



THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS / LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044

School of Law
1-913-864-4550

September 5, 1973

Mr. John M. Nugent
University Archivist
Spencer Research Library

Dear John:

I am today transmitting to you one copy of a 165-page typescript entitled "K.U. Notes 1948-1972, Francis H. Heller." This typescript is in a black binder to which is affixed a label with the added notation "Until July 1, 1972: For the Chancellor's Eyes Only."

Another copy of this typescript has been delivered to Chancellor Dykes who has agreed to treat it with the same confidentiality which I am requesting the Archives to observe. It is my intent that these "Notes" should be available to the Chancellor in office but not to anyone else until the release date shown on the cover or with my specific personal approval.

The original typescript has been retained by me with accompanying instructions that it is to be destroyed unopened in case of my death.

I would appreciate your acknowledgment of this presentation to the University Archives, to include the conditions attached.

Sincerely,

Francis H. Heller

Francis H. Heller
Roy A. Roberts Professor
of Law and Political Science

FHH:st

Enclosure

cc: Chancellor Archie R. Dykes

K. U. NOTES
1948-1972

Francis H. Heller

When it first occurred to me that I should put some of my recollections of my years at K. U. on paper, the thought was to record what I recalled of the critical three years since Larry Chalmers had become Chancellor. Then, in July, 1972, John Langley asked me to read the manuscript of Cliff Griffin's history of the University. Two things struck me in the reading: one was the almost continuous state of crisis in which the University has found itself from the very beginning; the other was the relative paucity of good source material for this effort at historical writing. Most of what Griffin wrote was drawn either from formal minutes of meetings or from press accounts. Few, if any, of the key people involved had maintained records that could be used. This was especially so for the more recent period when the telephone increasingly displaced written communication. It was then that I decided that I should go further back and put down my recollections of events at K. U. since my coming here in 1948.

I had reached this decision but had done nothing about it as yet when, to my surprise as much as most everyone else's, Chancellor Chalmers resigned. Much of what I will say about Larry Chalmers in these pages will sound critical; but it does not vary from what I would have written if he had not resigned -- or if I had written before he decided to take this important step.

Kansas was little more to me than a name on a map when I received a telephone call in July, 1948, from Ethan Allen, who identified himself as the chairman of the Department of Political Science at the University of Kansas, said he had received my letter inquiring about possible job openings, and wanted to know if I could come to Lawrence for an interview. This visit took place on the last day of the 1948 summer session, I believe August 2. I thought it was oppressively hot and the campus, almost totally deserted by students and faculty, showed the effects of weeks of unbroken heat. The department was housed (?) in a war-surplus structure in the rear of Strong Hall. Compared to the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary -- the two institutions I had been affiliated with before -- everything looked horribly cramped and improvised. I was taken to meet Assistant Dean Ulmer in the College and was appalled at

the tiny office he occupied (nine years later he and I would actually share this same tiny space and would do so for 2 1/2 years!) The cafeteria at the Union was a depressing place for lunch. But I needed a job -- and I liked Ethan Allen immensely, from the very first moment. I had also been impressed in a short call on the graduate dean, John Nelson, who seemed to me to be asking all the right questions. I agreed on the spot to accept the offer of an assistant professorship at \$3,100 for the academic year; there was some talk that this appointment might be renewed after the first year, but I was not greatly concerned -- I took it for granted that I would want to move on.

My first exposure to K. U. administration took place almost at once. I had been told that a printed appointment form would be sent to me from the Chancellor's office confirming my appointment. I waited and waited -- it never arrived; routinely, it had been placed in the campus mail and awaited me when I arrived in mid-September. In the weeks preceding, I had been unable to get anyone even to try to find out what happened to it.

By contrast, I was totally astounded and actually thrilled when, on my very first day on the Hill, I was invited to join Chancellor Malott for lunch. I recall that the group included Ray Nichols,

but that everyone else was "new." One of those at the table was the first dean of the School of Journalism, Burton Marvin. I do not remember what we talked about, but I came away visibly impressed with the Chancellor and with a University where a brand-new assistant professor would receive this kind of personal attention from the "top brass."

The department was a lively aggregation and a congenial one. I think I liked everyone from the beginning. Though H. B. Chubb was the senior both in age and service, the outstanding senior staff member was Walter Sandelius. We got along so well that the following spring he invited me to share with him the Senior Honors Seminar he was scheduled to offer in the fall; it proved to be one of the most exciting intellectual experiences I ever had. Eldon Fields was officed near-by and, as chairman of the introductory courses (in which I taught two sections in my first semester), I saw a great deal of him. The following year he was clearly the man I should ask to stand up with me at our wedding. I saw somewhat less of Hilden Gibson, but the graduate students -- of whom I saw a good deal -- all viewed him as the most stimulating member of the department. Among the graduate students, Rhoten Smith, John Conard, Kenneth Beasley, and later Aubrey Bradley,

all shared the office in which Marian Ridgway (later at Southern Illinois) and I were, by virtue of being assistant professors, the senior occupants.

Since the furnished room I had been able to rent was too small to accommodate a desk, I spent most of my time at the office. Students soon came to know this and came in with surprising frequency. My classes were exciting to me; the students ran the gamut, but there were some who obviously could hold their own with the best anywhere. Among my students that first year were Stanley Kelley (later at Princeton as a faculty member), Kenneth Miller (likewise at Rutgers), Jay Grimm, who went on to Yale Law School with my strong encouragement and eventually to a highly successful career in investments in New York, Ed Stollenwerck, who went on to a career in public relations work, Jim Bibb, who became the State Budget Director, Bob Bennett, eventually President of the State Senate, and numerous others who later distinguished themselves. That I married a member of this class may prejudice me somewhat, but I do not recall ever having had so many exceptional students at one time.

Ed Stollenwerck's interest in public relations had already manifested itself in an intensive involvement with the campus

radio program. He had originated, hosted, and moderated a quiz program fashioned after the then highly popular radio show "Information, Please." His anchor man on the show was a Hungarian-born journalism professor by the name of Emil Telfel, an irascible genius who could come up with batting records from the twenties as easily as he could with quotations from poets in half a dozen languages. I never became a regular, but Ed asked me about once a month to be on the program. There were always three faculty members as panelists; the first time I went on, the third man was the new dean of the Medical School, Franklin Murphy. The three of us had an absolutely hilarious time, and we arranged to be on the program together several times afterwards.

Another source of contacts with some of the "older" hands of the faculty was the Army Reserve. Here I met Jim Hitt, George Baxter Smith, and a number of others who became good friends.

In formal faculty affairs I stayed pretty much in the background; that is, until the College Faculty began to discuss the shortcomings of the library in the fall of 1950. I had had the benefit of an excellent introduction to librarianship in my years at Virginia, where I had worked in every division of the library. I thought an expert assessment of the K. U. library situation would be more

constructive than some of the uninformed grumbling of the faculty. So I got up and made a motion to ask the Chancellor to call in the ALA for a survey. The motion carried but, not surprisingly, the Chancellor did not agree that the expense involved would be justified. But he agreed that an inquiry by a faculty committee would be in order. I was placed on this committee, of which Bill Shoemaker, the chairman of Romance Languages, was the chairman, and as secretary, the task of preparing the committee's report fell to me. Later, when Franklin Murphy brought Bob Vosper to K. U. as library director -- so Vosper told me -- Murphy just handed him the voluminous report and told him that these were his "marching orders."

Most of my time and energy, though, went into writing. By the spring of 1951 we were reading galleys for three books at the same time. Then, as luck would have it, I was called back to active duty in the Army.

We returned to Lawrence a couple of days before New Year's of 1953. On our first day in town, on the way to lunch in the Union cafeteria, we encountered a group of people including Murphy (who had become Chancellor during my absence from campus) and George Baxter Smith, who had recently been named Dean of the University,

a position which had been vacant since the retirement of Ellis Stouffer in 1950. We were both struck by the cordiality with which Murphy and Smith greeted us; later that same day we ran into Mrs. G. B. Smith, who was also exceptionally friendly. In retrospect, we have concluded that this reception was related to the next event which did not take place, however, until the following fall.

We were invited to dinner at the house of George Baxter Smith; this was startling since we had no reason to expect such an invitation. What was even more startling was that the only other guests were the Murphys, and Kenneth Anderson, the new dean of Education, and his wife. After dinner, Murphy and Smith proceeded to cross-examine me on a whole range of topics, though mostly they were interested in knowing how much thinking I had done about questions of educational policy. As Smith confirmed to me later, I was being looked over for the deanship of the College which Paul Lawson was due to relinquish at the end of that academic year.

George Waggoner, whom Murphy finally chose for the job, was quite clearly much better qualified than I. He had been an associate dean for several years at Indiana -- and he was a member

of K. U. 's fabulous class of '36, the most notable member of which, of course, was the Chancellor himself. Among the several critical personnel decisions which Murphy made in his nine years as Chancellor the appointment of George Waggoner stands out as the best and most successful one.

A number of coincidences brought George and me into close collaboration and personal friendship. Even before the identity of the new dean had become known, I had been elected to the College Administrative Committee. Under Lawson, that body had lingered and had rarely served as more than a rubber stamp. Waggoner let it be known at once that he would expect the committee to assume the key role which it had originally been intended to have. From the fall of 1954 on, the committee met with him at least once a week and became the principal agent for educational policy-making in the College. More importantly, however, when we were at last able to move out of an apartment into a house of our own, we discovered that our neighbor across the street was none other than the new dean. The agenda of the Administrative Committee soon came to be talked over on the way to and from the campus; the informality of the neighborhood made it possible for us to continue our daytime discussions into evenings and weekends. I

came to share George's plans for an honors program and to make some small contributions to these plans. When Carnegie provided money for a half-time position in the College Office to run the new Honors Program, I was eager to take the job.

The working relationship of the years that followed was almost ideal. George and I functioned very much as a team, with the veteran Gilbert Ulmer (who had served as assistant dean under Lawson since 1941) a most congenial helper. In 1958 we were able to persuade Veda Gibson, (the widow of Hilden Gibson and herself a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University) to assume the role of office manager for the College Office, and her sensitivity and grace dramatically transformed the image of the dean's office in the minds of students and faculty alike. The Honors Program was successful beyond our fondest expectations. Shortly, K. U. undergraduates carted off national honors such as Rhodes Scholarships and Woodrow Wilson Fellowships at a rate better than the largest State universities and second only to the most prestigious of the private institutions. It was perhaps no accident that everyone of K. U.'s Rhodes Scholars between 1956 and 1966 started out as one of my honors advisees.

In 1957, Murphy had the opportunity to name no less than

three new deans. Two of them, John McNown in Engineering and Jim Surface in Business, had been undergraduates at K. U., McNown in the class of 1936. The third, Major Slough in Law, had been on the faculty since shortly after World War II, and I had come to know him well. McNown and Surface had known Waggoner, though not well, but as luck would have it, they both acquired homes in the same block where George and I lived. A year earlier, Kenneth Anderson of Education had bought a house just two doors to the south from us. The 1100 block of Highland Drive became, for a few short years, "Deans' Row." Increasingly, our little group came to be Murphy's preferred circle of advisers.

It was with this group, then, that Murphy first discussed his view of the need of a strong international dimension for the University.

In fact, K. U. had long ago begun to move in that direction. Though it may only have been a coincidence, the University could point to the fact that its first Ph. D. was awarded, just before the turn of the century, to a foreign student, a mathematician from Switzerland. After World War II, the energetic chairman of the German department, J. A. ("Toni") Burzle, with the support of John Nelson, the dean of the Graduate School, developed a network

of student exchanges with universities in Europe. He also was the originator of an annual orientation program for foreign students which the U. S. Department of State has consistently supported and held up as a model to others.

Another imaginative venture in international studies owes much to K. U.'s receptiveness. In 1949, Chancellor Malott was attending a conference in Lucknow, India, and there he met Phillips Talbot, who developed for him the plan that eventually would become the American Universities Field Staff. Malott was intrigued and invited Talbot to visit Lawrence, deliver a lecture on India, and then explain his idea to a representative faculty group.

I was included in this group which included one or two persons from each of the areas that could be assumed to have an interest in Talbot's proposal. The essence of that plan was the creation of a consortium of six to twelve U. S. universities to support a group of area specialists (initially these would be individuals whose specialization had been sponsored and directed by the Institute of Current World Affairs). These men would be on a three-year cycle, of which two years would be spent in the field and the third year in the United States visiting and lecturing at the member institutions. In addition, the member institutions would

receive multiple copies of reports from the specialists in the field.

Our group was impressed by this plan and by the contributions it could make to K.U.'s academic programs. We recommended to the Chancellor that K.U. commit itself to enter into the proposed consortium, provided that five or more other universities also joined. K.U.'s commitment was the first one and enabled Talbot to obtain other commitments and to start the AUFS operation. Half seriously and half in jest, Talbot's session with our group has been referred to as the birth of the AUFS and I as the only one of the midwives who has remained with the organization throughout its life.

Murphy had recognized the value of the AUFS and, for most of his years as Chancellor, he served actively as chairman of AUFS' board of trustees. But he has also encouraged the addition of resident faculty strength and by the middle fifties three nuclei of potential ^{strength} in international studies had emerged. These area programs (Latin America, East Asia, and the Slavic and Soviet Area) were included in the 1957 budget request as line items (at the magnificent sum of \$20,000 each); with the approval of the budget by the legislature we were thereafter in a position to say that our international dimension had been formally endorsed by Regents and legislature, and we were also in a position to say to faculty members

pressing for developments into other areas that we had made our choice of areas in which to concentrate and that official approval of these areas precluded expansion into others.

Murphy, meanwhile, had also been drawn into the various international activities then being sponsored by the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and other agencies. In the summer of 1958, he was in the first group of American university presidents invited to visit the Soviet Union; almost as soon as he returned, he left for South America for a meeting of the Carnegie-sponsored Council on Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR), of which he was then the U. S. co-chairman. In September, he and K. U. entertained a group (led by Sir Eric Ashby) of over twenty vice-chancellors and similar officials from universities in the British Commonwealth. Shortly thereafter, Murphy was appointed to a special committee established by the Ford Foundation to define the role of the American university in world affairs (the Morrill Committee). Even before this committee began its deliberations, he decided that K. U. should produce its own response to the same questions and to this end he set up a University committee on "The University and World Affairs." I was asked to chair this group which included, among others, W. P. Smith, later

to be dean of Engineering, Jim Surface, dean of the School of Business, and W. Clarke Wescoe, dean of the School of Medicine.

I had met Wescoe about five years earlier when my wife and I were invited to join a dinner-discussion group originally based at the Medical Center and spearheaded by Dr. Albert N. Lemoine, Jr., the chairman of the Department of Ophthalmology. We remained members of this group throughout the years and in the late fifties and early sixties acted as the Lawrence "conveners" and, with the Lemoines, as the program committee. Although the Wescoes were not among the most regular participants, they came often enough and we came to know them well. Later, when I was given the responsibility for relations with medical schools in the College Office, a professional dimension was added to the social contacts. The Committee on the University and World Affairs (which took advantage of Wescoe's offer of hospitality to hold several meetings away from the Lawrence campus) served to reinforce the relationship.

Meanwhile, Murphy's work with CHEAR had brought him into a close personal association with Lic. Rodrigo Facio, the imaginative rector of the University of Costa Rica. After an exchange of visits at the chancellor-rector level, an agreement was

reached to establish a close working relationship between Kansas and Costa Rica. When Murphy mentioned these plans to John Gardner who was then the president of the Carnegie Corporation, Gardner indicated that Carnegie would be willing (indeed eager) to support some facet of this proposed relationship, provided (1) it offered a new approach, and (2) the proposal could be in his hands within a matter of days. As soon as Murphy returned from New York, he shared this information with Waggoner. That evening George and I sat up together until way past midnight brainstorming possibilities. By noon of the next day the outline of the Costa Rica Faculty Project was on Murphy's desk (it was a Saturday and I had typed it myself).

Within another year, our relationships with Costa Rica had taken on concrete forms. A junior year program was in operation, a dozen faculty members (with families) spent the month of August there as the first phase of their participation in the Carnegie Project. Soon Costa Rican students began to come to Lawrence in numbers sufficient to make the citizens of that small country the third-largest component among our foreign student population. We trained and conducted a Peace Corps project in the country. By 1966 we had come to know Costa Rica so well that a number of

us were on first name terms with both major candidates in that country's Presidential election.

At the same time, other foreign study opportunities developed. "Toni" Burzle originated the idea of the Summer Language Institutes and beginning in 1960 we sent upwards of 120 students each summer to locations in Germany, France, and Spain to get their second-year language instruction in the native setting. Again with Burzle's pioneering effort leading the way, a Junior Year in Bonn was set up beginning in 1964. The following year, by a reciprocal agreement with the University of Colorado, our students began to go to Bordeaux, France. Administratively, these ventures were all part of my responsibilities in the College Office.

At the same time, the implementation of the report prepared by the committee I had chaired on the University and World Affairs led to the establishment of a Committee on International Educational Affairs, of which I was named the acting chairman. In addition to a full inventory of University resources in international education, this committee was charged with the preparation of a major proposal to the Ford Foundation which resulted, in 1963, in a five-year grant of half a million dollars for international education. Ford had stipulated the establishment of an office to administer international

programs and the committee thus was transformed from an operational and planning group into an advisory committee. Prior to this, however, additional grants had been received from Ford and Carnegie in support of specific plans so that the committee's work could be said to have yielded nearly \$800,000 in outside funds. Without a doubt, the fact that the Endowment Association had provided a one-time grant of \$100,000 in 1962 carried much weight with the foundations as they considered our proposals. The vigorous thrust of our activities, possibly aided by my intensive participation in the work of such national groups as the Institute of International Education and the Council on Student Travel, resulted in the University's being cited by IIE in 1964 with the IIE-Reader's Digest Award in International Education. The award was accompanied by a monetary grant of \$1,000 which was to go to the person at the University who had contributed the most to the development of these activities. "Toni" Burzle and I were announced by the Chancellor as the two persons to share this award.

My other activities in the College Office continued even as the international activities took more and more of my time. The directorship of the Honors Program led me to a place on the regional selection committee of the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Program

which, in turn, brought me into association with the director of that program, Dr. Hans Rosenhaupt. It was probably he who began to advance my name for administrative positions at other institutions. The first inquiry of this kind which I decided to pursue with any degree of seriousness came from Wayne State University and I went there for an interview for the Arts and Sciences deanship in March, 1960. It was more of a trial run for me than anything else, since I was fairly certain that I would not want to exchange Lawrence for a metropolitan urban setting; in addition, I knew that Waggoner was the front runner for the presidency of the University of Oregon and I assumed that, if he decided to leave, I would stand a good chance of succeeding him. Before either of us, however, could face this issue, we (and the University community as a whole) were surprised and shocked by the announcement that Murphy would leave K. U. for the chancellorship of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Griffin's history does a pretty good job of describing the incredible tensions between Murphy and Governor George Docking. While I did not feel that I knew Docking well -- not nearly as well, for instance, as I knew his wife or his son Robert -- Murphy had asked me on several occasions to act as an intermediary between him and the Governor. The occasion I remember best was on the

day after the 1958 election. Murphy had been convinced that Clyde Reed, the Republican candidate and also, incidentally, the immediate past national president of the K. U. Alumni Association, would win; he had made no bones about his own efforts to help Reed's candidacy. On the day after the election, a whole busload of us were scheduled to go to Hutchinson for a regional alumni meeting. Murphy had conceived of these "extravaganzas" as a kind of saturation public relations effort. He took most of the deans and their wives; the program was a panel presentation moderated by him. Bob Vosper, a remarkable type of a librarian, was one anchor man of the team, and I was the other. Usually two other faculty members or administrators would round out the panel. We would go out on the University bus to arrive before lunch, put on a program for the local radio or TV station, then have a large evening gathering for the alumni. We had done this successfully in Topeka, Johnson County, Parsons and Great Bend. Hutchinson was to cover the southwestern part of the State.

The gloom on that bus going out to Hutchinson was so thick one could have cut it with a knife. Murphy looked like he had not been to bed all night. After we got to Hutchinson, he called Irv Youngberg and me into a private room and engaged us in a two-hour

session on how one might go about restoring good relations with the Governor. (The record shows that we did not succeed.)

Murphy's resignation threw the campus into a complete turmoil. An assembly in Hoch Auditorium the next day was a moving, teary affair. But the main concern was who would be picked to take his place, in the face of the Governor's public statement that he saw no need for a wide search, that in his opinion the presidents of Emporia KSTC, Pittsburg, and Wichita, and our own George Baxter Smith would all be excellent choices. I did not know then, but the Regents knew that he had already applied effective pressure on three of the Regents not to cast their votes for anyone unless it was one of the four persons he had mentioned.

The confused state of the faculty was made evident to me when on the day after the announcement of Murphy's resignation, Professor Oswald Backus of the History Department came to see me and urged me to allow him to advance my name as a candidate for the vacant position. Happily, even as I was stalling for time to clear my mind in the face of this unexpected suggestion, I learned that the Regents had decided to move rapidly and had persuaded the dean of the Medical School, Clarke Wescoe, to take the job. This seemed to me in every respect an excellent solution. Clarke was

fairly well known on the Lawrence campus and, more importantly, very favorably known to the legislature and around the State. Personally, I was delighted.

I did not know then but learned soon that Wescoe had to be subjected to heavy pressure before he would accept. His wife was most reluctant to move to Lawrence (and, it is fair to say, never was quite happy here). He was worried about the presence in the Chancellor's Office of George Baxter Smith, with whom he had had numerous disagreements throughout the Murphy years.

At the time Franklin Murphy succeeded to the Chancellorship, the No. 2 spot had been vacant for a year. Following the retirement of Ellis Stauffer, Malott had not named anyone to the position of "Dean of the University." Whether this was in anticipation of his own departure or for other reasons, I do not know. In any case, Murphy inherited the vacancy, but he, too, left it unfilled for over a year. Finally, in the fall of 1952, he named Smith, who was then Dean of the School of Education. I suspect -- but do not know -- that Murphy tried to find someone from outside the University -- there is no other explanation for the time lapse -- before he turned to Smith; and that he chose Smith for two reasons: one was that among the deans (except for Gorton, who had come to Fine Arts

just two years earlier) Smith was closer in age and (presumably) outlook to Murphy than any of the rest of them (Lawson was 62, Nelson 54, Carr in Engineering 58, etc.), and secondly because he had the reputation of being very adept at staff work.

It turned out, as the Murphy years went on, that neither assumption was correct. Smith and Murphy came to disagree sharply on matters of educational policy and their administrative styles frequently clashed. Wescoe was much more Murphy's type. Thus Wescoe at once expressed doubts that he could work with Smith. Murphy assured him that this would be no problem because Smith would be gone before Wescoe took over. Murphy's assumption here was that he (Murphy) would have no difficulty securing a presidency for Smith. He was aware of the fact that Smith was under consideration at Ohio University and at Arizona State. With a strong recommendation from him, Murphy felt certain that Smith would be offered one or the other of these two spots. As it happened, however, neither place made an offer -- the rumor had it that faculty committees at each place had obtained comments from colleagues at K. U., which comments served to eliminate Smith from further consideration. Thus, when Clarke Wescoe assumed the Chancellorship on July 1, 1960, the No. 2 position in the University

was still held by George Baxter Smith. It proved to be one of the major problems Wescoe had to face.

George Baxter Smith would probably have made an excellent president for an institution of a somewhat different kind than K. U. He had come through the doctoral program at Columbia Teachers College and was thoroughly imbued with its philosophy. He had long public school experience (though not at the policy level) and this probably conditioned him to give highest priority to satisfying public demands, i. e., making sure that the public (and its representatives) were not dissatisfied. These views clashed sharply with the emphasis on excellence to which Murphy had given such impetus. Almost as soon as Wescoe became Chancellor, these differences came to manifest themselves in a variety of minor, but cumulatively disturbing, conflicts. Eventually, some of the deans suggested that Wescoe hire a consulting firm to undertake a management survey of the University. Wescoe responded by asking Dean James Surface of the School of Business to make the survey.

Out of this survey came a reorganization of the central administration which went into effect in 1962. There were now four vice chancellors: Raymond Nichols' role in budgeting and fiscal matters was recognized by designating him Vice Chancellor for

Finance in addition to his former title of Executive Secretary; George Baxter Smith retained his title of Dean of the University but was designated Vice Chancellor for Institutional Planning, Keith Lawton was styled Vice Chancellor for Physical Plant Operations; but the major innovation was the creation of the position of Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculties -- essentially an academic vice president and clearly the No. 2 slot in the administration. It is my understanding that Wescoe offered this position first to George Waggoner who declined it. It was then offered to, and accepted by, Jim Surface. Smith was limited to institutional research, the summer session, liaison with ROTC, and university extension.

With Surface's move out of the School of Business, the Murphy appointees among the deans began to yield to new faces. The preceding year, it had become necessary for Wescoe to request the resignation in the middle of the year of the dean of the Law School, Major Slough, in the face of substantial allegations of homosexual activities with students. The Law School went for a year and a half with an acting dean before James K. Logan took over. In Engineering, John McNown's initial spurt of imaginative planning had been blunted by the onset of declining enrollments while the dean's interests were being drawn into other directions, especially the challenge of

introducing engineering education into Africa. After some leaves of absence, he resigned in 1965, being succeeded by the chairman of the department of electrical engineering, William P. Smith.

Less dramatic but of no less impact on the University was the change in the family conditions of Dean George R. Waggoner of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In the spring of 1960, Waggoner had been in negotiations with the University of Oregon, where he appeared to be the preferred candidate for the presidency. He learned, however, that his wife was suffering from cancer -- and withdrew from further consideration at Oregon. Similarly, the following year, he declined to be considered at Indiana, even though it had been an open secret that he was Herman Wells' candidate, and George clearly wanted the job. If Helen Waggoner's illness served to keep Waggoner in Lawrence, his remarriage just nine months after her death had the result of changing his perceptions and approach -- and thus affected his impact on the University as a whole.

Among the early participants in the "Lemoine Circle" was a young couple by the name of Ashton. He was an engineer with Trans World Airlines, she worked in continuing education at the University of Kansas City. In 1956, he was among the passengers of a TWA

plane which collided in mid-air above the Grand Canyon with a United Airlines plane and, along with all other occupants of the two planes, he died in the collision. Barbara, left with two gradeschool-age children, threw herself even more intensively into continuing education activities. In November of 1960, she invited me to be the principal speaker at a conference on women in higher education. I had a conflict, but suggested that I could ask George Waggoner, (whom she did not know) to do it. Seven months later they were married.

Barbara Waggoner was, however, not content with the essentially supportive role which Helen had played. She needed a role of her own. Two attempts to establish such a role through graduate work failed, but George's growing interest in Latin America came to provide precisely the vehicle she needed. Increasingly, she succeeded in persuading him that he should seek and accept assignments in Latin America. He took the first such extended absence in 1964 when he was gone for nearly four months. From then on, he averaged three months out of every year in Latin America; more importantly, those working closest with him came to believe that he was far more interested in his work in Latin America than he was in the problems of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Thus the reorganization of the administrative structure came to coincide with a period of fluidity at the level of the deans. This was accentuated by the fact that Surface was disinclined to make decisions. His favorite expression, "The answer is maybe, and that is final," intended to be funny, came to be seen by many as reflecting a basic attitude.

The spring semester of 1965 produced the first series of campus crises. I was out of the country at the time, having taken my first sabbatical since coming to K. U. 17 years earlier. While I was gone, three events occurred which had far-reaching consequences. The first of these was the decision to raze Fraser Hall. The second was the removal of the track coach, "Bill" Easton. The third was a highly publicized sit-in in the Chancellor's office, mostly by black students.

The need to replace Fraser Hall had long been obvious. The building had no foundation and had become increasingly more hazardous to occupy. Plans for a new structure had been underway for some time, but in early spring of 1965 the issue was precipitated by orders from the State Fire Marshall that the building had either to be made safe (a matter of several hundred thousand dollars) or it had to be vacated. Chancellor Wescoe had no choice but to take

the latter course of action, a decision which aroused strong emotions both on the campus and among alumni. For years afterwards, the razing of Fraser Hall was a continuing source of disaffection among alumni, fanned by faculty members in architecture and the arts whose principal objection was that the replacement structure was not an exact replica of the old landmark (and, in the eyes of many, an eyesore!).

I cannot claim to know what precipitated the removal of Bill Easton as coach of the track team. But it is fair to say that Bill had a strong following among alumni and that his removal came so abruptly as to give rise to criticism and resentment from many quarters. Although the decision was, of course, primarily that of the Athletic Director (Wade Stinson), the blame again focused on Wescoe.

The sit-in by the black students and others in sympathy with them served to contribute to Wescoe's feelings of frustration and the handling of the event did nothing to strengthen his position in any quarter. Among those arrested was Gale Sayers, a senior All-American football player (the following year, playing for the Chicago Bears, he was named the Outstanding Rookie Player in professional football); his presence assured nationwide publicity. (In fact, I

learned of the event because the Paris edition of the New York Herald-Tribune carried a report of the arrest of Gale Sayers in its sports section!)

The total impact of the events of that particular spring was to leave both Wescoe and Surface with a strong desire to extricate themselves. For Wescoe, however, there was the commitment he had made to a major program of celebration and fund-raising in connection with the University's centennial. As long as this commitment preoccupied him, he concealed his personal feelings with great care. Only those of us closest to him got an occasional inkling of his "presidential fatigue."

Surface was less circumscribed although he, too, appreciated the fact that a resignation without evident reason would be subject to a great deal of speculation, much of it probably less than helpful to the University. He did, however, still have close ties to the Harvard Business School where he had been on the faculty before he returned to K. U. in 1957, and he was able to arrange to be invited to come there as a visiting professor for the academic year 1967-68. He and Wescoe agreed that he would take leave to accept this invitation and that it would be left open whether he would then return to K. U. in the same capacity or in some other.

Surface's title had been changed to Provost and Dean of Faculties in 1966, largely to make it clear that he was indeed the No. 2 man on the Lawrence campus and not merely one of a group of vice chancellors. In a related change, the dean of the School of Medicine (Arden Miller) was designated Provost of the Kansas City campus. Both changes reflected the fact that, following the consolidation of the Medical School in Kansas City (a project dear to Wescoe's heart while he was dean), the two segments of the University became increasingly unrelated. Moreover, the provosts were, so Wescoe announced, to allow the Chancellor more time to devote to the external relations of the University, especially the "Program for Progress" as the major fund campaign started in the Centennial year came to be styled.

Surface - and Wescoe - assumed that the responsibilities of principal administrator (Provost) and chief academic officer (Dean of Faculties) would soon prove too much for one person and plans were made early to divide them. To this end I was asked to move into the Chancellor's office as Associate Dean of Faculties in July, 1966, with the explicit (but not publicized) assignment of understudying Surface; on July 1, 1967, I would then become Dean of Faculties, and, while Surface was at Harvard for the academic

year 1967-68, also Acting Provost. After Surface returned (if he returned) in 1968, the two positions would, for the first time, be divided among two persons.

To add to the burden which became mine in the summer of 1967, the committee appointed by Surface to recommend a successor to the Dean of Students, Laurence E. Woodruff, who had reached the mandatory retirement age, had become deadlocked and we saw no alternative but to place these responsibilities also on my desk until such a time as the impasse could be resolved.

If the load was heavy, it was eased by the nature of my relationship with Wescoe. It was apparently his view that I had to be able to function as his alter ego. He thus encouraged me to look at his incoming mail and he made it a practice to provide me with carbons of any but the most personal letters he wrote. To a slightly lesser degree, this was also the way he related to Ray Nichols. Both Ray and I were free to walk into his office at any time, peruse material on his desk, or join him if he was in conference. Neither of us, I believe, abused the invitation, but it was significant as an indication of how the Chancellor wanted his immediate staff to function.

Wescoe had a remarkably warm personality and he was at

his best when -- as we would refer to it behind his back -- he could "play doctor." His tendency was to take a problem and try to "heal it"; he was less inclined to think in terms of broad policy and there is little in his public statements that addresses itself to policies. In retrospect, his 1961 Humanities Lecture ("Preparation for a Profession") probably revealed more of himself than anything else he said for the record.

He was, like Murphy and Malott before him, an excellent public speaker. Also like his predecessors, he quickly gained prominence on the national higher education scene. Commitments requiring frequent absences from campus multiplied. Thus, while I served as acting provost, he was president of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Chairman of a committee set up by the Markle Foundation to study the governance of medical schools, member of an HEW committee to assess future needs in medical education, a featured speaker at the World Health Congress in New Delhi, India, etc., etc. His absences from the campus were thus frequent, but he made it a practice whenever he was gone to call in daily. At the same time, he expected me to make the necessary decisions in his absence and never failed to back me in public (privately he

occasionally disagreed, but there was never a difference of major importance or on a major issue.)

In some ways, 1967-68 was a good year. We had a significant increase in enrollment, resulting in the opportunity to add approximately one hundred positions to the faculty - by far the largest increase in any year. We added some excellent people: Clifford Clark, a K. U. alumnus, came from New York University to become dean of the School of Business; David Heron was enticed away from the University of Nevada to take over the directorship of the University Libraries. Faculty quality was added in virtually every quarter.

But the year also saw, as it did elsewhere throughout the country, a marked increase in student unrest. It began in the fall when the Director of Libraries, (Thomas Buckman), without clearing the matter with anyone in the central administration, announced that budgetary constraints would make it necessary to close the main library an hour earlier each evening. Almost at once, students began to collect names to a petition protesting the move; both the Chancellor and I let it be known that we were pleased by this expression of student concern. We were less pleased when this was followed by a poster campaign summoning students to

prevent the earlier closing of the library by a sit-in. Wescoe prevailed on the Regents to release an amount sufficient to restore the hour of daily service. The next day Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) claimed that they had demonstrated that "student power" could force "the establishment" to its knees.

As was true on most college campuses, K. U. had only a tiny group of students who could be called "militant." In 1966-67, a graduate student in English, Hamilton Salsich, emerged as a highly articulate spokesman for the New Left. I liked Salsich and found him easy to talk with. He was intellectual, well-read, and pointedly opposed to violence. The newspapers, both on campus and downtown, found him easy to quote and thus overstated his importance. If anything, he was probably a moderating influence. Younger member of the (never rigidly organized) group would randomly become visible as more radical activists.

"The Street," however -- the area from about 11th to about 14th Streets between Kentucky and Louisiana -- was peopled by many who were not students at all. Some were dropouts, some drifters, some were stopping in "River City" on the way between coasts. Lawrence was not only a waystation; it was also a supply point. As the drug culture spread, the fact that marijuana grows

wild in Kansas soon became widely known. Some of Lawrence's "street people" prospered like capitalists, selling and trading "grass." (Some years later, some of them actually produced a film on the "Kaw Valley Hemp Pickers" which CBS bought and gave a nationwide viewing!)

A third element contributing to tension was the racial situation. Griffin's history describes the status of black students at the University in the twenties and thirties. Conversations with Elmer Jackson and other black alumni confirm that, except for the classroom, the black student's life at K. U. was totally segregated. As was true in many other places, the breakdown of racial barrier was spearheaded by those two pet aversions of the "good" liberal faculty member, athletics and the military.

With his preeminence on the national basketball scene at stake, coach Phog Allen recruited the first black varsity athlete (Lavannes Squires) about 1950 or 1951. When Chuck Mather was brought to K. U. in 1954, from Massillon, Ohio, as football coach, he brought with him several blacks who had played on his undefeated high school team, including Homer Floyd (later the executive director of the Kansas Civil Rights Commission) and Russell Stephenson (who went into the ministry where he quickly gained widespread

recognition). By the time Wilt Chamberlain arrived in 1956, only his height was unusual, not his color.

The three ROTC units had been under orders from Washington since 1947 to open enrollment to blacks and the Air Force in particular began to number blacks regularly amongs its cadets. This is not to say that discrimination disappeared. When a selection committee (of which I was a member) in the early sixties picked a black girl as queen of the Military Ball, the chill that received her was nearly overpowering. (She was, incidentally, the first black girl ever so honored at K. U.)

The black students' principal concern was, however, with the problems they faced in the community. Restaurants and barberships refused to serve them while movie theaters banished them to the balcony. Without fanfare and publicity, Don Alderson, the assistant dean of men, worked constantly -- and with some success -- to break down the merchants' resistance. But Lawrence, once the outposts of anti-slavery sentiment, was rife with intolerance. By 1967, racially-based fights at the high school had become the order of the day. A highly verbal militant organizer, Leonard Harrison, (after 1971 a fugitive from justice in Tanzania), successfully stimulated the radicalization of the young blacks in town.

This was the setting in 1967-68. If the tension atmosphere had not sufficed, other problems also contributed to Wescoe's "presidential fatigue." In 1966, Robert Docking, the son of George Docking who, as Governor, had so openly feuded with Franklin Murphy, was elected Governor. Wescoe had not been as outspokenly in support of the Republican candidate as Murphy had been in 1958, but his political leanings and his associations were predominantly Republican (his father-in-law, the late Judge Benton, had long been a power in Republican politics in Wyandotte County). He had few connections to the new Governor who, although an outspokenly loyal K. U. alumnus, was firmly committed to budgetary restraint and lowered taxes.

In the legislature, the overpowering presence of Paul Wunsch had vanished. Glee Smith (Law '47), elected to take Wunsch's place as senate president pro tem, had shown no inclination to use the reins of Senate leadership in the same manner. John Conard, as Speaker, might have stepped into the vacuum left by Wunsch's departure, but his sights were on the Governorship in '68 and he chose caution rather than strength as the means to gain political support.

In Washington, the first signs of what would soon manifest

itself as massive disenchantment with higher education could be observed though most educators failed to perceive their significance. Cutbacks in Federal funding were, to be sure, vexing, but few expected that they would be anything but temporary. The assumption was that, once the military activities in Vietnam came to an end, the resources siphoned off by this effort would become available for domestic programs, notably the support of education.

The war in Vietnam also affected the area of private giving. Taxes rose and inflation caused the wealthy to seek shelter for their liquid assets in investments of relative security. K. U.'s major fund drive, the "Program for Progress," was in trouble. (Eventually, in 1969, the University would announce that the goal of \$18.3 million had not only been met but exceeded; but this result would never have been reached except for the fact that two large estates yielded nearly five million of the total.)

Part of the fund drive's problem was in its organization. A Chicago firm had been employed to make a feasibility survey, out of which there came the figure of \$18.3 million as the goal for the drive. The Chicagoans submitted a bid for the management of the drive itself, with 5% of the gross as their fee. The staff of the Endowment Association calculated that for one-third of that amount

they could do it themselves, and that was the decision. In practice, the "in-house" team was never able to muster the persistent follow-through that was required. In addition, they relied almost entirely on Wescoe to obtain major gifts. By the spring of 1968 some relief was found for him when I and a few others were drafted to make some fund-raising trips, but basically the burden was on Wescoe's shoulders.

Two major items that had been included in the "shopping list" of the drive were to be new buildings: a new structure for the Museum of Art and a new building for the Law School. Wescoe assumed -- entirely correctly I think -- that there was no chance of getting State funds for a museum; assisted by Marilyn Stokstad, the lively and enthusiastic director of the Museum of Art, he spent many days cultivating a Tulsa couple who had indicated interest in the project. He came so close that one morning in the spring of 1968 the wife called to say they would do it; the same afternoon the husband decided to take the three million dollars and invest them in Florida real estate!

The story of the law building was equally disheartening. The need for a new building to house the School of Law had been made convincingly by the dean, James K. Logan, and given considerable

publicity among members of the legal profession. The legislative climate, however, seemed unfavorable, especially in the light of considerable public discussion in the legislature of a proposal to merge the school with Washburn's, presumably in Topeka. Under these circumstances, Wescoe determined, and Logan agreed, that it would be best to seek private funds for a new building. Accordingly, a new Law Center was identified as one major goal of the "Program for Progress."

Apparently, however, the ability (or willingness?) of the legal profession to raise funds for this purpose had been badly misjudged. In spite of determined efforts by Wescoe and Logan, less than one-sixth of the amount required was contributed. When Logan resigned in 1968, he cited the failure to make progress toward a new building as one of his principal reasons.

Although he reserved such comments to the privacy of the office, Wescoe resented the implication that he, the Chancellor, had not done enough. He was, in fact, increasingly bitter about the faculty and the deans and what he believed to be their lack of appreciation of his efforts. Comments expressing this bitterness were made with increasing frequency to such intimates as Nichols, Surface, and me.

The most extreme manifestation came after Commencement in June, 1968. I do not know how far back the custom goes to have the deans and the Chancellor's staff gather for a post-Commencement party. In any case, this year we acted as host for the gathering. The Chancellor and his wife usually are invited to drop in at other parties as well, so that the deans' party is usually in full swing by the time they arrive. So it was also this year. And, as had also become almost traditional, the Minnesotans in the group (Kenneth Anderson, George Baxter Smith, and W. P. Smith) were leading the singing. The Wescoes moved through the group in the living room and sat down in the family room, where there were only two or three people, Jim Logan being one of them. I brought drinks to the Wescoes but then went back to the kitchen where the bar was set up. It could not have been more than half an hour later that Wescoe came into the kitchen, visibly agitated, said that he had never been so insulted in his life, and announced that they were leaving. His comments were laced with profanities aimed at the deans who, he said, were "bastards who didn't even know enough to know which side their bread was buttered on." I followed him out of the house to try to calm him down, but his anger was not to be quelled.

He recovered sufficiently after he got home to call me and say that he knew that my wife and I were completely blameless. But he reiterated his resentment at the failure of the deans to acknowledge that he had brought the University through a most difficult year, in fact the failure of most of them to speak to him at all.

What made the latter part of 1967-68 so difficult for Wescoe included, in addition to conditions and events already mentioned, three developments that he took rather personally: the initiation of the new governance system, the fiasco of the humanities building, and the strident voice of the S. D. S.

The University Senate, in a form established in the administration of Frank Strong and only slightly modified in the thirties, had long been virtually inoperative. Since academic matters had always been under the jurisdiction of the several schools, faculty interest in the Senate was minimal. Occasionally there were eloquent pleas (such as Jim Maloney's, described in considerable detail in Griffin's book) for the faculty to betake itself and act responsibly, but nothing ever came of them.

In 1965, the Senate Advisory Committee (actually a steering committee) under the chairmanship of Charles K. Warriner (Sociology)

obtained Senate authorization for a thoroughgoing re-examination of the Senate's function. The Warriner proposal received extensive discussion in 1966-67. Its major premise was that there should be separation of powers along classical lines, with the Senate as the legislature. The Chancellor was to be specifically excluded from the Senate, vice chancellors and deans to be allowed to attend but denied the vote. The Senate divided sharply into those who saw the University as a "conflict society" and those who perceived it as a joint venture.

After lengthy debate, the Warriner draft was returned to the Senate Advisory Committee, now chaired by Ambrose Saricks (History). Saricks, who had just (on my suggestion) been named associate dean of the Graduate School, was clearly of the "joint venture" persuasion and under his direction a new draft was prepared which the Senate approved. The Chancellor accepted the reform proposal (which placed him in the chair of both the Senate and the newly-created University Council) but he frequently alluded to the anti-administration sentiment that had been so vocally evident and which -- regrettably (and I think erroneously) -- he viewed as faculty animosity toward him.

In fact, the new pattern soon worked quite smoothly, due in large part to Saricks, who had been elected chairman of the Senate

Executive Committee (SenEx). He welcomed my suggestion for regular weekly meetings between him and me (as Acting Provost) and I made every effort (including paying SenEx' huge mimeographing and mailing bills) to be helpful to the new operation. Wescoe also found Saricks easy to work with but worried considerably over the potentialities of the system if someone of more aggressive inclinations should become its spokesman. But even with Saricks at the helm, he saw the new system as an added burden to himself.

One of the things I did not come to appreciate fully until quite late was the fact that Wescoe's experience was deeply rooted in the practices and tradition of medicine. Hospitals -- and medical schools -- are almost of necessity authoritarian in character. Clarke had learned to talk the language of academia, but he felt more comfortable in hierarchical settings.

For that reason, I surmise, he preferred the company of those of his associates who clearly worked for him. Next to Nichols this meant Keith Lawton, whose role as chief coordinator of the physical plant he had -- somewhat to the dismay of the faculty -- distinguished with the title "Vice Chancellor." Lawton, it should be said, had always been an indefatigable worker and a source of seemingly unlimited optimism. Wescoe often sent him to speak to alumni where

his enthusiasm easily overshadowed the mayhem he committed on the King's English.

Lawton had primary responsibility for the University's master plan for the sixties. The key to this plan was the removal of two old buildings (Robinson and Haworth) in the center of the campus and the erection in their place of a large structure to accommodate the humanities departments. When this building became available, most of the University would -- for the first time in its history -- be adequately housed.

Funds for the State's share of the construction were approved by the legislature in 1965 (a major share was to come from the Federal government under Titles I and II of the Higher Education Act). State law, however, requires that the State Architect select an associate architect for each major project; practice dictates that the selection meet with the Governor's approval. Thus selection of an architect becomes a matter of political patronage. In the case of the humanities building, the Governor (William Avery) took eight months before awarding the job to a Wichita firm.

The firm's representatives succeeded very quickly in gaining the confidence and fanning the enthusiasm of the administration and of the faculty building committee. It was obvious that they saw in

their assignment the opportunity to create a landmark structure. They seemed to be listening well and went to great pains to cross-check their visualizations with all concerned.

By January 1968, the architects had produced a striking design, a 26-story tower on a base of three circular, inter-connecting "pods." Word of the unusual design proposal soon became common knowledge (there were eleven members on the faculty building committee alone) and the Chancellor came under considerable pressure to make it public. The Journal-World, which had been the source of much of the pressure, gave the plan extensive and attractive coverage; the impact was most favorable.

Unfortunately, the release of the design had been premature. In spite of repeated questions by Wescoe, the architects had not stayed within the authorized dollar limits. They had grossly underestimated the costs of such items as the high-speed elevators required to serve the tower and, more importantly, they had totally ignored the rapid increase in labor costs which had followed a lengthy strike of the building construction unions in the Kansas City area.

This became evident as the bid specifications were being prepared. The architects, somewhat naively, suggested that, if

we really liked the design, we could certainly do as some of their other clients had done in like circumstances and obtain additional financing. In later days, the Board of Regents staff would charge that Keith Lawton should have monitored the architects' work more closely, and Keith would assert that the State Architect's Office had been remiss in this respect. I was never able to determine what the facts were, but there was no doubt of the result: the lowest bid was well in excess of the funds available. The tower could not be built; two years of planning effort had been wasted.

For Wescoe, this was a bitter pill. Clearly, he had conceived of the humanities building as the crowning monument to his years at K. U. He had reason to believe that the Regents would name the building after him. Already students were referring to the depression where Robinson Gymnasium had stood before it was razed as "Wescoe Hole"; and some began to claim it as a kind of "People's Park." It was the very opposite from what he had envisaged.

The new breed of students made Wescoe decidedly uncomfortable. He was the product of a Lutheran education, a fraternity man to whom the fraternity had in fact opened important doors (as ATO's "Man of the Year" he had not only won a scholarship that

enabled him to go to medical school, but met and married the national president's daughter; later at K. U. the fraternity linked him closely to A. H. "Red" Crumb, one of the most influential alumni leaders and member of the Board of Regents), and -- as previously noted -- his leanings were decidedly toward the conservative end of the political spectrum. The anger of the New Left militants he found difficult to deal with. Their manners and bearing appalled him. He always thought of himself as very open with students -- as indeed he was -- but he also expected to be treated with the kind of respect which he believed was due his position.

As was true on other campuses throughout the nation, the year 1967-68 had seen a marked increase in student militancy. More often than not, it fell to me, in the Chancellor's absence, to visit with the protesters. In late March of 1968, a group led by Hamilton Salsich had requested a meeting with the Chancellor to discuss their demand for the removal from the campus of the ROTC, the termination of national defense-related research, and a public statement condemning the war in Vietnam. Wescoe's calendar simply would not accommodate the necessary time, so I met with the group.

The date was April 2. There were roughly fifteen in the

group, enough to fill the Regents Room. A Kansan reporter asked if I had any objection to her taping the session. I said that, of course, I did not object. (Weeks later I would learn that the young woman was an S. D. S. member and the tape was primarily for that group's use against me.)

Largely due to Salsich's restraint, the session was strained but without unpleasantries. I took the traditional positions: as long as there were students who wished to pursue the ROTC curriculum, the University had an obligation to make the program available; the University should not dictate to faculty members what constituted research (and anyhow, there was no "military" research being conducted at K. U.); and, as a servant of society at large, the University must observe strict neutrality in all political controversies.

My responses obviously failed to satisfy the students. Several of them voiced their frustration; there was talk of a strike, of the need to get rid of "the establishment," of the (to them self-evident) proposition that the University should be what the students want it to be. I stood my ground, remaining as coldly formal as I could be. Finally, I was asked if I would be willing to debate my position at a public forum. I agreed to do so and the evening of April 23 was set for the event.

Shortly before noon on the 23rd, Steve Hollis, a former advisee of mine in the Honors Program, called and said that it was extremely urgent that he see me at once. I knew that Steve, following conviction for forgery of a drug prescription, had dropped out of school and was living among the "street people." But I had helped to arrange it so that Steve had been able to serve his sentence on weekends in Lawrence rather than to have to spend ninety days in the jail at Pittsburg and Steve appeared to feel under some obligation to me. What he had to tell me, he said, could not wait; furthermore, he could not be seen going into my office. He suggested we meet in the men's room in the basement of Bailey Hall.

The meeting that evening, Steve told me, was rigged to trap me and set the stage for a major confrontation on campus. The neutral moderator who had been agreed upon was to be called off campus by a fake telephone call from his family; I would be offered a replacement who, while ostensibly of similar qualifications, was actually an S. D. S. member. The S. D. S. had spent hours studying the tape of the April 2 meeting in order to phrase questions that would lead me to answer in a way that could be exploited to arouse student opinion. Steve thought I should refuse to go on.

I did not think I had any choice. Unfortunately my schedule

for the rest of the day was ^{so} hopelessly committed (the School of Pharmacy had an accreditation team on campus) that I could not even consult with others.

As Steve had predicted, the meeting had been well staged by the S. D. S. As I looked around the room, I saw about half a dozen friendly faculty faces (including Bill Argersinger and Bill Balfour) and a few ROTC-type burr haircuts. There were about 60 persons whom I judged to be, in one way or the other, associated with the S. D. S. Mike Maher, an associate professor of zoology, a highly vocal anti-war spokesman and reputedly an S. D. S. adviser, sat in the second row with a tape recorder. (In 1971, Maher was officially reprimanded for distributing marijuana cigarettes to students at his home for a seminar.)

In spite of the scenario, I thought things went fairly well for a while. It was clear to me, however, that Salsich was not calling the tune any more. That role had been assumed by Rick Atkinson, and Atkinson was generally regarded as one of the two or three most radical members of the S. D. S. on campus.

The fireworks came when questions were invited from the audience. The chairman allowed one of the ROTC to make a statement, but then there began what was obviously a pre-arranged

sequence, many of the questions of the "when-will-you-quit-beating-your-wife" type. Finally there came the clincher: would I not agree that the sole justification for a university was that it was composed of students and that therefore students should have power in the university?

I had assumed that a question like this would be asked and I had decided not to duck it. Yes, I said, a university without students was unthinkable, but so was a university without faculty. I spoke, I continued, from experience; I had been an active student leader in my days and I knew the problems. As a complex organization, the university could not move with dramatic speed and thus students could really never expect to affect the organization while they themselves could reap the benefits. "The fact is that students are transients---." The room exploded in jeers and catcalls. I had touched a sensitive nerve -- and I had also provided them, at long last, with an easy slogan for their campaign to radicalize the student body.

By the weekend, posters had appeared on campus asking "Are you a transient? Show them that this is your University."

I was out of town on an assignment for the North Central Association on Sunday and Monday. When I came back on campus

I found that a delegation had called on Wescoe with a set of demands which included that he disavow me publicly, that ROTC be banned from the campus, and that students be given 50% of the seats in the University Senate. Petitions were being circulated all over the campus inviting students to sign up if they did not think of themselves as transients. It was straight out of the S. D. S. handbook.

Unfortunately, the newly elected student body president, the first non-fraternity man in years, was totally bewildered by the developments. He seemed unable to gauge the extent to which the campaign was succeeding and at times seemed to reach the point where he felt that, in order to maintain his own position, he would need himself to embrace the attack. His two predecessors, Kyle Craig and Alson Martin, however, had the political savvy to understand that the campaign would not survive long if some counter-proposals were advanced that would pacify the majority of the petition signers without, however, yielding on all points.

I knew both Craig and Martin well, especially Martin. The nephew of Dr. Helen Gilles (wife of Paul Gilles, University Professor of Chemistry), an advisee and student of mine, Al had been the first student to be elected student body president in his sophomore year. His term in office had been exceptionally successful and his reputation on campus was excellent.

As Martin developed his ideas to me, it was clear to me that what he proposed could only happen if he could persuade Saricks and the new Senate leadership to join forces with him. So I called Saricks and asked him to see Martin at once. Later that evening Wescoe called and asked me to come to his house. Saricks and the other members of the Senate Executive Committee were there, as were about ten students including Martin, Craig, and Cliff Conrad, the new student body president. Saricks said that he and his colleagues had conferred and were prepared to propose to the Senate Council and then to the Senate that a special committee be appointed to prepare a plan over the summer for the inclusion of students in the Senate. The crucial fact in this recommendation was that the Senate would be called upon to approve the principle of student participation; the charge to the special committee would be to develop how it was to be done, not whether it should be done. There was considerable speculation that evening about the way the faculty would respond to the proposition.

The students present were unanimous in the view that if the Senate accepted the proposition, the protest movement would collapse. Bill Balfour (dean of Student Affairs since February), had spent the evening with some of the protest leaders and now

joined us; he agreed. Atkinson and those with him, Balfour reported, recognized that their mass support would disappear rapidly if there were faculty action acknowledging the right of students to a share in the governance of the University.

Wescoc expressed concern about the impact of the proposal on his legal responsibilities, but concurred that it was clearly the best available option. He had previously agreed to appear at an off-campus meeting of the protest group and was clearly under great tension. But he agreed to go along.

The response of the faculty a few days later was entirely affirmative. Cliff Conrad was allowed to address the Senate and acquitted himself very well. There were few questions and virtually no objections. The Senate approved a committee of twelve (six faculty members and six students). Saricks and Conrad were named co-chairmen. I do not recall the full list of members; one of the faculty members was my good friend Clifford Ketzler, who kept me regularly posted on the committee's progress. One of the student members was a newly elected member of the All-Student Council, a graduate student in political science from Texas by the name of Richard von Ende. He soon emerged not only as the major moderating influence but also as the committee's

workhorse. When the committee recommendations were approved by the Senate and by vote of the student body, von Ende became the first student vice-chairman of the reconstituted SenEx.

But even before this revision of the governance system came into being, Wescoe had announced that he would relinquish his position as Chancellor at the end of the academic year 1968-69. It was a development that I had seen coming for at least six months. At that time I had shared my speculations with Ray Nichols, whose response was that in that case he might take early retirement. He had "broken in" three new chancellors, he said, and was not at all sure that he had it in him to do the same thing a fourth time.

Wescoe made his announcement at the opening Convocation. The Regents promptly established machinery to select a successor. Because they also needed to find a replacement for "Pete" Cunningham, the **P**resident of Fort Hays State College, who had reached retirement age, the Regents divided themselves (except Ned Cushing, the Board chairman) into two committees of four each. A. H. "Red" Cromb was named chairman of the search committee for K. U. I drafted a letter which Wescoe signed urging the committee to entrust the major role in the search process to a committee to be elected by the faculty. The committee responded with the invitation

to the faculty to elect such a committee.

The faculty promptly elected three administrators: W. P. Albrecht and Ambrose Saricks, dean and associate dean, respectively, of the Graduate School, and Robert Cobb, acting dean (in Waggoner's absence on sabbatical leave) of the College. Other members were Paul Gilles, (Chemistry), and Charles Oldfather, (Law). A representative of the Medical School faculty was later added.

Although the Regents' committee indicated that it planned to deal with the faculty committee only, a student committee was also elected, with von Ende as chairman. It was generally understood that, regardless of the Regents' original intention, the two committees worked as one and eventually they were treated as one by Mr. Cromb and his committee.

Under the chairmanship of Bill Albrecht (and later, when Albrecht was taken ill, of Ambrose Saricks) the combined committee began in late October to solicit names. In late November it was rumored that Calvin VanderWerf, then the **P**resident of Hope College, and George Beckmann of the University of Washington were strong contenders. Both had been at K. U. and I had good reasons to believe that it would be harmful to K. U. to have either

of them return as Chancellor. I chose, however, not to divulge these reasons which were essentially subjective evaluations. What I did was to write a letter to Cromb urging that what the University needed was new ideas and that, therefore, preference should be given to persons without ties to K. U. In addition I made the point that the Regents could best demonstrate their desire to maintain and renew K. U.'s vigor by selecting someone younger than the departing incumbent.

I was, of course, aware of the fact that several of my colleagues had suggested to the committee that I should be considered for the job. It was in full cognizance of this fact that I set down two conditions which, quite evidently, eliminated me from all consideration. The likelihood that the student radicals would object to me did not weigh as heavily as my conviction that my administrative skills were largely of the staff (or "inside") variety. In addition, I was mindful of the fact that K. U. had a record, even in recent decades, of nearly ten years' service by each Chancellor and, since I did not want to remain in administration beyond the age of sixty, I would not have enough years left to serve even an average term. On the other hand, I believed that my experience would be useful to a new Chancellor, especially one who was not

familiar with the Kansas scene. My wife's background and associations in Western Kansas, her activities as lobbyist and later State president of the League of Women Voters, as well as my association with President Truman on the one side, and such Republicans as John Conard on the other -- all had given us a circle of friends and acquaintances that covered the State geographically and socially. Murphy and Wescoe had made use of these contacts of ours. We represented K. U. at alumni meetings from St. Francis to Pittsburg, but also outside of Kansas (though the plums -- like flying trips to Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico -- never came our way). Increasingly, wherever we went, former students of mine were prominently in evidence.

It was from one of these former students that I got the first inkling of the search committee's progress. About mid-January 1969 I received a telephone call from Fred Morrison, one of K. U.'s "academic triple crown winners" (Rhodes, Danforth, Woodrow Wilson) and by then an assistant professor of law at the University of Iowa. He presumed, he said, that I had heard that President Hancher had just announced that he would retire at the end of the current academic year; would I allow him, Fred, to submit my name for the vacancy. My answer was that Iowa had

the right man for the job in the person of "Sandy" Boyd, their Vice President for Academic Affairs. But "Sandy," said Fred, was the leading candidate for the K. U. job and very much interested in it. How did Fred know that? Well, only last week "Sandy" had asked Fred to have lunch with him and had pumped him about K. U. and Kansas. And he had told Fred that he had been notified that his was one of six names which the faculty committee had turned over to the Regents.

If anyone in Lawrence knew who was on the list, the secret was so well kept that I never learned anything. There was a good deal of speculation about Jim Surface, but I figured that Jim had to be out of the K. U. picture since he was eagerly pursuing other leads, most actively the Chancellorship of the University of Denver.

I recall that I was walking the dog late one Sunday afternoon when I saw "Red" Cromb drive west on Stratford Road, then turn into the driveway of Paul Gilles' house on Iowa Street. I commented to my wife later that evening that I knew of no reason for "Red" to visit the Gilles home except the business of the Chancellor's search.

The next morning around 8:20 Jim Surface asked me to assemble the deans, if possible, by nine o'clock. When they were all there, Jim told them that at 11:00 a. m. the Regents would announce

the appointment of the new Chancellor was was -- and Jim consulted a piece of paper -- a man by the name of E. L. Chalmers, currently Vice President for Academic Affairs at Florida State University. Jim added that he was sorry, he did not know what the initials stood for!

I had never heard of Chalmers, but Vincent Thursby, who had been with me at Virginia, was now assistant graduate dean at F.S.U., and I called him. I came away with the impression that we were getting a man of very exceptional talents. Others on the faculty and in the administration who called their friends or counterparts at F.S.U. had very similar reports: very bright, very likeable -- practically all of us failed to notice the things that were not being said to us.

Larry and Mary Ann Chalmers paid their first official visit to Lawrence in mid-March. The reaction to them was generally very positive, though it was quite obvious that Larry was quite a contrast from Clarke Wescoe. Thus it was noticeable -- or at least Donna and I noticed -- that Larry was rather uncomfortable at the black-tie dinner which the Wescoes gave in their honor at the Chancellor's residence. When the party broke up around ten, we invited them to our house for a drink and talked for several

hours. When I returned from having taken them back to the guest house, Donna's first comment was that this man would have to learn a great deal before he understood Kansans. She had noticed that, in a situation where he should have been listening, he had done most of the talking. And was it possible that somebody who had been a vice president for less than two years really knew all the people whose names he was so freely dropping? It would be two years before I would concede that her instinctive impressions that evening proved more accurate than my desire to believe in the advertised virtues of the man.

Yet the indications were plentiful, although I -- and most others -- refused to take them at face value. The very next day, for instance, as I was driving the Chalmerses to the Kansas City airport, Larry commented critically on his meetings that morning with the Executive Secretaries, respectively, of the Alumni Association and the Endowment Association. He had no intention, he said, to meet the schedules suggested to him by these two men and would make his own decisions on such matters. Since I had occasionally felt that Wescoe had been too much "alumni-oriented," I was not displeased and failed to read anything else into this comment.

Yet I already knew at this time -- though I could not speak of it -- that Jim Surface had accepted an offer of a professorship

at Vanderbilt and that much would depend on the relationship between the new Chancellor and me. He should, I believed, have a free hand; so I wrote him and enclosed an undated letter of resignation -- which he promptly returned. An accompanying letter said that he had heard nothing but words of praise about me and expected to rely heavily on me. Indeed, while there might be some adjustments of the administrative structure later, for now he hoped that I would be willing to serve as acting provost as well as dean of faculties. I was much impressed with one sentence in this letter; in essence it said that he had no desire to impose any new style on K. U., but that he planned to adapt himself to the fullest to the Kansas way of doing things.

I felt very positive about the new Chancellor. Obviously, he would do things differently from Wescoe, but the extent of the difference escaped me. I did not really like it when he wound up drinking beer until 3 a. m. with the newly elected student body president, especially since he was the S. D. S. -supported candidate and had won by only eight votes in a very close three-way race. I had an uneasy feeling when he commented that he rather liked long hair and what it stood for. But in the main I was impressed by Chalmers, perhaps more so because Wescoe's final weeks were

so full of problems and of evidence of his desire to escape them.

The major (though by no means the only) crisis of the spring of 1969 concerned the ROTC Tri-Service Review. This traditional event had been picketed in other years (as it had been in the thirties), but this year an S. D. S. -initiated group had announced that it would block the path of the parade altogether. Local service veterans, vocally led by former track star Wes Santee, announced that they were prepared to clear the ROTC opponents out of the way. (Only a week earlier, a Navy ROTC ceremony had been badly harrassed by protesters.)

After lengthy discussions, Wescoe and the three ROTC Commandants agreed that the units would form in the stadium, but that, if it appeared that they would not be able to march without making physical contact with the anti-war protesters, Wescoe would wave his handkerchief and the public address announcer would cancel the event.

When the time came, over a hundred protesters had linked arms and formed a circle immediately in front of the ROTC. They sang and jeered and dared the ROTC to move in on them. The apparent leaders of the activity were a faculty member, John Wright of the Department of Human Development, and the new vice president

of the student body, Marilyn Bowman (her father, Paul, was executive director of Community Studies, Inc., in Kansas City; her uncle John held the same position with the Council for International Educational Exchange in New York -- I was a director of both organizations).

I had remained in the Chancellor's office to handle possible calls from the Regents or the Governor, but a loud cheer from the stadium unmistakably conveyed the message that the review had been called off. Shortly afterwards, two members of the Board of Regents arrived at the office; they had been in the stands, had witnessed the events, and were outraged. Ned Cushing soon regained his composure, but "Red" Cromb could not be contained: his florid face was nearly purple with rage, his hands were shaking, and I was seriously concerned that he would suffer a heart attack. When Wescoe joined us shortly afterwards, the two Regents belabored him mercilessly: all participants in the protest should be summarily dismissed, and without any delays by hearings or similar formalities.

What followed was a shouting match unlike anything I had ever heard before. In the end the two Regents acknowledged that they had to leave the next steps to the Chancellor. Wescoe, in turn, had made it plain that he was totally fed up and had announced that he would avail himself of accrued leave time and relinquish his position the day after Commencement.

The disciplinary proceedings that followed were complicated by the fact that in the revision of the governance system some of the implications of the changes for the campus judicial system had not been fully considered. But it was undisputed that an accused student had the option of a public or private proceeding, and that, if he elected a private proceeding, not even the identity of the accused could be revealed.

This refusal to divulge the names of all participants in the protest, steadfastly affirmed by Jim Surface, who by now was acting Chancellor, infuriated the Journal-World and the State Senator from Douglas County, Reynolds (Ren) Shultz. (In 1968, Shultz had won the Republican nomination by a flip of a coin after the vote count had shown him tied with the incumbent, Don Hults -- with many observers believing that the similarity in last names had helped Shultz gain the tie.) Shultz, as chairman of a legislative committee, insisted that he was entitled to the full list of names and that he would publicize the list to assure that potential employers would have it available.

Although the Regents had named Jim Surface acting Chancellor, he spent less than a month on the job. By early July, he began to move his family to Nashville and by July 25 he was gone. Larry

Chalmers was not due in until September 1. For all practical purposes, the burden of administering the University of Kansas that summer was mine. Quite a bit later I wondered out loud to Max Bickford, the Board's Executive Officer, why Jim had been given the designation of acting Chancellor and I had not, and I received the very candid answer that "Red" Cromb had never forgiven me for talking back to him after the ROTC review incident.

The reason Larry Chalmers did not come to K. U. until the first of September was that he had been awarded a Danforth grant for university administrators. (It was not until a good bit later that I came to wonder how someone with the limited experience he had managed to get this kind of an opportunity. I am still not sure how he did it, though I suspect that this, too, may have been tied to Werner Baum -- about whom more later.) We did, however, have an appointment with the North Central Association in connection with the regular ten-year reevaluation. Of course, Larry had not been there for the team visit and, technically, he was not yet responsible. But he said that he wanted to appear on K. U.'s behalf, and I saw this as a good opportunity for the two of us to spend some time together.

I flew to Chicago on the evening of July 22, only to discover

that Larry, contrary to our arrangements, was not there. Around 11 p. m., he finally called my room. He had just arrived from the East, where, he said, he had been visiting medical schools to acquaint himself with their particular problems. We agreed to meet in the bar where we remained until the bartender rather peremptorily called an end to the proceedings. It was after 2 a. m. and in a drug store across the street I had black coffee and Larry had a strawberry sundae. (In the months to come I would learn that, late at night or after some drinking, his preferred antidote was a rich sundae.)

We appeared before the North Central Review Committee at 10 a. m. the next morning. Since I had been a North Central examiner since 1962, I knew most of the members of the committee. Bob Clodius of Wisconsin, the chairman of the visiting team, had carefully explained the transition in which we found ourselves. As he told me later, the review team was surprised to have Larry Chalmers respond on matters he could not possibly be familiar with. Indeed, it was the very forwardness of his replies that caused the review team to recommend that the next reevaluation should be in five, rather than ten, years.

I recall that I was slightly startled to have Chalmers inter-

rupt me in mid-sentence before the North Central committee, but I had no doubt that it was indicative of his intensive study of K. U. affairs. I had prepared a loose-leaf binder for him with 32 position papers on various aspects of K. U., which he had acknowledged with almost profuse expressions of appreciation, and which I assumed had given him the background knowledge he required. (After he resigned in 1972, the binder was returned to me -- it had never been opened!)

My main concern was to help Chalmers get off to a good start. I suggested to Ray Nichols that we should introduce him to the downtown community as quickly as possible. Ray agreed, and the Hellers and the Nicholises joined in inviting over 300 people to meet Larry and Mary Ann at our house on the evening of his first day on the job. We followed this up with a series of smaller occasions, all intended to make it easy for them to meet people.

It was at the first home football game that I sensed for the first time that, perhaps, these activities did not please Larry Chalmers as fully as his words had led me to believe. He showed irritation when the president of the visiting team's school (Glenn Terrill of Washington State) greeted me like an old friend (and, indeed, our acquaintance goes back to the middle fifties when he

was an assistant dean at Colorado) and Donna noticed that he was not too happy at my continuing efforts to introduce him to alumni and legislators among the spectators. I concluded that the newness had worn off and decided to let my role taper off.

Chalmers, I felt, had been compelled to start his tenure under seriously adverse conditions and my prime purpose was to help him succeed. As has been the custom at K. U., we had not planned on a formal inauguration, but handled the installation of the new Chancellor within the format of the Opening Convocation, with the Chancellor's address as the major feature.

Larry Chalmers was not the public speaker that his predecessors had been. For one, he always read his speeches and, in writing them, he seemingly lacked an understanding of audience needs. His speeches were, therefore, always tightly organized, sparse in verbiage, and thoroughly intellectual. If he attempted humor it usually fell flat. Alumni audiences in particular, remembering the sales pitches of Deane Malott, the inspirational eloquence of Franklin Murphy and the emotion-laden rhetoric of Clarke Wescoe, were untouched by the new Chancellor's speeches. This reaction was aggravated when it became known that he used the same speech repeatedly, barely adapting it to local conditions.

His installation address differed in one respect: he had circulated a draft in advance and incorporated numerous suggestions, especially von Ende's and mine. Still, the occasion did not produce enthusiasm. Perhaps the setting had something to do with it: the Field House, unless it is filled to the rafters, is a cold place in which to speak and its accoustics were not designed for public speaking.

The luncheon afterwards also had some discordant notes. As master of ceremonies, I tried to set a tone of relaxed dignity and Governor Docking and Charles Oldfather (as newly elected chairman of SenEx, he represented the faculty) easily fell in with it. The student body president, however, read a statement that depicted the campus as a scene of combat between the generations and repeatedly warned the Chancellor that he would find himself in an impossible role if he sought to be the man in the middle. The national alumni president, by contrast, reminded the new Chancellor of the thousands of alumni who viewed the University with a sense of jealous ownership and expected him to keep it just as they remembered it.

As if this were not enough, when the lunch was over, a KBI agent served the new Chancellor with a subpoena: Senator

Shultz' committee wanted "those names" by 4 o'clock that afternoon. (The list was supplied but by a skillful maneuver Senator Ed Reilly -- another former student of mine -- completely stymied Shultz: the list went to the Attorney General for safekeeping and was never released.)

It was a strained beginning, although the faculty and the administrative officers were eager to see only the best. They were -- understandably -- especially attracted by the new Chancellor's repeated assertion that as soon as he succeeded in putting the University on "formulated budgeting," the financial picture would be sharply improved. To be sure, none of us knew precisely what "formulated budgeting" meant, but Larry pointed to Florida State's prosperity -- and that was enough.

Looking into the Florida situation, I soon learned that "formulated budgeting" there had not been initiated by the universities, but had been imposed by the State legislature. Its intricacies were administered by a State Board staff approximately twenty times the size of our Board of Regents' office. The success of the system was at least in part explained by the fact that, so far, the allocation process had never failed to provide something for everybody.

The Kansas situation was quite different. First of all, the

budget scene in Kansas had been dominated for fifteen years by Jim Bibb as State Budget Director ("Mike" Harder's book on the Kansas Legislature quotes a former staff member as saying:

l.c. ^{The} ~~G~~overnor is ~~G~~overnor, but Mr. Bibb is ~~K~~ing. "). I had known Jim Bibb since my first year at K. U. when he had been in two of my classes; it seemed unlikely to me that he would agree to any change in budgeting that would reduce the influence of his office.

The politics of higher education in Kansas was (and is) both more pronounced and less complex than in Florida. There the multiplicity of institutions provides the opportunity for shifting coalitions. In Kansas these options rarely exist.

The rivalry between Lawrence and Manhattan goes back to the very beginnings of the two institutions and consistently laps over into the legislature. A ^{tr}~~ue~~ of sorts had been established in the early fifties when Murphy and President James A. McCain agreed to divide the political tasks, with K. U. "working" the Senate and Kansas State the House of Representatives. Since the Higher Education Appropriations bill traditionally originates in the Senate, this arrangement had certain advantages for K. U. Even so, Murphy sensed the need to reinforce K. U.'s position, so that, when John Conard was elected to the House, Murphy used his influence to have him placed on the House Ways and Means Committee.

John Conard had been an instructor in the Political Science department when I came to K. U., one of those with whom I shared the office. He had an undergraduate degree in journalism and had been editor of the Daily Kansan. After wartime service as a navy flier, he returned to K. U. and earned a master's degree in political science (and married the departmental secretary). In 1950 he went to Paris on a Rotary fellowship, earned a doctorate from the Sorbonne, and then stayed on for several years working for the Point IV organization. When he returned to the U. S., after a brief period on the newspaper in Syracuse (the nearest paper to his hometown of Coolidge -- the last settlement on U.S. 50 before the Colorado line), he bought the paper in Greensburg and it was from there that he entered politics.

John and Virginia had remained close to us throughout the years and we knew what his political ambitions were. In fact, although he always made his own decisions, he would seek our advice at most crucial junctures. Murphy knew this and so he had given me the task of explaining to John why he should seek a place on the Ways and Means rather than on some committee of greater interest to the area he represented.

These were also the days when my wife Donna was most

active as legislative representative for the League of Women Voters, incidentally aiding K. U. where she could. She was helped by the fact that there were friends on all sides: Odd Williams and Conard on the Republican side of the House, Dale Saffels of Garden City (her hometown) among the Democrats; "Gus" Lauterbach of Colby (where her father's family had lived) was chairman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee, etc., etc.

Then, in 1963, the University of Wichita issue exploded upon the scene. Paul Wunsch, having removed himself from consideration for the governorship time and again, had decided that 1964 would be the year to bid for the top spot. His calculation was relatively simple: if he could gain a substantial majority in the State's largest city, he should be able to win. Business interests in Wichita had long favored major State aid for the municipal university. If the State were to assume the entire burden, city taxes could be significantly reduced.

Wunsch introduced a bill to create the "University of Southern Kansas." So fully did he control the Senate that all procedures were set aside and the bill approved without discussion or dissent. The same tactics were attempted in the House, but were blocked singlehandedly by Odd Williams (who, by common under-

standing, thereby killed his own career in politics). His resistance led to a compromise: The Regents were to employ outside consultants to review public higher education in Kansas and prepare plans to include the future role of the University of Wichita.

Nine months and \$200,000 later, the Academy for Educational Development (mostly Sidney Tickton) had produced a document that recommended a 22-person board, half K. U., half Kansas State, to direct the University of Wichita as an "associated" university. The Wichita people were furious: they insisted on equal footing with the two universities already in the system. The Regents saw no need for another board. K. U. did not want another institution offering doctoral work. K-State feared for its undergraduate enrollment.

The compromise that was finally approved was hammered out in a midnight conference between Wescoe, Conard and the chairman of the Board of Regents, Clyde Reed of Parsons. The University of Wichita would become Wichita State University, "associated" with the University of Kansas. What "associated" meant was not spelled out in the law, but was incorporated in a minute of the Board of Regents: The Board would name the president of WSU "on due consideration of the nomination" made by the K. U. Chancellor; Wichita's budget would be submitted through K. U., and

Wichita would develop no doctoral program not in its 1963-64 catalog (which meant that only "Logopedics" was exempt from the ban); any doctoral work to be offered was to be controlled by K. U. and lead to a K. U. degree. (The first two conditions soon proved to be meaningless. The K.U. Chancellor has, at best, a theoretical veto in the presidential selection process. K.U. has never had the manpower to do any more with the Wichita budget than to send it on; by 1967 there was no pretense that this was a workable condition. The only part still effective in 1972 relates to doctoral work.)

Thus by 1969 the two-way contest among the universities had become a three-way battle, and in this battle K.U.'s position had been noticeably weakened. In addition to Wichita's entry, there was the increasingly separate stance of the Medical Center. For eighteen years the Chancellor had been able to say, with justification, that he was the one person most knowledgeable about the School of Medicine. The vice chancellors in Lawrence were without authority in Kansas City. The condition was dramatized when Wescoe named two provosts, one for each campus. The Board of Regents had long had a separate committee for the Medical School. Increasingly the Medical Center came to behave as a separate institution. (For example, in 1971, while I was still Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, I did not meet Dr. Rieke, the new Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs,

until two months after he had assumed his duties. The following spring, the governance system was amended to create two separate Senates.)

In addition, the administrative instability since 1962 had placed K. U. at a disadvantage vis-a-vis Kansas State. There, McCain had built up an excellent administrative machinery and a smoothly working public relations set-up. McCain himself was highly effective politically. Kansas State was moving while K. U. fumbled.

I tend to attribute K. U.'s administrative weakness in some part to Wescoe's very human desire not to hurt people's feelings. He had demonstrated this trait when he retained George Baxter Smith. He recognized that we needed to computerize our paperwork, but Ray Nichols was wedded to the pen-and-pencil methods he had used since 1928, and it would be just as easy to wait the few years until his retirement.

Larry Chalmers, of course, had the opportunity to reorganize. Rather than to do this directly, he asked SenEx to request a subcommittee of the Senate Council Committee on Organization and Administration ("O& A") to provide him with recommendations. Not entirely by coincidence, the subcommittee was chaired by Ray

Nichols; the other two members were von Ende (in his second year as SenEx vice-chairman) and Professor Roy Laird (political science). These three operated on the premise -- which I regarded as entirely plausible -- that the new Chancellor should have the kind of organizational structure he preferred. Accordingly, although most administrative officers were interviewed, the report reflected Chalmers' ideas.

Much to my and Bill Balfour's surprise, however, the Chancellor did not release the report nor direct its implementation. He went to the Board of Regents and obtained approval for the dropping of the two provosts and the naming of some vice chancellors, and this was duly announced. Then each of the vice chancellors received a Xerox copy of that part of the sub-committee's report pertaining to his area, with a buck slip on which "For appropriate action" had been checked. Balfour, Nitcher and I asked what constituted "appropriate action" and were told to use our judgments.

The three of us were also concerned about staff coordination, in the absence of a provost. Again, the reply was to use our judgments.

Actually, for a time at least, this matter of coordination presented no problem. Balfour and Nitcher both owed their position

to my recommendation and both were satisfied that, whatever the title, I held the position of priority. Chalmers had issued a memo in the fall of 1969 announcing that in his absence I was to be in charge, and all three of us assumed that this meant that I was the No. 2 man.

In some ways, however, it had already become clear that Chalmers saw the working relationships in the Chancellor's office quite differently from what they had been before.

One of the roles which I had assumed in 1967, entirely by default, was that of supervision of the functioning of the office complex. If I saw the need for repairs, I arranged for them to be done. If the clerical staff had problems, they brought them to me.

One of the petty but persistent problem areas was the mail situation. As the Post Office began to reduce service, it came to be more efficient to send someone after the mail. The amount of mail increased sharply when the Post Office ceased to provide directory service: now all mail without departmental identification was given to the Chancellor's office to be readdressed there. My detailed knowledge of the faculty made it possible for me to supply the department addresses from memory. Often, to vary the tedium of hours of paperwork on Sunday, I would take fifteen or twenty minutes

to work up the accumulated stack of mail to be readdressed.

Since we first reduced and then discontinued the Saturday clerical work force, I had made it a habit on Saturdays to pick up the mail myself. I was surprised on one Saturday in December, 1969, to be told by the employee at the Post Office that they were forbidden to give me the mail: only the Chancellor's secretary and Ray Nichols were authorized to receive mail at the office.

I asked the Chancellor's secretary on Monday what this was all about, and was told that the Post Office had a new regulation requiring specific authorization to pick up the mail. I asked why, in the light of past practice, I was excluded and she said that the Chancellor had specifically told her that he did not want me to see what mail he got. He had also instructed her that mail waiting to be readdressed was to be kept under lock and key.

I wondered how I would get access to my own mail on Saturdays. She suggested that I ask the Chancellor. When I did so, he told me that the secretary had asked him to take steps to assure that I would not handle the mail. As for my office mail on Saturdays, surely that could always wait until Monday. (He knew, of course, that I was in the habit of putting in full working days both on Saturdays and Sundays. He himself took great pains to avoid the office on weekends.)

I elected, as between the Chancellor and the secretary, to believe the Chancellor. In fact, most of the irritations I felt that fall seemed to be traceable to the Chancellor's secretary. I was no longer able to look at the Chancellor's appointment book; it was locked in her desk. Unless he happened to mention it conversationally, I was not advised of his absences from campus (although he had designated me to act on his behalf whenever he was absent). On the other hand, my own secretary complained of being bossed around by the Chancellor's secretary, on the grounds that as the Chancellor's secretary she was in charge of all secretaries.

In January I asked for an opportunity to discuss these irritations with Larry. He explained that Mrs. Greenewalt had had health and domestic problems; otherwise she would certainly have taken the time to explain to me what changes were being made. The changes, he insisted, were all intended to enable me (and others in comparable positions) to devote full energy to our own areas. It is indicative both of my attitude and our relationship at the time that the explanations seemed entirely plausible to me and that the session ended with my telling him that I had found the first four months of the Chalmers era exciting and stimulating, while he assured me of his continuing reliance on me.

It had indeed been a full and exciting fall. At the first meeting of the Council of Presidents in September, Larry had proposed that the task of comprehensive planning for the Regents be turned over to the academic vice presidents. This was the beginning of COCAO, the Council of Chief Academic Officers, over which I presided for the first two years, and which soon came to take up two to three full working days each month. It was an excellent and congenial group. Alvin Proctor of Pittsburg, I had known since 1948 as a fellow political scientist. John Chalmers (no relation to Larry) had been Kansas State's dean of Arts and Sciences from 1963 to 1969, and I had known him in that capacity; in addition, our wives had worked together in the League of Women Voters. The others in the group I had not known before, or not known well, but I found all of them good to work with.

On campus the main source of additional work and concern was the rising militancy of the black students. The pressure had begun to build up in the spring of 1968 when the militant organizer Leonard Harrison had threatened Wescoe with bombs and fire if the University did not meet his demands. That summer I held several discussions with black student leaders seeking to find ways to meet justified complaints within the existing program, (and, incidentally,

went them away from Harrison). A few adjustments were possible, but it also became clear to me that we would have to have a black in the administration to cope with the continuing problem. I recommended to Surface on his return from Harvard that we should recruit an assistant to either the Chancellor or the Provost. A similar recommendation came from an informal faculty group convened by the dean of the School of Architecture, Charles Kahn, who suggested that the focus should be on K. U.'s need to communicate with the urban core population and that we should, therefore, seek an assistant "for urban affairs."

The person chosen for this position, Philip M. Gary, joined us in July, 1969. It soon became evident that he had an exceedingly difficult row to hoe. The Black Student Union (BSU) sought to reduce him to a tool for its militant aspirations. The Chancellor expected him to keep the black militants under control. Dean Kahn and his colleagues wanted him to spearhead a curriculum in urban studies. Dean Waggoner wanted him to build a black studies program within the College. Phil Gary had neither the intelligence nor the fortitude to chart his own course among these conflicting demands on him.

The new leadership of the BSU decided to test the new Chancellor as soon as possible. A delegation called on Chalmers to

demand equal place for blacks in all Homecoming activities. Chalmers referred them to the committee in charge. When the committee failed to make the requested changes, some forty-odd blacks moved into the Chancellor's office.

Chalmers was at a meeting of the Council of Deans in the Spencer Library when he was notified that the blacks were in his office. He told me to come with him and we ran back to Strong Hall. The blacks were crowded into his office, sitting on his desk, on the window sills, everywhere, but they gave way to let us in. They reiterated their demands. Most specifically, they wanted a black queen. Chalmers assured them they could have a black ceremony which would be in addition to the traditional one. The blacks filed out.

The whole thing had not lasted ten minutes. Chalmers was shaking all over. He was furious at Dick Wintermote who, he said, as chairman of the committee should have resolved the problem. And where was Phil Gary? It turned out that he was in Kansas City. And, planned or not, his sister-in-law was to be the black's Homecoming Queen!

Public reaction to the "double" Homecoming ceremony was distinctly unfavorable. At least one Regent wondered rather

pointedly -- and for the newspapers -- why Kansas State seemed to cope with its blacks so much better.

It was against this background that the blacks now presented a virtual shopping list of demands. Even the appearance of their document made it clear that they had simply copied from the demands made on other campuses. What it added up to was fairly simple: a black university within the University.

Chalmers agreed to reply within thirty days. He divided the demands and handed appropriate sections to Balfour, Nitcher, Oldfather (as SenEx chairman) and me, with the request that we submit comments within two weeks. Since most of the items related to academic matters, the major task fell to me.

The following week was the annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges in Chicago which both Larry and I were scheduled to attend. Hoping that it would afford an opportunity for some relaxed conversation, we booked tickets on the same flight. Weather conditions forced the plan to land at Indianapolis and we rented a car to get us to Chicago. Although the weather was miserable, I enjoyed the trip. As happened to me time and again, in private conversation I found Larry Chalmers most attractive and what he said entirely convincing.

I worked on my comments on the black demands while we were in Chicago and had an opportunity to discuss my first draft with Larry there. I completed the paper after I returned to Lawrence and handed it to him in good time. Much to my surprise -- and that of Balfour, Nitcher and Oldfather -- the only thing he did was to add a brief note of transmittal and forward our comments as written (for him) to the BSU. In due course, the BSU leaders learned that, if they wished to discuss the issues further, they were to address themselves to the author of the respective comment.

Luckily, we were due to receive a rather sizeable number of new positions for the coming year (it would be the last time that we were that fortunate) and I set aside one-third of them for black additions to the faculty. The Chancellor had previously agreed that I should have two assistants (his office at Florida State had five times the staff I had) and I was able to recruit James Rosser, a black Ph. D. in health education from Southern Illinois, and without a doubt the luckiest choice I could have made. He was one of seventeen blacks who joined the faculty in 1970, though most of them were short of the doctorate.

Another recruiting task that fell to me in 1969-70 was to find a new dean for the School of Journalism. Warren Agee had

resigned in late spring to accept the deanship at Georgia. I made no effort to dissuade him and I heard no anguished outcries from either faculty or students.

No sooner had Agee's resignation been announced than I heard from various newspapermen around the State boosting John Conard for the job. John had run for Lieutenant-Governor in 1968 and had been defeated in the primary. For the first time in ten years he did not hold public office, and I had already learned that he was restive in Greensburg. But I doubted his ability to function as dean of a school, and I doubted even more that a search committee of faculty and students would find him acceptable. But in talking to him in the summer of '69, I found him determined to try for the dean's job.

I discussed the matter with Chalmers early in the fall and expressed the view that John might make a valuable addition to the University in the public relations area. We agreed that we would -- since John left us no choice -- interview him along with other candidates for the deanship, but that, when he saw the Chancellor, Larry would assess him primarily in the light of the other possibility.

The faculty-student committee was virtually unanimous in its preference for Edward Bassett of the University of Michigan.

The Chancellor, on the other hand, thought that John Conard would make an excellent Director of University Relations (he had already persuaded Jim Gunn to resign from the position).

I was concerned about the reaction of the newspapermen and urged that both appointments be announced at the same time.

Chalmers did not consider that advisable and assured me that the press would understand; specifically he had discussed the situation with Dolph Simons, Jr., who, with Paul Miner of the Kansas City Star and Stanley Stauffer of Topeka, had interviewed all candidates and strongly supported Conard.

I wrote letters to Simons, Miner and Stauffer to thank them for their help and hinted that their first choice had not been cast aside entirely. But this letter crossed in the mail with an irate missive from Dolph, Jr., who had learned from John's sole supporter on the search committee what the committee had recommended and the Chancellor decided. Dolph's letter said he had been exploited, double-crossed, cheated -- and he was not about ever to allow himself to be so used again. There was no hint that he had been apprised of what we intended to do with "his" candidate.

When I asked Larry, he said that the matter had been covered in a long conversation he had had with Dolph, Jr. and his father two

weeks earlier. That conference, in turn, had been a response to a letter which Dolph, Sr., had written him pointing out that the frequency of contradictions in his public statements was damage his credibility. Since the Journal-World has, across the years, found fault with every Chancellor, I (and others) chose not to attach much importance to the letter. Irvin Youngberg's comment was typical: "It just comes a little earlier this time."

The persistent rumor in the Chancellor's office was that Dolph, Sr., had all his life wanted to be named a Regent. More recently it was said that there had been a strong campaign to place the other son, Dr. John Simon, then at Mayo's, in the Chancellor's job. (The same story was current again in the fall of 1972.)

It had also been reported that a group had been formed in Johnson County to "get" Larry Chalmers and that Dolph, Jr., was a regular participant in the group's meetings. The impetus for the organization had been provided when Chalmers used his first public appearance in Kansas City to declare himself in sympathy with anti-war protests, and, generally, with advocates of change.

The Chancellor maintained this public stance consistently. Internally, however, he had me advise the faculty that classes missed on "Moratorium Day" had to be made up and that failure to schedule

a make-up would result in loss of pay for that day.

As anti-war sentiment intensified on campus and elsewhere, Professor Lawrence Velvel of the School of Law began to gain notoriety. A specialist in constitutional law, Velvel had brought suit against President Johnson to stop the war in Vietnam and, when that failed, had filed a similar suit against the Secretary of Defense. He had served as legal adviser to the Massachusetts legislature in the framing of that body's anti-war resolution.

In January, 1970, the law faculty recommended Velvel for promotion to full professor.

In February, Professor Velvel spoke from the steps of the Law School to a group protesting the trial of the so-called "Chicago Seven." What he said was not particularly offensive (the worst was that he reported that friends of his in Chicago considered Judge Hoffman "a bastard") and apparently was audible only to those nearest to him. But some of the crowd moved from the campus to the Douglas County Court House where several acts of vandalism occurred. The press, perhaps understandably, reported the two events as if they were cause and effect.

There was another name on the promotion list that had received considerable unfavorable notice in the press. Assistant

Professor Fred Litto of the Department of Speech and Drama had been in charge of preparing a theatre group for a visit to the Iron Curtain countries. K.U. had been selected by the State Department to mount a tour to Yugoslavia, Rumania, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia to demonstrate American stage methods to theatre students in these countries. This would be the seventh (or eighth?) time and, as had been done in previous years, the group went on a short tour in Kansas to test its performance before a live audience.

I never saw the scenes Litto had chosen, but in Fredonia, Kansas, the audience seemed to think them beyond the limits of propriety. More seriously, a secretary whom Litto had fired sent an unexpurgated version of the script to members of Congress, with a letter complaining that her tax dollars would be used to stage this kind of material abroad, and as example of American culture at that. Litto's explanation -- that the unexpurgated scripts had been typed only as working copies, from which unsuitable scenes and language would be deleted -- never caught up with the charges. The State Department official in charge of the program lost his job and Litto very nearly lost out on his promotion.

Traditionally, approval of the University's promotion list by the Regents had virtually become a matter of routine. But at the

March, 1970, meeting Regent Henry Bubb took exception to the inclusion of Velvel and Litto on the list. Rather than to precipitate a public discussion, Chalmers asked for permission to withdraw the list, ostensibly because two of the other institutions did not have their lists in and the Regents had set it as their policy to approve all promotion lists at one meeting.

The true reason was, of course, obvious and was duly reported in the press. At once, David Awbrey, the student body president, called for a student strike to protest the Regents' action (or inaction). Larry Chalmers was reluctant to object to Awbrey's plan; he only wished it could be made to appear spontaneous. I felt that Awbrey, who had been frustrated all winter as the BSU occupied center stage, had at last seen an issue on which he could radicalize the campus. Von Ende agreed with me and largely through his efforts the strike plan was given so much publicity that the Chancellor finally had to consult SenEx and that group issued a statement that made it clear that the controversy had been exaggerated by Awbrey -- by implication, at least, for his own purposes. (At its next meeting, the Board of Regents approved the entire list of promotions.)

Throughout the early spring months, tension was in the air. On campus, anti-war demonstrations occurred with increasing

frequency, though generally without incident. "The street" seemed to be full of strange faces. Rumors were rife that not only "pot" but guns and explosives were being traded freely. David Awbrey's commune vied with two others for the claim to being the most "far out." In downtown Lawrence, racial conflict at the high school had reached the edge of violence amidst utterly inept handling by the school administration. It was in this setting that the Kansas Union fire occurred.

April 20 was a Monday. I do not recall why I was working at the office in the evening, but it was there that shortly after ten I heard the sirens of the fire trucks. I knew, of course, that it was standard operating procedure for the Lawrence Fire Department to respond to any alarm from the campus with a basic increment of three trucks including the big ladder truck. My practice was to call the campus police dispatcher, find out what the problem was, and then, if it was of any seriousness, to go to the scene myself.

On this occasion, however, before I could place a call, the phone rang. My wife called to say that Frank Burge, the Union's director, had been notified that it was the Union Building that was on fire and that it was serious; as he had rushed out of the house, he had told Gladys, his wife, to get the word to me.

I dropped everything I was doing and ran to the Union. Rushing up the stairs to the top floor I joined Burge. We were looking into the ballroom, but all we could see was fiery red. Firemen were bringing additional hoses up the stairwell. In front of us, a portion of the ceiling fell in.

When I went back to the building's main entrance, Mike Thomas, the young Acting Chief of the Campus Police, had arrived and was directing the control of the crowd that had begun to gather. Ray Nichols was there -- I recall that it struck me that it was the first time that I had ever seen him without a tie. I asked him if he knew where the Chancellor was, and he said that he thought Larry was either in New York or Washington. I said that I thought we should notify him at once. We called the Chancellor's residence and his wife told us that he was indeed in Washington, but she could not tell us where he was staying; she thought that Larry's secretary might have that information. The secretary, it turned out, had an unlisted telephone number. I was on the verge of sending a police car to her trailer home for the information I needed when Dick Wintermote, the Alumni secretary, showed up. He knew that the Chancellor was to have been at an alumni meeting in Washington and that he was staying at the Sonesta Hotel.

By this time it was past midnight in Washington, but I called anyhow. Dr. Chalmers, the hotel reported, was not in. I asked that he be told that it was urgent that he call me back. The return call finally came at 1:30 (2:30 a. m. Eastern time). I gave the Chancellor a report on the situation, including the happy news that just a half hour earlier the wind had changed and that it therefore now appeared that the (new) north wing would not be affected. He asked if there was anything he could do that I was not already doing; he assumed that we were doing all we could and would call again at 9 a. m. his time.

The fire itself has been fully described in the papers and elsewhere. At six a. m., Frank Burge and I, standing ankle-deep in water in what had been the main lobby, were discussing what, if any, part of the Union's services was still operational.

I went home to take a shower and change clothes. I had spent so much time in the burning building that I had the sensation that smoke adhered to every hair on my head. Showered and in clean clothes, I felt refreshed and returned to my office. There was a message to call Mike Thomas: the city police was asking for help at the high school where fighting had erupted between black and white students. Our men had been up all night, but Mike

thought he could spare a few until noon. I approved and told Mike that I had already decided that we would need a security effort for the coming nights that could only be handled with volunteers. Just about then Keith Lawton arrived. He had been in Florida at a conference, but had taken the first available plane back when he had heard of the fire on a late evening newscast. He had had the same thought: we needed to organize a fire watch of faculty and selected students.

At a hastily called meeting of the deans I related what we had been able to learn about the origins of the fire and the extent of the damages and developed the plan for the fire watch. We had barely finished when I was told that the city manager urgently wanted to speak to me. Six months earlier I had served on the committee to select a new manager for Lawrence and I considered the man we chose, Buford Watson, to be an experienced professional.

When I got him on the phone, he indicated that the mayor, Don Metzler, was also on the line. The city commission had been in emergency session for the last hour. The situation at the high school was virtually out of hand. The city police lacked the manpower, even with the help we had provided, to cope with the situation. The mayor had been in touch with the Governor and would send off

a telegram requesting the assistance of the National Guard. I was familiar with the Guard's emergency plan and knew that if Guard units moved into Lawrence, the approaches to the campus, especially "the street," would be intensively patrolled and I could easily envisage the response not only of the "street people" but of large sections of the University community itself. I pleaded with Metzler to consider alternatives. He said the commission had gone into all of this, and saw no other solution: curfew from dusk to dawn, and the National Guard.

That night as Larry Chalmers returned to Lawrence, every road leading into Lawrence was blocked by the State Highway Patrol, the streets of Lawrence were deserted, on campus every building was locked and faculty members, aided by some students, were taking turns patrolling the interior of the buildings. There were only a few minor incidents that night.

The following morning a National Guard unit from Garnett arrived. That night there were numerous instances of curfew violations, beer cans and other missiles being thrown at Guardsmen, with retaliatory arrests of often innocent persons. What had begun as a community problem at the high school was now largely a conflict in "the street" at the University's doorstep. A hard-core

vigilante downtown acted as if the entire problem had been engineered by the University.

The curfew was lifted and the National Guard withdrawn just before the weekend. At the same time, we suspended the fire watch on campus. But less than three weeks later we found it necessary to reinstitute the plan. It was the week of Cambodia and Kent State.

Word of the deaths at Kent State reached us in mid-afternoon (Monday, May 4) while Bill Balfour and I and a few others were with the Chancellor. We realized at once what this event would do for the protest movement. And we anticipated that, whatever happened, we would not be spared. Increasing numbers of strangers had been reported in "the street" since the week of the Union fire. Anti-war rallies had become an almost daily occurrence and the number of participants had noticeably grown.

On Tuesday morning I was taken aback by the anger shared by virtually all the students in my Western Civilization class. That morning reports began to filter in of students demanding that instructors set aside regular coursework and devote the period to discussion of the war and the events at Kent State; there were also a few complaints from students about faculty members doing so on their own initiative.

That noon, at a memorial service outside Strong Hall, the cry "Shut 'er down! Strike!" was heard for the first time. We learned through informants that a strike committee had been formed and would meet that evening to plan action to bring about the closing of the University. Governor Docking let it be known that there would be no closing of the State institutions. Downtown, members of the vigilante group now organized as "Support Your Lawrence Police" let it be known that they were armed to protect their homes and businesses.

Wednesday was an incredibly tense day, largely because we did not know what to expect. The Governor called repeatedly and told the Chancellor that he stood ready to send 100 or more of the State Highway Patrol to Lawrence. There was a difference of opinion about who would decide when that step might become necessary.

The radio reported more and more colleges closing, especially the more prestigious ones. Chalmers was asked by reporters what would happen at K. U. and equivocated. The Governor repeated that there would be no closing. Alumni and parents called in, demanding assurances that there would be no yielding to strike agitation.

That evening the largest protest rally ever, probably close to three thousand persons, gathered outside Strong Hall. Bob Sheldon, an assistant professor of religion and an anti-war advocate of firmly non-violent convictions, acted as moderator. But his effort to contain the momentum toward direct action were of no avail. From one speaker to the next the crescendo mounted. David Awbrey called for a show of solidarity with the victims of Kent State. Professor John Wright sought to keep the emotions under control by asking the assembled crowd to concentrate on their present feeling of togetherness, but he was followed by a Vietnam veteran who evoked every nuance of the brutalities of war and declared that only a total paralysis of American society would bring an end to the fighting.

Professor Velvel reminded the audience that he had sought to work through the system and had found it totally unyielding. Even a man like Larry Chalmers could not be trusted. The students had to take things into their own hands if they wanted results.

The next speaker took full advantage of this opening. He was, he said, a stranger to K. U. ; in fact, he allowed that he was what the local press would undoubtedly describe as an "outside agitator." What, he asked, had K. U. students done to assert themselves,

to take charge of the University which was rightfully theirs? He was obviously well briefed, for he next went into a series of rhetorical questions that served to bring the crowd to a fever pitch. He even reminded them that two years ago they had been shamefully branded as "transients," yet they continued to allow the perpetrator of this slander to hold a top administrative spot in the University.

Other speakers followed, all echoing the theme of the need for visible and direct action. Finally the stranger reached for the microphone again and yelled: "Let's get the ROTC off campus -- NOW!"

It had turned dark by now, but from my office window I had the impression that about a third of the crowd moved in the direction of the Military Science Building. I called Lawton who was at the Traffic and Security Office. He had already had a radio report from one of the officers who had been among the crowd, in civilian clothes. The ROTC unit officers and some of their students were in the building and had been alerted. Lawton had also informed Chalmers, who was at home where he could field telephone calls from Regents, the Governor and others.

This three-way arrangement -- Larry in his study at home,

Lawton with the campus police, and I in my office -- had been developed in the days after the Union fire and had worked well. We had decided to use it again now.

I had a radio with a police band and was listening to the Lawrence police dispatcher. He was instructing one car to go to the east exit of the Turnpike; twenty-five highway patrol cars were due in within the hour and should be directed to the Highway Commission maintenance compound at Teepee Junction. I reached for the phone to find out what the Chancellor knew about this when there was an incoming call for me.

It was Gary Shivers, the University radio station's principal reporter and announcer. He was on the slope north of the ROTC building and was calling on two-way radio to the station which had connected him to me by telephone.

Gary reported that there was quite a bit of scuffling and some rock throwing at the entrances to the ROTC building, but most of the participants seemed youngsters caught up in the fever of the moment. Most of the campus radicals, with the "outside agitator" and several others who looked to him to be strangers, were in a group behind the approximately five hundred students who were watching the proceedings from the slope north of the building.

In the darkness, Gary had been able to overhear the conversation of the group. Their assumption was that the vandalism at the ROTC building -- in addition to other scattered incidents which had been set up to divert part of the campus police -- had by now led to a call for help to the city police. When the city police arrived, presumably in full riot gear, the group would push the crowd forward so that a maximum number of students would be exposed to the police action. Five hundred students against thirty or forty armed cops -- sooner or later the police would have no choice but to use gas and fire arms.

John Wright had heard much the same thing and he was standing next to Gary to corroborate the report. I had totally disapproved of Wright's role in the disruption of the ROTC review the previous year, but I knew that he was wholly opposed to violence and had done yeoman's work to facilitate community peace. John was absolutely convinced that, if uniformed police appeared on the scene, the situation would go out of control.

I dialled the unlisted number at the Chancellor's residence and got Mary Ann on the phone. Larry, she said, had had a "very difficult" telephone conversation with the Governor, who insisted that Lawrence was in immediate need of help from the Highway

Patrol. The conversation had left Larry so tense and exhausted that he had felt the need to take a sedative. At the moment he had just fallen asleep.

If Larry was under sedation, there was no point in waking him. There was no time to waste. I called Lawton. Had we called the city police? Yes, about thirty minutes ago the Chancellor had so instructed him. Where were they now? On 19th Street, approaching Naismith Avenue. "Keith," I said, "I don't care how you do it, but the Lawrence police must not turn into Naismith." Keith reminded me that he had acted on the Chancellor's orders. I told Keith that the Chancellor was unable to make the necessary decision at the moment, and that I took the full responsibility.

Keith complied. The gamble paid off. The crowd dispersed peacefully, leaving only a mass of broken window glass as evidence of the evening's activity.

Our principal difficulty the next morning was trying to figure out who we were dealing with at any given moment. There were the John Wrights who wanted an end to the war but abhorred the use of violence. There were younger faculty members like David Katzman in History and Haskell Springer in English who saw the events as a renaissance of the "movement" that had meant so much

to them as graduate students. There were "freaks" who opposed all forms of social organization, and there were student politicians who wanted to make sure they would wind up on the winning side. In the series of discussions we held Thursday morning, it seemed that, for whatever reasons, more people favored a strike than were against it. I had the distinct impression that Chalmers would personally have favored suspending classes for the remainder of the semester, but Docking had made it very clear that school would go on.

The students may have sensed Chalmers' dilemma. In any case, they came up with a variety of schemes to "co-opt" him. Around noon, for instance, handbills were posted and distributed announcing a mass meeting in Hoch Auditorium, with the Chancellor as one of the featured speakers. He had never been consulted, but felt that he should appear.

While the Chancellor was at the meeting, his secretary told me that President Baum of the University of Rhode Island was on the phone and, in Larry's unavailability, wished to speak with me. Werner Baum had been Graduate Dean at Florida State University in the late fifties and had interviewed me for the directorship of a School of Public Affairs (a plan which was never implemented). In

1961, as FSU's Vice President for Academic Affairs, Baum had picked a young assistant professor of Psychology to be his assistant, and two years later he placed him in the deanship of Arts and Sciences. I knew that Larry Chalmers had been Baum's protege -- and Baum knew that I knew. (It may be only coincidence, but in 1971 Baum went through serious marital problems, and, also in 1971, he fired his academic vice president -- both events duplicated by Larry Chalmers in 1972.)

Baum said that Larry had called him to discuss "mutual problems" and that Baum had told him what had taken place at Rhode Island. Larry had asked for more details and this was the reason for Baum's return call. I duly noted everything Baum told me and relayed it to the Chancellor.

That evening (Thursday) the Chancellor, Balfour and I met with SenEx. Throughout the evening reports came in of scattered incidents around the campus. At one stage, housing units reported that they had received telephone calls, purporting to come from the Chancellor's office, and asking everyone to remain calm while the National Guard took control of the campus. A small group of supportive students, who had congregated to offer general assistance, was put to work to get the word out that there was no

talk even of the National Guard and that the other message had been a fake.

Amongst interruptions such as these, SenEx deliberated through much of the night. Gradually, with skillful inputs from the Chancellor, a plan emerged. There would be no suspension of classes; individual students, however, would have the option of doing "alternative" work while receiving grades of "Pass" for the courses they discontinued; the plan would be presented to a mass meeting of faculty and students on Friday afternoon and, if ratified there, would take effect at once.

Thanks to his adroit handling of the situation, the Chancellor was able to credit SenEx with this scheme. Only he and I knew that it was almost to the word what Werner Baum had asked me to relay to Larry Thursday afternoon.

An estimated 13,000 persons were in the Stadium Friday, and shouted overwhelming approval of the "plan for alternative learning." Again I was not there, but back in the office, fielding telephone calls. When Larry returned he was exuberant. It was, without a doubt, his finest hour -- and the peak of his popularity.

It is my recollection that approximately 4,500 students availed themselves of the option afforded to them by the plan.

Virtually all of them, however, were in the College and, significantly, the courses with the highest percentage of students opting "out" were the beginning foreign language courses, calculus, and college algebra. Many of the "alternatives" set up by a "coordinating committee" failed for lack of participation. Any observer of the campus scene would be justified in concluding that, while K. U. had not closed, it certainly had not continued normal operations.

After initial expressions of relief that a student strike had been averted, press and alumni reactions became largely critical. John Conard, who had moved to Lawrence shortly after the May events and was about to take over his duties in University Relations, reported that there was widespread criticism of the University in general and the Chancellor in particular in many parts of the State. He urged that the Chancellor devote the summer to a crash program of visits with alumni groups. Dick Wintermote heartily concurred and Chalmers agreed to the plan.

Nearly forty meetings were held between late June and the middle of August. With a few exceptions, Larry felt good about the response. Conard, who accompanied him throughout, confessed to me that the Chancellor's rose-colored view was as much of a shock to him as was the frequent evidence of outright hostility by members of the audience.

The ability to maintain an optimistic perspective is, of course, a valuable perquisite for university administration, but I had begun to wonder if Larry's particular brand of optimism was not perhaps somewhat ill conceived. In the spring of 1969 I once heard him say that no university president who had the support of students would get fired and no president could long survive if the students were not behind him. In the summer of 1970, Chalmers probably enjoyed as much student support as any Chancellor had ever had; yet on July 19 he escaped dismissal by the Board of Regents by the scant margin of one vote.

The occasion was a special meeting of the Board precipitated by Chalmers' refusal to fire Gary Dean Jackson from his half-time job as assistant dean of men. In the days that preceded Lawrence had been shaken by the death from police bullets of two young men, one a black, the other a white student. The first death occurred on the east side of town, but in the proximity of a house which the BSU was using for community activities, which it was widely rumored also served for the storage of weapons and ammunition. It is indicative of the level of tension in the community at the time that the militant blacks and the white vigilantes alike believed it essential to their safety to be armed.

Gary Jackson was one of several students active in the BSU who had been placed in part-time jobs in student-related offices, in an effort to meet the contention of black students that, without blacks in these offices, they lacked effective access. These appointments had begun on July 1; two weeks later, Gary Jackson was identified as the individual who purchased a sizeable quantity of ammunition (my recollection is that it was over two thousand rounds) in Topeka and transported the entire amount to Lawrence. Members of the Board of Regents expressed the view that this was evidence of an attitude toward society that could not be reconciled with his counseling role and indicated to the Chancellor their belief that he should be summarily dismissed. Chalmers' reply was that he knew of no State law or University regulation that prohibited the purchase of ammunition and that he saw no reason for firing Jackson. If the Board desired the dismissal, he would need to be formally ordered to take such an action.

I supported the Chancellor's position on strictly legal grounds. Within the month, the Board of Regents had promulgated a "Code of Conduct" and in it had specified that suspensions for violations of the code should always be preceded by a statement of charges, a formal hearing, and the opportunity to be represented by counsel.

In my opinion, the Board was asking the Chancellor to violate its own rules as well as constitutional standards of due process. (This is precisely what the United States Court of Appeals held in 1973. Chalmers v. Jackson.)

When the Chancellor returned from the special meeting of the Board which had ordered him to dismiss Gary Jackson, he came into my office, visibly shaken. Henry Bubb had moved that he, Chalmers, be dismissed and the motion had failed by the close vote of 4-3 (two members were absent; one of the Regents, voting against the motion, had stated that he would have voted for the motion, except for his belief that a step of this importance should be taken by the full Board).

What upset Chalmers the most was that one of the three votes against him was cast by Jess Stewart. Larry knew fully well that, beginning with his anti-war statement in September 1969, Henry Bubb had been opposed to him. Tom Griffith, who had cast the third vote for Bubb's motion, followed Bubb's lead on practically all matters. But Stewart had not only always appeared to be supportive of Chalmers, he had on at least one occasion allowed himself to be a party to an effort by the Chancellor to discredit Bubb with the Governor. (I handled the letters involved and was, therefore,

acquainted with this episode; it may not have been an isolated instance.)

Chalmers told me that he had met Stewart at the Topeka airport and driven him to the State House. Stewart, he said, sounded as supportive as ever. At the State House, Stewart had gone into the Governor's office. Chalmers told me that when Stewart came to the Regents' office some time later, he was pale and taciturn. Then, when Bubb put his motion, Jess voted "aye." It seemed clear to Larry (and to me at the time) that whoever it was Stewart saw in the Governor's office (it developed later that it had not been the Governor, but his two closest aides, Pat Burnau and Tom Van Cleave) had known of Bubb's intentions and prevailed on Stewart to vote for the motion -- and against Chalmers.

Governor Robert Docking had, to the best of my knowledge, always been correct and cordial in his relationship with the Chancellor. Differing from his father, Bob Docking rarely showed anger or displeasure in public. But he had been greatly upset -- and had shown his irritation -- when he learned that on May 8 (the "day of alternatives") his wife, representing him on the platform at a meeting in the Field House featuring Senator Edmund Muskie, was booed by the K. U. student body.

Much later the Governor told me in confidence that in January, 1969, he had received a telephone call from the Governor of Florida (Claude Kirk) who had told him that he understood Chalmers was being considered for the K. U. job and that he, Kirk, wanted to warn Docking against Chalmers. Docking commented to me that he had never liked Kirk (a Republican) and had, therefore, paid no attention to the call. Since Bubb had long been prominent in Republican politics (he was national chairman of the "Citizens for Reagan" in 1968), I assumed that he may have received a similar call.

Stewart told me in January, 1972, that he had concluded by June, 1970, that the Board would have to find a way to remove Chalmers. He did not tell me whether there was any connection between his visit at the Governor's office and his vote against Chalmers -- and I did not ask him.

None of this was known to me in July, 1970. On the contrary, I saw the situation entirely through the Chancellor's eyes and supported him to the fullest. As we moved into his second year in office, I believed firmly that, if only student unrest would subside, K. U. would thrive under Larry Chalmers' leadership. I tended to minimize the differences that occasionally surfaced

between us and attributed them to the difference in our experiences. To be sure, I would get annoyed at what I considered mannerisms, especially the frequent references to the way he had done things "at another university" but Murphy and Wescoe each also had favorite expressions that I had not much cared for -- and, certainly, as time went by, Larry would, as he had written me in June, 1969, adapt himself to Kansas.

But as we passed through the fall and winter of 1970, a number of events took place that increasingly convinced me that Larry had no intention of adapting himself, but that, quite to the contrary, his intention was to change K. U. and, furthermore, that he had decided that there was no place for me in his scheme of things.

On campus, Larry's views on change within the University were noticeably guarded. Indeed, my statements on the subject were probably more positive and more direct than his. If he spoke elsewhere, it was the exception rather than the rule for any of us to see what he planned to say. In fact, I first heard about an address he gave at Santa Barbara that year when a faculty member asked me to comment on the view of higher education espoused in that speech.

Concern about the Chancellor's educational ideas increased after he restated them in an appearance at Bowling Green State University. Then, in 1971, he developed some of the same notions before the Kansas City Press Club and the Kansas City Star printed the full text, albeit only in the back pages of the Sunday editorial section.

The key to his conception not only of higher education, but of society, was that change and progress could be accomplished only by conflict. There were, he told the Kansas City Press Club, basically two types of people. The Type A person puts his faith in compromise and the ability of people to reconcile their differences. The Type B individual not only accepts conflict as normal, but also believes that the best results come out of open confrontation. In a way, what Chalmers put forward was a variation on the determinism of Charles Reich, whose Greening of America was at that time widely viewed as the gospel of the New Left.

Although these views did not see print until about a year later, in the fall of 1970 there were several occasions when the Chancellor urged me to deal with personnel problems by provoking open breaks with the individuals concerned. He would tell me that I should confront this or that dean with the flat choice of complying

with whatever it was I wanted or being removed from his position. On one occasion a visitor from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare congratulated the Chancellor on the high caliber of the deans and especially those chosen during my tenure; Chalmers replied -- I thought flippantly, but later I realized that he was not joking at all -- that I would not pass the test as a really good chief academic officer until I had fired an equal number of deans!

Late in October the pressure on me was more directly applied. On October 19, I was in Chicago on University business and missed the ~~bi-weekly~~ ^{monthly} meeting of the Council of Deans. The following day June Michal, my administrative assistant who kept the minutes for the Council of Deans, brought me the minutes with the comment that it had been a very unusual meeting. Reading the minutes, I learned that a motion had been made and passed which required me to submit all decisions on allocation of funds or positions to the Council of Deans for advance approval. Bill Albrecht, who was my first appointment that morning, supplied the background: the Chancellor had rather skillfully maneuvered the Council into the topic and then urged the deans to put their intentions on record.

Actually, he had done something very similar the previous January when I had had to miss a meeting of the Council, but on that occasion George Waggoner had prevented a formal vote. This

time the College was represented by one of the associate deans who had raised no objection, but merely abstained from voting.

What had precipitated the Council of Deans' action was the fact that our fee collections had fallen short of the budgeted estimate and that a decision had to be made as to how the shortage would be covered. A plan prepared by me had been sent to the deans for discussion at this meeting. As I had expected, it did not meet with anybody's approval. The Chancellor then suggested that the deans might undertake to develop a plan of their own. Four committees of the deans worked on such plans for the next four weeks and produced -- as I expected -- four incompatible schemes. With only minor dissent, the Council then asked me to do what I thought was necessary.

I had not asked the deans to reserve their resolution of October 19; I was fairly certain that they would do so of their own accord after even a brief experience. We had just been notified that we would receive \$26,000 in Federal funds for undergraduate instructional equipment. In the past, the allocation of this annual grant had been made in my office. Now I asked the deans how they wished to proceed. Several of them, frustrated by their inability to come up with a resolution for their previous problem, were

eager to have this money distributed by the Council. It was agreed that they should try to do so. Three weeks later they reported no agreement. A motion to replace the October 19 resolution with a statement requiring that my allocation decisions be discussed in the Council before being announced as final passed without dissent.

The previous week I had been involved in a quite unrelated incident, but one which produced the first open clash between the Chancellor and me. The first home game of the basketball season had been in progress for about half an hour when an usher first asked Keith Lawton to come into the corridor and then Keith beckoned me to come out. A telephone call had been received that a bomb had been placed in the Field House to go off at 9 p. m. The Chancellor was out of town, as was the Athletic Director; what did I want to do? A quick calculation showed that at 9 p. m. the half-time interval would be in progress and the majority of the spectators would be milling about in the corridors. If, in fact, there was a bomb, it seemed to me that the lesser risk would be to have the spectators in their seats and try to control the likely panic through the public address system. I undertook to go to our bench, acquainted Coach Ted Owens with the situation, and asked him to confer with the other coach and the officials so that the first half

would be stretched out to last until 9:05; and this was done.

The sports writers, of course, soon discovered why so many unexplained time-outs were called near the end of the first half. When the Chancellor returned to the campus the following day, he was clearly displeased. He walked into my office, where I was meeting with several people, and in their presence demanded to know who had directed that the game be delayed. When I said I had given the instruction, he demanded to know why I had not followed the policy he had established that, except for an inconspicuous search, anonymous bomb threats would be ignored. I replied that, while I knew that this was the policy we followed with classroom buildings, I did not know of any policy applying to athletic events. Chalmers' voice became very sharp when he replied that most assuredly it did. All I knew to say was that I was sorry, but I did not think that I had ever been told. Later that day I went into the Chancellor's office and repeated that I was sorry if I had mishandled the situation, but I honestly believed that there was no policy and that I had no choice but to use my own judgment. Chalmers said there had been bomb threats during football games and he had applied what he called "our high risk policy." I noted that this was the first I had heard of threats against the stadium and that, obviously,

if I had known, I would have known what to do.

I thought that would end the matter, but Larry brought it up again at the regular Thursday afternoon meeting with the student body officers and the SenEx chairman. My only response was to say, as calmly as I could, that I now understood the policy and would act accordingly if the occasion should arise again.

When the Chancellor again mentioned the matter, this time at the Friday staff meeting, I was less restrained. I did not feel, I said rather sharply, that I should have to accept criticism for violating a policy that had not been communicated to me. The Chancellor did not respond and moved on to the regular agenda.

One of the major items on this agenda was the threat of a student strike. The BSU, it had been learned, would call a strike on Monday (December 7) to demand the reinstatement in his job of Gary Dean Jackson. Nobody seemed to know what to expect. The Chancellor's nervousness was apparent to all. I decided that his testiness about my handling of the bomb policy may have been due more to the strike threat than anything else.

The strike call was a failure. On the very first morning a white student challenged a black who was painting slogans on the sidewalk and the black wheeled around and shot him. Although the

injury later proved not to be serious, the incident sent a shock wave through the campus. While most black students stayed away from classes, the majority of them did so out of fear and remained at home or in their rooms. Only a small minority took part in active protests and strike agitation.

On Friday evening of that week a bomb went off at the Computation Center. As had been the case when the Union burned, I was the first administrator on the scene, shortly followed by Ray Nichols. We tried immediately to locate the Chancellor, but to no avail. His young son only knew that his parents had gone out for the evening, but not where they had gone. Somewhat later George Baxter Smith arrived and reported that earlier in the evening (by this time it was midnight) he had seen Larry and Mary Ann at a dance at the Ramada Inn. I called there and found out that they had left an hour earlier. Another call to the residence indicated that, apparently, they had not gone home. It was almost 1 a. m. when the Chancellor finally joined us; he was in a dinner jacket and evidently had been at a party after he left the dance. But when the Governor came to the campus the following day to inspect the damage, he told him that he had rushed over from his residence in time to help put the three students wounded in the blast into the ambulance.

Incidents such as these in which Larry simply did not speak the truth had occurred with increasing frequency. A most painful experience had been a Statewide television show, arranged by John Conard, when Henry Jamison, the editor of the Abilene newspaper, had publicly confronted Larry with documented statements and Larry had flatly denied ever making them.

From my perspective a particular difficulty was that I could not find out what he was saying to members of the faculty whom he saw in his office. Perhaps the most troublesome situation of this kind occurred in connection with the Department of Computer Science.

That department had been set up in 1968 as a separate unit reporting directly to Academic Affairs. This was undoubtedly not an ideal solution, but George Waggoner had made it clear that he did not wish to use College resources to develop Computer Science and placement in the School of Engineering would overemphasize applied aspects of the discipline.

In the effort to build up the new department, personnel and personality problems which an established department might have been able to cope with took on critical dimensions. Because there was no dean between the department and me, I had to deal with these matters directly. By Christmas of 1970 two factions were fighting

for control of the department; charges and countercharges abounded and it was virtually impossible to tell who was speaking the truth.

Although I realized that he was far from being the ideal person for the job, I tended to support the chairman, Earl Schweppe. The opposition contered around Zamir Bavel, whom I had come to distrust when I had dealt with him on previous occasions. The mastermind behind the efforts to unseat Schweppe was, however, Walter Sedelow who (with his wife) had joined us in the fall of 1970. Both Sedelows went to see Chalmers; one of the assistant professors in the department told Schweppe that the Sedelows reported to what they regarded as "their" faction that the Chancellor had told them to bide their time, that he expected to bring about changes that would be favorable to them. I mentioned to Chalmers that I understood he had seen the Sedelows and wondered whether anything had transpired that could help me cope with the conflict within the department. The Chancellor replied in the negative; the Sedelows had only brought him greetings from a mutual friend. Obviously, I was in no position to quarrel with that explanation, even though I was convinced that, at best, it was a half-truth.

A few weeks later it came about that I refused to authorize an extraordinary salary increase for Bavel, who had told Schweppe

that he had an exceptional offer from another university (I had called my counterpart at that university and knew that the offer was not official and would not be authorized at anything near the figure Bavel had cited to Schweppe). Bavel came to my office and asked if I was absolutely determined to deny his salary demand. I said I was. His reply was that that left him no choice but to resign. I told him that I regretted that, but that obviously the decision was his. He got up, shook my hand and said good-bye, adding that, on the way out, he would stop by and, if the Chancellor were free, also say good-bye to him. Ten minutes later he emerged from the Chancellor's office and announced that he would stay. I asked Chalmers on three separate occasions what had transpired and whether any commitments had been made to Bavel. Chalmers asserted that he had promised nothing; in the light of all my previous dealings with Bavel I found this very difficult to understand. (In April, 1972, after my resignation but before its effective date, Chalmers instructed me to provide a salary increase of nearly thirty percent for Bavel and to record for my successor a commitment to Bavel of a salary increase in 1973 of twice the percentage of the overall increase in the University's salary budget.)

There were other instances that served to erode my belief

in Chalmers, such as the occasion when he told me that the Council of Presidents had agreed that COCAO should proceed at once with the development of "decision points" for a system of formulated budgeting and I discovered at the COCAO meeting that my five colleagues had heard just the opposite from their presidents. And there were occasions when it was evident that the Chancellor put no credence in what I said to him, as in the case of a law student whom I had known for fifteen years and whose personal and educational history I knew well: Larry asked the dean of the Law School to verify what I had told him.

In retrospect, any of these incidents would have been reason enough for me to resign. By this time, however, most of the deans had come into conflict with the Chancellor over one issue or the other and, more or less directly, they had stressed the importance they attached to my continuing in the office I held. Again in retrospect, one or two of the people (none of them themselves deans of schools) who talked to me in this vein probably talked out of both sides of their mouths. I have reason to believe that there were occasions when what was said in my office was promptly related across the hall. But if -- as I am convinced he did -- Chalmers knew what my attitude had come to be, he never showed it.

On the surface our relations seemed cordial enough. He knew that I had met with Howard Bowen to discuss the possibility of going to Claremont as president of the Graduate School; I am sure that he was aware that Virginia was considering me for the position of provost, and I told him, even before my first meeting with a representative of the search committee, that I would be a serious candidate for the presidency at Rutgers. I do not know whether he actively supported me for any of these positions but, if I am correct in my view that by this time he wanted to get rid of me, the easiest way out would, of course, have been for me to get a desirable job elsewhere.

In any case, both of us did a great deal of traveling that spring. Sometimes a week would go by without an opportunity for me to talk to Chalmers. Like his predecessors, Larry was beginning to get involved in the activities of the national higher education organizations.

There was one activity, however, in which both of us took a rather active interest that spring. This was a group which George Waggoner and Bill Albrecht had convened under the name of the "ad hoc committee on the liberal arts and sciences at K. U."

What had triggered Waggoner to establish this committee

was continuous pressure from Balfour and me to clarify the role and define the future of the "Colleges-Within-the-College."

The idea behind the CWC's was sound: students would gain more out of their educational experiences if these were coordinated with their living experiences. Therefore, the freshmen and sophomores in the College would be placed in one of five colleges. Ideally, students who lived together would learn together.

Waggoner had developed these ideas in 1965. I had expressed fears which I had about the faculty's receptivity to the idea. It seemed to represent a challenge to departmental autonomy and I expected that there would be resistance. Two years earlier George had, for the first time in his deanship, been completely stymied by the faculty when he sought approval of a statement on educational policy that contained nothing more radical than the notion that there need not be a mandatory correlation between credit hours and time spent in class. I anticipated comparable difficulties if the CWC notion were put to a vote.

But George chose not to put it to a vote. Remembering that he had managed to carry the faculty with him ten years earlier when he had launched the Honors Program, he decided to employ the same approach with the CWC's. He secured a small grant from the

Carnegie Corporation and simply announced that its purpose would be to conduct an experiment in living-learning relationships with a portion of the entering freshman class. In September 1967, two hundred freshmen housed in Ellsworth and Oliver Hall had opted for inclusion in "Centennial College," the pilot project for the CWC's.

Centennial College had a director and administrative staff of its own and maintained the records for all its students in its office in Ellsworth Hall. Most of the work in the office was done by two assistant directors, each on half-time appointments with the other half in the dean of men's or dean of women's office respectively. It had been Waggoner's idea that he would thus induce the student personnel offices to decentralize and he took it for granted that the faculty member or academic administrator would set the tone for the operation.

Waggoner was hopeful that Aldon D. ("Don") Bell, a young member of the history department whom he had added to his staff in 1966, would be named to replace Laurence Woodruff as Dean of Students. Bell had actively participated in all phases of planning for the CWC's and, even more than Waggoner, he saw here the opportunity to make an impact on the student personnel system.

A former Rhodes Scholar, Bell was outspoken not only in his belief in an overriding value of liberal arts, but also in regard to his own personal ambitions. Personally attractive and intelligent, he used his wife's inherited wealth to good advantage; the Bells entertained often and well and had rapidly built up a wide circle of friends. In 1968 (and again in 1972) he had considerable support for the Chancellorship.

It was partly due to Bell's candidacy that the search committee for the Dean of Students had become deadlocked in 1967. It is possible that Surface had indicated a personal preference for Bell. In any case, after I had recommended and Wescoe had decided to ask Bill Balfour to take the job, Bell wrote me an angry and intemperate letter which asserted as much. Surface, on the other hand, denied categorically that there had been any kind of commitment made to Bell.

During 1968-69, while Waggoner was on leave, Bell was charged with the responsibility for the further development of the CWC's. But Bell lacked Waggoner's finesse and as a result the always delicate balance between the student personnel deans and the College office deteriorated rapidly. By the fall of 1969 it was almost impossible to find out who was doing what with or to the CWC's.

As dean of Arts and Sciences at Florida State University, Larry Chalmers had been instrumental in the development of what were there called "cluster colleges," a pattern not dissimilar to our CWC plan. When he accepted the Chancellorship at K. U. he noted that the existence of the CWC's was one of the things that had attracted him to Lawrence and he repeated that statement on several occasions. Our own previous publicity virtually committed us to the continuance of the program; the new Chancellor's endorsement of it made it essential that we seek to make it a success.

Waggoner tried to make the most of the situation. Since the University had pointed with such public pride to the program, he sought to get the necessary funds and positions from campus (i. e. non-College) resources. But since the program was "within the College," he was unwilling to relinquish control. But even after he returned from leave he continued to depend on Bell to do the actual directing. By this time not only the personnel deans were upset, but so were most of the College department chairmen. About half way through the academic year 1969-70, Bill Balfour and I made a comprehensive presentation to the Chancellor and asked him to set up a meeting to review the entire matter with Waggoner and the two of us.

For some reason or the other it had escaped Balfour and me that Bell and Chalmers had met two years earlier at a conference on "cluster colleges" at Santa Barbara. Bell was, in fact, the only person at K. U. who had known Chalmers before 1969. If we had been aware of that circumstance, we would have been less surprised when Chalmers responded to our recommendation by conferring with Waggoner and Bell -- without Balfour and me. It was out of this meeting that the "ad hoc committee on the Liberal Arts and Sciences at K. U." developed.

It was a remarkably astute maneuver. The membership was impressively representative. There were two departmental chairmen who had been outspokenly critical of the CWC's. There was Maynard Shelly, a psychology professor much concerned about affective teaching. There were two professional school deans who had wondered out loud whether the CWC's were not devices to recruit students away from them. Others included Jerry Lewis, the Director of Centennial College, who favored extension of the CWC's into four-year programs, Clark Bricker of the Chemistry Department who advocated assignment of students to colleges by field of study rather than living units, and Bill Albrecht, the Dean of the Graduate School. The group also included two graduate and two undergraduate

students. Notably absent was anyone representing the point of view of the student personnel deans. Absent also was Don Bell who, after several private conversations with the Chancellor, had elected to accept an offer from the University of Washington. The Chancellor and I were invited to join the committee whenever our time permitted.

Waggoner encouraged a wide-ranging discussion of the many differing points of view on the committee. This consumed the time of several meetings until Christmas. Then George suggested that, since he would be gone to South America for about six weeks, the committee turn its attention to the relations of the Graduate School with the College. He had discussed this with Dean Albrecht and the two of them had agreed that a discussion of the Liberal Arts and Sciences should include graduate programs as well as the undergraduate curriculum.

In fact, the committee returned to the problem of the CWC's for only two meetings in the second semester. At the first one the suggestion was advanced -- I do not recall by whom -- that if each of the colleges were a four-year operation, they might be differentiated not so much by curricular content but by educational philosophy. One of them might serve as the administrative framework

for an essentially unstructured degree (the Bachelor of General Studies had just been recommended to the College Assembly), another might accommodate something as rigidly structured as the Pearson College Humanities Program, while in still another students might find the mixture of requirements and electives of the present B. A. program.

This approach had more appeal than any other previously discussed and it was decided to continue exploring it. The next meeting was attended by the Chancellor, whose reaction was immediate and enthusiastic. He could see the proposed pattern lend itself to experimentation of all sorts. Not only would it accommodate "Aquinas College" (everybody thought this was a very clever label for the Pearson Humanities Program!) but now John Wright could have his "Operant Conditioning College" and somebody else could have a "Karl Marx College" or even "Henry Bubb's College of Capitalistic Virtues"! Chalmers turned to Waggoner and flatly told him that he wanted to see this pattern in full swing by the fall of 1972! (The faculty's negative vote on the Pearson Humanities Program ^{in 1973} was, I am certain, partly triggered by the specter, evoked by the Chancellor, of the possibility of things like a "Karl Marx College" or a "John Wright College.")

In general, however, the Chancellor found little time to attend the committee's sessions and neither did George Waggoner (nor, for that matter, did I). This left Bill Albrecht free to advance his plan for the reorganization of graduate studies.

The idea itself was not new. Under Albrecht's guidance the Executive Committee of the Graduate School had explored alternate forms of organization several years earlier and in either 1965 or 1966 Albrecht had presented a plan to decentralize the administration of graduate studies, somewhat along the lines of the pattern in use at Michigan State and at Rochester. Neither Surface nor Wescoe developed much enthusiasm for the plan, believing it would result in a need for more, rather than fewer administrators. After some inconclusive discussions, Albrecht withdrew the proposal.

Now, with only one more year before his mandatory retirement, he thought the time was opportune to advance the plan once more. He had ascertained that the Chancellor liked the idea and he knew that I had always favored it. George Waggoner, who had been indifferent at the time the plan was first advanced, could now see some decided advantages. The professional deans had always been uneasy about the Graduate School's centralized control, especially of admissions of students. The proposal for the reorganization

of the Graduate School cleared the ad hoc committee in quick order.

Bill Albrecht checked with me at every step and the proposal was entirely acceptable to me. This was particularly true with regard to the designation of the administrator who would handle research and Graduate School policy. I had never assumed that titles had much operational significance within the University, but I appreciated their usefulness in external relations. I am sure that it helped Lawton in his negotiations with Federal officials over construction funds that he carried the title "Vice Chancellor." Certainly the same argument could be made for the principal administrator of research contracts. Neither Bill nor I expected that any other significance would attach to the title. We were wrong.

The Graduate Council approved the reorganization in late May, to be effective with the academic year 1972-73. Early in June I prepared a memorandum for the Chancellor outlining the procedure I proposed to set in motion to put the changes into effect. My premise was that we were reorganizing parts of my area of responsibility and that therefore it was up to me to take the necessary action.

Over a month went by before there was any kind of response. To a verbal inquiry the response was that a reply was ready to be

typed. In the second week in July, while the Chancellor was out of town, I received a copy of a memorandum which he had addressed to Albrecht, Argersinger, and Waggoner. In no more than two sentences it announced that the Chancellor would appoint a committee to advise him on the allocation of functions and units to the new Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies.

When Chalmers returned a few days later, I asked him if this memorandum should be understood as an implied rejection of the recommendations I had made. His reply was that he had not rejected my recommendations, but believe that it would be desirable to learn how those most affected thought the actual functions should be distributed.

The Chancellor took a full month's vacation that summer and by the time he was back classes were about to begin. I had agreed in late July to take on the Constitutional Law class which had been left without an instructor when Velvel resigned from the Law School faculty on short notice to take a job in the east. This put me under somewhat more pressure than had usually been the case, and it was several days before I had an opportunity to raise the matter of the reorganization.

I told Larry that in conversations with others, including

Argersinger, Waggoner and Albrecht, I had found that nobody was very clear what was to happen next or what the future administrative relationships were to be. His reply was to remind me that he would have a task force advise him which of the responsibilities of my office should remain with me and which should be transferred to the new Vice Chancellor. Once that was done, a job description could be prepared for the new position and a search committee organized to fill the job. I said that I had difficulty understanding just how things were to work. Surely it was not planned that there should be two Vice Chancellors handling academic affairs, one the advanced and interesting ones and the other the rest.

We were interrupted at this point and did not return to the discussion until two weeks later. By that time the Chancellor had met with various groups and discussed the composition and the charge of the task force which he planned to set up. The sum of the feedback I received was that the nature of the reorganization would not be up for debate. There would be two Vice Chancellors, one for Academic Affairs and one for Research and Graduate Studies; the task force's assignment was to prepare two lists of units to show which ones should report to which Vice Chancellor.

I told the Chancellor that I was puzzled since I was certain

that neither the ad hoc committee nor the Graduate Council had intended to change the relationship of research administration and graduate studies to the Office of Academic Affairs. He said that, "Obviously," the recommendation that there be a Vice Chancellor could have no other meaning. I repeated that I just did not see that anywhere in the document nor had I heard it in any of the discussions. I would have to think about the direction in which we appeared to be moving; and I added that it might well turn out that he would need not one but two search committees.

It is my recollection that Larry showed no reaction at all and moved the conversation to a topic of more immediate concern to him, the question of the status of the Gay Liberation Front.

At the time Chalmers had come to Lawrence, it had been the established practice -- as was true at most colleges and universities at that time -- to treat the so-called student activity fee almost as if it were part of the tuition the student paid. Ray Nichols, always the watchdog of the University's finances, never failed to remind us that the law specified the purposes for which student activity fees might be spent but there was no doubt that it was the Chancellor who decided where the money would go.

In March, 1970, as I was putting the finishing touches to

the budget for 1970-71, the budget officer (Martin Jones) told me that the Chancellor had transferred all decisions with regard to the use of the student activity fee to the Student Senate.

There had been no consultation of any kind. The first word from the students -- understandably -- was that they would recognize no existing commitment of any kind. It was July before such long-established activities as the concert course, the University Theatre, and the intercollegiate debate program would receive even a portion of the funds that would permit them to continue. By contrast, large sums had been given to ill-defined and totally uncontrolled projects advanced by the BSU and various other militant groups. Some of these projects were thinly disguised ways to provide income for militant stalwarts such as David Awbrey.

On the face of it, Chalmers proclaimed that he had handed control of the student activity fees to the Student Senate as a matter of principle. Privately he expected that having money available would so divide the Student Senate that it would be ineffective as a possible rallying point for student power. Thus, whenever students came to him to seek his support, he would urge them to take their request to the Student Senate.

The Gay Liberation Front surfaced as an organized activity

in 1970-71. In late spring it requested formal recognition and an allocation of money to support its activities. Chalmers had heard from some of the Regents and some alumni legislators who had expressed outrage at the openness with which the Gay Liberation Front had begun to operate. Whatever the nature of the pressure on him, the Chancellor clearly did not want to accord the GLF the status of a recognized student organization (which, at the time, conferred the right to use University facilities and to seek a share of the student activity monies).

On September 29, the agenda of the Student Senate called for a discussion of the GLF's status and it was understood that a resolution would be introduced to reject the Chancellor's position. I rarely went to Student Senate meetings, but Bill Balfour attended regularly. This evening the Chancellor went, too. He asked for the floor to defend his position -- and was roundly booed.

When we met in his office the following afternoon for the regular weekly session with the student leaders and the SenEx chairman, it was evident that he had been shaken by the Student Senate's outburst against him. But he was still determined to keep the lid on the GLF. A militant women's group had announced a dance to be held the following evening in the Union, with the proceeds

to go to the GLF for the law suit which that group had initiated against the University. Chalmers said he wanted that dance cancelled. Balfour reported that only that morning the University Events Committee had reaffirmed its decision of two weeks ago to allow this dance. Chalmers told Balfour to reverse the committee's decision. Balfour reminded the Chancellor that on a previous occasion he, Chalmers, had publicly stated that the University Events Committee was not responsible to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; he could see no grounds on which he could now assume that responsibility. The Chancellor conceded the point but continued to insist that he wanted the dance cancelled. Finally someone suggested that he might want to consult SenEx and he asked Ray Nichols to arrange for such a meeting that evening.

Because my Senior Honors Seminar was already scheduled into the Regents Room that evening, SenEx convened in the Chancellor's own office. Initially the committee met without Chalmers, who had agreed to speak and answer questions at an AAUP meeting. I joined the group after my class ended and Larry came in somewhat later.

He looked pale and seemed unsteady. For at least a half hour he did not speak. Then Joe Marzluff, the NROTC commandant

who, to the Chancellor's surprise, had been elected to SenEx in the spring, said that, however much he realized the public ^{relations} advantages that would come from a cancellation of the dance, he was unable to find anything in the rules or regulations that could be used as a justification for such an action. Henry Snyder then asked the Chancellor pointedly whether, in the light of this advice from SenEx, he, Chalmers, would now act to stop the event. There was a good minute's silence; then Larry said in a tired voice: "No, I'll take your advice." After the SenEx members had left, he commented to Balfour and me that this had been a rough twenty-four hours and that he just hoped to be able to get to sleep tonight.

The next day I heard from some who had been at the AAUP meeting and I could then understand Chalmers' state of mind. The chapter president (Bunker Clark) had apparently feared that, if he allowed questions from the floor, there would be hostile and discourteous statements made. On the other hand, he was too much of a civil libertarian to allow himself to screen the questions which had been submitted in advance. He resolved the dilemma by shuffling the cards bearing the questions in open meeting, dividing them into roughly equal stacks and then asking the Chancellor to take one from each stack in sequence. He knew that there were

some "rough" questions in the lot, but he was not prepared for what actually happened: the first card the Chancellor picked up read: "Dr. Chalmers: You have been quoted as saying that, if ever it were in the best interest of the University, you would resign as Chancellor. Why have you not done so?" As if this were not enough, the second question asked whether Chalmers had been correctly quoted as having said, in his speech at Bowling Green, that the future would see the faculty confronted, and eventually controlled, by a coalition of students and administration. Chalmers, so my informants reported, really never managed to extricate himself from the difficult situation in which these questions placed him.

If these encounters with students and faculty caused the Chancellor discomfort, he managed very quickly to conceal it. He left the next day to attend the football game at Minnesota and then went to the ACE meeting in Washington. It would be ten days before I saw him again, at a meeting of the Council of Deans, and he returned vigorously to the matter of reorganization and the setting up of the task force.

For me, however, the session with SenEx on the evening of September 30 had served to bring into focus one of the things I had come to sense but had not previously seen with such clarity.

The exchange with Henry Snyder that evening had now made it quite clear: Chalmers would, at all costs, seek to avoid the burden of having made a decision. I remembered now the numerous instances when he had handled things in such a way as to divert possible blame from him to others. And it was entirely consistent with this attitude that he would not respond to inputs rather than to reject them. I began to see several of the incidents of the recent past in a different light: Chalmers did indeed want to be rid of me, but he wanted to maneuver it so that it could not be said that he had fired me.

October saw several developments which added to the strain between Chalmers and me. For one, Larry told me to fire the dean of the School of Fine Arts and I did not do it. Dean Gorton had taken the lead in a successful movement to have the Senate repeal the so-called 20% rule. This regulation, stipulating that every policy-making committee should have student membership equal to at least twenty percent of its faculty and staff membership had been adopted in the spring by the University Council acting for the Senate. There had been no notice, there was no committee review, and there was even a question about the actual presence of a quorum.

In the fall, a coalition of music and engineering faculty

forced a vote on the matter in the Senate and the motion to rescind the 20% rule carried. Chalmers made it fairly clear where he stood. Tom Gorton had shown that he was against students and should be fired as dean.

As it happened, two weeks later a motion to reconsider carried and the 20% rule received the formal approval it had lacked before. I did not fire Tom Gorton and Larry Chalmers did not insist.

Somewhere in this same time period, the Daily Kansan ran an interview with me under the headline "Grades Are Here To Stay, Heller Says." Immediately next was another story: "Chalmers Sees End to Grading." (The wording may not be precise, but that was clearly the import of the two captions.) I had responded to questions of a Kansan reporter but had been unaware that my replies were to be contrasted with the Chancellor's. I knew, of course, that our views on this subject differed, but I also knew that the Chancellor had in the past avoided a direct answer, especially for newspaper attribution. The juxtaposition of our views received considerable comment but, surprisingly, it was never mentioned in any conversation between the two of us.

Also in October Larry finally appointed the task force on the allocation of functions to the new Vice Chancellor. It was an out-

standing group, chaired by Ed Smissman in Medicinal Chemistry. To meet the Chancellor's deadline of December 15, the task force met weekly and sometimes twice a week. It taped all interviews it had -- and most of the people in the central administration were invited to state their views -- and produced a report that seemed to me to deserve the Chancellor's attention. For, in addition to producing the two lists the Chancellor had requested, the task force also addressed itself to the need for coordination, noted the difficulties that had begun to arise since the position of provost had been abolished, and recommended the appointment of an executive vice chancellor.

I received a copy of the report from Ross Copeland, the associate director of the Bureau of Child Research, to whom it had been given by his boss, Dick Schiefelbusch, who was a member of the task force. Ross and Dick were among the people with whom I had standing appointments -- a time-consuming practice but one which enabled me to remain abreast of developments. Earlier that year I had been able to secure the support of the two Kansas senators and Ross had been named the United States representative (with the personal rank of Ambassador) to the Inter-American Children's Bureau.

At a party in Ross' honor in late November John Conard had suggested that we have a formal dinner at his house just before Christmas for Ross and that he would invite Senator Pearson and his wife (John had served briefly as Pearson's administrative assistant and through John we had also come to know the Pearsons well). I thought that would be great and we set the date for December 22.

At just about the same time John Langley, the director of the University Press of Kansas, had shown me the finished pages for a very handsome book of Kansas photographs which he planned to release in January. I asked him if it would be possible to have three handbound copies before Christmas, that I thought of using them as presents for the two senators and the Governor. (The Press was established by the Board of Regents in 1966 as a joint operation of the three universities. I had served as chairman of its board of trustees since its inception.) When John delivered the requested copies a week before Christmas, I decided that the Conard's party would be a good time to hand Jim Pearson his copy.

A few days before the party John Conard told me that he had mentioned to the Chancellor that he expected to have Senator and Mrs. Pearson for dinner and that Larry had -- for all practical

purposes -- invited himself to the party. On the evening of the party, however, the Chancellor and Mrs. Chalmers were so late coming that the Conards were beginning to wonder whether they were coming at all.

When they arrived, they seemed unusually tense. In fact, Mary Ann hardly spoke to anyone all evening. Larry appeared to be annoyed at the cordiality of the exchanges when I presented Jim Pearson with the gift book. He fairly bristled when I asked him if I could transact one piece of business with him (he was due to leave for two weeks the following morning) and asked him if he had any objection to the appointment of Charles Eldredge as Director of the Museum of Art.

I had had no indication in the past that the Chancellor was in the least interested in the Museum of Art, or in art in general. He owned two or three paintings which had been given him by friends at Florida State, but at K. U. he had been noticeably absent from openings and other museum events. He had been negative about plans for a new building to house the Museum of Art. When Bret Waller, the Museum Director, was weighing an offer from the Metropolitan Museum, I was not able to convince the Chancellor to help me keep him at K. U. I was now at the point where I was likely to lose the acting director as well, unless I could offer him

the job on a firm basis. Marilyn Stokstad, the chairman of the Department of Art History and herself a former director of the Museum, and John McKay, the associate dean for the Visual Arts, had long urged me to appoint Eldredge on a permanent basis. Now he had an attractive offer and I needed to be able to act at once.

Chalmers was annoyed. He interposed a series of trifling objections and then told me to do as I pleased. He really did not care one way or the other, he said.

Dinner was no less strained. John Conard tried to entertain us with the reading of some parodies on university administration. Larry was plainly not amused. Jim Pearson then tried to talk about various people he had known in higher education. What, he asked, ever happened to John King after he left Emporia to go to Wyoming? Without thinking I replied that John King had made the same error I had seen a general make in World War II: he had arrived at my outfit, the 24th division, with a footlocker full of directives issued by him at his former command, and had simply ordered that they be reissued with only the heading changed; John King had thought that what worked at Emporia should also work at Wyoming -- and it hadn't. There was an awkward silence as I realized that I could just as easily have cited Larry Chalmers coming to Kansas from FSU.

Not surprisingly, the party soon broke up. It was clear to me that if I had deliberately tried to provoke Larry, I could not have angered him more. Von Ende (whom Conard, on my recommendation, had taken on as an assistant in 1970) was visibly disturbed. Conard thought that Larry and Mary Ann had had an argument which accounted for their lack of humor. I was rather taken aback by the cumulative effect of the evening.

During the two weeks that he was gone, Chalmers met with the search committee at Ohio State. He returned to Lawrence on the afternoon of January 3 and announced that he had withdrawn his name at Ohio State. That evening he met the Smissman task force at dinner.

I saw him briefly the following morning. Since we were between semesters, I had a relatively light schedule of appointments. I left the office at 11:30, went to get a haircut, picked up lunch off campus, and then went to my study in the Spencer Library to work on the preparation of my second-semester course.

When I returned to the office shortly after 4 p. m., my secretary, Betty Sickles, said that the Chancellor wanted to see me as soon as possible, and Ross Copeland had been trying urgently to reach me since noon. Rather casually I asked her to tell Copeland

that I would call him as soon as I had seen the Chancellor, and went off to Larry's office.

Chalmers closed the door and asked me to sit down. He had, he said, met with the Smissman task force and had been told that I had said to the task force that I would not be able to work under the reconstituted organization. This was, Chalmers added, not the first instance that had come to his attention of my open disapproval of his plans and actions. He wanted me to resign as of the end of the academic year. His face was flushed; he stubbed out the cigarette he had just lit.

As quietly as I could I said that he was, of course, entitled to have my resignation any time he wished. I only hoped that we could handle it so as to cause a minimum of disruption for the University.

I rather suspect that Larry would have been happier if I had erupted in anger. Now he said that he quite agreed, but I should understand that not only had the task force urged that I be removed, but the Board of Regents had -- as early as the previous summer -- told him to get rid of me.

I remember saying that, never having been fired before, I was not certain what the next steps should be. I was due to go to

a COCAO meeting in Manhattan the following day. Perhaps we could discuss specifics of the announcement after my return. Chalmers was entirely agreeable. If I wished to take a sabbatical the following year, he would certainly approve. Everybody would understand that I had needed a rest. My reply was that, quite to the contrary, nobody who knew me would consider that believable. I would put some ideas on paper, though, and we agreed to meet on Saturday to prepare the details.

I went back to my office and asked Betty Sickles to get Ross Copeland on the phone. Ross told me that his next-door neighbor, Bob Aangeenbrug, had come by his house shortly before midnight the night before and had told him that he had just left the Chancellor and that the big news was that Francis Heller was to be fired the next day. Ross had felt that he should first find out from Dick Schiefelbusch what had transpired at the task force's meeting with the Chancellor and that was the reason he had not tried to reach me before noon.

The task force's meeting with the Chancellor, so Schiefelbusch had reported, had been rather casual through dinner. Then Smissman had asked Bill Swift to lead off and Bill began to develop the task force's thinking about coordination and the effect of the lack of a

provost. Chalmers had interrupted him in mid-sentence: none of this would be a problem in the future -- he intended, the next day, to ask for my resignation and was certain that anyone chosen to be my successor would work for him as he wanted it done. The task force, Schiefelbusch had told Copeland, was speechless. At last Smissman had suggested that they really had no other thoughts to advance, and the meeting had adjourned.

It was now clear to me that my resignation was not a matter between me and the Chancellor only. By any estimate, at least twenty people knew about it already. Certainly, Saturday would be too late to talk about ways of handling it for public consumption.

At home that evening I drafted a scenario. My resignation would be tied to my appointment to a Roy Roberts professorship (E. Raymond Hall, who held one of the two chairs supported by the Roberts endowment was due to retire and hence the position was properly available); I would remain in office until June 30, be available (in pay status) to my successor for consultation for the first two weeks in July, and then have a month's paid vacation before the beginning of the academic year. I put all this in a long-hand memorandum, along with the text of a proposed news release, and had it taken to the Chancellor's residence as I headed to Manhattan for the COCAO meeting.

My COCAO colleagues were visibly shaken by my news, especially the assertion that the Regents had in some way encouraged the Chancellor's decision. Max Bickford, the Board's executive officer, was there and I asked him privately what he could tell me. I knew, of course, that I had on occasion openly disagreed with some members of the Board, and Bickford and I had differed more often than not (I had always been appalled that the Board's chief of staff should be someone with no professional experience above the junior college level). Why had the Board urged Chalmers to dismiss me? Bickford said flatly that he had never heard any discussion of me in any gathering of the Board, formal or informal. Possibly, though, some individual members might have talked to Chalmers; Stewart, for instance, had been rather upset after last June's COCAO meeting -- although Max properly recalled that it had been John Chalmers of Kansas State and not I who had challenged Jess most directly.

Jess Stewart joined us the next day, and I asked him directly. His reply was that if this was what Larry had told me, that it was an out-and-out lie. And he went on to tell me that the Board was virtually unanimous in the conclusion that they had made a horrible mistake in 1969 and that they were hoping to find some way to rectify it, the sooner the better. Of course, he was telling me this in strict

confidence, but, he said, what Larry was doing now with regard to me was really upsetting to him. He asked me if he should contact other Regents. I told him that the last thing I wanted was to precipitate a public controversy; my first concern was for the welfare of the University and that it seemed to me that no good could come from prolonging or publicizing the issue.

Yet at this moment I had no word from Chalmers that he had agreed to the proposal I had left for him. When I called him, he acknowledged receiving it, but said that he could not appoint me to the Roberts professorship without a recommendation from the Department of Political Science, supported by appropriate letters from external authorities. I asked him if he realized that during fifteen years in administration I really had not much opportunity to do the things that bolster one's standing in a discipline. He countered by saying that he was committed to doing things according to established procedures, and he was simply following what my office had advised him was the procedure. I went back to my COCAO colleagues convinced that Chalmers had won this round.

Late in the afternoon, however, I had a call from John Conard, who wanted to clear with me what was to be released to the media the next morning. It was essentially my draft except for a sentence that

said that the Department of Political Science had recommended, and a special committee headed by Bill Albrecht had endorsed, my appointment to the Roberts professorship. There was not a word of acknowledgment of my fifteen years' service, or of any contribution I might have made to the University. The Chancellor merely allowed himself to be quoted to the effect that I was the hardest working administrator he had ever known. But, at least I would be on salary throughout the summer and not incur a serious cut in income thereafter. (Chalmers, incidentally, never acknowledged the resignation I submitted. Eventually, in July, my successor was instructed to do so!)

As I was later able to find out, Chalmers had shown my letter to Nichols and had asked him to set the procedure in motion. The procedure, of course, called ^{for} a committee chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and including the dean for Research Administration, the Graduate dean, the dean of the School concerned, and two or three holders of named professorships selected by the Vice Chancellor. Since obviously I could not act as chairman, Nichols had the good sense to ask Bill Albrecht to do so and apparently the two of them agreed that the process should be expedited as much as possible. (Bill Swift, who had

served as both associate and acting dean of the Graduate School, had given Albrecht a full run-down of the events as he knew them from the vantage point of the task force.)

Albrecht called Herman Lujan, who was chairman of the department, and asked him to go to work at once. Lujan told me that he received this call at 10 a. m., and that Albrecht wondered if he could possibly have an answer for him before the next morning. I do not know how he did it, but by 2 p. m., when the department's faculty met, Herm had verbal statements (and promises to back them with letters) from the incumbent and two former presidents of the American Political Science Association.

Of course, once my impending departure from the Office of Academic Affairs became known, interest began to focus on the question of who the two new vice chancellors would be. Chalmers decided -- quite appropriately, I thought -- that it would not be advisable to bring in persons not familiar with K. U. There was only one search committee named and it was charged to bring to the Chancellor two lists of six persons each (there was no mention of duplication of names, and in the final event two names appeared on both lists), these names to be drawn from those then on the K. U. faculty or who had left within the last two years. That latter group,

intriguingly, included only two persons who had even minor administrative experience, Don Bell and Ambrose Saricks. Bell later told a mutual friend that he had called Chalmers to tell him that he was very much interested and that it was he, Bell, who had suggested the two-year formula.

The search committee, however, did not include Bell on either of its lists. In fact, Saricks was the only one of the six persons suggested for the position in Academic Affairs who had not indicated that he preferred not to be considered.

It came as no surprise to me that I was not consulted and, indeed, my first knowledge of the appointment of the two new vice chancellors came when the managing editor of the Journal-World called me to obtain additional information on Saricks. I had, of course, known Saricks, and known him quite well since he first came to K. U. in 1950. I was delighted to have him come back to K. U. and genuinely pleased that it was he to whom I would turn over my desk. And I told him so in a telephone call I placed as soon as my caller had hung up.

We agreed that Saricks would come up to spend a few hours to meet the office staff. About ten days later I would be in Wichita for a COCAO meeting and we planned to spend an evening together

One thing was certain. If Larry Chalmers thought he had the students behind him, he was sadly mistaken. I am fairly convinced that he did not consider it important what the faculty felt: he was certain that one could always produce enough divisions within the faculty to negate its potential weight. He probably felt fairly confident about the support he could count on from the restructured administrative group. Oldfather (whom he had named University Attorney against all recommendations) had been the search committee member who had first interviewed him; Saricks had been the acting chairman of the search committee; Aangeenbrug (whom he now named Director of Institutional Research and Planning) had shown himself eager to echo Chalmers' views on virtually all matters; Argersinger was a question mark but would be easy to move aside -- his acceptance of the vice chancellorship was so hedged with reservations that it would present no problems to find a reason to replace him.

What, of course, nobody knew was that the lawyers were even then working on the divorce proceedings. One of the lawyers involved told me later that everything had been done to consummate the divorce by late June, but that Larry requested that it be postponed to the middle of August. He had, rather candidly, said that at that time it would take at least two weeks for the Regents to

assemble from their various vacation locations and the interval would produce a massive movement in his support by the returning students.

Thus it was that the news was timed to be made public on August 15. In retrospect, we were able to think of occasions, most notably the dinner at the Conards, when it was evident that there was friction between Larry and Mary Ann. But I had heard nothing of another woman (though acquaintances at Florida State University told me afterwards that it had been common knowledge there) and I had no knowledge to substantiate the various other rumors that were making the rounds. What I did know was what Jess Stewart had told me in January about the Regents' feelings and I was, therefore, quite certain that they would not pass up this opportunity.

In fact, of course, the Regents acted with remarkable speed. On August 19, Chalmers had resigned and Ray Nichols had been named Acting Chancellor.

The choice of Nichols was almost inevitable in view of the administrative disarray created by Chalmers. Of course, Nichols could do nothing with the situation except to try to keep it afloat. He did yeoman work rebuilding ties with friends and supporters

off-campus; internally he could do no more than to seek to avert total paralysis. The task of re-generating the campus as an on-going effort would, of necessity, fall into the lap of the man who would succeed him in 1973.