Young Journalists Keep Tulane in the News

In the mid-1990s Tulane College students Lane Greene ’97, Noam Scheiber ’98, and Chris Suellentrop ’97 collaborated with a few other of Tulane’s cleverest student writers to publish the Brouhaha, a campus humor magazine in the best sense of the tradition. Well written and devastatingly funny, the Brou was widely read and admired, even by those whom it lampooned. Like many student projects, the Brou could not survive the graduation of the students who had brought it to life. The clever words of Greene, Scheiber, and Suellentrop are still in print, though: now one can find them on the pages and Web sites of such venerable publications as The Economist, The New Republic, and Slate.

Alumni of the college have had great success at the highest levels of journalism. William Fitzpatrick ’32 and Ira Harkey ’51 won Pulitzer Prizes for editorial writing. Howard K. Smith ’36 (see page 8) earned his stripes as a war correspondent, moderated historic presidential debates, and anchored ABC News. Bill Monroe ’42 (see page 8) was NBC’s White House correspondent and hosted Meet the Press. More recently, David Crook ’75 and Christopher Drew ’77 (see page 9) have become editors at the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, respectively.

continued on page four
A Letter from the Dean

Last semester we enjoyed a visit from journalist Christopher Drew ’77 (see page 9), who was the guest of our spring Dean’s Colloquium. Drew’s perspective from inside “the paper of record” was of particular interest right now, as the mainstream media, under fire from their audience, struggle to maintain their impartiality and respectability.

The Duren Professorship Program continues to thrive, as poet and Professor of English Peter Cooley expands his visiting-writers program to include two literary readings in Cudd Hall each semester; and former dean Tony Cummings is a new Duren Professor, teaching in Cudd Hall’s classroom twice a week.

Homecoming and reunions were a huge success, with more than two hundred alumni and friends enjoying our kickoff cocktail party. I really enjoyed seeing so many of you here.

Yours,

George L. Bernstein
Dean of Tulane College

Editor’s Note

You no doubt noticed a change to the cover of this issue of the Collegian; you may also have noticed that it feels a bit weightier in your hands. In the last few years we’ve received countless notes asking if we were ever going to publish another Tulane College Review, the journal of scholarly articles, memoirs, and speeches by faculty and alumni that we published in 2001 and 2002. We were delighted by how many of you enjoyed the journal, and we’ve missed publishing it. So we’ve decided to add to each issue of the Collegian articles of the kind we used to print in the Review.

This first issue features an excerpt from Dean Bernstein’s recently published book and a paper delivered by former dean Tony Cummings at Johns Hopkins University. The goal of the Review is to showcase the stellar work our faculty and alumni are currently producing. I encourage anyone interested in contributing to send us work for consideration; we are happy to look at previously published work. We ask that submissions be no longer than twelve double-spaced manuscript pages.
Tulane College said farewell to three of its oldest and dearest friends last spring with the retirement of Professors William Alworth (chemistry), James Kilroy (English), and Ed O’Neal (psychology). Said Dean Jean Danielson of the Honors Program, who also retired last spring, “These men were strong pillars of support for undergraduate education in their many years here. A university is lucky to have just one such professor at any given time, and we were lucky to have three, each contributing in his own way to the quality of education we constantly seek.”

Jim Kilroy came to Tulane in 1984 as dean of A&S. He served the college until 1988, when he became dean of the Faculty of the Liberal Arts and Sciences at the time of the merger of the Newcomb and Tulane College faculties. In 1990 he became provost of the university; he served in that position for six years. Professor Molly Travis, chair of the Department of English, shared these words about Professor Kilroy: “Jim Kilroy was the best of colleagues and a beloved instructor and mentor. It is not uncommon for former administrators to assume a low profile as they settle back into an academic department. Not the case at all with Jim. He involved himself in such major tasks as revising the departmental constitution, serving as interim director of graduate studies, as well as serving on the departmental executive committee and the salary committee. Jim was extremely generous with his
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“THESE MEN WERE STRONG PILLARS OF SUPPORT FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN THEIR MANY YEARS HERE. A UNIVERSITY IS LUCKY TO HAVE JUST ONE SUCH PROFESSOR AT ANY GIVEN TIME, AND WE WERE LUCKY TO HAVE THREE.”

—DEAN JEAN DANIELSON
Robert Lane Greene ‘97, an international-relations major and Marshall Scholar, joined The Economist’s online unit as editor of its “Countries” segment in 1999, helping to give a Web presence to one of the world’s oldest political and literary newspapers. He now writes for “Global Agenda,” The Economist’s online news-analysis section and for the print edition of The Economist, and he is a contributor to The New Republic.

Chris Suellentrop ‘97, who went on to attend the school of journalism at the University of Missouri, is Slate’s deputy Washington bureau chief. By most measures, Slate is the Internet’s leading (and its original) newsmagazine. His writing has also appeared in Governing, the Los Angeles Times, and The New York Observer, and he has appeared on CNN and NPR.

Noam Scheiber ‘98, a mathematics and economics major and a Rhodes Scholar, has been with The New Republic, one of the nation’s leading political magazines, since 2000 and is now senior editor. Scheiber has also written for The New York Times Magazine, the Washington Post, Slate, Salon, The Washington Monthly, the Chicago Tribune, and The Christian Science Monitor. He has appeared on CNN, CNBC, and NPR.

Only a few years after graduating from Tulane, Greene, Scheiber, and Suellentrop have shown themselves worthy of this tradition. The level of their accomplishment was on prominent display during their coverage of the 2004 U.S. presidential election. Suellentrop was Slate’s principal campaign correspondent from the primaries through November 2. Most of his datelines came from campaign planes and rallies as he covered the candidates as closely as one could aspire to.

Scheiber wrote columns and election coverage for The New Republic throughout the campaign and served as acting managing editor in the campaign’s early stages. He was posted at both parties’ conventions on behalf of the magazine. And he has of late become the magazine’s blogger-in-chief, steering his esteemed publication into the most up-to-date forum for public-affairs commentary.

Greene wrote about the election from a global perspective for both The Economist and The New Republic. He co-authored the coverage that visitors to theeconomist.com read on the Web site’s front page. His contributions to The New Republic chronicled Europe’s unprecedented interest in this particular election.

All three credit Tulane with their journalistic beginnings. Greene, like so many who have known
saw two cultures represented in the electorate that aren’t really speaking to one another: “The ‘blue’ world of the coasts and Europe undervalues the importance of character, values, and strength. The ‘red’ middle of America undervalues sophistication, competence, and shades of gray. It makes for very poor conversation: ‘You are a warmongering simpleton!’ ‘You are a French-speaking appeaser!’”

In spite of the much-discussed cultural divide, Scheiber frames the issue in different terms: “This was always going to be an election about national security. Because of that, Kerry needed to do something truly dramatic to signal to middle America that he’d keep the country safe. Kerry never forced people to rethink all their stereotypes about Democratic candidates and national security, and I think he paid the price for that.”

Though Suellentrop picked Kerry in Slate’s quadrennial staff straw poll, his day-to-day coverage presaged whose campaign would be more effective. His blow-by-blow account of an August Bush rally in Columbus, Ohio, was unique compared to the sound-bite coverage usually afforded these events. “After last week’s Democratic convention I felt that John Kerry had become the favorite in the presidential race. Now, after only two days with President Bush, I’m not so sure. He’s that good.”

On the other hand, an October 19 report from a Kerry rally in Tampa illustrated how the senator nullified the intended effect of his prepared speech by more than doubling its verbiage. In his election wrap-up, Suellentrop wrote that, while Kerry’s campaign was good, Bush’s was better: “Vision without details beats details without vision.”

The regular features and special contributions of Robert Lane Greene, Noam Scheiber, and Chris Suellentrop are available in the print versions of The New Republic and The Economist and at their Web sites: economist.com (see “Global Agenda”), tnr.com (see Scheiber’s &c. blog), and slate.msn.com (see Sullentrop’s “Assessment” column).
time. He won a string of teaching awards and had a large following among our majors. At the end of each semester in a Kilroy course, students rarely said good-bye; rather, they parted with a ‘See you next semester.’ Jim served on doctoral exams and dissertation committees and directed numerous honors theses and independent studies. What a joy it must have been to study James Joyce’s *Ulysses* and *Finnegan’s Wake* with him! No one loves great literature more than Jim Kilroy, and he was able to inspire our students both through his personal passion for the subject and also through his meticulous instruction in literary interpretation, addressing not only aesthetic but political and moral questions as well. He demanded the best work from students, and they worked hard to give him that. He was regularly invited to dinner with his students’ parents when they visited Tulane, and he and his wife, Mary, hosted a party for graduates and their parents each spring before commencement. He was a teacher who changed lives. An exemplary humanist scholar and teacher, Jim Kilroy has taught us all why and how literature matters.”

Professor Janet Ruscher of the Department of Psychology offered these words about Ed O’Neal: “Ed has done more than his fair share of spreading the name of Tulane across the United States—in fact, my first introduction to Tulane was when my undergraduate social-psychology instructor, David Page, proceeded to tell the class about his research with Ed at Tulane. At that time, Ed was studying ‘the weapons effect,’ which is the notion that the presence of aggressive stimuli could increase aggressive responding. The study of note was one in which the researchers drove around Uptown New Orleans with a shotgun in the back window of the car and waited to see if people honked more when the gun was present. Turns out, the Uptown residents called the police, and Ed, as both department chair and research supervisor, had some explaining to do.

“What Ed wasn’t scaring the community with guns, he was the consummate teacher. Along with the freshman honors course in general psychology, Ed offered a wide range of courses in social psychology—from aggression to body image to intimate relationships. In the course of his over thirty years at Tulane, Ed supervised over one hundred dissertations, master’s theses, and honors theses. His students have gone on to successful careers, and he’s kept in touch with most of them—his list of addresses suggests that he is a one-man alumni association. “Ed also provided high levels of service to the department and the university. He served on just about any university committee that you can bring to mind, served as department chair from 1978 to 1984, and received numerous teaching and service awards.”

Bill Alworth joined the chemistry faculty in 1965 after studying at Harvard and the University of California, Berkeley. His work has been supported by such distinguished institutions as the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Cancer Institute. He served as chair of the chemistry department on four occasions and was instrumental in establishing the major in biological chemistry. Alworth’s dedication to students is evinced in the time he spends working with them beyond the classroom: he has sponsored six postdoctoral projects and directed seventeen doctoral dissertations, nine master’s theses, and ten undergraduate honors theses, and he has mentored count- less undergraduates who have completed independent studies in his laboratory. George Gokel ’68, professor and director of the Program in Chemical Biology at Washington University in
St. Louis, and North American editor of the *New Journal of Chemistry*, had this to say about Professor Alworth: “Bill’s good humor and intellect are obvious. What may not be is that he always made sure we understood what we were doing, why, and what it meant to him and to the world. Bill inspired us to get answers rather than mere results. It was quite remarkable for an undergraduate to realize that we were really affecting the state of learning.”

A prize has been established in Professor Alworth’s name that will be given to an outstanding graduating senior biological-chemistry major in Newcomb or Tulane College. The prize will honor both academics and research. For more information on contributing to the fund for this prize, please contact Nancy Hopkins in the Department of Cell and Molecular Biology at nhopkin@tulane.edu.

Geoffrey Beene ’43, one of the country’s most distinguished fashion designers, passed away in September. Beene, who was born in Haynesville, LA, came to Tulane to study medicine. He earned his B.S. at A&S and went on to the Tulane School of Medicine. He came from a family of doctors, so, he said, “the family thought I ought to be a doctor. The first two years weren’t bad, because it was classroom work, but the third year we got into vivisection, cadavers and all that horrendous stuff. And every disease we studied I got.” Beene started his career in fashion in California, then in 1947 moved to New York to study at the Traphagen School of Fashion, continuing his studies in Paris. A true fashion-industry pioneer, Beene was one of the first American designers to start his own company and one of the first to have a second line of more affordable, casual clothes. His lauded designs are featured in several museum collections.
FROM THE ARCHIVES:
A TRADITION OF GREAT JOURNALISM

FROM “IN MEMORIAM”
SPRING 2002

After graduating from Tulane with honors, Howard K. Smith ’36 studied at Heidelberg University in Germany, and at Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar. Smith began his journalism career as a reporter for the New Orleans States-Item before distinguishing himself during World War II as part of a team of CBS radio reporters known as “the Murrow Boys”; he succeeded Edward R. Murrow as London correspondent in 1946. In 1957 he returned to the United States as a news correspondent and commentator for the network, hosting such distinguished programs as Face the Nation. Smith is perhaps best known as the moderator of the first Nixon-Kennedy debate, a seminal moment in television and presidential history. He also moderated the Carter-Reagan “Great Debate” in 1980. As a veteran reporter, he became co-anchor of ABC's evening news in 1969.

Howard Smith was esteemed for the strength of his convictions, both in the world of journalism and the world at large. His strong support of the civil rights movement and his uncompromising coverage of the Vietnam War earned him great respect among colleagues and viewers. He was the recipient of four Overseas Press Club awards, a George Polk Award, and an Emmy. Smith's publications include the 1942 best seller Last Train from Berlin and his 1966 memoir, Events Leading Up to My Death.

FROM “REFLECTIONS ON A LIFETIME OF JOURNALISM:
MONROE ’42 RETURNS FOR COLLOQUIUM”
MICHAEL G. SHERMAN ’01, FALL 2000

Through the turmoil of a hostage crisis, the fear and tension of the Cold War, and the bombast and brilliance of six different presidencies, one Tulane College alumnus fought for the truth through his tough questioning of world leaders and news makers. Bill Monroe ’42, a philosophy major and a journalism minor, describes himself as an “intellectual, certified by a Tulane degree” and a “crotchety journalist.” Actually, he is one of America’s most distinguished journalists, having served as Washington bureau chief for NBC News and moderator of Meet the Press.

His career started in his hometown of New Orleans while he was a Tulane College student. Monroe recalls working with Professor George E. Simmons (acting dean of Tulane College, 1944–47). “I learned a great respect for the profession from him,” Monroe said. “Professor Simmons was very rigorous in his application of ethics.”

During World War II, when a reporter from the New Orleans bureau of the United Press wire service was on leave, Professor Simmons recommended Monroe to fill in. Monroe performed well and was later offered a job when the war pulled other United Press reporters overseas, leaving several vacancies in the New Orleans bureau.

His television career began as the news director of WDSU, New Orleans’s first television station. “When I joined the station, we had only two or three news readers and no reporters.” By the time Monroe left the station seven years later, it had a full staff of anchors, reporters, and even a Washington bureau.
Monroe’s success at WDSU unlocked opportunities at a national network. He was offered a chance to run the Chicago or Washington, D.C., news bureau of NBC News, and accepted the latter. He continued his role as an administrative journalist, but also worked on air for NBC. As a correspondent for NBC’s Today Show, then moderator of Meet the Press, Monroe conducted groundbreaking interviews.

Monroe’s achievements at NBC have had a lasting impact. “For nearly a decade Bill Monroe set a standard for excellence as moderator of Meet the Press,” said current host Tim Russert. Meet the Press continues to be the highest-rated program of its kind.

Monroe credits Tulane with playing a major role in his intellectual development. “I feel a lot of intellectual progress can be made only when you shed prejudices, and I was prejudiced against science,” Monroe said. “Philosophy was where my interest lay. When my philosophy professor explained that philosophy was similar to science in that they were both concerned with finding the truth, he captured my attention. He explained how the two worked well when studied together, and that sparked an interest in science I’ve had for my entire life.”

FROM “SUBMARINES SURFACE TO TOP OF BEST-SELLERS LIST”

Christopher Drew ’77 first realized his interest in journalism when he was at Tulane. During his second year he crossregistered at Loyola for a journalism class and began to write for the Hullabaloo. Upon the encouragement of his journalism professor, Drew applied for a summer internship through The Wall Street Journal Newspaper Fund. During the winter break, Drew received a phone call congratulating him on his selection to the Atlanta bureau of the Journal.

After graduation, the Journal hired Drew to work in its Dallas bureau. Dissatisfied with routine assignments after a couple of years, Drew and his wife moved back to New Orleans, where he began writing investigative reports for the Times-Picayune, where his enthusiasm for journalism was reinvigorated. “Getting to do investigative stories is what really ended up persuading me to stick with journalism as a career,” Drew said. “I like to peel back the layers of stories and find out what is going on past the day-to-day level.”

In 1983 Drew accepted a position with the Chicago Tribune to cover the Midwest’s economy. At the time, the farm crisis was at its worst in the heartland, and Drew traveled all over the Midwest writing about its impact on local farmers. This beat also brought Drew to Washington, D.C., where he covered stories about the relief aid bill, Iran Contra, and scandalous employee cutbacks in the meat-packing industry.

Christopher Drew is currently an investigative reporter and projects editor at the New York Times. He is coauthor with his wife, Annette Lawrence Drew (Newcomb ’78), and Sherry Sontag of the best-selling Blind Man’s Bluff: The Untold Story of American Submarine Espionage. The book became the source for a PBS documentary on the subject featuring Chris himself.
The world’s largest empire, which created the illusion of might, but there is much debate over how important it was—to Britain’s economy or to its power. Certainly by 1900, the empire had become impossible to defend. In the end, Britain, like the other European powers and Japan, has simply declined relative to the United States and the former colonial world.

The notion of cultural decline is even more ambiguous. For those who have not liked the consequences of the social revolution of the 1960s, evidence of decline is seen in the sexual revolution, the decline of religion and rise of secularism and moral relativism, the increase in crime, and the apparent decline in the quality of education. More broadly, they perceived a decline of all that was associated with Victorian values. Whether these changes represent decline, however, is very much a matter of opinion and political perspective.

To what degree does politics help to account for this British preoccupation with decline? Conservative perceptions of decline can be traced back to the aftermath of the American and French Revolutions and to the advent of the liberal state that they heralded. Ultimately, this liberal state was defined by democracy, the guarantee of rights, the rule of law, equality before the law, and equality of opportunity—in other words, liberty and equality. Britain had been a state committed to liberty in principle before either of those revolutions occurred; indeed, both were partly inspired by the British example. Britain was not, however, a state committed to equality. It was a society based on a privileged aristocracy. Those privileges were not institutionalized by law, except politically through the House of Lords. However, there was a broader ideological claim, going back to the eighteenth century, that the aristocracy was the nation’s natural rulers. Rule by the aristocracy was rule by the educated, the rational, the cultured, the best that society could produce; rule by democracy was rule by the ignorant, the emotional, the base, the
worst that society could produce. The professional, financial, and commercial classes were not excluded from positions of status and power in the eighteenth century, especially in their local communities, while the richest of them were part of the ruling elite. Nonetheless, their position was clearly subordinate, for their numbers still were limited—especially the number of those of great wealth.

That was changed by the Industrial Revolution and the broader capitalist expansion that came with it. Thus, throughout the nineteenth century, as this newly enhanced middle class began to assert its values of individualism and profit maximization and to demand an equal role in the political system, the aristocratic and educated elites bemoaned the threat of political and cultural decline. Matthew Arnold, in Culture and Anarchy (1869), explicitly established the opposition of middle-class notions of liberty—“when every man may say what he likes” and is “able to do as he likes”—to aristocratic conceptions of culture, which he defined as aspiring “to make the best that has been thought and known in the world current everywhere.” All one had to do was to look at the United States to see the danger. America was the home of a society based on liberty, equality, and capitalism—a land without an aristocracy and so without culture. For Arnold, schooled by Tocqueville, Americanization meant the triumph of vulgarity and banality over the aspiration to perfection. Indeed, America was no model for any of Britain’s elites, except the most thoroughly democratic of the middle class. Yet the principle of equality continued its subversive expansion. The extension of the franchise, the broadening of the curriculum of Oxford and Cambridge beyond the study of the Classical world, and the opening of the civil service to appointment by examination, all threatened to introduce a standard based on equality and utility rather than quality and culture (and so, in modern parlance, a “dumbing down”). All these changes were resisted, though futilely.

The danger posed by the rise of the middle class passed, however, as that class embraced many of the values of the aristocracy. These values were passed on to the children of both at the growing number of public (i.e., private boarding) schools and at Oxford and Cambridge. At the same time, the culture aimed at the middle class proved to be of a quality equaling any that Britain had begot before. For the class that had produced and embraced Dickens and Eliot, Trollope and Tennyson, the Brontës and the Pre-Raphaelites could hardly be decried for undermining an aspiration to perfection. A new danger appeared, however. With the introduction of universal elementary education after 1870 and the creation of a majority working-class electorate in 1884, governance by the masses, and a culture aimed at them, now threatened. That threat came to be symbolized in the 1890s by the emergence of the popular press, written for what George Gissing’s entrepreneur journalist Whelpdale called “the quarter-educated . . . that is being turned out by the Board [i.e., state-provided primary] schools, the young men and women who can just read, but are incapable of sustained attention.”

The peril seemed to be confirmed by the perceived political power of the first “press barons,” Lords Harmsworth and Beaverbrook, during the First World War and between the wars. The traditional elites countered with their own attempt to control culture in the new democratic age. After the First World War, for example, the elitist and paternalistic BBC was established following the advent of radio. The masses might have had their own distinct culture, but its ability to expand beyond their own world and achieve any broader validity would be circumscribed. Once again, however, America was a contaminating influence. For nothing could be done to limit the influence of Hollywood, and American films helped define the fantasies and pleasures of people of all classes in Britain as well as in the United States during the Great Depression of the 1930s. F. R. Leavis took up the mantle of Arnold
in decrying the “leveling down” of British cultural standards that came with the influence of American movies and advertising. Culture, for Leavis, was defined by literature, not by anything that ordinary people were doing.

In the aftermath of the Second World War, the politics of the working class emerged triumphant in Britain. By the 1960s, prosperity, universal secondary education, and a postwar baby boom had created the conditions for the emergence of a popular culture that could be universalized. The fact that this culture incorporated American imports, American marketing techniques, and sometimes even British working-class influences hardly endeared it to the intellectual and social elites, even as their own children embraced it. These elites were now far more broadly defined than the old aristocracy, though they still incorporated it and many of its values. More than anything else, they came to be defined by education (public schools and Oxbridge) and profession (government service, the professions, and finance, as well as land ownership). For some among this class, decline was real enough. They had had a stake in governing the empire and in the military and naval forces that protected it. The shrinkage of these positions harmed them. They also were threatened by efforts to reform education—the expansion of the number of universities and so of the population that received a higher education, the transformation of the university curriculum to incorporate new methodologies and disciplines, and the end of educational tracking through the introduction of comprehensive schools that included students of all abilities and backgrounds. These social groups were not necessarily the defenders of threatened Victorian values, which were associated with the nineteenth-century middle class that was the target of Arnold’s irony. Rather, they were the bearers of Arnold’s and Leavis’s concerns about maintaining standards, resisting the triumph of ideology over reason and common sense, and preserving a dominant culture that was defined by the intellectual and social elite. Here, then, was one group of people who had a stake in emphasizing the dangers of decline in the postwar era. In doing so, they could build on a long cultural tradition that had helped to define their privileged status in the society.

In the late 1960s, however, there emerged a second group who embraced the mythology of decline. They were conservatives, but the term “neo-liberals” better conveys their association with the laissez-faire values of the Victorian middle class, as well as their opposition to the paternalistic conservative elites whose traditions derived from the Victorian aristocracy. Politically, they were represented by Margaret Thatcher and her followers; intellectually, their voice was the Austro-British economist Friedrich von Hayek. For them, the source of decline was socialism, which promoted a false conception of equality because it undermined the rewarding of ability and effort. Like the aristocratic and intellectual proponents of decline, they identified a lowering of standards and the subordination of quality to quantity; unlike the former, however, they were not skeptical about the democracy, and they were not wedded to Oxbridge definitions of quality. Indeed, they were as suspicious of the traditional elites as they were of the socialists, for they believed the former had been fatally tainted by the latter. Indeed, paternalism and socialism seemed suspiciously similar. While the welfare state long had been with Britain (longer than Victorianism had been), and while socialism (and its liberal counterpart, “new liberalism”) had been shaping government policy since the beginning of the twentieth century, the year 1945 had a special meaning for the neo-liberals in marking the advent of decline. First, the policies of the Labour government of 1945 to 1950 represented the triumph of the socialist consensus that shaped Britain for the next thirty-five years. Second, the postwar era marked the triumph of Keynesian economics, with its corollary of government interference in the economy and so the disruption of the market as the arbiter of economic activity. Finally, it was only in the 1960s that the values of moral decline became pervasive. However long the forces for social and cultural change may have been at work, it was in the sixties that it became good to have sex outside marriage, that homosexuals were defined as normal, that women were encouraged to get divorces if they
were unhappy in marriage, that personal happiness and self-gratification rather than self-discipline and self-denial became guiding moral principles of life.

While the neo-liberals and the elitists represented two different strains of what might be called a predisposition to see decline, there was some overlap between them. The most important was their attitude toward popular culture. The neo-liberals should have been attracted to popular culture: it was an expression of the democracy that was validated by the marketplace, while it weakened the hold of the elites on the values of the country. They could not embrace it, however, because socialists promoted different aspects of popular culture as an expression of the working class that was of equal validity with elite culture. It was another mark against the sixties that it was the decade in which popular culture first became pervasive. This phenomenon was another example of the decline of objective standards of quality which both groups so hated. More generally, their dislike of a broader compromising of standards in search of an impossible equality also linked the neo-liberals and the elitists. The supposed decline in the quality of British education came to embody all that was wrong with the socialist vision of society for both groups. It introduced trendy subjects instead of teaching students the basics that would prepare them for life; it substituted feeling good about oneself for self-discipline as the basis for learning; and it suppressed quality in favor of equality. Local authorities dominated by socialists, who wasted the public’s funds to promote faddish methodologies in education (as well as popular culture), became the targets of the wrath of the neo-liberals in their effort to reverse moral decline.

There was one more reason why Margaret Thatcher and her supporters saw socialism as the source of Britain’s decline: as an anti-imperialist and pacifist ideology, it seemed in some ways responsible for Britain’s decline as a world power. In this respect, socialism was the heir to the tradition of nineteenth-century liberalism represented by the free-trade radical Richard Cobden and by William Gladstone, the leader of the Liberal Party for most of the years 1868 to 1894. Cobden saw empire as a burden to be shed, wanted to reduce defense spending as much as possible, and thought all quarrels between states should be settled by arbitration. Gladstone believed that the principles of Christian morality should be applied to foreign policy and that decisions involving the European powers should be made collectively by a Concert of Europe rather than unilaterally by Britain and others states pursuing narrow national interests. Gladstone was not a pacifist and did not want to get rid of the empire, but he embraced the Cobdenite position on defense spending, while his moralistic approach to policy became the watchword for most Liberals. Some of the early leaders of the Labour Party, like Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald, came out of the left wing of the Liberal Party and carried its traditions to the new party. At the same time, socialism brought to the Labour Party its own traditions of anti-imperialism and pacifism, which were a product of its hostility to capitalism. Socialists saw imperialism as the result of capitalism’s insatiable search for profits, based on an exploitation of other peoples abroad analogous to its exploitation of the working class at home. War, too, was the result of the competition for markets by capitalist states; it involved the workers dying to expand the profits of their masters. Marx had said that the workers knew no nation, that their common interests were stronger than any national identity they could have with the capitalists. Thus pacifism was an expression of the view that the workers had no stake in wars, which were fought in the interests of others while weakening a working-class movement that was supposed to transcend national boundaries.

The reality of working-class nationalism, however, became evident in all European countries during the First World War, and socialism everywhere had to adapt its foreign policy to reflect that reality. Nonetheless, there always remained a socialist left wing that stood by the pure ideology. As a result, conservatives were skeptical of the patriotism of the movement as a whole, and they found it politically useful to emphasize the influence of this “unpatriotic” left wing. In Britain, the First World War allowed a complete fusion of the liberal and socialist pacifist traditions in opposition to the war and
to the introduction of conscription by the British army. So the decline of the Liberal Party after the war made no fundamental difference in the foreign policy map of the left. Labour incorporated many of the same tensions and divisions as the Liberals had, with some differences of emphasis. Most importantly, anti-imperialism was much more central to all shades of socialist opinion than it had been to liberalism, and socialists had an interest in socialist solidarity in Europe that was irrelevant to liberalism. During the interwar period, socialist foreign policy was based on internationalism as represented by the League of Nations, disarmament, and a suspicion of the Conservatives’ hostility to the communist Soviet Union. Following a Labour Party split in 1931, the pacifist George Lansbury even was leader for a few years; however, from 1935 to 1945 the centrists reestablished their control of the party and its foreign policy. After the Second World War, Labour’s foreign, defense, and colonial policies were not radically different from those of the Conservatives. Indeed, it was the Conservatives who unloaded most of the empire.

For the Thatcherites, however, this consensus was merely evidence of how much the socialist mentality had permeated the Conservatives’ ruling establishment. For dating back to Benjamin Disraeli in the 1870s, identification with the empire as a central tenet of British patriotism had been a watchword of the Conservative Party. It is hardly a coincidence, then, that the fixation on decline by patriotic Conservatives coincided with the end of empire, and they saw a consensus defined by Labour as the culprit. Thatcher and others believed that such socialist influences were the source of a national tendency to apologize for Britain’s past and to be embarrassed about asserting power to pursue British interests. This mentality was represented by Drabble’s Alison, who, after pondering how so many non-Europeans got away with tweaking the lion’s tail, concluded, “And it served it [Britain] right.”5 Most dangerous to the Thatcherites was the sacrifice of the military to an expanding and bloated welfare state, which represented socialist priorities. If reversing Britain’s decline was central to Thatcherism, then it had to involve an attack on the whole socialist approach to Britain’s external interests as well as on socialist domestic policies.

Given this apparent conservative interest, dating well back into the nineteenth century, in promoting the view that Britain was in decline, it would seem reasonable to assume that the political left had an equal stake in rejecting that view. An alternative myth of progress can be traced back to the Enlightenment in France, and it certainly was central to the liberalism of the Victorian middle class. Progress was rooted in three sources: the Industrial Revolution and the wealth and technological innovation that it generated; the march of science as it better understood the natural world; and the spread of liberal democracy. The last was more an assertion of faith than an observed reality in the nineteenth century, but for those who held to its inevitability and its association with progress, the example of the United States was a source of hope and inspiration rather than a lesson of what was to be avoided. Socialism propagated its own myth of inevitability: the claim that the working class and the socialist state must triumph for historically determinable reasons. The inevitable triumph of socialism also might involve a march of progress, but especially for the pure Marxist, small gains were dangerous because they could postpone rather than facilitate the triumph of the working class. While most members of the Labour left after the Second World War were not Marxists, the left came to the conclusion that the policies of 1945 to 1950 had had just this effect of postponing a more broadly based advent of socialism in Britain. Thus, they had no stake in arguing against decline. On the contrary, they had a stake in embracing economic decline in particular, for they had their own solution to it: a more radical socialization of the British economy and of British society.

Radical socialists also offered no challenge to contentions of cultural decline, for they were not convinced that all that much change had occurred. Where the conservatives saw a decline in standards by the revamping of the education curriculum and the introduction of comprehensive schools, the socialists saw public schools and Oxbridge colleges that were
as elitist as ever and that still defined privileged access within British society. Even the spread of popular culture was an ambiguous gain. On the one hand, government still channeled most of its money to elite institutions like the Royal Opera House and the National Theatre. On the other hand, popular culture was becoming suspiciously Americanized. The radical socialists distrusted the United States. They believed that it used the Cold War as a pretext to divide Europe, exploit the less developed world, and sustain an arms race that threatened a nuclear holocaust. All of this had negated the possibility of a genuinely socialist foreign policy, by undermining the benefits of decolonization, blocking socialist solidarity, and forcing Britain to waste enormous amounts of money in order to be a nuclear power and maintain its worldwide influence. Worst of all, the United States was the self-proclaimed home of unrestrained capitalism. Too much of popular culture seemed to socialists to be driven by the imperatives of American capitalism, replacing more genuine expressions of British working-class cultural identity. So while there was much socialist celebration of certain aspects of popular culture as an alternative to elite culture, there was less inclination to repudiate aggressively charges of cultural decline, especially by the socialist intellectuals who were themselves part of the elite.

Arguably, the centrist mainstream of the Labour Party should have had no stake in promoting arguments about Britain’s decline. Yet by the early 1960s Britain’s “deficient” economic performance when compared to other developed countries was a political issue that was too tempting to resist. After all, the Conservatives had been in power since 1951 and had proclaimed that Britons had never had it so good. Yet the “objective” data showed nothing but failure relative to Britain’s peers. What better issue was there for a party to unite on, when it had been in opposition for more than a decade and had been riven by divisions for much of that time? So Britain’s decline became the centerpiece of Labour’s campaign in 1964. Thereafter, it remained at the center of the political debate, as each party attacked the other for doing nothing about reversing decline, while claiming that it could do better. Thus, in every respect, politics was at the heart of Britain’s decline—whether economic, political, or cultural.

Decline was not merely a function of the British imagination. Britain had been the world’s premier economic power for more than one hundred years. This position, however, was the result of Britain’s development as the world’s foremost capitalist state from 1714 to 1870, and especially of its being the pioneer of the economic revolution, which came with the accelerating development of manufacturing technology after 1760. All of the advantages of being first would inevitably disappear as other countries caught up, and indeed it has been argued that they became liabilities thereafter.5 There was also a real element of political decline. While Britain was never the undisputed supreme power of Europe, there was no state anywhere that was greater in the nineteenth century. The rise of the United States as a supreme power may not have been inevitable, but it certainly was foreseeable, and many Britons did foresee it in the mid-nineteenth century, long before most Americans thought in these terms. As with the loss of economic supremacy, it was not something Britain could easily have done anything about, unless it wanted to try to help the South win the American Civil War. Finally, in terms of the territory it controlled worldwide, Britain was the world’s greatest power until after 1945. In many ways, however, after 1850 the empire was more a symbol of power than a source of power.

Yet the rhetoric of decline implies something more than merely the loss of this economic and territorial supremacy through circumstances beyond Britain’s control, or in ways that may even have been beneficial. It implies fault: that this loss of supremacy reflected some larger weakness in the British people, and, if that weakness were corrected, decline would be reversed. This perception of weakness was largely because Britain’s relative economic decline went well beyond its loss of supremacy to the United States. By the 1960s it was falling behind other industrialized nations, as measured by gross domestic product (GDP) per head of the population, and that slide in the “league tables” of economic performance
the people who accept it, the myth provides a guide to future understanding and action.” This conception of myth was inspired by Georges Sorel’s 1911 work on syndicalism, *Reflections on Violence*.


5 Drabble, *The Ice Age*, p. 92.

6 This is one of the arguments in Alan Sked, *Britain’s Decline: Problems and Perspectives* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), chap. 2.

7 See Arthur Herman, *The Idea of Decline in Western History* (New York, etc.: The Free Press, 1997), for a full discussion of this tendency, and many others besides.

Endnotes


3 I use the term myth here as I described it in my article, “Liberals, the Irish Famine and the Role of the State,” *Irish Historical Studies*, XXIX, 116 (November 1995), p. 513: “The term myth as used here does not necessarily imply that the account is untrue. Rather, the myth comprises a combination of fact, fiction and the unknowable in a narrative of such power that, for...
The following paper was delivered by former dean and current Duren Professor Tony Cummings at Johns Hopkins University in October. In it, he presents the central argument of his most recent book, *The Maecenas and the Madrigalist: Patrons, Patronage, and the Origins of the Italian Madrigal* (American Philosophical Society 2004). Though the book details a complex musicological history, its lively description of life in cinquecento Florence—with all its political intrigue, social scandal, and cultural opulence—will interest anyone with an appreciation of Renaissance arts and history.

There were five common agents of secular artistic patronage in sixteenth-century Italy; Eric Cochrane offered the following taxonomy: princes; private patrons, who, “anticipating the salons of the eighteenth century, associated as equals with the artists and writers they regularly invited to their houses”; the academy; preparatory schools; and the printing presses. Primary historical sources from early-sixteenth-century Florence contain illuminating documentation for the activities of various kinds of informal, quasi-private institutions that flourished there: literary societies or academies of the type included in Cochrane’s second and third categories, such as the famous group that met in the garden of the Rucellai, and the Sacred Academy of the Medici. The membership rosters and musical activities of these institutions can be reconstructed from extant primary materials, which provide interesting insights into the musical culture of the era.

The principal music-historical significance of such sources, in my view, is that they illuminate the ultimate origins of the Italian madrigal of the sixteenth century. The influence of the literary and musical practices of these informal institutions of patronage on the development of the madrigal was significant, especially given that the cultural and intellec-
organized of these institutions—the famous group that met in the lavish garden of the Rucellai—was in many respects the most consequential, with respect to both the distinction of its members and the substance of its intellectual program. Its significance notwithstanding, the Rucellai group is never referred to by contemporaries in more specific or enlightening terms than “our company,” “these afternoon friends,” or “those letterati of the garden of the Rucellai.”

The members were probably identified on the basis of protocols that were not highly articulated: Cosimino di Cosimo Rucellai (and his grandfather Bernardo before him) invited guests considered especially simpatici to the informal gatherings. The closely related institution known as the Sacred Academy of the Medici was more formally organized, to judge from its regularized protocols, the nomenclature used to refer to it, and its concrete programmatic activities: the terms of reference are “Florentine Academy,” “Sacred Gymnasium,” or “Sacred Academy,” and the Academy commissioned the editing of texts and undertook other specific initiatives designed to conserve and celebrate the Florentine literary past. The overlap in membership among these two groups is noteworthy, as is the complex network of relationships that linked individual members of these institutions to one another. Although membership in these associations sometimes entailed specific responsibilities, in most cases there was little more expectation than that members would convene regularly with one another for food, drink, and conversation. Music—whether performed by the members themselves, commissioned by them, or otherwise experienced by them as an audience—was essential to the complex of elements that constituted the institutions’ programs.
Virtually all the leading Florentine artistic, intellectual, and political figures of the time—Michelangelo; Machiavelli; leading Florentine historians and political theorists; several of the Medici, Rucellai, and Strozzi families; and many others—were members of such institutions. The earliest madrigal composers—the Florentines Francesco de Layolle and Bernardo Pisano and the northerner Philippe Verdelot—were either intimates of members or members themselves. It is well known that Verdelot wrote some of his earliest madrigals to be sung between the acts of comedies by Rucellai-group member Niccolò Machiavelli. In undertaking their first essays in the new genre, the earliest madrigalists played to the musical tastes and experiences of the distinguished Florentines who were their patrons and confrères in these institutions.

A number of extant documents attest the programmatic interests and activities of these institutions—the members’ general literary interests and their particular interest in the literary and poetic achievements of the “Three Crowns” of the medieval Tuscan literary tradition: Boccaccio, Dante, and Petrarch. Gelli wrote, “Our ancestors . . . almost caused the practices and craftsmanship in our language employed by the above-mentioned ‘Three [Crowns]’ to be lost altogether; and the first who began in Florence to observe them once again, in speech and in writing, were those same letterati who frequented the garden of the Rucellai. Some of these learned men . . . began to draw out these said observations and put them so much into effect that the language then regained that esteem that you see.” And, further, “I once remember hearing it said that [Janus] Lascaris, that Greek for whom these moderns have such high regard, would say at table in the garden of the Rucellai . . . that, with respect to eloquence and modo di dire, he would not recognize Boccaccio as inferior to any of their Greek writers. . . .” Doni had participants in the meetings quote Petrarchan verse. The courtesan La Nannina “Zinzera” says, “I want to tell that, the other night, I was at the garden of the Rucellai, to sing, where there was a tremendous discussion about Petrarch among those learned men; and there was one who held that this Laura had been [a metaphor for] ‘Philosophy,’ and not a woman, [on the basis of] that canzone that begins: ‘A lady much more beautiful than the sun, / more bright and of equal age . . . / drew me to her ranks when I was still unripe.’” There then ensued an animated exchange, at the end of which “there was one who said: ‘Love held me twenty-one years burning.’”

Assuming their historicity, these texts and others suggest that one of the principal elements of the program of the Rucellai group was the restitution of fourteenth-century literary values and practices. Contemporary literary language was to be refashioned and purified along the lines suggested by the literary output of the Three Crowns. The principal impetus for this literary program was an interest in determining if the Tuscan language, as a potential vehicle for sophisticated literary expression, was comparable to ancient Greek and Latin. If the earliest madrigalists in the city of Florence in fact frequented the garden of the Rucellai (and although not entirely conclusive, the evidence is nonetheless suggestive), they would have been privy to learned discourse about linguistic and literary matters, which almost inevitably would have stimulated, influenced, and refined their thinking about the musico-literary genre known as the cinquecento madrigal.

That the earliest madrigal composers were intimates of members of the Rucellai group and the Sacred Academy of the Medici, there can be no doubt. A number of texts attest Francesco de Layolle’s and Bernardo Pisano’s acquaintance, if not friendship, with any number of members of the Rucellai garden “academy.” Layolle is mentioned in correspondence among members of the group; he appears in the dialogues of Rucellai-group member Antonio Brucioli; he was the dedicatee of verse authored by member Luigi Alamanni and returned the compliment by setting three of Alamanni’s poems to music. Pisano’s associations are attested by references documenting relationships with the Strozzi, Janus Lascaris, and Palla Rucellai.

Moreover, a notably high percentage of the verse set by Layolle, Pisano, and Verdelot was authored by members of the Rucellai group and Medici Sacred Academy. Fully a third of the Italian texts
set by Layolle was authored by either members of the Rucellai group or one of the Three Crowns, principally Petrarch. Fully two thirds of the Italian texts set by Pisano were authored by either Rucellai-group member Lorenzo Strozzi or one of the Three Crowns, principally Petrarch. Five of Verdelot’s madrigals are on texts by Rucellai-group member Niccolò Machiavelli; six are on Petrarchan texts.

How specifically might the aesthetic sensibilities of members of the Rucellai group and the Medici Sacred Academy have affected the musical characteristics of the new genre? The thesis I advance in my forthcoming book is that the Italian madrigal represents a transformation (or a purification) of contemporary polyphony—part-music—through the application of the stylistic characteristics of musical genres favored by the Rucellai group and the Sacred Academy. That is, madrigalian polyphony exemplifies a distinctive kind of part-writing appreciably different from that of other contemporary polyphonic genres, in ways that reveal the effects of the musical practices of the contemporary academies, resulting in a kind of musical style uniquely suited to the artistic objectives of the earliest madrigalists. Among those who frequented the garden of the Rucellai were any number of individuals actively engaged with time-honored Florentine musical practices: solo-singing to string accompaniment; the carnival song (or canto carnascialesco), which served to explain carnival processions; and the carnival song’s sacred counterpart, the lauda. Many members were demonstrably conversant with the tradition of solo song; more were conversant with the tradition of the carnival song by virtue of their membership in the contemporary companies responsible for staging Florentine carnival activities. More relevant still, Layolle and Pisano were both laudesì (singers of laude). The genres manifest stylistic features that recur in the early madrigal: its more homophonic and homorhythmic style and the resulting greater intelligibility of the text.

One preeminent member of the Rucellai group, Antonio Brucioli, furnished a compelling intellectual rationale for solo singing to string accompaniment and for the more homophonic, homorhythmic style typical of the canto carnascialesco and related genres. In his dialogues, Brucioli articulates what might be called a rudimentary philosophy of music: “With respect to music . . . I would not take care that a young person thus expend his energy, because there is nothing upright and honorable about something unsupported by a foundation of words and aphorisms; moreover—when the delicate voices and voluptuous accents, with the softening effects of harmony, reach the ears (affecting the spirit), or tempt the libido of young souls, or cause them to be languishing in pain, or act rashly upon the immediate impulses of the spirit—such things contaminate one’s virtue not a little. And in this way, certainly, the Greeks first corrupted their upright, ancient, and laudable practices, indulging in theatrical performances, scenes, and choruses, with which they would excite the ears and spirit with various sentiments. Then this pernicious effeminacy was exported to Rome, which broke the stamina of its ancient seriousness. And one will be able to see what good our own era could hope for from similar vocal music if one considers the practices and knowledge with which those who today make a profession of it are endowed, for which I do not judge it worthy of free men, that it could be of benefit to themselves and others.” Brucioli’s quintessentially Platonic arguments, which effectively constituted a humanist topos, belong to a venerable tradition. One locus classicus was Cicero’s The Laws. As Cicero himself indicated, his authority in turn was Plato, in the Republic. The sentiments of these revered classical authors were subsequently echoed by fifteenth- and sixteenth-century humanist writers.

Brucioli’s references to “a foundation of words and aphorisms” (which suggests the central importance of a text), to the plural “delicate voices,” and to the “voluptuous accents” and “softening effects of harmony” must indicate polyphonic vocal music. Brucioli’s argument is thus consistent with another venerable humanist topos. In Nino Pirrotta’s formulation, “a constant residuum” of the sixteenth-century critique of polyphony “is the deep dissatisfaction that polyphony could soothe the ear with soft consonances or smoothly managed dissonances . . . but
lacked the power of captivating . . . its audience. . . .

Both the structure and ways of performing polyphonic music hindered the understanding of the texts, with which the aesthetic conceptions of the time identified the emotional message of the composition.” Now, how might the humanistic sensibilities of Brucioli and his colleagues in the Rucellai group have been reflected in their resultant musical tastes and in their actual musical experiences? Where there was conventional humanistic thinking about music, there were presumably conventionally humanistic kinds of music making. To judge from the testimony of Brucioli’s text, such music making as there was in the Rucellai gardens is likely to have been principally of a particular type, evocatively described by Pirrotta. In place of polyphonic vocal music, there would instead have been solo singing to which the soloist himself provided his own string accompaniment, which had been characteristic of the musical practices of Italian humanist circles since the previous century. To Brucioli and his colleagues, such practices would have profiled and made intelligible the “foundation of words and aphorisms” and avoided the “pernicious effeminacy” of “delicate voices,” “voluptuous accents,” and “softening effects of harmony” deemed to be characteristic of contemporary vocal polyphony. Solo singing permitted a sensitive, expressive response on the part of the soloist to the meaning of the text and to individual text elements of the sort that is evident in the early madrigal, though translated into the polyphonic “maniera.” Such considerations were all the more pertinent because of the importance to the members of the Rucellai group of linguistic and literary matters. In Delio Cantimori’s word, “The young men of the Orti Oricellari . . . devoted to their own Florentine and Italian tongues the same care and attention which Valla had dedicated to Latin. . . . The object was . . . to see whether the Italian or the Florentine language was capable of the same fluency and eloquence, the same precision of speech, the same potentialities of rhetorical expression as the Greek.” This, in turn, might give some sense of what kind of music would have been deemed appropriate to the “program” of the Rucellai group. Under such circumstances, compositional or performative practices that clearly highlighted the text and permitted the exquisite refinements of Petrarchan and neo-Petrarchan verse to be fully intelligible would have been favored. That is an argument for spare homorhythmic settings of Italian verse or for solo singing to string accompaniment, rather than for polyphony.

My thesis thus contrasts with the current prevailing thesis that the Italian madrigal was a refashioning of the so-called new chanson of French composers like Antoine Bruhier, Ninot le Petit, and others. There is no doubt that such compositions are transmitted in Florentine sources contemporary with the origins of the madrigal. But I know of no evidence that Florentine cultural figures knew these compositions as actual sounding music, although speculation that they did is hardly extravagant. On the other hand, the historical evidence alluded to here and assembled exhaustively in my forthcoming monograph documents incontrovertibly that members of the Florentine cultural élite were not only demonstrably conversant with solo song and the homophonic, homorhythmic textures of the carnival song–lauta tradition, but also actively engaged with such genres. I argue that such genres were a more proximate source than the new chanson, and a more specifically Florentine source, for the stylistic characteristics that typify the early madrigal. The earliest madrigalists—Layolle, Pisano, and Verdelot—thus had proximate, appropriate models for such stylistic characteristics that typify the early madrigal. The earliest madrigalists—Layolle, Pisano, and Verdelot—thus had proximate, appropriate models for such stylistic characteristics that typify the early madrigal. The earliest madrigalists—Layolle, Pisano, and Verdelot—thus had proximate, appropriate models for such stylistic characteristics that typify the early madrigal.
1930s

Houston's Veteran's Administration Medical Center was renamed for Dr. Michael E. DeBakey '30 in a ceremony in June. In a speech quoting Shakespeare, Byron, and Thomas Jefferson, the father of modern cardiovascular surgery said that the honor touched his heart. DeBakey, at ninety-five, is chancellor emeritus of Baylor College of Medicine.

1940s

Dr. George R. Hugman Jr. ’47 reports that “life has been great”: he has been married since 1953 and has four successful children and nineteen grandchildren.

1960s

The Reverend William Gedge Gayle Jr. ’60 is retiring as rector of St. Martin’s Episcopal Church in Metairie, LA, after forty years as a clergyman and more than twenty-seven years at St. Martin’s Church. He will be embarking on a new career as a tree farmer on a family farm in Beauregard Parish. He and his wife, Susan, will continue to maintain their Metairie residence and their Tulane football season tickets.

Dr. Jeffrey H. Ahlin ’65 was elected president of the American Orthodontic Society at last fall’s annual meeting. After Tulane, Dr. Ahlin graduated from Temple University Dental School and Boston University School of Graduate Dentistry. He served as a dental officer on the U.S.S. Kittyhawk from 1969 to 1971. Dr. Ahlin taught at Tufts’s and Harvard’s schools of dental medicine and has authored two textbooks and several scientific papers. He and his wife, Kyra, live in Gloucester, MA, with their children, Konrad, fifteen, and Verity, ten.

In September Joseph A. Grace Jr. ’66 assumed the position of chief information officer for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery as Captain Grace, Naval Reserve. The one-year recall to active duty has him moving to Washington, D.C., where he will work for the surgeon general.

Dr. William H. Bailey ’69 recently returned to private practice following deployment to Iraq as a director of Critical Care Air Transport for the Air Force. He was nominated for the Bronze Star for valor for MEDEVAC rescue and evacuation missions.

1970s

Dana Abbott ’72, head swim coach at Katy High School in Katy, TX, was named to Who’s Who in Aquatics in 2002 and 2003. He is currently president of the National Interscholastic Swimming Coaches’ Association.

James “Ted” Booth ’75 is serving as the staff cochair for the Redistricting and Elections Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Holland Timmins ’79 was appointed chief investment officer of the Texas Permanent School Fund in Austin.

1980s

Dr. Mark Felger ’85 was elected chief of the surgery department of the Heart Hospital of Austin, TX.

David Hertz ’85 has been named general counsel of Signature Bank and Bank Hapoalim. David lives in New York City with his wife, Diane, and two-year-old son, Braden.

Robert B. Landry III ’85 was appointed president and chief executive officer of the National Cancer Coalition (NCC) last June. The goal of the NCC is to “serve needy cancer victims and their families and to increase support of quality cancer research.” A graduate of the LSU School of Law, he has served as counsel for numerous health care facilities, medical service providers, and nonprofit organizations.

Timothy A. Clear ’89, who lives in Zurich with his wife, Johna, was recently promoted to senior management at the headquarters of Swiss Reinsurance Co. He works in the corporate IT department as the head of business engineering and analysis. Tim joined Swiss Re after leaving Openshop, a German eCommerce company that went public in 2000.

1990s

Erik “Chet” Carlson ’90 and his wife were blessed by modern science with their first child two years ago. Chet reports that Nicholas is a big, healthy, wonderful baby boy.

Dan Coughlin ’91 and his wife welcomed their third child, Colleen Abbey, in November. Also this year, Dan was certified as a civil trial specialist by the National Board of Trial Advocacy.

Evan Farmer ’95 is the latest host of TLC’s While You Were Out. Evan lends his carpentry and design talent to the program. He also runs a home-renovating company, is a musician, and has worked with MTV as a VJ and actor.


Brian Cort Screnar ’97 has spent the past two years as finance director for Senator John Edwards’s presidential campaign, as well as for other political organizations. Recently, Brian started a political and business-capital fund-raising firm in Washington, D.C.
Tulane College is the university's liberal arts division for men and its historic undergraduate college. Of the university's six undergraduate divisions, Tulane College alone dates from the beginnings of the university. The college was founded in 1847 by the act of the State of Louisiana that founded the University of Louisiana. The act provided for “faculties...of the natural sciences, and...letters, and a college proper or academical department,” which today is Tulane College, and departments of law and medicine, which today are the Tulane Law and Medical Schools. The already-existing Medical College of Louisiana, which had been founded in 1834 as an independent institution, became the university's department of medicine.

The university was renamed “The Tulane University of Louisiana” in 1884 in recognition of the generosity of millionaire philanthropist Paul Tulane, who had provided the institution with an endowment. The “college proper or academical department” was renamed Tulane College at the same time.

Throughout the 1880s and ’90s, the administrators regularly discussed the inadequacy of the campus on Common Street in downtown New Orleans, where the university had been located since its founding. They began the purchase of the property along St. Charles Avenue that eventually became the uptown campus. In 1894, the university was relocated to its current site, and Tulane College was relocated to Gibson Hall, now the main administration building, which had been constructed specifically for the college. The same year, courses in engineering and applied science were removed from the curriculum of Tulane College, and a separate College of Technology (now the School of Engineering) was founded. Tulane College was renamed the College of Arts and Sciences at that time.

In 1988, the separate faculties and curricula of the College of Arts and Sciences and the H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College, the university's liberal arts division for women, which had been founded in 1886, were merged. Today, men and women attend class together and are taught a common curriculum by a single faculty, the Faculty of the Liberal Arts and Sciences.

In 1993, the university’s board of administrators voted to restore the college’s historic nineteenth-century name, Tulane College.

The college now enrolls 1,600 men pursuing the bachelor of arts, bachelor of fine arts, and bachelor of science degrees. Its living alumni number some 21,000, the largest number of any of the university’s schools and colleges; among them are some of the nation’s and the world’s most accomplished and distinguished professionals in a remarkable variety of fields.

In the 150 years since its founding, Tulane College has subscribed to a few basic principles: a belief in the enduring value of a liberal arts education, a conviction about the importance of extracurricular activities and accomplishments, and a justifiable pride in the achievements of its talented students and distinguished alumni.
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Professor Alworth inspired us to get answers rather than mere results. It was quite remarkable for an undergraduate to realize that we were really affecting the state of learning.”

GEORGE GOKEL ’68, PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR OF THE PROGRAM IN CHEMICAL BIOLOGY AT WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS