MORTAR AND THE IMMORTAL

We can’t do much about the yesterdays—except exercise the wisdom of hindsight. Sufficient unto the day were the challenges thereof.

Looking out from the new liberal arts building, president Milo A. Rediger and Dr. Gordon Zimmerman, director of development, ponder a landmark of Taylor’s yesterday—the observatory—while studying what has become a 20th century best-read see scroll—a blueprint!

But some things that are old never get old. Take the stars. Looking through the telescope today students see the same stars in the same juxtaposition, spanning their routes with the same predictability as in earlier days. And, contemplating the immutability of God and his laws, our youth dream dreams and see visions and discover their places in His firmament.

Whether within the walls of old Maytag gym, or in the antiseptic liberal arts building, the finite and Infinite continue to meet in eternal transaction at our Alma Mater. This is the supreme reason for her existence. After all, the new building may last only a hundred years.
The hallmark of our time is confusion. It is expressed in unreadable art, the unrecognizable drama, the unlistenable music, the meaningless activity, the unexplainable behavior of our paintings, our plays and our people.

At a conference recently, I saw a showing of films prepared especially for this national meeting of college and university representatives by Sol Worth, the director of the University of Pennsylvania's Documentary Film Laboratory, researched from among the films made by students in classes and on their own. I left with feelings of confusion and guilt—not for our student generation but for what we have failed to do in giving our children a clear and reasonable world in which to live and grow up to meaningful maturity. They expressed their fears, their frustrations, their desperate search and their rebellion against a society with values gone wrong. Civil rights, segregation, foreign policy, academic freedom and irreligion provide excellent frames of reference for these expressions.

Recently, while confined to the bathroom by lather, razor and attire inappropriate for exposure to the public, I listened to the entire musical composition (you see, I couldn't get out to turn off the radio) titled "Sloopy, Hang On". I declare I heard almost no lyrics other than Sloopy, Hang On throughout the whole number—except for this very significant variation on the theme from Sloopy, Hang On to Hang On, Sloopy. I could only conclude that this must be a dramatic description of the mad rush to "Where the Action Is", and that some of Sloopy's friends were afraid Sloopy wouldn't make it there and that he would miss out on something exciting.

Now, I may be a million miles away from a correct philosophical critique of this popular top-ten school-bus favorite, but I am only reporting my experience and my reaction to the younger generation's attempt to communicate with me. What I am really afraid of is that the converse of this experience is also true, and that the values and the traditions and what we consider to be the axioms and postulates of our Christian heritage and history are not getting through to them with any more meaning or clarity. And we are not teaching if they are not learning!

In order to be filled in more adequately, I recently spent 15 or 20 minutes watching the half-hour TV show called Hollywood-A-Go-Go. (I couldn't take more than that much of it, I must confess.) Here the younger set was putting the physical motions to "Sloopy, Hang On" and another number that goes 00-000-0000-0000-00000 with an ascending order of volume and motion until a literal frenzy is achieved. I believe they, both boys and girls, expended an amount of energy in that half hour equal to the physical exercise I got when I was their age doing farm chores from 5 to 7:30 a.m. and from 4:30 to 7 p.m. every day of the week.

In those days, I was so exhausted that I had to have a model-T Ford to drive the ten-mile round trip to my high school classes. (Now our students are so exhausted that they have to drive three blocks to football practice.)

But now, with this introduction, you may have suspected that I am a cynic about the younger generation, our students. I am not. I think they can be the finest ever. But I am disturbingly concerned about the faculty and the administrators, the teaching and the curriculum, the whole educational thrust and direction as to whether or not these are adequate for the salvation of these students (not used either as salvage or as a theological term) and for the survival of our society.

Now I want to point out several rays of hope and offer some suggestions for change toward improvement. These will become the planks in the platform of my attempt to (offer leadership in the presidency) of Taylor University.

I am confident that the history of the future will confirm my conviction that the survival of the small Christian liberal arts college is integrally related to our willingness to make a cruely frank and honest diagnosis and to accept and participate in radical changes of many of the traditions and habits of college administrators, professors and students. In the past we have rationalized some of our faults with humorous stories and disguised others in pseudo scholarship. (The jokes about forgetfulness, absentmindedness and ivory-towerishness are no credit or compliment to us! Who, of all people, should be least guilty of absent-mindedness if not college teachers?)

by President Milo A. Rediger
In the next decade the problems of higher education are going to become even greater and more complex. So all of us will have to do more things better and more better things.

Not different generations

The first ray of hope I see is a divinely built-in safeguard. It is that faculty and students are not necessarily or really different generations. We have made too much of a communication symbol with all of our talk about generations, just as some theologians have done it with dispensations. What is a generation but a general symbol by which we attempt to communicate? Who can draw the line between two generations?

This used to bother me when as a teen-ager I sat on a one-legged milk stool several hours a day and thought about things like time and life and eternity and personal identity and responsibility. (Parenthetically, why should we assume that young people today think of nothing serious or important? I surely did at their age, and you did, too; and I doubt if my parents or my teachers were aware of how much I did this. I thought of things like this and how important they seemed to me and how scared I was of their possible meanings which were such uncertainties to me at the time.)

We talk too much about passing something on from one generation to another, as if there were a sharp line over which the passing must take place. God built in a safeguard against the possibility by disposing us to act in such a manner as to guarantee the births of offspring continuously by the calendar and the clock. Now look at the practical effects of this. Some of us are 60ish, some 50ish, 40ish, some 30ish, some 20ish. — and now we have overlapped the student generation.

Who can set a dateline at which time a separation between generations should be declared? And if it should be done, the least likely time would be that 4-year period when all of us, from the 60ish on down to and including the students (and I've used the directional reference here only chronologically) have the opportunity to live together, work together, share our knowledge, our hopes, our disappointments, our discoveries, our values — what better time could there be for communication and transmission? I declare it to be the point in experience farthest away from a line between generations.

This is extremely important because of a startling sociological fact — by 1966 more than half of our population will be 15 or under! Combine with this one of the Berkeley slogans of recent vintage, "Don't trust anyone over 25", and you have identified a most significant dilemma of our time. Now, this does suggest not only the necessity for change but the fact that change is happening and is already on us.

We are not favored with the option of change or no change; our option is to determine whether we will just undergo the changes or will we put our heads together, our noses to the grindstone and our shoulders to the wheel (and I've run out of figures) to influence and control the direction and flow of them. Our society and our way of life depend on our answer. God placed a tremendous responsibility on us by the way he constituted us individually and structured the race.

Not narrow education

It is insufficient to hold the 19th Century idea of the purpose of education as the preparation of enough learned men to preserve and conduct the republic. Rather, as Frank Koeppel said at the recent White House conference, "it is education's purpose and responsibility to keep the nation strong and good." (and he didn't mean strong in the sense of ROTC units and military research grants, either).

Education needs to be broad, liberal and free. It must be supported by the people who benefit from it and by all who are committed to its goals. Higher education ought to be our finest example of American free enterprise. I believe nothing is more vulgar in education than the present cut-throat competition for federal grants, and the free flow of federal funds is one of the most stultifying influences on American education today. It is not the issue of federal aid to education, or the separation of church and state that concerns me most. It is this devitalization of the educative enterprise that accompanies the emphasis on grant-receiving and the commensurate de-emphasis on teaching.

We cannot act as if no relationship existed between higher education and the federal government, and I appreciate what benefits we enjoy from the governmental system we have helped to create. But I re-emphasize that we must keep principle and practice consistent, participate where we should and can, and, above all, continue to practice our belief in individual initiative and an economy based on free enterprise. Programs and controls that disregard or negate the fact of God in human society and the effect of principles such as supply and demand will never enjoy divine favor — and the nation that forgets God is doomed.

I am speaking here about the practical results of certain aspects of federal aid and participation in the business of higher education. I would keep it largely within the framework of free enterprise, and support it with private resources. There are many who believe that private venture capital may become the life blood of the good, small educational institutions in America. Without it we will be no better in the '70s than was
"In my opinion, a third ray of hope lies in the greatness of smallness... we do not have to be little because we are small."

Germany in the '30s and '40s or Russia in the '50s and '60s.

Not little because small

In my opinion, a third ray of hope lies in the greatness of smallness. Even at a time when the fad is for colleges to become universities, we do not have to be little because we are small. I think the greatest tragedy that could befall American education and America itself would be the disappearance of the small liberal arts colleges. Even in them the vocational emphasis and the special fields have become so prevalent as to reduce the pure liberal arts strength to about a statistical third.

Nevertheless, we are the garrison of liberal education and we do not succeed as such just by virtue of size. It is a Biblical principle that the small can be great, and this applies to the Christian college as well as to persons. We can be good without being big.

The significance of many a small college has been vitiatted by its attempt to imitate the large multiversity. I believe we can achieve greatness via our considered effort to be a small multipurpose university. To do so we must set some limitation on numbers. Yet we must "roll with the punch" and be realistic about the world in our time. I remember when we built the Ayres Alumni Memorial library on the assumption that 600 was the maximum enrollment for a good small college. We believed it so sincerely that the construction design does not provide for the possibility of expansion of the building. This is why we must now build a larger facility, and we have tentatively thought of planning for a maximum enrollment of 1800 by 1972. I recognize that this is subject to many considerations. One is our ability to structure this growth financially. My concern is that we preserve the greatness of our smallness. We must continue to be personal, individual, and humane in our efforts to guide students into and through the exciting adventure of learning and growing. Why have we assumed that the discoveries we make about the needs and treatment of underprivileged children or slow learners or late bloomers do not apply to the normal majority? If we emphasize TLC in our mental hospitals and find it effective, why should we wait until people are sick to apply it? Remember another Berkeley slogan: "I am a human being; do not fold, bend or mutilate."

Granted, I am one of the first to tell parents we do not run a kindergarten or a reformatory or a mental hospital. But I think I hear the students saying, "We are human beings; do not merely numberize us, do not overmechanize us, do not massize education too much." And with this, I believe, the good small college can comply more successfully and meaningfully than can the numerically great university.

Not one group alone

My fourth concern, and I consider it a potential ray of hope, is the reactivation and further development of the community concept. While this ultimately does include the larger community in a geographical sense, I am now speaking of the academic community which is the essential core of the idea of a university. The academic community is composed of both teachers and students.

Taylor University has pioneered in the community concept of campus life and government. In 1944 we set the student council in an organizational context which related it meaningfully to the administration and enabled it to do more meaningful things than serving as chore-boys in a faculty-student reception. In 1946 we converted the council's status from just another student organization to that of executive committee of the student body. In 1952 a campus council was organized and a monthly town-meeting type of conference was held, with student, faculty and administrative councils participating. In 1955 the student judiciary began to function as an honor board in citizenship affairs.

The ray of hope here lies in a proper rapport between faculty and students, mutual respect, and a fair exchange of common courtesies and consideration. This is facilitated greatly by two factors, one internal and one external. The first is an honest and genuine care for each other within the context of educational aims, goals and proprieties. The other is a planned opportunity for frequent dialogue in larger and smaller groups, via prepared reports, panel discussions and question-answer sessions relative to the important business of the educational enterprise.

This will include discussions of policy at all levels, even though it may not distribute to students an equal share with faculty in final decision-making. In one of the best and most instructive examples of the helpfulness of students, the students quite cooly, if not subtly, titled their part of the program "The swine return the pearls".

Not man alone

I would be quite unwilling to become involved in so stupendous a task as I have outlined here, were it not for a final ray of hope. I speak of the availability of divine resources. This is not a task for man alone. It is as big and as important as anything God could ever entrust to man. I believe He will not leave us alone. Our physical strength needs to be supplemented by His blessing, our wisdom must come from Him, and our spirits must be one with Him. We have seen many recent evidences of His care and His help. Let us daily seek His guidance for our academic, citizenship, financial and public relations policies, programs and problems.
Looking south-west: In the background are East Hall left, and Wengatz Hall, center.

THE SCIENCE BUILDING

Looking south-east: the president's old home can be seen in the distance at center.
No memory of Alma Mater older than a year or so is likely to bear much resemblance to today's college or university. Which, in our fast-moving society, is precisely as it should be, if higher education is . . .

To Keep Pace with America

What on earth is going on, there?

Across the land, alumni and alumnae are asking that question about their alma maters. Most of America's colleges and universities are changing rapidly, and some of them drastically. Alumni and alumnae, taught for years to be loyal to good old Siwash and to be sentimental about its history and traditions, are puzzled or outraged.

And they are not the only ones making anguished responses to the new developments on the nation's campuses.

From a student in Texas: "The professors care less and less about teaching. They don't grade our papers or exams any more, and they turn over the discussion sections of their classes to graduate students. Why can't we have mind-to-mind combat?"

From a university administrator in Michigan: "The faculty and students treat this place more like a bus terminal every year. They come and go as they never did before."

From a professor at a college in Pennsylvania: "The present crop of students? They're the brightest ever. They're also the most arrogant, cynical, disrespectful, ungrateful, and intense group I've taught in 30 years."

From a student in Ohio: "The whole bit on this campus now is about 'the needs of society;' 'the needs of the international situation;' 'the needs of the IBM system.' What about my needs?"

From the dean of a college in Massachusetts: "Everything historic and sacred, everything built by 2,000 years of civilization, suddenly seems old hat. Wisdom now consists in being up-to-the-minute."

From a professor in New Jersey: "So help me, I only have time to read about 10 books a year, now. I'm always behind."

From a professor at a college for women in Virginia: "What's happening to good manners? And good taste? And decent dress? Are we entering a new age of the slob?"

From a trustee of a university in Rhode Island: "They all want us to care for and support our institution, when they themselves don't give a hoot."

From an alumnus of a college in California: "No one seems to have time for friendship, good humor, and fun, now. The students don't even sing, any more. Why, most of them don't know the college songs."

What is happening at America's colleges and universities to cause such comments?
Today’s colleges and universities:

It began around 1950—silently, unnoticed. The signs were little ones, seemingly unconnected. Suddenly the number of books published began to soar. That year Congress established a National Science Foundation to promote scientific progress through education and basic research. College enrollments, swollen by returned war veterans with G.I. Bill benefits, refused to return to “normal”; instead, they began to rise sharply. Industry began to expand its research facilities significantly, raiding the colleges and graduate schools for brainy talent. Faculty salaries, at their lowest since the 1930’s in terms of real income, began to inch up at the leading colleges. China, the most populous nation in the world, fell to the Communists, only a short time after several Eastern European nations were seized by Communist coups d’etat; and, aided by support from several philanthropic foundations, there was a rush to study Communism, military problems and weapons, the Orient, and underdeveloped countries.

Now, 15 years later, we have begun to comprehend what started then. The United States, locked in a Cold War that may drag on for half a century, has entered a new era of rapid and unrelenting change. The nation continues to enjoy many of the benefits of peace, but it is forced to adopt much of the urgency and pressure of wartime. To meet the bold challenges from outside, Americans have had to transform many of their nation’s habits and institutions.

The biggest change has been in the rate of change itself.

Life has always changed. But never in the history of the world has it changed with such rapidity as it does now. Scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer recently observed: “One thing that is new is the prevalence of newness, the changing scale and scope of change itself, so that the world alters as we walk in it, so that the years of a man’s life measure not some small growth or rearrangement or modification of what he learned in childhood, but a great upheaval.”

Psychiatrist Erik Erikson has put it thus: “Today, men over 50 owe their identity as individuals, as citizens, and as professional workers to a period when change had a different quality and when a dominant view of the world was one of a one-way extension into a future of prosperity, progress, and reason. If they rebelled, they did so against details of this firm trend and often only for the sake of what they thought were even firmer ones. They learned to respond to the periodic challenge of war and revolution by reasserting the interrupted trend toward normalcy. What has changed in the meantime is, above all, the character of change itself.”

This new pace of change, which is not likely to slow down soon, has begun to affect every facet of American life. In our vocabulary, people now speak of being “on the move,” of “running around,” and of “go, go, go.” In our politics, we are witnessing a major realignment of the two-party system. Editor Max Ways of Fortune magazine has said, “Most American political and social issues today arise out of a concern over the pace and quality of change.” In our morality, many are becoming more “cool,” or uncommitted. If life changes swiftly, many think it wise not to get too attached or devoted to any particular set of beliefs or hierarchy of values.
busy faculties, serious students, and hard courses

Of all American institutions, that which is most profoundly affected by the new tempo of radical change is the school. And, although all levels of schooling are feeling the pressure to change, those probably feeling it the most are our colleges and universities.

At the heart of America's shift to a new life of constant change is a revolution in the role and nature of higher education. Increasingly, all of us live in a society shaped by our colleges and universities.

From the campuses has come the expertise to travel to the moon, to crack the genetic code, and to develop computers that calculate as fast as light. From the campuses has come new information about Africa's resources, Latin-American economics, and Oriental politics. In the past 15 years, college and university scholars have produced a dozen or more accurate translations of the Bible, more than were produced in the past 15 centuries. University researchers have helped virtually to wipe out three of the nation's worst diseases: malaria, tuberculosis, and polio. The chief work in art and music, outside of a few large cities, is now being done in our colleges and universities. And profound concern for the U.S. racial situation, for U.S. foreign policy, for the problems of increasing urbanism, and for new religious forms is now being expressed by students and professors inside the academies of higher learning.

As American colleges and universities have been instrumental in creating a new world of whirlwind change, so have they themselves been subjected to unprecedented pressures to change. They are different places from what they were 15 years ago—in some cases almost unrecognizably different. The faculties are busier, the students more serious, and the courses harder. The campuses gleam with new buildings. While the shady-grove and paneled-library colleges used to spend nearly all of their time teaching the young, they have now been burdened with an array of new duties.

Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, has put the new situation succinctly: "The university has become a prime instrument of national purpose. This is new. This is the essence of the transformation now engulfing our universities."

The colleges have always assisted the national purpose by helping to produce better clergymen, farmers, lawyers, businessmen, doctors, and teachers. Through athletics, through religious and moral guidance, and through fairly demanding academic work, particularly in history and literature, the colleges have helped to keep a sizable portion of the men who have ruled America rugged, reasonably upright and public-spirited, and informed and sensible. The problem of an effete, selfish, or ignorant upper class that plagues certain other nations has largely been avoided in the United States.

But never before have the colleges and universities been expected to fulfill so many dreams and projects of the American people. Will we outdistance the Russians in the space race? It depends on the caliber
of scientists and engineers that our universities produce. Will we find a cure for cancer, for arthritis, for the common cold? It depends upon the faculties and the graduates of our medical schools. Will we stop the Chinese drive for world dominion? It depends heavily on the political experts the universities turn out and on the military weapons that university research helps develop. Will we be able to maintain our high standard of living and to avoid depressions? It depends upon whether the universities can supply business and government with inventive, imaginative, farsighted persons and ideas. Will we be able to keep human values alive in our machine-filled world? Look to college philosophers and poets. Everyone, it seems— from the impoverished but aspiring Negro to the mother who wants her children to be emotionally healthy—sees the college and the university as a deliverer, today.

Thus it is no exaggeration to say that colleges and universities have become one of our greatest resources in the cold war, and one of our greatest assets in the uncertain peace. America’s schools have taken a new place at the center of society. Ernest Sirluck, dean of graduate studies at the University of Toronto, has said: "The calamities of recent history have undermined the prestige and authority of what used to be the great central institutions of society. . . . Many people have turned to the universities . . . in the hope of finding, through them, a renewed or substitute authority in life."

New responsibilities are transforming once-quiet campuses

The new pressures to serve the nation in an ever-expanding variety of ways have wrought a stunning transformation in most American colleges and universities.

For one thing, they look different, compared with 15 years ago. Since 1950, American colleges and universities have spent about $16.5 billion on new buildings. One third of the entire higher education plant in the United States is less than 15 years old. More than 180 completely new campuses are now being built or planned.

Scarcely a college has not added at least one building to its plant; most have added three, four, or more. (Science buildings, libraries, and dormitories have been the most desperately needed additions.) Their architecture and placement have moved some alumni and students to howls of protest, and others to expressions of awe and delight.

The new construction is required largely because of the startling growth in the number of young people wanting to go to college. In 1950, there were about 2.2 million undergraduates, or roughly 18 percent of all Americans between 18 and 21 years of age. This academic year, 1965–66, there are about 5.4 million undergraduates—a whopping 30 percent of the 18–21 age group. * The total number of college students in the United States has more than doubled in a mere decade and a half.

As two officials of the American Council on Education pointed out, not long ago: "It is apparent that a permanent revolution in collegiate patterns has occurred, and that higher education has become and will continue to be the common training ground for American adult life, rather than the province of a small, select portion of society."

Of today’s 5.4 million undergraduates, one in every five attends a kind of college that barely existed before World War II—the junior, or community, college. Such colleges now comprise nearly one third of America’s 2,200 institutions of higher education. In California, where community colleges have become an integral part of the higher education scene, 84 of every 100 freshmen and sophomores last year were enrolled in this kind of institution. By 1975, estimates the U.S. Office of Education, one in every two students, nationally, will attend a two-year college.

Graduate schools are growing almost as fast.

*The percentage is sometimes quoted as being much higher because it is assumed that nearly all undergraduates are in the 18–21 bracket. Actually only 68 percent of all college students are in that age category. Three percent are under 18; 29 percent are over 21.
Higher education's patterns are changing; so are its leaders

While only 11 percent of America's college graduates went on to graduate work in 1950, about 25 percent will do so after their commencement in 1966. At one institution, over 85 percent of the recipients of bachelor's degrees now continue their education at graduate and professional schools. Some institutions, once regarded primarily as undergraduate schools, now have more graduate students than undergraduates. Across America, another phenomenon has occurred: numerous state colleges have added graduate schools and become universities.

There are also dramatic shifts taking place among the various kinds of colleges. It is often forgotten that 877, or 40 percent, of America's colleges and universities are related, in one way or another, with religious denominations (Protestant, 484; Catholic, 366; others, 27). But the percentage of the nation's students that the church-related institutions enroll has been dropping fast; last year they had 950,000 undergraduates, or only 18 percent of the total. Sixty-nine of the church-related colleges have fewer than 100 students. Twenty percent lack accreditation, and another 30 percent are considered to be academically marginal. Partially this is because they have been unable to find adequate financial support. A Danforth Foundation commission on church colleges and universities noted last spring: "The irresponsibility of American churches in providing for their institutions is deplorable. The average contribution of churches to their colleges is only 12.8 percent of their operating budgets."

Church-related colleges have had to contend with a growing secularization in American life, with the increasing difficulty of locating scholars with a religious commitment, and with bad planning from their sponsoring church groups. About planning, the Danforth Commission report observed: "No one can justify the operation of four Presbyterian colleges in Iowa, three Methodist colleges in Indiana, five United Presbyterian institutions in Missouri, nine Methodist colleges in North Carolina (including two brand new ones), and three Roman Catholic colleges for women in Milwaukee."

Another important shift among the colleges is the changing position of private institutions, as public institutions grow in size and number at a much faster rate. In 1950, 50 percent of all students were enrolled in private colleges; this year, the private colleges' share is only 33 percent. By 1975, fewer than 25 percent of all students are expected to be
by, but 15 years ago there were roughly 120,000 Negroes in college, 70 percent of them in predominantly Negro institutions; last year, according to Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, there were 220,000 Negroes in college, but only 40 percent at predominantly Negro institutions.

The remarkable growth in the number of students going to college and the shifting patterns of college attendance have had great impact on the administrators of the colleges and universities. They have become, at many institutions, a new breed of men.

Not too long ago, many college and university presidents taught a course or two, wrote important papers on higher education as well as articles and books in their fields of scholarship, knew most of the faculty intimately, attended alumni reunions, and spoke with heartiness and wit at student dinners, Rotary meetings, and football rallies. Now many presidents are preoccupied with planning their schools’ growth and with the crushing job of finding the funds to make such growth possible.

Many a college or university president today is, above all else, a fund-raiser. If he is head of a private institution, he spends great amounts of time searching for individual and corporate donors; if he leads a public institution, he adds the task of legislative relations, for it is from the legislature that the bulk of his financial support must come.

With much of the rest of his time, he is involved in economic planning, architectural design, personnel recruitment for his faculty and staff, and curriculum changes. (Curriculums have been changing almost as substantially as the physical facilities, because the explosion in knowledge has been as sizable as the explosion in college admissions. Whole new fields such as biophysics and mathematical economics have sprung up; traditional fields have expanded to include new topics such as comparative ethnic music and the history of film; and topics that once were touched on lightly, such as Oriental studies or oceanography, now require extended treatment.)

To cope with his vastly enlarged duties, the mod-

enrolled in the non-public colleges and universities.

Other changes are evident: More and more students prefer urban colleges and universities to rural ones; now, for example, with more than 400,000 students in her colleges and universities, America’s greatest college town is metropolitan New York. Coeducation is gaining in relation to the all-men’s and the all-women’s colleges. And many predominantly Negro colleges have begun to worry about their future. The best Negro students are sought after by many leading colleges and universities, and each year more and more Negroes enroll at integrated institutions. Precise figures are hard to come
Many professors are research-minded specialists

eren college or university president has often had to
double or triple his administrative staff since 1950.
Positions that never existed before at most institu-
tions, such as campus architects, computer pro-
grammers, government liaison officials, and deans
of financial aid, have sprung up. The number of
institutions holding membership in the American
College Public Relations Association, to cite only
one example, has risen from 591 in 1950 to more
than 1,000 this year—including nearly 3,000 indi-
vidual workers in the public relations and fund-
raising field.

A whole new profession, that of the college “de-
velopment officer,” has virtually been created in
the past 15 years to help the president, who is usu-
ually a transplanted scholar, with the twin problems
of institutional growth and fund-raising. According
to Eldredge Hiller, executive director of the Ameri-
can Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, “In 1950
very few colleges and universities, except those in
the Ivy League and scattered wealthy institutions,
had directors or vice presidents of development.
Now there are very few institutions of higher learn-
ing that do not.” In addition, many schools that
have been faced with the necessity of special de-
velopment projects or huge capital campaigns have
sought expertise and temporary personnel from out-
side development consultants. The number of major
firms in this field has increased from 10 to 26 since
1950, and virtually every firm’s staff has grown
dramatically over the years.

Many alumni, faculty members, and students
who have watched the president’s suite of offices
expand have decried the “growing bureaucracy.”
What was once “old President Doe” is now “The
Administration,” assailed on all sides as a driving,
impersonal, remote organization whose purposes
and procedures are largely alien to the traditional
world of academe.

No doubt there is some truth to such charges. In
their pursuit of dollars to raise faculty salaries and
to pay for better facilities, a number of top officials
at America’s colleges and universities have had
insufficient time for educational problems, and some
have been more concerned with business efficiency
than with producing intelligent, sensible human
beings. However, no one has yet suggested how
“presxy” can be his old, sweet, leisurely, scholarly
self and also a dynamic, farsighted administrator
who can successfully meet the new challenges of
unprecedented, radical, and constant change.

One president in the Midwest recently said: “The
engineering faculty wants a nuclear reactor. The
arts faculty needs a new theater. The students want
new dormitories and a bigger psychiatric consulting
office. The alumni want a better faculty and a new
gymnasium. And they all expect me to produce
these out of a single office with one secretary and a
small filing cabinet, while maintaining friendly con-
tacts with them all. I need a magic lantern.”

Another president, at a small college in New
England, said: “The faculty and students claim
they don’t see much of me any more. Some have
become vituperative and others have wondered if I
really still care about them and the learning process.
I was a teacher for 18 years. I miss them—and my
scholarly work—terribly.”

The role and pace of the professors have
changed almost as much as the administrators’, if
not more, in the new period of rapid growth and
radical change.

For the most part, scholars are no longer regarded
as ivory-tower dreamers, divorced from society.
They are now important, even indispensable, men
and women, holding keys to international security,
economic growth, better health, and cultural ex-
cellence. For the first time in decades, most of their
salaries are approaching respectability. (The na-
tional average of faculty salaries has risen from
$5,311 in 1950 to $9,317 in 1965, according to a
survey conducted by the American Association of
University Professors.) The best of them are pur-
sued by business, government, and other colleges.
They travel frequently to speak at national con-
ferences on modern music or contemporary urban
problems, and to international conferences on particle physics or literature.

In the classroom, they are seldom the professors of the past: the witty, cultured gentlemen and ladies—or tedious pedants—who know Greek, Latin, French, literature, art, music, and history fairly well. They are now earnest, expert specialists who know algebraic geometry or international monetary economics—and not much more than that—exceedingly well. Sensing America's needs, a growing number of them are attracted to research, and many prefer it to teaching. And those who are not attracted are often pushed by an academic "rating system" which, in effect, gives its highest rewards and promotions to people who conduct research and write about the results they achieve. "Publish or perish" is the professors' succinct, if somewhat overstated, way of describing how the system operates.

Since many of the scholars—and especially the youngest instructors—are more dedicated and "focused" than their predecessors of yesteryear, the allegiance of professors has to a large degree shifted from their college and university to their academic discipline. A radio-astronomer first, a Siwash professor second, might be a fair way of putting it.

There is much talk about giving control of the universities back to the faculties, but there are strong indications that, when the opportunity is offered, the faculty members don't want it. Academic decision-making involves committee work, elaborate investigations, and lengthy deliberations—time away from their laboratories and books. Besides, many professors fully expect to move soon, to another college or to industry or government, so why bother about the curriculum or rules of student conduct? Then, too, some of them plead an inability to take part in broad decision-making since they are expert in only one limited area. "I'm a geologist," said one professor in the West. "What would I know about admissions policies or student demonstrations?"

Professors have had to narrow their scholarly interests chiefly because knowledge has advanced to a point where it is no longer possible to master more than a tiny portion of it. Physicist Randall Whaley, who is now chancellor of the University of Missouri at Kansas City, has observed: "There is about 100 times as much to know now as was available in 1900. By the year 2000, there will be over 1,000 times as much." (Since 1950 the number of scholarly periodicals has increased from 45,000 to
The push to do research: Does it affect teaching?

But what about education—the teaching of young people—that has traditionally been the basic aim of our institutions of higher learning?

Many scholars contend, as one university president put it, that "current research commitments are far more of a positive aid than a detriment to teaching," because they keep teachers vital and at the forefront of knowledge. "No one engaged in research in his field is going to read decade-old lecture notes to his class, as many of the so-called 'great professors' of yesterday did," said a teacher at a university in Wisconsin.

Others, however, see grave problems resulting from the great emphasis on research. For one thing, they argue, research causes professors to spend less time with students. It also introduces a disturbing note of competitiveness among the faculty. One physicist put it this way:

"I think my professional field of physics is getting too hectic, too overcrowded; there is too much pressure for my taste. . . . Research is done under tremendous pressure because there are so many people after the same problem that one cannot afford to relax. If you are working on something which 10 other groups are working on at the same time, and you take a week's vacation, the others beat you and publish first. So it is a mad race."

Heavy research, others argue, may cause professors to concentrate narrowly on their discipline and to see their students largely in relation to it alone. Numerous observers have pointed to the professors' shift to more demanding instruction, but also to their more technical, pedantic teaching. They say the emphasis in teaching may be moving from broad understanding to factual knowledge, from community and world problems to each discipline's tasks, from the releasing of young people's minds to the cramming of their minds with the stuff of each subject. A professor in Louisiana has said, "In modern college teaching there is much more of the 'how' than the 'why.' Values and fundamentals are too interdisciplinary."

And, say the critics, research focuses attention on the new, on the frontiers of knowledge, and tends to forget the history of a subject or the tradition of intellectual inquiry. This has wrought havoc with liberal arts education, which seeks to introduce young people to the modes, the achievements, the
consequences, and the difficulties of intellectual inquiry in Western civilization. Professor Maure Goldschmidt, of Oregon’s Reed College, has said:

“The job of a liberal arts college is to pass on the heritage, not to push the frontiers. Once you get into the competitive research market, the demands become incompatible with good teaching.”

Another professor, at a university in Florida, has said:

“Our colleges are supposed to train intelligent citizens who will use knowledge wisely, not just intellectual drones. To do this, the colleges must convey to students a sense of where we’ve come from, where we are now, and where we are going—as well as what it all means—and not just inform them of the current problems of research in each field.”
'Somewhat despairingly, Professor Jacques Barzun recently wrote:

"Nowadays the only true believers in the liberal arts tradition are the men of business. They really prefer general intelligence, literacy, and adaptability. They know, in the first place, that the conditions of their work change so rapidly that no college courses can prepare for them. And they also know how often men in mid-career suddenly feel that their work is not enough to sustain their spirits."

Many college and university teachers readily admit that they may have neglected, more than they should, the main job of educating the young. But they just as readily point out that their role is changing, that the rate of accumulation of knowledge is accelerating madly, and that they are extremely busy and divided individuals. They also note that it is through research that more money, glory, prestige, and promotions are best attained in their profession.

For some scholars, research is also where the highest excitement and promise in education are to be found. "With knowledge increasing so rapidly, research is the only way to assure a teacher that he is keeping ahead, that he is aware of the really new and important things in his field, that he can be an effective teacher of the next generation," says one advocate of research-cum-instruction. And, for some, research is the best way they know to serve the nation. "Aren't new ideas, more information, and new discoveries most important to the United States if we are to remain free and prosperous?" asks a professor in the Southwest. "We're in a protracted war with nations that have sworn to bury us."

The students, of course, are perplexed by the new academic scene.

They arrive at college having read the catalogues and brochures with their decade-old paragraphs about "the importance of each individual" and "the many student-faculty relationships"—and having heard from alumni some rosy stories about the leisurely, friendly, pre-war days at Quadrangle U. On some campuses, the reality almost lives up to the expectations. But on others, the students are
The students react to "the system" with fierce independence

dismayed to discover that they are treated as merely parts of another class (unless they are geniuses, star athletes, or troublemakers), and that the faculty and deans are extremely busy. For administrators, faculty, and alumni, at least, accommodating to the new world of radical change has been an evolutionary process, to which they have had a chance to adjust somewhat gradually; to the students, arriving fresh each year, it comes as a severe shock.

Forced to look after themselves and gather broad understanding outside of their classes, they form their own community life, with their own values and methods of self-discovery. Piqued by apparent adult indifference and cut off from regular contacts with grown-up dilemmas, they tend to become more outspoken, more irresponsible, more independent. Since the amount of financial aid for students has tripled since 1950, and since the current condition of American society is one of affluence, many students can be independent in expensive ways: twist parties in Florida, exotic cars, and huge record collections. They tend to become more sophisticated about those things that they are left to deal with on their own: travel, religion, recreation, sex, politics.

Partly as a reaction to what they consider to be adult dedication to narrow, selfish pursuits, and partly in imitation of their professors, they have become more international-minded and socially conscious. Possibly one in 10 students in some colleges works off-campus in community service projects—tutoring the poor, fixing up slum dwellings, or singing and acting for local charities. To the consternation of many adults, some students have become a force for social change, far away from their colleges, through the Peace Corps in Bolivia or a picket line in another state. Pressured to be brighter than any previous generation, they fight to
feel as useful as any previous generation. A student from Iowa said: "I don’t want to study, study, study, just to fill a hole in some government or industrial bureaucracy."

The students want to work out a new style of academic life, just as administrators and faculty members are doing; but they don’t know quite how, as yet. They are burying the rah-rah stuff, but what is to take its place? They protest vociferously against whatever they don’t like, but they have no program of reform. Restless, an increasing number of them change colleges at least once during their undergraduate careers. They are like the two characters in Jack Kerouac’s On the Road. “We got to go and never stop till we get there,” says one. "Where are we going, man?” asks the other. “I don’t know, but we gotta go,” is the answer.

As with any group in swift transition, the students are often painfully confused and contradictory. A Newsweek poll last year that asked students whom they admired most found that many said “Nobody” or gave names like Y. A. Tittle or Joan Baez. It is no longer rare to find students on some campuses dressed in an Ivy League button-down shirt, farmer’s dungarees, a French beret, and a Roman beard—all at once. They argue against large bureaucracies, but most turn to the industrial giants, not to smaller companies or their own business ventures,
The alumni lament: We don't recognize the place

when they look for jobs after graduation. They are critical of religion, but they desperately seek people, courses, and experiences that can reveal some meaning to them. An instructor at a university in Connecticut says: “The chapel is fairly empty, but the religion courses are bulging with students.”

Caught in the rapids of powerful change, and left with only their own resources to deal with the rush, the students tend to feel helpless—often too much so. Sociologist David Riesman has noted: “The students know that there are many decisions out of their conceivable control, decisions upon which their lives and fortunes truly depend. But . . . this truth, this insight, is over-generalized, and, being believed, it becomes more and more ‘true’. ” Many students, as a result, have become grumblers and cynics, and some have preferred to withdraw into private pads or into early marriages. However, there are indications that some students are learning how to be effective—if only, so far, through the largely negative methods of disruption.

If the faculties and the students are perplexed and groping, the alumni of many American colleges and universities are positively dazed. Everything they have revered for years seems to be crumbling: college spirit, fraternities, good manners, freshman customs, colorful lectures, singing, humor magazines and reliable student newspapers, long talks and walks with professors, daily chapel, dinners by candlelight in formal dress, reunions that are fun. As one alumnus in Tennessee said, “They keep asking me to give money to a place I no longer recognize.” Assaulted by many such remarks, one development officer in Massachusetts countered: “Look, alumni have seen America and the world change. When the old-timers went to school there were no television sets, few cars and fewer airplanes, no nuclear weapons, and no Red China. Why should colleges alone stand still? It’s partly our fault, though. We traded too long on sentiment rather than information, allegiance, and purpose.”

What some alumni are beginning to realize is that they themselves are changing rapidly. Owing to the recent expansion of enrollments, nearly one half of all alumni and alumnae now are persons who have been graduated since 1950, when the period of accelerated change began. At a number of colleges, the song-and-revels homecomings have been turned into seminars and discussions about space travel or African politics. And at some institutions, alumni councils are being asked to advise on, and, in some cases, to help determine parts of college policy.

Dean David B. Truman, of New York’s Columbia College, recently contended that alumni are going to have to learn to play an entirely new role vis-à-vis their alma maters. The increasingly mobile life of most scholars, many administrators, and a growing number of students, said the dean, means that, if anyone is to continue to have a deep concern for the whole life and future of each institution, “that focus increasingly must come from somewhere outside the once-collegial body of the faculty”—namely, from the alumni.

However, even many alumni are finding it harder to develop strong attachments to one college or university. Consider the person who goes to, say, Davidson College in North Carolina, gets a law degree from the University of Virginia, marries a girl who was graduated from Wellesley, and settles in Albuquerque, New Mexico, where he pays taxes to help support the state university. (He pays Federal taxes, too, part of which goes, through Government grants and contracts, to finance work at hundreds of other colleges and universities.)

Probably the hardest thing of all for many alumni—indeed, for people of all loyalties—to be reconciled to is that we live in a new era of radical change, a new time when almost nothing stands still for very long, and when continual change is the normal pattern of development. It is a terrible fact to face openly, for it requires that whole chunks of our traditional way of thinking and behaving be revised.

Take the standard chore of defining the purpose of any particular college or university. Actually,
some colleges and universities are now discarding the whole idea of statements of purpose, regarding their main task as one of remaining open-ended to accommodate the rapid changes. "There is no single 'end' to be discovered," says California's Clark Kerr. Many administrators and professors agree. But American higher education is sufficiently vast and varied to house many—especially those at small colleges or church-related institutions—who differ with this view.

What alumni and alumnæ will have to find, as will everyone connected with higher education, are some new norms, some novel patterns of behavior by which to navigate in this new, constantly innovating society.

For the alumni and alumnæ, then, there must be an ever-fresh outlook. They must resist the inclination to howl at every departure that their alma mater makes from the good old days. They need to see their alma mater and its role in a new light. To remind professors about their obligations to teach students in a stimulating and broadening manner may be a continuing task for alumni; but to ask the faculty to return to pre-1950 habits of leisurely teaching and counseling will be no service to the new academic world.

In order to maintain its greatness, to keep ahead, America must innovate. To innovate, it must conduct research. Hence, research is here to stay. And so is the new seriousness of purpose and the intensity of academic work that today is so widespread on the campuses.

Alumni could become a greater force for keeping alive at our universities and colleges a sense of joy, a knowledge of Western traditions and values, a quest for meaning, and a respect for individual persons, especially young persons, against the mounting pressures for sheer work, new findings, mere facts, and bureaucratic depersonalization. In a period of radical change, they could press for some enduring values amidst the flux. In a period focused on the new, they could remind the colleges of the virtues of teaching about the past.

But they can do this only if they recognize the existence of rapid change as a new factor in the life of the nation's colleges; if they ask, "How and what kind of change?" and not, "Why change?"

"It isn't easy," said an alumnus from Utah. "It's like asking a farm boy to get used to riding an escalator all day long."

One long-time observer, the editor of a distinguished alumni magazine, has put it this way:

"We—all of us—need an entirely new concept of higher education. Continuous, rapid change is now inevitable and normal. If we recognize that our colleges from now on will be perpetually changing, but not in inexorable patterns, we shall be able to control the direction of change more intelligently. And we can learn to accept our colleges on a wholly new basis as centers of our loyalty and affection."

---
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A major event for the Business Club was the Awards Banquet held May 6, when a significant and spiritually challenging address was presented by Mr. Alfred A. Whittaker, President of the International Division of Bristol-Meyers, and the father of a Taylor freshman, Donald Whittaker.

During the event seven awards were presented to outstanding business students. These included the Wall Street Journal Award, the Stock Award, the Achievement Award, and four Scholarship Awards. The latter are sponsored by the Pierce Governor Company of Upland, Mr. Leland A. Boren, President.

Special guests included several business and industrial leaders from Upland, Marion and Hartford City.

Local industrialists and Taylor personnel enjoyed the banquet fellowship. (L-R): Mr. Joseph Smid, Plant Manager, Fisher Body Corporation, Marion; Dr. Kenneth Van Sise, Associate Prof. of Business and Economics; Mr. Alfred A. Whittaker, President, Bristol-Meyers, International Division, and guest speaker; and President Milo A. Rediger.

Right, top photo: James Richard, senior from Santa Barbara, California, received the Achievement Award from Dr. Van Sise. Lower right: Recipients of Scholarship Awards were (L-R), Theodore Wood, sophomore from Sea Cliff, N.Y.; Samuel Shellhamer, junior from Wabash, Indiana; Richard Gygi, junior from Elkart, Indiana; and (not pictured), Nancy Kitson, sophomore from Eldorado, Ohio.
□ 1931

George Breaden and his wife, Lola, serve the Lord in various ways in Beirut, Lebanon. He writes of the many obstacles placed in the way of believers and asks our prayers for them. They have been in Beirut for over six years and hope to return to this country later this year.

□ 1938

Major Margaret Trefz writes of the various activities during the Centenary Year of the Salvation Army, at Usher Institute in Bulawayo, Rhodesia, and in other related stations. During some of the meetings a number of Junior and Senior Soldiers were enrolled.

□ 1944

Elizabeth Suderman

Elizabeth Suderman gives a vivid word picture of the Christmas program presented by the children and young people at the Missao de Catota, Serpa Pinta, Angola, Africa. The new primary school building with plenty of room and light is being enjoyed by all.

Theda Davis is serving as a missionary to Ecuador. She teaches English and music to 230 pupils, in grades one through six. In addition she is a “Jill-of-all-trades,” serving as treasurer and bookkeeper. She spent a few weeks in the States, returning after Easter to Ecuador for another year of service. Her address is Casilla 187, Esmeraldas, Ecuador.

□ 1945

Jane Winterling continues her work in Jadotville, Democratic Republic of Congo, and gives an interesting word picture of the various women’s and children’s meetings—in the prison, army camps, and assemblies—in their efforts to spread the Word. She expects to return to Nyankunde in May.

□ 1951

Art and Carol (Dixon ’49) Mix and children have returned to Walanae, Hawaii, after a short furlough. They have been busy building up church attendance and finances but now are confident the church will be stronger than before. Carol is chairman of the Language Arts Department with 18 teachers under her supervision. Doug is in the top sixth grade section; Michael, in the top fourth grade section; Greg attends nursery school, and Kathy is busy “helping” mother and causing a general stir when she interrupts her big brothers in their play.

□ 1952

Ruby Enns has returned to India where she is teaching children of missionaries at the Lushington School, Ootacamund, Nilgiris, South India. She feels she is being both teacher and parent to these children so the parents can do their missionary work free of worry.

Jean M. Morgan writes that The Jesse Lee Home has moved from Seward, Alaska, to Star Route A, Box 65, Anchorage, Alaska. The new million dollar plant is located just outside of Anchorage on 25 acres of beautifully wooded, hilly country about two miles from the Chugach mountains.

□ 1953

Fred and Gloria (Krebs ’52) Kleinhen are serving their second term under the C. & M.A. Mission Board in Viet Nam. Their address is Box 41, Nhatrang, Viet Nam.

Hugh Sprunger and family are on furlough from their work in Taiwan, Formosa, and are at 355 Compromise Street, Berne, Indiana.

□ 1954

Joanne (Dutro) Maughlin, husband, Stan, Carla, one year old and Alan, four are at E.S.U. Katabue, B.P. 780 Luluaouabour, Republique Democratique du Congo. Stan is busy with building and maintenance and they both find themselves in need of language study again, because of the move to a different area.

Mrs. Steven Stoltzfus (Leona (Tish) Tieszen ’54) gives a glowing account of the wonderful vacation in the States that she, her husband, Philip, and James, and Lola Tuesta, a Peruvian girl who accompanied them, enjoyed a few months ago. They have returned to Tournavista, Peru, South America.

□ 1955

C. P. Tarkington and family who work at the Christian Servicemen’s Center at Koza, Okinawa, expect to leave for furlough in late May, visiting their workers in Taiwan, and the Philippines and friends in Guam and Hawaii. They also attend the O.C.S.C. Conference in Denver in late July and visit their own families after this.

□ 1960

Eldon Howard and family have recently arrived in Africa, where they are working under the Sudan Interior Mission. Their address is Box 14, Keno, North Nigeria, West Africa. Eldon is developing a new accounting system for the Eye Hospital and Optical Shop and Elizabeth is working as a nurse in the S.I.M. Eye Hospital.

□ 1961

Stewart and Marlene (Silvis) Georgia are at Mount Darwin, Rhodesia, Africa, at the Mavuradonha Mission Station. Marlene teaches English Lit and History and Stew teaches maths and sciences and goes to the villages on the weekends. They have over 70 students who are eager to learn and succeed in their classes.

□ 1962

Ray and Adrien (Chandler ‘63) Durham plan to do mission work in the Philippine Islands under Overseas Crusades.

□ 1963

Duane and Marcia (Weber ’64) Schmucker are at the Concord Missionary Home, 95 Windermere Road, Durban, Natal, South Africa, where they are hard at work studying Zulu, with about 450 words mastered so far. They also help in a Zulu Sunday School and in a new church work.

NEWS OF THE CLASSES

□ 1920

Lula Fern Cline, who taught at Taylor in the 20's and again in the early 30's, recently moved to 4222 South Washington Street, Marion, Indiana. A veteran educator, she spent the last several years in Jacksonville, Florida, where a special "This Is Your Life" program was given in her honor last June.

□ 1941

Virginia Ruth Bunner
Los Angeles Area Chapter Meets
by Alice Uphold '39

The Los Angeles area Taylor Alumni Chapter held a dinner meeting in the new World Vision International Headquarters building in Monrovia on Saturday evening, March 5, 1966. Our host and hostess were Dr. Ted and Dorothy (Weaver) Engstrom, both of class '38. Ted holds the responsible position of Executive Vice President of World Vision.

The meeting was well organized by President Richard Norris, Jr. and his wife, Mary Louise (Winters), both of the class of '51. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. (Mabel Thomas x'27) Richard Norris, Sr., prepared and served a delicious Cantonese dinner. Following the meal, the group sang several choruses. President Dick Norris conducted a brief business meeting, and Rev. David and Becky (Swander) LeMasters organized the program.

1950

Cleo (Murdoch) Henry writes that she and her family are at 14610 S.E. 113th Street, Renton, Washington. Her husband, Keith, enjoys his work at Boeing. They have found the people friendly and enjoy working with the pre-schoolers in their church.

Roland Sumney has recently been promoted to secretary and elected to the Board of Directors at Brotherhood Mutual Insurance Company in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Betty (Egeberg) Olsen and her husband, Walter, are now in their new home at 2203 Austin Drive, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Walter works at the Apollo Testing site in Las Cruces. David is three years old and Beth, 1.

Recently Gary Cooper was awarded the M.A. degree in counseling from Eastern Michigan University. His wife, Marilyn, teaches school half days. Both are active in church, teaching the college class and singing in the choir. Tammy Lynn is five and anxious to start kindergarten. Gary Lee II has to wait two years to start school.

1960

Don and Norma (Richards '58) Toland live at 6 R. 1, Washington Boro, Pennsylvania, where Don is in the selling field, selling Cooper tires wholesale to dealers in the Lancaster area. Norma teaches fourth graders in the community of Oley, Pa. Arlene is four years old and enjoys their new home in the country.

1961

Larry Fuhrer has recently accepted the position of Director of National Alumni Campaign (for raising capital funds) for the Illinois Institute of Technology. He will complete his Master's in Public Relations in June of this year. He and his wife the former Linda Larsen '62, live at 908 Parkway, Wheaton, Illinois.

1964

Roy and Lynne (Oseberg) Hagen have recently moved to 12215 South Sangamon, Chicago. Lynne is working on her Master's degree in Social Work at the University of Chicago. Roy is teaching in Homewood, Illinois, and also working on his Master's.

Brian and Beverly (Jacobs) Brightly are completing their second year at New York Theological (Biblical) Seminary. Brian is also studying drama at Union Theological Seminary and is assistant minister and youth director at a Methodist Church. Beverly received the M.A. in Educational Psychology at N.Y.U, under a full scholarship, and has begun work on the Ph. D. degree. Brian Jr., is now almost one year old. Last summer Brian was assistant minister in an all negro church in North Carolina, where he was in charge of a recreational program for 200 youth. His work was sponsored by the Students Intercultural Ministry.

1965

Mrs. Curtis Reithel (Lois Hitchcock) is teaching 4th grade in the Lansing Public Schools. Her husband is a graduate student in political science at Michigan State. They live at 15081 Spartan Village, East Lansing.

Virginia Ruth Bunner, first grade teacher at Upland, Indiana, for 22 years, will leave in August for three years teaching at the Seoul Foreign School, Seoul, Korea. She will teach one of two first grades in the mission school which has 100 students enrolled in Kindergarten through 12 grades. The school is housed in a modern building with a new auditorium and well equipped class rooms, with texts and accommodations very similar to local schools.

Mrs. Don Yocom (Dorothy Ferree) is the author of a meditation accepted for publication in the Upper Room, worldwide interdenominational devotional guide. The meditation, published in the March-April issue, was used on March 4.

Rev. and Mrs. Robert Villwock (Dorothy Fenstermacher) have moved to Red Lake Falls, Minnesota, where they serve the Presbyterian Church.

Paul Steiner has recently been promoted to Director of Claims with the Brotherhood Mutual Insurance Company in Fort Wayne, Indiana. He, his wife, the former Ruth Henry '51, and family live at 1825 Florida Drive.

Mrs. Robert Merian (Rose Marie Stoddard) writes that her husband, Bob, '50, is in Psychological Warfare in South Viet Nam with the U.S. Information Service. Mrs. Merian's address is Apt. A22 Tyler House, Presidential Gardens, Alexandria, Virginia.

Dr. and Mrs. James H. Oliver, Jr. (Arlene Ann Williams x'55) live at Lancelot Drive, San Antonio, Texas. Jim is a major in the Air Force, completing his third year as a resident in Aviation Medicine at Brooks A.F.B. Nan is a busy mother with their five children, Kathy 10, Doug 8, Jamie 6, Malcolm 3, and Susan, 18 months.

David A. Jones has recently been appointed headmaster of Morgan Park Academy, an independent co-educational school at 2135 West 111th Street, Chicago, Illinois. He has been associated with the school since 1957 and has been principal of the Upper School since 1964.

Captain Thomas G. Beers is serving as Staff Secretary for Task Force 70 in Okinawa until August, this year.

Chaplain Stan J. Beach is serving in Viet Nam, attached to the Third Marine Division, for 13 months duty. His wife, Ellen, and children, Laurie and Randy, are at 325 Norman Street, Caro, Michigan.
MEET MR. AVERAGE

It is finished! At long last the Mount Everest task of compiling all the facts and figures of the alumni questionnaire, which was sent out two years ago, has been completed. Nineteen typewritten pages is the fruit of months of minute and diligent work by our office secretary, Mrs. Shippy. This has been a very demanding task and each day has been fraught with many hazards to the accomplishment of this task. The ringing of the telephone, the addressing of chapter mailings and the transcription of correspondence by a "wordy" boss, are just a few of the hazards encountered.

This compilation has given us a rather good idea of Mr. or Mrs. Average Alumnus, as we had a return of 1410 questionnaires of a possible 3800. If you still have yours, we would appreciate your filling it out and sending it to us as it is important for our biographical files.

To endeavor to give you a picture of Mr. or Mrs. Average Alumnus will be rather difficult in many areas but I will try. Of course, we are told there is no person to whom we can refer as Mr. Average, for we all vary from the norm in many points. In order to avoid the conflict of referring to this person as he or she, we will use the first name, "Average," as our term of reference to this individual.

Average is a remarkable person of ability, accomplishments, responsible leadership, and is a Christian.

Average is married and has a family of 2.6 children, whose spouse may also have attended Taylor as one out of three have. Average attended Taylor for three years and has an A.B. degree, or may be one of the four who has the B.S. degree. Average majored in one of three disciplines, Education, Social Science, or Religion and Philosophy. Average may also have a graduate degree as 60% of our returns showed. If Average did not receive a degree at Taylor, it could have been for one or more of 25 different reasons.

One out of seven of the returns showed that Mr. Average was in military service for a period of one month to 27 years.

Average has been a church member ever since his graduation from Taylor. Average is very active in the church and holds one or more responsible lay leadership offices. What is Average's church denomination? It could be any one of 50, but Average is either a Methodist or Baptist, as over half of our alumni listed membership in these two denominations.

Average may be politically-minded but is not a politician, as only 24 have ever run for public office, with only 12 being elected. Average is a community-minded individual and participates in one or more of 53 community activities.

According to the returns of the questionnaire we have 54 different occupations represented which we have compiled under four headings: Service personnel, which relates to the fields of Education and Religion; Professional, such as law and medicine; Homemaker, and Business. Average has chosen his vocation in the field of "service" and it is a draw as to whether it is the field of Education or the ministry. Nine hundred sixteen of the alumni listed family incomes of $5000 to over

(Continued on page 19)

“Alumni” Ed gives interesting facts on the results of the alumni questionnaire.

Publishers

Two alumni, Edgar Bolles ’30 and Maurice Coburn ’49 are the founders and publishers of "The Weekly Antique News" which, at last report, was enjoying a favorable and growing public response.

The paper has been enlarged from four to eight pages to accommodate all the advertisers, and the number of paid subscribers has increased steadily. If interested write to Ed or Maurice at Quality House Publishers. P. O. Box 908, Wheaton, Illinois 60187.

Correction. The photo of the Richard Norris family which appeared in the Winter issue of the magazine was erroneously identified as "Mr. & Mrs. Jim Norris & family." Jim (’51) and family live at 359 Hoffman Ave., Turtle Creek Village, Lebanon, Ohio.

BIRTHS

Paul and Karen (Brown) Nelson, both of the class of ’64, announce the birth of Andrea Grace on March 5.

Lt. (j.g.) Kenneth ’62 and Virginia ’65 are proud to announce the arrival of Daniel Kent, born February 21. Ken is Public Information Officer at Oceana Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia.

Charles ’57 and Charlotte (Justice ’58) Saleska are the proud parents of Kent Wayne, born March 17. Scott is three years old.

Dale Alan was born to Alan and Gretchen (Miller ’59) Loomis on July 11, 1965.

Tom and Gloria (Griffin ’63) Skubish are the proud parents of Richard Edwin, born February 20.

Doyle ’63 and Judy (Miller ’64) Hayes announce the birth of Joyce Denice on November 23, 1965.

William ’61 and Becky Ringenberg are happy to announce the arrival of Matthew Carey on March 3.


WEDDINGS

Lois Jackson ’63 and Dennis Austin ’65 were united in marriage at the College Wesleyan Methodist Church in Marion, Indiana, on April 2nd. They live at 1005C Park Forest Drive, Marion, Indiana.

Annette Nerguzian and Daniel Bruce, both graduates of 1965, were married on January 1, 1966. Both are teaching in the Marion, Indiana, public schools.

DEATHS

Navy Captain Wells R. Bill, Jr. died on March 20 at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. He had served in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations since 1963. Among the survivors are his wife, Mariorie (White ’36) Bill, a son, Wells R. III, and a daughter, Barbara, who will enter Taylor this fall.

Elma M. Kellar, who lived in Taylor's campus from 1928 to 1954, died on July 17 at the Veteran's Administration Hospital, Marion, Indiana. He would have been 89 years old on May 18. Among the survivors are two daughters, Margaret Kellar ’36, of Providence, Rhode Island, and Mrs. D. V. Whitenack (Mildred Kellar x’27) of Delta, Ohio.
BUFFALO ALUMNI HOST TAYLOR EDUCATION PROFESSOR

Front row, L-R: “Alumni” Ed Bruer x’40; Dave and Faith (Dodge x’55) Wheeler ’53; Dorothy (Wing x’56) and Art Blakley, and Dorsey W. Brause, Chairman of the Taylor Division of Education. He is married to the former Doris Oswald ‘52.

Second row: Dave and Mrs. Larson ’60; Wesley and Patty (Haas ’46) McEntire ’45; Yvonne Rosecrans ’65; Mrs. Wilks and mother; Third row: Margery Sidey; Roger and Mrs. Winn ’61. Photo was taken by Tom Sidey ’50.

MEET MR. AVERAGE

(Continued from page 18)

$25,000, with the average family income somewhere between $8500 and $9000.

Average’s cultural activities extend to attendance at plays and concerts, the reading of non-fiction, listening to radio and TV concerts, perhaps collecting classical recordings and may play a musical instrument. With radio and TV in the home, Average listens to news, classical music, and religious programs, while viewing news, drama and movies, situation comedies, sports, panel and quiz programs.

The reading material in the home consists of Reader’s Digest, religious magazines, news magazines, and Life. The bookshelf in the library will be headed by religious and devotional books, then biographical and historical, with professional books, third place, and fiction on the lower shelf. The ten books Average has read this year are BLACK LIKE ME, TO KILL A MOCKINGBIRD, THE AGONY AND THE ECSTASY, LORD OF THE FLIES, BEYOND OURSELVES, TAKE MY HANDS, EXODUS, THE UGLY AMERICAN, CANNIBAL VALLEY, and SHOES OF THE FISHERMAN.

It is apparent that Average is the same gregarious individual as when at Taylor because leading the list of recreational activities is informal contact with friends. Average is still an athlete, if not in body, at least in mind, and enjoys the outdoor sports and activities, from a quiet game of croquet to a fast run downhill on skis. With an inquiring mind, itching feet, a good set of wheels, and filling stations on every corner, Average, enjoying the pleasures of traveling, takes off for the other side of the mountain.

Average, like every good alumnus, has compliments and complaints to make of the Taylor program. It has taken three pages to compile these and we find they are as different as the years of graduation. We thank you for your words of commendation and constructive criticism. Some of the things you have criticized have already been rectified, and others are under study and will be taken care of as fast as it is possible. As your Executive Director, I can assure you that the administration has been and will be taking a close look at all your suggestions and complaints. I am certain you will realize that at no time will Taylor ever be without faults and weaknesses, since it is an institution operated by humans and subject to the handicaps which they impose on it by lack of time, wisdom, or finances. I certainly wish that I, and my home, were without faults.

I have been praying that every one of you might have the opportunity of returning to campus within the next year or two to witness the changes that God hath wrought here and the changes which are to come if we will remain faithful in prayer and financial support. You can help Taylor become what, under God, it ought to be if you will take time to give her the benefit of your counsel, your prayers and finances.

The complete compilation of the questionnaires will be on file in the Alumni Office for any who may wish to study it.
Missionary work with a tribe in Papua, the southeastern part of the island of New Guinea, Australia might seem an uneven exchange for the relative comforts of life here. But for area residents the Rev. and Mrs. Sutherland MacLean it is the culmination of many years of preparation and anticipation.

Before departing on the first leg of their journey Jan. 28 to Sydney, Australia, the MacLeans and their children resided in Armonk with Mrs. MacLean’s family. She is the former Miss Rodina Priestly, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James K. Priestly of 8 Hadley Road. Mr. MacLean is the son of Mrs. Robert MacLean of 144 N. Broadway, White Plains, and the late Mr. MacLean.

Since their marriage in May of 1962 the MacLeans have eagerly awaited assignment to missionary work. Now a family of four with two daughters, Heather, age 3 and Rodina, 15 months old, they are on their way to the primitive areas of remote Papua for a four year assignment.

Their work is under the auspices of the Un evasioned Fields Mission, a nonsectarian group that draws workers from many faiths and sends them to areas never before probed by clergymen.

Since they did not know the exact location of their mission site, the MacLeans, who met while she was conducting a Bible study group in her home, had to pack clothing suitable for either the jungle lowlands or the more frigid climate of the high lands of Papua.

Mrs. MacLean’s first concern, however, was with cooking utensils. A plane will deliver food to the family once a week and serve as their only link to the “civilized” world. The comforts taken for granted here such as electricity and running water will be a forsaken luxury. Thus in addition to the responsibilities of the religious roles, the MacLean family will face the hardships of building a household from the raw materials of the wilderness, in the company of a people who know nothing of the convenient life of automobiles, split-level homes and extension telephones.

Both the MacLeans are well prepared for their venture. Mrs. MacLean studied at the Mission Headquarters Bala-Cynwyd in Pennsylvania. A former resident of White Plains, she was graduated from White Plains High School and attended Taylor University at Upland, Ind.

Mr. MacLean holds a bachelor of arts degree from Princeton University where he was president of the Evangelical Fellowship. He received his master’s degree in theology from the Dallas Theological Seminary in Texas. A former resident of Eastchester, he is an alumnus of Eastchester High School.

Both studied at the Wycliffe Institute of Language at the University of Washington, Seattle.

Before moving to Armonk, the Rev. and Mrs. MacLean were with the Bloomfield, Michigan Baptist Church. They both participated in the work at the Sermons in Science Pavilion at the New York World’s Fair.

To prepare them for the tasks of primitive living they went to Melbourne for training at candidate school with an orientation course and a refresher course in linguistics. From there, the young family of four will begin their four year assignment.

(Reprinted by permission of The Reporter Dispatch, White Plains, N. Y.)