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I recently found a stack of my old grade school report cards. The year-end comments are revealing. Miss Rack wrote of my fourth-grade efforts that “I am positive that Billy can do better than passing work. He prefers to waste his time, paying little attention and not trying at all.” (I should report that I was in love with Miss Rack, and these comments on my report card did some damage to the relationship.) Mr. Glasser found me little changed by the sixth grade. “These grades are a direct result of William’s unwillingness to assume the necessary responsibilities of sixth grade. He has often proven that with some application he could achieve better grades. His future success at school will be directly related to the rate at which he matures.” (I did not love Mr. Glasser.)

I, however, was not about to mature academically anytime soon. I did not start taking school seriously until the second semester of my junior year at Boston University. I am, then, a “late-bloomer,” a person whose achievements come well after the age at which society normally expects them.

Since early 1988 Jack Levin of Northeastern University and I have been studying educational late-blooming in America. (Jack is also an educational late-bloomer, having first made the academic probation list and then the Dean’s list in college.) We began by conducting in-depth interviews with a sample of Northeastern University students who were poor or mediocre in high school, but became honor roll students at Northeastern. Here is what has emerged as a model for the way educational late-blooming seems to occur.

Capacity

First, students must have the capacity to do academic work. Aside from the intellectual capacity to do school work, we have found among educational late-bloomers a sort of emotional acapacity which allows them to make intense commitments to activities other than school work. While getting D’s and C’s in high school, the late-bloomers were often fanatic “students” of rock music, sports, television programs, old films and so on. Ask a boy who is about to flunk the eighth grade about the players on professional sports teams and their performance statistics, and he will likely get an “A” for his encyclopedic knowledge. The ability to learn the names and positions of hundreds of athletes could easily be translated into “A’s” in school since both require the ability to memorize long lists of essentially meaningless information.

Opportunity

All the late-bloomers we spoke to were able to get into college and to stay in school in spite of their poor academic performance. American society appears to be unique among societies with formal systems of education in the extent to which individuals are given the opportunity to continue in school despite poor performance. In Japan, England, Germany, in fact, essentially everywhere, if you haven’t performed on time, you get no chance to continue to higher education. In America, however, 34% of all colleges have open access admissions policies and, as at Bridgewater, older students are increasingly encouraged to return to, or even begin undergraduate degrees. Of course, late-blooming is still largely a middle to upper-class phenomenon. Families must be willing and able to do without the salary that a mediocre student could be earning if he or she were not still in school, waiting to bloom.

Stimulating Event

At some point, given the intellectual and emotional capacity, and the opportunity to continue in school despite poor performance, something must occur which motivates an individual to want to do academic work. The late-bloomers we interviewed reported both positive and negative forms of such stimuli. Among the positive ones were 1) taking a course with an excellent teacher who made learning seem rewarding, 2) finding the subject to major in which might not have been available in high school (e.g. engineering, anthropology, philosophy and so on) and 3) making friends for whom doing well in school is already important. Among the more negative stimulating events were 1) realizing, typically in the junior or senior year, that unless something changes you are going to be qualified to do for a living only things you do not want to do and 2) being told by parents that they will no longer pay tuition or housing costs for a college student who will not do college work.

Once some combination of these stimuli focus the attention of the potential late-bloomer on doing school work, she or he typically does so with great drive and energy. They seem to derive more pleasure from their academic success than students who have always gotten high grades, and even seem to maintain their motivation to perform longer and more intensely than early-achievers. So far as we can tell from our research to this point, parents of potential late-bloomers and people who hope to bloom themselves have reason to be patient for the time when capacity and opportunity are joined by the right stimulating events. Late-blooming may well occur in school and beyond.

EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

Waiting For The Late-Bloomer

By William Levin
The Death Penalty and Mass Murder

By Jack Levin

I had to think long and hard about the death penalty before finally taking an abolitionist stance. Whether or not I agree with the public reaction, I do understand why Ted Bundy's recent execution by the State of Florida was seen by many around the country as a cause for celebration. After all, the world lost one of its most despicable killers.

Almost 80 percent of Americans now favor the death penalty; and it's not hard to understand the reason why. People are fed up with violent crime. They believe that it is out of control and they want to do something about it. Many idolize Bernard Goetz, the so-called “subway vigilante” because he refused to just sit back and be victimized. You can see the same appeal in Charles Bronson's *Death Wish* films and in *Rambo* and *Rocky*.

Politicians have done just about everything possible to scare us to death. In the last presidential campaign, for example, I saw the furloughed rapist Willy Horton so often in political commercials that I began to think that Willy was the candidate for office.

We all know that the crime rate is unacceptably high; but we may not be having the unprecedented epidemic that tabloid TV programs claim. Believe it or not, the rate of violent crime was substantially higher in 1980 than it is today. Yet, in their nationally televised debates, candidates Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter never even mentioned crime. In 1980, they were apparently too busy discussing the real campaign issues of the day.

I cringe every time I read in the newspaper that mass killer Charles Manson is eligible for parole, because I know what people will think: “The criminal justice system is soft on murderers. Down with the criminal justice system and up with capital punishment.” Actually, Charles Manson had received the death penalty. But, in 1972, the Supreme Court of the United States struck down capital punishment because it was being applied in an uneven, capricious manner. At that point, any murderer on death row was instead given the next most severe sentence possible under state law. In California, that sentence was life with parole eligibility. As a result, Charles Manson was then eligible for parole after serving only seven years.

When someone asks whether or not I support the death penalty, I often respond, “It all depends on the alternative.” If the alternative in response to a brutal, hideous murder is life imprisonment with parole eligibility, then I am indeed in favor of the death penalty. If, however, the alternative is a life sentence without the possibility of ever being paroled, then capital punishment becomes unnecessary for the protection of society and I am therefore against it.

A series of rulings by the Supreme Court in 1976 paved the way for states to restore the death penalty, but only when applied under strict guidelines. In some states (e.g., California), those convicted of murder continue to become eligible for parole after serving several years behind bars; but, if the court adds the “special circumstances provision,” the only possible sentences are either death or life imprisonment without parole eligibility. (In Massachusetts, first degree murderers are not eligible for parole).

Thirty-eight states now have special circumstances statutes for heinous crimes such as multiple murder or murder with rape. Under such conditions, the death penalty is unnecessary as a means for protecting society from vicious killers, because we can instead lock them up and throw away the key. If Charles Manson had committed his hideous crimes in 1989, he would, in all probability, never have received a paroleable sentence, not even in California.

Of course, the ability of the death penalty to protect us from or deter violent criminals has little, if anything, to do with its widespread appeal. Abolition of the death penalty is usually followed by a reduction in the homicide rate. Even more ironically, the murder rate actually rises for a period of time after a killer has been executed. Would-be murderers apparently identify more with the state executioner than they do with the condemned inmate.

The primary motive for the death penalty is the thirst for retribution or revenge — “an eye for an eye; a life for a life.” Florida certainly did get a measure of revenge by executing serial killer Ted Bundy in the electric chair. The residents of Florida then threw a party. For most Americans, the opportunity to get even with a serial killer is reason enough to apply the death penalty. But for those few who instead believe that capital punishment can be justified only to the extent that it protects society's members, then execution by the state is nothing less than cruel and unnecessary punishment. In a civilized society, our best defense against “wild animals” is to lock them in cages so they can't get the rest of us.

JACK LEVIN is a Professor of Sociology at Northeastern University.
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF A NEIGHBORHOOD SPAT

By Sandra Faiman-Silva

The dramas of daily life are often substance for true anthropological inquiry because they present us with examples of social conflict and its resolution, thereby illuminating perennial questions faced by members of a society. What can a dispute between two neighbors in a not-so-remote village of Cape Cod tell us that might be of interest to students of dispute resolution, resource use, and even political economy? The dispute examined here appears to have far-reaching implications not only because of the disputants themselves, representatives of two classes of American citizenry; but also because their conflict and the process used to achieve resolution address important environmental and ecological dilemmas faced by Americans today.

The setting for this drama is Cape Cod's Waquoit Peninsula and the Seapit/Childs River, which separates Waquoit from Washburn's Island. Waquoit Peninsula is a residential community of about 100 homes situated on spacious lots along the Seapit and Childs River, Waquoit Bay, and adjacent waterways. The peninsula is typically "Cape Cod" architecturally and ecologically. Many homes are sided with weathered cedar shingles; scrub pine and oak along with field grasses mark the landscape. During the summer, Waquoit Bay is dotted with sailboats moored in its protected waters. Washburn's Island, accessible only by boat, separates Waquoit from the open ocean of Vineyard Sound. Today the uninhabited island is managed by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Management as part of the South Cape Beach recreational area. Evidence of former uses as a private residence of the Washburn family and World War II occupation by United States military personnel for amphibious training are evident. However, most of Washburn's Island is overgrown with scrub pine, marsh grasses and surrounded by sandy beaches. The island is an attractive destination for weekend boaters to spend the day picnicking or even overnight camping.

Cape Cod itself, including the Waquoit Peninsula, has experienced phenomenal growth during the past one and one-half decades. During the years 1970-1980, Barnstable County, which encompasses all of Cape Cod, grew a phenomenal 53%, while the rest of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts grew only .8%. Much of the immigrant population is at or near retirement age. Between 1970-1980 the Cape Cod population aged sixty years and older grew 83.4%. The largest rate of increase has actually been in the 65-70 age group, mainly those who have chosen Cape Cod as a retirement home.

The Cape Cod region also attracts a significant number of seasonal tourists. The population of Falmouth, of which Waquoit is a part, triples during the summer months, from a winter population of about 25,000 to about 75,000. Tourists include sporadic week-end visitors as well as families who spend summers in spacious Cape residences and winters in the Boston area.

Ocean-related subsistence activities long predated Cape Cod's tourism industry, and were in evidence even during aboriginal occupations by pre-Colonial Native Americans living along coastal shores and subsisting in part on fish and shellfish. Fishing continues to be a significant feature of Cape Cod, practiced by both commercial fishermen and pleasure fishing craft. The region of direct interest to this investigation, the Seapit River linking Waquoit Bay to Vineyard Sound, has been a site of organized grant shellfishing since at least 1877. Shellfish grants are a kind of lease of the bottom on which a grantee can cultivate shellfish, in essence farming the sea. Grants prior to the turn of the century permitted the hoader to "plant, grow and dig" shellfish. At the turn of the century oysters were primarily grown along the Seapit waterway, known by the trade name "Sea Pete," which was an especially successful species. Early shellfishermen found the Seapit River to be ideally suited to shellfishing, in part due to its brackish water, which seemed to promote fast growth of shellfish.

Oysters and other shellfish were cultivated by "catching spat" or oyster seed on shell midden (old oyster shells) intentionally placed on sand bars to provide a bed for spawning. Shells were later collected by grantees and removed to the Seapit grant sites, where they were broadcast over sections of the grant to be harvested later.

Public uses of shores, estuaries, rivers and the sea itself are governed by complex and elaborate maritime laws and state statutes. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts was the first region in the nascent colonial New World to articulate and codify rules governing public access to coastal regions and waterways. Using the so-called Public...
Trust Doctrine, rooted in ancient Roman Law, the colonial Ordinance of 1641 guaranteed public access to “great ponds.” Later in 1647 private ownership was extended to the law water mark, the lowest exposed point of the tidal flow. The public was still given rights to so-called intertidal zones, which is the tidewaters region between high and low water marks, to fish, fowl, and navigate. The waterways themselves, however, according to the Public Trust Doctrine, remained perennially accessible to the public.

In 1983 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts articulated and codified the Public Trust Doctrine with respect to tidelands, under Chapter 91 of the General Laws of the Commonwealth. Chapter 91 stipulated that the areas between the high and low water marks, called private tidelands, were owned by the upland owner. Lands seaward of the extreme low water marks were owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and called Commonwealth tidelands. The public still had access to the private and Commonwealth Tidelands, by virtue of the Public Trust Doctrine. Chapter 91 was designed to protect that access and insure that subsequent coastal building “served a proper public interest” and promoted the public’s benefit (Massachusetts Coastal Zone Mgt., MCZM Review pamphlet, 1983-1985, Executive Office of Economic Affairs, Boston).

Rights to shellfishing by grant are governed by local communities under State statute (Chapter 130, Sec. 57). Applications for grants are reviewed by local parties, in the case of Falmouth, by the Board of Selectmen in consultation with experts if necessary, to determine the feasibility of such grants. Grant leases are for twenty-five years, renewable for fifteen years thereafter, but the law implies that monopoly of the sea bottom is not intended.

Today a clam fisherman, Mr. K, one of the dispassionates in our drama, operates a Seapit River shellfish grant, where he has lived and fished since 1956. He began shellfishing at his site on the Seapit River in 1956, after the death of the former owner, Gordon Burgess, who had acquired grant rights from his own father in 1925. Mr. K uses essentially the same technology as that employed since the turn of the century by clam fishermen to seed and harvest clams on his grant of about 22,000 acres. The grant entitles him to seed and harvest shellfish on the bottom. The surface water, however, remains free to responsible public access by boaters. Individuals trespassing on the grant can be prosecuted and the grant-holder is protected against construction on or destruction of the site.

Mr. K is an “old salt,” a veritable institution on the Waquoit Peninsula. His small, family-owned business employs from two to five persons, and at the age of seventy he still works alongside men fifty years younger performing rigorous physical labor digging shellfish and transporting sixty-pound bails. Mr. K harvests shellfish for export off the Cape, selling to distributors who transport much of his product to New Bedford, sixty miles away. Tractor trailers arrive at his dock several times per week to pick up “product” for transport to regional markets.

Waquoit Peninsula is today a moderately densely-populated residential community, and Seapit Road is the single major access route in and out of the peninsula. The peninsula also houses the Waquoit Yacht Club, established in the 1920s; Edward’s Boatyard on the Childs River, where pleasure and commercial boats are serviced, docked, and maintained; and a seasonally busy town boat landing on Seapit Road used by dozens of pleasure boaters to gain access to Waquoit Bay.

The problem of multiple and/or conflicting uses of coastal and deep-sea areas has become a prominent concern of marine policy research, particularly in the age of oil supertankers, off-shore drilling, and heightened environmental awareness. The opening of George’s Bank and the California coast to oil exploration aroused strong public criticism, since such uses pose serious potential threats to fish habitats and recreational uses. Conflict has also arisen in other areas of marine resource use. The use of coastal regions for sewage disposal, both on- and off-shore, seriously threatens marine species and over-all health of coastal waters. Even the placement of aquaculture projects, an environmentally benign yet potentially cost-effective and job-generating economic strategy, has also been met with objection by citizens who were denied access to coastal resources as a result.

As previously noted, fishing has been an integral component of the Cape Cod regional economy since the 17th century, and continues to be an enduring aspect of local Cape Cod life into the 1980s. K’s business represents an activity that has been in evidence since early European settlers entered the region. His shellfish business represents the entrepreneurial self-sufficiency long admired by students of American business enterprise. K has built up his own business today to the point where it provides a comfortable income for himself and his family, and supports a small number of employees. K, although not wealthy, has a valuable family asset and a solvent business.

K’s shellfish operation provides a useful model for contemporary small-scale coastal resource use. Scientists and environmentalists warn that ours is a delicate ecosystem subject to abuse and exhaustion. Shellfishing as conducted by grant fishermen, such as K, exemplifies a method of resource management and use that, when properly conducted, is highly benign. Grant shellfishing creates a balance between species productivity and harvest potential, maximizes efficient use of space, reduces the need for more costly methods of random shellfishing, and preserves the physical environment fully intact. Furthermore, grant shellfishing uses little in the way of large-scale, expensive equipment, save small power boats and trucks to access and transport product. Shellfishing is labor-intensive, and the localized, circumscribed scope of the grant on specific acreage reduces the need to travel great distances to shellfish beds.

K’s business is appropriately scaled to accommodate to the human component of the workplace. He has a reputation for hiring unemployable and marginal workers who otherwise might be unemployed. The production strategy employed by K in his family-owned business may be characterized as “appro-
meandering to the rear of the K home, a lovely typically Cape Cod vista.

The Rs sought to rally friends and neighbors to urge the town to reduce business-related activities on the Waquoit Peninsula. As a practicing maritime lawyer (and, in fact, attorney for the Massachusetts Lobstermen's Assn.), Mr. R. pursued various avenues of possible litigation to resolve his dispute with his neighbor. What ensued over the course of a year was a process typical of the American judicial system based upon the premise of free and open access to litigation in civil society. R used both the local process of grant assignment through the Falmouth Board of Selectmen and the court litigation process in his attempt to close K's shellfish business. Using his expertise as an attorney and familiarity with maritime law, Mr. R learned of two weaknesses in K's grant entitlement and sought to both (a) obtain the shellfish grant on behalf of himself and his neighbors, and (b) challenge K's right to a long-standing zoning variance.

The shellfish license held by Mr. K was up for renewal in 1986, and due to the vague language of statutes governing grant renewals, it was unclear whether Mr. K could indeed reapply for the same grant. Mr. R, aware of the vagueness of the legal documentation, challenged K's renewal of his shellfish lease, and he, himself, along with several of his neighbors on the peninsula, applied for the shellfish grant themselves. Mr. K's daughter, a partner in the family shellfish business, also applied for the grant, recognizing that her father's advancing age would probably preclude him from successfully managing the business much longer.

The Ks won the first round of legal disputes when the Town of Falmouth decided to award the shellfish grant to K's daughter in March, 1986. At the Town Selectmen's hearing, class factionalism inherent in this dispute was evident. Rallying behind K were at least two dozen fishermen. An interesting alliance of fishermen and academic experts also took shape, when several experts from Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute nearby, testified on behalf of K's shellfishing and management.

Testimonials to K's good work were abundant. Some noted how K had always purchased "product" from local fishermen when other markets were unavailable during the slow winter season. Others pointed out that K hired unemployed fishermen year round and ensured that work was available for them. Oceanographic experts testified that K was extremely well-informed in the shellfish seeding and procreation business, maintained an environmentally sound enterprise, used labor-intensive techniques, and always treated the grant in an environmentally-sensitive manner.

K, it was also noted, was perhaps the best informed local source of information concerning shellfish seeding techniques and processing of shellfish, such that he was viewed by members of the local scientific community as an expert in his field. One final spectator concluded that rather than being an eyesore, K's shellfish business, his sheds, boats, and outbuildings, "simply add to the charm of the area." The sentiment of the audience was clearly in favor of K.

A second area of dispute arose when Mr. R pointed out to the local building commissioner that the K property had never been given a zoning variance as a commercial enterprise operating in a residential zone. K had never applied for a variance because he assumed that his business was protected as a "pre-existing, non-conforming use of the property," having been in operation prior to current zoning regulations. Subsequent to being served a "cease and desist" order by the building commissioner as a follow-up to R's complaint, the Falmouth Zoning Board of Appeals voted that K was indeed entitled to operate as a "pre-existing non-conforming user of the property" and his right to operate was reinstated. The R faction, however, decided to exercise its right to appeal the zoning decision to the Massachusetts District Court.

This second aspect of the current dispute, the issue of zoning variances, has proven to be more thorny and costly to both parties. R, however, has a distinct financial advantage, since, as
his own counsel, litigation costs him virtually nothing. K noted that his antagonist, R, was using a tactic of litigating him into bankruptcy. K, however, did not intend to quit, since his very livelihood and that of his daughter were at stake. In March, 1987, the Massachusetts District Court upheld the town’s zoning variance on the property, thus affirming the Ks’ title to the grant.

Conflict resolution processes utilized in this dispute exemplify standard procedures for such dispute resolution within our contemporary western legal system, where complex social institutions including courts, experts, statute and legislation govern the dispute resolution process. Unlike situations of dispute in traditionally-oriented societies, conflict resolution under contemporary western models entails a formalized, depersonalized method of addressing the dispute process.

Dispute resolution in traditional settings typically takes two forms, depending upon the nature of the persons involved. Where the dispute involves individuals closely or intimately associated who will most likely meet in subsequent close face-to-face contact, such as kin or close neighbors, disputes are typically resolved through informal channels, such as a village mediator or close kinsman. When the help of an outside mediator is enlisted, the mediation process typically entails elaborate negotiation by disputing parties over several sessions. Resolutions so mediated are viewed as binding by both parties, however, and life resumes as previously.

Disputes involving more impersonal disputants, such as state bureaucrats, distant acquaintances, or county agents, are typically resolved through formal channels of courts, formal litigation and trial, where these institutions are available. These types of disputes and the institutional process of resolution are viewed by members of traditionally oriented societies as appropriate only for the more impersonal dispute situations, however.

The present dispute reveals that resolution in contemporary American society entails formal procedures using highly institutionalized, impersonal mechanisms of court litigation, hearing and technicality, regardless of the relationship between disputants. The process of dispute resolution within the western model of jurisprudence assumes that informally negotiated settlement is impossible. In fact, escalation of the dispute to the impersonal level of courts and hearings is perceived as the proper method of resolution.

The dispute in this case grew out of radically different assumptions regarding resource use in a local community characterized by several crucial aspects: 1. a long-standing fishing tradition; 2. rapid influx of retirees and increased demands by the recreational sector; and, 3. the class antagonisms of the two disputing parties as expressed by their radically different views regarding appropriate uses of the immediate environment.

In conclusion, disputes of this kind cannot easily be reconciled, and may even be exacerbated by the absence of informal mechanisms of dispute resolution in American society. In this instance, however, the garnering of support through personal networks and the expression of personal opinions at public hearings facilitated the voicing of community sentiment which otherwise might not have been heard in formal litigation processes. Open public hearings were crucial to permit the expression of public opinion which supported the right of the subsistence/commercial fisherman to pursue his livelihood over the rights of a privileged class of newcomers desiring access to recreational space. Mechanisms of dispute resolution which exclude informal, face-to-face interactions, in fact, promote legal bias which favors those with the resources to pay, rather than facilitating the open, public expression of opinion. Public sentiment expressed in this episode revealed the public’s willingness to accommodate to environmentally sensitive, mixed commercial/recreational uses of coastal regions, a sentiment which may have been obscured if the dispute had remained on a purely formal level.
A CALL FOR FREE ELECTIONS

By Maurice Rotstein

Americans take pride in their nation’s electoral process. Many feel that the orderly, well-regulated and stable organization by which, each year, our country selects its political leaders might well serve as a model for people in the developing world, where fraud and violence all too often accompany political contests. We have only to note the turmoil that has marked election campaigns in recent years, in places like Haiti, the Philippines, South Korea and elsewhere, in order to appreciate how fortunate America is in the relative calm and efficiency with which its political machinery operates.

The beginning of a presidential administration is a particularly appropriate occasion, therefore, to re-examine the American political process. There are some in our country who are not altogether satisfied with the way the system works, claiming that it is in fact far from perfect. It is charged that, stable and orderly as they are, our political contests are seriously in need of improvement. It is true that over the years numerous reforms have been made. The nuts and bolts, so to speak, of the voting process have steadily improved; voting precincts are safeguarded, private booths insure a secret ballot, and nowadays computerization provides quick and accurate information on the outcome.

All this is true, say the critics, but it is not sufficient. What remains imperfect about our elections, they claim, is the undue influence of money in the entire process. There is gross inequality in the amount of funds available to competing candidates, and this remains a galling matter. The imbalance between the economic “have-nots,” those with rich friends and big war chests, and the “have-nots,” those less fortunate in their access to money sources, prevents anything like an even contest for public office. What we have, then, are not really free elections. Indeed elections, as we know them, are very expensive.

Moreover, this financial disparity is continually widening. What has happened is that the amount of money spent in campaigning has steadily grown, far out-distancing even the rate of inflation. The driving force behind this ever-increasing hunger for financing has been the growing level of organization involved in modern campaigning practice. Nowadays even modestly run campaigns require large professional staffs, comprising experts of many kinds: campaign managers, speechwriters, special poll-takers, advance men, public relations specialists. In addition there are all the highly visible features which have come to be expected in the political wars: posters and banners, buttons and bumper-stickers. And beyond these, what dominates everything else is the concentrated use of the communications media, particularly television. And all of this requires great fund-raising effort.

The immensity of financial resources being accumulated by the more affluent campaign committees in recent years has even led to some unhappy results. Sometimes, finding themselves with a good deal more than they could use in legitimate ways, these committees have resorted to what is referred to as “dirty tricks,” underhanded activity designed to destroy an opposing candidate’s image before the public. This was the sort of business that sent several of Richard Nixon’s aides in the 1972 presidential campaign, including John Mitchell, Nixon’s campaign manager and former attorney-general, to prison. What made such things possible was that so much of the money collected by Nixon’s re-election campaign committee came in “laundered,” that is, passed through banks in such a way that it couldn’t easily be traced to its source. Then, because such money did not have to be officially listed as having been received, it could be used without being accounted for, as required by the election laws.

What has happened, in short, is that political campaigning has become something of a “growth industry.” Indeed, as one adds up the amount of money spent on political contests, the sheer volume becomes ever more impressive. Thus, for example, during the elections of 1980, in which President Carter was running for re-election, all of the Democratic presidential primary candidates spent over $35 million, while all the Republican presidential primary candidates spent more than $56 million, for a total of some $92 million. Needless to say, the overall total spent on that election of 1980 ran to well into nine figures.

Each succeeding round of elections has demanded ever greater expenditures. The presidential race of 1984 outdid that of 1980 and was in turn outdone in 1988. Also, we should bear in mind the money spent for seats in Congress, for the 100 Senate places and 435 in the House of Representatives. In 1986, the most recent federal election year in which there were contests for Congress alone, candidates running for the House and Senate all together spent 71% more than the amount used four years earlier, for a grand total of $350
million. Elections have indeed become big business. Incidentally, one should also note that all the figures given here omit any mention of the funds allocated by Americans to elect their state and local officials.

How well does all of this money translate into achieving a satisfactory election process? How does such infusion of cash into the business of selecting our political leaders affect the system? What is the level of participation by the citizenry? Actually, it is difficult if not impossible to find any direct connection between money spent and voter participation. In fact, the history of recent elections shows that voter turnout has shrunk while the money spent has grown. For example, voter turnout in the presidential elections of 1960 was 62.8%. It was 61.9% in 1964, 60.6% in 1968, 55.5% in 1972, 54.3% in 1976, 53.9% in 1980, 53% in 1984, and in 1988 dipped for the first time below 50%. More than half the people simply didn't bother to come out. What the American people seemed to be saying last year was that their choice for president was "none of the above." Meanwhile, in congressional contests the results were similar: in 1986 only 37.7% of those eligible voted, and although the figure was somewhat higher in 1988 it can be ascribed to the fact that it was a presidential election year.

It must be clear from all this that half of the people of the United States don't seem to care enough about their electoral system to take part in it. Truly such apathy should disturb us all. One can't help thinking: "Could the democratic process be made to work better?"

The revelations of corruption that emerged from the Watergate scandal led Congress in 1974 to pass one more change in the long history of election reforms. It was generally agreed that the business of raising funds for campaigns clearly tended to corrupt politics. Any individual or corporation that contributed large sums to a political campaign wasn't doing it out of simple generosity; something was expected in return, one way or another. This of course was nothing new. It had always been recognized that money had influence and that big money wielded big influence. The act of 1974 aimed to lessen private influence by providing candidates with government funds. It meant to accomplish this by matching, within certain limits, the amount a candidate could raise privately. At the same time, it limited the amount individuals or groups could give a candidate. Competition for office, it was thought, would thus become more equal.

It turned out that reform could create as many problems as it was supposed to solve. It soon became clear that any candidate able to attract more money privately than his or her rivals would therefore also get more public money. Critics pointed out that this would make political races more rather than less unequal! Also, the Federal
major lobbies, The American Medical Association, The National Association of Realtors and the National Rifle Association, showed that these have steadily raised their level of contributions to political action committees (PACs), from $630,000 in 1982, to $1.6 million in 1984, to $3.6 million in 1986. The total of PAC contributions to members of Congress in 1988 reached a staggering figure of $117.5 million.

What is the reason for such large sums going into politicians’ hands? Office-seekers, whether in or out of office, are constantly building their war chests. The pressure to increase campaign funds has led many of them closer and closer to unethical, if not illegal, conduct which, when exposed, has become an embarrassment. Thus, Senator Bentsen, the Texas Democrat who ran for the vice-presidency last year, created something of a furor when it was revealed that he had been asking lobbyists to contribute $10,000 each to his next re-election contest, even though it was still two years off. One lobbyist has acknowledged in a television interview that such requests are not unusual.

Meanwhile the cost of individual campaigns has continued upward. Getting elected to Congress takes intensive radio and TV advertising, mass mailing and highly paid expert help. By 1984 the average cost of waging a hard-fought contest for a House seat had risen to $484,949, up by one-third from 1982. Senate races cost even more. Republican Jesse Helms of North Carolina, widely recognized as the tobacco industry’s foremost defender in Congress, spent $16.5 million to win re-election in 1984, while his opponent spent $9.5 million. It isn’t only the size of private money that bothers critics; it is the hypocrisy involved. Law-breaking by politicians has of course resulted in jail sentences. Yet, the critics say, receiving honoraria or other methods of taking money privately, even though strictly legal, should be outlawed. The Senate in 1986 voted to limit gifts from PACs and to require disclosure of corporate and union contributions, but that has not ended the problem. The controversy over House Speaker Jim Wright is a case in point. And so the issue remains alive. A few politicians have even sought to profit from growing public indignation by declaring they would refuse any PAC money. Unfortunately, few others have followed their lead. Thus the post-Watergate move to limit the power of money in politics has achieved nothing.

What then needs to be done? Simply enacting yet another election reform would end up, as so many have in the past, leaving the usual loopholes. The time has come to break the bond between lobbies and lawmakers. We have to make public officials immune to the power of money in private hands. To accomplish this it is necessary to destroy the ability of money to affect elections by making elections free—really free—thus ending what amounts to the buying of public officials impossible. This means to bar altogether the use of all money—anyone’s money—from the election process, to forbid it by law, in short to prevent the spending of any non-public funds in support of any candidacy. The purpose of an election campaign is to air before the voters the issues and the viewpoint of each candidate. There is no need for “selling” him or her in the way that merchandisers sell pain relievers or deodorants. There should be an absolute ban on advertising of any kind, no banners, no parades, no bumper-stickers or buttons, no singing commercials on the air.

What is needed instead is simply a discussion of the issues, without appeal to emotion, without any attempt to sway voters by gaudy display. We can learn a lesson from John Stuart Mill, one of the most important contributors to democratic theory in the nineteenth century, who made precisely this point when he himself was urged by friends to stand for election (in Britain candidates “stand” instead of run for office). He made one simple stipulation: neither he nor anyone else was to spend as much as one penny on his behalf. He offered to speak in public and to answer any questions on campaign issues, nothing more. It is worth noting that he won a seat in the House of Commons.

How can we adapt that principle to our society? The fact is that it is well
within the possible. Of course we live in a different world and the media of communication are far more diverse and complex than in Mill’s time. Modern technology can make the application of his ideas quite easy. The government should provide for the printing and mailing of campaign literature to all registered voters. Clearly, the cost of such a provision, compared to present-day campaign expenditures, would be practically nothing. In addition, election laws should require all radio and television stations to make available an equal and specified amount of broadcast time to all candidates without charge. No other campaigning would be permitted. Within this context, adequate broadcast debates could be included, as they are nowadays.

What about the cost of using radio and TV? We tend to forget that the airwaves are public property; they do not belong to the broadcasters and never have. The airwaves have been assigned by a license given free by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with law. This law states that use of radio frequencies and TV channels is allotted to the broadcasters “in the public interest.” In practice this has meant, over the years, that stations have been expected to devote a portion of the broadcast day to programs of public interest. Clearly it is their obligation to put campaign programs on the air.

Thus, freed from the stranglehold of money, the individual politician would no longer be in the position of asking for financing support from the lobbyist. Does this mean the death of lobbies? Not at all. The aim of a lobby is to bring particular viewpoints regarding public matters before the lawmakers. It is desirable that Congress be made aware of what people think; lobbies are a legitimate channel for that purpose. Everybody in a democracy is entitled to the free expression of his or her ideas. Lobbies are justified, even necessary in our modern world. However, under a publicly funded electoral system lobbies would have to depend on the persuasion of logic, not on their economic power. This could not help but promote the public good.

Could such a fundamental change be brought about? Those who benefit from the present system will naturally fight to retain it. But they are the very ones upon whom any change depends. Here lies a great irony. In the final analysis, reform of our entire electoral system could be achieved only by the organization of a lobby yet more powerful than any in the past.
American environmental history is replete with the contributions of men and women of many vocations: philosophers (like Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau), scientists (like George Perkins Marsh and John Wesley Powell), political advocates (like Gifford Pinchot and Stewart Udall), and crusaders (like John Muir and Rachel Carson). John D. Rockefeller, Jr. was none of these, yet he has earned a place of distinction as one of the great benefactors of the twentieth century movement to conserve national resources. One of America's greatest philanthropists, Rockefeller donated $474 million to a variety of interests between 1916 and 1959, including generous gifts to several national parks and historic restoration projects, like Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia. The wisdom and shrewd timing of his funding, together with his love of beauty and nature, made his contributions important ones, ensuring that the Rockefeller legacy will provide to generations of Americans the opportunity to appreciate this nation's scenic lands and unique heritage.

Rockefeller's life-long love for the out-of-doors began in his childhood. He was born on January 29, 1874, in Cleveland, Ohio, the fifth child and only son of wealthy industrialist John D. Rockefeller, Sr. and Laura Celestia Spelman. From the age of four John enjoyed summers at the family homestead at Forest Hill, Ohio, which were full of country pleasures, including boating, swimming, horseback riding, hiking, picnicking and bicycling. His father was enthusiastically undertaking landscaping projects on the hundreds of acres of rolling woodlands. John must have been fascinated by watching the building of paths and roads, the planting of trees, and the construction of a lake, because he developed an expertise in groundskeeping which enabled him, by the age of sixteen, to become responsible for much of such work at Forest Hill. From the age of ten he enjoyed traveling with the family to areas of scenic beauty such as Yellowstone National Park. During the winters, his father's business interests brought the family to their New York City home, and led to their establishing an estate at Pocantico, New York, which gave John an opportunity to explore the Hudson River Valley. The national parks of the west, as well as numerous sites along the Hudson became favorite places for Rockefeller, and he would return to them many times as an adult, often funding projects.

His deep commitment to philanthropy was also rooted in childhood. John would never know the loose and lazy life of a rich man's son. Strict Baptists, the family followed a church-centered life which stressed duty to God and fellow man. Daily Bible reading was a devout ritual that Rockefeller would keep throughout his life. Temperance, thrift, and charity, the forceful opinions of the household, were both preached and lived. These virtues remained important tenets of his adult years.

Rockefeller’s philanthropic endeavors were no doubt motivated in part by a desire to vindicate the Rockefeller name. Rockefeller, Sr. was frequently maligned for his Robber Baron successes with Standard Oil Company. Both father and son shared the belief that the Rockefeller fortune was the worthy fruit of the work of a Christian gentleman. Rockefeller worked hard throughout his life so that his many gifts made in the public interest would overcome the hated specter of "tainted money." Efficient and well-conceived giving became Rockefeller's vocation, and his genius for philanthropy earned much praise for the family name.

His philosophy toward his inherited wealth was revealed to friend and biographer Raymond B. Fosdick:

I was born into [wealth] ... . It was there like air or food or any other element ... . The only question with wealth is what you do with it. It can be used for evil purposes or it can be an instrumentality for constructive social living.

Rockefeller studied economics and sociology at Brown University, and after graduation in 1897, joined his father's office in New York City. Although he showed no great talent for business, he became acquainted with men who would help him further his own interests. One such man was Frederick T. Gates, a former Baptist minister who handled various Rockefeller charities. Rockefeller would later credit his influence as having taught him much about philanthropy.

Among Rockefeller's duties for his father's organization was the repair of properties such as the home at Forest Hill. He was a perfectionist, very concerned with detail, who liked to deal personally with craftsmen, such as carpenters. Rockefeller was fond of
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carrying a four-foot rule in his back pocket, which he used often throughout his life as he toured his various projects. His acquired expertise in construction techniques served him well on later restorations.

In 1901 Rockefeller married Abigail Aldrich, daughter of Senator Nelson Aldrich of Rhode Island. Their forty-seven year marriage included a special compatibility regarding philanthropy. Mrs. Rockefeller was a great patron of the arts. She worked closely with her husband on projects such as The Cloisters in New York, a museum and fine architectural restoration.

The year 1910 would be identified later by Rockefeller as a turning point in his life. At the age of thirty-six he began to move away from the business world, where his high positions in companies like Standard Oil brought him little satisfaction. The next decade would see him play an increasing role in conservation activity, which must have provided him a welcomed haven from the unpleasantness of business.

In 1916 he donated five thousand acres near his summer home at Seal Harbor, Maine, to help establish what would become Acadia National Park, the first national park east of the Mississippi River. The following year he was granted permission to build and maintain roadways on the island, which resulted in sixty miles of well-built roads.

The following year he offered fifty-six acres in Upper Manhattan to New York City for Fort Tryon Park. The gift would not be accepted until 1930. This was the first of several times in Rockefeller's career when he would have to hold a donation in trust until legal and political barriers were overcome. Across the Hudson River, he was acquiring acres along the cliffs of the Palisades for later presentation to the state of New York.

Twenty-five miles up river the thirty-five hundred acre estate at Pocantico had become an “experiment in conservation” under Rockefeller's guidance. Carefully designed landscaping and roadways satisfied his sensitive appreciation of nature. “The impulse to build enclaves of quiet harmony was a deep-seated one” in Rockefeller.

By 1921 the bulk of Rockefeller, Sr.'s fortune, $500 million, had been transferred to his son, who was forty-seven years old. The vastness of these financial resources enabled Rockefeller to pursue very large-scale projects. While other families among the nation's most wealthy were generous with gifts to museums, hospitals, alma maters, and foundations, Rockefeller's philanthropy was characterized less by a sense of noblesse oblige and more by a systematic approach to undertake projects designed to serve the public interest. Particularly appealing were worthy causes which might gain initial success due to an infusion of Rockefeller money but could later become independent of his funding. One such stone was Yellowstone National Park.

In 1924 Rockefeller, along with his wife and three of their sons, toured several wilderness areas of the west. Yellowstone, a place of fond boyhood memories, was in an appalling condition. For over five decades the nation's first national park had suffered from a lack of administrative and financial attention. The fledgling National Park Service, established in 1916, was struggling to care for the magnificent areas under its jurisdiction. Many public lands had been nearly ruined by irresponsible use, caused in part by having been overseen by a variety of agencies, including the Army. Rockefeller was moved to fund an immediate clean-up of Yellowstone roadways.

Rockefeller believed that when the United States Congress failed to act upon vital national interests it was up to private initiative. During a visit to Mesa Verde, Colorado, Rockefeller asked Superintendent Jesse Nusbaum how much money had been appropriated by the government for a museum there. Upon hearing the reply, “Nothing,” Rockefeller stated, “I want to contribute and help you demonstrate the merits of your museum project, with the understanding, of course, that it is properly a government responsibility.”

Returning west in 1926, Rockefeller toured Jackson Hole Basin in the Grand Teton Mountain area. His guide was Yellowstone Superintendent Horace Albright, who would serve later as head of the National Park Service. This meeting was the beginning of a thirty-year association which would see them often collaborating on conservation projects. Albright purposely led the Rockefellers past views cluttered with run-down shacks. His scheme to interest Rockefeller in acquiring and preserving the area worked: the result was a gift of over thirty thousand acres to Grand Teton National Park. Legal hassles and negative publicity delayed the presentation until 1950.

More gifts followed. That same year Rockefeller initiated what would become a $2 million bequest to establish Redwood National Park in California. Several large gifts, also in 1926, benefited parks farther east, including Shenandoah National Park in Virginia, and a $5 million memorial donation to Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee as a tribute to his mother. Two years later he offered to match all government funds that would add to the forested acres of Yosemite National Park in California. This resulted in an addition of fifteen thousand acres at a cost of $1,750,000.

In the 1950's Horace Albright reflected upon Rockefeller's contributions to the conservation movement. Remembering the difficulties of creating the National Park System, Albright credits Rockefeller as one who "quietly stepped in at critical times and turned the tide when everything seemed to be going against us."

A Phi Beta Kappa banquet held in New York City in February 1924 was
the spark which would revolutionize historic preservation in the United States. The address, a proposal that the Society build a memorial hall at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, was delivered by the Reverend Dr. W.A.R. Goodwin, rector of the town’s Bruton Parish Church. Goodwin, a charismatic visionary, had dreams of rescuing the small town from its shabby modern trappings and restoring it to its colonial grandeur. Rockefeller’s polite expression of interest in Williamsburg spurred Goodwin to present a restoration proposal to the Rockefeller organization four months later. He was turned down. A similar proposal to the henry Ford organization was also refused.

Goodwin’s enthusiasm for his idea was matched by his persistence. A 1926 visit brought Rockefeller to Williamsburg. Goodwin made good use of the opportunity to guide his party on a tour of the town and captured Rockefeller’s imagination. To his delight, Goodwin soon discovered that Rockefeller envisioned a restoration project on a larger scale than Goodwin had dared hope. Rockefeller’s interest in restoring a large area of the town (or none at all) was characteristic of the man. “I’m only interested in ideal projects,” he asserted.

Goodwin was authorized to begin purchasing Williamsburg properties, but was hampered by Rockefeller’s insistence that his identity as benefactor be kept a secret. Not until 1928 was Goodwin allowed to announce the town’s patron. The names, “Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.” were met with enthusiastic applause.

The restoration involved rebuilding more than one hundred colonial structures, forty of which were still standing in 1926. Painstaking care was necessary to accurately reproduce historic buildings which included the House of Burgesses, and the famed Raleigh Tavern, a meeting place for George Washington, George Mason, and Patrick Henry. The project required purchasing some two hundred parcels of property from private owners. The restoration, which opened to the public in 1936, cost far more than Rockefeller’s original $4 to $5 million estimate. The price of Colonial Williamsburg came to over $100 million, half of which was Rockefeller money.

The project to restore the colonial capital of Virginia interested Rockefeller more deeply than any of his other projects. His personal involvement would last over thirty years. Until his death in 1960 he spent “twice-yearly sojourns at Bassett Hall, a fine colonial mansion on the edge of Williamsburg” in order to oversee the expansion and maintenance of the great undertaking.

The Williamsburg restoration became a school for historic preservation work. Rockefeller insisted on perfection in all aspects of the project, which required an extensive historical research. Authenticity was recreated in detail, from exact placement of buildings on their original sites to use of materials which replicated those of the colonial period. Rockefeller assembled a large staff of professionals whose methods would become the standard in historic preservation.

The fine work of dozens of archaeologists and architects was integral to the restoration, and Rockefeller loved to work beside them. Among the many accolades bestowed upon Rockefeller for his involvement were honorary memberships in the American Institute of Architects in 1936 and the Society of Landscape Architects in 1938.

Rockefeller’s funding of the Williamsburg restoration led the way for similar projects across the nation. Until Williamsburg, restorations were done on a much smaller scale, and the costs were often borne by the middle class. Besides developing the expertise which would be instrumental in other projects, the Williamsburg experience was dramatic inspiration which captured public interest and helped to gain support for the growing historic preservation movement.

Rockefeller became involved in other restoration projects. He aided Versailles, Fontainebleau, and Reims in their recovery from damage sustained during World War I. Several sites of historic interest along his favorite movements of this century was the Progressive Era. Since the latter decades of the nineteenth century there had been a growing awareness among scientists and others that ever-increasing industrialization was a threat to the environment. The Progressive Era, which saw the advent of a variety of reform agencies in an attempt to solve society’s ills with government solutions, also turned its attention to the stewardship of the land. A debate over what types of policy to implement split conservationists between two philosophies. One side sought maximum economic utility of resources, as espoused by the politically active forester, Gifford Pinchot. The goal of the other, in the tradition of naturalist John Muir, was aesthetic: to prevent human intrusion from spoiling nature. Rockefeller took a middle view. He argued that government should regulate designated areas, such as national parks, in the public interest. This meant providing visitors with sufficient amenities, like museums, to aid in their appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the area, while avoiding unsightly development, such as billboard advertisements and tawdry souvenir stands, which would detract from the beauty of nature. His position was attractive to the numbers of tourists who, with the advent of Henry Ford’s automobile, took to the road in increasing numbers to view the scenic parks and historic shrines.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr.’s role in the conservation and historic preservation movements of this century was the result of a keen interest in nature, an appreciation of the cultural heritage of America, and a sincere desire to serve the public interest via philanthropy. From the coast of Maine to California’s redwood forests to the cobbled streets of Colonial Williamsburg, the United States has been enriched by his contributions. Historian Roderick Nash has written that a country’s stewardship of its historic monuments tells as much about those who preserved it as it does about the original builders. In that case, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. has earned a hero’s legacy within the field of environmental history.
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Two Poems

By Beverly Tokarz

PORTRAIT OF JOHN L.

Five years back,
in a spring so wet
even the rocks turned green
in the constant rain,
I found an old man's face
lighting my mornings.
I see him still.

He stood in a square of light
when I carried my paints
into the place
for a ten o'clock class.
A bright white nurse
whisked me down a corridor,
wishing me luck and patience.
John followed at a distance
examining the floor.

Twelve people in a small, pale room
bent in concentration or despair.
I made my mouth tell life
in the dull, stale air,
flew lines across a page
with yellow oil color.

He'd watch the careful motion
and repeat the pattern,
his long, knotted fingers
gripping the brush.
His amazed face, lined better
than any master's drawing,
said life still mattered.
Color by color that long, wet spring
we made the only magic
that remained.

Once he imagined
a boat on a green-gray sea
rough with motion,
heading somewhere
he could not say quite where.

Now I picture the sea
grown pale in his eyes,
hear him ask in a whisper
if I've seen his young brother
walking up from the cornfield
heading in for supper.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY, MY COBALT ANGEL

It's our anniversary, Marc Chagall.
Do you remember, dancing
in your blue painter's heaven,
how we met?

I was sleeping, lulled
from the yellow day
glowing around my head
like a searchlight
into some gray avenue
looking like the day after World War One.
Apathetic sidewalks crackled
like tempers. So tired.
A little rain, I think, was falling.

My paintings were all at home
under the dusty bed
gathering moths and sorrow.
Here were no colors,
no definite boundaries of line
to rejoice in.
Out of a neutral mist
you (who is this?) were suddenly there:
overcoat, no hat, old man's face
clear and smooth as a lake,
only with rippled brow.
Who spoke first? Was it you,
out of that space you earned by patience?
Was it me, out of my sojourner's
loss and hope?

Words, never precise enough to help,
have evaporated now
into that dream's smog.
Still, you stand like a monument.
"Make your life,
build it like a painting.
It is a something we must all make.
Make it yours." That is what
your eyes, full of light, said.

Somewhere, colors were waiting for you.
I woke into heavy orange air.
Beyond my window, the wan city
glowed in the light of the departing sun
like a painting flown into pure color.
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It was September of 1952. I was one of nearly 200 freshmen seated in the back, underclassman section, of the Horace Mann Auditorium at Bridgewater State Teachers College. Above us at the left was a series of murals painted in an arched pattern which echoed the shapes of large, beautiful windows on the opposite wall. The central and most brightly colored mural, which depicted Horace Mann administering the first Normal School entrance examination (1840) to three young women under the legend, “A Trained Teacher For Every Child,” most assuredly inspired more than one aspiring teacher.

The murmur of excited voices stopped abruptly, leaving my own voice ringing in my ears, when a slight, angular Dickensian scholar, the President of the College, entered. He spoke gently. After a brief welcome, he introduced the chairperson of each program so that the special joys and requirements of studying one’s chosen discipline might be described.

After what seemed an eternity, the discussion had turned to the importance of observation and the care with which deductions should be made. I was the second student to be called to the front. Professor Kelly, quite imposing in his spotless white lab coat, entered via a door at the right which led from the laboratory. He pushed a cart to the front of the large demonstration table and transferred a number of containers of chemicals from the cart to the table. “Chemistry,” he said, “is what chemists do”; a sensible definition and one which put us at ease and exemplified his approach: to make sense of what has been described as a science in which one tries to determine what is in a sealed box without opening it.

The discussion had turned to the search for Truth, it was startling to hear the truth spoken so unequivocally. The next day we met for the first chemistry lecture. About 30 of us entered a classic lecture hall with raised seating. The springy hardwood floor which squeaked as one walked and the spindly side-arm oak chairs which swayed as one sat down and with each subsequent movement reflected the uncertainty we all felt.

Punctually, Professor Kelly, quite imposing in his spotless white lab coat, entered via a door at the right which led from the laboratory. He pushed a cart to the front of the large demonstration table and transferred a number of containers of chemicals from the cart to the table. “Chemistry,” he said, “is what chemists do”; a sensible definition and one which put us at ease and exemplified his approach: to make sense of what has been described as a science in which one tries to determine what is in a sealed box without opening it.

The discussion had turned to the importance of observation and the care with which deductions should be made. I was the second student to be called to the front. Professor Kelly handed me a bottle and since the first student had been fooled by the weight of a similar cardboard container which had a battered and flimsy appearance. Being afraid that if I grasped it firmly, my arm would jerk upward as I took it, I relaxed my arm and took it from his hand. It was filled with lead shot!! The point had been made; the senses must be doubted.

It was his practice to sequester himself in his office, which doubled as the stock room, prior to every class period in order to prepare for the delivery of polished lectures given without notes. The hallmark of these lectures was a perfect blending of practical example and theory. He introduced us to his mysterious world of dancing molecules and described the ways in which this dance could be used to explain natural phenomena such as atmospheric pressure. He also described how the beauty of crystals results from a symmetry of structure which is in itself beautiful. Through these and other discussions, he led us to an understanding of abstract theories and to the development of an ability to recognize the patterns of symmetry which underlie the basic principles of science.

During the first semester of college, one of my friends dropped out of chemistry class. On leaving, she talked to Prof. Kelly to reassure him that she had the highest respect for him and his skill as a teacher and was leaving for personal reasons. I asked her how he had reacted, thinking that such a man not need or want such reassurances. She answered that he had very graciously thanked her and wished her well. This was the first indication that what he was to tell us shortly before graduation was true; that TL (the name by which we all had come to call him, except to his face) was an abbreviation for “tender loving” and not, as we had heard, for “tough luck.”

TL was born just before the turn of the century, on August 17, 1898. It was a time when experiments pivotal to the understanding of chemistry were being performed. Sir J.J. Thomson had, in the previous year, discovered the electron and Ernest Rutherford was beginning his exploration of radioactivity which led to the modern picture of the atom. These and subsequent discoveries gave a new, more theoretical face to...
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chemistry, which made it possible for TL to pose his favorite question. "Why?"

The enthusiasm and sense of adventure in being a chemist developed during his youth and imparted to us are described in the reflections of Thomson, whom he was fond of quoting: "As we conquer peak after peak we see in front of us regions full of interest and beauty, but we do not see our goal, we do not see the horizon; in the distance tower still higher peaks, which will yield to those who ascend still wider prospects."

TL brought to his teaching a training in the classics acquired from the Jesuits at the College of the Holy Cross, where he enrolled in September of 1917. Tuition was $100 and board and lodging $300 per year (the average yearly non-farm salary in 1917 was $866) and to defray expenses he served as the college mailman for four years. Entrance examinations were given in Latin, Greek, English, history, math and a modern foreign language and the college curriculum required continuation of study in all of these areas as well as in religion, philosophy, economics and the sciences. He graduated cum laude in 1921 and his classmates recognized in him two attributes essential to the successful teacher: "no member will ever forget TL's keen knowledge in this branch of study (Chemistry) and his helping hand in many an unfortunate's hour of despair."

This training in the classics, with its emphasis on language, was evident in the skill with which he taught the language of science, which has its roots in Latin and Greek. His explanation for the naming of a series of sulfur-containing compounds with skunk-like odors is illustrative. Interestingly, these compounds are not named for their foul odors but for their ability to tightly bind mercury and other toxic metals, a property which accounts for their use as antidotes for metal poisoning. Their name, mercaptan, comes from the Latin mercurium capitan, which means seizing mercury. An anecdote solidified this word in the memory. Kelly told of a colleague who studied mercaptans, the odors of which linger, and of this man's uncanny ability to find an empty seat even on the most crowded trolley.

Being one of the top students to graduate from Holy Cross in 1921, he was offered an assistantship and acceptance into the Master's program in Chemistry. Upon receipt of the Master's Degree in 1924, he was named Assistant Professor of Chemistry, an unusual honor.

During the 1926-7 academic year Kelly took a leave of absence from teaching to enter the Ph.D. program at Columbia University. He was awarded a second Master's Degree in 1927. The Ph.D. dissertation he planned to complete on returning to Holy Cross was never finished, due to the pressures of additional teaching responsibilities and those of raising a large family — he and his wife, Mary, were to become the parents of nine.

Columbia Graduate School provided TL with the opportunity to study with scientists whose research and thinking were on the frontier. It also provided him, and through him his students, with a direct academic link to the pioneers of chemical thought: Wöhler, the father of Organic Chemistry and through Wöhler to his professor, Berzelius, who determined accurate atomic weights upon which Dalton based the atomic theory. This link is traced through faculty members at Columbia who had studied with Charles F. Chandler, the founder of Columbia's Chemistry Department, who had sailed on a whaling ship from New Bedford in 1854 to study with Wöhler.

The historic perspective gained at Columbia was evident, for Chemistry as taught by TL was peopled with a cast of interesting characters. His description of the great organic chemist Louis Feisar of Harvard, who pioneered the investigation of the carcinogenicity of aromatic compounds, was so vivid that when we accompanied TL to Student Night at MIT the highlight of the experience was not the speaker, his topic, or the locale, but the presence of Feisar in the audience.

TL was to remain at Holy Cross until 1936, during which time he was an integral member of the only graduate program at the College to be accredited by the AAU. He directed research in analytic, colloidal and, his speciality, organic chemistry, and published a number of articles in the highly respected Journal of the American Chemical Society.

When Chandler had begun teaching at Columbia in 1864, no salary had been provided. The professor was expected to collect his salary in student fees. A salary was provided at Holy Cross in 1936, but that of a junior faculty member was insufficient to support a growing family. Thus, for financial reasons, TL left Holy Cross to become a senior faculty member and the lone science (Biology, Chemistry and Physics) teacher at Westfield State Teachers College.

When a position opened at Bridgewater, a college which had a long tradition of training teachers of science and which afforded him the opportunity to again become Professor of Chemistry, he asked for and was granted a transfer effective February 24, 1942. Due to the circumstances of the transfer he lived temporarily in Tillinghast Hall while making arrangements to relocate his family. At Bridgewater, his immediate predecessor had left abruptly after mid-year examinations to run his own business, while lamenting that he had not found a way
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to get students to study. TL had the answer: expect it, demand it.

The active research begun at Holy Cross was not to continue. Like Wöhler, TL was to spend the last 30 years of his career devoting virtually all of his energies to teaching and to the development of a strong academic program. He served as the Chairman of the Physical Sciences Department and later of both the Chemistry and Physics Departments which were formed under his leadership in 1964.

In the state colleges, facilities for research did not exist. There was no Chemistry major — the first BS in Chemistry was awarded in 1966; there were no graduate students to direct — the first candidate for an MS enrolled in 1971; the teaching loads were high — as high as 18 with an average of 12 hours per semester; and the most sophisticated pieces of apparatus available were a number of analytic balances and a hydrogen sulfide generator — a generator which emitted the odor of rotten eggs, an odor not detected by the desensitized noses of the fledgling chemists but which added a certain discomfort to the other occupants of Boyden Hall, which housed the laboratory as well as virtually all classrooms and administrative offices. Furthermore, the total value of equipment and materials in 1953 was estimated at only $6500, an amount approximately equal to the annual salary of the Professor. This paucity of materials and a concern for waste and needless pollution of the environment led TL to develop semimicro techniques which anticipated by many years the current trend toward micro-procedures with one significant difference: these new techniques required expensive, specially designed glassware, but he preferred the cheap but elegant test tube.

The most significant drawback to active research was the inadequate library, which was housed in a large room divided by arches which now houses the President's office. In 1953, the library held just over 25,000 books, with only 3,000 in all branches of science. TL encouraged us to visit a real library. Many of the classrooms were decorated with works of art and on the lecture hall walls hung reproductions of two allegorical murals by Puvis de Chavannes. He called our attention to the one entitled "Physics," which had been described by Puvis as depicting "the wondrous agency of Electricity. Speech flashes through Space and swift as lightning bears tides of good and evil." TL urged us to visit the Boston Public Library where the originals decorate a magnificent staircase and as additional incentive he offered extra credit to anyone who found out why mercury, that intriguing metallic liquid, was shipped in 76 lb flasks — a most odd unit of weight. (As it turns out, 76 lb is equivalent to 75 librae, a Roman unit of weight. The Romans, who mined and processed mercury ore in Spain, chose a weight which was convenient for a man to carry and this unit had somehow survived over the centuries.)

TL's philosophy of teaching mirrored that expressed by his professor at Holy Cross, Rev. George L. Coyle, S,J.; that is, "a student should derive more than technical expertise from his study of Chemistry." TL stressed that the study of chemistry and physics required the development of skill in logical reasoning; a failure to develop this skill was seen by him as the "greatest deficiency in the American system of public education." In addition, he tried to instill the homely virtues such as humility; not an externally expressed humility which we would have seen as false in him as a role model, but an internalized one: "the more we learn, the more we know how little we know." And as a corollary, he warned that since chance may be as important as plan in scientific discovery, we must be prepared to take advantage of accidental occurrences, a skill he called serendipity, a word coined in 1754 which has recently gained in popular usage but was new to us. He exemplified serendipity with a story of a chemist who discovered a metal catalyzed reaction when a thermometer he was using as a stirring rod — something we had been warned never to do — broke, spilling mercury into his reaction mixture. He also instilled independence, especially in the laboratory. After giving initial directions, he would retire to his office-stockroom, adjacent to the laboratory, to return from time to time to check our progress. His assistant, Elmer, who was not a trained chemist, was left to supervise but not to coach. At least initially we did not realize that he had set up a series of mirrors so that he could see into the laboratory in case of a real disaster.

In the post World War II years, which he described as an "era of changing and of oftentimes doubtful philosophies," TL raised a number of important societal issues. For example, he asked: "Does a scientist have a moral obligation to influence the ways in which and the purposes for which his creation is used?" This question was posed, not during a discussion of nuclear reactions, but during a discussion of the preparation of soap. (Napalm, a gel formed when an aluminum soap is suspended in gasoline, was developed during WWII by a team led by Louis Feiser.) Today, most would agree that a scientist does indeed bear such a responsibility, but at the time most of us considered research to be a pure quest for knowledge. (It is interesting to note that when the use of Napalm became the subject of demonstrations in the sixties, demonstrators focused on the government, the manufacturers, and the universities which had contracts with these manufacturers, but did not focus on the scientists who had developed it.)

Beginning in the late forties, as a result of his reputation as a distinguished and demanding teacher, TL was able to arrange for Bridgewater students to enroll in the Master's program at Boston College and to receive assistantships, an economic necessity for most. The success of every student he sent to BC is testimony to his teaching. We had taken but half the courses in chemistry required in the bona fide programs taken by those with whom we were to compete. But we had studied all of our chemistry with TL and had practiced the art of analytical thinking required in his well-constructed examinations, which always incorporated that one question which required creativity and the extension of a logical argument beyond the point reached in class or in the text,
and that made the difference.

Lest one think that this was an all too serious man, it should be noted that he had a zest for life and was noted for his jovial manner. Reports circulated that he could be seen during the summer months in a Cape Cod pub dressed in Bermuda shorts, wearing sandals, sporting a full beard and engaged in lively conversation — an image hard to reconcile with his professional persona. In addition, he was known to have an acerbic wit, describing one colleague known for procrastination as the "late Mr. P" and a verbose administrator as "a sender, not a receiver."

TL retired in 1965 at the age of 67, the year his youngest child graduated from college, to travel the world, an odyssey he had planned from youth. His last lecture in Physical Science, a required course for students in the Elementary Education program, was given in the lecture hall of the new science building, built in 1964, before a class of about 200. The standing ovation he received — such a demonstration of appreciation is not a tradition at Bridgewater — was a symbol of the affection and respect felt, but rarely expressed, by former students of almost half a century.

It has often been said that teaching is an ephemeral art form, that each performance is written on the wind. I believe the contrary to be true; that the law of conservation of energy applied to teaching and that the energy of this master teacher, T. Leonard Kelly, who took such great joy in the accomplishments of his students is immortalized in the lives and careers of these students to be passed on undiminished.
A Call For Senior Volunteerism

By Genevieve Ash

Just twelve short years from now a new century will commence. Though we may not be able to predict a great deal about how we will live then we do know of at least three factors that will influence life in the 21st century — dramatic shifts in the demographic composition of our nation, the aging of our population and the spirit of volunteerism that is developing in the elderly community.

Statisticians, demographers, sociologists and the media are predicting an historically unprecedented population explosion of elderly persons. By the year 2025, it has been projected that the proportion of elderly people in the population will be about 17 percent. Recently, the Alliance for Aging Research forecast that the “baby boom” generation would be the healthiest and the longest-lived generation in history because of expected medical advances in gerontology.

But knowledge of population shifts alone does not recognize the unique character of the elderly. First, it is important to realize that the elderly are the most heterogeneous segment of the population characterized by special interest groups, diversities, distinct personalities, aspirations and objectives. Experts in the field of aging have had difficulty in categorizing older Americans by physical characteristics or in making distinctions such as between the young elderly, middle-aged elderly, or the old and the frail elderly. Older Americans defy definitions now and will continue to do so when the “baby boomers” reach their advanced years.

Secondly, aging is not a contagious disease, but a gradual slowing down process, a dynamic process encompassing complex bodily changes, a redefinition of social identities and an adjustment in psychological function. Chronological age has little meaning, although it does serve as a convenient indicator, not only of psychological change, but of social status as well.

Thirdly, although financial security is paramount for a stress-free retirement and requires pre-retirement planning, there are other facets of the retirement state that should receive special consideration. In some instances, retirement can produce an identity crisis. This is true when a person’s occupation becomes obsolete or when a person’s profession, work, or vocation is closely associated with his personality. Unfortunately, there is not now, nor does there appear to be in the immediate future, a blueprint that a retiree can study. Without any psychological adjustment preparation, people tend to drift. In some instances, they succumb to stagnation and become hollow persons. On the other hand, many elderly citizens have found that lunches, poker, bridge, golf, fishing and travels are not enough to keep them intellectually alive and in the mainstream of life.

Alexis DeToqueville, the English political scientist, after his visit to the United States in 1832 wrote in his book Democracy in America, “I am persuaded,” he observed of America, “that the collective strengths of the citizens will always conduct more efficaciously to the public welfare than the authority of government.” This astute observation indicates that America was not exclusively a republic of political power, but a vast republic of voluntary values and actions that represent our real greatness. He also noted a tendency of Americans to unite with their fellows in organizations for a variety of purposes, such as professions, common interest, religious denominations, and for mutual advantages.

The willingness of the elderly to serve could be used as a new approach to both old and new problems. It has been estimated by a Louis Harris Associates Survey that volunteerism would be increased by 10 percent if more information and support were available. At present, there is a shortage of volunteers, particularly among women between the ages of 25 to 65. Obviously, some of this is due to the extraordinary increase of women in the workforce, the abolition of mandatory retirement in many industries and public institutions, flexible working hours, and part-time retirement. The tenor of volunteer work specifically for women has changed dramatically, but requires a great amount of time, dedication, sincerity, and a variety of marketable abilities.

It is usual for many seniors to belong to more than one elderly organization, one that is closely allied to their previous occupation or profession, and one that is more general in nature.

The following abridged list of older citizens’ organizations with their brief descriptions were chosen as examples of the varieties and differences that exist among these organizations:

**OWL (the Older Women’s League)** — works through its local chapters to bring about better lives for older women “by effecting change in public policy through the education of OWL members and policy makers at all levels to benefit the developing creative new forms of self-help, by changing the image of older women from pitiable and powerless to proud, self-directed and strong.”

**The National Association of Retired Federal Employees** — works through
local chapters to "protect the interests of all persons qualified under the Federal Government's Civil Service Retirement and Disability System." This organization has group insurance including health, accident, life, fire, homeowners, and automobile, and is available to its members.

_The National Alliance of Senior Citizens_ — works through regional and state groups. The NASC brings together, "persons advocating the advancement of senior Americans through sound fiscal policy and through belief in the American system of individuality and personal freedom. Purpose is to inform the membership and the American public on the needs of senior citizens and of the programs and policies being carried out by the government and other specified groups."

_The Silver-Haired Legislature_ — state organizations. The program goals are to "provide an educational advocacy program for seniors to become more aware of the legislative process, lobbying, community organizations and to encourage additional participation for senior leaders." Twenty-four states now have Silver-Haired Legislatures. In Massachusetts, any person over the age of 60 who is a registered voter and is a resident of the district he/she will represent is eligible to be a candidate for the Silver Haired Legislature. Elections are held every year, the tenure of office is for two years and elected members may run for re-election to succeed themselves.

_American Association of Retired Persons_ (AARP/NRTA) — The goals of this organization were set forth by Dr. Ethel Percy Andrus in 1958: "To enhance the quality of life for older persons; to lead in determining the role and place of older persons in society; and to improve the image of aging." 27 million people divided by regions, chapters, and units comprise the membership. Membership is available to anyone 50 or over.

Big is not necessarily better, but as a result of the phenomenal growth of AARP, there are innumerable membership services and programs for which one may volunteer: consumer affairs, criminal justice, health advocacy services, housing institute of life long learning, inter-generational activities, reminiscences, tax aide, traffic and driver safety, and widowed persons' service. Each year, they have priority programs, such as a health care campaign, minority affairs initiative, women's initiative, and worker's equity.

AARP's media service includes the magazine, _Modern Maturity_, a Public Broadcasting television show, radio programs and newspaper column in major cities. They have a National Legislative Network which is involved in current national issues each as social security, deficit reduction, tax reforms, and medicine. There are also volunteer State Legislative Committees in each state which concentrate on such issues as health care cost containment, teacher and state employees pension coverage, and consumer rights.

In spite of the almost overwhelming number of pragmatic programs, AARP has not ignored the mystery of man nor relegated him to human engineers or technocrats. Man's search for meaning, his inherent desire for wholeness, and his many dimensions are recognized by the organization's Inter-religious Liaison. _The National Interfaith Coalition on Aging_ refers to this aspect of man, "as spiritual well being is the affirmation of life."

In 1985, John Denning, President of AARP, and the leadership conceived a program which they called _New Roles in Society_ (Aging in the 21st Century). Briefly, the mission of this program is: "(to) respond to needs of all generations, to explore in a systematic way what the future holds for us, to identify trends, to take action that will help us to achieve a better society for all generations." Its major goals are delineated as follows: "to develop forecasts of changing conditions in the future which will influence the quality of American life to promote expanded
opportunities for involvement of older persons in all spheres of life; and to promote options for people to pursue a wide range of activities."

For example, following through on the AARP program, it might be well to have the many non-profit organizations in each community form a consortium to examine the roles in which the elderly can serve as volunteers. Additional benefits of such a consortium would not only be the prevention of the many duplications of service, but a check on the proper utilization of elderly talents. Local governments should actively recruit older people for their volunteer town and city boards and committees. Personnel boards should be mandated to keep a list of eligible part-time workers available for the inevitable busy times of year. The Massachusetts General Court made a tremendous step in this direction when it passed Senate Bill 1728 in 1987 which provides for "the chairman of the county commissioners to appoint a senior citizen in his/her county to serve as an associate commissioner for affairs concerning the elderly. The associate commissioner shall have no powers or authority in the county government, but will advise the county commissioners on affairs of the elderly and act as an ombudsman for senior citizens and elder agencies located within the county."

All levels of government need to reassess their elderly programs starting with the re-evaluation of the federal government's oversized, complicated categorical programs, which are wasteful and inefficient. The public is now aware of the number of ineligible people being served, the duplication of services and unnecessary funds that are appropriated. The reviewing should include all policies pertaining to women, to correct the inequities that now exist in Social Security, insurance, child care, and employment opportunities.

The older generation, their life-styles, contributions, and capabilities should be evaluated so that they will be properly appreciated as a continuing and untapped resource. As a result, they can be kept in the mainstream of life by offering significant and needed help to all facets of society, but particularly to young people who are going through difficult periods of their lives, periods that the older person has survived. With the exception of an addiction to hard drugs, there is no problem that the older generation has not experienced. Thus, the life experiences, skills, talents, and cumulative knowledge of the graying population can be utilized to transmit the best of our culture.

No doubt there will be many institutions, associations, and organizations that will offer ideal opportunities to this older population who not only wish to stay in the mainstream of life, but would hope to participate in the exciting if dubious future. At the moment, however, AARP seems to be the elderly association striving to comprehend these critical issues, analyze them with an intergenerational approach, and act as a catalyst for remediation.
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MIKHAIL S. GORBACHEV: AN INTIMATE BIOGRAPHY

The editors of Time magazine, with an introduction by Strobe Talbott. 1988

By Guy Clifford

Because few biographical works have been written about the Soviet Union's dynamic new leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, this very readable paperback by eight Time editors is a welcome and timely contribution. It is appropriate reading for any person interested in a man who may well be the USSR's leader for the remainder of this century, if not longer.

The authors trace Gorbachev's life from his birth in 1931 through his third summit meeting with Ronald Reagan in 1987. Born the only son of Russian peasants in southern Russia at the time Stalin ruthlessly collectivized Soviet agriculture, Gorbachev's boyhood was also coincident with the purges and show trials of the 1930's and a brief period of Nazi occupation of his village during World War II, when he lived with his grandparents while his father served in the army. Nonetheless, he received a public education and in his early teens made his contribution to the "Great Patriotic War" by working as a combine harvester operator. His activity in the Komsomol, the Communist youth organization, and his work in agriculture earned him the Red Banner of Labor, a prestigious award, and the support of local party officials. In turn, he won admission at age nineteen to Moscow State University where he studied law, continued his Komsomol activities and met and married his wife, Raisa. Upon graduation they returned to Gorbachev's native Stavropol region where their only child, Irina, was born. The two decades spent there were marked by a steady progression to more responsible party positions. Summoned to Moscow in 1978, he was chosen as the party's General Secretary by The Politburo only eight years later.

The man the dour Andrei Gromyko said "has a nice smile, but teeth of iron," when he suggested to his fellow Politburo members that Gorbachev was the right choice to succeed Constantine Chernenko, wasted no time demonstrating his strength, political skill and reformist bent. Intelligent, well educated, seasoned, personable, articulate and self-assured, Gorbachev embarked on an ambitious program to reduce nuclear arms, decentralize the economy (Perestroika) and increase intellectual, artistic and social freedom (Glasnost). Glasnost and Perestroika are new and becoming better understood in his country as well as in the West, and are proving to be more than just slogans.

It is too early to say where all the ferment will lead, but the energetic, relatively young (fifty-seven) and committed Communist leader has, in the words of the editor of Time, "given the Soviet Union, its allies and its enemies a gift they had not received from a Soviet leader in recent memory: a measure of hope." Ronald Reagan, a strident anti-communist, was on occasion upstaged by Gorbachev and in the view of some observers was pressured into negotiating the INF treaty so as to effectively compete with the positive image developed by the leader of the "Evil Empire." The two superpower leaders demonstrated in their relations that Margaret Thatcher's contention, "I can deal with this man," applies to them. Now that George Bush is in the White House, he and other world leaders may understand Mikhail Gorbachev even better.

This informative book, introduced by Time Washington Bureau Chief Strobe Talbott, contains a helpful, six-page chronology of events in the USSR since the 1917 revolution. It also includes seven pages of provocative quotations by Gorbachev on a miscellany of topics, among them Glasnost and Perestroika. The book is usefully indexed, and its sixteen pages of photographs add interest for the reader. Although the chapters were individually written by six of the Time editors, this poses no problem to the reader. And finally, this book is a first for Time, having been conceived after the magazine chose Mikhail Gorbachev as its "Man of the Year" in 1987. The editors, each with impressive individual credentials, did a fine job in expanding on their original portrait of the current Soviet leader.

GUY CLIFFORD is a Professor of Political Science
Here is a book of six “memoirs” that register the “self-consciousness” of an extraordinary man of letters, John Updike, written, as he declares, to discourage anyone else from taking “my life, my lode of ore and heap of memories, from me.” The result is much more than a simple claim of autobiographical ownership. Two meanings of Updike’s title Self-Consciousness are here, both embarrassment with self and meditation upon self, and they leaven each other. Childhood and adolescent embarrassed apprehension of one’s self was, Updike tells us, exacerbated for him by the afflictions of psoriasis and stuttering. To each of these he gives a chapter full of disarming revelations of personal discomfort. But in each case the point is the movement to the second definition of self-consciousness. In ways detailed convincingly and with wit, Updike sees both afflictions as having encouraged his artistic aspiration. “Only psoriasis could have taken a very average little boy, and furthermore a boy who loved the average, the daily, the safely hidden, and made him into a prolific, adaptable, ruthless-enough writer.” And again: “though it still crops up, this anxious guilty blockage in the throat, I have managed to maneuver several millions of words around it.”

Illuminating here is Updike’s clear sense of the scope and ambition of his own attempt in fiction. He answers eloquently the two most persistent negative criticisms of his work. To those who have called his style self-indulgent, he declares: “My own style seemed to me a groping and elemental attempt to approximate the complexity of envisioned phenomena and it surprised me to have it called luxuriant and self-indulgent; self-indulgent, surely, is exactly what it wasn’t — other-indulgent, rather. My models were the styles of Proust and Henry Green as I read them (one in translation): styles of tender exploration that tried to wrap themselves around the things, the tints and voices and perfumes, of the apprehended real.” To those who have complained that he had little or nothing to say, he answers with a crucial apologia: “I, who seemed to myself full of things to say, who had all of Shillington to say, Shillington and Pennsylvania and the whole mass of middling, hidden, troubled America to say, and who had seen and heard things in my two childhood homes, as my parents’ giant faces revolved and spoke, achieving utterance under some terrible pressure of American disappointment, that would take a lifetime to sort out, particularize, and extol with the proper dark beauty.” And indeed, one of the best things about these memoirs is the honest, touching portraits of Updike’s parents that emerge. Earlier, he says more about his sense of his literary calling: “I saw myself as a literary spy within average, public school, supermarket America. It was there I felt comfortable; it was there that I felt the real news was.”

Though both contain gems of self and social scrutiny, two of the six sections rankle. Updike’s rationale “On Not Being a Dove” during the Vietnam War seems shallow, specious, out of balance with the still festering wounds of that troubled time. And his “Letter to My Grandsons” lapses into windy genealogy, understandable surely, for this is a real letter and in it he digs out and orders matters of family history worth passing on. But the whole is a bit beyond the interest of a reader from outside the Updike family. Still and all, no Updike page is without at least one sentence that impresses stylistically or shows us something we’re better off knowing about. For example, in the genealogy chapter, there is his wonderful eye for defining detail, nailed down in a line of authoritative, accurate adjectives when he observes on his father’s ancestral street in Trenton, New Jersey, two men who “plodded into the wind, past the shreds of yesterday’s snowstorm, in the same stooped style, a rachitic, nicotinic style familiar to me from my years around Reading — the industrial workingman’s style, simultaneously bleary, patient, bitter, stunted, and cocky.” And in the “Dove” chapter, he contemplates his own “anti-bohemian gesture” of regular church attendance with winning self-deprecation: “Thus blended among my neighbors, I felt out of harm’s way. The basic dread that all religion offers to assuage drove me there, but there was a wider benefit in the distance churchgoing put between me and the stereotypical writer, my disenchar­­ge Manhattan counterpart.”

The last section combines a beautifully evoked return to Shillington and the farmhouse of Updike’s now ailing mother with meditations “On Being a Self Forever.” Naturally enough, Updike’s religious sense turns out to be connected to his artist’s apprehension of the world. He recalls the basement Sunday School of his youth, and the sense he felt there of God’s having extended “a Yes, a blessing, and I accepted that blessing, offering in return only a nickel a week and my art, my poor little art.” He continues, and spells out the connection: “Imitation is praise. Description expresses love. I early arrived at these self-justifying inklings. Having accepted that old Shillington blessing, I have felt free to describe life as accurately as I could, with especial attention to human erosions and betrayals. What small faith I have has given me what artistic courage I have. My theory was that God already knows everything and cannot be shocked. And only truth is useful.
Only truth can be built upon.

Happiness, concludes Updike, “is best seen out of the corner of the eye,” and he provides two positive images from his lifetime of “selves” to end on: as a cocky Harvard junior sitting down in a lecture hall at the start of a course, and “the other morning” walking back from his mailbox, when “I experienced happiness so sharply I tried to factor it into its components.” Here are two components from this last section: “Existence itself does not feel horrible; it feels like an ecstasy, rather, which we only have to be still to experience. Habit and accustomness have painted over pure gold with a dull paint that can, however, be scratched away, to reveal the shining underbase.” And again: “the self who looked up into the empyrean of print from that dusty farm in Pennsylvania with its outhouse and coal-oil stove is not so remote from me that I can still think it anything less than wonderful to have become a writer.”

This is a man blessed (literally, as he sees it) with talent, opportunity, and an enviably even temperament. He has used his gifts wisely, that’s clear. But what saves this book from complacency is Updike’s consciousness throughout of having stayed “out of harm’s way.” That phrase, a favorite of his grandfather’s, runs through the book as the leitmotif of Updike’s self-portrait of the artist as a cautious observer from outside the fray. He sees himself as having remained like the little boy he was, enjoying “the sensation of shelter, of being out of the rain, but just out,” as when he would crouch behind the porch wicker furniture during rainstorms, “irresponsible, safe, and witnessing.” As he puts it on the book’s last page, he feels “a touch of disdain” at having been “my own life’s careful manager and promoter. . . . I have steered my unique little craft carefully, at the same time doubting that carefulness is the most sublime virtue. He that gains his life shall lose it.” Well, maybe so. And yet, had Updike’s life and art exhibited the headlong turbulence, callousness, and risk of a Tolstoy or even a Faulkner, he could not have brought us the “news” of the heart of the country, of the American middle, as he has done so consistently and well for so many years. But it seems clear from the witty and sane consciousness of self herein displayed that he knows this too.

For John Updike truly is what that overworked phrase conveys — a national treasure. He is a thoroughly American writer whose art affirms by bearing witness to ordinary life. Not surprisingly, his memoir of Self-Consciousness has a lot in common with Updike’s own best fiction. This is a decent man’s book of quotidian hours — transformed by the artist’s dazzling gift of tongues. The result is homely earnestness raised to another power by sheer talent and loving attention to craft.
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THE RISE AND FALL OF THE GREAT POWERS

Paul Kennedy
Vintage, 1988

By Michael J. Kryzanek

Where the 1980’s has been pre-occupied with personal gain and self-aggrandizement, the 1990’s may very well become a decade in which Americans begin to re-evaluate themselves, their country and their future. Concern over the excesses of the “me” generation, new and foreboding social and environmental challenges, serious problems in key sectors such as education and manufacturing and the constant barrage of statistics claiming the superiority of Japan have forced Americans to examine the state of the United States and to speculate on whether our time in the sun may have indeed come to an end.

This process of introspection has been advanced by the publication of a number of books which seek to explore the current crisis of American confidence. Amidst this explosion of analysis and criticism, Paul Kennedy’s The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers is without question the best book to examine the issue of national decay and decline. Kennedy, a Yale historian, takes a wide lens view of history to investigate why the great powers — Greece, Rome, Spain, France, Germany and England — saw their influence and control diminish only to be replaced by new more powerful players in the international arena.

Kennedy is convinced that the rise and fall of great powers cannot be attributed to random and unrelated circumstances. Rather Kennedy believes that the great powers all shared a common set of conditions that led to their eventual decline. Kennedy places heavy emphasis on the relationship between military expenditures and economic/technological change and the tendency of dominant nations to expand their influence and control beyond their reach in determining the ingredients for survival as a great power.

For nations to maintain their status, they must balance their expenditures relative to defense with investment in technology, take the necessary steps to sustain economic development and manage resources, and avoid what Kennedy calls “imperialist overreach.” Excessive allocations for defense at the expense of research and development or ill-advised attempts to reassert control will eventually lead to a diminution of national power and perhaps even a permanent decline. As Kennedy points out with his detailed discussions of the decline of Spanish dominance in the 18th century and the reversal of British imperial pre-eminence after World War II, there must be a proper balance between defense, consumption and investment and an avoidance of “overstretch” if a great power is to maintain its greatness.

Kennedy provides the most cogent analysis concerning his thesis when he examines the future direction of the current great powers — China, Europe, Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States. For those Americans caught in this crisis of confidence, Kennedy is not pessimistic about the future or convinced that a fall is in the offing. Kennedy, however, is critical of national leaders who have failed to recognize the importance of investing resources in those areas that will enhance our power and for squandering precious resources on grandiose and dangerous defense projects. According to Kennedy, this country still has the ability to manage the forces of change and regain the initiative in the international sphere, but major readjustments and sacrifices will be required.

The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers is one of those rare books that strikes at the heart of an age and defines the issues that a nation must face in order to survive. Paul Kennedy’s painstaking examination of the reasons why nations are unable to maintain their great power status is essential reading for those concerned about the future of the United States. In this age of self-doubt where many believe that the United States is becoming the next Great Britain, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers may hold the key to avoiding that fate or describing accurately how it might happen.

MICHAEL J. KRYZANEK is a Professor of Political Science
Business Administration and Management Education in the United States

By Frederick Sheppard

Expenditures for business and management education and training have also increased dramatically. The total of all expenditures for business education — including management education, technical training and all other forms of business related training in the United States — is estimated to be in excess of $45 billion annually. Approximately $13 billion of the total is expended upon management education, exclusive of supervisory training. This includes approximately $600 million for graduate schools of business and management.

Early Developments

The creation of the conditions under which the training and education of managers and administrators could emerge as a clearly definable field of professional study required the convergence of several forces. First, there had to be a need — a demand — for people who had the specialized skills and knowledge that business curricula could provide. Second, there had to be a specific and unique body of knowledge that could be organized into courses of study. Third, there had to be early pioneers in the field to do the initial research and publish the early works in the areas of scientific management, organization theory and finance. Finally, there had to be academic leaders to recognize a need and define and implement courses of study in institutions of higher education.

The demands of an expanding nation and a growing population brought about specialized collegiate education as a societal necessity. The consequence was the establishment of medical, law, engineering and other professional schools in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, specialization in business education lagged behind most other professional fields. The first collegiate school of business, the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, was not established until 1881. This apparent lag is explained by Drucker as follows: "In the first place, the very idea of specialized training in business met with resistance from the purveyors of traditional liberal arts education — resistance which has never fully disappeared. Second, collegiate business education, like other areas of specialized training, arose in response to a need, and this particular need did not manifest itself much before the close of the nineteenth century ... The nineteenth century witnessed a vast development of our natural resources and an expansion of domestic markets."

Following the Civil War, the Midwest and West opened to population migration. The development of new power sources, transportation and communications capabilities facilitated the growth of markets and industrialization. With expansion of industries came the urbanization of populations and the increased impact of manufacturing industries upon the economy. Agriculture, which at the beginning of the nineteenth century provided approximately ninety percent of all jobs in the United States, gradually lost its position of primacy in the economy to manufacturing industries and to the service industries that formed to support manufacturing.

By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, industrialization was well underway. With the development of large corporate structures came the bureaucratization of American busi-
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ness. This created the need for specialized collegiate training and provided the impetus for the establishment of business curricula on college campuses across the United States. As the flow of college educated people began to assume the responsibility for managing major segments of American business and capital investments, business success became more associated with the attainment of high managerial position than with ownership.

The evolution of business and management as distinct professional disciplines could not have occurred without the development and codification of a specialized body of knowledge. Many researchers and writers, most of whom published their works in this century, have contributed to this body of knowledge and a sequence of events has intensified the need for professionally educated management personnel.

Henry Fayol, a French engineer, developed and published the first general theory of management in the early 20th century. He was followed by other European and American researchers. In the United States, Frederick W. Taylor has been credited with being the father of scientific management for his extensive research, lecturing and writing in the period just prior to World War I. He was followed by Henry Gantt, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth, Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Abraham Maslow, Douglas McGregor and other early pioneers who created a base of knowledge that is a part of business curricula to this day.

Another essential tool of management accounting underwent a gradual process of refinement in the nineteenth century to become a significant factor in the body of management knowledge and a vital aspect of management professionalism. With the growth of business enterprises and with the increasing dominance of the corporate form of organization structure, the need became evident for more authoritative, reliable and consistent standards of financial reporting and control. The adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution on March 1, 1913 gave Congress the power to levy taxes on income. This resulted in the Revenue Act of 1913 which ushered in a new era of professional requirements for accounting practitioners as millions of corporations, partnerships, and individuals became accountable to the federal government for the payment of income taxes.

Regulatory legislation, the expansion of labor unions, and the development of increasingly complex employee remuneration and fringe benefit plans provided additional incentives to the professionalization of accounting. Professional organizations, such as the American Accounting Association and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants codified accounting standards and established certification criteria that enhanced the field of professional knowledge and emphasized the importance of formal higher education for professional qualification and certification. According to education historian Don C. Marshall, "During the rapid growth of collegiate business schools after the turn of the century, every new school, without exception, provided instruction in accounting. Thus from the earliest college level program to the present, a course in accounting has been included in business school curricula, usually as part of the core course work."

The need was clearly established for formally trained and educated managers and administrators. Researchers, scholars and practitioners came forth to create a unique body of knowledge that previously did not exist.

The Rise Of The Business School

Although there had been earlier, unsuccessful attempts at the establishment of schools of business at the University of Louisiana in 1851, at the University of Wisconsin in 1869 and at Washington and Lee in 1869, the first successful and lasting school of business in higher education took form at the University of Pennsylvania in 1881. After the aborted attempts at other schools, it remained for Joseph Wharton, well-known Philadelphia iron-master and financier, to provide the ideological and financial ($100,000) resources which led to the establishment of the first collegiate school of business. Wharton was a proponent of specialized business education and felt that all college training should be oriented toward citizenship, community responsibility, and high ethical standards.

He defined the objectives of the business school which was to take his name, as follows:

To provide for young men a means of training and correct instruction in the knowledge and the arts of modern finance and economy, both public and private, in order that, being well informed and free from delusions in these important subjects, they may either serve the community skillfully, as well as faithfully, in offices of trust, or, remaining in private life, they may prudently manage their own affairs and maintain sound financial morality; in short, to establish means for importing a liberal education in all matters concerning finance and commerce.

His vision was not for a narrow curriculum of business subjects, but that instruction be based "upon the broad principles deduced from all human knowledge; and ground in science, as well as in art, pupils . . . are thereby fitted both to practice what they have learned and to become themselves teachers and discoverers." Not all the business schools which followed the establishment of the Wharton School were founded upon such lofty principles.

There was a seventeen year hiatus after the establishment of the Wharton School before another American college or university ventured into business education. This occurred at the University of Chicago in 1898 where a business school emerged from the economics program.

Curriculum

The Wharton School established a pattern for the curriculum of the early schools of business. Edmund J. James, who was employed by the University of Pennsylvania to organize the new program, had interests primarily in finance and public administration. During his
tenure, the Wharton School curriculum consisted almost wholly of courses in history, government, and economics, with a small nucleus of offerings in accounting, business law, and business organization.

Within twenty years after the founding of the Wharton School, courses were being offered in most of the larger fields of business accounting, commerce and marketing, transportation, insurance, industry (production), corporate finance, investment banking and real estate. These subjects were taught by specialists.

Because new schools of business were typically created on the model of existing programs and because educational standards were being promulgated by accreditation agencies, there was soon a trend toward a core business administration/management curriculum. In an extensive study entitled *Higher Education for Business*, published in 1959, the authors suggested a core curriculum for undergraduate business students which is very much like that of today’s business school curricula.

What has changed is the course content and the teaching methodology. Also, course content and emphasis has been modified to reflect increasingly and complex business competition and the internationalization of the business environment. For example, rapid advances in computer technology and computer-oriented/management information systems have influenced the curricula in the form of new computer and management courses and concentrations; computer exercises and management simulations for courses in accounting, operations management, market research and business policy. Also, there is unprecedented emphasis upon social responsibility and ethical aspects of business.

Some curriculum issues remain for our continual examination, such as the balance between the liberal arts and the “vocational” content in business school curricula and the differentiation between undergraduate and graduate management curricula.

Given the relative recency of management education in America it should be no surprise that there are some fundamental issues to confront.

Business educators continue to face the same dilemmas and frustrations that have been the subject of debate and evaluation since the inception of business curricula in higher education. The demands upon the management faculty intensify and add weight to both sides of the balance — to strengthen the liberal arts content of management curricula while satisfying the ever expanding demands to educate the students in the evolving technologies and disciplines of management.
SOMETHING TO SAY

By Barbara Apstein

Although I was impressed by Mark’s comment about Huck Finn and situation ethics, his remark that he had taken American Literature the previous semester also summoned forth other, less pleasurable reflections: from the murky depths of my academic unconscious the words “course prerequisites” emerged, followed by “Successful completion of EN 101, EN 102 (or their equivalent) is a prerequisite to all other English courses.”

After class, I asked Mark how he had happened to take American Literature before completing Writing II. “I never liked writing very much,” he admitted, “so I kept putting it off. This is my last semester, so I can’t put it off any more. To tell you the truth, though, I’m finding writing easier now that I have something to say.”

Here was an advisor’s nightmare, a violation of all the rules of orderly academic sequence. Writing in college is generally thought of as one of the “essential academic skills” that students will need in preparation for their more advanced work. In theory, they are to master the writing skills first and then, over the next four years, acquire the body of knowledge they will use the skill on.

This sequence — learning the skill or technique first and then using it — has some descriptive validity when the tasks are relatively simple. If we first learn how to beat egg whites until they are stiff, how to fold gently, without deflating them, into a thick chocolate goop, then we can put these skills together to make a souffle. If we first learn how to shift gears, apply brakes and use directional signals, then we can drive a car. But writing doesn’t work quite this way, because writing is a more complex activity: if a writer has nothing to write about, he is engaging in an empty exercise. The beater of egg whites and the student driver can see what their skill is to be used for, why it is worth having. But the beginning writer can’t know why she is learning about thesis statements or commas or run on sentences unless there is something she wants to say.

Recalling Mark’s work during the course of the semester confirmed my impression that he did have something to say. His essays had explored a range of ideas and had made some imaginative connections between our reading and concepts drawn from anthropology, political science, history, psychology — courses he had taken during his college years. For so many freshmen, the first question about a writing assignment is “How long does this have to be?” — their principal purpose seems to be to fill a predetermined number of typed pages. Mark’s four years of reading and thinking in a variety of courses had enriched his writing and given him what so many entering freshmen lack — an authentic purpose.

I don’t mean to recommend that all students postpone taking Writing I and II. Nonetheless, it may be worth re-thinking our attitude towards prerequisites and course sequences. The habits of thoughtful reading and reflection which many students develop during their college years can spill over into required courses in unexpected ways.
WINNER TAKES ALL
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