

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1962

3:30 P.M.

MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY AUDITORIUM

The membership of the Senate totals 172 including 132 elected members and 40 ex officio members (32 Administrative Committee and 8 Faculty Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the membership (87) must be present. Constitution changes require advanced publication and 115 affirmative votes. By-Law changes require 87 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of members present and voting.

Faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members may be present at Senate meetings but shall not be entitled to vote or make motions. Such faculty may, at their request and with the approval of the Senate, be given the privilege to speak on matters under consideration in which they have an interest.

Members of standing committees who are not members of the Senate, including student members, may be present at a meeting of the Senate during such time as a report of their committee is under discussion and may participate in such discussion, but shall not have the privilege of making motions or of voting.

A special section will be provided for the seating of such faculty and such members of standing committees.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be circulated during the meeting. Members will please check their names to indicate their presence. If the list misses you please stop afterward to check your name. The roll, after adjournment, will be on the rostrum.

An attendance record for nonmembers will also be circulated and will be on the rostrum after the meeting.

As voted by the Senate, a summary of the attendance of members elected for the current academic year will be included in the June minutes.

NOT FOR RELEASE PRIOR TO THE SENATE MEETING

Year 1961-62

No. 6

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA THE SENATE DOCKET

March 8, 1962

Your Committee on Business and Rules respectfully presents the following matters for consideration:

I. MINUTES OF JANUARY 18, 1962

Reported for Action

II. MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 1, 1962

Reported for Action

III. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

1. *Tuition Increases.* On January 10, 1962, President Wilson discussed the possibility of an increase in tuition for the 1962-63 school year. The President pointed out that in the fall term, 1961, the University had 2,600 more students than were funded for. He noted that the dollars received from tuition pay about 30 per cent of the cost of the students' education and as a result the University now finds itself in a deficit position. To provide for the increased instructional costs it was necessary to borrow from funds reserved for unfilled positions. He cautioned that this gradual attrition of funds has reached the point where the flexibility of the University is reduced and the instructional program is in danger of being seriously affected. He indicated that to replace these funds it will be necessary to find an additional \$650,000 in the 1962-63 school year.

President Wilson noted that the budgetary situation has been strained to the limit in this school year and that if the same condition persists next year, we will have virtually no reversion money for supplies and critical nonrecurring items. He added that it would be impossible to maintain the University on its present level of quality without additional funds. He indicated that the first use to which increased revenues would be put would be in the restoration of line items in the academic areas.

The President presented two possibilities for obtaining the necessary revenue. The first of these was to increase tuition and fees from the present base of \$91 a term to \$100 a term. He discussed two variants of this first proposal: either to indicate that tuition was increased to \$80 with the incidental fee unchanged at \$20, or to consider the entire \$100 as tuition, and budget internally the services provided in the past by the incidental fee. Vice President Lunden believed that such increases would provide an estimated \$660,000 in income.

The second proposition discussed by the President related to premium tuition charges for professional areas. He suggested the possibility of setting the minimum tuition level for these areas at \$100 a term plus the \$20 incidental fee. Dean Lockhart indicated that such an increase would cause difficulties with the scholarship program in the Law School and added that if the increase was the only way in which the University might provide for a maintenance of quality, then it would seem wise to couple it with a program of tuition scholarships.

Dean McFarland said that for students whose homes lie beyond commuting range the major item of cost in attending the University is the cost of room and board rather than tuition and fees. He urged continuing attention to this. It was reported that the self-liquidating nature of the dormitory program at the University imposes higher costs than those at the state colleges where the dormitories have often been built with state funds.

In summing up the discussions, President Wilson indicated that there would be continuing efforts to find additional funds to meet the needs of the University but that conversations he has had indicate that there is no alternative source of funds. While he does have substantial concern for the implications of a tuition increase, for its impact on the student body, on the land grant tradition, and on enrollments, it appears necessary to move in this direction.

Vice President Willey presented on February 5, 1962, a summary of the studies made of tuition since the previous meeting of the Administrative Committee. The present schedule presumably took into account the charges of the University in relation to those of other Big Ten institutions. There had been discussion of a differential fee for some of the professional colleges, with the proposal of a higher fee schedule for designated or professional degree programs. It had been asked if a new tuition schedule might reflect the differences in instructional costs or the market for graduates in the particular fields. No such schedule was proposed at this time. The suggestion of different tuition rates for Upper Division students, as against those in Lower Division work, was not carried out in the schedule introduced, with the one exception of the Institute of Technology.

President Wilson asked that this schedule be considered as a compromise proposal which might establish a stable upper limit for common tuition without leading into difficulties with premium tuitions. He thought that, generally, there ought not to be differences between the charges for Upper Division and Lower Division work, but that the proposal for the Institute of Technology might be acceptable. In commenting on offsetting high tuition in many instances by scholarship grants, the President expressed himself as favoring the equality of opportunity which grows out of low and uniform tuitions in the public schools and colleges.

In discussion which followed, reference was made to various tuition schemes, and it was indicated that, at least for the present, a very simple pattern of change should be followed. Some inequities could result from the proposed schedule because of the crossing over of students between colleges, it was pointed out, and it was remarked that this schedule would not bring about complete accord among the several levels of work in the different colleges. Dean Bryce Crawford reported on a further proposal before the Fees Committee to modify the Graduate School tuition for Ph.D. candidates, for example, those registered for thesis only. An objection raised to the differential tuition proposed to apply within the Institute of Technology was answered by representatives of that unit who thought that the schedule would be capable of ready administration and that it properly reflected the division of the instruction into two different levels. The committee received, as additional background material, a table which the recorder had prepared to show how tuition and fees have varied for students in the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts since the year 1930.

Considerable attention was given to the incidental fee and to the needs which activities supported by that fee have for additional revenue. Not only is the work of the *Daily* and of the Minnesota Students' Association academically oriented, but that work is even now to a great extent on a volunteer basis, it was said.

Certain members of the committee expressed grave concern for the continuing attendance of students as costs at the University increase. The availability of adequate loan funds will become increasingly important if extreme hardship is not to result. Further objections heard to the proposed tuition increases were concerned with their effect on graduate and nonresident students. The departure of the Graduate School tuition from that of the Arts College was viewed as undesirable, and several members of the committee pointed out that the further increases in the nonresident tuition rate would work against high caliber students who come to the University from afar. In certain professional areas, veterinary medicine for example, some of the best students are from out of state. Co-operative agreements between states may become more necessary if students are to be able to take work not available in their home states.

By resolution, duly made, seconded, and voted, the committee reluctantly endorsed the proposed tuition rates for 1962-63, the schedule of which is incorporated in the minutes, as a necessary step in University planning, with the understanding that this matter will be taken to the Fees Committee and the Board of Regents for consideration.

2. *Physical Examinations for New Faculty Members.* At the meeting of December 13, 1961, the Administrative Committee had asked a small sub-committee, headed by Dean Lockhart, to review the stated requirements for the physical examination of new appointees to the faculty. Dean Lockhart presented a written report which provided for a minor rephrasing of the statements concerning the physical examination to appear in materials circulated to faculty and prospective faculty. It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to endorse the report as expressing the desirable changes.

3. *Periodic Medical Examinations for Major Administrative Officers.* The subject of periodic medical examinations for major administrative officers had been before the committee on several occasions, the last time being December 13, 1961. Dr. Cowan was asked to report on the steps that had been taken looking toward the implementation of the program. He stated that the members of the committee would soon be receiving calls advising them of the availability of the examination, and he outlined the nature and extent of the examination contemplated.

4. *Proposal for Co-ordination of Sponsored Studies Through the Graduate Research Center.* The dean of the Graduate School had, in response to a request from the President, prepared a written plan (January 23, 1962) for central co-ordination of research proposals, particularly those involving sponsored research, contracts, or support from the private foundations. Such co-ordination, if it calls for new operating procedures, might provide academic or institutional judgments somewhat commensurate with the fiscal judgments now required. Dean Bryce Crawford thought that priorities among proposals from the University would be suggested only when asked for by the supporting agency. Time schedules in submitting proposals are crucial, it was stated, and these would need to take into account any more complicated procedure. The University sometimes has residual or "phasing out" responsibilities for projects and these could be dealt with by a co-ordinating agency. Also, some degree of reporting would make it possible to keep the University constituency informed of the utility and research contributions of the University. Co-ordination should in no case establish barriers to work, and it was the general agreement that direct contact should be maintained between faculty members concerned and the agencies that support their work.

In view of the reasons expressed for co-ordination and the gathering of information on research proposals, the President asked that the document be redrafted to indicate the use of existing channels of information and co-ordination and a locus for certain academic judgments. Use of the procedure might then be initiated on a tentative basis, subject to review, with the purpose of expediting and supporting the research program of the University.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

IV. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

1. Reported for Information

Hearing on the Gerald Proposals

An open hearing, to which all faculty members were invited, was held Thursday, January 25, 1962 in 115 Ford Hall with 20 faculty members present. Professor Gerald made the following statement:

I have asked for this hearing so that we can discuss my proposals that the Senate meetings be open to the press. The proposals are in two parts.

The first part, the proposed constitutional amendment, is simply an enabling act designed to help the Senate consider, with a minimum of frustration, the second proposal. Amendments require a two-thirds vote of all members of the Senate; to obtain consideration, they must be submitted in writing to each member of the Senate and the faculties eligible to vote for Senate members; after original passage in the Senate they must be submitted to the faculty eligible to vote for Senate members and then to the Regents for approval.

We are likely to find it necessary to deal with attendance of nonmembers of the Senate for a long time and should not have to confront such a frustrating routine to work out the best plan for the University as a whole. The second part of the proposal is for consideration under rules for amendment of the By-Laws; measures in this category require a majority vote of all members of the Senate for passage.

It should be made clear that under Article II of the Senate Constitution the approval by the Senate of these proposals would require the concurrence of the President and the Regents in order to be effective. Therefore, we are certain to have a chance for full consideration of the proposal by the entire University administration.

I explained to the Senate that the proposals were made in the hope that publicity for deliberations of the Senate would help the public understand some of the very serious problems that confront our growing University. The fact that the Senate is closed to the public tends to hide its real importance. This is unfortunate because the Senate is concerned with classroom problems and educational policy, as well as with other things, and is the part of the University most likely to explain the conditions which confront the classroom teacher. Opening the Senate would not affect the very large powers of the President, and I should not want them diminished. We need strong leadership and must have it. At the same time, we also need a visible Senate so that its prestige and usefulness may grow along with the seriousness of our problems.

I have been asked if I make this proposal as a journalist on behalf of other journalists. I do not represent any journalists. I act as a teacher. I have not and will not consult with journalists about this proposal. I believe that they can help us explain the University to the public, but they will do it in their own way.

I am aware that some members of the faculty don't want to be bothered with consultation and leadership problems. I share the longing for the day of the all-enlightened philosopher-king and would willingly place all my burdens on him. Since this longing will apparently not soon be satisfied, I work with those who in good will and humility try to improve communication and consultation in our fine but complex community.

I have also been asked:

Question: Are you trying to weaken the President as the leader of the faculty and staff in favor of a strong faculty or committee system?

Answer: No. I do not wish to change or to reduce any of the powers or the prerogatives of the President. I believe in a strong leadership free of unnecessary encumbrances. I also believe in open meetings of the Senate. Closed meetings keep the public from seeing the faculty at work and cause the University to appear in the public eye in a greatly distorted way. We are, to the public, a football team, a big hospital, and a tough place to park a car. The Senate is silly because it gets mixed up on such things as the Rose Bowl. The hospital is mostly for little girls with bad hearts and hidden away somewhere, mostly in classes of 2,000 each, are 28,000 students.

Question: Do you think the press is mature enough to help us explain our problems?

Answer: With our mature help, the press is a very fine communications agency. Without our help, the press is a lover of cheer leaders, 35-yard touchdown passes, and Pom Pom girls. I wouldn't expect the press to come to the Senate meetings, even if they should be open, unless we help journalists understand what goes on. They are, however, very teachable, especially when they are convinced that the persons they deal with are candid and open. I wouldn't want the Senate opened unless we give the reporters as much help there as we give them in the press box at Memorial Stadium. At the very least, they need competent spotters and an open telephone line to the bench.

Question: Wouldn't it create confusion if the Senate starts competing with the Administration for public attention?

Answer: No, there would be no competition. The insight the public can get from the Senate is into teaching problems, classroom situations, problems of educational policy. The Senate is a source of intimate information about the conditions of teacher and student contacts. The members of the Senate have the capacity of breaking masses of students into visible individuals with problems that must be solved. The increased visibility will help the public see and understand the underfinanced portions of the University. Here is a great mass of students exposed to all of the possible hazards of cheapened, high-volume, impersonal education, unprotected by severe standards of accreditation and professional competence (such as the professional schools must meet). That part of the University particularly needs visibility at this time.

Question: Would not discussion of University problems be stopped or seriously impaired by opening the Senate? Would self-consciousness and other restraints intervene to frustrate our efforts to solve problems?

Answer: Not on balance. True, there might be a brief period of self-consciousness, but it would soon wear off. We will forget that the press is there. I assume the Senate and *ad hoc* committee system would largely remain closed. There are some notable exceptions to the rule, such as the Senate Committee on Student Affairs; but assuming some timidity for a while on the Senate floor it seems that the committee system would be stimulated to more thorough and systematic action. This would be of great benefit to the consideration of University problems.

Question: Some Senate members say that they will be increasingly under pressure as individuals if meetings are open. Is that not a serious drawback to your proposal?

Answer: If you mean that the opening of the Senate might make more members of the faculty aware of some of the very serious problems the University has in getting the community's consent to its program of expensive physical growth, then I should think that sort of pressure ought to be felt by all of us, would, in fact, be good for us. If you mean that pressure might be brought on members of the Senate on such matters as Rose Bowl participation or watering down academic standards in order to accommodate more students on the same money, then I should think it better to face such pressures openly, in public, rather than in private. Persons in positions of public trust, such as we occupy, are expected to have a reasonable amount of fortitude and if they have it there is no real problem.

We can no longer assume that conditions which insulate the University from the view and the understanding of the general public is a good thing. A great many sheltered institutions have found conditions radically altered since the cost of public education has heavily increased. Apparently, we are going to have to earn our way in competition for the tax dollar with other public institutions and we need to be daily and meaningfully in the public eye in order to achieve support and understanding.

During the discussion that followed, concern was expressed regarding the technique to be used when it becomes desirable to hold a closed meeting. Suggestions made included alternate open and closed meetings, some provision whereby with less than majority vote the Senate might go into executive session, closed informational meetings where no action would be taken, or hearings such as that being presently held.

To the question, if the Senate meetings are opened to the press would it follow that Senate committees would also be open, the reply was no, that the committees would make their own rules. The suggestion was made that if that is the intent, it should be spelled out in the By-Laws.

Arguments against the proposal were the serious restraint on the Senate if the press were present, the belief that opening the Senate to the press will not achieve the purpose in mind, that it would inhibit the President and others in reporting to the Senate, and that there are better ways of handling publicity than through open meetings.

2. Reported for Action

(Without Committee Recommendation)

Professor Gerald's Proposals

PROPOSAL 1

Amend Article III, Section 7, of the Constitution of the University Senate by adding, at the end of the section, the following:,,

"The By-Laws may provide for the attendance of other persons."

PROPOSAL 2

Amend the By-Laws of the University Senate, Article I, by adding a new section, to be appropriately numbered and to read as follows:

Representatives of the Minnesota print and electronic media, accredited for the purpose by the President, shall be admitted to sessions of the Senate except when the Senate, by a majority vote of members present and voting, excludes them for part or all of a meeting. Cameras, microphones, and recording equipment may be used only at such times and in such manner as shall conform to the rules of the Senate regulating their use.

ELIO D. MONACHESI, Chairman

V. REPORT OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

The Faculty Consultative Committee traveled to Duluth on January 29, 1962, for an evening meeting with the Duluth chapter of AAUP and for meetings on January 30 with the Administrative Committee and the faculty of UMD. A number of problems and topics of concern to the Duluth faculty were discussed and these matters will be transmitted by the committee to President Wilson.

Of major concern to the UMD faculty were (1) the excessive student-teacher ratio; (2) the disadvantageous position of UMD in teacher training operations relative to the state colleges; (3) recruitment and retention of competent faculty; (4) the desire to offer graduate programs at UMD; (5) improved opportunities for carrying on research and scholarly activities; (6) improvements of the sabbatical and quarter leave systems.

President Wilson discussed the proposal for tuition increase with the committee, and its members were invited to attend the Administrative Committee meeting at which the proposal was considered.

The committee has received, through the courtesy of Vice President Wenberg, a communication from Professor Charles Sawyer, chairman, Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, University of Michigan. Professor Sawyer transmitted the following resolution which had been adopted by the University of Michigan Senate:

"Resolved, That the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs be instructed to communicate with the corresponding bodies of the other Big Ten schools to determine what action their several faculties might take to lessen the degree of professionalism in intercollegiate athletics."

Your FCC will give further consideration to the content of Professor Sawyer's communication and may, at a later date, bring a recommendation to the Senate regarding it.

WILL M. MYERS, Chairman

(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the seating of the nonfaculty members of the Committee on Education and the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics for the discussion of these reports.)

VI. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Reported for Continued Consideration

University Reorganization and Liberal Education

For the details of the report and digest of the previous discussion see Senate Minutes for February 1, 1962.

E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, Chairman

VII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Reported for Information

Approved Schedules

Baseball 1962

March 19, 20	University of Texas at Austin
March 19, 20	Texas Lutheran College at Sequin (Squad will be divided for the above 2 dates)
March 21, 22	Texas A & M College at College Station
March 23, 24	Sam Houston State Teachers College at Huntsville, 2 games each day
March 30	Iowa State University at Ames
March 31	Iowa State University at Ames, 2 games
April 13	South Dakota State College at Brookings
April 14	South Dakota State College at Brookings, 2 games
April 20	State College of Iowa
April 21	State College of Iowa, 2 games
April 27	Michigan State University
April 28	University of Michigan, 2 games
May 4	Ohio State University at Columbus
May 5	Indiana University at Bloomington, 2 games
May 11	University of Wisconsin
May 12	Northwestern University, 2 games
May 18	University of Illinois at Urbana
May 19	Purdue University at Lafayette, 2 games
May 25	State University of Iowa
May 26	State University of Iowa, 2 games

Golf 1962

March 19-23	Matches against teams from University of Houston and Rice University at Houston, Texas
April 30	Quadrangular matches against University of Wisconsin, State University of Iowa, and University of Illinois at Urbana
May 7	Triangular matches against State University of Iowa and University of Wisconsin at Madison
May 10	Carleton College
May 18-19	Conference Matches at Urbana
June 18-23	N.C.A.A. matches at Chapel Hill, N. C.

Tennis 1962

March 19	University of Houston at Houston
March 20	Rice University at Houston
March 21	Texas A & M College at Houston
March 22	Baylor University at Houston
March 23	Rice Invitational Intercollegiate Tournament at Houston
April 7	Iowa State University
April 16	Carleton College
April 20, 21	Quadrangular matches with University of Louisville, Washington University of St. Louis, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
April 24	University of Wichita
April 27-28	Quadrangular matches with State University of Iowa, Michigan State University, and University of Wisconsin
May 4-5	Quadrangular matches with Ohio State University, Notre Dame University, and University of Wisconsin at Madison
May 8	State University of Iowa
May 12	Alumni
May 16	Indiana University
May 17-19	Conference championship matches at Minnesota
June 18-23	N.C.A.A. championship matches at Palo Alto, California

M. O. SCHULTZE, Chairman

(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the withdrawal of nonfaculty committee members.)

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. NECROLOGY

JOHN J. BITTNER

1904-1961

John J. Bittner, professor and director of the Division of Cancer Biology, died unexpectedly on December 14, 1961, as he entered the elevator in Lyon Laboratories. He is survived by his wife, Esther Mahaffey Bittner, 2 daughters, Mrs. Mary Margaret Bowker and Mrs. Elizabeth Ann Loague, 1 brother, Guy C. Bittner, and 2 sisters, Mrs. Leonell Strong and Mrs. Josephine Trunbull.

Dr. Bittner was born February 25, 1904, in Meadville, Pennsylvania. As a young man he was so proficient in baseball, basketball, and track that he received offers of athletic scholarships at several schools but he chose to attend St. Stephen's College (now Bard College) where he received a B.A. degree in 1925. He taught at Donaldson Preparatory School for 1 year before beginning his graduate work at the University of Michigan where he worked with Dr. Clarence Little and also with Dr. Leonell Strong who had taught him biology at St. Stephen's College. At the University of Michigan he received his M.S. degree in 1929 and his Ph.D. degree in 1930.

The work started during his graduate years at Michigan was continued at the Roscoe B. Jackson Memorial Laboratories, Bar Harbor, Maine. While at Bar Harbor, he made some of his most important scientific contributions. Perhaps the most significant of these was his discovery of the role of the milk agent in the genesis of mouse mammary tumors.

In 1942, he came to Minnesota as George Chase Christian professor of cancer research and director of the Division of Cancer Biology. Mouse mammary cancer and the factors which influence its development continued to be his chief interest but he was active in many other areas. Graduate students from many departments came to work with him and they in turn have made significant contributions.

Dr. Bittner had published more than 200 papers. He had contributed chapters to several books and had lectured widely in this country and abroad. Honorary degrees were awarded him by Bard College and the University of Perugia. In recognition of his outstanding achievements he received the Alvarenga Award of the American College of Physicians; the Medal of the American Cancer Society; the Comfort Crookshank Award of the Middlesex Hospital Medical School in London, and the Bertner Award of the University of Texas Medical School.

John Bittner was a quiet, modest, intense man who devoted himself to his work, his family, and his close friends. In each of these he found success and happiness.

LYNWOOD CLIFFORD DOWNS

1893-1961

Lynwood Clifford Downs, professor emeritus of German, died in Minneapolis, January 21, 1961, after a few months' illness. He was 67 years old. He is survived by his wife Esther; a son Daniel, Fertile, Minnesota; 3 daughters, Florence G. Nelson, Seattle, Washington, Cornelia R. Einsweiler, Minneapolis, and Polly L. Hessong, Covina, California; and 14 grandchildren.

Professor Downs was born in Mattituck, New York, on February 24, 1893. He received his secondary education in Riverhead Cornell School in New York, his bachelor and master of arts degrees from Cornell University in 1914 and 1915 respectively. He was called to the University of Minnesota as instructor in 1916. From 1917 to 1919 he served in the Army, with 1 year overseas. Between 1919 and 1931 he held positions as instructor at the University of Minnesota, assistant professor at Lehigh University and Oberlin College, and professor at Drake University. He returned to the University of Minnesota in 1931 to complete his work for the Ph.D. degree which he obtained the same year, and remained in continuous service until July 1959.

His record at the University of Minnesota was one of excellent teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels, publication of texts which retained their usefulness and popularity through the years, unstinting sacrifice of time and effort in administrative and organizational functions of the

Department of German and the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, and respected leadership among German teachers in Minnesota. For a long time he was editor of the *German News* which appeared three times a quarter and gave more than 200 teachers of the state down-to-earth information as well as inspiration for their work in German. He published articles in linguistic and historical journals, investigated the history of Germans in Minnesota, and was interested in Civil War and world slang. One of his last contributions was collaboration in the multi-language dictionary of the *Britannica* which appeared in 1954.

Professor Downs' colleagues and graduate students considered his lectures and discussions in his specialty, Germanic philology, models of clarity and honest scholarship. We continue to hear from students at all levels, who appreciated his keen understanding of their problems in and out of class, his dry humor and his readiness and ability to help them. Professor Downs' death so soon after retirement came with a great sense of loss to his many friends and colleagues.

MARGUERITE GUINOTTE

1882-1961

Miss Marguerite Guinotte, assistant professor emeritus in the department of Romance Languages, died on July 13, 1961. She was 79 years old.

Miss Guinotte was born in Neuilly, France, on March 19, 1882. She taught in Paris before coming to the United States. After arrival here, she studied at Columbia University, and later, in 1920, she took the Master's degree from the University of Minnesota. Before joining the staff of the Department of Romance Languages in 1913, she had already taught at the Loomis School in St. Paul and Northrop Collegiate School in Minneapolis.

At the time of her retirement in 1950 the French government conferred upon her the *Palmes Academiques*, for her many years of devoted teaching and promotion of French culture. Several generations of University students remember her as a dedicated teacher, eager to bring them new insights on the civilization of her native France.

WILLIAM LINDSAY

1882-1962

William Lindsay, professor of music from 1921 to 1950, was born in Tokyo, Japan, on April 9, 1882, and died in Bournemouth, England, on January 5, 1962. He was brought to Britain at an early age and received his academic training at Watson's College and at the University of Edinburgh, where he graduated with a major in English. Musical training was concurrent with academic, so that he went in 1904 to the Leipzig Conservatory where he was first a pupil and then an assistant to Robert Teichmüller. He also did some study with Ernst von Dohnanyi. Having won the Mendelssohn Prize in 1909, he went to the Hochschule für Musik in Berlin. In 1914, on the outbreak of war, he was interned in the prison camp at Ruhleben. He returned to England in 1918 and came to America in 1921.

He came to this university partly on the recommendation of Myra Hess, and at once established himself as a significant artist. During his tenure he appeared with every conductor of the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra—Oberhoffer, Verbrugghen, Ormandy, Mitropoulos, and Dorati—and gave innumerable solo and chamber recitals. He twice took sabbatical leave, in 1927 and 1939, for study in London, Paris, Berlin, and Leipzig.

After retirement he lived for a time in Lenox, Massachusetts, and later in Carmel, California, where he won high acclaim. In 1954, however, he went back to England where he made his home, returning here for a visit in the summer of 1957. No one who knew him can think dispassionately of the quaint humor, the kindly personal interest, the concern for true artistry, and the underlying humanism that informed all his effort.

JOSEPH MORRIS THOMAS

1876-1962

Joseph Morris Thomas, professor emeritus of English and assistant dean for the Senior College, was born November 15, 1876, in Saugatuck, Michigan, and died January 4, 1962, in Minneapolis at the age of 85.

Professor Thomas graduated Ph.B. from the University of Michigan in 1898, A.M. in 1903, and Ph.D. in 1909. He was a graduate student at Harvard University in 1908, and pursued further studies at the British Museum in 1914-15 and at the Universities of Grenoble and Paris in 1922-23 and Paris in 1930-31. He taught in the high school of Ironwood, Michigan, in 1898-99, and was principal of the high school of Manistee, Michigan, in 1899-1900. He was an instructor in English at the University of Michigan from 1901 to 1906, assistant professor from 1906 to 1909.

In 1909, on the retirement of Professor Maria Sanford, he was called to the University of Minnesota as professor and head of the Department of Rhetoric and Public Speaking and specifically charged with the task of reforming and reorganizing the teaching of freshman composition. In 1921 the administration of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, against the protests of all parties concerned, combined English and Rhetoric in a single Department of English and set up a separate Department of Public Speaking (the present Department of Speech and Theater Arts). Professor Thomas's academic position now became that of professor of English and chairman of the new Department of English; but he had already been called upon to fill an additional, different, and very demanding administrative position. A reorganization of the College administration in 1919-20 had created two assistant deanships in addition to that of the assistant dean for students' work; and of one of these, that of assistant dean for the Senior College, Professor Thomas had been appointed the first incumbent. As such, he was largely responsible for determining the functions of that office; and during the many years of his uncommonly able direction of the freshman course in composition he earned the gratitude of the University at large. He continued in his two capacities as professor of English and assistant dean until his retirement in 1945. Other honors included the presidency of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1919.

Anyone who knew Professor Thomas well realized that his interests were centered in students. He believed in students, he believed in teaching, he believed in the teaching of composition. When he wrote a textbook he put into it all his convictions about what students most needed to know. His book on freshman composition was the best of its day. His anthologies were based on the fundamental principle that students need, not facts about literature, but a real acquaintance with literature itself. The authors who appeared in his anthologies were represented by long passages that students could really "get their teeth into." The volumes of *Great English Writers* were an education in themselves, and many students kept their copies for permanent reading.

People who knew Professor Thomas in his younger days will remember the range of his nonacademic interests. Hunting, fishing, golf, and bridge were all an essential part of his life, and they were a perennial source of his charm and versatility. Whatever he did or failed to do, Mr. Thomas was one of the notable figures on the campus. No faculty meeting was complete without him. "Did you hear what Tommy said about ———?" was a common question in the old days.

Professor Thomas is survived by a son, Frederick Whitney Thomas, and a granddaughter, Sheila Louise Thomas.