

How It All Ended

by Yates Hafner

Cautionary Note:

I was Dean of Monteith College for $4\frac{3}{4}$ years—from July, 1971, through March 29, 1976, when I “relinquished the deanship” (President George E. Gullen, Jr.’s delicate euphemism for “was fired”). Deans serve at the pleasure of the president, and my president was not pleased with me. This narrative, a mixture of memories, opinions, and demonstrable facts, might make clear why he had cause to be displeased, and we in Monteith to be vexed.

As for the memories, they go back thirty-three years and more to my middle age. With Mark Twain I can avouch that “when I was younger I could remember anything, whether it happened or not; but I am getting old, and soon I shall remember only the latter.” Sprinkled liberally throughout these vivid memories are a variety of opinions. The reader may have trouble telling which are which.

As for the facts, I have kept in the attic five boxes stuffed with documents and notes from that period. Until this summer, I hadn’t opened any of those boxes since filling them thirty-three years ago. The paper clips were all rusted and many of the papers brittle. Like history, some stirred lively images, then became flakey in my hands. I must say that reading through those faded and decaying memos, figures, clippings, minutes, and scribblings was painful. I was living through all our troubles again. Again I felt the pressures, anxieties, the burden, of trying to save our college under attack. It was, I suppose, a bit of post-traumatic stress syndrome. It explains, perhaps, why I had shied away from looking at that material again. Nor had I done so had not Cliff Maier persuaded me to tell the story as I saw it.

At one point while writing it, unexpectedly I started crying. Despite some morbidly amusing episodes, the whole thing still hurts.

Welcome to Wayne

In March of 1971, when I drove up to Detroit from Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, to be interviewed for the deanship of Monteith College, I was welcomed warmly by Professor of Physics Henry V. Bohm, who at that time was an ad-

ministrators high up in the echelons of Wayne State University and chairman of the search committee for a new dean of Monteith. Both he, Academic Vice President Ali Cambel, and Executive Vice President Edward Cushman assured me that Monteith was a very important part of Wayne State University. They said they were impressed by my credentials. That was either poor judgment or astute craftiness, but it seemed sincere, and I was flattered.

For a half hour I met with Wayne State President William Rea Keast in his office. I had read some of Keast's articles on eighteenth-century British literature when I was a graduate student at Stanford. He said that after his retirement in two months he planned to "read back into English literature," read, reflect, and write on the problems and possibilities of higher education in America and relate himself particularly to institutions that can provide meaningful education for minority groups. The main problem of American civilization, he asserted, "after we get rid of the nonsense in Southeast Asia [the catastrophic Vietnam War]" was racism.

I quickly gathered that he was tendering me the perspective of a larger context in which to conceive the mission of Monteith College, a mission, however, that I understood Monteith to have already embraced. But what President Keast said underscored the importance he attached to the College. He said that General Motors needed models for achieving something *other* than products; it needed something that the University could provide: the humanizing of the workplace.

Yet the University, he said, instead of developing models that could be salutary for industry, had adopted the GM model! Keast told me he had been astonished by the degree of understanding, compassion, and commitment he had found among Detroit's top industrial leaders. He said their problems and his were quite similar: how to change their respective organizations. Resistance came from the sheer size and mechanics of organization but also from the failure of subordinates to understand and carry out humane programs.

Monteith's position is unquestionably secure, he told me. The reputation of the faculty and the value of the program have been established on the strength of the performance of their students. "It is time that their influence on the rest of the University becomes more pronounced. They need new and younger leadership. . . . Thirty-seven is about right." (Before my next appointment I had a short break, which gave me an opportunity to write down all I could remember of what Mr. Keast had said to me.) Realizing that this man was about to vacate the presidency was my first disappointment in coming to Wayne. Later, after he had left the University, I heard others speak disparagingly of him.

I then met the first and founding dean of Monteith, Woodburn O. Ross. He did not interview me but gave me a chance to ask any and all questions that came to mind. The single most important thing he said and that has stayed with me ever since was: "What sets Monteith apart is that it has always stood for the student." What a shocking thing to say! But he did say that, and he meant it. Not "cared for" but "*stood for*," he said. Throughout my tenure in the dean's office, I tried—I'm not saying I always succeeded—to remember that sacred tradition and to bear it in

mind in every decision I had to make about program and personnel. And I always felt that Woody, a man of practical wisdom and better political sense than I had, was ever ready to assist me but would never force himself upon me. Well, he did force himself upon me once. It was just before I was to plead for the survival of Monteith at a meeting of the University Council on November 5, 1975. To fortify me against an ordeal he knew would be stressful, he took me to a nice restaurant in the Park Shelton for lunch and coaxed me into having a martini.

My second disappointment in coming to Wayne was learning that Professors Sally Cassidy, George Drury, and Paule Verdet were leaving that summer. I had known all three for many years and admired not only their intellectual gifts, creativity, and resilience of mind but also their understanding of, and personal devotion to, students. I felt their departure was a great loss for the College and the University. I was also saddened to learn that a major determinant in their decision to leave was a rift in the Science of Society Division. I was not in a position to do anything about that rift. It was an accomplished fact. But it made me wonder about the nature and spirit of instruction in the Science of Society required sequence of courses. That is one reason I decided to audit their first course in the fall. (The other was to remedy a lack in my own education.)

Rumblings

The first warning I got that the College might be in some danger came unexpectedly during my initial meeting with the whole faculty assembled in a room of the Student Center Building. A few members evinced distrust of faculty in the College of Liberal Arts, counseling me to keep them away from Monteith—that is, not to invite them to participate in any of our activities. At the time, I thought their attitude was probably a little paranoiac. I had not done my homework thoroughly enough to be cognizant of the historic opposition to the founding of the College and of their displeasure at the official confirmation of its continuance at the time of judgment in 1964. So, I optimistically thought to myself that cultivating good relations with faculty members in Liberal Arts, far from being dangerous, would be healthy and natural in a university of scholars. Yet, once I became immersed in the immediate business of Monteith, I did not find or make time for reaching out beyond the borders of my own college. Nor, with very few exceptions, did any of them reach out to me. I did have cordial relations with my fellow deans, however, especially with the deans of the professional schools.

Every Friday morning—or every other Friday, I don't remember which—we had a President-Deans Conference high up in McKenzie Hall. Ed Cushman and Martin Stearns, Dean of Liberal Arts, were cigar smokers, and Doctor of Medicine Larry Weiner, Deputy Dean of the Medical School, who often represented Dean Bob Coye, was a chain cigarette smoker. After about an hour into each meeting, Stanley Stynes, Dean of Engineering, and I would get up, go to a window, open it up, and breathe the fresh Detroit air. I often sat next to Eberhard Mammen, Dean of Phar-

macy, who always wore French cuffs. With a conspiratorial voice he would mutter in my ear, "We're in a mushroom factory, where they keep us in the dark and feed us horseshit." Or, if someone on the President's staff was holding forth with little of value to say, Eberhard would whisper, "I could give him a suppository. It might help." But I was obliged to take seriously everything that was said across the huge oval table, so I diligently took notes and reported anything I supposed significant to our Division heads. Every year, at almost every meeting, the message was the same: It will be extremely difficult to balance the budget next year; even this year we may have to cut back. And at every meeting Martin Stearns would complain that his college was already cut to the bone. We all knew what he would say as soon as he took his cigar out of his mouth. Dean Coye always had an excuse for missing a meeting. The real reason was that he couldn't stand the agony. He became a good friend of mine, as did Stan Stynes, Victor Doherty, Dean of the Business School, Sidney Dillick, Dean of Social Work, Wilbur Menge and later Ed Simpkins, Deans of Education. Woody was right: The professional schools all cherished what we were doing in Monteith, because they could see the results in the Monteith graduates who came to them. Those deans understood the value of a coherent interdisciplinary liberal education.

But back to the rumblings. In 1973, to my astonishment, Hank Bohm, who was then Provost of the University, granted authorization for us to recruit as many as ten new faculty members for the 1974-75 academic year. We conducted national searches and appointed a brilliant array of people (see the document "New Members of the Faculty, 1974-75," posted on this website). Hank and his associate provost E. Burrows Smith, a handsome, courtly professor of French, professed to be thrilled with the quality of these new appointments—which they approved even though (or because?) it would increase our expenditures and thereby inflate our cost per credit hour, which was already almost double that of Liberal Arts. (The cause of this disparity, of course, was that most of the credit hours generated by Liberal Arts were produced by poorly paid graduate teaching assistants and part-time faculty, whereas ours were almost entirely by full-time faculty.)

I say I was astonished, because on May 22, 1973, the Provost had issued an order to every dean to prepare to give layoff notices to nearly "all faculty and academic staff whose term contracts will expire between July 1, 1973, and June 30, 1974." The reason for the cuts was that "1973-74 will certainly be tight in most units, tighter than 1972-73 [which was really tight]. I see no way of avoiding the likelihood that *you will have fewer general fund faculty and academic staff positions in 1974-75 than in the previous year*" (my emphasis). Then, on August 23, 1973, Burrows wrote, "You know that the budgetary outlook for 1974-75 is extremely gloomy. You are not apt to have any more real dollars than in the current year and you may have fewer. . . . It is difficult, if not impossible, to defend the maintenance of faculty positions in the face of declining enrollments. . . . you must plan for some staff reductions."

Of course, we complied with these orders, and the Provost's office approved of our compliance plans yet without forbidding us to proceed with the recruitment

of ten new assistant professors! In retrospect, I see that I was naïve not to have been alarmed by this discrepancy. But the administration had been crying “Wolf!” for so many years that I thought little of it and, after securing our new appointments, I relaxed and basked in the sunlight of Henry and Burrow’s praise. Our students will be well served. That’s what matters.

In the fall quarter of 1973 I created a furor by withdrawing my recommendation that Ron Aronson, assistant professor of Humanistic Studies, be granted continuing tenure. I won’t go into the reasons for my decision. I bring it up because the case became a campus-wide *cause célèbre*—so much so that I felt it incumbent to issue a public statement in answer to some thirteen questions that I felt needed clear answers for students and colleagues throughout the University. The last of these was a response to fear and anxiety. I quote my response because it indicates my own view of the viability of Monteith at the time and my trust in President Gullen.

Is There a Plan to Eliminate Monteith College?

There is none that I know of. None that President Gullen knows of. On a number of very recent occasions President Gullen has proclaimed categorically that his administration has every intention to continue supporting Monteith College. He is worried about our enrollment, to be sure. So am I. But we are both convinced that Monteith is one of the finest colleges in this university and that it will remain as integral a part of Wayne as the College of Liberal Arts or the Medical School. I personally trust that if there were any thought whatever being given to the dissolution of Monteith College by the Gullen administration, he would let me know about it immediately.

I am also confident that, given better understanding of the nature of Monteith, our enrollment will increase significantly even in a period of declining enrollments nationally. More than ever before, the present climate of life on planet earth makes a coherent general education yoked with the development of professional competence the most appealing educational goal of people who are aware of contemporary problems and resolved to do something about them. And this is what Monteith offers, has done, and is prepared to continue doing.

Several members of the administration complimented me for this memo, “Recent Personnel Decisions and the State of the College,” dated January 22, 1974. Neither Provost Bohm nor President Gullen himself expressed any demurrals to the last two paragraphs.

Meanwhile, Ron Aronson won a legal case that enjoined the University to grant him tenure, and went on to become elected to the Academy of Scholars, the most elite organization of distinguished scholars at Wayne State University. What does that tell you about the judgment of Dean Hafner in 1973?

Endgame, Part One: Betrayal

Back in the 1960s, the noted architect Paul Rudolph designed a special building for Monteith with classrooms and with offices for the entire faculty. Not everyone liked the design, of course, but it was striking. A scale model sat in the foyer of the dean's office. One of my ambitions was to get the thing built, with modifications to suit the faculty. Early in the morning on a sunny day in May 1975, I rode my bicycle to campus from my home on Detroit's east side, for an eight o'clock appointment I had made with Executive Vice President Edward Cushman, to discuss with him a strategy to raise money for the erection of this building on the Wayne State campus. Ed was a pleasant, good-humored, cordial man. Whenever we met, he invariably rose to shake my hand and offer me a cigar, even though he must have realized I didn't smoke. This time, however, no handshake, no cigar. Before I could say anything, he said, "We're going into the President's office." No explanation was offered. He stepped briskly and I followed without a word.

The door was open, we went in, the President asked me to sit down. Henry Bohm was already seated. The President began with these words, as nearly as I can remember: "Dean Hafner, . . ."

(Oh, by the way, I must tell you. Whenever he and I passed on the sidewalk, if I said, "Hello, Mr. President," he would say, "Hi, Yates." So, the next time I would say, "Hi, George," and he would simply nod and say, with a little rise in his voice, "Dean." He was funny that way, and I always enjoyed his humor.)

Anyway, he said that I had a bright future at Wayne State University and that he was sure I would be here long after he had passed on. But he wanted me to know that the night before, he had had a closed meeting with the Board of Governors during which he had proposed that Monteith College be closed down. This had nothing to do with the quality of the College, he said; it was simply a matter of financial exigency. "Monteith is a luxury we can no longer afford." He went on to say he regretted that the Board did not support his proposal unanimously. Seven were in favor, but one was opposed. Michael Einheuser, a Monteith alumnus and attorney who had recently been elected to the Board, refused to go along with the plan. They argued late into the night. Nonetheless, Mr. Gullen informed me that he would continue his endeavor to persuade the Governors to agree to his plan to phase out Monteith over a three- or four-year period. He wanted me to know this. And he enjoined me to tell nobody. I said, "But the faculty need to know this, don't they?" He replied that if word gets around, "students will be beating on tin pans in the streets and causing a lot of commotion." So I am to keep my mouth shut. The proposal will be presented formally to the Board at its June meeting for a vote; the majority will rule.

Then the President told me that Henry and I should begin planning immediately the details of how the College will be closed: How should the phase-out work? What arrangements need to be made? And so forth. At this, Mr. Gullen rose, we all rose, and Henry proceeded to escort me to his office. I'm afraid Henry did not find

me very cooperative. When we were alone I told him that I wish he would have told me about this earlier. Recently the President of Kalamazoo College, whom I had met at a conference, asked me to be dean of the faculty there, and at about the same time, I was nominated for the post of dean of the College of Arts and Letters at my alma mater, the University of Notre Dame. I had declined the Kalamazoo offer and had notified the search committee at Notre Dame that I did not wish to be considered a candidate. I had explained to both parties that I was honored but felt that I had unfinished business at Monteith and wanted to help build this strong college even stronger. I told these things to Henry with plenty of resentment and said I was in no mood to cooperate right now, and walked out.

Before going on with the story, I'll mention just one reason why I was excited about Monteith's future. It was a dream I had (which eventually appeared in a list of new program proposals included in the University's Self-Study report to the North Central Association in 1976). My dream was to establish a graduate program at Monteith in interdisciplinary general education, to prepare college teachers for programs like Monteith's. It would be modeled after Stanford's graduate program in humanities as a co-major for Ph.D. students specializing in any discipline in the arts and sciences. The Monteith part of the curriculum would consist mainly of studies in the history of ideas in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Each candidate would earn a Ph.D. with a double major. Such a program would help meet the national need for college teachers able to conduct interdisciplinary general education. It would also help reduce Monteith's cost per credit hour by enabling doctoral candidates in this program to take charge of undergraduate discussion groups as part of their training under the tutelage of seasoned professors. They would be required to sit in on staff planning meetings, to attend the undergraduate lectures given by senior faculty, and to do directed reading in the history of ideas beyond the minimum undergraduate reading assignments. Why didn't I introduce this idea earlier? Was it timidity? Fear of failure? Lack of confidence that I could persuade departments in the College of Liberal Arts to cooperate? I don't know. But to this day it's one of my regrets.

Back to the story: I returned to my office, bewildered, angry, and hoping to avoid being seen. I spoke to no one. Shut the door. Fuming that they had done this behind my back after assuring me that Monteith's future was secure, I fretted what to do. I decided that, for the moment, I would obey the President and tell nobody—except my wife. And Woodburn Ross. Yes, I must confide in Woody and get his advice. I felt very sorry to have to bring him this news, but I must. So I called him and we made a date to meet for lunch at his favorite restaurant, Little Harry's, on East Jefferson Avenue. (It has since been torn down to make room for an International House of Pancakes. A quiet, elegant restaurant vanished. *Mais ou sont les neiges d'antan?*)

Soon—I'm not sure what day it was—a group of faculty members came in to see me. I think it was Jerry Bails—you remember him, a quiet, humane professor with an honest face—who looked me straight in the eye and asked point blank whether there was any truth in the rumor that the administration plans to shut

down the College. I should have been prepared for the question, but I was not. I don't know what I said. Probably something like "I cannot answer that question." Politely, they did not badger me but quietly left my office. I was aghast. I felt sure they could see the truth in my face.

Shortly afterwards, I cornered President Gullen as he was leaving Community Arts Auditorium. I said I had to talk to him immediately. We sat on a stone bench between the Auditorium and the Music Department building. "People are asking me questions. They've heard rumors. Should I wear sunglasses all the time so that no one can look into my eyes and see that I'm lying?" He only repeated, "I wish you wouldn't tell anybody." I told him I could not go on concealing the news he had forbidden me to divulge. With that we parted.

I thought of resigning but decided Monteith needed a dean more than ever to fight this absurd, sinister plot.

Woody agreed that I ought to tell the faculty, who would surely inform the students and begin organizing a resistance movement. He said he was surprised at George, who had treated himself (Woody) very nicely. Woody felt sure that the plot was Bohm's doing and speculated that both George and Henry might lose their jobs when all this breaks into the open, because they have decided to terminate a sixteen-year-old academic program without consulting any dean or the University Council or the faculty of the College beforehand. At the end of lunch Woody quoted a psalm: "Put not thy trust in princes."

I returned to campus, called a meeting of the faculty, and told them everything. We began to organize. We formed student-faculty action groups: budget analysis, media contacts, alumni contacts, AAUP, Chicano-Boricua Studies group, Labor Studies group, contacts with professional schools, contacts in state government, contacts with colleges modeled after Monteith, contacts with professors at other universities who had studied Monteith, and one on shaping the case for Monteith. Each group reported to the Coordinating Committee, which compiled a set of thirteen documents distributed to each member of the Board of Governors. It is available in the University Archives and is the single best source of information about the College and University budget considerations. The documents cover in detail and make clear the many mistakes made by the Gullen administration in devising—hastily and without proper consultations, good judgment, or foresight—a secret plot to phase out the College. Every factor bearing upon this decision, from arithmetical prognostications to biased practices by the University Admissions Office, are presented and analyzed. The conclusion was that, far from saving the proposed \$200,000 in 1975-76 by closing down Monteith and turning away the large number of students who had already been admitted to Monteith for the Fall term in 1976, the administration's plan would very likely result in an even larger deficit.

(This same set of documents and much more besides were presented to the University Council's subcommittee created later to advise on the plan to phase out the College.)

A Brief Digression

Here's what I think: The material and arguments that we assembled and sent to the Governors expose the folly or the malevolence or both, on the part of the central administration. I recall that when I first came to Monteith the outgoing dean of the School of Business Administration sourly said to me of the central administration, "They don't know what they're doing." I see now that he was right. Before coming to Wayne, Messrs. Cushman and Gullen had been executives in the American Motors Corporation. Neither had any experience in the academic world since their student days. They ran the University as if it were a manufacturing facility. The University produced and sold credit hours. This is not just a fanciful analogy. In an address to the University Council on June 18, 1975, Mr. Gullen referred to student credit hours as "the life-blood of the university." If buyers bought enough of these, they were given a valuable certificate called a degree. Management was responsible for delivering credit hours at the lowest possible cost. The rest was marketing, public relations, research and development. The CEO, who reported to the chairman of the board, had supreme authority to run the business as he saw fit. Academic traditions, however, such as faculty control of the curriculum, tenure policies, and so forth, proved a nuisance. These gentlemen, who I believe genuinely wanted to serve the University and the people of metropolitan Detroit, never fully understood or adjusted to the mores of university culture. They were too far distant from the complexities and nuances of student learning.

Even as industrialists they did not inspire confidence. For the first five years of his presidency, George Gullen established no long-range planning apparatus. The administration floundered, moving jerkily from one financial crisis to the next without a set of rational criteria for handling the crises. In 1975 the administration was on the verge of panic. In their effort to balance the budget they showed little intelligence. Scrambling to avoid a multi-million dollar shortfall, they made a big deal out of what they called the "necessity" of eliminating a college to save \$200,000 a year—a calculation based on dubious assumptions. One huge inflationary factor was the expected increase in the University's Detroit Edison bill of a million dollars. Did the President ever make an overture to Walker Cisler, chairman of Detroit Edison and a member of the Anthony Wayne Society, to lower the bill and write off the difference as a charitable donation to reduce the corporation's tax bill? If he had, I think he would have reported such an accomplishment at a President/Deans Conference.

But George Gullen was a hard-working man. He took his responsibilities with the utmost seriousness. He never gave up fighting for what he believed in, and he truly believed in the greatness of Wayne State University. He probably ruined his health by over-working. It's just, I think, that he was the wrong man for the job—just as I was the wrong man for my job. Rae Keast was mistaken: Monteith did not need a young dean, it needed a dean who was older, more experienced, and politically savvy.

End of digression

On June 3, 1975, the administration sent to the Board of Governors a two-page rationale for phasing out Monteith. The memorandum states, "It should be emphasized that the phasing out of the Monteith College programs here outlined is not to be taken as a step to improve the academic quality of Wayne State University, but rather as a step made painfully necessary by budgetary problems of the University."

On Wednesday, June 11, first the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors met (comprising all eight Governors), then the Budget and Finance Committee, at their usual place, in the Alumni House. I spoke briefly, mainly stressing the value of preserving Monteith and drawing the Governors' attention to the set of documents we had delivered earlier. Several of us, including Woodburn Ross, were present.

Most of the time was taken up by President Gullen's presentation. After explaining that the University expects a shortfall of \$4,000,000 in 1975-76, he laid out a way of cutting that deficit in half, mainly by raising tuition 10%. But the remaining gap could be \$5,000,000 if the recommendations of the Governor of the State of Michigan are approved by the legislature. Mr. Gullen reported that Mr. Cushman was talking to union leaders about the possibility of days off without pay. In addition, 200 to 250 people would have to be laid off. There would still be a gap, which makes it obligatory to consider phasing out Monteith.

He argued that Monteith could be merged with the College of Lifelong Learning,¹ that enrollments in Monteith had dropped dramatically over the past five years, that in a three-to-four-year phase-out all current Monteith students could graduate, that no freshmen should be permitted to enroll in Monteith henceforth, that no Monteith faculty would be laid off but transferred to other units, that these measures will save \$200,000 for each of the next four years. He emphasized that the future is extremely bleak; fiscal 1976-77 looks even worse than '75-76. Indeed, this is a long-term problem. He said, "We agree that Monteith College is excellent." But can we afford an operation that affects relatively few students? The drop in enrollments this fall, he said, is higher in Monteith than anywhere else.

Every one of Mr. Gullen's statements was either problematic or false. We had anticipated and furnished evidence to refute all of them in the papers delivered beforehand to the Governors and to the President and his staff. Woody and I were allowed to speak to these points, Woody suggesting that Henry Bohm had misled the President into this wild scheme. George said that was not true. Then he added, "I hope to God the gap is only four million. I fear it's more like eight. We cannot go on

¹ Several months earlier—I forget when—President Gullen had recommended that we explore the possibility of cooperating with the College of Lifelong Learning. In response, Al Stern and Sara Leopold had proposed to Dean Ben Jordan that Monteith create and staff a program in the history of ideas through the Weekend College, but the program was vetoed by Vice President Ronald Haughton.

at our present level of funding.” He figured that the right thing to do was to achieve “the greatest good for the greatest number.” He said, “I honestly believe, with sorrow and sadness, that Monteith is one of the units that can be phased out with the least harm to the least number.” It has never achieved its optimum size of 1,200 students. This is not, he added, a criticism of either Dr. Bohm, Dean Hafner, or the Director of Admissions.

Professor Al Stern attempted to refute some of Gullen’s assumptions, particularly the assumption that if Monteith is phased out, all of our students will remain in the University and there will be no loss of tuition revenue. On a positive note, Al stated that there is no enmity toward the administration on our part. We will do everything we can to help, given the opportunity. We’ll go to Lansing to avert any decision that would have catastrophic consequences for the University.

Newly hired Assistant Professor Jaime de la Isla stood up for the preservation of the Chicano-Boricua Studies Program. He remarked that President Gullen had assured the Latino faculty that every effort would be made to ensure a better future for Latino students in the University, but, said Jaime, “We do not see that ‘better future’ outside Monteith College.” In response, Mr. Gullen denied that he had proposed that they join Project 350 (a non-credit program bringing high school graduates from the inner city to the University to prepare them to matriculate). Governor Kurt Keydel said the Board reiterates the President’s assurance that no harm will come to Chicano-Boricua Studies. To which Jaime replied, “You cannot separate the destinies of Chicano-Boricua Studies and Monteith College.” That drew applause from onlookers.

There followed a lengthy debate among the Governors, begun by Michael Einheuser’s recommendation that incoming freshmen be allowed to enroll in Monteith next fall and that the percentage cut in Monteith’s budget be not greater than that of any other college in the University. Governors Augustus Calloway and Kurt Keydel both avowed that they had known for four or five years that Monteith was in trouble. (That was news to me.) Leon Atchison thought the Board should give Monteith time and opportunity to air its views widely; the Committee should wait until the University Council’s Policy Committee weighs in on the issue, and defer the vote until the statutory deadline of June 25 for approving next year’s budget. Wilbur Brucker agreed; furthermore, he would like a report from the President’s Commission on General Education (for the establishment of which I had proposed and drafted an order, signed by the President in March 1975). Mr. Brucker also wanted advice from the President/Deans Conference. Some thought there wasn’t enough time for such consultations. Professor Martin Wechsler, a faculty delegate to the Budget and Finance Committee, agreed that the University Council’s Policy Committee might not be able to report by June 25, because it refuses to convene on account of the administration’s flaunting of proper academic procedure. The Council was composed of elected faculty and academic staff representatives from every unit of the University, and the administration had bypassed it completely in arriving at its determination to establish academic policy on its own authority without faculty consultation.

Governor George Edwards spoke at considerable length on a number of issues. On the whole, he was not in favor of rushing a decision to close Monteith. He moved that Monteith be allowed to enroll the freshman class in Fall 1976, that Monteith's budget cut be not greater than that of other units, and that the College be reviewed in the following year. President Gullen urged that the committee recommend his budget today, because it will not meet again until June 25, and the budget proposal normally ought to go next to the Executive Committee. As for the points raised in the documents submitted by Dean Hafner, they were intended only for discussion. The motion favored by the administration passed narrowly.

Afterwards, I had lunch with Woody at Adam Martini's Restaurant. Again I made notes on what he had to say. Not surprisingly, he offered some pointed observations. First, he reminded me, "This college stood not only for general education. It stood also for the undergraduate—who has been given a raw deal. We take anybody admissible to the University. They aren't the best when they enter. But they are the best when they graduate. We are extraordinarily good. All the colleges are." This last sentence may not sound right. After all, in order for some colleges to be extraordinarily good, some must be just ordinary, right? It's possible that I made an error in transcription. On the other hand, he had often told me that the best friends of Monteith were the professional schools, and later in this conversation he remarked that the College of Liberal Arts is "admirably organized by departments whose function is to explore discrete disciplines in depth," although it does not offer an integrated, coherent program of general education. Whereas, our function is to integrate—which we do well, extraordinarily well. So, Woody was praising, without reservation, all the colleges of Wayne for achieving quite well their specific objectives. He was saying that this is a university we should all be proud of. And I'm sure he meant it.

He went on to observe that the proposal to phase out Monteith should come more properly before the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board rather than the Budget Committee, but there's no opportunity for that to happen, because the former is not meeting. Unfortunately, everybody misunderstands the College, he said. And he gave me this advice: At the earliest opportunity, we should invite members of the Board and the administration to meet our faculty, at a place of our own choosing, to enable the Board and the administration to understand Monteith, what it intends to do and is doing, and at the same time to enable our faculty and students to understand the concerns of the Board and the administration. That was excellent advice, and I regret that I never followed up on it. After the June 13th meeting of the full board (see below), everything was in the hands of the University Council, and all our efforts were bent toward enabling that body to arrive at a true understanding of the College.

On the morning of the 13th the Alumni room was packed with spectators. It was standing room only. The Governors sat in a horseshoe arrangement, with the Chairman of the Board and the President of the University sitting at the head table in the center, and presidential staff aides off to one side. Several of us from Monteith were allowed to address the Governors from a microphone placed a few feet from

the end of the table opposite the floor-to-ceiling windows. Today I don't remember much of what anybody said, even what I said. I do remember, however, hearing someone on our side near me say *soto voce*, "That's Horace Sheffield who just walked in. We've nothing to worry about." I noticed that all the official people sitting at the tables looked up at Mr. Sheffield when he appeared. He was a distinguished and well-known labor leader. His very presence at this meeting was a signal (without his having to say a word) that the labor unions in Detroit were keenly interested in the survival of Monteith for the sake of the opportunities it offered to labor union members.

Of the handful of us permitted to address the Board, I was allowed more time than the rest. I stressed the obvious issues:

1. The high quality of Monteith's program, the diverse clientele it educated through labor and Latino studies, and its distinguished reputation as the initiator of the fast-growing phenomenon of cluster colleges throughout America: It is important for Wayne State University to keep alive this extremely important tradition of integrated, coherent, interdisciplinary, personally meaningful general education, a unique program not offered anywhere else in the University.

2. The question of savings: To phase out Monteith and realize the presumed savings of \$200,000 in 1975-76 will not work. The administration's plan reveals inadequate attention to detail and several unwarranted assumptions. Far from saving money, it would probably result in a larger loss of revenue.

3. Procedures and due process: In violation of national AAUP norms and Wayne State University statutes, there has been no consultation beforehand with the University Council, nor with the council of deans, nor even with the dean and faculty of Monteith College. The failure to consult is apt to evoke censorship by the AAUP's national board and rebuke by the North Central Association. Tinkering with budget lines is not a proper way to create, eliminate, or modify academic policy—in this case, to eliminate an entire college.

Governor Kurt Keydel tried to trap me with a question: On philosophical grounds would I insist on keeping Monteith alive if by doing so 250 employees of the University would lose their jobs and their livelihood? I answered that that was a false and illogical choice; in logic we call it the fallacy of the complex question. It oversimplified the multitude of alternatives for balancing the budget. Mr. Keydel was not satisfied with this answer. He wanted me to state my "*philosophical position*" on the morality of the decision I would make: Is it better for a few to suffer rather than many? I answered that I had given him a philosophical answer, because logic is the indispensable handmaid to philosophy. Reducing the practical problems of finance to a hypothetical choice is not a philosophically sound way of proceeding. A sprinkle of laughter could be heard.

Maybe what I said was a good debater's rejoinder, but it was impolitic, a pyrrhic victory, the loss of another vote. I'm afraid it embarrassed Mr. Keydel, who was a neighbor of mine in Indian Village and a very kind and generous man.

Even so, we managed to win the battle that day—probably thanks to Mr. Sheffield's appearance. The majority of the Governors voted to stay the execution of Monteith pending a faculty study of the College by the University Council.

At 3:45 in the afternoon, Governor Max Pincus telephoned to say that he and George Edwards had lunch together after the meeting. He said they both feel strongly that Monteith should continue, but they are not committed to more than one year at the present time. There must be some savings. They are thinking the cut must be at least \$50,000 (6%). Monteith will have a year to improve enrollment and reduce expenses. Mr. Pincus speculated that maybe letting three people go would save \$50,000. That fall the administration asked us to cut \$25,000; we proposed instead a cut of \$50,000, which the Provost readily accepted.

Mr. Pincus also suggested that perhaps I should go over the heads of Gullen, Cushman, and Bohm and continue the dialogue with members of the Board (something the President had strictly enjoined the deans never to do). Don't go through the Secretary of the Board, Pincus warned, but communicate directly with each of us individually at our office addresses. My failure to follow that advice was another of my mistakes.

As it turned out, we did not have a year to do as he and George Edwards advised; we had not quite five months before the University Council reached its devastating conclusion. No matter what we did to cut costs and increase enrollments, it was too late. Besides, Mr. Thorderson, the new director of Admissions, supported by the Provost, thwarted nearly every effort we made to recruit students. We had furnished the Board with a bill of particulars, but the obstructions persisted.

Endgame, Part Two: Vilification and Defeat

Satisfied at last with an official recognition of their indispensable role in matters of academic policy, the Policy Committee of the University Council promptly created an ad hoc sub-committee to work in cooperation with its Budget Committee to examine Monteith in comparison with other programs in the University and in the context of the University's budget. If I understand correctly, this meant that they would have to examine also the College of Lifelong Learning and the College of Liberal Arts—at least their theory and practice of general education. (See the University Council minutes for July 14, 1975.) The administration had never challenged the value or effectiveness of instruction in Monteith; in fact, the President had acclaimed the excellence of the College. The real question was: Is it worth the cost? So, the University Council had to make a judgment of the academic program and its implementation, as well as an analysis of its expenditures, and compare these findings with the corresponding features of the other colleges.

Two days before the University Council created the ad hoc Monteith committee, Sol Rossman, an associate professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, requested that I send him as much information about the College as possible and as soon as possible, because he was to chair that committee. He already had the folder

we had given the Board of Governors, but in addition perhaps enrollment figures would be helpful. He said that the questions had not yet been defined, but eventually the University Council's Policy Committee, Curriculum and Instruction Committee, and Budget Committee would meet together and address the question of phasing out Monteith. Eight members of the University faculty had expressed interest, he said, in serving on the sub-committee: Sandra Brown (Admissions), Leon Lucas (Social Work), Helen Suchara (Education), Ruth Morrissey (Nursing), James McMicking (Engineering), Bernice Kaplan (Anthropology), Norman LeBel (Chemistry), C. Norman Guice (History), and Rossman. They will work throughout the summer, although the composition of the committee was not officially confirmed by the University Council until it met on July 14.

To help the ad hoc committee do its job, we sent them loads of material: a bibliography of books, articles, and research reports on Monteith; samples of syllabi from all three divisions; letters from other academics, including a very long one from Mildred Henry, research sociologist at Berkeley, who participated in the longitudinal study of Monteith students sponsored by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. In her letter Dr. Henry endeavored to place the Monteith project in the context of the rest of contemporary higher education and American civilization. From the oral report that the Rossman committee made to the University Council on November 5 and 12, 1975, it appears that they completely ignored this letter and all the research reports on Monteith. No mention of the specifics of any of them was ever made. My hunch is that they had their minds made up before they even got started. One day that summer, while having lunch at the Belcrest next to a table where some of the committee members were also dining, a professor from Monteith overheard one of them say, "Now we'll finally get the bastards." The old hostility was still there. To paraphrase Peguy in one of his poems, "Professors have a memory that goes way back."

By July 28 the University had a new provost, Professor of German Diether Haenicke. Dr. Bohm had been removed silently, without fanfare or public explanation. Shortly after Diether was appointed, he visited me in my office. He wanted to know of any promises that had been made to me. I wasn't sure what a promise was. Was having been assured that Monteith would never be eliminated a promise?

Interestingly, on August 22, 1975, the University Council passed a resolution drafted by Professor Ross Stagner, chairman of the Psychology Department, and directed to President Gullen, supporting Gullen's efforts to weather the current financial crisis. It read, in part, "Instruction and research are the primary function of Wayne State University; therefore, all programs which do not directly serve these primary functions must be examined as to whether their function is essential to Wayne State University at this time. Programs of lower priority should be terminated as humanely as possible." One should have thought that those parties most concerned and responsible for balancing the budget, agreeing with the University Council's stated priorities, would have nominated, say, the varsity football program for termination "as humanely as possible" instead of an entire college. I don't know what the budget was for varsity football, but I doubt that its income from ticket sales

came anywhere near its costs. The Tartars (as they were then called) lost nearly every game every year, and attendance was very low. I suppose, though, it would not have been politic to suggest following the example of the University of Chicago and eliminating varsity football. The UofC used to be a great university until it did that.

On September 18, having received about 1,000 pages of documents from Monteith during the summer, the ad hoc committee met with representatives of Monteith to ask questions. Representing the College were Paul Bluemle, Kay Hartley, Martin Herman, Jaime De la Isla, Sara Leopold, Clifford Maier, Carleton Maley, Thomas Waters, and myself. During the meeting we asked the committee members whether they had any negative criticisms of Monteith or whether they had received any negative criticisms of the College from anyone else. They answered that, with the possible exception of an expression of disappointment with the combined program between Monteith and the Law School (which had been initiated by the Law School and which the Monteith representatives admitted did not work well), they had no criticisms to offer, nor had they received any. Mr. Rossman said that of course it was inevitable that one would pick up comments from “the man on the street”—that would happen about any college—but he said that he and the committee did not take casual anecdotes seriously.

By September 22, Monteith had accepted a budget reduction of \$91,418 (11%) and had volunteered to accept an additional cut of \$16,307. Eight other schools and colleges had received net increases in their allocations. In order to further reduce our cost per credit hour, we increased the maximum size of discussion sections to 20 from 12. Applications and admissions had increased in the spring by some 20% over the preceding year, but in the fall term of 1975 the no-show rate (the number of persons who declined to register in Monteith *or to attend Wayne State at all*) reached a record-breaking 50%, which was double the average rate of no-shows in previous years. That the University administration was bent on closing down Monteith may have had something to do with the decline. Monteith advisor Dr. Richard Schell told the Monteith Faculty-Student Assembly on October 8, “Seldom a day goes by that a student doesn’t ask whether it will be possible to complete a degree in Monteith.” The figure also suggests possible corroboration of our hunch that if students who would normally be attracted to Monteith are deprived of the opportunity, many will go to another university; you cannot count on their staying at Wayne; there will be a corresponding loss of tuition revenue.

For the second time, at the ad hoc committee’s request, the same representatives of Monteith (plus Monteith Student Board president Albers, and Maria Torres, replacing Jaime De la Isla) met on October 10 to answer questions. Again we asked whether committee members themselves perceived any shortcomings in Monteith or had received any negative criticisms from any other source. And again they answered no to both questions. In fact, they expressed several compliments for Monteith. We brought up a few problems that we have in the College, all of which are discussed in our Self-Study Report dated August 13, 1975, copies of which had been given to the committee. We told them what we were doing about those problems.

The only comment offered by committee members on the problems we had identified was that such problems (for example, how to help students write better and how to reduce the time faculty must spend in meetings) are shared generally throughout this and practically every American university. We asked that our next meeting with the committee be devoted to a consideration of budgetary matters.

As it turned out, we were never invited back; the October 10th meeting was the last chance the committee gave us to meet with them.

On October 21, Provost Haenicke telephoned to let me know that one week earlier the ad hoc committee had made an oral report to the Policy Committee of the University Council and that, after brief debate, the Policy Committee had endorsed the recommendation that Monteith “be phased out.” Associate Provost Mel Stewart was also on the line (I presume as a witness that Dean Hafner had been notified). I was surprised on four counts: first, that the committee had made and reported its decision only four days after our last meeting with them; second, that even though they never voiced a single criticism of Monteith their judgment apparently was that this college was not worth a straw; third, that Diether waited a full week before telling me; and fourth, that he told me at all—that was not consonant with the way his higher-ups had done business back in May. I wonder if he had to talk the President into allowing me to be forewarned. At any rate, I thought it was nice of him to call.

That day I gathered our coordinating committee together. Paul Bluemle made some very astute remarks:

1. If the reason for recommending a phase-out of Monteith is that the University is faced with a dire financial crisis and needs to save several million dollars in order to balance its budget, and that Monteith must go because its cost per credit hour is too high, would the committee have recommended that one or more of our competitors for funds be phased out if our cost per credit hour were lower than theirs, say, \$5 or \$10? (We felt sure we knew the answer to that.)

2. The committee and Wayne State as an institution, said Paul, “is saying they don’t care for me and they don’t care for Monteith.” (I felt this expression of hurt to be particularly stinging, since Paul had served the College and the University as a professor [in the true sense of the word] and in various administrative capacities so selflessly for fifteen years. I don’t think he was ever fully appreciated by the administration.)

3. They will save nothing unless they retain our students and can teach them more cheaply. How many can they keep?

4. It is clear from the chronology and the committee’s rationale that some very powerful figures are moving very rapidly. A reasonable inference is that they are doing so for other than budgetary reasons. Evidently, George Gullen is doing a PR job on the legislature [and using Monteith for this purpose]. Nothing has been done by the administration to reduce expenditures within the current fiscal year.

5. We should spend five or ten minutes with each student to discuss each one’s personal situation.

Anticipating that some students might decide to transfer into Liberal Arts, Dick Schell recommended that we make a case for that college to accept Natural Science and Socio-humanistic Studies credits as applicable to Liberal Arts group requirements. (Dick followed through on his own recommendation quite successfully.)

On the 27th the ad hoc committee released its two-page “Summary Report,” stating, “The quality of the basic Monteith program is not in question. The problem reduces to a university-wide financial one.” I think that explains why they voiced no criticisms whatever at either of our two meetings with them. On the other hand, it does not necessarily mean that the quality of the program is high, average, or barely passable—just that quality was not an issue, only cost. The “Summary Report” comments briefly on costs per credit hour and the financial situation of the University, then states, “Given the current and continuing financial plight of the University and the duplicative and costly nature of Monteith, the Committee regretfully recommends that Monteith be phased out.” (That was a nice way of proclaiming bad news. Were there no evidence to the contrary I would accept their regret at their word.) The nature of the reputed duplication, length and practicability of the phase-out, the 11%-to-15% savings already realized by Monteith, the savings that might (or might not!) accrue from eliminating the College, the cost of Monteith to the University as a percentage of total expenditures (0.18%), concrete circumstances that bear upon the feasibility of financial savings, the fate of the programs and of the students, a comparative evaluation of Monteith in relation to other colleges and to the goals of the University (which was part of the charge to the committee), and the educational consequences for Wayne and its national reputation are not mentioned. The emphasis in the report is on severe financial exigency (although use of the term was probably discouraged by University attorneys fearful of trouble with the unions). The report neither specified nor alluded to any *evidence* that the phasing out of Monteith would redound to the greater good of the University and its students.

The day after Mr. Haenicke’s phone call, the secretary of the University Council, Professor Milton D. Glick, wrote to me, “The University Council will consider the adoption of the enclosed Summary Report of the ad hoc Monteith Committee at its meeting of November 5, 1975.²

On November 4, representatives of the local chapter of the AAUP met with three representatives of the University Council to discuss the question of protecting the rights of Monteith faculty who might be affected by the proposed dismantling of the College. The AAUP had prepared a document for the University Council that in-

² It appeared to me that Milton Glick did outstanding work as secretary of the University Council. I am reminded, though, of an anecdote related to me by Professor Sandra McCoy on October 28. In a conversation with Milton she said, “In Monteith we’re teaching Plato. In Liberal Arts you’re giving an “in-depth” course analyzing graffiti on restroom walls.’ Milton nearly fainted.” At the end of their conversation he exclaimed, “I wish that g__d committee had said that Monteith was no good. It would make my life easier.” On November 12th they did.

cluded a statement of national AAUP policy on terminating programs on account of financial exigency. The message to the University Council is reputed to have warned that if “extraordinary financial exigency” is declared as the reason for abolishing Monteith, the University administration could use that proclamation to reduce other programs as well and to lay off faculty in other schools and colleges. It urged that a “program termination” should be based on *educational* grounds and that, in either case, national AAUP policies should be followed when dealing with the problem of what to do with affected staff. A compromise was reached: The AAUP would not distribute its document if representatives of the University Council would give assurance that an amendment would be made from the floor with respect to the AAUP policies on faculty reassignments.³

The University Council met on the following afternoon, the 5th of November. A statement from President Gullen supporting the proposed abolition of Monteith strictly on *financial* grounds was distributed. Introducing ad hoc committee chairman Sol Rossman, Provost Haenicke (who was, *ex officio*, chairman of the University Council) emphasized that the oral report that Mr. Rossman was about to give—and *not* the “Summary Report” distributed earlier—will constitute “the official report of the committee.” A full account of the three-hour debate that followed and of relevant documents received by the Council is contained in the Council’s minutes and appendices for November 5, 1975. Three Monteith students, Al Stern, and I were allowed to address the Council. A full transcript of my remarks is in the University Archives. Each of us who spoke attempted to refute the falsehoods and misjudgments perpetrated by the ad hoc committee in its “Summary Report” and by others. Professors Sara Leopold and Martin Herman, the Monteith elected representatives to the Council, also engaged in the debate.

Practically all the points that we had made and thought germane to the issue were ignored by speakers opposed to the continuance of Monteith. Instead, they argued that nothing of value would be lost if Monteith were discontinued because, after all, everything offered by Monteith is available elsewhere in the University, and Monteith faculty would be disbursed throughout other University departments. Monteith, they said, was “duplicative.” Students presently enrolled in Monteith will of course transfer into Liberal Arts or the College of Lifelong Learning, where they will get as fine or better an education at a much lower expense to the University.

While the main argument against Monteith was based on the administration’s cry of financial distress, the oral report by Mr. Rossman and company omitted

³ I learned of these transactions from Associate Professor of Science of Society Ernst Benjamin, who was president of the Wayne State chapter of the American Association of University Professors at that time. Attending the meeting were himself and Professor Fran Wehmer (Psychology) for the AAUP, and Professors Glick, Kaplan, and Rossman for the University Council. National AAUP policy in effect at that time is stated in its publication “On Institutional Problems Resulting from Financial Exigency: Some Operating Guidelines,” *Policy Documents and Reports* (February, 1973), pp. 43-44.

the written statement in the “Summary Report” that “[t]he quality of the basic Monteith program is not in question.” Nor did the oral report repeat that “[t]he problem reduces to a university-wide financial one.” Rather, it emphasized that “the widespread problem of the decline of quality of education must take precedence over the interests of a small group.” In other words, funding Monteith College has resulted in a decline in the quality of education, both because Monteith does it poorly and because the allocation of funds to Monteith deprives other colleges of the support they need, to the detriment of the quality of education they can offer. Finally, instead of the October 27th words “The Committee regretfully recommends that Monteith be phased out,” the November 5th report simply stated, “. . . the Committee recommends a program discontinuance of Monteith College to be accomplished by a phase out.” By these words, the University Council could avoid invoking “extraordinary financial exigency” as its reason for phasing out Monteith, leaving the impression that “program discontinuance” was based on educational grounds: Monteith’s “duplicative” nature and an affirmation that the first priority of the University was to provide education of high quality to the largest number of students.

By avoiding the invocation of “extraordinary financial exigency,” the Council could preclude the possibility that the administration might use that as an excuse for possibly getting rid of personnel and programs in other parts of the University. Yet the rhetoric employed by the administration spelled out the gravest funding crisis ever faced by the University and still worse to come. I think, however, that Messrs. Gullen, Cushman, and Haenicke, no less than the local leadership of the AAUP faculty union and the Policy Committee of the University Council wanted to avoid the terrible calamitous turmoil that would have occurred had they invoked “extraordinary financial exigency” and begun to close down sundry programs and lay off scads of people to balance the budget. Only one dramatic gesture was needed to accentuate the desperate plight of the University and maybe persuade the state legislature and Governor Milliken to rescue our beleaguered university in the heart of Detroit. That gesture was gladly facilitated by the inveterate enemies of Monteith, who had waited patiently for sixteen years for this perfect opportunity.

For internal political purposes, however, as I have just explained, it was expedient for the ad hoc committee to play down the immediate financial aspect in favor of making it appear that the decision was justified principally by considerations of educational policy and priorities. A substitute motion, proposed by Martin Herman, would have allowed Monteith to continue but with the provision that by 1977-78 it shall have demonstrated its ability to reduce its cost per credit hour “to a level comparable to those of other undergraduate programs in the University.”

Much more debate ensued at the November 5th meeting. One member of the ad hoc committee, Leon Lucas, rose to defend Monteith. Others did, too. But Norman LeBel, in response to the substitute motion, doubted that Monteith could reduce its costs “without losing the valuable personalized instruction, which is a hallmark of the core program at Monteith College.” Visitors at the meeting, who had been invited to speak at the beginning, were not allowed to speak further, so I was unable to mention the graduate program (see p. 7 above) and its potential for delivering credit hours as cheaply as certain Liberal Arts departments that relied

ering credit hours as cheaply as certain Liberal Arts departments that relied heavily on part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants.

But it was Mr. Rossman who held forth at greatest length. For his arguments, see especially p. 403 of the University Council minutes. In my opinion, he wielded some tricky distortions. For example, he said, “The Committee found it extremely difficult to justify sections of 700 in Liberal Arts while sections of 12 to 20 students existed in Monteith College.” I think the large lecture courses in Liberal Arts, in Psychology and Biology, for example, were the products of deliberate pedagogy and would not have been changed substantially had those departments had more money and staff. In Monteith also we set up large lecture sections, with as many as 300 students each, in all the core courses of the three divisions. True, each course also entailed small discussion groups. We rarely employed part-timers to teach those sections and never used graduate teaching assistants (we had none).

Mr. Rossman further argued that interdisciplinary education at Wayne was not confined to Monteith, but neither he nor members of his committee engaged in discussion of the *content* of Monteith’s core curriculum—which, after all, one would have thought to be the most crucial feature to examine if one were trying to evaluate the educational policy and practice of a college in comparison with those of other colleges. A few courses with some cross-disciplinary content, offered as electives to satisfy group requirements, do not constitute anything like Monteith’s required core curriculum of six team-taught interdisciplinary courses in each of three areas, plus three advanced courses in Modes of Thought, and a senior essay.⁴ To claim that Monteith was “duplicative” of the curriculum in Liberal Arts was a spurious argument, evidence of negligent scholarship or intentional misrepresentation.

Mr. Rossman also asserted that Monteith did not have “a great deal of impact on the University” and did not serve as “a major service unit of the University.” He made no mention of the Monteith program for the School of Social Work, which had led to the creation of a bachelor’s degree program in that school. Nor did he mention the general education program that the College of Engineering had asked Monteith to develop and which was providing instruction to some 300 or so undergraduates every term. That program was created at the request of Dean Stynes after the national engineering accreditation authority had criticized his college for the scanty general educational provisions for engineering students given by the College of Liberal Arts. Mr. Rossman also neglected to mention that it was Monteith College that initiated a program in Black Studies at the University (which led eventually to the creation of the Department of Africana Studies). He neglected to mention the Chicano-Boricua Studies program, which created opportunities in higher education for Latino students who otherwise in all likelihood would never have attended college at all. He neglected to mention the Monteith program in Labor Studies, which created another vibrant constituency for the University. He never mentioned the Library Project directed by the late Patricia Knapp, which led to the creation of

⁴ Al Stern’s senior course Modes of Thought had been visited, evaluated, and praised by the distinguished Constitutional historian Alfred Kelly.

courses in bibliographic instruction in college and university libraries nationwide. He never mentioned our program in Third World and Women's Studies, which was the first such program at Wayne State, out of which evolved the Women's Studies program in the College of Liberal Arts and the creation of the Women's Center in the University. Finally, he said nothing, nothing at all about the acclaim for Monteith that had been expressed by experts outside the University, such as David Riesman, Zelda Gamson, Joseph Gusfield, Morris Keeton, Conrad Hilberry, George Fischer,⁵ or Paul Heist and Mildred Henry of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. Nope. No impact.

And regarding the effectiveness of the core program, Mr. Rossman did not cite any of the available quantitative measurements of academic achievement—for example, the results of the Graduate Record Exam given to our first senior class in 1963, which are listed in ch. 6 of the "Report to the President" (December, 1963). Measured against the national norms established in 1954, which were based on the scores of seniors from 200 colleges, the scores achieved by Monteith seniors in the social science area averaged in the 72nd percentile, in the humanities area the 74th percentile, and in the natural science area the 78th percentile. Cliff Maier has pointed out that the average percentile achieved by all Monteith seniors on the natural science area question regarding scientific development was 96, and on the question regarding scientific methodology, 98. This was a cross-section of Monteith seniors, very few of whom had majored in a scientific discipline. Yet, some of the old guard in biology, chemistry, and physics in the College of Liberal Arts continued to scoff at Monteith's core curriculum in natural science. It appears that, for them, scientific inquiry did not reach beyond the laboratory.

⁵ In his book *Urban Higher Education in the United States* (City University of New York, 1974), George Fischer, Professor of Sociology in the Graduate School at CUNY, devoted a chapter to Monteith. He wrote, "It struck me that the Detroit school [Monteith] enjoys strong support from the many professional schools of its parent institution. While the main undergraduate unit, the College of Liberal Arts, tends to view Monteith as an educationally questionable upstart and a costly rival for scarce funds, the professional schools welcome and back the General Education scheme. Contrary to the usual view, they see it as a means of drawing into their professions students with a more developed imagination and understanding of life than undergraduates get when they specialize in narrow disciplines. That Monteith students spend at least half of their time on broad mental skills turns out to be very definitely a plus. This holds as well, it seems, for graduate schools. *Each year, from 66% to 80% of its alumni go on to either a graduate or a professional school* (p. 276, my italics).

Fischer also points out that Monteith was "the first 'cluster college' unit in urban higher education—the first to show that meaningful human collaboration over time works well only on a small scale, even in a vast place." In a footnote he adds, "More than that, a list of the forty-three cluster colleges in the United States shows that Monteith is the oldest of all of them" (p. 281).

Burning to point out some of these things, I asked but was denied permission to respond; the rules of the Council did not allow further input from outsiders. No vote on either the main or the substitute motion was taken at that meeting, which adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

The full Council met again a week later. Speaking for the ad hoc committee, Ms. Kaplan defended the thoroughness with which they had undertaken their work. She then addressed a number of issues that had been broached at the November 5th meeting of the Council. She said that the ad hoc committee felt that the only characteristic of Monteith that was unique was the small size of its discussion sections; every other feature of the Monteith program had its counterpart in either the College of Liberal Arts or the Weekend College. She cited many examples but did not mention that all the courses that involve cross-disciplinary work were electives and did not constitute a coherent program of general education.

She disposed of the myth that Monteith has a national reputation by pointing out that only 2% of its students come from outside the tri-county area; she pointed also to the absence of significant grants, which everybody knows are a “measure of national recognition,” a sign of “fame.” She pointed to the high attrition rate and low graduation rate of students in Monteith (somewhat oversimplifying the reality, we thought). She dismissed Monteith’s relations with other schools and colleges at Wayne and denied Monteith’ pioneered Black Studies and Chicano-Boricua Studies at Wayne. She calculated that, of the 1130 students taking Monteith courses in the Fall 1975 quarter, “only 749 claim[ed] Monteith as their College.” So, she “questioned whether this was a luxury the institution could afford.”

Mr. Rossman then joined Ms. Kaplan’s attack, casting aspersions on the quality of the Monteith faculty and disparaging the accomplishments of Monteith alumni. On the latter point they said not a word about the proportion of Monteith graduates who had earned graduate and professional degrees, a significantly higher proportion than that of Liberal Arts alumni.⁶

⁶ On the morning of June 11, Paul Bluemle had asked four students to compile a list of occupational choices of our graduates. Data were available for only 597 of the alumni who had graduated between 1963 and 1975:

Academic Dean	1	Engineers	3	Nurses	3
Architects	4	Industrial Relations	3	Peace Corps	3
Artists	3	Judge	1	Pharmacists	2
Biologists	19	Lawyers	74	Professors	48
Business	29	Librarians	11	Police	1
Chemists	5	Mass Media	42	Psychologists	22
Civil Service	3	Medical Doctors	49	Religion	8
Dentists	3	Military	18	Social Work	31
Elementary & Secondary Educ.	202	Museum Curators	2		

Some members of the Council urged that, since the ad hoc committee had introduced, in effect, an entirely new report, changing radically the grounds for their recommendation, Monteith should be allowed an opportunity to rebut. Mr. Haenicke, who chaired the University Council, ruled that that would not be necessary since Dean Hafner had already been given a hearing at the beginning of the debate on November 5. A request by Martin Herman to be given more time to study the new report, which had been distributed only two days before the present meeting, was ignored. While he had the floor, Marty responded to as many points as he could, emphasizing the high achievement of Monteith students as documented by David Riesman and the Berkeley Center—both of which Kaplan and Rossman had scornfully dismissed. His substitute motion was defeated. A written commentary on that motion, which I had sent to the Council, was ignored.

Several members of the Council spoke forcefully in defense of the College but to no avail. One scholar declared that he could not imagine that anything Monteith might say at this point could change his mind. When the main motion was called, Sara Leopold called for a roll-call vote, but the Council chose to vote by show of hands. The motion to adopt the recommendation of the ad hoc committee carried by a vote of 37 to 20 with 1 abstention.

The meeting on Wednesday, November 12, 1975, lasted two hours. Before it adjourned, the Provost made a statement, reported on page 412 of the minutes:

Mr. Haenicke stated that this was a trying and painful decision for the Council to make. Every thoughtful faculty member would regret the demise of a program. [Insinuating that those who voted for the demise of the College were not very thoughtful?] Mr. Haenicke urged that the vote should not be looked at in terms of “defeat” and “victory.” [Does anyone doubt that the enemies of Monteith felt victorious and the losers thought themselves defeated?] He expressed his hope that those members in favor of maintaining the program would not consider it a terrible defeat. [Just a mild setback, perhaps.] He said that the administration certainly does not consider the outcome as a victory. [If not a victory, what did they think it was? Perhaps they really knew it was a disaster.] Mr. Haenicke expressed his strong belief that it was a necessary but unpleasant decision. He believed that in such unfortunate times with insufficient funding there must be discontinuance of programs. He also wanted to reiterate his statement that as Provost he would insist that the phase-out of Monteith College would be done as humanely and honorably as possible. He said he feels it is his responsibility to assist in every way, the placement of faculty of Monteith College in appropriate positions throughout the University. He closed by thanking the ad hoc Monteith Committee which had made a very trying decision executed in a very fine fashion.

With those last six words the meeting adjourned: “executed in a very fine fashion.”

Afterwards, a few of us walked over to the Belcrest for a drink. A woman who had been a member of the ad hoc committee came up to the table where we were sitting and said how sorry she was for the outcome.

Since my wife had our car that afternoon to take our children to music lessons, I asked Sara Leopold for a ride home. We rode most of the way in silence. Before getting out of the car, I turned to thank her and saw tears streaming down her cheeks.

I learned later, on December 2, from Ruth Morrissey, a member of the ad hoc committee, that in the end its decision was unanimous and based solely on fiscal grounds. The committee never brought up or discussed any negative criticisms of Monteith, she said. Yet, Professors Kaplan and Rossman came to the November 12th Council meeting thoroughly prepared to blast our faculty, students, core program, and alumni. For many Council members, perhaps, this was the clincher. The chair had ruled against the request of Professors Herman and Leopold to allow them to prepare a defense against these new and totally unexpected calumnies.

Without much real hope we kept struggling to find salvation. For the rest of Fall Quarter, the coordinating committee thought of various things to do, mostly political, and we followed through with all the energy we had. An attempt on December 3 to persuade the University Council to reopen hearings on the Monteith case failed. Everything now would be up to the Board of Governors. The state legislature was not about to intervene on our behalf. Our urgent objective then, of course, was to dissuade the Board of Governors, who were to meet on December 10, from siding with the united front of the Gullen administration and the University Council's majority. Al Stern did manage to generate further publicity by holding a press conference in which he and I set forth a Monteith plan to continue operations at a drastically reduced cost.⁷

For the last time, on December 10, 1975, I addressed the Board of Governors. I presented the plan for survival that we had released to the news media a few days prior. My theme was responsibility: "Cognizant of the needs of Detroit and the University's financial crisis, we come with a twofold sense of responsibility: We recognize a responsibility to contribute what we can to this university's continuing quest for excellence in undergraduate education. And we recognize a responsibility to contribute what we can to the solution of the University's temporary but severe financial problems. Excellence and economy: a twofold responsibility that we fully

⁷ The plan was to expand the function of Monteith into that of a service college that would provide a coherent general education to some 2,045 pre-professional undergraduates at a competitive cost per credit hour. Included was our program for advanced transfer students from other colleges. The experiment would be evaluated in the second year by an objective outside agency under the supervision of a committee of the Board of Governors. The plan envisioned recruitment of six sizeable clienteles not then being served by Wayne State.

accept.” I then went on to describe the plan. The Governors listened politely to my lame rhetoric, argued back and forth a little, Mr. Gullen said what he thought should be done, and the motion to phase out Monteith carried by a vote of 7 to 1.

Back in the office there was work to do. We counted 21 tasks we needed to start in on right away to ensure the best possible arrangements for our students for the remainder of the academic year and beyond. In March 1976, I was terminated as dean, and Marty Herman was appointed acting dean. In my judgment, no better person could have been chosen for the job.

Epilogue

As it turned out, Diether Haenicke certainly lived up to his word in finding appropriate relocations for all but one member of the Monteith faculty, tenured and non-tenured alike, who wished to keep working in Wayne State University. Understandably, some faculty wanted nothing further to do with the institution and found good positions in higher education elsewhere. Only one person who wanted to remain at Wayne was not permitted to do so. And she, Dr. Rodabe Bharucha-Reid, filed a lawsuit alleging discrimination. Her lawyer proposed a very modest out-of-court settlement, but President Gullen turned it down. Instead, he hired the most illustrious law firm in Michigan to represent the University at a jury trial. She won, and the ruling of the court probably cost this public, state-supported University between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 by the time the University paid for the settlement and all the legal fees.

Some of the faculty who stayed were reassigned to the Humanities Department in the College of Liberal Arts, where they continued to give courses they had designed at Monteith. Others, in the natural and social sciences, joined the Weekend College/University Studies program, where they too kept alive the Monteith tradition of general education. The Labor School and Chicano-Boricua Studies were retained as autonomous operations in the University. Dean Herman arranged for several of us (myself included) to give courses still needed by surviving Monteith students to complete their degree requirements during the phase-out period. The last one finished in 1981.

Eventually, the University terminated Weekend College and the College of Lifelong Learning, too. The Monteith tradition was then metamorphosed into the Interdisciplinary Studies Program of the (new) College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs. A few years ago, a new administration closed down the Humanities Department but saved its courses. Abruptly, in 2007, it terminated the ISP.

In April 1976, President Gullen gave me a twelve-month “administrative leave” unasked-for and with full pay! At the end of my leave, the English Department in Liberal Arts graciously took me in, where I happily taught until even after my retirement—except for a nutty unpaid leave in the early 1980s to trade euro-dollar futures on the floor of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

Where the President found the money for my administrative leave and for the retention of my colleagues elsewhere in the University and to pay for the Bharucha-Reid extravaganza, I don't know.

While I disagree with a number of their judgments and deplore some of their tactics, I am persuaded that Gullen and Cushman, Bohm and Haenicke, even Kaplan and Rossman were utterly sincere in their beliefs and unswervingly devoted to fighting for their convictions. I can say the same thing of myself. While I did the best I could, my best was not good enough. To my chagrin, I must admit I made several errors: It was a mistake

- * not to have taken my Monteith colleagues' distrust of the old guard in Liberal Arts more seriously;

- * not to have identified and reached out to our enemies in a friendly way, listened to their concerns, and discussed our program design with them;

- * not to have attended Board of Governors meetings regularly and socialized with them;

- * not to have sought out wealthy prospective donors, including foundations;

- * not to have worked more cooperatively with Dean Ben Jordan after Ron Haughton rejected the plan that Al Stern and Sara Leopold had proposed;

- * and not to have acted earlier on the plan to create a graduate program in Monteith to prepare prospective college teachers for careers in general education.

I suppose the Greeks might have called these personal failings a *hamartia* (literally, "missing the mark"—a metaphor taken from archery and often mistranslated as "tragic flaw"). My ten-year-old son, Daniel, watching the June 13th meeting of the Board of Governors, discerned the truth. We had let him take the day off from the Detroit Waldorf School, where the main lesson subject in the sixth-grade curriculum was Roman civilization. After the meeting, Daniel said to me, "Papa, you remind me of Marius. He was a good general but a poor politician."

Well, as the chorus says in the *Oresteia*, "Wisdom comes alone through suffering." I learned that my proper course in life lay no longer in the dark wood of academic administration but in the green pastures of learning.

One thought nags me more than any other: It's that I did not follow the wise counsel of my (and formerly Woodburn Ross's) secretary, Mrs. Gloria Fisher—whom all alumni of Monteith College surely and fondly remember. You see, I used to suppose that I could solve any problem by sitting at my typewriter and composing clear, accurate, coherent, persuasive memoranda, certain that reason would carry the day. After all, this was a university, a community of scholars. So instead of going out to lunch, I would bring a brown bag to the office and spend the noon hour at the typewriter "solving problems." From time to time Gloria would suggest that I take this or that important personage out to lunch, as Mr. Ross used to do. To this day I cannot dispel the thought that, had I followed her advice and the example of Woodburn Ross, it might have made a difference.

Probably the best thing I ever did in 1976 was to encourage Gloria to take the necessary steps to qualify for a position commensurate with her remarkable intelligence, competence, experience, wisdom, and kindness. She became an academic advisor in the College of Education—the best one over there, in my opinion.

Yates Hafner
July 11, 2009

Addendum to “How It All Ended”

The following is a transcript of a first-hand report of what happened at the meeting of the University Council on November 12, 1975, written by a Monteith alumna and professional journalist who was then a columnist for the *Detroit Free Press*. —YH

MEMO

November 13, 1975

TO: Yates Hafner

FROM: Sandra Bunnell

RE: University Council meeting on Nov. 12, 1975

I'd like to give my impressions of both what was said and what I saw as the psychological climate of this meeting, since I feel what was not spoken is in some ways more important. Anyone who did not attend both meetings (Nov. 5 and 12) would not be aware of the dramatic difference in the atmosphere. I'll try to give my perceptions of what transpired in chronological order.

First, I feel that George Gullen's 15-minute report on the Budget Task Force at the beginning had the net effect of informing the Council members that they had a task to do and they had better do it. This would fit in with the apparent impatience of the group to get down to the business at hand, calling the question, cutting off debate, etc. Almost nothing was said in defense of Monteith this time, in direct contrast to the Nov. 5 meeting.

Bernice Kaplan got up to introduce the report on the ad hoc committee's findings on the “quality” of the Monteith program, after Sol Rossman said she would do so in response to questions raised last week on this subject. There followed a thirty- or forty-minute report, before and after which Rossman said the decision to close Monteith had nothing to do with “quality.” I was puzzled by this seeming contradiction.

Kaplan read three statements of purpose from the Weekend Studies program, Liberal Arts, and Monteith. All sounded remarkably similar. She then spoke to Monteith's claims of uniqueness: In small class size, there was no real duplication; in team-teaching there was some duplication; and in the integrated and cross-disciplinary approach there was definite duplication, although course content was not identical. Rossman gave a rundown of Liberal Arts cross-disciplinary courses, mentioning two graduate courses and co-major studies in Black Studies, environment, etc. (I was struck by lack of mention at any time that Monteith pre-dated many of these courses and was indeed the inspiration for them. It was only under prodding from Martin Herman that Rossman admitted Monteith had been the model for the Weekend Studies program.) He failed to explain the difference between the integrated, sequential nature of the Monteith curriculum and scattered cross-disciplinary courses in Liberal Arts. He also failed to mention that some of the departments teaching those courses, notably Humanities, are also undergoing tremen-

dous cuts. I personally feel that interdisciplinary education at Wayne will die with Monteith. At any rate, Rossman and Kaplan were trying to convince the Council members that this type of education would continue in other programs if Monteith were phased out.

Kaplan then zeroed in on students, saying that students in Liberal Arts and Monteith were virtually the same in their goals and abilities. She said it was strange, considered in the light of Monteith's "national reputation," that only 2% of Monteith students came from outside the tri-county area. She gave no comparable statistics for the other colleges. She said the attrition rate was 50% between the freshman and sophomore years, and that only 10% of incoming students complete their studies in Monteith. (Rossman admitted under questioning that this figure was 25% for Liberal Arts. Herman pointed out that many students who entered Monteith took their degrees in the professional schools in which they were simultaneously enrolled. These students would not then have "Monteith" degrees.)

Rossman said that Monteith had started special programs for law and social work students, and that these failed and were phased out. Herman pointed out that the law program left something to be desired; however, the social work program was successful and was incorporated into the School of Social Work as a result. Again, no comparable statistics were given for Liberal Arts or the College of Lifelong Learning experimental programs. Kaplan said: "We wondered why, if the program were so great, it had so little appeal to students."

Rossman said, as he had said the week before, that Monteith had had little impact on the rest of the University. This is in direct contradiction to just the few things mentioned in this meeting—namely, that Weekend Studies was based on the Monteith model, that Social Work had incorporated a program begun in Monteith, that several of the cross-disciplinary courses mentioned in Liberal Arts were inspired by Monteith courses. It also contradicts those instructors in other colleges who have praised Monteith students in their classes.

Rossman gave a report on the Monteith faculty that could be called an attack. He said 40% of the Monteith faculty do not hold the doctorate, that they were not very involved in "research and scholarly activities," and that they had a poor record on publications. He listed the publications Monteith faculty members have had recently, implying they were not competent instructors because of this (not actually saying so). Then, a little later on, he made the puzzling statement that "Monteith faculty, if inducted into other University programs, could only serve to strengthen these programs." I was reminded of a statement made the week before by a professor from Liberal Arts who said that employing Monteith instructors in other programs might be like "spreading the disease."

Kaplan went further. When questioned about the aspersions cast on the Monteith faculty, she said: "Well, I didn't want to get personal but since you asked I'll tell you." She said that last year, while she was going over tenure papers from Liberal Arts and Monteith instructors, the difference in their appearance "made her

cry. . . . There are people who have been promoted to full professor in Monteith that couldn't make instructor in Liberal Arts."

When questioned about publications of Liberal Arts professors, Rossman said he had no hard data on this but "every other day or so some colleague was discussing something he had just published."

Rossman also reported that Monteith students received consistently higher grades than Liberal Arts students, but did not attribute this to superior ability. The implication was that it was easier to get high grades in Monteith. He gave breakdowns for the last several years in each grade category. Herman pointed out that in a study he had done a few years ago, Monteith students who got high grades in Monteith courses got even higher grades in their non-Monteith courses. (This, incidentally, was borne out in my own experience. I got straight A's in Liberal Arts but not always in Monteith classes.) Rossman then said that graduates of Monteith "did not demonstrate any particular professional achievement" in comparison to Liberal Arts grads, but could not offer statistics to back this up. He said instead that graduates of Liberal Arts had also gone on to become lawyers, "real lawyers," and doctors, etc. Did he mean as opposed to bogus lawyers? The implications were very insulting.

Again, no other programs were examined for achievements of the students or alumni, the professional activities of the faculty, and so forth. Rossman said: "Monteith is not a poor program. . . . It is adequate. It should not be questioned on the basis of quality." (I frankly don't understand the import of this sequence of statements.)

He also said something in direct contradiction to a statement made last week about retaining the valuable programs of Monteith in other parts of the University. This week he said these programs could not easily be preserved in other colleges. (I have felt this way all along, but that was not the ad hoc committee's original contention.) He said there would also be a problem with graduate school requirements in transferring Monteith courses to other parts of the University.

After this "discussion," in which Haenicke said he didn't feel anything further could be said by Monteith in response to these charges (Martin Herman having asked for a written list of charges so that Monteith could respond to them—his request was ignored), the University Council got on with the business of voting down the Herman substitute motion (which, incidentally, provides as much of a mechanism for saving the University money as does the proposed phase-out), voting in two proposed amendments, and passing the main motion endorsing the ad hoc committee report. I remember feeling stunned throughout that the University Council members could accept such a report on Monteith's "quality" without question. It was so heavily slanted and actually false in important areas that I was shocked to be hearing what I was hearing. At one point I said, almost uncontrollably, "They're all sheep today." I was sickened by what I considered a dramatic turnaround from last week, which resulted in a massive display of cowardice. Those are my feelings about what took place.

/signed, Sandra Bunnell/

About herself, Sandra (Bunnell) Xenakis writes (August 25, 2009):

I was a student at Monteith College from Sept. 1963 through summer of 1967, graduating in Jan. 1968 with a B.A. degree, concentration in languages. I had heard of Monteith through a presentation at my high school in Detroit. A National Merit Scholar, I had applied to and been accepted by four different colleges, but decided to live at home and attend Monteith because it sounded so much like what I wanted. Years later, I can say that was one of the best decisions I ever made. After graduating, I spent several years in publishing and journalism, returning briefly to Monteith as a writer and consultant for several months in 1975 to try and help save the college. The foregoing account was written during that period, after attending the WSU University Council meetings in Nov. 1975, during which the fate of Monteith was decided. After that I spent a decade in public relations, running my own agency at one point, and later became a freelance writer, business coach, and jewelry designer. Today I still do writing, jewelry design, and coaching, direct a Writers' Workshop in Chelsea, Michigan, and run a program to educate creative people about business skills, called Art Meets Business.