YEARS OF TENSION

After fifteen years from the time of the tensions on the 2600 campuses following the Viet Nam War, it is very difficult, even yet, to get the total situation in perspective. In many ways the entire situation was a time of stress and evaluation when many segments of society and particularly of higher education were evaluating the situation in which they found themselves and each in more or less its own way, was striving for survival and recognition.

There had been a long evolution in the psychological development which brought the times of tension to the 2600 campuses. After the second World War, the GIs had returned in great numbers. We had 500 new students who came between the first and second semester. We had had no pre-warning that they were coming. Fortunately we were able to staff the classes with people who were properly trained academically. By starting classes at 6:00 in the morning and going until 10:00 at night we were able to accommodate the GI's. They were very intent upon getting their education and getting it as quickly as possible. They were not interested in the social life on the campus. They were not interested in athletics. They were only interested in getting as many credits as possible to make up for the four years that most of them had lost. This coming of the GI bulge strained the educational systems all over the United States and there was considerable readjustment both from the standpoint of courses and scheduling and, in some cases, educational philosophy.
Following the GI enlarged enrollment in most of the schools, there was a very large number of students who came to all universities. It was a time between the 2nd World War and the Viet Nam War. It was a time of uncertainty, of students under great duress and pressure as to whether they would be drafted. Many enlisted so that they could pick their branch of the service and there was very great reaction against the fact that young men did not want to go to the Viet Nam War.

I remember visiting Berkeley and as I went on the edge of the campus there must have been thirty tables at which people were seated each of whom was stressing a different kind of protest. The protest, of course, was very much against being drafted and there were many demonstrations whose motto was "Hell no, I won't go."

The draft was written in such a way that students pursuing a straight course toward a degree could be deferred. This meant that if a student received good grades, he could be deferred for four years as long as he went directly to secure his degree. This gave many outstanding students a chance to pursue their education and be of better service to the military when they had graduated. However, it also gave a chance for many students to hide in the university and many of these students were very recalcitrant, were very troublesome, were not interested in going to college but wanted the privilege of being deferred for four years. These people formed the basis
of many of the problems on the 2600 university campuses. They were also the basis of many of the riots, the sit-ins, and the difficult times that occurred on the university campuses.

I remember hearing a student say that if they didn't make some kind of protest on the campus of the University of Puget Sound, they would be considered dumbbells and would not have any status. For that reason they organized such things as peace vigils where everyone stood around the Sutton Quadrangle in silence during the lunch hour. Another time they organized a vigil on the roof of Jones Hall in which different students took turns in reading the list of all American soldiers who had been killed in Viet Nam.

In many ways the entire student revolution from 1965 until 1972 was like the Children's Crusades of the middle ages. The psychological build up - there was a whip-lash effect - feeling that if you are not in the middle of it, you are not achieving, you are not living up to your responsibility and also feeling that we must do everything we possibly can to gain control, to use our power in anyway to demonstrate the fact that we are dynamic and revolutionary citizens. The revolt was against all kinds of authority. Against authority of the parents, of schools, universities, churches, government, military and anything that had any degree of authority. On April 19, 1965 the Atlantic Monthly published a 50 page special edition called, "The Troubled Campus." In this it talked of the riots which had been in
Berkeley and in other places, the sit-ins where students had sat in various president's offices and dean's offices, and treasurer's offices. Where university presidents and deans had been forced to resign and where the curriculum of various schools had been strongly influenced by the pressure which came from these young people who felt very keenly that their time had come. The fifty pages in the Atlantic Monthly talked about the philosophy of the revolution, how it had happened, what might be achieved by it and a dialogue of many of the unusual situations on the campuses where the students had literally taken over.

At the University of Puget Sound, we had little trouble and some tension. The U. S. News and World Report of August 3, 1970 had an article on Why College Presidents are Quitting. The breadth of the article shows how wide spread the tension was on campuses in the United States. It says:

"The wear and tear of academic life in 1970 is driving college presidents out of their jobs in numbers that educators view as alarming.

According to figures compiled by the American Council on Education, the annual turnover in college presidencies has jumped nearly 80 percent in the last three years.

Among the universities looking for new presidents in July were Harvard, Stanford, Wisconsin, Arizona State, Texas at Austin, Texas A. & M., and the State University of New York. There are many others."
One of the presidents said that, "Running a university today is called the 'lonliest job in the world.'" The presidents reported that they are an unorganized group and without allies. They also said that they were being squeezed by the Trustees who did not understand legislators, the alumni, and the general public. All of these groups were demanding educational economies and law and order on the campus. On the other side they are faced with "liberal" faculties, militant students and the threat of more rioting as the semesters went on.

Some of the examples of presidents who had resigned were Dr. Fred Harrington, president of the University of Wisconsin, where some of the outstanding tension and rioting took place. He said the legislative criticism and inadequate support from the regents was the reason for his resigning. Many of the residences of college presidents were picketed and stoned. Dr. Edward H. Levi, University of Chicago and former acting president of the University of California found it necessary to employ body guards as did Hilton C. Buley who was retired from the University of Southern Connecticut State College in New Haven and he also felt the necessity for having body guards. Samuel E. Braden, who was president of Illinois State University resigned. He told friends that he and his family can no longer stand the "ever-present threat of violence."

A week after he was burned in effigy at a student demonstration, Dr. James F. Tucker quit as president of Virginia State College in Petersburg "for reasons pertaining to the best
Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer announced his resignation at Stanford on June 25th. He explained: "Entirely too much of my effort has been devoted to matters of purely administrative or even police nature." A return to a more scholarly life, he added, "will be most welcome." Dr. Pitzer had to call police to his campus thirteen times in May of 1970.

Dr. Allan W. Ostar, executive director of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities said they were leaving "no win" jobs. He added that the authority of the presidents had been so eroded in recent years that it is difficult, and sometimes impossible, for them to exercise effective leadership. Dr. Theodore Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, has estimated that his real authority had been eroded away to the extent that he now had roughly one-tenth of the power over university affairs that he had in 1952 when he became president.

Of the 274 institutions in the State-College Association, over 10 percent were without presidents because of the tension and difficulties of the times.

The basic criticism of the president has been widespread. I remember once that Louis Benezet, a personal friend, who was president of the Claremont University Center in California wisely said, "The president has been too lax; he has been too firm and unyielding; he has not listened to his
faculty; he has indulged his faculty or his students; he has acted too fast; he has waited too long to act; he has called in the police; he hasn't called in the police. Whatever it is he should have done, he didn't do; whatever he shouldn't have done, he foolishly did do."

Because the problem was so universal and so very broad in its outreach, President Nixon asked that a special President's Commission on Campus Unrest be established. This was headed by William W. Scranton, former Governor of Pennsylvania who was Chairman. It had a good many university people and lay people on the committee. It made its report in October of 1970. The report was 55 pages long and dealt with all kinds of problems arising including arson and professional agitators on the campus.

Out of these studies and others came the fact that the National Student Association held the first National Student Power Conference at the University of Minnesota on November 17th and 18th, 1967. There were 330 student governments involved and they were associated with the National Student Association which was less than fifteen percent of the nations accredited eligible colleges. The National Student Association members were militant and were indoctrinated by a number of extremist faculty members and older agitators who most often were off the campuses. While the Central Intelligent Agency of the Government said it was no longer supporting the National Student Association, nevertheless, according to the Washington Post, $390,000 had come to the National Student Association by the
Edward Schwartz, who was president of the National Student Association said that the students should organize themselves in such a way that they could bring insurrection to the campuses, such as the University of California at Berkeley, San Francisco State College and the University of Wisconsin.

President Schwartz, of the National Student Association set up four steps leading to the control of the national campuses by radical students. The first one was what he called "Gradual Escalation", which meant that the students must be weaned gradually into revolutionary fervor. "If the base of support for the initial goals is too broad, its fundamental objectives become explicit, campus participation may dwindle and that should not be." Second he said that the National Student Association should instruct student revolutionaries that the goal is to create a dialectical situation in which the administration is forced to reject seemingly reasonable request for change in such a manner as to alienate the entire campus. For this reason, they should avoid negotiation, not allow them to take place, and not allow reform rather than revolution. He further stated that radicals want college administrators to become immoderate or reactionary and to alienate the entire student body. This was what happened in Germany and for that reason the Nazi Party had an ease in becoming strong. Third, he said, "Secure
administrative fury." The National Student Association stressed the importance of maneuvering the president of the college or the regents into reacting angrily and slurring the character of the campus groups. The NSA president declares, "Even if your first proposal is not acceptable to many students, the administration's reactions will outweigh their reservations. A slur on the character of any student group within reasonable bounds of respectability is an indirect slap at the entire campus. This should be made clear and should make the administration furious if possible." The fourth point was to try to get a few campus "respectables" or even invulnerables, like honor students or Woodrow Wilson winners to take up the cause. The NA paper said, "Frankly, the goal of revolutionary campus movements are basic changes within the universities, such as "resignation of the president, abolition of the board of trustees, elimination of classes."

Following these four guidelines, it was possible on December 6th of that year for the San Francisco State College with only 100 organized radicals out of a total student body of 18,500 to succeed in closing down the campus during riots in which fires were set and campus property destroyed. Accordingly, Life Magazine of October 20, 1967 said, "The National Association of Student Congress last August mapped out ways to "bring any university which won't cooperate with our desires to a grinding halt." At least 40 campuses were selected as targets for the revolutionary fervor - including Northwestern, Columbia University, the University of Colorado and Stanford.
On the national scene, the National Student Association went on record in favor of organized resistance to the draft and for supporting black power which meant the aims of the Stokeley Carmichaels "by any means necessary" which does not exclude riot, arson, and mayhem.

At the University of Puget Sound we had little trouble and some tension. It was a time when students felt the psychological pressure from all over the country and felt that they should augment their power. Also part of the entire situation was the fact that there had been many teaching assistants who had worked during the early part of the tension and who had received their Master's degrees and done part of their work on their Doctor's degrees. In the GI bulge we had hired some of these people and they kept their feelings of anxiety and insecurity and their pressures against authority, particularly as it related to the securing of tenure on the faculty and they were a constant source of agitation on all campuses and we had our share on the campus of the University of Puget Sound.

At the University of Puget Sound we had students, many of whom were more or less immature, set up procedures following somewhat the guidelines of the National Student Association. There was a bonafide campaign to try to get the University Administration to take positions which would alienate parts of the student body. There was a petition signed by a group of agitators asking that the president be forced to resign, that the curriculum be given to the hands of the
students, and that the trustees be asked to resign and that the students be allowed to pick fifty percent of the trustees. Also that the students have control over the faculty tenure procedures. Naturally, these were turned down and the students theoretically said that they would close the University although they did not basically have any real following. Out of 2400 students, we had probably thirty or forty that were agitators. While I hesitate to say it, very many of them were what I thought of in terms of "losers." People who had no reality, no connection with the real world in which we live. Again, many of them were children of the parsonage - although the major portion of the children of the parsonage were level headed and very fine but there were those who somehow or other had not reached a point of maturity where the idealism of youth had a real facing with the facts of daily living.

One of the leaders of the agitation at the University of Puget Sound was David Vance, who was the son of an Episcopal clergyman who had St. Mary's Church in the northend of Tacoma. David Vance was a tall, good-looking young man but very immature. He decided that he could not get the proper hearing nor the proper following so he decided to edit an underground newspaper which he called SATYA - a word from the Indian language meaning truth. David was one of the chief people motivating this kind of action on the campus. He was a freshman (who had lost a job or two) because he had been an agitator against authority and also a leader in the movement to resist the draft.
It is ironic that the Reverend Mr. Vance came to me before David's entering the university and said that he needed considerable money to help educate his two sons and would it be possible for me to allocate some of the scholarship money to him. I had a very tender spot in my heart for the clergy and I allocated generously for David's education. I was exceedingly disappointed in the kind of student leadership which David gave. He had a philosophy of life that the State owed him a living. He did not feel that he ought to do any work and that his needs should be taken care of by the University and by the State. He succeeded in getting the daughter of a Methodist minister pregnant and they were married in the Kilworth Chapel. Afterwards he announced to her that he did not intend to work and that he was going to go on relief and secure whatever monies he possibly could from the State. There was a disagreement sooner or later with his wife and she divorced him and took the child with her. Because of the position of the son, it was embarassing to the congregation of the church and ultimately they strongly suggested that his father seek another congregation. He resigned from his church in the northend of Tacoma and became what is called a missionary minister under theegis of the Episcopal Church. (To this day David has not had a constructive life and still goes on the philosophy that someone owes him a living.)

A colleague of his was Marsha Burdette. Her father was a Methodist minister and lived in Portland. I knew him when I taught at Willamette and he came to see me and say that he needed
help for Marsha's education. I allocated rather generously to her education. She became one of the most outstanding leaders against the administration and against authority. She took it upon herself to try to force the Greek system off the campus and demanded that the Greeks be forced to pledge anyone that sought to be a member. It was one of those situations where she tried to get the administration into a very vulnerable position by virtue of a dialectical situation whereby if you espouse to either side you are wrong. I finally ruled that the membership of the Greek system on our campus would be determined by the members of the Greek system and not by any rule from national headquarters or any national officers. Marsha was very indignant at this rule and said that it was made by a spineless administrator. When the student senate debated it at some length, there were notes in the minutes that she spoke seven times in one meeting trying to persuade the Senate to her point of view. Marsha was a most unhappy person and when she graduated she was still a person who felt very keenly that life held little future for her or for her student generation.

The times of tension were universal. It was a revolt against authority. It was a revolt against the rules and regulations by which a university should be administered. It was a revolt against required courses. It was a revolt against any action that would suggest that the classical ideas and traditions of university education were effective. All that should be changed and students should rule their own education in any way they saw fit.
I recall coming to the office one morning and finding a piece of paper under the door which said, "The students of UPS demand an answer regarding the position of UPS in relation to the war in Indo-China. We request that you make a statement regarding this position at the ROTC Presidential Review Wednesday morning. We also request your presence at the top floor of Jones Hall at anytime tomorrow, May 10th, 1972."

I did not make any statement concerning the Indo-China War and completely ignored the situation. I found out later that the people who made the demands were three people who got together and decided they would do it in the name of the students. It was often little groups like this that came in and made the so-called demands.

Because of the tension and the fact that students were saying that the administration here and elsewhere did not listen to them, we set up the University Council which listened to all of their suggestions, demands, and requests and gave them an honest hearing. While it took endless hours of time of the administrators and others involved it did act as a clearing house and it was also a way by which repressions could be alleviated.

There was a request that came from the University of Puget Sound anti-war coalition, requesting me, as President and the University to cooperate in fulfilling what they called
the following objectives:

1) Calling a town meeting for students, faculty, administration and community persons. It is hoped that this meeting will serve as a forum for discussion of new developments in the war, and actions people have adopted to change their relation to the war.

2) Boycotting some products now used on this campus (foods and equipment) manufactured by corporations producing war materials where there is no alternate or no basic demand.

3) Attending stockholders' meetings of all war production corporations in which the University has investments (e.g. International Telephone and Telegraph, Dow Chemical, General Electric, Zenith, etc.). We do not wish to ask the University to sell our stocks. Rather, by attending the stockholders meetings, we can demand that the corporations stop the use of our money to produce for war, and redirect this money to non-military production. We will support the reconversion of these corporations to non-military products and will turn over the resources of our University to that end.

I tried to stay ahead of the situation always and I could sense that we were to have some tension. I strongly suggested to the Board of Trustees that we create what we called the University Council. This would be an organization made up of three students, three faculty members, three alumni, two administrators and two trustees and any group or any individual who felt that he had a genuine cause - either a complaint or a cause for concern - had a right to come before the Council, give his cause or concern to it and be heard. The Council would then recommend to the administration and to the Board of Trustees whatever action should be recommended. Structured as it was with students, faculty, and alumni having more representation than the trustees or administration, there was never a feeling that the students could be outvoted or that the vote
would be predetermined by virtue of office. The Council rendered a great service and it was very fortunate that Mr. Clapp, who was Chairman of the Board of Trustees, appointed Mr. Garrett VanderEnde as Chairman of the Council. Mr. VanderEnde had been City Manager in San Francisco and was president of the Pacific First Federal Savings and Loan Association in Tacoma and was Vice-Chairman of the Board of Trustees. He was a man of outstanding stature, of infinite patience and a man who had the ability to knit all points of view into a common situation.

We had many meetings of the Council. Many interesting kinds of situations were discussed. I remember one day four students came into my office and demanded that I speak as the President of the University of Puget Sound in a very strong statement against the Federal Government, particularly as it related to Viet Nam. I pointed out to the four that while they were four, we had approximately 300 young men in the ROTC Unit and those men had signed up voluntarily to take ROTC. They represented one point of view which was considerably different than the one that the four young men were representing to me that day. They were very exercised and very belligerent saying they could create a sit-in and also take over and shut down the school if the statement was not forthcoming. I mentioned the fact that this was the kind of thing for which the Council had been established and if they would bring their brief before the Council we would arrange a meeting of the Council and they could present their point of view
and we would abide by the action of the Council. They did this and there was a very long discussion concerning the Viet Nam situation and the Council said they thought it was unwise for such a statement to be made. They felt that the University was for educational purposes and not necessarily to make political statements.

I remember another time when two young men came in on a Friday at 8:00 in the morning and said that they wanted me to dismiss classes for 10 days so that they could go out and electioneer for the candidates prior to the election. They came at 8:00 and wanted me to make the announcement by 10:00 so that classes would not meet for the next two weeks. I said that this was not possible. That we had to, by law, fulfill a certain number of days of classes and it was the kind of action that would really have to come from the faculty. However, I said if they would like to appear before the Council to present their point of view, I was certain the Council would listen very carefully. They said, "How soon can the Council meet?" I said, "Well, it is Friday and we will set up a meeting on Monday. On Monday the Council met and the young men, together with some other colleagues that they had gathered over the weekend came and spoke with great vigor before the Council. In the discussion, one of the faculty members said, "But I have a certain amount of material that I have to cover during the semester and I cannot cover it if we have ten days or two weeks in which there are no classes." Then one of the faculty members mentioned that they
could electioneer while attending classes rather than having classes dismissed. One of the young men became angry and said, "I don't want any damn fool professor telling me what I can do and what I can't do." At that, one of the professors said, "You know, son, I have you in my class and if you do not attend class in the next ten days, you will fail the course." The argument was long and arduous and vigorous and belligerent. After about two hours discussion, the Council voted and the vote was three for the students point of view and nine for continuing classes as usual. However, the young men had had their hearing, it had been carefully discussed and there was no question but what their point of view had been considered, and it was necessary for them to abide by the decision.

The Council met on many occasions. There were careful records kept. The points of view had to deal with the curriculum, the student's social life, the administration points of view, the schedule of the classes, the points of tenure, and there was no phase of University life that was not a part of the Council's consideration.

One day a young man by the name of Alan Poobus came in and demanded that the University reveal all of its financial aspects including all of the stocks and bonds which it had, that the University relinquish its responsibility in the hiring of faculty, in granting of tenure, and that the University allow the students to name fifty percent of all the trustees. This was the extent to which the Student Body was reaching out for power and strength. Naturally, these were discussed but there was
no basic change in the Administrative policy concerning tenure, concerning curriculum or concerning structure of the Board of Trustees. It was typical, however, of the kind of situation in which the students demanded that they have power and that they be allowed to run the University.

After the change concerning the coming of the GI and the draft deferrment, our Dean, Norman Thomas decided to go East and teach in New Jersey. This left the position open and I looked around for a new dean. There was one man who was highly recommended teaching in Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. His name was Robert Bock. I interviewed him at length and he appeared to be an outstanding person. He had a degree in Education, he had a degree in Management, and he had written several books on Management. I hired him to be the head of the School of Business. He was so well liked by the faculty and also the administration that it was not very long before we made him Acting Dean of the University. After serving as Acting Dean for a very short while he came in and asked to be made the regular Dean of the University. His service had been excellent, he showed unusually great promise and I recommended to the Board of Trustees that he be made Dean. He was Dean and served very well. It was not too long, however, when some of my colleagues told me that they thought he was inordinately ambitious and that he had designs of changing the University completely. He wanted to eliminate the School of Occupational Therapy, he wanted to eliminate the practical courses in Education,
he wanted to eliminate the practical courses in Business. He was interested in doing away with all the accounting courses and the courses training for Certified Public Accountants. About the same time, some of the teaching assistants started coming in and asking me if I would guarantee them permanent places on the faculty of the University of Puget Sound. I told them this was not possible and that they would have to come up through the tenure track and have the recommendation of the Dean and their peers. This caused considerable dissatisfaction on the part of some of the junior faculty. Finally, in talking with one of the junior faculty I said, "You are one of several who have come in on this proposition. I am wondering how it happened." He then told me that the Dean had said he would give them tenure if it would be possible but the President would not allow him, nor would the President give him the money to adjust the salaries according to what he thought they were worth. I was then aware of the fact that there was a constant agitation from the Dean's office concerning the fact that he would like to do those things which would change the character of the University. I had allowed him certain leeway on the budget. He overran his budget by $260,000 in one year. I counselled with him and we had a rather strong conversation. I took back the full responsibility for the budget. Fortunately, we had had enough money which had accumulated in the GI bulge to take care of the deficit for that year. It was the only year we had a deficit in the 31 years in which I was head of the University.
During the years we had some very unusual and very fine editors on the Trail. Most of them were loyal and they were students who were interested in journalism and also the good of the University of Puget Sound. However, on several occasions we had editors who were rather injudicious in much of what they published and they definitely lacked good judgement. Several of the editors seemed to get considerable joy out of publishing the happenings on other campuses like the riots at Berkeley, the resignation of administrators in other schools, and the sit-ins and lie-ins which were common news both in the daily papers and in the student papers.

At the height of the tensions on various campuses, we had an editor by the name of Gracia Alkema. She was a major in English and felt very keenly that she was a crusader. She was of the opinion that she ought to remake the world overnight and also the University of Puget Sound. Her editorials were scurrilous and vicious. She was always saying this University cannot continue as it is. It has to have a new philosophy. It has to have a new organization. She would have an editorial says, "It is tragic we are losing three professors next year." She did not say that two of them were going to study for their doctorate and the third wanted to move back east because his family was there. In the same issue, she did not reveal the fact that we were having fourteen new faculty members come the next year. Each issue had some cause, each issue had some very derogatory statement concerning the administration and the fact that the University simply could not continue to exist. She had some
editorials in which she was revealing materials which was discussed in the Board of Trustee meeting and was also discussed in my cabinet meeting which I held every ten days to two weeks. There were also reports from the various vice-presidents and other members in the administration. I kept wondering how this information, while it was not harmful, was semi-confidential, and how it happened that she had obtained it. I found out that each Friday afternoon she was meeting with Dean Bock and they were evaluating the last editorial and planning the next one. I also found out that Dean Bock was giving the information to the Teaching Assistants and was telling many heads of the departments that he regretted exceedingly that he did not have more money from the president so that he could make their teaching much easier and their departments much larger. Finally on February 21, 1969, he wrote to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees suggesting that the University be reorganized, that instead of him being vice-president and dean that he should be made vice-president and provost with power to serve as the sole academic officer and speak for the University in academic matters. He wanted his office to be answerable only to one member of the Board of Trustees whom he hoped would be Garrett VanderEnde, and that he would have full financial control of the University budget with the understanding that the president would be the officer in charge of commencements and other phases of the public relations for the University. Also that the president would raise a million dollars a year and give it to the provost so that he could spend it in anyway that he saw fit.
His letter had been sent to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and to the vice-chairman, both of whom sent me copies of his letter immediately and Mr. Clapp, Mr. VanderEnde and I met at Pacific First Federal to discuss it. Mr. Clapp said that he thought he was a brash young man, very eager for power, who was inordinately ambitious. Mr. VanderEnde said he had a feeling that he was very eager for the full power of the University to be in his hands and that he was not ready for such a responsibility. The decision was made that he should be turned down completely and absolutely, and Mr. Clapp was the person who would do it. I received a call from Florida asking about Robert H. Bock, saying that he was applying for a position at a University in Florida and would I recommend him. He was negotiating for a new position. He had said openly and publicly that he would never stay in any one place longer than five years. I did not know that at the time I hired him. He wanted to be provost and he felt that if he could then become president of the University of Puget Sound that would fulfill his ambition. In his letter to the two Trustees he had written, "I must respectfully request the Executive Committee to respond directly to me by Tuesday, February 25th so that I do not jeopardize another opportunity. In the event that this proposal is not accepted or that I resign, would you please refrain from making copies of this letter and destroy the original copy." After that meeting I called him into my office and we had a rather unusual conference. I told him I knew he had the offer in Florida and I strongly recommended that he take it and take it immediately, otherwise we would have to announce that his services would not be needed any longer at the University of Puget Sound.
In his relationship with Gracia Alkema, I found that there was a very close and most unusual relationship that these two had had through the year. Of course, Gracia came out with the headlines in the Trail that Dr. Bock resigned because he did not like the academic atmosphere and the restraint which he felt was being put on the University by the administration. She was completely against the administration and looked upon Dr. Bock as the most outstanding person who had come to the University.

When the word came out that Dr. Bock was resigning there was great grumbling on the part of many of the faculty. Norman Anderson, who is in the Geology Department said that he would lead a group to see if there would not be a change in the presidency. He went over to the president's residence and talked to Mrs. Thompson and said, "Why you people won't even be here five months. We will see that you are out of here. There is no possibility of your staying on." Anderson upset Mrs. Thompson and he used very, very poor judgement instead of coming in and talking to me, knowing full well what I would tell him. But he chose to harass us by making Mrs. Thompson feel very uncomfortable.

I found that John Lantz had been writing his letters to the Board of Trustees strongly stating the fact that he felt that the time had come for a change in the administration and that the University would benefit a great deal. He pointed out that I was 62 years old and should be thinking in terms of retirement and it would be a good idea if I would retire early.

A group of the faculty, teaching assistants, led by
Dr. Bock, by Norman Anderson, by Ernest Karlstrom, and others put forth an item on the agenda at a faculty meeting concerning restructuring of the University. What it really was was a very subtle way of getting a vote of confidence or no confidence in the administration. Anderson came to me and said, 'Now you really should get an attorney to represent you because you have no idea the feeling that will be engendered.' He said, 'Why don't you ask Paul Perdue to represent you?' I knew that Paul Perdue was a very dedicated and loyal person to me but on the other hand it was one of those situations where I had absolute confidence in the faculty and felt, while there would be a great argument both pro and con, that we would carry the day. Anderson had said, 'Why Dean Bock is the first breath of fresh air we have had in a long time at the University and it was a great tragedy when he left us.' The day came for the faculty meeting. We had the regular agenda, then came this recommendation — it was put to a vote and the vote was three to one in favor of the present administration. There had been considerable discussion about tenure and other phases of faculty administration. We had a case of Mr. Robert Lee, who was hired by the English Department and proved to be a very distressing and disastrous appointment. I finally had to rule that he could finish out his year and another contract would be given to him but that he would not be given a permanent spot on the University faculty or given tenure. This caused a great deal of discussion. The students divided about it, the faculty divided about it. Again John Lantz was the leader of the contention. John Magee was the leader holding that he should not be given a contract. These two
had been adversaries in these situations for a long time. One time when we were discussing Professor Annis, who was certainly an activist of the first order, John Lantz stood up in my office - John Magee was sitting there - and he said, "I will break the faculty in two if you do not give Annis tenure." John Magee said the last thing we should do is give Annis tenure and I actually thought they were going to have a fist fight right in my office over whether or not this man should have tenure. In the evaluation I found that Annis was a very outstanding professor of Shakespeare, probably one of the best on the Westcoast. Unfortunately, he had these other interests - such as swimming the Puyallup River to see that the Indians got proper recognition for their fishing rights. This made the headlines and, of course, we had some very negative public relations because of it.

Dr. Bock then announced that he had a very outstanding position in Florida, that he would leave and go there, which he did. Gracia Alkema graduated and their relationship was broken up by virtue of their moving away and the Trail returned to some degree of normalcy without having to create a crisis every week.

In general the years of crises at the University of Puget Sound were no stronger or no more difficult than on any other campus. We did not have the riots, we did not have the sit-ins, we did not have the arson, we did not have the shutting of professors out of classes. We did have the Council, we did have the long discussions, we did have the unfortunate situation
in which the Dean tried to do a great deal of harm to the curriculum and, of course, tried to upset the administration and become president of the school. Since his going to Florida he has been moved from Florida to Wisconsin, and again was moved because of his unusual aggressiveness and because of the fact that his ambition outruns his judgement.

Following the meeting of the faculty in which they set up a motion to try to determine whether they had a vote of confidence or no confidence in the administration, and the fact that Norm Anderson, John Lantz, and several others had written to a number of Trustees whom they felt they knew well enough to communicate with them, Norton Clapp on March 19th, 1969 wrote a letter to the members of the faculty of the University of Puget Sound as follows:

"TO THE MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In recent weeks the Board of Trustees have received communications from and have noted several statements and articles by members of the faculty, students, and others, relating to the future of the University. The trustees are aware of the concern and problem expressed and after a full discussion at a recent meeting, their Executive Committee directed me to issue a statement on their behalf.

The University has passed through more than three-quarters of a century of growth and development, and has played a useful role in the Pacific Northwest. Whatever success it has enjoyed has been due to the ability and devotion of its faculty, administration, trustees, alumni and students and to the generosity of many friends. To continue to progress, it is vital that these groups work close together and in harmony.
Recent events have shown that communication among several elements could be better. I am happy to report that steps have been taken to improve this situation.

The trustees are aware of the fact that the size and character of our population here in the Northwest is changing rapidly and that this change is occurring at a time when our whole nation's educational system is being subjected to searching scrutiny. Students are questioning the relevance of subjects being offered, and the public is wondering whether our procedures are modern and effective. Our students needs to be prepared to live happily and usefully in a world which is changing so rapidly that it is hard to visualize what it will be like when they reach their prime. All this means that we, all of us, must take a new and fresh look at what is ahead.

As a first and important forward step, our trustees established a special Committee on Extension and Development and directed it to bring in a comprehensive long-range plan. This committee, with the active involvement of Dean Bock and Prof. Sinclair, have produced a first "study draft."

The next step was to request faculty participation in the further development and refinement of this plan, it being felt that its input and counsel were essential to the creation of a worthwhile program.

The first meeting of faculty and trustees was held Monday, March 17, and a fruitful discussion took place. On the recommendation of the faculty representatives, it was agreed that some students and alumni should be named to this group. Copies of the "study draft" are being furnished to the faculty representatives, and will be supplied to the student and alumni representatives when they are appointed.

It was agreed that this coordinating committee, to be effective, should be kept small, two from each group, plus one alternate from each available on call. It is contemplated that several task forces, which will include other individuals, will meet to consider and rework various portions of the plan, reporting their recommendations to the coordinating Committee. The specific areas of study, and the setting up of the task forces were left to a subsequent meeting to be held shortly.

The Executive Committee has approved this procedure and has expressed its pleasure over the fine cooperation shown by all concerned in setting up this activity. It is felt that
many of the concerns and problems that are bothering some of the members of the University community will disappear, or find appropriate solution in the meaty discussions that will take place in carrying out this program.

Due to so many circumstances, the President has recently, rather unwittingly, become somewhat of a focal point. Accordingly, it is felt appropriate that some mention should be made here of Dr. Thompson.

All of us, who have known and worked with him, hold him in high personal regard. Furthermore, we are grateful for the years of devoted service that he has rendered and leadership that he has given to the University. I know, and you know, that he loves this school with a passion, and because of this, he has suffered greatly as a result of many of the recent happenings.

Dr. Thompson is the President of the University. In spite of, perhaps because of, the changing times and the tensions on the American campuses, he cannot function effectively without our willingness to join ranks behind him.

As we look ahead, one of the most important elements in this whole involved picture is the people who must operate our University and guide its destiny. As we move forward, it will be essential to have all responsible positions (and this includes faculty, administration and trustees) filled with people who will produce optimum results. Inevitably, this will result in changes from time to time throughout the organization. We must be prepared to make and accept these changes.

Some suggestions have been made that Dr. Thompson should be relieved of his responsibilities. In our view, however, precipitous and premature personnel changes do not usually turn out well and often result in harm. Thus, we feel that it would be undesirable to carry out the suggestion of taking steps now along that line. We are, at the same time, fully aware of the fact that Dr. Thompson is in his early sixties, and we realize that it is not inappropriate to now start looking ahead toward what should be done in anticipation of his retirement.

In this general connection, you will also be interested in knowing that one of the subjects felt appropriate for task force consideration is the organizational structure which will be most suitable for the University of Puget Sound of Tomorrow. This should prove to be an excellent forum for consideration of the reorganization of the governance of the University which has been urged by some groups. The suggestion is one which we feel should be fully explored.
We know the President's strengths and we all hope these may be used to the fullest in the future. We are eager to see him fulfill his desire to double the endowment fund in the next five years. The Board is considering a number of organizational options that would allow him to expend his major energies to this end.

We feel that now that the machinery has been set up for adequate communication and dialogue between the essential elements of the University, we should direct our joint efforts to carrying on the present operations of the University and to perfecting via this plan a constantly improving program for the future.

The trustees feel a strong sense of responsibility toward the continuance of a fine, well-respected and useful institution. They are equally aware of the changing times, and seek your active assistance and guidance in doing whatever is necessary to make it possible for the University to fulfill its highest capabilities.

I assure you that the Board of Trustees is not only sympathetic, but also most interested in the development and implementation of a really good plan, as we feel that this is the most intelligent way by which we can help prepare the University of Puget Sound for the future. The help of the faculty is essential to the success of this effort.

Thank you very much for your expressions of interest, and please be assured that we are grateful for the fine services rendered to the University by the faculty.

Very truly yours,
Norton Clapp,
Chairman
Board of Trustees

This letter came after Dean Bock had had a meeting of students in which he said that he felt the administration at the University of Puget Sound was top-heavy. In other words, I did not give him full power to spend any amount of money that he wished and to have absolute sway over the curriculum and faculty selection. It was a tenuous time on the campus of the University of Puget Sound, particularly because of the disruptive leadership of Norman Anderson, John Lantz, and Ernest Karlstrom,
and the fact that they were leading a crusade for a change in administration.

Mr. Clapps letter was clear, to the point, and was of the nature that quieted things down considerably and let the faculty know that the Trustees and the Administration was still in control at the University.

It is interesting that one of the most vicious of the editors of the Trail came to my office recently and looked at me and said, "Dr. T., how under the sun did you put up with me. I was so immature, and so eager for power that I made a fool of myself." I said, "Well son, this has been the process of education through all the years and it is still the process. While I have had 40,000 of you young people under my eagis, counting the time I started in 1937, I have great regard and affection for youth and absolute confidence that if you give youth the facts and give them a chance to think things through, 95 percent of the time they will come up with the right answer. It is usually when someone from the outside tries to force their will on them that it leaves them in an emotional state and they make mistakes."

I have great regard and affection for the University of Puget Sound. Ninety percent of the faculty are loyal, genuine, and sincere. There was always a feeling that they could come in, tell me what their problems were, what their recommendations were, and we listened carefully and took their recommendations seriously. Mr. Clapp was correct when he said I love the University with
a passion and I always shall.