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A scene from the Junior Science Camp in Northern Michigan? Guess again. The vision and resources of the Junior Basketball Camp leaders have helped bring about this new 8-acre recreation facility on the southwest section of Taylor's property. For views of other summer activities on campus see pages 4 and 5.
SEEING THINGS

The roads to Point Lookout, Clingman's Dome, the Palisades and other high places are filled with sight-seers this time of year. There is something exhilarating about going up to where the air ventilates the soul. One finds a therapeutic release from the enervating things that take the living out of life.

The plain fact is that humanity needs a larger, longer view. God made man to see farther than the TV set or the corner drive-in or the assembly line or the ticker tape machine.

These are a part of life, to be sure, but facts and feelings must have a context; they must be seen from the perspective of a high place.

On these pages your eyes can span many of Taylor's hallowed acres from an entirely fresh vantage point, the very top of the new science building. Here in panorama is the evidence of those who have seen clearly, who have had visions of a new Taylor—and now it is taking form before our eyes. Part of the empty expanse can well symbolize the need for a chapel-auditorium. One great day soon, we trust, it will begin to rise at the heart of the campus.

High places, of course, are not always geographical. Taylor is Taylor, partly because its people—students, faculty, staff and others who find their way to the campus—are led to high spiritual and intellectual places. Though our habitation may be in the valley of routine, we have learned, by Revelation, to look unto the "hills" where we can thrill to a view of the forever.
The Junior Basketball Camp, in session June 11 to August 5, hosts several sports celebrities each summer. Clyde Lee, former All-American at Vanderbilt University and currently with the San Francisco Warriors, towers over aspiring basketballers from the Marion area. The campers are John Finch, Larry Shorten, and Bill Nelson.

The founders and directors of the program are Taylor basketball coach Don J. Odle, and Marion Crawley, coach of four state champion high school teams. Clyde Lee is one of a number of leading athletes with an evangelical Christian witness.
The college may have appeared quiet to passersby. But with construction, repairing of buildings, moving, basketball and baseball, the apparent serenity has been deceptive.

For right: Indiana "Press Photographer of the Year," Ed Breen of the Marion Leader-Tribune, stands atop the nearly-completed Science Building from where he took the panoramic photos on pages 2-3, using a Hasselblad SWC camera.

Second from right: John Jantzen, Assistant Professor of French, assists the Maintenance staff in refurbishing the old campus buildings and spends much of his free time working on a Ph. D. dissertation.

Below: The Taylor baseball team, Hoosier Conference Champions, and NAIA regional winners, extended their unbeaten streak to 25 consecutive games before losing to Eastern Michigan in the Area Finals by the slim scores of 2-1 and 3-2. Among TU sluggers were (l-r) Dwight Johnson, Rick Atkinson, Mike Mancini and Randy Mohler.

Bottom: Vida Wood, Professor of Biology, fills two dozen boxes with laboratory equipment in preparation for the big move to the new Science Building.
Zeke Smith and the Southern Baptists

Denominational conferences often used to be something of endurance contests, blandly predictable, with interminable reports, each trying to out-distance the others with much speaking. The high point of some sessions was probably the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, or a dramatic presentation by the Resolutions Committee whose articulate spokesman made each "be it resolved" an experience in eloquence.

But with all the struggles now going on in humanity's arenas, the Church, like Jacob, has been forced to do some wrestling—not only with principalities and powers but with flesh and blood issues and personalities.

And many church groups are undergoing the trauma of sounding out some sacrosanct traditions such as the separation of church and state. Some raw nerves were touched, according to a report of the Chronicle of Higher Education, during a recent Southern Baptist conference debating the propriety of accepting federal loans and grants for Baptist colleges.

The catalyst, according to the Chronicle, was a fictitious letter from a rural Southern Baptist named "Zeke Smith."

In a chatty manner Zeke described how his small country church had changed "since you came about five years ago and spoke to our brotherhood one hot summer night.

"We all got together and the Deacons passed a resolution and got our legislator to make this a State Aid road and now it has been blacktopped. We also have a parking lot. The County Supervisor sent the road grader by and graded up our drive and put gravel on it and also put gravel on the parking lot. We sure did appreciate this. It didn't cost us a cent, but after all, we have a lot of voters in our church."

The letter continued with descriptions of a Rural Electrification Association power line for the church, a federal loan for a community water system serving the church. A GI Bill-educated pastor, and local tax exemptions for church property.

The correspondence from the mythical Zeke illustrates the dilemma facing not only Southern Baptists, but other private college educators who have been studying devoutly the issue of federal funds. The tradition of separation of church and state collides with the anxieties of education leaders who fear that many four-year colleges will fail or become second-rate if federal loans and grants are turned away.

The whole issue is many-sided. Of course, and involves not only construction grants and loans but scholarships, student loan funds and grants for research and for library materials. To go a step further, tax deductability of private gifts to colleges can also be called a type of federal aid. So the question is no longer whether we will accept federal aid, but to what extent.

The special feature beginning on the following page, "Living With Uncle" is an intriguing discussion of the relationships between the federal government and the enterprise called higher education. We believe it deserves your thoughtful reading.

---

Note: Views expressed in "Living with Uncle" do not necessarily reflect those of Taylor University. The college is now preparing an official policy statement concerning Federal aid to Christian higher education.
America's colleges and universities, recipients of billions in Federal funds, have a new relationship:

Life with Uncle

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

eral institutional support which they have been receiving since the nineteenth century.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

R
ECENT STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS have dramatized another problem to which the partnership between the government and the campus has contributed: the relative emphasis that is placed
compete for limited funds

on research and on the teaching of undergraduates.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

More help will surely be forthcoming.

The fact that Federal funds have been concentrated in the sciences has also had a pronounced effect on colleges and universities. In many institutions, faculty members in the natural sciences earn more than faculty members in the humanities and social sciences; they have better facilities, more frequent leaves, and generally more influence on the campus.
The government's support of science can also disrupt the academic balance and internal priorities of a college or university. One president explained:

"Our highest-priority construction project was a $3 million building for our humanities departments. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act, we could expect to get a third of this from the Federal government. This would leave $2 million for us to get from private sources.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The affluence of research:

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

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

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

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

The Bureau of the Budget, for example, has had to
a siren song to teachers

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

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

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

T

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The recommendation went unheeded.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Colleges and universities believe, for the most

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"What is going on here," says McGeorge Bundy, "is a great adventure in the purpose and performance of a free people." The partnership between higher education and the Federal government, he believes, is an experiment in American democracy. Essentially, it is an effort to combine the forces of our educational and political systems for the common good. And the partnership is distinctly American—boldly built step by step in full public view, inspired by visionaries, tested and tempered by honest skeptics, forged out of practical political compromise.

Does it involve risks? Of course it does. But what great adventure does not? Is it not by risk-taking that free—and intelligent—people progress?
CLASS NEWS

1923
Mrs. John Mabuce (Mary French) was recently elected as a member of the Board of Directors of the National Council of Churches for a three-year term. She was a delegate to the Triennial Conference in Miami in December, 1966. Mrs. Mabuce has been a member of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church for eleven years and is vice-chairman of the Personnel Committee which reviews all missionaries of the Methodist Church. Dr. Mabuce '19, retired several years ago after 44 years in the Methodist ministry. He is a member of the National Chapel-Auditorium Committee of Taylor University.

1929
Wilson and Doris (Atkinson '26) Paul, who act as tour guides for a West Coast travel agency, have visited 49 countries since 1959 and have been around the world three times. This summer they are visiting Scandinavia, Finland and the North Cape. Dr. Paul is Director of Lectures and the Concert Series at Michigan State. Mrs. Paul writes children's plays and books, though she does not limit herself to children's literature. Since entering the professional music field she writes for journals dedicated to music and collaborates with her sister, Esther Mary Fuller x'29, of Naples, Florida, in various musical productions such as "Songs of Travel in Many Lands." As a public service, 45,000 copies of this book have been distributed to elementary classrooms of the nation.

1931
Rev. Ernest Shumaker of Fowler, Indiana, organized and led a team of 16 laymen and ministers which spent the month of August in a Congo work camp. Mr. Shumaker is the Lafayette District missionary secretary. The team assisted with the mission program at the Piper Memorial Hospital in Kapanga. Dr. '59 and Mrs. (Dawn Shumaker x'58) Leroy Kinzer of Markle, Indiana, were members of the team.

1932
Virgil Brown and his wife have served the Centenary Methodist Church at Shullsburg, Wisconsin, for four years. Three of their sons are married and all live in that part of the state so they see them often.

1936
Mrs. Ethel Rose, who with her husband managed the college store from 1936-1943 wrote a letter to the college recently. Two of their children, Robert and Thora, attended Taylor. Robert is a city planner and Thora teaches psychiatric nursing. An older son is a Naval Commander. Mr. H. C. Rose authored the book "The Instructor and His Job."

1939
Dr. Evan H. Bergwall was appointed District Superintendent of the Warsaw District during the North Indiana Methodist Annual Conference in May. He had been pastor of the Simpson Methodist Church, Fort Wayne for eight years. The Bergwalls reside at 221 N. Union Street, Warsaw.

1942
Rev. Howard A. Lyman was awarded an honorary degree by Adrian College during commencement exercises on May 28. Howard is senior pastor of the Central Methodist Church in Lansing, Michigan. He has given leadership in the Michigan Conference, serving as a delegate to the 1964 General Conference, the 1966 Special Conference in Chicago on the merger with the EUB church, and the 1966 World Methodist Conference in London.

1951
Harold and Janice Herber
Dr. Harold Herber '51, is associate professor of Education at Syracuse University. He conducts the "Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program," and as a reading specialist, he has published several books under the title, "Learning Your Language." He is co-editor of "Journal of Reading," the main professional magazine in the field. He and his wife, the former Janice Rose '52, live at 209 North Manlius Street, Fayetteville, New York. The Herbers are sponsors of the Dorothy L. Knight Scholarship which is allocated to a needy sophomore who demonstrates academic and service potential.

1952
Rev. H. J. Buwalda, pastor of the Evangelical United Brethren Church of Hastings, Michigan, left Pasadena, California, on June 28 for a missionary tour of Japan, Hong Kong, Vietnam and Korea. He was the evangelist in city-wide meetings in Pusan and Taegu, Korea, as well as to leper colonies in the Orient. Mrs. Buwalda and sons, Herb and Jarric, stayed in Pasadena during his absence. Their older son, Dennis '66, is now a minister in the Indiana Conference of the E.U.B. Church.

1954
Dr. Lawrence Lacour, staff member of the Methodist Board of Evangelism since 1957, has been appointed pastor of the First Methodist Church in Colorado Springs, Colorado, the fifth largest congregation in Methodism with 6200 members.

1955
Nancy Jacobson was commended for ten years of distinguished service by the Delaware County Christian School, Newtown Square, Pennsylvania. She recently received a Master's degree in Library Science from Villanova University, and teaches sixth grade and head's the elementary school library.

1957
Philip Van Wyken has recently been appointed pastor at the Immanuel Community Church in St. Paul (suburb: Roseville). His address is 2375 Dellwood Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota.

1958
Theodore G. Curtis has recently received a Master's degree in Industrial Education from Ball State University. He and his wife, the former Carol Miller '59, live at R.R. 1, Jonesboro, Indiana.

Robert, Norma Jean (Walker x'59) Cotner, Jon, eight years, and Erin Andrea, four months, have moved from Muncie, Indiana, to Wheaton, Maryland, where Bob is a resource teacher in English in the Montgomery County Schools. Their new address is 2819 Hardy Avenue, Wheaton, Maryland 20902.

Chaplain Stan Beach is still at the U.S. Naval Hospital, Ward 12-S, Great Lakes, Illinois. About two months ago he had further surgery on his leg, which seems to be healing satisfactorily now. He is working a few
hours each day in the Chaplain’s Office, though he has to remain seated with his leg elevated.

1959

Mrs. James Glenn (Irlene Gierman) has been chosen for inclusion in the 1966 edition of Outstanding Young Women of America, a biographical compilation of 6000 women between the ages of 21 and 35 who have distinguished themselves in civic and professional activities. Rev. Glenn is the pastor of the Evangelical Mennonite Church in Pioneer, Ohio, where they live with their three children at 401 Baubice Street.

1960

Howard and Sue (Andrews) Mathis-en live at 1 Nelson Street, Webster, Massachusetts, where they serve the Zion Lutheran Church. Howard received the Master of Arts degree in Religion from Concordia Seminary recently. Randi Sue is two years old.

William S. Reasner was graduated this spring from the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary with a Masters of Theology, cum laude, in the field of Biblical Studies. He was graduated from Asbury Theological Seminary in 1953 and is serving the Olivet Methodist Church, Elmer, New Jersey.

1961

Rev. Veryl Roth, pastor of the Evangelical Mennonite Church in Berne, Indiana, and his wife, Norma, were a part of the ninth annual European Seminar sponsored by Gordon College, Wenham, Mass., which Veryl attended as a seminary student. The tour was an eight-week field trip on the theme, “On the Trail of Our Christian Heritage.” England, Holland, Greece, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and France were visited. During his absence Rev. Roth’s pulpit was filled by Rev. Russell Van Vleet ‘46, who, with his family, is on furlough from their missionary duties in the Dominican Republic.

Captain Clifford W. Owens has been appointed a U.S. Army chaplain. After attending Chaplain’s School at Fort Hamilton, New York, for nine weeks he will be stationed with the 5th Army at Fort Carson, Colorado. Mrs. Owens, the former Ruth Agar ’63, and their four children will accompany him to Fort Carson in September.

1962

Rev. John W. Williams has been appointed full time chaplain at the V.A. Hospital in Saginaw, Michigan. He still serves the LaPorte Methodist Church in Freeland, Michigan, and lives at 3303 Smith’s Crossing, R.R. 2, Freeland.

Joseph P. Hayden has been appointed Director of Development of Hayden Mills, Tecumseh, Michigan.

George Douglas Smith received the Master of Divinity degree from Asbury Theological Seminary at the commencement exercises the latter part of May.

1963

David and Pat (Tschetter) Cook have recently moved to 800 East 132nd Street, Burr Ridge, Illinois. David has been with the Shell Oil Company as a company representative, in Minneapolis, for a year. After teaching three years, Pat is a full-time mother to Pamela Lynn, about nine months.

Allen and Janelle Goethus have moved from Indianapolis to 933½ Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Illinois.

Dale and Janet (Spitzer) Sorensen’s new address is Box 274, Guilford Road, R.R. 10, Rockford, Illinois, where they serve the Calvary Memorial Church.

David and Dianne (Skoglund ’64) Valentine live in South Carolina where David is a Lieutenant in the U.S. Navy Dental Corps, attached to the Marines, and stationed at Parris Island. He recently received his degree from Loyola University Dental School in Chicago. Dianne is enjoying being a full time housewife.

1964

John and Anita (Weimer ’63) Freeman live at 621 North Iowa, Gunningon, Colorado, where John is attending Western State College, majoring in Physics.

William Wiley recently received his Master’s in Education with a specialization in accounting from Ball State University this spring. He plans to teach Economics and Business at Marion College this fall.

1966

Samuel Kuwana is completing work on an advanced degree at U. of U. His wife, Phoebe, was recently honored for high scholastic achievement. Both are African students sponsored by Indiana Methodists as part of the “Operation Education” program.
in a Brazilian school in third and fourth grades, and Nathaniel is studying English, first grade, with his mother.

1952

John Simpson, who is in the Palau Islands with his family, writes of the typhoon which hit their islands. Morning light revealed the destruction, but also much for which to be thankful. No one was hurt, the three boats all glided up on the bank, with not one damaged, two huge trees blew down behind the generator building, but not on it, their house was still standing and the only building destroyed was an old, termite ridden one. They were able to continue the school, with some classes being held in the home. Many people of Palau lost almost everything and without the parents' helping to supply food for the 100 girls in the school, a real problem exists. Our prayers are requested.

The Kemptons: Bethany, Lois, Coralie, Keith, Charles, and Glendon.

Charles and Lois (inboden) Kemp ton and children were involved in a very serious car accident on May 24 at Westmoreland, Tennessee, when a car ran a stop sign and crashed into their car. Chuck and Lois were not injured but the four children were thrown from the car. The three older children, Keith, Bethany, and Glendon, received cuts and serious abrasions but are all right now. Coralie, just four years old, has a very serious skull fracture and brain damage, and has received brain surgery in the Vanderbilt University Hospital in Nashville. She has made some improvement and has been moved from the Intensive Care Unit (after 30 days there) into the Pediatric Surgical Ward. The Kemptons wrote, "She will need much prayer and direct healing from God for her ever to be herself again."

Recently the Kemptons were accepted by World Gospel Crusades to engage in a literature ministry of the type Chuck did in his term in Japan. However, Coralie will need further surgery so the timing of their future plans depends on this.

John and Jeanette (Badertscher x'54) Cornell write of the importance of the bookmobile in Maracaibo, Venezuela and surrounding areas, where "if the evangelical volume does not reach every hamlet, the pages of a corrupt and licentious literature will"—"Good News Broadcaster," May, 1967. They, and their seven children spent their vacation in Oceana, Columbia, where John taught at the Oceana Bible Institute.

1953

Harold Olsen, who is in the Radio Department of Africa Inland Mission, P.O. Kijabe, Kenya, East Africa, has bought a print of "Angel in Ebony" for the mission library in Nairobi. Not only their own missionaries but missionaries and Africans in other church groups are using the film. Many say it is the finest film ever shown to Christian groups in Kenya. He writes, "The Lord has given us fantastic opportunities putting on gospel programs—both on radio and television, here in peaceful and prosperous Kenya."

Gerald and Miriam (Deyo '55) Close write that Nyadere Hospital, Nyadere, Salisbury, Rhodesia, rarely lacks interesting cases, such as a badly mauled leopard victim, malnutrition and starvation cases, among many others. Witchcraft is still very much with the African people also, hindering healing in many cases. "Beverly and Stephen, the two eldest children, are 90 miles away at the Methodist Hostel, attending school. Miriam teaches Randy, and Doug and Dan are finally finding each other compatible."

1955

Bill Yoder, European Youth for Christ Director, Joan (Selleck x'57), Christina, and Heidi, have left Geneva, Switzerland for a year at the Wheaton, Illinois area. They have been in Europe for eleven years. Bill's time in the States is divided between graduate study and a ministry in representing the Overseas Division of YFC International.

1957

Dr. and Mrs. Raymond Isely (Ruth Skaaden x'59) have arrived at Wembo Nyama, Congo, Africa, where Ray works in the Lambuth Memorial Hospital.

1958

Dr. and Mrs. Edward Dodge (Nancy DeLay '57) and family are at the Public Health College, Gondar, Ethiopia, where Ed is an assistant professor. In a comparatively new experiment, the College trains health officers, community nurses, and sanitariums to staff rural Health Centers. The students are high school graduates who are given four years of education in basic sciences, clinical medicine and preventive medicine. Ed's primary task is to work with these students in their fourth year,
doing various kinds of village health surveys and trying to introduce health measures that are both effective and acceptable to villagers, with the latter often a major problem. Gondar is a town of 25,000 with an elevated feel and is supposed to have a very temperate climate. There are only 300 doctors in a country of 22 million people and most are foreigners, living in the large cities. Thus the country has a big health problem and a very inadequate health force.

Randy is eight, Jeff, four, and Amy nine months. Randy is enrolled in the International School at Gondar, which is primarily for children of faculty.

1959

John and Gwen (Davies) Getman and children have moved to Bokondini, into the coolness of the mountains in the interior of West Iran. It is the newest of Missionary Aviation Fellowship's bases. They lived in one end of a 28x40 foot warehouse at first but have built their own house now. Their land parcel of land had to come from trees on the mountainside, which had to be cut, sawed, and dried. All fixtures, such as bathtub, sink, pipes, wiring, etc., had to come first, and the house had to be built one way as they stop, visiting with the missionaries, as they have not talked to a white person for many months, and preparing for the time that they will have to wait for another plane over the noon hour or over night.

Afternoons Gwen is the teacher for Cheryl and Jimmy, while Susie and Lynda take naps. Cheryl is in second grade and Jimmy in kindergarten.

1961

Stewart and Marlene (Silvis) Georgia, whose address is Private Bag 16, Mount Darwin, Rhodesia, Africa, have found that African villages are as primitive as they had heard, with ploughing being done by oxen, making corn flour by stamping it in hollow logs and sacrificing to their ancestors. Their main ministry is still the students in the secondary school and they ask our prayers for this important work.

1962

Ross and Mary Evelyn (Leslie) Beach are in language school at the TEAM Mission, P.O. Box 2672, Seoul, Korea. They hope to teach in a Christian college in Korea's east coast.

1963

Sarah Wimmer, who is a secretary-bookkeeper in Burundi, Africa, writes of their "new" missionary, a small English Ford, and of the many needs it fills—taking patients to the hospital, getting literature to some of the bookstores scattered around Burundi, taking another missionary and Sarah to Kayera where special services were conducted in the grade school for three days with a wonderful response from the children, in addition to many others. Sarah's address is B.P. 76, Gitega, Burundi, Africa.

1964

Marilyn Porter writes that when she returned to her station from a trip to Nairi and Turkish x'62, at the Kiamosi Hospital where she works. Jean is a medical student at an osteopathic school in Chicago and has been awarded a grant to work in Kenya for the summer. She is at the Nairobi Hospital but may be assigned to Kiamosi Hospital where Marilyn works. Marilyn's address is Tiriiki, P.O. Kisumu, Kenya, East Africa.

1965

Theodore Mbuulungu, M UK E D I. Congo, Africa, directs and teaches in the Secondary School at Mukedi Station. He writes, "Our Congo land is undergoing many changes, economic, social, political, etc. We are happy for our new president with his government. He makes reforms and is a friend to many nations in Africa as well as foreign nations.

1966

DN James P. Sauguen, B403364, Hq. Co. (Dental), 1st War, Rekt, FPO, San Francisco, California 96602, is a dental technician in Vietnam. In this capacity, he is not in a combat situation. He is thankful for the fine Christians he has met and for the things God has permitted him to do.

Dan and Judy (Englund) Kastelein, who are with YFC at 6806 Viernheim, Saarlzndstr #29, Germany, have had to cancel a bus trip to the Holy Land with the young people from their chapel, due to the conditions in the Middle East. Because summer jobs are scarce, summertime offers a challenge to them to develop activities which will interest the high schoolers and allow Dan and Judy to share the gospel with them. Dan plans several bicycle trips and Judy is working on events for the girls. Bus trips to places of interest in Germany are also planned.

2Lt. Kenneth Hess, 05338906, is a platoon leader in the company located near Pleiku, Vietnam, where he is employed in construction of buildings for the Dragon Mountain Base Camp. His new address is Co. B, 20th Engr. Battalion, FPO San Francisco, California 96318.

WEDDINGS

Marcia Edgett '62 and Ward Turner were married on June 10. They plan to attend Moody this fall.

Hazel Butz '38 and Jamie J. Carruth were united in marriage in the college chapel on May 27.

Barton Comstock and Marilyn Stukey, both of the class of 64, were united in marriage on June 11 in the Monroe, Indiana, Methodist Church. Marilyn is a senior in the Methodist Hospital School of Nursing. They are living in Indianapolis until fall when they will move to Kansas City, Kansas, where Barton is in medical school.

Gregg Litchty '65 and Kathy McKeen were married on June 10. Gregg is employed in the South Adams School System and they live in Berne, Indiana.

Dr. A. Wesley Pugh '22 and Marguerite Deyo '31 were united in marriage on June 6 by Bishop Richard Raines at the episcopal residence of the North Indiana Conference in Indianapolis. They are making their home at 401 West Bougainville Road, Lehigh Acres, Florida.

Elsie Shugart x'65 and Joe Vandegrift '66 were married on June 3 at Bethel Friends Church, near Marion, Indiana. They live at 1908 North Capitol, Apt 5, Indianapolis, Indiana, and Joe expects to attend Asbury Theological Seminary this fall.

BIRTHS

Paul and Gladys (Haakensen) Weisgerber, both of the class of 59, are the proud parents of Timlyn, born May 5. Robbie is almost two.

David '64 and Aina (Sander x'66) Carlson are happy to announce the birth of David Lee, Jr. on October 4. Dave had a job with Western Electric in Cicero, Illinois. Aina has her degree from Wheaton College. They live at 1117 East Roosevelt, Wheaton, Illinois.


Ron and Jane (Stickler) Heizerman, both of the class of 63, are the proud parents of Timothy Neil. born June 10.

David Paul was born to Robert and Marilyn (Adams x'59) Schick on June 16. Diane is almost three years old. They live at 6802 N.W. 60th Street, Bethany, Oklahoma.

Ray '62 and Adrian (Chandler x'63) Durham are happy to announce the birth of Katherine Alice on June 12. They are with Overseas Crusade, P.O. Box 1416, Manila, The Philippines. Ray coaches and also teaches Science, English, and Bible Study Methods at Faith Academy, the school for missionaries' children in Manila.

DEATHS

Idris Hinshaw '29, died May 8, 1967, at her home in Fountain City, Indiana. She had been a school history and foreign languages teacher in the Fountain City School for 34 years. An Idris Hinshaw Memorial Fund has been established by the Northeastern Wayne School Board.

Raymond R. Sturgis '26, passed away on March 30, the day after his 75th birthday, after having suffered a heart attack. He was a retired Methodist minister. Survivors include his wife, who lives at 9271 Marmade, St. Louis, Missouri, and two daughters.
Meet Robert L. Warren, long-time business executive with LeTourneau-Westinghouse, who joined the Taylor family August 1st. In his new calling he will seek to bridge communications gaps between commerce and the campus. Mr. Warren stands symbolically on the well-traveled wooden bridge just north-west of the campus, with the 367-employee Pierce Governor plant visible in the background.

Dr. Milo A. Rediger spoke at the Taylor presidential dinner-reception held in the Detroit area April 28 in the Ford Motor Company executive dining room. Ralph Higgin's '63 was chairman of the well attended event.

Robert L. Warren, Manager, Direct Sales, International Division of the LeTourneau-Westinghouse Corporation, (WABCO) has been appointed Assistant to the President of Taylor University effective August 1, 1967, according to an announcement by the President, Dr. Milo A. Rediger.

Warren, an executive of WABCO for 29 years, previously held the following positions: Manager of National Accounts, Domestic Division; Manager, National Sales, International Division; Manager, New York Office, International Division; Sales Supervisor, Middle and Far Eastern Territory; Service Manager, International Division; Manager, Engineering Records Department.

Mr. Warren's work has taken him frequently to the continents of Australia, South America and Europe, as well as to major U.S. cities. He was given a "Million Miler" award by the commercial airlines in 1965.

Warren has attended Sales Analysis Institutes, Management Seminars and Marketing and Business Seminars conducted by the American Management Association and the Alexander Hamilton Institute.

"We are pleased to have a businessman of Mr. Warren's background on our staff, to aid us in expending our relationships with business and industry, and our service to the communities," Dr. Rediger commented.

Mrs. Warren is employed as secretary to an attorney. They have one daughter, a sophomore at Taylor.
**FALL SPORTS SCHEDULE**

### FOOTBALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 16</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 30</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14</td>
<td>Indiana Central</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>Hanover (Homecoming)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 28</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4</td>
<td>Defiance (Parents Day)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Fourth Annual Taylor Conditioner</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashland, Ball State, Eastern Illinois,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miami, Manchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester College</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson College</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Fifth Annual Taylor Invitational</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson, Aquinas, Cumberland, Earlham,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenville, Kentucky State, Manchester,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Northern, Spring Arbor, Atterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Corps, Vincennes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashland College Distance Classic</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earlham Invitational</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana Central College</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin College</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Little Big State (at Indianapolis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HCC (at Earlham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAIA (at Omaha, Nebraska)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TENNIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Bellarmine College, Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester College</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin College</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson College</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Goshen College</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earlham College</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanover College</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana Central College</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goshen College</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>9:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>