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The University

“Salvation, Trial and Individualism” by UR’s Dean of Student Life (Fall, 1967) is tops!

MRS. LEWIS B. HENDERSHOT, ’12

... I have just read the Review (Fall, 1967) entirely through in complete fascination. Those first two articles (“The University as Myth” and “Salvation, Trial and Individualism”) are of the greatest interest to those whose lifelong concern has been education. I always read every word in the Review. It is distinguished in appearance and content.

BLANCHE J. THOMPSON, ’32G

... it seems to me that more and more Rochester Review has become a propaganda organ for the university. Some of your features (student teaching in the inner city) I have read with real concern and appreciation, but too much of the time the material is vapid, cliched, and pointless. I place some of the Frosh Week remarks (Winter, 1968) in this category. I was amazed to find references, very oblique ones, to student discontent in the articles by Professors Hawkins and Kaufmann in your previous issue. From Rochester Review and the Alumni News, one could only gather that everyone at UR is happy and smiling.

PATRICIA RUNK SWEENEY, ’60

Your good works in the Rochester Review are appreciated. The American Association of University Women here will discuss Helen T. Nowlis’ article on drugs (Winter, 1968). In (other) groups we can use the article on the humanities by Jules Brody... I would like my grandchildren to know more about your university if you could also send them the Review.

MARY T. SERGE NEWELL, ’26

(Continued on Page 26)
RARE INDEED is the college dean who is not called upon these days to describe, explain, analyze, categorize, or otherwise elucidate on that frequently puzzling but always fascinating phenomenon: today's student.

On the next few pages, Kenneth E. Clark, dean of the University's College of Arts and Science, identifies some characteristics and concerns of "students, 1968 model," as he sees them at Rochester. Three cases in point—two on the River Campus and one at the Eastman School of Music—are highlighted on Pages 8 through 19.
There have always been differences of viewpoint about problems between older and younger generations. Not very long ago questions on this campus had to do with the propriety of dormitories that were not rigidly segregated by sex. Earlier it was the matter of alcohol and parties on campus. Before that was the era of the flapper and of F. Scott Fitzgerald, which produced a generation so frivolous that obviously—in the eyes of its elders, at least—it would not be able to deal with the serious problems of the world. Yet it was that generation which brought us victory in World War II and built this country into a scientific and industrial giant.

In the light of recent events on campus, it is hard to believe that our students today are the same students they were at the beginning of the fall semester. Yet they can be described in the same terms. They came to the campus knowing more subject matter than any prior student groups. They have high aspirations and see a world in which their qualities will produce rich rewards for them. They are willing to work to achieve those rewards, although they will question the nature of the work they are required to do in order to attain the status they want.

At the same time they are uncertain about their own futures, anxious about the degree to which they will succeed in attaining their goals, questioning sharply and persistently the sort of system in which we operate. They question particularly the discrepancies they observe between stated positions and actual behavior. They are supreme autocrats, since they demand that the persons with whom they associate show perfection and consistency between stated goals and achievements—and they accept no explanations for failure to achieve those goals. Thus, one may say that our younger generation today is no different from those of earlier periods.

Yet students are behaving differently. They seem to be working for objectives different from those we would have expected. Moreover, they seem to be taking us as their targets, rather than occupying themselves with those targets we would select for them. We would like them to look at the problems of ignorance and knowledge, to examine man's past folly, to develop skills and techniques that would enable them to become workers in productive areas when they reach an appropriate age and status. But we gradually come to realize that they know more than most of us did at the same age—and even that some of them know more about a particular problem than the persons who are dealing with that problem.

Nevertheless, we old folks operate on the principle that there is some virtue associated with greater experience, and that wisdom comes with age. We also suggest that a person should walk before he runs, that it is necessary to deal with the little problems before tackling the big ones, that a man must earn his credentials by working in a subordinate role before he may participate in deliberations on larger issues.

Among other things, students want the good life now. They see the affluence of our society, observe the way their elders live, and want a piece of the action. They listen to us talk about individual rights and the right of groups to govern themselves. Then they look at their own status as students and the degree to which their actions are restricted, and they argue that they should have the privilege of governing themselves now. This means not merely the right to decide when they are permitted to visit each other in their rooms or whether or not they are permitted to leave campus, but also the right to choose how and what to study—to be in part the architects of their own undergraduate program.

We support this point of view, believing that students need to give careful thought to their selection of courses. But then the students ask for the privilege of participating in the decisions about the content of each course and argue for the establishment of certain courses that do not now exist. They are becoming more and more interested in independent reading and research courses. They are zealous in securing faculty sponsors for these individually structured courses, and they dedicate
Students . . . question particularly the discrepancies they observe between stated positions and actual behavior.

themselves wholeheartedly to succeeding in them.

Allied to this trend, but taking another form of expression, is an experimental extracurricular project known as the “January Plan” in which several students participated this year. With faculty and college approval in each case, they agreed to complete their first-semester course work ahead of time and assume a special study project for a month. They expect to evaluate their experiences objectively and discuss them with people in the University who are involved in curricular matters.

(It might be noted that the faculty is proud of its students—until they ask to sit on faculty committees, and to make decisions about curriculum and about degree requirements, and, in fact, to be partners in all decisions that involve them!)

A ll of the student attitudes described here can be summarized in one word: impatient. Students do not want to wait until they have left the campus to achieve those things that are important to them. In fact, some of them think that now is the only period of their lives in which they will have a chance to deal with these matters.

A second characteristic of today’s student is that he has discovered he is an object of interest in our culture. That so many newspapers and magazines write about college students is not ignored by students. Indeed, on many campuses students are discontented because they see other student groups reaping a great deal of national publicity. Students at Rochester, for example, are aware that they are facing the same problems as others in dealing with the same issues; yet they receive less attention. Accordingly, a not insignificant portion of the activities on campus is motivated by a desire for attention in the national press. When the attraction of television cameras is added, it is easy to see how students would be willing to expend a considerable amount of effort to get a cut of this national publicity pie.

These days a number of national organizations help students keep informed about events on campuses throughout the country. Students read the newspapers from other colleges, they communicate through the National Student Association, they are influenced by the actions and the campaigns of organizations such as the Students for a Democratic Society. Some of the national student groups make plans prior to the academic year for the particular programs they will work on during that year, and operate quite effectively to help carry out those programs.

Again, this does not differ from the past. The student Communist movements of the Thirties, the Marxian-Socialist groups after World War II, and the various social action groups, both liberal and conservative, are not unknown on campuses; however, these groups generally produced much discussion, but little action that would attract nationwide attention.

Today there are new components. For one thing, some students have had experience with civil disobedience in the civil rights movement, and a number of them feel that one must have the privilege of protesting anything one does not believe in. Not surprisingly, there is a feeling of power associated with such programs of action, as well as a gratifying sense of identification with a movement in which one does something more than just sit around and argue. Moreover, many students today are heavily laden with anxiety when they see that their drive toward establishing themselves as important and well-paid members of society is threatened by the risks they may have to run by participating in the war in Vietnam.

Partly because of the nature of current problems and partly because so many programs dealing with them have had substantial moral components, campus discussions of moral issues have intensified. Those who believe that this is a return to religion, however, may be somewhat disappointed. Actually the morality is a new morality that emphasizes the right of the individual to do pretty much as he pleases. It is an argument for freedom—and against any posture that is even slightly insincere or inconsistent.

This is the argument that students use in opposing any regulations that might operate to reduce sexual activity on campus. They contend that the rules are imposed by members of a generation that has described itself as not adhering to rules of sexual morality—and that they are imposed on students who, although they subscribe to no rigid code of moral behavior, do subscribe to the importance of not being hypocritical about one’s actions.

On the other hand, students sometimes play the game the other way against us. For example, undergraduates are pleased to have the “pass-fail” option in one of the courses they elect each semester—that is, they receive no grade other than “satisfactory” or “fail” in that course. Our faculty legislated this option in the hope that it would lead students to elect a wider variety of courses. We now have enough evidence to know that it does not serve this purpose, although it may serve other useful functions. But the students argue on any grounds, with little attention to incon-
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...like it or not, (students’) view of us is no better or clearer than our view of them.

A more interesting area to consider is one with which we have recently been faced—the students’ use of the sit-in as a means of protest. Prior to the sit-in last fall (when a number of students obstructed the recruitment interviews scheduled with Dow Chemical Company), students wanted to know in considerable detail the probable outcome of such action. They concluded that they were likely to be arrested. As a result of this expectation, many carried bail money to the sit-in, and at least one student did not sit-in because the record of an arrest might have produced consequences undesirable for his future. Incidentally, when the anticipated arrests did not occur, there were students who were unhappy that they had not participated!

During the winter students raised questions about the penalties likely in the event of another such sit-in. The faculty groups with which I have met have strongly supported the position that the announced penalty for such a sit-in should be suspension.

Students argue that this is too severe and that we ought to consider other penalties. They point out that suspension may lead them to be drafted, so that the effect of the penalty is multiplied by the additional action of draft boards. Yet, if we were to say that there would be no penalty associated with the sit-in, the attractiveness and the meaning of the sit-in for students would evaporate. Actually, they require a sufficient penalty for their actions to make their moral stand one that is important and dangerous.

The key element in the student demonstration is its symbolism. The choice of Dow Chemical is accidental; if there were not this issue, there would be some other. Moreover, it is not just the Vietnam war that is at issue (the early Berkeley demonstrations, for example, focused on the matter of free speech). There is no reason to assume that if the Vietnam conflict were resolved, student activist groups would dissolve and this mode of demonstration would disappear. It is true, of course, that the recent demonstrations are more serious because they involve a larger number of students (capitalizing, so to speak, on the extent of disagreement about the U.S. role in Vietnam).

To avoid the risks involved when many students demonstrate, it has been proposed that we delay certain scheduled recruitment interviews. However, the University has established that such interviews are an approved practice on this campus and that freedom of speech and action must be maintained; thus, delay merely dodges the central issues and settles nothing. Moreover, to compromise the principle of freedom on this issue is distasteful—and, pragmatically, it would merely assure another episode, another show of student power. Therefore, it can be argued that clearly announced penalties, by virtue of their suppressive effects, may be a better method to preclude future occurrences of this sort.

Obviously, the problem of how to deal with matters of this sort is not easy. One could gamble that the issue would be resolved if no penalty were assigned for sit-ins or similar demonstrations. Or one might say that we need to cooperate with students by making it clear ahead of time precisely what the nature of the risk is, so that only those students who are willing to take a stand that involves such severe penalties would participate. By using the latter method we would sort out the dilettantes—the ones who go along for the ride—from those who possess a very strong and serious commitment.

Another position one might take is that the University is a learning institution, and that we should impose a modest penalty that would not be disabling for life or even for any sizable interval of time, but which, nevertheless, would result in the appropriate sort of modification of behavior that we expect in the classroom. This is our attitude regarding much of classroom instruction, in which both penalties and rewards (such as grades) are not real-life penalties and rewards but are contrived so that students may learn.
One faculty member argues that we have no right to put our students in such a moral dilemma. He contends that the University is really a large family and that one does not impose penalties of this sort on members of one's own family. There is something to be said for this; nevertheless, it is also true that we always set higher standards for behavior within the family than we do for persons we do not know.

Frankly, I would like to set high standards for the conduct of our students. I would like them to resolve these questions about demonstrating and about showing their convictions in such a way as to make it unnecessary for us to throw them out of school or to take other painful actions against them. I am proud of the way in which they demonstrated at the second Dow Chemical interview. This was restrained and yet clearly showed the students' distaste for any association of the University with a company that manufactures napalm. Furthermore, their message came through more clearly when their mode of demonstration was not also a challenge to authority.

In turn, I think we need to convey to the students that we desire to receive, recognize, and understand their motivations for improving the society around them. We must overlook their arrogance, their authoritarianism, and their naivety—just as we ask them to overlook our conservatism, our comfortable position of privilege and power, and our, in their eyes, shortsightedness.

We must remember that they view us as unwilling to deal with new problems, as being unconcerned, as having made a mess of things; like it or not, their view of us is no better or clearer than our view of them. Under such circumstances it is obvious that we are perceiving each other incorrectly. We are sharpening the differences between us rather than searching for points of common concern and identity of values. Both of us will learn to understand each other and to resolve our problems only by the willingness to listen, the desire to try to understand, and the recognition that if somehow or other we adults did some of the things that the students pressure us to do, it might not turn out so badly after all!
Frances (Ranny) Cooper's study of modern art—one of the most ambitious projects in the new student-sponsored Jan Plan—took her from the campus art library to art museums in Boston and New York City. Funds from undergraduate groups helped to finance her project.
What happens when nineteen undergraduates are permitted to take a month off from classes to pursue some pet projects of their own devising?

Is there a need—or even a place—for a free-wheeling program of this kind on a campus that already offers such options as freshman preceptorials, the Honors Program, and a generous smorgasbord of do-it-yourself reading courses?

These questions and a number of allied ones have been the subject of some lively faculty-student discussion this semester following a student-initiated experiment known as the January Plan or Jan Plan.

Two months before it actually got under way, the Jan Plan was hardly more than a gleam in its sponsors’ eye. But by December, largely through the massive efforts of four determined undergraduates—seniors Alice Leonard and Lawrence Grossberg,
Dean Kenneth E. Clark gets a progress report on the Jan Plan from Stuart Mushlin, Alice Leonard, and Lawrence Grossberg. For their Jan Plan studies, Stu and Larry chose creative writing projects.

Members of the Jan Plan’s class in contemporary culture meet with their leader, Assistant Professor Paul Levine. Both content and format of the course were determined jointly by the student participants and Levine.

Senior Edwin Kaplan describes the techniques he used in producing four stained glass windows. The results of his Jan Plan project have already attracted the attention of a Buffalo art gallery and a national magazine.
Alice Leonard of Washington, D.C.—a member of the organizing committee—hopes the Plan will be enriched and "selectively expanded" next year.

Its purpose, in the words of the organizing committee, was "to provide a relevant, creative experience for undergraduates outside of the usual format of college courses but within the University structure." For some participants, this added up to a month of intensive work on special research projects, either on or off campus. For others, it became an experimental course (loosely titled "Contemporary Culture") which they designed with their Jan Plan instructor, Assistant Professor Paul Levine of the Department of English.

Inicial impetus for the Plan came early last fall when Alice, Stu, and Beth attended a regional conference on "educational reform" at Colgate University and learned of a similar program conducted for all Colgate undergraduates. The idea, they decided, had possibilities for Rochester. With the endorsement of Dean Clark and $1,000 in seed money from four River Campus organizations—the Students' Association, the Association of Women Students, Inter-Hall Council, and Interfraternity Council—the committee plunged into the task of recruiting and evaluating prospective participants.

Recognizing that the initial experience with the Plan would determine its fate at Rochester, the committee tried to choose students who evidenced a dedication not only to their specific projects but also to the success of the total venture. ("We couldn't afford any cop-outs," Stu puts it.) Of the 19 students selected, eight were seniors; eight, juniors; and three, sophomores.

Far from providing its participants with a month-long vacation, the Jan Plan threw them into a frenzy of pre-Christmas activity that left many of them with no holiday at all.

For senior Lyn Kagihara, a pre-dental major from Honolulu, the Jan Plan offered a rare opportunity to "explore the possibilities of photography as a medium of self-expression." Released from the pressure of classes, tests, and term papers, Lyn concentrated on "the two most important aspects of photography: vision and technique," and, under the guidance of William Giles, assistant professor of fine arts, found that she was able, for the first time since entering college, to "grow at my own unpressured pace."

Like Lyn, Edwin Kaplan (a history
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A study of the organization of Congressional staffs drew four Jan Plan participants to Washington, D.C. (Upper left) Sophomore Sandy Schwarz talks with one of the 367 Congressional aides interviewed. (Lower left) Back on campus, the students are collating and evaluating their material in a course given especially for them by Professor Richard Fenno, their Jan Plan adviser. In their report, the group termed their project "the single most rewarding and enlightening academic experience we have encountered at the University."
major from Kenmore) used his month to pursue an artistic avocation. Ed had already taken as many studio arts courses as he could fit into his regular academic program; through the Jan Plan he gained “time to explore and create, to relax and think.” The results of his project—a group of stained glass windows—are scheduled for display at a Buffalo gallery.

To Frances Cooper of West Newton, Mass., the Plan provided “an opportune program at an opportune time.” Winner of the University’s first annual Student Leadership Award last spring, Ranny had become so immersed in academic and extracurricular commitments that she had no time outside the classroom to pursue her interest in contemporary art. During her “free” month she plunged into a study of the works of Mondrian, Kandinsky, and Pollock—initially on campus, then at New York’s Museum of Modern Art and Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts. Out of her visits came a hefty research paper, a detailed personal commentary on the individual art works studied, and, even more significant, she feels, the realization that “never before have I been so motivated to learn!”

For many of the participants, January became a month of self-discovery. Enid Moses, for example, had for some time questioned her earlier decision to major in French literature on the River Campus rather than in music at the Eastman School. Her Jan Plan project—a first-hand study of Eastman students—filled her with admiration for the School’s hard-working, dedicated young musicians—but convinced her that her original decision was the right one.

The theme of self-discovery crops up repeatedly in the participants’ post-January evaluations of their experience. One student reports: “I learned a lot about my project, but I also learned a lot about myself.” Another writes: “The result of my month is a short story. This is only the visible product and represents the top of the iceberg. More meaningful to me were the freedom to explore my own resources and the conclusions about myself that I was able to reach...the concept of doing something, and completing something, for myself.” (In the preface to his story, he says of his work, “though it is a little ugly and malformed, it is all mine, and I guess that counts for something, if not everything.”)

In general, the participants tend to describe their month in superlatives. Some samples: “the most exciting, meaningful academic experience I’ve had”... “a unique opportunity to enter an area to which total commitment had been forbidden because of academic pressures”... “probably the greatest experience that I have had in college and one of the most exciting, stimulating, and rewarding experiences in my life.” Nevertheless, the students are quick to point out the Plan’s deficiencies and to suggest improvements—among them, earlier planning, the setting of more realistic goals, and larger travel allowances “so the Plan won’t end up being a rich man’s educational experience.”

A full-dress report on the Plan—its strengths and weaknesses, its performance and potential—was presented in March, when President W. Allen Wallis hosted the participating students, their faculty sponsors, and other academic and administrative officers at a dinner at the Faculty Club. The big question—will the Plan be continued next year?—will be decided later this spring.

Interestingly, even its most enthusiastic advocates do not urge a Jan Plan for every student. A number of them feel that when “something special” becomes a routine part of the curriculum, much of its spontaneity and flexibility is lost. Thus, they hope simply that the program will “continue, grow, and improve in the coming years.” At this point, the chances are good that it may do just that.
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Law School or Not?
A Landmark Course Helps Them Decide...

LYNNE CLARKE
ONE LATE WINTER AFTERNOON on the fifth floor of the Monroe County Hall of Justice, four attorneys argued a murder appeal. The facts of the case, unusually grisly, were reviewed in detail; subtle points of law, the slender threads by which a man's fate hung in balance, were eloquently advanced, and questioned by three judges.

Throughout the arguments, fifteen undergraduates and a few observers were kept on the edges of their seats. When it was over, the presiding justice looked down from the bench and asked if there were any questions. A half-dozen hands went up. Another session of the University of Rochester's new pre-law seminar, "Career Planning in Law," had begun.

The arguments (in law school terminology, a "moot court") reenacted an appeal that actually had been argued before the Appellate Division, Fourth Department. The "actors"—law assistants to the Appellate Division; Harry D. Goldman and G. Robert Witmer, associate justices of the Supreme Court, Appellate Division; and State Supreme Court Justice Jacob Ark—were participating at the request of Goldman, who teaches the pre-law seminar, now in its first year at UR—and, quite possibly, its first year on any campus.

"You really learn more about law in this class than I'd expected," Judge Ark told the group as the session ended—a tribute to Goldman and his students. Although the main purpose of the course is to introduce enough information to enable students to decide whether to apply to law school, Goldman is already working hard to get his class to think like lawyers—a task heretofore left to first-year law school professors.

The idea of a pre-law seminar was suggested to President W. Allen Wallis last spring by three River Campus undergraduates—Charles Eldredge, of Vestal, N.Y., William Goldstein, of Newton Centre, Mass., and Steven Skalet, of White Plains, N.Y.—who were interested in law but knew no way to learn what lawyers actually do. Wallis promptly arranged a series of interviews for them with a number of lawyers and judges, including Justice Goldman.

Goldman agreed to teach the seminar, which is listed as a history reading course, requires term papers and a final exam, and carries four credits. The course has been administered by Professor Hayden V. White of the history department, who selected, from an initial group of thirty applicants, fifteen UR...
The arguments over, Bill Goldstein rises to address the court. In time-honored law school fashion, Justice Goldman answers his questions with still more questions.

Students receive words of praise from Judge Witmer: "I think something of real value is coming forth in this seminar. I wish you well."

Charles Eldredge (center): "We're getting a chance to see how legal minds work—and to find out if we have legal minds." Four UR seniors in the seminar have applied to law school; all have been accepted.

To students in an appellate courtroom for the first time, the reenacted murder appeal must have seemed a vastly more restrained performance than those they had seen on "Perry Mason" and "The Defenders." The emphasis was on law, not histrionics; the facts were sifted through for their legal relevance, not their ability to titillate.

Arguments and questioning over, Goldman asked the students to vote whether, on the basis of what they had heard, they would uphold or reverse the lower court's decision to convict. Ballots were marked, collected and counted while the judge explained that the real court had split, 3-2, and had voted to uphold the conviction of first-degree murder. The class did the same, splitting 8-7.

At other meetings, the students have heard talks by judges and attorneys from various kinds of courts. During a recent session, Judge John J. Conway of the Monroe County Court spoke on the responsibilities of a county court judge and the indigent defense system; attorney David Hoffberg explained the lawyer's responsibility in a civil case; and County Court Judge John A. Mastrella, a former assistant district attorney, discussed arraignment.

Judge Goldman is convinced that this is the first time a course of this type has been tried anywhere. "The American Bar Association and the New York State Bar Association are both very interested in the program," he says, "and have asked for a complete report on our progress."

He is keeping track of how many of his students actually enter law. "How many have applied to law school?" he asked at the close of the courtroom session. Six hands went up.

"But not all of us are seniors," one boy replied.

"Well," countered Goldman, "how many have decided not to apply to law school?"

One hand was raised—that of the only girl present. "And I thought you were going to be my Portia!" Goldman said.
Some of the Eastman School students involved with the "Musicians for Peace" movement are (left to right) Stephen Paulson, '68, Barbara Kessler, '70, and Thomas Herman, '69, whose works were selected for performance at the first "MFP" concert; Guido Ajmone-Marsan, '68, conductor; Nina Novotny, '70, violinist; and Daniel Morgenstern, '70, founder of the group.
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Variation on a Theme of Protest

"Not all those who protest against the war in Vietnam do so belligerently," The New York Times noted recently in a report on an anti-war movement initiated by students at the University's Eastman School of Music.

Unlike many such projects throughout the country, Eastman's anti-war effort—"Musicians for Peace"—is being conducted "quietly and harmoniously" and thus "deserves notice," wrote Raymond Ericson, music editor of the Times. (Two noted musicians who apparently agree are Leonard Bernstein and Elie Siegmeister, who have sent letters of commendation to the participating students.)

Founder of the loosely knit group is Daniel Morgenstern, a 20-year-old sophomore from Cleveland, whose feelings against war ("all war, not just the Vietnam war") prompted him to telephone President Johnson about the matter last January. A few weeks after their conversation, Morgenstern—who studies flute and humanities at Eastman—and some friends came up
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Selecting the newly composed music for the first “MFP” concert was serious work for the student judges. The anti-war project drew a note of encouragement from Leonard Bernstein (see Page 19).

with the idea of a series of concerts on behalf of peace. Their initial call for performers and composers for the cause brought a turnout of more than a hundred students the next day.

Shortly thereafter, the group (described by the Times as “serious but casual and nonpolitical”) issued a statement, which said in part: “The arts embody the good in man, and we, as musicians, are responsible for an artistic expression of a plea for peace and an end to all war. In presenting a series of concerts we hope to convey these beliefs.”

By early March more than 20 new compositions—most of them written by Eastman students—had been submitted for consideration. The works selected for performance this semester include musical settings for Wilfrid Owen’s anti-war poem “Dulce et Decorum Est” and “Why Do the Heathens Rage” from the Book of Psalms; “Genesis Thunder,” a composition for flute and piano that incorporates a poem by Dylan Thomas; several songs for which students have written both words and music; and one composition in which a speaker reads a newspaper casualty report from Vietnam while a soprano sings an “Agnus Dei.”

The concerts also offer a leavening of works from the classical repertoire—among them, selections from Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto No. 5, the first movement of Beethoven’s Sixth Symphony (Pastoral), and Brahms’
One of the group's objectives, according to Morgenstern, is to counteract the adverse effects of some of the more highly publicized protest movements (in his words, "we want to keep people from being turned off by the protestors"). Convinced that the physical appearance of many demonstrators obscures their message, participants in "Musicians for Peace" have taken a decidedly different tack: in a gesture described by the *Times* as "a sacrifice that seems above and beyond the call of duty," some heretofore hirsute members of the group have shaved their beards as a means of stressing their seriousness of purpose.

Although "Musicians for Peace" is neither sponsored nor endorsed by the Eastman School, it was formed with the approval of Walter Hendl, the School's director. Hendl commented recently that "not all of our students or all of our faculty will agree with the stand taken by these students, but the mature, constructive nature of their means of expression is a heartening illustration of the difference between responsible dissent and irresponsible dissension. . . . I am proud that our students have chosen this personal and utterly serious way to dramatize their views."

He concluded: "I'll be at the concerts—neither as sympathizer nor antagonist—but to hear how well the music is played."
To say that a college or university has coherence is to say that there is an intellectual pattern to its activities. Its curricula may be projections from a central core; they may be foundation stones that support a central, overarching school or department; they may reflect a common method of study or point of view or concern with a common problem; they may represent an elaborate interweaving of subjects. In such an institution, each part has a close intellectual relationship with several other parts, and, through them, with all other parts.

The distinction between a coherent and a noncoherent or conglomerate university is not unlike that between a corporation whose products are related (in their manufacture, distribution, or consumption) and one that is simply a collection of businesses related only in that they are owned by a single holding company.

The University of Rochester illustrates this difference: at some stages of its history, it has been coherent, at others, conglomerate; today it has elements of both. It was founded in 1850 as a small, private, nonsectarian, liberal arts college for men. Under the influence of Susan B. Anthony it became coeducational in 1900, but otherwise it remained unchanged until about the time of World War I. Then within a decade the Eastman School of Music, the School of Medicine and Dentistry, and the Memorial Art Gallery were founded and placed under the University’s charter. But because these acquisitions made little impact on one another or on the original College of Arts and Science, they constituted, in effect, a conglomerate university, not unified even by a common heating system (in Robert Hutchins’ figure), for only the Art Gallery and the College were located together.

During the next forty years, this conglomeration evolved into a coherent institution, as first the biological and physical sciences and then the humanities and social sciences developed faculties and graduate programs comparable to those in medicine and music, and as these separate parts were consolidated geographically. Even today, however, the University retains some degree of conglomerateness in that the Eastman School, the Art Gallery, and the humanities departments are at different locations.

Coherence is created, maintained, and strengthened by giving a consistently high priority to those goals that
promote it. On the one hand, energetic efforts are made to fill in gaps and to round out programs that will increase it; on the other, opportunities are grasped or spurned according to whether they create coherence or conglomerateness.

Although coherence has obvious merits, one should not presume that it is always preferable to conglomerateness. In at least two situations, the latter contributes much to a university. The first—again illustrated by the University of Rochester—is related to long-range growth. Had Rochester, at the time of World War I, rejected the schools of music and medicine and the Art Gallery (as, indeed, in the nineteenth century it had rejected engineering) on the grounds that they were not compatible with the small-scale, undergraduate, liberal arts education to which it was always preferable to conglomerateness. The second was to achieve a significant role in at least two situations, the latter contributes much to a university.

Conglomerateness is desirable also when an institution has exclusive responsibility for the higher education of a certain constituency (usually political, as a state or city, but possibly religious, ethnic, or occupational). In such cases, one of the institution's most useful functions is to serve any of its constituency's legitimate interests in higher education that are not met elsewhere, regardless of whether the resulting institution maintains close intellectual coherence. Indeed, it is perhaps fair to conclude that academic freedom is increasing should not be allowed to obscure the fact that academic freedom itself may be waning.

The fact that lip service to academic freedom is increasing should not be allowed to obscure the fact that academic freedom itself may be waning.

The notion that each university can have its own institutional coherence and its own set of priorities that derive from and contribute to that coherence presupposes a variety of academic freedoms. These seem to be diminishing. As they dwindle, universities are likely to have less control over their own priorities; consequently, conglomerateness is likely to prevail both within institutions and among them. The fact that lip service to academic freedom is increasing should not be allowed to obscure the fact that academic freedom itself may be waning.

Consider, for example, one of the most basic of academic freedoms, freedom to present controversial views on the campus. On few campuses in America today does such freedom truly exist. Stokely Carmichael can speak without hindrance, but George Wallace creates so grave a threat of disorder as to preclude the possibility that he would be listened to calmly and fairly. Senator Fulbright would be given a respectful hearing on any campus; few would dare invite Robert McNamara, since his appearance would almost certainly precipitate tensions, probably protests, and possibly disorders that would prevent free and open discussion. Timothy Leary enjoys freedom of speech on most campuses, J. Edgar Hoover on few; Nelson Rockefeller and Robert Kennedy on many, Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey on few. Even when a speaker manages to deliver his speech and an audience manages to hear it, if he has entered the campus in the face of pickets or with security forces in evidence to protect him, it cannot be claimed that he has enjoyed more than a mockery of a free, full academic presentation of his views.

University administrators cannot take steps to preserve genuine freedom of speech for unpopular speakers without incurring the charge of suppressing free speech. The man who must present his views after running a gantlet of hostile demonstrators or while confronted by insulting placards is certainly not being given a rational hearing; yet to bar the placards and their bearers or otherwise to uphold decorum would be regarded—especially by faculty members—as a limitation on academic freedom and would lead to tension and disorder so great as to cause more damage to the university than is caused by simply avoiding unpopular speakers. Furthermore, the fact that many faculty mem-

W. Allen Wallis, president of the University of Rochester, was invited to write the essay from which this article was adapted as a background paper for the 50th annual meeting of the American Council on Education. His paper is included in a book—"Whose Goals for Higher Education?"—published early this year by the Council.
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bers exhibit conditioned responses to any charge that academic freedom has been violated or even threatened should not obscure that freedom of speech cannot be preserved for some without limiting it for others, once either party to a disagreement rejects generally accepted standards of decorum, fair play, discussion, and mutual respect. Once these standards are disdained, genuine freedom of discussion cannot possibly take place, and no matter what steps are taken—even if none are taken—there will be real truth to the charge that academic freedom has been compromised.

Note that these infringements commonly occur when nonacademic figures come to the campus to talk about nonacademic subjects. Their appearances are usually heralded by assertions about the importance of being involved in the big issues on which the welfare of the human race is said to depend, and by condemnation or ridicule of the academic, sequestered in his cloister, concentrating on trivialities like the structure of the nucleus, the nature of good and evil, the genetic code, the conditions of economic growth, English poetry of the seventeenth century, or the cause and cure of arthritis—"trivialities" being defined implicitly as those matters about which no politician, popular pundit, or propagandist is at the moment creating a clamor.

None of the other traditional academic freedoms is as conspicuously corroded as is freedom of speech. Others, however, are tarnished. The element that is common to these developments is the contaminating effect that follows when universities assume a role of influence and power in practical affairs beyond the academic realm. Involvement in the affairs of others invites involvement by others in the affairs of the university, and this involvement by outsiders results in restraints on the freedom of the university to establish its own priorities and thereby to maintain its own coherence.

The academic freedom of the individual faculty member is granted not as a privilege but as a means of obtaining a service to the university, and thereby to society, that cannot easily be obtained unless the faculty member has complete freedom to choose his own subjects for study and to publish and teach the truth as he sees it, motivated by no consideration other than truth. Academic tenure is granted for the same reason that life tenure is granted to Supreme Court justices: to minimize considerations of the economic self-interest of the professor. No one need suspect that he teaches the views he teaches just to keep his job.

Today, however, other powerful interests have come to bear on professors besides just keeping their jobs. One widely used college textbook, for example, advocates views which its author had refuted earlier in a more sophisticated technical treatise. One wonders whether the author now believes what his textbook teaches or whether he simply recognizes the commercial reality that the views presented in the textbook are more acceptable to most teachers, who will thus be more inclined to adopt it.

To take another common situation, it is more and more often the practice of foundations and government agencies to support not the work of a university but the work of a specific faculty member. Since grants to faculty members affect their prestige directly and their remunerations indirectly, may not the desire to receive such grants influence the views they express, in particular, their praise or criticism of the work of those who give grants?

In addition, many faculty members involve themselves deeply in public affairs and even in partisan politics. Such involvements, too, create conflicts of interest.

Less and less does tenure serve to resolve these potential conflicts; thus, it comes to be viewed as merely a sort of special economic privilege of professors. This view—widely held even by faculty members—weakens an important support for academic freedom.

As faculty members seek not only truth but also power, prestige, and pay from outside the university, the single-mindedness and disinterestedness of their pursuit of truth is increasingly called into question. Consequently, their claim that they should be free of restraint and responsibility—and the support given to this claim by administrators and trustees—is received with increasing skepticism. As faculty members become more and more subject to outside influences, an institution's capacity to set its own priorities and to establish or strengthen its coherence is further limited. Indeed, these outside influences—which have become capable of directing the activities of faculty members at a time when universities themselves, in the interest of academic freedom, are conscientiously restraining themselves from direction of their faculties—constitute a powerful force for conglomerateness.

The freedom of universities to establish their own priorities and patterns of coherence has been eroded as the importance of funds from the government has grown. The constraints operate not because these funds are of public rather than private origin, but because the source of funds is central-
Funds from an excessively large private source can have an influence as government funds...

A large physical education department may be denied a federal grant for a new library, whereas a second college academically inferior in every way may have an identical application granted, the reason being that the first institution will show a smaller percentage increase in total academic space, because the formulae applied by the federal government count space for physical education as academic space. Actually, of course, quite apart from the problem of what space should be counted as academic, we may question whether percentage increase of academic space is a meaningful indication of where a grant will be most useful. At any rate, whatever the formula used, those institutions that best fit it will be aided and those which best carve out their own special pattern of academic coherence may be passed over.

Funds from an excessively large private source can have an influence as government funds; that is to say, in accomplishing their particular objectives through universities, large private agencies may diminish the autonomy and diversity of our system of higher education.

One nongovernmental force that often hampers an institution’s freedom is the accrediting agency. Those agencies which are organized by groups of colleges and universities may operate in ways somewhat resembling those of industrial cartels. Others, supported by departments or professional schools, may exert outside pressure on a university in behalf of one of its parts—or against one of its parts if that part is out of step with corresponding departments or schools elsewhere. Still other accrediting agencies—in some professions, for example—are controlled by special-interest groups.

A strong institution can sometimes refuse to yield control of its curriculum to these outside agencies, but such resistance is unusual. Students are reluctant to attend, and donors to support, unaccredited institutions. In some cases a student is not allowed to take the examinations required for professional licensure unless he has a degree from an accredited institution; even if his preparation is superior to that specified by accrediting formulae, he is prevented from demonstrating this competence. Moreover, in at least one instance, Congress has specified that funds should be restricted to institutions accredited by a certain professional association whose interests only partly coincide with those of students and employers of graduates and only partly favor quality in education. More commonly, Congress requires merely the approval of some “nationally recognized accrediting agency,” an undefined phrase which presumably means an accrediting agency that is accredited by the National Commission on Accrediting.

Each type of accrediting agency is attempting to do good, at least by its own lights. But even if they protect some students from shoddy or perhaps even fraudulent schools, in the aggregate their value is negative: their beneficial effects do not offset the harm they do by hindering improvements in curricula and by limiting the power of each institution to set its own priorities and to establish its own pattern of activities, coherent or conglomerate as suits its circumstances.

The foregoing account of current
hazards to institutional integrity, emphasizing as it has the tensions created by outside influences on student life, faculty activities, and administrative policy-making, may seem to have prepared the way for conclusions rather different from those that follow.

It may seem that since the threats arise from the baneful effects of the university's involvements with the outside world, the remedy is to withdraw, to convert our institutions into ivory towers, sequestered monasteries. But that way madness lies: Most problems of individuals and institutions arise from relations with other individuals, institutions, and society; and the autistic university would be no more viable—or admirable—than the autistic individual. As Ortega y Gasset puts it,

Not only does [the university] need perpetual contact with science, on pain of atrophy, it needs contact, likewise, with the public life, with historical reality, with the present. . . . The university must be open to the whole reality of its time. It must be in the midst of real life, and saturated with it.

My conclusion, then, may sound moralistic. The university must have the strength of character to resist these encroachments and even to bend them to its own ends. To have strength of character, it first must have character, and it must be aware of its character. The university, though it is very much a part of society, has a distinctive role. Government, business, journalism, art, war, religion—these are not its roles, yet it has intimate and extensive relations with each and with much else.

We must define the university's central and unique role in order to differentiate it from the many institutions and activities with which it is in close association. From the definition, we can then devise tests of whether particular activities are congruent with that role and of how intimate and extensive the university's relations with other institutions should be.

Once the university sees its own role clearly and adheres to that role, it will be in a position to resist encroachments. If the university—through its principal spokesmen and policy-makers—assumes the posture of an innkeeper, making itself available to serve any paying customer who may enter, refusing only those so blatantly unrespectable that they will repel other paying customers, it can expect to be treated as such. If it assumes the posture of a patent-medicine huckster, claiming that it will create prosperity (or, in the more fashionable phrase, "stimulate economic growth"), eliminate inequality, ennoble justice, improve government, elevate art, cure disease, resolve labor disputes, prevent war, and purify the air, it can expect to be treated as a huckster. But if it has a clear view of what it can and should do—of what its special mission is—it can command respect for that view.

It is not appropriate here to enunciate the central character and purposes of a university, against which proposed activities should be tested. What I would emphasize is the diversity of American colleges and universities. With college education becoming nearly universal and graduate degrees more common than undergraduate degrees used to be, the importance of diversity is increasing. One of the most serious dangers to our system of higher education is that uniformity and homogeneity may very well result if the external pressures exerted upon our institutions are not counteracted by the firmness of their individual characters.

The way to maintain an institution's coherence and its control over its own priorities, then, is not to try to turn back the tides undermining our freedom and independence (though perhaps we can at least stem these tides), nor to flee into isolated ivory towers (though perhaps we can clarify the division of labor between universities and the rest of society), but to define, to keep clearly in mind, to explain within the university, and to assert forcefully to the outside world the special purposes and modes of action that maximize a university's value to society. Hammer blows on one side of a sheet of metal will leave it misshapen and formless if there is nothing on the other side; but if on the other side there is a firm, well-shaped anvil, the pressure of the hammer will delineate clearly and firmly the character of the solid form beneath.
The Management Center Moves to Bus Ad

The Management Research Center, a world-wide network of management research and training groups, is moving its headquarters to the College of Business Administration this spring.

The Center, which was established in 1966, has been in residence at the University of Pittsburgh. Its members conduct programs of research in individual, small group, and organizational psychology, with emphasis on the study of managerial behavior in business and industry.

Through its International Research Groups of Management (IRGOM) component—linking research and training groups on four continents—the Center promotes new techniques in management education, carries on research in management behavior, and also serves as a data bank for the storage and retrieval of information in the behavioral sciences.

In the United States, one of its primary activities is the instruction of industrial training personnel in the use of simulated exercises of key management activities. (An initial set of these exercises has been translated into 12 languages.) In addition, the Center evaluates managerial behavior in a variety of organizational settings both here and abroad.

Continuing financial support of its projects has come from the Ford Foundation, the Office of Naval Research, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and other agencies.

According to William H. Meckling, dean of the College of Business Administration, the Center's resources and programs will enable the College to offer a Ph.D. degree in business administration with specialization in the behavioral sciences. In addition, graduate programs in conjunction with the Center will be offered by the Department of Psychology of the College of Arts and Science.

Director of the Center is Bernard M. Bass, an internationally known scholar and consultant in the behavioral sciences, who will head a staff of seven professional associates and will hold a joint appointment as professor of business administration and psychology.

Ivy-Covered Politics

A new course in the politics of university administration is being given on the River Campus this semester.

Topics include the nature of universities and their role as social institutions, the decision-making process in academia, and a comparison of universities with industrial and political organizations.

The course is taught by a corps of faculty and staff members (including Kenneth E. Clark, dean of the College of Arts and Science) and guest lecturers. Coordinator is Thomas R. Mason, who is UR's director of planning and institutional studies and an assistant professor of political science.

Homecoming

A lumnus and former staff member Frank J. Dowd, Jr., vice president of Lincoln University since 1961, will return to the River Campus as dean of the University School of Liberal and Applied Studies in July. He succeeds Arthur L. Assum, now dean of curriculum and instruction at Monroe Community College.

Dowd received a bachelor of arts degree (with honors in history) in 1948 and a master of arts degree in political science in 1957—both from Rochester. A River Campus staff member for twelve years, he served successively as assistant to the director of admissions, director of men's residence halls, executive assistant to the dean of the College of Arts and Science, assistant dean of students, and associate dean of students, and also taught courses in American and comparative government.

At Lincoln Dowd has supervised university relations, admissions and financial aid, summer programs, and special projects (he was instrumental in organizing the African Student Center for Refugee Students in 1961), and was assistant secretary of the board of trustees.

New Faces

T wo appointments of more than usual interest are those of Jacob Bigeleisen, a member of the National Academy of Sciences and senior chemist at Brookhaven National Laboratory, who will become professor of chemistry; and Harmon R. Holcomb of the Colgate Rochester Divinity School faculty, who will become professor of philosophy and director of studies in religion. Both appointments are effective this fall.

Bigeleisen, an authority on the behavior of isotopes, received the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission's 1964 E. O. Lawrence Award and the American Chemical Society's 1958 award for nuclear applications in chemistry. A
fellow of the American Physical Society and of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Bigeleisen is one of "100 great chemists" whose names are inscribed in the lecture hall at the Technion, Haifa, Israel.

As a member of the National Academy of Sciences, Bigeleisen ranks among the nation's most eminent scientists. Five UR professors currently are Academy members: Wallace O. Fenn, Distinguished University Professor of Physiology; Marshall D. Gates, Jr., professor of chemistry; Johannes F. C. Holtfreter, Tracy H. Harris Professor of Zoology; Robert E. Marshak, Distinguished University Professor of Physics; and Dr. George H. Whipple, professor emeritus of pathology and former dean of the School of Medicine and Dentistry. (W. Albert Noyes, Distinguished Senior Professor of Chemistry and former department chairman, also is a member.)

Holcomb, who has been at Colgate Rochester since 1945 and will remain on its faculty as adjunct professor of philosophy of religion, has frequently been a visiting professor at UR.

His appointment here has been termed an "important link" between Colgate Rochester and the University, whose formal affiliation last summer was one of the first established between a major seminary and university in recent years. The appointment also marks the continuing expansion of UR's academic program in religion which has been under way since late 1966, when a petition requesting more courses in religion was signed by more than 1,000 students.

**Hanson's "Sixth"**

The world premiere of Howard Hanson's Sixth Symphony—with the conductor and former Eastman School of Music director conducting the New York Philharmonic—won a warm welcome at New York's Lincoln Center earlier this season. The Hanson symphony was among the principal orchestral works commissioned by the Philharmonic to celebrate its 125th anniversary.

In a lengthy article on the event, TIME Magazine noted that "Howard Hanson is a musical conservative who has probably done more than any other American composer to promote new and experimental music. For 40 years, before his retirement in 1964 as director of the University of Rochester's Eastman School of Music, he supervised the premieres of nearly 2,000 pieces by more than 700-odd U.S. composers. Many of these compositions were in a harshly dissonant, far-out style for which Hanson himself had little liking. Nevertheless, he insisted, 'Well-knit music that sounds like hell is still competent musicianship and deserves a hearing.'"

TIME's reviewer characterized Hanson's latest symphony as an "impressive display of the composer's craft as well as his capacity for communication," and concluded: "Against this, the absence of startling innovation seems less important. After all, well-knit music that does not sound like hell deserves a hearing, too."

**UR Newsmakers**

Professor Marvin B. Becker has been elected a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J. A leading scholar in the field of Italian medieval and Renaissance history, he will be at the Institute next year on leave from his UR post.

Robert G. Loewy, dean of the College of Engineering and Applied Science, has been appointed to the Presidential Scientific Advisory Council panel on military aircraft.

Dr. Earle B. Mahoney, professor of surgery, was recently named an American Heart Association committee, composed of 15 leaders in medicine, law, religion, education, and communications, whose members will study the moral and legal implications of heart transplants and similar experiments on humans.

Patrick J. Parker, associate dean for executive programs in the College of Business Administration, has been selected as one of the year's "Outstanding Young Men of America."...

A. William Salomone, Wilson Professor of History, has been awarded the Citation for Distinguished Achievement of the Society for Italian Historical Studies for "the significant contri-

---

**RE: VIEWpoints**

(Continued from Page 2)

**Brynn Mawr, Pa.**

I get the feeling from reading the Rochester Review that the College has not yet quite found its way in the modern world. I liked John Slater's letter (Winter, 1968).

**ANGELINE H. LOGRASSO, '17**

The high school...where I teach is groping for ways in which the school can deal with the very real drug problem in the community. The principal has unfortunately stated his intention to develop programs to "discourage" drug use. His legalistic, moralistic attitude is getting in the way of possible fruitful dialogue on the subject...I feel that the article by Dr. Nowlis in the winter issue of Rochester Review might be the kind of lucid presentation which will change his mind. Is there any way to get some reprints of her fine article?

(NAME WITHHELD)

Albany, N.Y.

We are interested in using the excellent article "Youth and the 'Drug Problem':

Some Basic Concepts" by Helen H. Nowlis, which appeared in the Winter 1968 issue of the Rochester Review.

New York State Education is the membership magazine of the 100,000-member New York State Teachers Association. We think the article would be extremely valuable reading for public school teachers, and we hope we can obtain your permission to reprint it. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the Rochester Review. It is a very fine example of magazine journalism.

**MATTHEW F. DOHERTY**

Associate Editor
bution which he has made to our understanding of modern Italy through writings which have thrown new and revealing light on the interconnection between Italian intellectual and political developments"....

Associate Professor Sherman Hawkins was one of only 33 scholars recently awarded grants-in-aid for postdoctoral research in a national competition held by the American Council of Learned Societies. The grant will support his work on a book on religion and Renaissance tragedy which he is currently researching at Oxford University.

The "Battered Child"

A University Medical Center program to combat the growing problem of child abuse by parents—the so-called "battered child syndrome"—is helping to protect both children and parents involved in such cases.

In a recent article in the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, two researchers active in the UR program (Mrs. Joan C. Holter of the Center's medical social service and Dr. Stanford B. Friedman, assistant professor of pediatrics and psychiatry) point out that, contrary to popular thinking, parents who physically abuse their children are not necessarily young in age—nor are their actions primarily caused by the child's specific behavior. Rather, such abuse is an expression of parental frustration and anger during a family crisis in which parents actually are reacting to their own inner feelings—not to the child's "misbehavior."

A major problem in protecting young victims of extreme parental abuse has been the reluctance of many doctors to make the diagnosis of abuse when confronted with an injured or starving child. At the UR Medical Center, this diagnosis is made by a team that includes the staff pediatrician, the private pediatrician (if involved), the medical social worker, the chairman of the Department of Pediatrics, and other consultants. The diagnosis is reported to appropriate community agencies, whose representatives work closely with the Center's staff to develop and carry out a plan for individual treatment of the child and his family.

UR Scholars Contribute to Major New Encyclopedia

Ten faculty members, including President W. Allen Wallis, are among the authors of a 17-volume International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, published this spring by Macmillan and Free Press. President Wallis is chairman of the editorial advisory board and chairman of the executive committee of the mammoth encyclopedia, which has been nearly eight years in the making and has cost an estimated $2 million. (Wallis has been associated with the project since 1955, when he headed a study group that investigated the need for a new encyclopedia in the rapidly expanding fields of the social sciences.)

The 9,000-page work—the first comprehensive encyclopedia in the social sciences published in nearly 35 years—covers ten major fields, from anthropology to statistics, and also includes 600 biographies. Its 1,716 original articles, totalling more than eight million words, were written by 1,505 contributors (including some of the world's most eminent social scientists) from more than 30 countries.

UR authors are Associate Professor Milton Berman, Professor Hayden V. White, and Professor Perez Zagorin (history); Dean Kenneth E. Clark (psychology); Professor Donald F. Gordon (business administration); Professor Lionel W. McKenzie (economics); Associate Professor Robert S. Merrill and Professor Rene Millon (anthropology); Professor William H. Riker (political science); and President Wallis.

The need for a comprehensive new work on the social sciences has been recognized since the early 1950's. In 1960, five years after the Wallis study group unanimously recommended preparation of such an encyclopedia, arrangements were made to launch the gigantic editorial project and Wallis was named to head its prestigious editorial advisory board.

Early reviews of the work have noted that "a new set of adulatory adjectives is needed to praise" such distinguished contributors as Jean Piaget on developmental psychology and Oskar Morgenstern on game theory, and have predicted that the Encyclopedia "is likely to be a major influence in the fast-growing social sciences for more than a generation."
Portrait of Three Students Taking a Break Between Classes—a one-month break, that is. Their story—and that of 16 other participants in the University's experimental Jan Plan—starts on Page 8.