annual awards contest. RICHARD M. CRITCHFIELD has been commissioned as a Second Lt. in the U.S. Air Force upon graduation from Officer Training School at Lackland AFB, Texas, and has been assigned to Vandenberg AFB, Calif. HARRY J. DADDERFITY, Jr., territory representative at Xerox Corp.'s Fort Washington branch, was graduated recently from the company's national sales development center in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. MAX J. DOBLES was commissioned a Second Lt. after graduating from the Infantry Officer Candidate School, Ft. Benning, Ga. JOHN J. KISZKA has been commissioned a Second Lt. in the U.S. Air Force upon graduation from Officer Training School at Lackland AFB, Tex., and has recently completed a training course for weapons controllers at Tyndall AFB, Fla. GEORGE C. LENNOX has entered U.S. Air Force pilot training at Laredo AFB, Tex. WILLIAM P. MCLAUGHLIN was commissioned an Army Second Lt. after graduating from the Infantry Officer Candidate School, Ft. Benning, Ga. ANTHONY G. MICHAELS has been commissioned a Second Lt. in the U.S. Air Force upon graduation from Officer Training School at Lackland AFB, Tex., and has been assigned to Lowry AFB, Colo. THOMAS E. PIERCE completed a finance officer orientation course at the Army Finance School, Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Ind. HARRY R. SILETTE, Jr., has been graduated from the four week logistics management course at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, and has been assigned to Tinker AFB, Okla. WILLIAM J. TOTH is a Second Lt. in the Marine Corps at Quantico, Va. JOSEPH C. WOOD is serving with the Peace Corps in Colombia, S.A. STANLEY ZELENSKI has been commissioned a Second Lt. in the U.S. Air Force upon graduation from Officer Training School at Lackland AFB, Tex., and has been assigned to Chanute AFB, Ill. Marriage: FRANK J. MAY to Virginia Gates. Birth: To ALLEN T. FOX and wife, Abby, a son, Allen Thomas.


Dave McGrath / premiere performer

David J. McGrath, '60, was a softly-spoken, calm young man from a distinguished Rhode Island family (he is the son of the late J. Howard McGrath, U.S. Attorney General under President Truman) when an undergraduate at La Salle. He still is. But soon after graduation he leaped into the glamorous, action-world of motion picture promotion. As Metro-Goldwyn Mayer's top promotion man in one of the world's culture capitals, New York, his is a job many folks think they'd do without pay; but most couldn't stand up under the pace and pressure. Before, during, and after the recent world premiere of MGM's "The Dirty Dozen," Dave and his staff squired more than 150 East Coast critics for three days of hob-nobbing with the film's all-male cast, which includes Lee Marvin, (photo background), Ernest Borgnine, Telly Sevalas, Robert Ryan, and movie newcomer Jim Brown, former NFL gridiron great. For Dave, however, it's not quite a picnic. Too often, it is coping with one or more of the 999 details that make a successful opening. He, his vivacious wife, Ruth Ann, and their three children, make their home in northern New Jersey.
The Drs. Connolly

When Look Magazine recently published a pictorial account of life and near-death in a battlefield hospital ("A Marine's Longest Night," May 2, 1967), they no doubt chose the Dr. Connolly in the more dramatic environment. The photo story depicted the work of Navy Lt. Cdr. John M. Connolly, Jr., M.D., '55, in an emergency operation that saved the life of Marine Corporal Andre Williams, who had been wounded minutes earlier in a Vietcong Mortar attack. Two of the photos, courtesy of Look, appear on these pages. Even more stirring, however, might be the career of his father, John M. Connolly, Sr., M.D., '12, who this year marks his 50th anniversary as a physician serving the Oak Lane—Mt. Airy Community. The elder Dr. Connolly (shown here in a father-son portrait on the La Salle campus), still operates two offices in the area and sees more than a dozen patients daily. In his undergraduate days at La Salle, he was a standout basketball player and only recently was honored with a Basketball Old Timers Award for his court achievements. "Medicine is pretty much the same today as it's always been," he claims. "But the Wonder Drugs have made it easier on the doctors." Of medical treatment in Vietnam, Dr. Connolly, Jr. says the big difference lies in helicopter evacuation of the wounded, who are now flown to field hospitals often within 10 minutes of injury.
Would you believe it was two years ago when Dr. John A. Guischard, '38, left to become a priest after 20 years of distinguished service to La Salle in the modern languages department? This fall, he begins his third and final year of studies at the Beda College in Rome, where at age 50 he will be ordained a Roman Catholic priest March 30, 1968. Never one to confine himself only to the matter at hand, Dr. Guischard has been active in the dramatic efforts of the Beda students over the past two years. Last winter, he directed Beda's production of Jean Anouilh's "Beckett." He has also used summers and vacation periods to travel about the Continent, including frequent visits to "La Salle-in-Europe" at Fribourg, Switzerland, a program he founded some seven years ago. He is spending this summer on the island of Elba in the beautiful Mediterranean. He still expects to be assigned to the diocese of Burlington, Vermont, after his ordination.
Jim Butler, Revisited