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URSINUS COLLEGE 1970-1976
THE START OF ITS SECOND CENTURY

A TIME FOR DISPUTE OVER PRINCIPLES & PRIORITIES

An Interpretation

Richard P. Richter

REVISED FALL 1998
FOREWORD

The idea for this essay occurred to me while I was constructing a chronology of selected events at Ursinus College from 1970 to 1976, the period of President William S. Pettit's administration. While at that task, I thought I began to discern a meaningful pattern running through those events as they appeared in the records and as they resurfaced in my memory. The essay attempts to clarify and set forth that pattern.

The resulting interpretation may appear to readers as a conventional historical analysis. They should know, however, that it is mainly an attempt, after a quarter of a century, to organize my personal thoughts about events that directly involved me. I was vice president for administrative affairs as well as an instructor in English throughout the 1970-1976 period and became president immediately following it. The two concepts that drive the interpretation--"parochial purpose" and "professional practice"--arose originally into organizing abstractions from reflections upon my personal experiences on campus in those years. Only afterward did I consult standard histories of American higher education to give them context and, I hope, some objective validity.

While writing the essay, I told myself that the passing of years improved my insight into happenings that at the time tangled my colleagues and me in their unfolding. Doing so was quite possibly a private indulgence rather than evidence of distilled enlightenment. Whatever the case, I make this interpretation available primarily because it is from the perspective of someone who was there. It is the result of an attempt to explain to myself what I saw taking place from where I stood. I make no claim that the text gives a complete or even an "objective" account of the college in those years. Despite my attempt to be clear about the facts and to organize them thematically, perhaps readers should approach the text as an "oral history" in writing rather than as a piece of historical analysis.

This text, completed in the fall of 1998, along with its two appendices, supersedes a version finished earlier in the year and distributed to a handful of Ursinus people. They should consider this the preferred text.

I thank Ursinus College for enabling me to undertake this essay (as well as its companion piece, the chronology). David Mill and Charles Jamison of the Myrin Library staff assisted and encouraged me in many ways. Professor Ronald E. Hess gave me minutes of faculty meetings and other relevant material from his files. President John Strassburger read the original text and offered useful suggestions for this revision. All faults in the text are my responsibility.

Richard P. Richter
Fall 1998
Donald L. Helfferich's event-filled presidency ended on 31 October 1970. His taste for the dramatic gave a colorful curtain to his long years in the administration (1936-58 as vice president, 1958-70 as president). He timed his retirement to coincide with the completion of the college's first hundred years. The centennial celebration therefore took on the dramatic color that he created around his departure from the presidency. And because it coincided with the centennial celebration, his departure seemed to become a little larger than life. It seemed to wink with destiny's glitter.

In his final year, Helfferich sought to stamp his administration with a lasting seal of success. Unverified rumor held that he was less than enthusiastic about the account of his administration in the manuscript centennial history of the college written by Calvin D. Yost, '30, professor of English and librarian. Whatever his opinion of the manuscript, its printed version, which did not appear until after his death, caught a note of success that he would have wanted to hear:

*The campus* [i.e., addition of new and upgraded facilities] *gives concrete evidence of his leadership during his presidency; then there are the intangible gifts to the spiritual, intellectual and social life of the College, just as real if not so easily enumerated. He brought the College through its Centennial Year able to look back on its first hundred years with justifiable pride.*

About a month before Helfferich left office, the college sent an update on its condition to the Middle States Association, its regional accrediting agency. It was an answer to some of the questions raised by a visiting team in 1968, when Middle States reaffirmed the college's accreditation. The update acquits the college on some specific issues dealing with faculty workloads and documents other advances in the academic
program. Then it concludes with an assessment of the general condition of the college. It was certainly Helfferich's view of what he was leaving to his successor to carry on:

We are extremely pleased with the recent progress that Ursinus College has made on all fronts and we are proud to report it. We believe that we are in a far better position than ever before to meet the challenging days ahead. It would give us great pleasure indeed to have members of the team who visited us in February of 1968 to return to the campus to see what has taken place in less than three years.

Helfferich did not limit his use of the centennial moment to mark his administration with a seal of success. He also used it to point the college on the path it would take into the first years of its second century.

He gave his farewell report to the board of directors a self-deprecating spin as he faded from office. In a bit of doggerel he wrote,

And so to retreat--perchance to dream;
I'm still running little errands for the faculty and dean.

He said he moved comfortably "to the cryptic bench marked Chancellor," giving the impression that his continued influence and presence would not weigh heavily on the board or his successor. The board decided to create this new office with scant job specifications other than the requirement that the incumbent concern himself with finances and fund-raising. It mainly wanted to ensure that Helfferich would be a resource for the new president.

He could justifiably move out of the president's office with a degree of comfort. He could feel that he had labored as hard as he could through the centennial year--while still towering over the college--to set its future course. His labors had concentrated on three critical points. With key board members, he had affirmed the ability of his long-time academic dean to assume the duties of the presidency. Through a systematic long-term planning process, he had handed the board a comprehensive and ambitious plan for developing new financial resources and for further advancing the quality of the institution. Perhaps most important in his mind, he had obtained the board's vote in principle for a ringing assertion of the college's conservative philosophic temper.

While he might retreat and run little errands as chancellor, no one doubted that he would be watching to see how the fruits of these labors would fall. His "cryptic bench" gave him an official though sketchily defined place from which to watch events and, if he chose, to try to influence them. Helfferich himself knew that his effort to fix the course of the college would not determine it but merely open a possible avenue among others. He knew that there were uncertainties and unresolved tensions surrounding the choice of president, the long-term development plan, and the declaration of philosophic conservatism. He was also enough of a theater man to realize that he no longer would direct the play or perform the lead role. The "cryptic bench" might look to some observers like a familiar director's chair, repositioned for a better view of the actors. Helfferich himself knew his influence, great or small, would come mainly from the work
he already had performed.

With the election of the veteran academic dean, William S. Pettit, to succeed Helfferich, the segments of the college community entered into a kind of running dispute that helped to define the years from 1970 to 1976. As Helfferich himself might have privately expected, the dispute enfolded the three critical points on which he had labored as he prepared to depart in the centennial year. In essence, the college community was seeking to clarify its priorities and directions while struggling to survive in a daunting external environment.

This contentious exercise went on through the entire period. It engaged the voices of the board, administration, faculty, students, and some alumni. The argument was not very orderly or disciplined. Sometimes the participants thought it was about bread and butter rather than basic institutional values. Sometimes two segments of the college community contested without the knowledge or involvement of other segments, compounding confusion.

The dispute made for a politicized mood much of the time on campus. This unsettled many people. Some remembered the Helfferich years with nostalgia, forgetting that internal and external discord often disrupted them too. Others wished for a better time to come. In spite of the mood—sometimes because of it—students played hard and worked well, and faculty pursued their professional tasks diligently. Likewise, in spite of or because of the mood, the administration and board satisfactorily did the daily tasks needed to keep the operation going. The successful records of students of these years following their graduation confirm the essential effectiveness of educational work through the six-year period.

Nevertheless, the students happened along at a time when the internal dynamics of the college and events in the nation combined to provoke disagreements over the direction Ursinus should take. The college community had to confront these disagreements and resolve the tensions before it could take next steps in its development as a liberal arts college.

***

Participants in the events of that time did not always clearly see the genesis or the complete picture of these tensions. Reflecting on them a quarter of a century later, I think I discern more clearly than I could at the time a pattern running through the disagreements. The remainder of this essay tries to trace that pattern through selected events of the period. Mainly I am seeking to satisfy a long-felt personal need to bring greater order to memories of an exciting time in Ursinus's history and a formative time for me. If this perceived order also contributes to the understanding of others interested in the college's development in those years, that will be a gratuitous extra.

The disputes at the time seemed to arise from the opposition of two differing ideas about the purpose of the college as it moved beyond the Helfferich era. Faculty, administrators, students, and board members seemed to gravitate toward one or the other of these ideas, depending upon their personal convictions, their roles in the college's life, and their vision of its traditions and prospects. Looking back, I can still see the participants playing their roles in response to these two motivating ideas. The interpretation of events that follows will remain faithful to that original impression, even
though this involves the risk of oversimplification. After outlining the two ideas below, I will try to minimize that risk by identifying the several historical threads from which they were woven.

One of the two motivating ideas was that the college's overriding reason for being was to develop the moral character of students in the broad sense of that term. While the academic program was obviously the principal activity of the campus community, it was in service to the larger end of making better human beings—the "whole" person. In principle, the college developed the students' intellectual attainments as a means, not an end. The knowledge gained from the academic course of study, from this viewpoint, would enhance the ability of students to be better moral agents in the world, whatever professions they might enter.

Because of this priority, the college encouraged students to learn and practice excellence in their behavior as well as in their intellectual endeavors. To do this, it set forth expectations for social conduct, complete with disciplinary sanctions. Just as students would progress in knowledge in their classes, so they would progress in their responsible behavior outside of class. The college sustained the extracurricular and residential programs not just for relaxation and comfort. It designed these programs to give students opportunities to develop the social and leadership skills of a fully developed person. The result was to be the proverbially "well-rounded" graduate, developed in every sense—intellectually, socially, and morally—to serve society. In this view, the out-of-class program, centered in residence hall living and dining in common, and the social interaction of students with one another, were as important as the curriculum in the programmatic structure of the college. Because of the importance of these aspects of the college experience in the history of the college, the administration and the board of directors watched over them with a sense of special responsibility.

The second idea about the purpose of the college was that it was overridingly an academic enterprise. The faculty professed knowledge, and students learned from them. The faculty thought of themselves as members of a profession that divided into disciplines and areas of learning. Although at Ursinus at that time they rarely were publishing scholars in their disciplines, they tended to define themselves in terms of their disciplinary callings. Their allegiances with colleagues on campus often began with the members of their department or division. They encouraged their best and brightest students to advance as far as possible within their majors. They were always on the alert to bring a promising student into the disciplinary fold, to get them excited about biology or political science or whatever.

Those who espoused this second idea did not deny that the college developed the moral character of students. However, from their viewpoint, student values developed mainly from the content of the liberal arts, the honest and objective pursuit of truth in courses, and the influence and example of teachers in action. Faculty prided themselves as mentors who valued their students as developing human beings, even those students who were not academic stars. They acknowledged that the social experience among students and the many extracurricular activities played a part in their development. But they tended not to be overly intentional in wanting to direct extracurricular life, and they were quick to condemn its anti-intellectual effects. When they did become involved, they usually favored any steps that would reinforce intellectual values at the expense of purely social values. Although by custom they shared in the administration of student discipline
with deans, they were often ambivalent about this role when social values were at play. When students violated rules that jeopardized the academic program, however, they tended to be vigilant.

A number of faculty adherents to this second idea who were graduates of the college had a special loyalty to the institution—grounded in the rich experiences they had had as students and as fledgling instructors in their familiar terrain. In an intimate way, they knew what it meant to be "molded" by Ursinus. Their loyalty, however, did not neutralize their commitment to this second idea about the basic purpose of the college. If anything, when dispute over priorities arose, it gave them a feeling—as faculty members—that they knew better than anyone did what would best serve the college's interests.

These two ideas about college purposes in the 1970-1976 period could appear to be quite separate and distinct from one another. Participants of that time, however, would probably have agreed, if they could have gained the needed perspective, that they were really differences in emphasis and orientation rather than categorical opposites. A member of the board, administration, or faculty at a given moment in a particular discussion might have felt sympathetic to the first idea or to the second, depending on circumstances. To a certain extent, the disputes arose from the reluctance of Ursinus people of various groups to see that they actually stood on ample common ground with those who appeared to disagree with them. Indeed, that actuality made it possible, in the end, for Ursinus to hold together in spite of the disputes and to go forward in subsequent years. However, the differences were real. It was necessary for the people of Ursinus to deal with them in the politics of the institution before it could undertake an unabashed renewal in a subsequent period.

It helps to understand that the conflict over college purposes did not arise suddenly out of nowhere in the heated-up political atmosphere of that particular historical moment. Each of the two differing ideas sketched here had a lengthy genealogy in the history of American colleges and a particular track of development at Ursinus. Before probing how they played out in some of the important events of the post-Helfferich period, I would like to try to identify the historical threads woven into the two motivating ideas of the time. This should soften the impression that, by pitting two overarching ideas against one another, I am drawing an overly simplified interpretation of a complicated situation. This attempt to order events in terms of a simple opposition starts with an acknowledgment of the complexity of underlying crosscurrents.

***

The first idea, emphasizing the development of moral character, had venerable roots in the very beginnings of American higher education. Ursinus in 1869 was founded in religious piety hardly less strident than that which accompanied the founding of Harvard in 1636 and all the denominational colleges that preceded Ursinus's start. The first president, John H. A. Bomberger, and the three presidents who followed him all were men of the cloth. They were wholehearted advocates of "Apostolic Christian" faith through the old German Reformed (later Evangelical and Reformed) Church. Most of the early instructors also were ordained ministers, who placed a premium on moral development. All doubtless would have subscribed to the declaration of a contemporary president of Amherst College in 1872: "Character...is of more consequence than
intellect." Character meant Christian character to them. By linking education with religion, they aimed to discipline the intellect along with the emotional side of human nature, using Biblical truth as an ultimate reference. The outcome they sought was a graduate whose mental and moral faculties were in balance, equipping him to serve society as a fully formed Christian.

The moral fervor driving the early college rings forth in the following passage from the 1881 catalog:

\[\text{The college aims} \text{ to give chief prominence to the moral and religious element of education as of supreme value. Without true views of life, and right principles for its government, the acquisitions of learning only increase man's power for evil.}\]

While the overtly religious foundations of the old regimen gradually declined at Ursinus, following a nearly universal pattern in mainstream denominational colleges, important themes lived on. The old pietistic approach established a fundamental link between virtue and supervised discipline in and out of the classroom. It was the first basis for educating "the whole person." By harnessing intellect with morality, it left a legacy of "service" at colleges such as Ursinus. A respect for a higher order of things remained in the institutional memory long after the early years of pietism. (The religious affiliation of the college remained symbolically fixed and visible through the uniquely long leadership of board president Harry E. Paisley. An active Reformed church layman, Paisley served as head of the board from 1909 to his death in 1961 at the age of 97, surely a national record.) This helped sustain a serious concern about moral responsibility if not about explicit forms of religious practice. At its core was the lingering idea of an enduring right and wrong in human behavior that was immune to changing fashions and generational enthusiasms. The mission statement in the catalog of 1970-71 carried a trace of the old piety up to the modern day. It said that the college would cultivate in students, among other qualities, "ideals of morality and service consonant with the Christian character."

Ursinus in its early years implemented the pietistic worldview in part through the curriculum of "mental discipline." This theme, too, flowed out of the past and helped to enliven the conflict of ideas about college purpose in the 1970-1976 period. It harnessed academic work to the development of character. In 1869, this hoary curriculum based in the Greek and Roman classics was actually losing its hegemony in American colleges of the old kind. At the same time, upstart institutions such as John Hopkins University and Cornell University were opening to a wholly different modern beat that would ultimately change most of American higher education. However, Ursinus, new to the game but old in its orientation toward piety, adopted the traditional curriculum of mental discipline pretty much as Yale had canonized it in a famous 1828 defense--at least as much as it could afford. This was consistent with Bomberger's pietistic motives. Yale had declared its support for the traditional goal of education, "the discipline and the furniture of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge." Colleges pursued this goal through disciplined study of prescribed classical texts in daily class recitation, with no electives. The rote form of learning allowed professors without special knowledge to conduct classes in a variety of subjects from day to day.
The curriculum of mental discipline in its original form did not last at Ursinus any more than at other colleges in step with changing times. Even before Bomberger retired in 1890, science courses came into the curriculum, and other innovations blew into the Perkiomen Valley from the larger academic landscape. Changes in the academic preparation of professors and in instructional methods over time left the old approach behind. But it combined with religious piety to leave lasting traces. It subordinated the intellectual pursuit of knowledge as such and correspondingly elevated mental discipline as a higher value. It made diligence in class a virtue that professors ever after would seek in their students. (Complex in its lasting influence, the curriculum of mental discipline also was a genealogical source for the second motivating idea about the purpose of Ursinus, as we shall see shortly.)

The first motivating idea of the 1970-1976 period, relating to character development, had another genealogical source in what historian Frederick Rudolph aptly called "the collegiate way." The collegiate way was to set up a residential campus in a sylvan setting, out of the way of social distractions, and then to engage students and faculty in an intensive living and learning experience. It harked back to the original Harvard College and to its models in the rural colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. In the American form of the collegiate way, as it evolved through the two and a third centuries before Ursinus came on the scene, paternalism and discipline were its keynotes. Rules and regulations in residence halls and dining halls combined with compulsory chapel to control the moral and social development of students.

The regimented social experience of the collegiate way complemented the curriculum of mental discipline in "rounding" the student into a responsible adult. The collegiate way translated into the legal doctrine of in loco parentis. Through the decades, students at Ursinus, like those elsewhere, both chafed at and enjoyed the collegiate way, and the college, like others, adjusted the regimen as styles and expectations changed. The metaphor of "family" persisted as a description of the collegiate way throughout the century. The whole idea of educating in an intimate residential setting shines forth from the following language out of the 1913-1914 catalog:

The college aims to provide thoroughly healthful, wholesome and homelike conditions in the residences for both young men and young women. The boarding department is made an educational asset in the institution. All resident students take their meals in a large, cheery dining room constructed on artistic and thoroughly sanitary lines. The meals are prepared in a spacious, well-lighted, sanitary kitchen with complete modern equipment.

By controlling the conditions under which the students live, the college provides a physical basis for its higher functions that insures not only health of body and joy of life, but greatly promotes mental efficiency and success in intellectual pursuits.

Most students and some faculty by 1970 perceived that the comparison with "homelike" conditions had grown thin and that the collegiate way at Ursinus was best described as "controlling." When they compared the Ursinus rulebook with those of similar colleges, they concluded the Ursinus atmosphere was excessively regulatory.
Still, the long and attractive tradition of the collegiate way gave strength and legitimacy in many minds to the idea of the 1970-1976 period that character development was the first goal of the college. This was so even though many advocates of the idea probably saw little connection between the collegiate way and the traces of the pietistic impulse and of the curriculum of mental discipline. Indeed, most on both sides of the disputes felt at least a nostalgic connection with the more colorful and humane features of the old collegiate way, even in the midst of revolutionary social changes spawned in the late 1960s. The challenge in many minds was to preserve the desirable features of collegiate life while muting its paternalistic and disciplinary keynotes. The collegiate way, of course, aimed not only at disciplining the social life of students but also at providing a setting for the development of the intellect. This historical tradition, therefore, while mainly flowing into and supporting the idea that the college's aim was primarily the overall development of character, also bore on the second idea, as we will see.

(To follow the path of development of the old piety at Ursinus and its convergence with the collegiate way, see the analysis of catalog copy in Appendix I.)

That second idea—that the college was overridingly an academic enterprise—would have been obvious and uncontroversial in 1970 if an academic revolution had not occurred in American colleges during the century of Ursinus's existence. Clearly, the old curriculum of mental discipline was academic in its commitment to classroom recitation and prescribed text. Starting after the Civil War, however, professors in American colleges ceased over time to come mainly from the clergy. The German research universities and the graduate programs in American universities (those hatched full-fledged and those that metamorphosed out of the old colleges, led by Harvard and Yale) spawned a new class of academic professionals. It changed the nature of most colleges by changing the character of the acceptable credentials and the disciplinary boundaries of their curricula. The first Ursinus faculty member to hold a Ph.D degree, from Yale, Edmund Morris Hyde, came to the college in 1887 (Calvin D. Yost, Ursinus College, 57-8). This was less than twenty years after the founding. By fits and starts, Ursinus thus launched itself on a long journey. It was moving toward its destination as a modern liberal arts college, with faculty members who were conscious of themselves as practitioners in fields of disciplinary expertise that flourished independent of any single institution. It was moving toward the type of institution labeled by Christopher Jencks and David Riesman a "university college." In such a college, the main priority of academic professionals became that of preparing students for doing graduate work in universities in major academic fields. This was never the only priority, and it had to compete with other, more practical outcomes, such as preparation for business and high school teaching. The latter were especially important at Ursinus. Nevertheless, the sense of linkage with graduate programs and a culture of professionalism came to characterize the life of the faculty at Ursinus as it did at other colleges of its kind. This tilted such institutions toward a vision removed from the old college pursuing the classical plan of Yale.

The rise of scientific research in the post-Civil War universities drove the academic revolution and had its effects at the undergraduate level. Ursinus was teaching science at a relatively early stage of its existence. It soon came to focus on the science required for preparation to do graduate work in the medical schools of the Philadelphia area. In time "pre-med science" would become the dominant attraction to Ursinus students interested
in preparing for professional and graduate school.

Also in the late nineteenth century, the scientific spirit led to the development of modern social science disciplines. Economists, historians, sociologists, political scientists, and anthropologists came out of the graduate schools to teach in colleges such as Ursinus. They augmented the professionalization of the faculties of such institutions. At the same time, they gave a new kind of intellectual support for the goal of "service" to society. This reinforced older ideas about institutional purpose rooted in the pietistic tradition.

In the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, "liberal culture" in new humanities departments of the emerging universities developed in reaction to the new scientific emphasis. This laid the groundwork for the development of departments of English literature, modern languages, and philosophy in undergraduate colleges. Ursinus followed the pattern, sometimes lagging behind a little because of limited resources.

The split between sciences and humanities had a fragmenting effect at Ursinus as elsewhere in undergraduate colleges. The relevant observation here, though, is that the advocates of liberal culture were just as professionalized as were professors in the sciences. Their graduate school pedigrees and professional self-definition were of first importance to them. We need to emphasize this point because the movement for modern liberal culture reached for roots in the old classical curriculum, that mainstay of piety. Moreover, the advocates of liberal culture, with their emphasis on an ideal moral order and the values of civilization, found the old collegiate way to be a friendly setting within which to teach. In short, professors in the humanities had intellectual affinities with the older order, but that in itself did not align them unqualifiedly with the idea that the college's primary purpose was character development. The faculty across the disciplines, to be sure, had differing professional backgrounds and intellectual traditions. But those backgrounds and traditions rested on the common ground of academic professionalism.

I have taken this quick excursion through a couple of centuries of American college history to put some additional flesh on two basic ideas about college purpose. (For a more extended discussion of the themes touched on above and an identification of sources, see Appendix II.) One of those ideas emphasized the development of character and, as our historical excursion suggests, had deep roots in the old piety and pedagogy and in the collegiate way. I propose to use the term parochial purpose as shorthand for this idea in the ensuing discussion. Any such shorthand risks misrepresenting a complex reality, but the genealogical exercise may have provided some antidote. Also, "parochial" may ring a pejorative note in a reader's ear. I do not use it to convey a critical judgment but to suggest that those who favored this idea gave priority to local institutional ownership of the process of character development. Developing character was the special work of the faculty and staff of a particular place, with its own texture of habit and tradition.

The same may be said about the purpose of conveying knowledge, of course. However, that second motivating idea at play in the 1970-1976 period was firmly in the hands of a professional faculty. The professional style was unabashedly intellectual, and its practitioners tended to view it as "cosmopolitan" rather than local and particular. Faculty members could differentiate their teaching in the various academic disciplines from the college's programmatic aim to shape the moral behavior of students. In the extreme, they could even think of "character development" as an obstacle to their work.
when it appeared to be nothing but the enforcement of social rules and regulations. As shorthand for the second motivating idea about the college's purpose in the interpretation that follows, I will use the term **professional practice**. Here too, the excursion into American college history may have helped to minimize the danger of oversimplification.

***

Through nearly all of Ursinus College's first century, attitudes of faculty and students toward the changing relationship between its parochial purpose to shape behavior and the professional practice of the academic disciplines remained fairly supportive and stable. A willing cadre of professors managed to sustain loyalties to profession and to institution with little sign of discomfort. They shared a Christian life (or tolerance of that life). The registrar's (admissions) office admitted mainly like-minded students to campus. A non-sectarian policy on admission ensured from the start that the student body would not be narrowly Protestant Reformed in religion. But most students for many decades were homogeneously white, middle class, and Christian. Most were graduates of public high schools in eastern Pennsylvania and southern New Jersey. The corps of people who administered the college and a good many of the professors worshipped in the Reformed church or kindred denominations. The presence of a Reformed minister on campus as a chaplain, the annual celebration of Christmas with the traditional performance of Handel's *Messiah* in Bomberger Hall, the important role of the student "Y" in student affairs, and other Christian activities gave the college a religious appearance. Under these conditions, the board and administration could feel that they were perpetuating the original purpose—to shape behavior according to Christian principles. Because the campus community broadly shared the same values, they could feel, at the same time, that this was not incompatible with the increasing academic strength of the faculty and its departments.

It took the social and political upheavals of the last half of the 1960s to begin to reveal that a parochial tradition and professional commitments could tilt the college one way or the other. President Helfferich had to concern himself with the disrupting effects of the anti-war movement among students and the overturning of traditional social values. In the early stage of conflict over norms of student behavior and the rules surrounding student life, he was usually flexible but always determined to hold onto the paternalistic collegiate way that he knew so intimately. Faculty members began to be less comfortable in the climate set by the surviving elements of the parochial purpose of the college. But Helfferich's commanding presence and the felt need of the faculty itself to keep order in Collegeville while campuses erupted across the nation combined to keep professional faculty concerns off the front burner.

After Helfferich withdrew in 1970 and Pettit took over, external pressures continued to impinge strongly on the campus. They had a major influence on the internal debate when it got going in earnest through the 1970-1976 period.

The disillusionment of the younger generation with the system that took the US to Vietnam remained. When the government ended the draft for college students, much heat left campuses, but they could not go back to a pre-Vietnam consensus on the way institutions should run. Ursinus students, like those elsewhere, by the early 1970s were becoming less confrontational in pursuing a youthful style of life but no less determined than their elder siblings to have greater freedoms. This put them in opposition to the
surviving social rules that came to stand for the behavioral goals at the heart of the parochial vision. The national Watergate trauma leading up to President Nixon's resignation in 1974 only intensified their sense of distance from an established order.

But the social revolution paled as an influence on the campus debate when compared with the economic crisis of the 1970s. Double-digit inflation caused by the world oil crisis and the cost of war put an unprecedented squeeze on college finances and personal budgets. It forced the college to seek frantically for more cost-efficient methods of operating. It also pushed faculty members into a state of anxiety about their ability to live on paychecks that year by year lost purchasing power, even when the college gave small periodic percentage increases.

While Ursinus was experiencing what all colleges were experiencing in this troubled period, it seemed noticeably different from some of the colleges to which people compared it. Its administrative leaders did not have the standard academic credentials of the typical educational leaders of selective liberal arts colleges. It was possible for faculty members lacking terminal degrees to attain tenure and influence among their colleagues. The administration still dominated the promotion and tenure process, and criteria other than professional performance occasionally appeared to determine decisions. The baby-boom student body was bright, as befitted the Sputnik-inspired school preparation of the time. However, the student body was rather homogeneous, as noted above. Through the selection procedures and self-selection, the majority leaned toward the conservative side of the scales when social attitudes and political persuasion were measured—a contrasting vocal minority to the contrary notwithstanding. The social policies of the college were conservative too, when compared with those at many similar colleges in the East. The rules prohibited alcohol on campus and severely limited contact between men and women in dormitories. Strong voices against the social upheavals of the times dominated the board of directors. Although the college had a long tradition of independence from denominational control, the board and administration acknowledged the connection with the United Church of Christ (successor to the Evangelical & Reformed Church) and sought to give it meaning in the way they managed the college. A local style of thought, rooted in Pennsylvania Dutch matter-of-factness and in traditional concerns for correct behavior, continued to preoccupy the leadership and many of the members of the campus community.

Despite such differentiating traits and some anomalies, Ursinus had an acknowledged place among the liberal arts colleges in Pennsylvania. In retrospect, it is possible to see it in 1970 at some point on a trajectory very much like that of other colleges. That trajectory, as we saw in our excursion into college history, was toward a role as a "university college" in the sense of that term given by Christopher Jencks & David Riesman in their book, The Academic Revolution. That is, Ursinus was moving toward the priority pursued by the recognized national liberal arts colleges of the time—that of preparing the majority of their students to go on to graduate work in a university. In 1970, Ursinus was playing that role to a considerable degree in the sciences and pre-medicine, less so in other disciplines. But it is unlikely that a college spokesperson would have described its purpose in such undiluted terms. The administration, board, many faculty, and many alumni had strong convictions about the importance of developing "the whole person" irrespective of his or her graduate education or career beyond Ursinus. In insisting on this role, Ursinus was not unlike comparable colleges or
even the national liberal arts colleges, except in the degree of importance it attached to it. In summary, related social, political, and economic conditions were crowding in on Ursinus's homegrown path of internal development as the 1970s began. The college was different but not uniquely so in its preoccupations.

The local differences, however, are the stuff of personal memory. And it is personal memory rather than historiographic method that shapes the sections that complete this essay. I was at Helfferich's elbow when he crafted the three-fold legacy that he gave to the Ursinus community as he left office, and I helped his successor to deal with its consequences. That is why the following sections focus on that legacy. The two competing ideas about the college's purpose loom vividly in my memory as forces that energized my contemporaries and me. That is why they are central to this interpretation. The resulting picture probably bears only limited resemblance to the whole tableau of Ursinus in those years. Perhaps it contributes a little to it, however, while it establishes some long-desired order in my personal remembrance of events. (I shift to third-person references to myself in the remainder of the essay.)

SELECTING A PRESIDENT--WITH CONDITIONS

The faculty's conflict with the administration during the 1970-1976 period did not start with their felt need to recapture their personal purchasing power in an inflationary economy. It started with their unhappiness over the process of selection that made William S. Pettit the president of Ursinus College, effective 1 November 1970. This unhappiness set the stage for the other dimensions of debate to come.

Donald L. Helfferich and key members of the board felt especially responsible for upholding the parochial purpose of the institution, however the college might define it. For Helfferich, this was partly a personal issue, since a Helfferich forebear had been among the German Reformed people at the founding. He felt that during his stewardship he had striven mightily to preserve the identity of the college as a unique product of Reformed church experience. He wanted that effort to continue. For key board members, especially Paul I. Guest, '38, then vice president of the board, it was a vital issue of control and morality.

Helfferich and board members both looked disdainfully at the disorder on campuses around the country provoked by youthful demonstrators against the Vietnam war and against established social values. Helfferich had taken a tough stand against student protests. While showing a clenched fist, he had drawn on his cleverness and innate sense of humor to keep students in line. He had been willing to listen to them if they approached him with civility and reasonableness. His board members had applauded his stand against disorder, seeing it as a demonstration of institutional principle and of effective management. And they wanted a tough stand against disorder to continue into the new administration. They believed that it differentiated Ursinus from other liberal arts colleges. It resonated with what they thought of as the distinctive parochial purpose of the college.

Helfferich and board members looked as disdainfully at the social revolution then occurring as they did at campus disorders and mass protests. They personally disapproved of the new sexual freedom at the heart of the revolution. They thought that the new freedom surrounding personal behavior would lead to excess and social decay. It
violated standards of behavior that they associated in their minds with the moralistic tradition of the college. Their fear of moral breakdown intensified their sense of responsibility to the college's parochial purpose.

That purpose gained expression by 1970 largely in behavioral, social terms and hardly at all in religious or even moralistic terms. "Apostolic Christianity" to a large extent by now meant a prescribed code of conduct, centered mainly in the dormitories. Neither the administration nor the faculty could any longer assert seriously that it had a calling to attend to the spiritual welfare of the students, except to speak platitudes. Still, the code of student conduct in dormitories combined with a dying chapel requirement and a curricular requirement in humanities to bear the main weight of the moralistic heritage of the college. The actual style of student life diverged increasingly from the norms of behavior laid down by the college rules. Administrators and faculty knew this. The parochial purpose, however, still infused the code of rules with an importance that transcended its relationship to the post-teenage style of life that followed the social revolution of the 1960s.

For the rest, the board expected the faculty and staff to express the parochial purpose by their personal example as men and women of good character. In interviews with prospective new faculty, the president and dean still sought to find men and women who would understand and support the parochial purpose, however different it might look by 1970. They had to temper their pointed questions after national civil rights laws created a new climate for personnel decisions, but they still did their best to get a reading on the personal convictions of candidates. Good people making up the faculty tried to do good by professing their academic disciplines well. Some still pointed out exemplary ideas and conduct from their academic subject matter to influence student values. In doing so, they aligned themselves, unwittingly, to be sure, with the original faculty who put classical and Biblical texts in front of the students for their exemplary value. In the main, these faculty members, however, would have done that because of their understanding of virtue in their own right as professional practitioners with integrity and as persons of moral worth. They would not have done so because of allegiance to the original pietistic purpose of the college.

In their study of the liberal disciplines, of course, students were learning about the central ideas of western culture. At Ursinus as at other colleges, this basic academic process became in many minds the modern substitute for the old parochial agenda, even though it was free of prescribed morality. Courses in the humanities especially emerged as the arena where students should discover the enduring values of Western civilization and contemplate the destiny of humankind--without conscious inducements from professors to believe this way or that way. The testimony of many alumni supports the notion that it was their academic subjects that opened their minds to the possibilities and dilemmas of human aspiration, even to the great drama of right versus wrong in the western tradition. Agile student minds undoubtedly gained insights for their own lives through their classes.

As the board deliberated on the selection of the next president, it had no time or inclination to look critically at the way in which the parochial purpose of the college had come down to them. They knew it was there, and they knew they had a solemn responsibility to preserve it. It offered a bulwark against the disorder and immorality that they saw threatening America--and Ursinus--at that moment. They had to choose a new
president who would understand this need. He would have to be able to follow Helfferich in sustaining the college's commitment to its code of social conduct, one of the most visible surviving elements of the parochial purpose.

The board also would look to a new president to manage the affairs of the college with administrative order and financial prudence. To many on the board and in the campus community, these characteristics of good management during Helfferich's years had become associated with Ursinus's parochial identity. They resonated with the historical traces of "low church" Reformed simplicity and frugality and with Pennsylvania Dutch practicality. Some thought that Helfferich's presidential style, soaked as it was in a family history intimately tied up with the college and in the ethnic culture of the region, constituted a model. Actually, it was largely personal and hardly transferable. Yet, the board could reasonably expect to find someone who understood and shared the values of orderliness and frugality. It helped the board to reinforce the importance of these values as presidential criteria by associating them with the college's traditional parochial vision. If the college managed its affairs in an orderly and frugal way, this would exemplify for students the kind of responsible social behavior the college expected of them.

The board began deliberating on its obligation to find a successor to Helfferich as early as May 1967. At the following meeting in November 1967 it appointed a small committee, with Ellwood S. Paisley, '13, chairman. No truer custodian of the parochial purpose of Ursinus College could have been found. He was the son of Harry Paisley, a pillar of the Reformed church, who had chaired the Ursinus board for 51 years. Ellwood's son, grandson, and other family members were graduates. Harry's long tenure in the chair undoubtedly contributed to the equilibrium between parochial and professional forces for half the institution's life. His son Ellwood admired his father's service to the college and emerged as a board member after his father's death. He was a willing helper to Helfferich on campus after he retired from a business career in the sixties. He represented the board on a student-faculty-administration trouble-shooting committee. He did much in this role during tense days on campus to defuse student anger by his friendly, trusting, and generous presence. A skilled draftsman, he designed the college shield that for many years adorned the cover of printed convocation programs. He ran many little errands for Helfferich and the board. This made him a large, dependable presence in the presidential search.

Helfferich himself recommended the make-up of the rest of the committee. William Elliott and Clarence Warden were Helfferich's friends from the corporate world who admired him and would follow his guidance. William Reimert, '24, president of the board, was editor of the Allentown daily newspapers. He was a stalwart layman in the Reformed church and a life-long friend of Helfferich's. Theodore R. Schwalm, another Reformed layman and businessman, would become board president following Reimert's death in 1969, and he would inherit the task of orchestrating the election of Pettit. Thomas P. Glassmoyer, '36, and Paul I. Guest, '38, both were successful Philadelphia lawyers, deeply involved as alumni and eager to support the parochial agenda of the college.

The board recognized the legitimate interest of the professional practitioners of the college by appointing one faculty member to the committee. The person chosen had an Ursinus and Reformed church pedigree second to none. He was Calvin D. Yost, Jr., '30,
professor of English and college librarian. He literally had been born at the college and had spent his entire professional life in its service. His father had been secretary of the board, librarian, and instructor in English and German for many years, a member of the group of Reformed men in the Omwake years that managed the college.

The make-up of the search committee—especially since Helfferich himself recommended it—ensured that the parochial purpose of the college would figure importantly in the search for a new president. Nominally at least, Yost would hold up the professional interests of the faculty in the process. Later the board brought two others onto an advisory faculty committee on presidential selection. Along with Yost, it appointed chemistry professor Roger P. Staiger, '43, and Geoffrey Dolman, English professor and head of the admissions office. Staiger had been a student of Pettit's and had been alumni secretary in his earlier years on the faculty. Like several other colleagues, he was married to a fellow graduate, was hired shortly after graduating, and earned his doctorate at the University of Pennsylvania while teaching at Ursinus. He and his wife had done extra duty in their younger years by proctoring a student dorm. Dolman, although not an alumnus, was a friend of Pettit and a loyal member of Helfferich's administrative team. Helfferich and the board could feel reasonably sure that this faculty trio would understand the board's feeling of responsibility to the parochial tradition. Yet, they also had to be prepared for the faculty representatives to speak up for the professional interests of their colleagues at this critical decision point in the life of the college.

When the board invited and received from the faculty group a set of recommended criteria, its recommendations came down heavily on academic status. Millard Gladfelter, former President of Temple University, the board's best-known academician, dissented somewhat, saying that the criteria should emphasize public relations, which would become increasingly important in the changing environment for colleges. He agreed with faculty, however, that the person chosen should have earned the Ph.D.

In the next twelve months, the committee did a considerable amount of work. It received applications from nineteen candidates and interviewed twelve of them. Paisley reported on the results of its work to the board on 15 May 1970. None of those interviewed measured up. Some were impressive "but lacked too many of the essentials." He concluded: "It is hoped that a candidate will appear who will be acceptable, but no one who will be chosen can fully take the place of Dr. Helfferich." The message seemed to be that the systematic search was over, and now the committee would wait for lightning to strike—or, more likely, for Helfferich to guide it to a decision that, to close watchers, was beginning to appear inevitable.

A big step closer to that decision was taken on 30 June 1970. The faculty advisory committee sent a message to the board that it would support Pettit for president if Helfferich did not wish to continue in the presidency. Significantly, the committee further recommended that in that event the search for a new president continue under the guidelines established by the committee on presidential succession. Helfferich of course had officially notified the board of his intention to retire in the centennial year as early as November 1967. No one had any reason to believe that he would be willing to continue in office past 1970. The wording of the message may have been intended more for the eyes of faculty colleagues than for those of the board.

Pettit arrived at Ursinus in 1933 after earning his bachelor's and master's degrees at
the University of Pennsylvania in chemistry. His course in organic chemistry became a staple of the science and pre-medical program. In due time he became one of the handful of people who administered the operation of the college on top of their teaching duties. He became responsible for registration (admissions), and, in 1954, President McClure appointed him the chief academic officer. He held the dean’s position until his election to the presidency. In 1969, thanks to a reorganization of the entire administration by Helfferich, he gained the added title of vice president for academic affairs. Helfferich probably conferred the vice presidential status on him to signal to the college community what the next step might be.

Pettit felt at home in the Ursinus atmosphere. He told nostalgic stories of his friendships with venerable Ursinus figures. He had a good working relationship with Helfferich. The Reformed tradition of frugality and no-nonsense hard work fitted his Spartan inclination. But he leaned in more than one direction. He had a discriminating eye for antiques, a talent for painting, and a cultivated appreciation for the place of form (he was a practicing Episcopalian) and graceful style in an educated life. These gave him breadth and variety as a person. Like most in his generation, the Great Depression made him cautious about money, wary of surprises, and concerned for security. He seemed to relish the sacrifice inherent in serving at an institution with no margin for frills. Faculty and students saw in him a tough administrator, a stickler for rules, bent on orderliness and rigor. Faculty members sometimes chafed under his tight control of the budget. Sometimes they felt he judged their performance arbitrarily. Students saw in him an unyielding force during the campus unrest in the last years of Helfferich’s administration. He stood fast with the president against student protests and for the rules governing student social conduct. To many students, he looked even more unyielding than Helfferich.

All this supported the feeling of Helfferich and the board committee that Pettit was well equipped to carry forward the parochial purpose of the college at a stressful time in its history. His status as the academic leader would have persuaded them that he was also naturally equipped to oversee the professional practice of the faculty. Faculty on the advisory committee knew of differing sentiments among their colleagues. As dean, Pettit had had to turn down many requests for resources over many years and for other reasons had opposed hopes for developing the curriculum or expanding the staff. The faculty affected by his negative decisions over time became resentful—an attitude caused by many academic deans after a certain amount of time in office. Pettit’s lack of a terminal degree weighed negatively in some faculty minds. Some also thought that at age 61 he was too old to begin a job as physically demanding as the presidency—although he was demonstrably a hard and steady worker. Still, the faculty advisory committee’s communication removed a major roadblock. It enabled the board to make a decision before the summer of 1970 ended.

It did not act, however, until 25 September, just five weeks before Helfferich’s departure from office. From the report of a staff member in whom Pettit confided that fall, we infer that he was diffident about the prospect of an offer, which had not yet been made. When the board committee did meet with him, however, it did not take long for him to agree.

He and the board thus ended the uncertainty that had been surrounding the prospect of Helfferich’s retirement for several years. But the board unwittingly complicated the
climate for the debate that would soon begin after Pettit's election. The appearance of a hasty, eleventh-hour fix curdled some of the good will the board had created when it asked Yost, Staiger, and Dolman to advise. More important, the board appeared to temper its confidence in Pettit after resolving to elect him. Its intention was to lay a path for continued stewardship of the office of president. Unintentionally, it appeared to be creating a caretaker administration. The resolution said, "We recommend the Board actively continue its search for a new and preferably younger person to assume the office of president with the understanding that the board is at liberty to complete final arrangement with such a person when found."

Board leaders soon must have realized the potential harm they had done with this resolution. At its regular fall board meeting on 13 November, just two weeks after he assumed office, board members voted to give Pettit a seat on the board for a regular five-year term. Paul Guest then gave him one of the few gold centennial medallions in circulation and said his election was unanimous. The minutes reported this as "evidence that the Board was in back of him." (The board leaders had a hard time getting it right, though. In the next breath, board president Theodore R. Schwalm sought to compliment Pettit while paying tribute to the outgoing president. The comparison he drew between the two men was not designed to give unqualified encouragement to a president just starting out: "I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Helfferich...I also wish to pay tribute to Dr. Pettit because he is falling into a position that is very difficult because of the illustrious leadership we had before."

The board's whole approach to the selection process could easily have justified a "no thanks" from a person in Pettit's position. He said "yes" certainly because of his loyalty to an institution that he had served by then for 37 years and that felt like home. He would never shirk a task called for by the organization. If he agreed in part because of sheer personal interest in having the ultimate institutional experience, in spite of the terms surrounding the appointment, any sympathetic colleague would have understood.

The board did not publicize its resolution to continue looking, and it did not go on looking. Pettit understandably seized the reins of office with a show of authority and vigor. Observers knew there was no other way for him to do it with any hope of succeeding. But the faculty advisory committee members were well aware of their recommendation and probably aware of the board's endorsement of it. And their awareness was not about to stay among the three of them.

This look at the process of selecting Pettit for the presidency helps to show how it adversely affected the protracted argument soon to come about institutional principles and priorities. What it did to his personal feeling about the assignment lies outside the scope of this inquiry, but it could not have been a comfort. The process affected Pettit's ability to lead. It made it more difficult for the faculty to follow his lead. It affected his ability and that of the students to deal forthrightly with the fundamental conflict between their changing mores and the social code, which bore the main weight of the parochial purpose of the college.

The search process and terms of his appointment adversely affected his ability to lead by giving him a predetermined direction to follow. Helfferich and the board leaders made it clear he was not to innovate or to improvise. He was to keep Ursinus on the path that Helfferich had cut in the past and had surveyed for the future. The terms of his appointment compelled him to follow the will of his board. He had no latitude for trying
to shape the board's perspective on the parochial purpose of the college or to innovate in academic matters.

A different type of personality, under pressure from the disputes, might have tried to change the terms between the board and himself. He might have risked an engagement with student and faculty issues on terms other than those familiar to the board. Pettit was an authoritarian in the sense that he respected the authority over him, just as he expected those under him to respect his authority. Without a clear mandate from the board to seek a new path through the difficult terrain of the 1970s, he was not disposed to be a pioneer. The board wanted someone to stand firm in the face of flak. It chose well for that role when it chose Pettit. But by working hard to stand firm, Pettit had to forgo other options that in the long run might have made a difference in the disputes.

**Faculty Argue for Professional Priorities**

The selection process adversely affected the faculty's will to follow Pettit's lead. It appeared in their eyes to deprive him of the legitimacy of leadership. Before he took office, a critical letter from a senior faculty member, soon to retire, appeared in the student newspaper. Donald G. Baker, professor of classical languages, complained of "the callous indifference to student and faculty opinion in the selection of a new president." Baker's forthright if awkward public statement probably caught the sentiments of more than a few colleagues disinclined to express them.

The lack of confidence felt by such faculty in Pettit's presidential authority led them over the course of his administration to take two initiatives. In both initiatives, they believed they acted because they had a responsibility to uphold the quality of the professional academic enterprise. What led to conflict was their corollary belief that the administration was failing to uphold it. The first initiative had to do with financial resources. The second had to do with faculty representation on the board of directors.

Faculty knew what double digit inflation was doing to their family budgets. Some were genuinely hurting. Others generalized from their experience to see a serious threat to the quality of the professional practice of the institution. As they saw it, low morale, caused by poor pay and poor future prospects, fed on itself to make the financial problem feel even worse than it was. Additionally, faculty said they feared that the lack of a good pay scale would diminish the ability of their departments to hire and retain excellent professors in the right specialties.

The start of a new administration in November 1970 purchased a little time for good will. To call it a honeymoon, however, would be a stretch. By March 1971 the issue of money was on the faculty meeting agenda. A faculty committee had been investigating practices at other colleges for reimbursement of expenses involved in attending professional meetings. For the committee members, this in large part was an issue of institutional quality rather than personal finances. If Ursinus professors did not receive reasonable reimbursement, they would not attend meetings. They would thus fail to keep up with the scholarship in their disciplines. That would lower the academic quality of Ursinus. The faculty committee recommended a catch-up strategy for Ursinus until reimbursements equaled those at comparable colleges; and it suggested that the college increase reimbursement scales over time to keep pace with inflation.

These modest recommendations kicked off the faculty-administration debate over
principles and priorities that was to characterize the entire period. Two responses to them are noteworthy for an account of that debate. First, the faculty voted to send the recommendations directly to the board of directors. Second, the president, chairing the meeting, voiced a word of caution.

The procedural step of communicating directly to the board, though no one said anything at the time, constituted a significant departure. The board agenda under Helfferich had been his to determine. Any faculty presence or representation of view was at his call. In numerous crises, he had carefully controlled the access of faculty and students. They communicated with board members on his terms. Pettit did not directly tag the action inappropriate at the time. Faculty therefore could feel that they had found a new means for expressing themselves on board policy directly to the governing body. In communicating directly with the board, they were seeking their welfare—and, as they saw it, the welfare of the professional practice of the institution. By doing so, however, they appeared to put at risk the prerogatives of the administration, which had custody of the parochial purpose of the college. The parochial-professional balance of forces was thus to a degree jeopardized by the initiative of the faculty. The issue of governance relationships raised at this time would persist through the period.

Although Pettit chose to say nothing on the spot about the direct communication to the board, he did caution the faculty. Immediate implementation might not be possible, he said, because inflation was making the college budget ever tighter. A $150 increase in tuition for 1971-72—a 5.5% increase—would hardly be in line with the cost of living, and to push higher would begin limiting the access of students from families with modest incomes.

At the following board meeting in May 1971, Pettit's voice on reimbursement policy and related benefits had the final say, faculty recommendations to the contrary notwithstanding. He sought and received board approval for a policy statement on faculty benefits that would not soon achieve the goals suggested by the faculty committee. The policy was "not an attempt to curb activities but to limit unnecessary ones."

It may have appeared to the board that Pettit had handily won a point in the argument with faculty over reimbursement benefits. But the faculty moved on to the larger issue of salaries. At its May 1971 meeting it elected a committee to study faculty salary structure and policies for increments, with a mandate to the committee to report back by the end of 1971. The proposal originated with the Ursinus chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Although the active members were relatively few, their colleagues on the faculty tacitly concurred when these members presumed to speak for them to the president and the board. A patina of professionalism still attached to the AAUP, giving it a sort of legitimacy in the campus debate, although never explicitly acknowledged. Near the end of the 1970-1976 period, the patina dissolved in the eyes of the administration and board when the local chapter flirted with unionization.

The faculty as a whole, in voting for the study, prevented the AAUP initiative from looking like a maverick move. It voted to refer the study to the standing committee on promotion and tenure, augmented by three others elected by the faculty.

The report that came back in December predictably found Ursinus salary increments lagging behind cost-of-living increases. It urged a near-term catch-up strategy for salaries of full professors, which had taken the hardest hit. The committee's final
recommendation demonstrated its sense of stewardship for the quality of professional practice. Performance evaluations from department heads on individual professors, it said, would be useful to the dean and president in deciding who should get how much in annual increments. As a statement in the debate, the committee was probably implying that the dean and president appeared remiss in not requiring performance evaluations. Faculty critics were beginning to believe that those who remained loyal to the parochial vision embodied in the administration received favor when it divided up the small amounts for salary increases. The college would best serve the professional practice of the college, the committee was saying, if it installed a system that would dispel such suspicions, unfounded or not.

What happened after the committee made its report and recommendations on salaries in December 1971 characterized the style of the prolonged debate over principles and priorities. At first, nothing much happened. And that, of course, the faculty heard as a response from the administration and board. They heard it as a negative answer to the question they had posed: Can or will the college do anything substantive about the financial plight of its professional practitioners? Some attributed the lack of response to the lack of authority lodged in the president. That kept alive the sense that limiting conditions had accompanied the selection of the president.

When audible messages about college finances did come from the president and others in the months after the committee's December 1971 report, they did nothing to encourage faculty to expect redress from the inflation pinch. From a professional standpoint, faculty felt that the foundations of the academic enterprise would be in jeopardy as long as a financial solution to their salary dilemma remained undiscovered. They felt justified in looking to the leadership for solutions. They felt frustrated when they perceived that the administration seemed unable to offer any.

As department heads set about building their budgets for 1972-73, Pettit cautioned them to be frugal in their expectations and complete in their plans. Contrary to past practice, they would no longer receive approval for expenditures for unbudgeted needs that cropped up after the new operating year began. When the board budget committee approved Pettit's 1972-73 budget in April 1972, it directed him to prepare the faculty for more fiscal tightness.

Before he could do that, the AAUP at the 5 April 1972 faculty meeting acted again to push the president and the board on salaries. It intended that its resolution reach the board at its upcoming meeting on 12 May 1972. This time the AAUP did not call for more study. It called for salary increments "sufficient to meet immediately the increased cost of living." It also recommended raises as soon as possible to put Ursinus averages in a certain category of the nationally published AAUP salary scale.

Pettit immediately expressed sympathy with the resolution. He endorsed the raising of salaries to correspond to the category II B-2 on the AAUP salary scale. But he said he objected to a commitment to meeting the cost of living increases. He explained the precarious situation of private higher education in the inflationary and competitive climate in the nation. He explained the financial problems at Ursinus in particular. Payments on the new debt for Helfferich Hall were demanding. The need to restore Bomberger Hall and install a College Union in the old library building required the use of funds that the college otherwise could spend for salaries and other operating expenses.

Faculty tended to remember Pettit's objection and to forget his endorsement. They
were even more certain that his basic message was bad news after he spoke at the following faculty meeting on 3 May 1972. Here Pettit dutifully carried out the directive he had received from the budget committee in April. Among other cutbacks, he told the faculty he anticipated a moratorium on expenditures for capital equipment and for faculty travel (in direct conflict with the earlier faculty hopes for catching up to sister colleges in their reimbursement allotments). And he hoped that the administration could "avoid cutting or freezing faculty salaries." It was a sobering moment.

In effect, Pettit on 3 May 1972 gave an answer on behalf of the board to the faculty's 5 April 1972 question. He did this before the faculty resolution came to the official attention of the board at its 12 May 1972 meeting. We might speculate about his timing. Perhaps he anticipated a negative reaction from the board to both the form and the substance of the faculty's recommendation. He wanted to cushion the feeling of letdown that this would bring to faculty. He wanted to cushion the reaction of the board that faculty were getting out of line. So, he took it on himself to convey a preliminary bit of bad news about salaries on top of the bad news about moratoria on travel expense and capital expenditures. This would let faculty know forthwith of the limits to improvement and shield the board from having to process the faculty communication. In passing, it might signal the faculty that their growing taste for sending messages directly to the board was not about to alter the basic line of governance through the president to the board.

But this speculation is not essential to the thesis of this essay. We do know that the board had made it clear as a condition of his appointment that the president should hold the line—on the fiscal management of the college as well as on campus order and the social code. Pettit could feel he was performing his duty well in notifying the faculty in a timely fashion of the financial constraints.

Although on his own he had responded in effect to the faculty's message, he did his duty to them when subsequently, on 12 May 1972, he submitted their recommendation to the board. He probably repeated his endorsement and his objection for the benefit of the board and probably informed it of the warning he already had conveyed to faculty on 3 May 1972. The board members, like the president, sympathized with the declining buying power of faculty. Unlike the president, they felt they had officially dealt with the issue in the goals for improvement set in the new fund-raising program, Century II. That Century II was not in fact funneling sufficient gift dollars into the income side of the budget to permit salary increases did not faze board members. They had given a mandate to Pettit to manage and keep order and his reports indicated he was doing that well. Century II fund-raising was going along and would continue to command the energy and attention of key board members. Owing to the limited terms of his appointment, Pettit was not able to propose far-reaching ideas for solutions. The board and the president, mutually reinforcing, were ill disposed to make budget balancing an even more difficult act by pumping up salaries as recommended.

So matters stood as news about the financial conditions in Pennsylvania's colleges and universities worsened. A survey by McKinsey & Co., commissioned by the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities, showed that the vast majority of institutions were becoming financially more vulnerable. On campus Pettit shared the McKinsey news, giving Ursinus better grades than the average but still warning of the adverse conditions. These included public disillusionment with colleges in the wake of
disruption and violence, cutbacks in government assistance, the likely inroads on private-college enrollments by the newly emerging community colleges, weakening demand in admission (perhaps owing in part to the waning of the draft for college-age men), and a "grim" placement market for graduates.

At their 6 December 1972 meeting, faculty learned the surprising and disheartening news that the college was failing to meet the original enrollment assumptions underlying Century II goals. Vice President Richard Richter, who was responsible for executing the development campaign under Pettit, told the faculty the enrollment assumption in the financial plan was 1250. The tuition stream of income was adversely affected because that target was now found to be unrealizable. Total enrollment figures remained a hundred or more short of that. Because gift funds from Century II were making up the operating shortfall, they were not enhancing faculty salaries or professional development.

Richter did not go on to explain that the annual operating budgets prepared for the board's approval made enrollment assumptions that were unrealistically pessimistic. They not only did not anticipate income from 1250 students, they did not even anticipate income from the actual 1100 or so then enrolled. The number was more about 985 or so. Because of this low budget estimate of tuition income, an operating deficit routinely appeared in the budget submitted to the board, regardless of the amount of gifts to the operation. At the end of the actual operating year, the better-than-budgeted enrollment would then yield the extra income to close the gap or come close to it. Because of this practice, started years before by Helfferich, budgeted operating expenses always looked excessive, even when the college achieved economies. This budgeting practice made the inflationary pinch look and feel greater to Pettit and his fellow administrators than it was—although it was real enough. They did not think that a detailed explanation to faculty at this point would improve understanding or perception. The fact was that, any way they looked at the situation, money was tight and inflation was making it tighter.

At the national level, President Nixon's Cost of Living Council in 1973 declared a 60-day price freeze to deal with the inflationary economy. It included college tuition, room and board fees. The freeze lifted and Ursinus was able to increase its charges. But the atmosphere of fiscal distress symbolized by the threat of a freeze added to the gloomy mood on campus.

The argument over salaries appeared to line up the faculty and administration on opposite sides of the table. The administration, constrained by the fiscal realities and the terms of the president's engagement by the board, appeared to be holding the line on expenditures in a style consistent with the parochial frugality of the place. The faculty appeared to be increasingly vocal advocates for saving the professional practice of the college from the destructive effects of inflation. One of the ironies of the argument was that the president came around by 16 November 1973 to a robust call to the board to improve salaries. Most faculty failed to know of his call or to credit him for it. The board responded in the budget with amounts that would prove too little and too late to end the argument.

At that November meeting, Pettit got as far out in front of the board as his limited mandate would permit him. He said the faculty were among those "most punished" by the inflationary economy. He set as a "requirement" for the year ahead "a supreme effort to move in the direction of restoring the purchasing power that our faculty members have lost during the recent year or two and additionally to support a substantial number of
merit increases in salary. To this end we must direct our careful and thoughtful attention." Pettit's message on the need for salary improvement was unmistakable. In a less argumentative climate, faculty members might have enjoyed taking credit for having succeeded in winning him to their point of view and in moving him to assertive action—and he might have enjoyed leading the way to an agreed-upon solution.

But the difficult financial environment persisted despite some advance in meeting the goals for faculty support in Century II. Small salary supplements in the 1974-75 year showed a will on the board to heed the president's call for a supreme effort. They did virtually nothing, however, to relieve the actual financial pinch felt by individual faculty members. The supplements probably did more harm than good to the morale of faculty. Again in the spring of 1975, urged by Pettit, the board conditionally authorized $50,000 for salary increases in the 1975-76 year. The lack of a promise and the smallness of the amount further fed the unhappiness of faculty.

As faculty pushed to change financial priorities and the administration worried over the mounting operating expenses caused by inflation, students played a muted counterpoint on the financial issue. Students knew the college was trying to keep tuition affordable. One student editorialized that instead of making the college cost-efficient, this effort made it "just plain cheap," but that view was not widely discussed. Each year, when considering how much to increase the charges, administrators agonizingly sought to find the precise amount that would yield maximum income without stirring criticism from students and their parents. They thus managed to hold down criticism but also held down needed increases in income. While Pettit and the board were contending with faculty concerns over finances, the Weekly editorialized in favor of a $400 tuition increase for 1976-77. It acknowledged that volunteer gifts would not be enough to keep up with expenses. The administration took some comfort from this show of student understanding of the need to bring in more income to combat double-digit increases in expenditures.

In the end, the president's words and deeds on salaries did not tell sufficiently in the ears of faculty. In the fall of 1975, the enrollment income was sufficient to allow Pettit to go ahead with the salary supplement conditionally authorized the previous spring. He called a special meeting for 17 October 1975 to announce this. One-time salary supplements, he said, would range from $100 to $400, with full professors getting the least and lower-paid instructors the most. But Pettit's announcement failed to capture the attention of the faculty. As he spoke, most were wondering what would happen when he and the board digested an unprecedented letter of concerns that would hit his desk that very day.

In the previous spring, many faculty had come to feel that only a truly dramatic call from the professoriate would stop the unproductive giving and taking that characterized the debate being conducted with and through the president. To avoid the appearance of narrow self-interest, that call would have to emphasize the need to maintain the quality of the professional practice of the college. If such a faculty thrust were to destabilize the relationship between the academic enterprise and the parochial purpose of the college as embodied in the president and board, they felt that such a consequence would be justifiable. In the fall of 1975, a small group drafted a letter addressed to the president and all members of the board. The draft of 7 October 1975 passed muster with those working on it, and it became the final form of the message, bearing that date. It listed six
concerns and called for immediate remedial action by the board. In the ten days that followed, the drafters went the rounds to solicit signatures of support from tenured colleagues. All of them sympathized and nearly all signed the letter. In the end, a total of 37 faculty signed.

The drafters did not ask untenured faculty members to sign because they might have feared it would jeopardize their chances for promotion and tenure, but some signed anyway. The influx of a number of young faculty members during the 1970-1976 period had increased the ranks of the untenured. They had brought new expectations for professional development and new viewpoints on the Ursinus campus culture. Some came to wonder when resources for faculty would increase. Some found the campus culture confusingly provincial. Their presence and their views doubtless encouraged the longer-serving leaders who wrote the letter of concerns.

An unprecedented political move by faculty, the letter gave fresh life to the major points of conflict over principles and priorities reaching back to the circumstances surrounding the selection of the president in 1970. For better or worse, it created a new playing field on which the administration and board would have to deal with the faculty initiative on salaries. As we will see below, significant change in salary administration resulted before Pettit departed from office.

Hoping also to succeed on their second initiative—securing a voice for faculty on the board—the faculty included it in the list of concerns itemized in the letter delivered on 17 October 1975. But the parochial purpose, now wrapped in the cloak of a policy statement on conservatism, restrained the board from granting that desire. A brief look at events reveals the board's unyielding opposition to the second initiative.

After that look, we will examine the formal and the substantive responses made by the administration and board to the unprecedented letter of concerns.

Virtually all faculty members supported the initiative to allocate more money in support of the professional practice that was their basic responsibility, including more money for their own welfare. A smaller but still significant number felt as deeply about the second initiative that came to the floor of the faculty. They believed it bore directly on financial decisions. Professional interests of the faculty would be better tended if faculty members had voice and vote as full-fledged members of the governing body. They felt that the conditional terms of Pettit's selection made this presence particularly important.

The desire of faculty to have one or more of their own on the governing body arose long before Pettit took office. President Helfferich and President McClure before him resisted the desire as a matter of governing principle. Their opposition had the solid support of the board. The legal view of the college attorney, Thomas P. Glassmoyer, '36, prevailed. Members of the faculty sitting on the board would be in a conflict of interest. They would be exercising management authority over themselves and peers. This would render them incapable of objectively exercising the fiduciary and other responsibilities legally incumbent on board members.

Nevertheless, a modus operandi, grounded in the tight-knit college community, had finessed the issue for some years. The wife of a faculty member, herself an alumna, served from 1960 to 1970. Technically, she owed her board membership to her nomination and election by the Alumni Association; it had the right to choose five alumni board members for no more than two five-year terms each, none of whom could be
members of the faculty. But then-President Helfferich informally had given his and the board's nod to the nomination in advance. Muriel Pancoast, '38, was the wife of G. Sieber Pancoast, '37, professor of political science and for a long time the dean of men and baseball coach. His complementary career as a Pennsylvania State legislator for fourteen years--pursued while continuing to carry a sizable course load--had earned him special stature in the college community. As a young married couple, the Pancoasts had done their service as live-in proctors in a women's dorm. Muriel's principal life's work was teaching in the local school system, but she had served as a part-time secretary of the Alumni Association. She was a classmate of Paul Guest, a vocal defender of the parochial tradition on the board. The Pancoasts were close friends of Thomas Glassmoyer and his wife, also an alumna. The Pancoasts were members of Trinity Reformed Church across the street from the campus, which had close historical ties to the college. Helfferich and other college leaders knew that Muriel was good-willed, insightful, and discreet. They could trust her to be a responsible custodian of the unofficial compromise agreement lying behind her board membership. Her service allowed the board and administration to avoid the election of a faculty member; and it allowed the faculty to feel that they had direct touch with the board's authority.

The mandatory conclusion of Mrs. Pancoast's two terms of service ended this mutually satisfactory arrangement. In 1969, Helfferich and the board attempted to provide a different but equally satisfactory arrangement short of electing faculty to the board. The proposed arrangement responded to stirrings of faculty and students over issues of governance that Helfferich had labored hard to contain, precursors of those that fueled the 1970-1976 debate. Board president William Reimert nudged Helfferich in this direction in the last months of Reimert's leadership before his death on 1 October 1969 at the age of 67. Reimert's letter of appointment to one of the faculty members to be involved explained the purpose and the strategy. The aim, commendable in the eyes of interested faculty, was "a closer relationship among the several elements of the college community." There were two parts to the strategy. The board henceforth would invite a member of the faculty and a representative student to meetings of the board. Second, a faculty and a student representative would serve on the "principal committees" of the board.

The letter of appointment sent to one faculty member over Reimert's signature elaborated on the new relationship being advanced by the board. (It also served to remind faculty that the board made the decisions).

*It is the function of the Board and its committees to pass judgment on policies and procedures recommended by the President of the College who speaks officially for the staff and faculty and students of the College before the Board.*

*Under the new arrangement, the Board and its committees will turn to student and faculty representatives for background information, and suggestions in reaching their decisions. The President of the College has asked me to encourage you to discuss your suggestions with him in advance of Board committee meetings.*
Had this approach taken full root, the board may well have avoided the faculty's push for a seat on the board during the contests of 1970-1976. At least one major faculty participant believed so. Reimert became terminally ill and with him went a powerful influence on Helfferich's judgment. Helfferich implemented the strategy selectively. He remembered when the whole truth about the shaken finances of the college in the Depression years would have destroyed the confidence of the faculty. He had become a master at dispensing enough of the picture to be responsible and encouraging without showing the full extent of the weaknesses. Despite Reimert's encouragement and his own inclination to take dramatic turns, he could not quite come to believe that the time had arrived for greater disclosure. Some appointments to committees took place and others did not. Guests began to receive invitations to board meetings on a regular basis. But essential committees went on meeting without faculty and students. When Pettit moved into the presidency, he perpetuated the selective implementation of Helfferich. The initiative to include faculty and students in the board's business through committees brought lasting representation on buildings and grounds and in long-term planning (through the intermediary staff long-term planning committee). This was an insufficient presence, however, to persuade faculty that they had access to the levers of final decision-making.

After 1970 the old faculty desire remained, especially among some alumni faculty members who felt disenfranchised by the board's policy. The limits they perceived on the new president's ability to lead, owing to their critical view of the selection process and its outcome, gave their desire a renewed intensity. Some faculty wanted assurance that the viewpoint of the academic professionals of the college would have direct influence on decision-making at the board level. They wanted to have a first-hand listener at the deliberations on policy that would determine their salaries and the parameters of their professional lives.

The initiative to gain a voice on the board surfaced just a few months after Pettit was in office. The occasion was the same 3 March 1971 meeting where faculty pushed for better reimbursement for professional travel expenses. The simultaneous surfacing of both financial and governance initiatives probably was intentional, at least it showed the range of attention faculty members were giving to the principles and priorities of the college early in the new administration. As in the initiative for better salaries, the local chapter of AAUP took the lead on the floor of the faculty. The faculty approved its proposal to put two faculty representatives on the board. The action included a directive to the secretary of the faculty to forward the resolution to the secretary of the board. The effect of this directive was to reinforce the faculty's expectation that the president himself would convey the message to the board. He did so without his endorsement just two days later, on 5 March 1971, when the regular board meeting took place. He told the board it was a manifestation of "the participation explosion," a reference to the opening up of social processes in the late 1960s. The board referred the matter to its nominating committee for review after several members spoke against it. Not surprisingly, the nominating committee at the next board meeting (14 May 1971) recommended against the request.

It was not clear then and is not clear now how much tactical cooperation took place between faculty members and students who took part in the ongoing debate over the directions of the college. Whatever it was, a proposal from the student government
reached the board at its 10 May 1974 meeting. It sought a seat with vote for one faculty member and one student. The board again turned down the request. It would not have been unreasonable for Pettit and board members to assume that some faculty were sympathetic to the student initiative, perhaps even in some way initiators of it, although they had no evidence of this.

The desire for board representation may have appeared to some board members to be an isolated show of dissatisfaction with the governance of the college by a few faculty members. The refusal of the board to act favorably, however, did not lay the matter to rest among faculty. When the letter of concerns appeared on 17 October 1975, faculty representation on the board surfaced as one of the six issues calling for immediate remedial action. Although it took the letter of concerns seriously, the board never weakened in its opposition to giving a voting seat to a faculty member. In this it felt legitimized by the parochial purpose, reinterpreted by Helfferich's statement on the college's conservative temper. The board leaders saw boards at other liberal arts colleges welcoming faculty and student members. These governance changes appeared to be episodes in the general rearrangement of social structures precipitated by the radical movements of the late 1960s—-a rearrangement to which they were in the main opposed. It was a small step for them to objectify their visceral sense of opposition and make it into a manifestation of the parochial purpose of the college. Faculty came to realize that the board and president, however diplomatically they might behave in response to the letter of concerns, would resist this initiative to the end.

***

We turn now for a more systematic look at the formal and the substantive responses of the board and president to the 17 October 1975 letter of concerns. By sending it, the faculty won for itself a new voice, which the president and board could not ignore. The very submission of it directly to every board member, combined with the bill of particulars, made 17 October 1975 the critical turning point in the prolonged argument between faculty and the board and president over principles and priorities. (The date on the letter was 7 October 1975; the date of delivery was 17 October 1975.) It put on the agenda of the college for the first time in a formal way larger questions of institutional balance. It gave the college a new opportunity, after years of undisciplined contest, to redefine the desired interrelationship of its parochial purpose and professional practice of the faculty.

The letter arrived on his desk on the same day that Pettit announced the favorable news about salary supplements for 1975-76. It listed six concerns and called on him and the board to meet with a small group of faculty to discuss them. It spelled out the following concerns: (1) "...drastic and imaginative action" should take place "to improve basic faculty salaries if Ursinus College is to maintain its academic excellence." (2) The administration had not been totally candid with alumni about the Century II Program. The alumni "should be fully apprised of the fact that while Century II was publicized as a total success, ...it has not fulfilled one of its original goals—namely, the improvement of faculty salaries." (3) The administration did not fully disclose the budget. Faculty should "participate in decisions as to the allocation of financial resources." (4) A grievance committee should be elected. (5) The faculty had not been given its "rightful
role in the governance" of the college. The expertise of faculty should be utilized in making administrative decisions. (6) Faculty should sit on the board.

After the faculty delivered the letter to the president and mailed copies to all board members, the form of the communications among board, president, and faculty between 17 October 1975 and 17 February 1976 became almost ritualistic in character. No one doubted that the faculty had finally succeeded in pushing the years-long debate about principles and priorities to some sort of climax. At the same time, all parties seemed to sense that delivery of the letter created a serious situation that had as much potential for harm as for good. Loose words, false reports, hasty demurrers, or hot heads could have caused the prevailing civility to crack. That could have led to an unsought communications breakdown. The basic educational operation would then have suffered. The public would have received bad signals. And the grievances themselves would have gone unaddressed.

Fortunately for the stability of the college, the faculty showed some patience. The letter of concerns had ended diplomatically by disclaiming personal animosity and espousing "genuine concern for and loyalty to Ursinus College." The president and board, for their part, took care to prepare measured responses to the concerns. A calculated but considerate tone descended during the gaps of time between communications. Everyone seemed motivated by the very enumeration of issues to remain orderly while the college squared up to the problems. The undertone of dissatisfaction with the presidential selection process, dating back to 1970, now had surfaced in the forthright expression of grievance. This seemed to cleanse the atmosphere. Faculty could feel as if they had finally had their say up front; the board and president could now think about how to respond; and the faculty could patiently but persistently wait for the invitation to meet and talk.

Pettit formally acknowledged receipt of the letter when the faculty gathered for its monthly meeting on 5 November 1975. He read the whole thing to the faculty on the premise that not all faculty had signed it and some might not be aware of its contents. He further said he could not immediately respond because the letter writers, in sending copies to all board members, had drawn thirty or more additional and concerned people into the discussion. He would have to wait for reaction from the board before he could respond as president.

Two days later he received a letter saying that the signers had met and elected a committee of five representatives who made themselves available to meet with the president and board. The "committee of five" were chemistry professors Roger P. Staiger,'43, and Ronald E. Hess, business professor Harry C. Symons, and political science professors Eugene H. Miller,'33, and G. Sieber Pancoast,'37. The whole faculty later ratified this selection.

On 14 November 1975, the board responded to the letter by way of a letter to the president, with instructions to him to communicate the message at the next faculty meeting, which took place on 3 December 1975.

Pettit met his promise to respond to the faculty at the 3 December 1975 faculty meeting. In addition to reading the letter from the board, he laid out a detailed plan designed to deal with some of the expressed concerns. Together, the board letter and the president's plan sought to be a total substantive response to the 17 October 1975 faculty letter of concerns. The "committee of five" would not be content, however, until it
succeeded in meeting with a board committee. That meeting belatedly took place after the semester break, on 17 February 1976. The participants went over ground already staked out by the previous responses from board and president with little of substance added, except the board members' renewed agreement that faculty salaries should improve.

On 5 March 1976 Pettit announced at the board meeting his wish to retire from office by 1 November 1976.

The rather ritualized form of message-and-response initiated by the 17 October 1975 letter led to a significant change in the position of the professoriate at Ursinus. A newly innovative Pettit was to a considerable degree responsible for this—granted that his innovations came as reactions to the faculty's initiative. The letter of concerns seemed to release him for the first time to step out on his own. Now that his administration was heading toward a final chapter, he seemed finally to avoid the constraints the board had imposed, intentionally or not, by the conditional nature of his selection. To keep order and to avoid hounding by the faculty at this point, he came back to them with a strong counter stroke. Ironically, his plan tilted the balance in the college further in favor of professional practice, even as he was doing his best to preserve the strength of the parochial purpose of the college. Nevertheless, the manner and substance of his actions from this point to the end of his term helped to hold the center while his and other voices worked to restabilize the college for the start of its next administration.

The president's plan went hand in hand with the board's 14 November 1975 letter to make up a comprehensive response to the concerns. Pettit was the principal drafter of the board letter. It cleared the table of certain concerns, reaffirmed the president's lead role, and thus set the stage for Pettit to announce his plan.

In its letter, the board said it was sympathetic to the concern over salaries and spoke affirmingly about steps that the college should take. It hoped faculty members with expertise on college problems would always come forward with the offer of help. But these were the only points of agreement with the 17 October 1975 faculty concerns. It refuted with printed evidence the allegation that reporting on Century II results had not been candid. It absolved the president of the charge of failing fully to disclose the budget by saying he had never been authorized by the board to do so (thus stating bluntly the limits the board set on Pettit's exercise of authority). It said the board would make no change in its long-standing policy against electing voting faculty representatives to the board; it would continue, however, to invite faculty members as well as students to meetings. As to grievances, it reviewed the standing structure of the administration and suggested that matters unsatisfied at the administrative level could come to the board for handling on an ad hoc basis. In other words, it opposed an elected grievance committee.

The plan Pettit unveiled at the 3 December 1975 meeting sought to address several of the faculty's concerns in a grand stroke. Preliminarily he reminded them of actions he already had taken to improve salaries. Then he announced the creation of a new three-member faculty advisory committee on college priorities. Faculty would elect the committee members. It would advise the president on salary administration and on the allocation of other financial resources. Additionally, a faculty member with expertise in finance and investments by appointment would join the college investment committee. New ad hoc advisory councils on admissions and fund-raising would draw still further on faculty expertise in administrative decision-making.
The "committee of five" immediately dissociated themselves from this plan, which Pettit had disclosed to them just before the general meeting of the faculty. They still awaited their face-to-face meeting with board members. Undaunted, Pettit urged faculty members to support his plan, to work for the common good, and to resist divisive actions that would hurt the college. When the "five" finally met with board members on 17 February 1975, it was in an atmosphere of anti-climax. The majority of faculty went along with the plan to create an advisory priorities committee, and it soon was functioning. The work of the "five" seemed largely over to most colleagues, doubly so when Pettit made his retirement announcement.

By mid-March, the priorities committee, working with the administration, was drawing up a new faculty salary scale. Finally, the faculty had a legitimate venue where they could discuss salaries without groping for a form in which to do that effectively. There was fair promise that the agenda would broaden to take in the college financial structure as a whole. So, an initiative that began on the floor of the faculty near the start of the 1970-1976 period reached a kind of finish. It did not bring many new dollars into faculty pocketbooks, then or later. But it created a new role for the professoriate in the management of the college. The management had become identified as one of the components of the parochial purpose of the college. By opening the door to direct professorial participation, Pettit thus made it possible for a new equilibrium to work itself out between the parochial and professional forces that energized the college. The administration that followed Pettit's converted the priorities committee into the central planning group for advancing the institution. And the faculty representative on the investment committee, Harry Symons, a member of the "five," built a bridge of confidence between faculty and the administration. He was as fiscally conservative as any board member. The ad hoc councils on admissions and fund-raising did not amount to much. Symbolically, though, they said the administration held out a newly welcoming hand to advice and assistance from the faculty. That too helped to restabilize the forces at play before a new administration took up its duties.

While the board and president were responding to the letter of concerns, the faculty pushed forward with a second initiative. That initiative added impetus to the review and revision of the place that professional practice occupied in the life of Ursinus. It involved a revision of the faculty handbook. The academic council in the previous academic year had empowered a committee to work on enrichments and supplements to the handbook. Up to that point, the administration produced the handbook. It was a personnel manual of sorts and a compendium of academic policies and practices. Rewriting many provisions, the faculty committee changed the tone by muting the administrative voice of the text and by emphasizing greater self-governance by the faculty. The draft received approval of the faculty at a special meeting on 13 February 1976. The president made it clear that the board would have the final say, and the faculty referred its recommendation to the governing body. A special board committee scrutinized the text. With some reservations, the committee recommended and received board approval on 14 May 1976. The board did not approve the provision for a formal grievance procedure that would take complaints beyond the level of its own government and instruction committee. The faculty thus failed to find a second door through which to push this same recommendation found in the letter of concerns. The board also disallowed explicit references to AAUP policies and disagreed with some specific provisions surrounding
tenure, sabbaticals, and outside employment.

Even with the reservations, the board's approval of the new handbook moved the college a significant step toward a more collegial culture and drew new boundaries around the management authority of the president and administration. Combined with the changes precipitated by the letter of concerns, these changes now shifted the priorities of the college noticeably in the direction of professional practice.

Students React to the Parochial Purpose

We have been looking at the way the process of selecting the president and the terms and conditions under which he took up his task fueled the faculty's concerns over resources and governance. Their voices rose to support the professional work of the college. This had the effect of putting them at odds with its parochial purpose—at least as that purpose had come to enfold the tight management practices Pettit inherited from Helfferich. Their argument won the rearrangements flowing from the 17 October 1975 letter of concerns and the handbook revision. It set the stage for the next administration to make further adjustments in the role that faculty played in the governance of the college.

Meanwhile, the students had their own argument to conduct about the parochial orientation of Ursinus. While Pettit contended with faculty, students engaged him in a parallel dispute over the legacy of the old piety and collegiate way. The surviving social constraints seemed anachronistic to many students: a total ban on alcohol on campus; no men allowed in women's dorms and no women allowed in men's dorms; dormitory curfews for women, monitored by live-in preceptresses of mature years; no cars for freshmen or those students on financial aid; stern punishments, including formal demerits, meted out paternalistically. Even a custom against walking on the grand front lawn still struggled to survive. Students were to greet faculty and one another when passing on campus. The image of a happy family, expressed in the catalog decades before, remained enshrined in the rulebook. For students who had entered their teens with the new social freedoms of the late 1960s, the rulebook symbolized a detention camp, not a happy family.

Through protests and negotiations during the six-year period, students succeeded in slightly stretching the net of social rules. (Students, with faculty support, had pressured Helfferich in his final months in office to eliminate a dress code for dinner.) The more energetic and thoughtful of student leaders tried to persuade the college to go deeper. They sought governance changes that would have conferred greater legal status on students—and, by the way, greater latitude for social behavior. In effect, they wanted to rearrange the priority given to the parochial purpose of the college. But their campaign largely failed. Unlike the faculty, the students never appreciably made a change in the formal authority of the college to regulate student behavior.

Their inexperience and status as clients of the college partly accounted for this failure. Student leaders were often aware, however naively, that they were trying to talk with the administration and board about the evolution of the parochial and professional priorities that drove the institution. But they lacked continuity, coming and going in the course of the six years, diplomas in hand. And they lacked the insight that faculty had into the governance arrangements that put policies into daily action.
More important in explaining student failure was the president's opposition to extending the agenda of debate much beyond the details of rules dealing with visitation in dormitories. He understood the parochial purpose from his many years of experience on the campus and personally wanted to support and defend it. He knew that the board expected him to do so. It was an important condition of its selection of him to be president. If he agreed to extend the discussion of student status to more general questions of social and academic policy, he would subject the prevailing social code to a kind of scrutiny that might discredit it. He settled for the protracted game of negotiating with students over the details of dorm visitation. When students did win a rare audience with board members on more general issues of governance, they could not contend with the legal and organizational sophistication of the board members. Nor could they move them from their solid support of the social rules as such.

By the end of the 1970-1976 period, the moralistic program of the college lacked credibility in the eyes of students as well as some faculty. Still, it survived. It would take a change of administration, with new terms of appointment for the president, to bring a more fundamental look at the foundations of the social code. This would mean revisiting the long tradition of parochial purpose and reaffirming it in a new way. It would mean attempting to make a behavioral agenda fit compatibly with the newly strengthened position of professional practice.

A sampling of students' actions will help flesh out the above interpretation of their successes and failures in the argument for changing the parochial agenda of Ursinus.

A. We first cite two policy actions by the board that promised a favorable setting for student activism but did not fulfill the students' hopes. B. Then we sample the tactical shifts and dodges taken by students and by the administration in the argument over the number of approved "open houses." They produced small gains for students and bought time for the administration. C. We end by looking at the comments some students made about their life on campus toward the end of the 1970-1976 period. These comments suggest that the prolonged argument over social rules generated critical attitudes that jeopardized the welfare of the college going forward. A change in the parochial-professional balance would be necessary to regain institutional well being.

A. The two policy actions that promised a favorable setting for student activism but did not fulfill the students' hopes occurred before Helfferich left office. One was the approval of a statement of "student freedoms and responsibilities." The second was the agreement of the board and faculty to create a new student life committee.

It almost seemed providential that the statement on student freedoms and responsibilities received the approval of the board at the same special meeting called to elect Pettit president, on 25 September 1970. It was the fruit of many discussions by a board committee struck to help contain the unrest of students arising in Helfferich's last year.

On the positive side, from the student viewpoint, the statement on student freedoms and responsibilities accorded the student government a recognized place in the governance of the college. It declared a broad philosophical assumption about the open-endedness of knowledge, thus affirming a basic tenet of the university research model. It ensured the freedom of students to express their reasoned views in course work and in approved extracurricular activities. It delegated authority to recognized student organizations to invite speakers and guests. It conferred freedom of the press and radio,
within the bounds of good taste. It gave students the right to distribute pamphlets and petitions about college or public issues. It acknowledged that students may have a legitimate point of view on policy matters, academic and otherwise, and committed the college to enabling student representatives to give advice.

All this sounded like a promising turn toward a vision of a new relationship between students and the established authorities of the college. It seemed in tune with a college dedicating itself primarily to the practice of the academic disciplines and becoming less committed to a prescriptive moralistic agenda. Students saw that the statement, however, would prevent any real shift in authority. The freedom and legitimacy conferred on students came from the board as a willing delegation of its authority. The statement made it clear that the board reserved the power to withdraw what it had delegated when it believed that doing so would best serve the interests of the college.

The board further demanded that the parochial purpose--manifesting itself as social rules--be affirmed. "As a college historically concerned with the whole range of human values, Ursinus deems it desirable that certain norms of social conduct be observed by students." The board allowed that students should participate in formulating regulations governing conduct. But it also expected that students were responsible for adjudicating and enforcing them. When the jockeying over "open houses" in dorms took place and Pettit expected students to help enforce good behavior, this expectation became a painful thorn in the side of student leaders.

Finally, the statement stood foursquare against disrupting the educational process and depriving anyone on campus of the right to speak and move. "The accepted method for exercising student influence is reasonable discussion through existing structures of organization." Everyone should accept change through orderly processes.

Once it received approval, students failed to use this rather well-crafted statement as a tool in their ongoing argument with the administration. They found that it did not help to get at the social rules that many students found onerous. One of the board members who helped write the statement reported what students told him after the statement received approval: it did not satisfy them because it did not endorse "the two main requests for liquor on campus and open dormitories."

But something else was at work too. In his last years in office, Helfferich had heightened faculty and student anxiety about the freedom of ideas on the Ursinus campus. Most notably, he had banned a speech on campus by Madalyn Murray O'Hair, who led the fight to remove prayer from public schools. Helfferich modified his parochial opposition to O'Hair after the fact and in other issues moved toward a posture more sympathetic with the academic freedom inherent in the university research model. The guarantee of rights enumerated in the statement on student freedoms and responsibilities may have provided a kind of closure to the Helfferich era in matters of free study and speech. It was an affirmation that Ursinus had taken another step toward a parochial-professional realignment--toward becoming a full-fledged "university college." In the ensuing Pettit years, students would have felt little need to invoke the statement on these matters.

A second policy action failed to favor student activism, despite initial student hopes. This was the creation of an overarching faculty-staff-student committee on student life.

When students learned that Pettit was the board's choice in late September 1970, student leaders feared a continuation of the social rules. In a Weekly interview in
October, Pettit confirmed that he would stand firmly behind the ban on open dorms when he took office in November. Late on the night of 8 October 1970, students massed in the women's quad to voice their protests against the parochial blanket that they felt the college was draping over them. They made a move toward Pettit's home off campus but stopped when they learned that he was out of town. They protested again the following day. Their march on campus took them from Brodbeck Hall to the new administration building and the flagpole at Bomberger Hall before they dispersed. D. L. Helfferich, a lame duck president until the end of the month, met with the Ursinus Student Government Association committee on student rights late that afternoon. Characteristically, he offered a stick and an olive branch. His statement to the campus expressed his resistance to demonstrations and then approved six weekend "open houses" for the fall semester.

This failed to dampen student anger. About a hundred students mounted another protest demonstration on 11 October 1970 and this time succeeded in gaining a meeting with the president-elect. Pettit met with a delegation of ten students. This meeting led him to make two recommendations to Helfferich. One was to arrange for a meeting of six students with a special board committee to air their concerns. The second was to threaten to seek a court injunction against student protests if they continued. Helfferich of course followed Pettit's recommendations. In their exaggerated deference to each other's position during the transitional month, Helfferich and Pettit added a touch of dramatic complexity to the delicate situation.

Disruptive demonstrations subsided, partly because some students had won an audience with the board and partly because of the cautious attitude of the majority of students. Moderate student voices spoke against the disruptions in the Weekly. One student said: "Why not demonstrate about something more important...like Vietnam, or poverty, or crime, or racism, or social injustice, or human rights." Nevertheless, student leaders pressed on with their argument over the parochial priorities of the college when they met with a special board committee led by Millard Gladfelter, former president of Temple University.

The students met with the board members on 22 October 1970 and again on 30 October. They went into discussions with a clear objective—to get board approval for a new "social council." They drew a parallel with the academic council, which was responsible for considering all academic policy. Their proposed council would be responsible for considering all social policy. Naively, they did not see that academic council had little power beyond that of making recommendations to the faculty as a whole. And it was several steps down on the hierarchy of power from the board of directors, which the students wanted to reach.

The board members in these meetings with students would have had two purposes in mind. One was to maintain the stability of the institution at a stressful time by listening calmly to students. The second was to educate the students, if possible, about the reason for the college's parochial priorities and persuade them to buy into them. To obtain the stability, the board members, like the administration, were willing to talk about dealing students more directly into the process of making student life policy.

As a seasoned and genial veteran of university leadership, Gladfelter engaged the students in serious discussion without appearing to patronize them. He gave no ground on social policies but yielded, or seemed to, on the issue of structure and process. He and
his committee supported the student idea for a new student life committee. By the time his recommendation went to the board on 13 November, however, students were not sure what they were going to get. Gladfelter's committee recommendation included plenty of language certain to stymie any quick action. A preliminary group was to "study and recommend a desirable structure for all committees and agencies that are now dealing with matters relating to student life and devise a plan for placing under the president a single agency, representative of students and faculty, that will act and advise on matters pertaining to student life."

Jane Siegel, '72, one of the leaders in negotiating with the board, wrote in her 12 November 1970 Weekly column, "The Kitchen Cynic," a few days later: "Everything today is committees and empty but impressive titles. In this real world of UC nobody stands out. The world is flat and the buck is passed until it falls off the edge of the world." She knew she was watching a procedural shuffle designed to slow events by embroiling students in complicated processes. But the students could do nothing to stop it.

The shuffle did not prevent the committee finally from coming into being, however. The board approved the creation of the committee when it met on 13 November 1970. The faculty followed suit at its next meeting. The board empowered it to "act and advise on proposals (and initiate its own business) concerning such broad areas of student life as the student union, dormitory regulations, student sponsored concerts and dances, judiciary reform, forums and other student activities." (Weekly, 19 Nov 70)

The committee, made up of eight faculty and staff and seven students, met for the first time on 26 February 1971. Despite the broad agenda envisioned at its creation, the students persuaded faculty and staff members on the committee to focus on the hottest issue. That was the issue of dormitory open houses. The committee agreed that men's dorms should open every weekend for visitation by women and forwarded its recommendation to the president. Students had the hopeful notion that, because the committee had come into being in response to their pressure, the committee's actions would have a new ring of authority. The committee had no authority other than to recommend to the president. Pettit made that clear when at the 5 March 1971 board meeting he explained the nature of the committee. He called it "a second generation creature of the board... considered to be a committee of the college whose function is advisory to the president." A few days later Pettit approved only half of the number of open houses recommended by the committee. The news dumbfounded students. It seemed as if someone had pushed them off the edge of the world.

By protesting and pushing, students had managed to persuade the college to create a new entity focused on student life. The committee had the power, if it wished to seize it, to question the parochial rationale that lay behind the social rules disliked so much by students. But it never succeeded in doing that. Pettit had gone along with the creation of the committee because it vented some steam and helped cool student protest. In the end, that probably was the main point of the board's exercise in creating it.

This alone would explain the failure of the committee to make any meaningful contribution to the debate over principles and priorities. There were other reasons too. The short-term goals of students prevented them from pressing for a more deep-seated evaluation of parochial intentions. Faculty did not see the student life committee as a venue for advancing their points of dispute over college priorities. When they indulged
the students by allowing them to set the agenda, faculty did nothing to focus the group on the underlying institutional traditions at stake. The committee created an additional administrative hoop through which students had to jump in seeking changes, this was an advantage for the administration. In particular, it allowed the administration to insist that students had a responsibility not only in the formulation of rules but also in their enforcement. It thus put a little more distance between students and the president's final decisions—a benefit for Pettit in his prolonged negotiations over student social rules. He needed any such benefits. He understood that it was not his job to accompany students into a root-and-branch questioning of the parochial purpose of the college. The fire and smoke surrounding the creation of the student life committee and its subsequent functioning as an extra layer of bureaucracy helped him avoid that.

B. When he halved the committee's recommendation for open houses, Pettit began a process of negotiating with student leaders over this issue that persisted throughout the six years. The students and the administration and board invested heavily in the contest over dormitory policy. It became a local teapot-sized Vietnam of sorts. The administration and board felt that the fall of the ban on open dorms would have a domino effect on the college's entire parochial structure, its century-long commitment to moral education. The students felt that the ban on open dorms displayed an exercise of arbitrary power. It imposed an anachronistic regimen in a college to which they had committed four formative years of their lives. They believed that changes in other educational programs at Ursinus could not advance until this specific policy changed. Ironically, both sides thus placed extraordinary importance on an issue that many similar colleges had already addressed.

The president of student government at the beginning of Pettit's administration had more insight than most students had into the significance of dorm policy. In a Weekly interview (19 November 1970) Alan Novak, '71, acknowledged that the students' preoccupation with changing social rules misplaced their importance. He believed that the learning process was the main issue, that the focus should have been on "what's breaking in the world." The social climate had to change, he felt, before the college could meaningfully address the more important academic climate. Helfferich's attempt to define "truth" in a policy statement on Ursinus's conservative "philosophic temper" he found "immoral." He urged a more robust dialectic between the conservative traditions of the college and the current student values. He condemned the rigidity of doctrinaire liberals as well as conservatives. ("On this campus 'Liberals' are as narrow as 'conservatives,'" he said, "a true liberal and conservative can be open-minded enough to enjoy each other, to enjoy debate.") He upheld the current ideal of the youth culture: "do your own thing as long as it doesn't infringe on anybody else's freedoms."

Novak showed that he had learned something about political theatrics from Chancellor Helfferich, whom he characterized as Ursinus's Augustus Caesar. His interview appeared just as he resigned as USGA president and dubbed himself the first "Chancellor" of the USGA. He thus spoke from his own "cryptic bench" with all the drama and none of the authority attached thereto. He was at that point the Cincinnatus of Ursinus students. As such, he had the perspective fairly clearly to see that the open dorm issue linked to a broader need to reconsider the principles and priorities of Ursinus in a dynamic moment of its development. In the tedious argument over how many hours to allow dorms to be open on how many weekends in a semester, most students lacked that
The terms of presidential appointment in 1970, as we have suggested, prevented Pettit from examining with students the root of the conflict. This left him with the tactical task of upholding the ban on open dorms by a succession of thrusts and feints. He constantly had to try to lower the heat of student feeling by appearing to yield a little. Then he had to keep the board from criticizing him by appearing to tighten up a little. He had to be sure that his handling of the students would accord with Helfferich's view of things as he watched over his legacy from his cryptic bench. He had to keep faculty sufficiently involved in his actions to prevent them from joining sides with students. As a steady rudder through the roiled waters created by all this, he had his own forthright belief in the traditional parochial position of the college.

Student leaders at Ursinus who followed Novak in ensuing years had a hard time rallying the majority to outright protest over the ban on open dorms. They could not even motivate the majority to express their support of change by voting in student government elections. Even when demonstrations occurred, no more than ten percent or so of the student body took part. Voter turnout was not dramatically greater. Moderate and even conservative values kept most students on task and out of trouble. At the same time, most of them opposed the ban on open dorms. One of the more editorially balanced *Weekly* editors of the period, Chuck Chambers, '73, said, "Virtually every student on the campus wants some change in the out-dated social rules." The cautiousness of the student majority worked to keep the argument over open dorms under control. But their near-universal displeasure with the ban kept the issue simmering.

Pettit dumbfounded student leaders in the spring 1971 semester by cutting in half the number of open dorms recommended by the new student life committee. In fact, he merely reaffirmed what Helfferich had granted for the fall semester during the protests of October. From that point on, the fate of the parochial purpose of the college seemed to hang on the way the president and student leaders negotiated over open dorms from semester to semester.

The administration granted or withheld open dorm privileges in part by evaluating student behavior during the occasional nights when women could visit men's dorms. When he cut the spring 1971 recommendation in half, Pettit said he did so because of the poor behavior of students during fall open houses. He coupled that with the failure of student government leaders to enforce the rules of decorum associated with the privilege of an open dorm night. The threat of rollbacks on the same grounds hovered over open dorm permissions throughout the six-year period.

In communications with students, Pettit consistently emphasized that it was his position not theirs most on the line when he granted exceptions to the general ban on open dorms. He told them that the limited exceptions won from him (and from Helfferich in his final days as president) had no sanction from the board of directors. His mandate was to hold the line on behalf of the social code, thus protecting the parochial purpose of the college. When he allowed an exception to the ban, however conditionally and however sparsely, he was in effect violating his mandate from the board. If he went too far, or if students spoiled the deal by misbehaving, he would provoke criticism from his board. This would make him incapable henceforth of granting any exceptions. Pettit may have colored this message brightly for effect, but it was accurate enough. It also revealed the underlying truth about the limitations placed by the
board on his authority to lead. Those limitations compelled him to announce his own risk in order to show even a small sympathy with the student viewpoint in the debate over social rules. The board leaders and Helfferich tacitly supported his tactics. He never granted enough student latitude to test the limits of that support.

Without ever resolving the argument over parochial priorities, the tactic actually helped to keep the lid on the campus. Also contributing to the maintenance of a kind of order was the accommodating style of student leaders with whom the president had to deal after Novak's self-banishment. Knowingly or not, they went along with the narrow limit set by the administration on the debate over parochial purpose. That is, each semester they led the charge through the student life committee to win a few more weekend exceptions to the ban on open dorms. On and off, they grudgingly acknowledged the logic that they had a responsibility to ensure good conduct whenever the administration lifted the ban. When deans inevitably caught students drinking, fighting, or causing damage, student leaders suffered under the pressure. Despite their assurances to the administration, they were not able to control the behavior of fellow students. This doomed them to receive criticism from the administration for failing to do so. They had to draw on all their ingenuity to persuade the administration to forgive the failure to enforce and to allow a continuation of open dorms. They promised greater diligence next time. The administration played along with a little more lenience or a little less, depending on the way the tide was running. The ingenuity of student leaders was not great enough to persuade fellow students to "play it cool" during open dorms, although they made heroic efforts to do so. Considering everything, they had an impossible mission.

Nevertheless, to appease the persistent student dissatisfaction, Pettit for spring 1972 agreed that men's dorms could be open every Saturday instead of just six times a semester. It took longer for him to agree to lift the ban in women's dorms but eventually he did so. Throughout, the privilege was in jeopardy whenever "community responsibility" failed to prevent misbehavior. From the standpoint of student leaders and their followers, newly won latitude for visitation was never enough. A little yielding by the college encouraged them to work harder for further change.

They won their biggest victory in social policy in 1974 when the curfew for women vanished along with other residential practices that did not apply equally to men. If there ever had been a curfew for men, it had died in the earlier years of the century. The change of women's dorm policy owed something to the alertness of student leaders to recent civil rights legislation in Pennsylvania and their insistence that the college measure up to new anti-discrimination regulations. The students told the college that they were preparing a formal complaint to the State human relations commission and that feelers were out to the area media. The legal requirements were clear to the attorneys on the board. However, when the board promptly approved new protocols for security equally applicable to men and women students, it reaffirmed the ban on open dorms—equally applicable, of course, to male and female dorms. Thus, even a substantial change in the cultural conditions of the campus, brought on by a change in the law, failed to dispel the dissatisfaction with the parochial agenda.

Looking back over the six-year argument over open dorms, the succession of student leaders could claim to have won a bit of ground. By the end of the period, those in place seemed even to understand that skirmishing for weekend privileges bore upon the
college's broader debate over the strategic direction of the college's development. The debate may have been reaching a kind of climax regarding professional practices, but the argument about the parochial agenda would have to go beyond the 1970-1976 period before the college community could settle it.

The student leaders of 1970-1976, despite their concerted push on open dorms, sensed that the administration had gained control of that agenda. They sometimes set their sights on other objectives that were more likely to succeed and less likely to open a new argument with the college. In doing so, they helped create a positive tone to counteract the negative feelings about social rules. James Stellar, '72, who took Novak's position unopposed in the spring 1971 semester, set an ambitious pattern. Stymied by the failure of the new student life committee to win more liberal dorm rules, he set a broad agenda for the student government. It touched on ecological concerns, a student-alumni preceptorship program, and student contributions to academic reforms. Stellar and his cohorts made some serious proposals to the academic council for broadening student course options, modeling them on examples from nearby University of Pennsylvania and elsewhere. Little substantial change came from these initiatives. Still, they demonstrated that student leaders were aware of the larger debate on priorities.

C. In the final phase of the 1970-1976 period, student protest over the parochial purpose of the college resurfaced. Three expressions of student discontent with student life from that moment illustrate the price the college paid for the success it had in containing the pressure to liberalize the social rules.

A confrontational stance toward authority, which marked the mood at the start of the 1970-1976 period, had waned over time. "Most of all," said the head of the student government in 1973, "this year's council would like to stress the point that they are dedicated to cooperating with the administration." Students mellowed and for a while most appeared to lose interest in the fight over parochial rules, faced as they were with the administration's control of that agenda. However, as faculty dissatisfaction crystallized into their letter of concerns to the president and board in the fall of 1975, it became evident that student dissatisfaction with college priorities also had remained alive. In the final phase of the Pettit administration, the voices of students blended with those of the faculty in the chorus demanding a reordering of college priorities.

This return of overt student protest differed in style from the student marches and noisy late-night confrontations that accompanied Pettit's installation as president in late 1970. It took the form of editorializing, student surveying, and the circulating of a petition—all of them activities sanctioned by the 1970 statement on student freedoms and responsibilities. The Weekly awakened that sleeping document by printing it in February 1974, a prelude to the successful attack on women's dorm curfews.

An editorial on 3 April 1975 brought a sudden renewal of attention to female unhappiness over open dorm policy. Marilyn Harsch, '75, criticized the "cute" account of women's regulations written recently by a woman who graduated in the 1950s. The old grad had chortled amusingly at the quaint regulations in the process of affirming them as good builders of character. Harsch's irritated response: "I get the feeling that they [alumnae] feel Ursinus should always go on in the same way. I don't know about most of the students, but I don't particularly care to go to school in a museum." Probably awakened to new student legal rights by recent legislation on student privacy and the civil rights legislation leading to the end of women's curfews, Harsch said students were adults
in the eyes of the law and deserved the right to privacy as adults in their dorm "homes." She challenged the college's parochial purpose when she opposed its presumption to form the morals of students.

When Charles Reese, '76, became the new student government president in January 1975, his first statements suggested that he would continue the accommodative and cooperative stance of his immediate predecessors. He gave a general call to the students to let their student government know when they "had something they felt the campus should hear" and then chastised them about pulling false fire alarms. An excellent pre-medical student who enjoyed the respect of the administration, Reese then quietly set out to elicit from students what they felt they wanted the campus to hear. This took the form of a survey of student opinion. Conducted with a certain diligence, the survey rang some long-familiar notes of disgruntlement. Reasons for wanting to transfer were legion. Weekend activities were poor for the 42 percent who stayed on campus most weekends. "Queen Victoria would be proud" of social rules. Ninety-five percent of respondents wanted to liberalize the dorm visitation policy. There were some favorable responses about the faculty, the academic reputation, and (astoundingly to surveyors) the food in Wismer Hall. Still, the overwhelming tilt of the results gave new life to the old student complaint against the social program rooted in the parochial purpose of the institution.

Reinforced by the survey findings, the student government followed up in November 1975 with a resolution to the administration and board. It invoked principles of freedom of choice within a democratic process and the broad social and intellectual goals of a liberal education. It declared that "rules that are unreasonable within the context of contemporary society create contempt for established authorities rather than mutual respect and cooperation." It asserted that the existing dormitory visitation policy violated those principles and fostered such contempt. Then it urged immediate action to implement a new dormitory system to "insure the greatest amount of individual choice, through a democratic process, as is possible within the physical limits of the college community." This meant giving local option to dorm groups on how many visitations to allow.

While Reese was preparing this message to Pettit from the student government, another ad hoc group of students was circulating a petition. The was a group of eighteen students who enjoyed excellent academic standing (including Reese). A key member, Robert Simon, '77, was a chemistry major who looked to two of the faculty "committee of five" as mentors. Simon made the faculty aware of the effort of the student group to get signatures on their petition. There was probably a feeling of convergence of forces between faculty and students at that point. Both groups knew the obstacles and satisfactions of obtaining the commitments of friends and colleagues in a formal attempt to influence the course of the institution.

The student petition asserted the following:

*Lack of communication [caused] the dominant mood of discontent on campus: discontent that finds expression in irresponsible acts of vandalism and in general contempt for the rules and regulations of the college. In order for the college to function as a viable academic institution, candid dialogue between students and the Board*
of Directors is necessary.

Like the student government resolution, the petition of the ad hoc group went to Pettit just in time for him to inform the board at its 14 November 1975 meeting. Appended to the signatures of the eighteen academic leaders were those of 475 additional students. The board referred both student statements to an ad hoc committee to work with faculty and students. It was not until February 1976 that students won their wish to talk face-to-face with board members. The feeling of accomplishment from just being there was their main gain. The board members gave no sign of leaning toward changes favored by the students in the parochial agenda of the college.

When Reese published the results of the student government survey, he quoted one of the student respondents at length. It seemed to him that the student commentator had hit the heart of the unhappiness over the college's hard stance on dorm rules:

*The most important reason for having open dorms, perhaps the most persuasive to the administration, is for the morale of the student body.... A large majority of the students are discontented and dissatisfied over the present situation. People are very sarcastic, cynical, and generally down on Ursinus. It might be hard for the administration to believe that such a "little" thing as not having open dorms could have such a great effect on student attitude, but when students are denied something precious to them (privacy, the opportunity to sit and listen to the radio, or just talk in their rooms), especially when everyone else at other colleges is not, there is bound to be resentment and hard feelings. (Weekly, 1 May 1975)*

This anonymous voice from the student body, however innocently, had indeed touched the heart of what was going on in the fight between students and the college over dorm rules. Ultimately, it had to do with the college's position in the marketplace of higher education. Close up, it had to do with consensus about the basic educational goals of the institution.

The terms and limits surrounding the board's selection of a president for the start of the second century precluded a concerted effort at consensus building. It buttressed the existing program for fulfilling the parochial purpose. It also ensured that, because of Pettit's seasoned skills at dealing with students, a certain stability would prevail in an unstable time for higher education in America. But it did not ensure that the good will conducive to the best learning environment would also prevail.

A student wrote in a letter to the editor (Weekly, 30 October 1975):

*Each year three or four hundred freshmen will jump on this stinking, sinking ship called Ursinus. All will flounder in the 40 steps to a better U.C. process. Apathy will reign supreme over the four years spent here to earn a genuinely fake sheepskin. Who will stand up and brave the storm to say "Hey! we, the students, NEED a freer atmosphere in which to live."*
Some administrators and faculty no doubt heard in this letter one more expression of student sour grapes, an echo of the strident voices of the late sixties. Probably a mere handful of students thought conditions were that bad. Many did not think they were very good. Most hoped for an altered direction that would bring change in the college's parochial position.

At the end of the period, then, owing in part to the limiting conditions of the presidential election in 1970 and in part to the firm resolve of the board to hold the line, Ursinus had held onto its program in moral behavior through six hard years. It had not fundamentally reexamined the relationship of this surviving parochial program to the rising academic emphasis in the college. It had dealt with the great changes in social values of students and newer faculty mainly by resisting them and yielding piecemeal when necessary. The outcome was low morale in the student body, with possible consequences for recruiting, retention, and future academic quality.

By 1976, the college moved perceptibly ahead on its trajectory toward professionalism at the expense of the parochial idea emphasizing character development. That was owing to the college's recognition of the faculty's needs and the creation of a structure that promised their closer participation in setting academic priorities. On the other hand, the pull of the parochial purpose remained evident in the limited ground gained by students in their fight for open dorms.

**FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENT--THE FAILURE OF SUCCESS, THE SUCCESS OF FAILURE**

Donald L. Helfferich was not the first college president to regret that circumstances had made him a campus master builder. He wished that posterity would be able to remember him as an educator, not a bricks-and-mortar man. Yet, he knew that the Ursinus physical plant had to move toward first-class status before its educational performance and reputation could move upward. He knew also that the funds that flowed into bricks and mortar would not be available to advance the teaching and learning budget as such. Before retiring from the presidency, he encompassed both the capital and non-capital financial needs of the college in a two-phase financial development plan extending out to 1976-77. The second of his three major legacies, the financial development plan was the most ambitious the college had seen.

Helfferich, class of '21, had joined the board in 1927 as a young alumnus. The college hit the financial bottom in the Great Depression that started just two years later. When the board chose Norman E. McClure to succeed President George L. Omwake in 1936, it elected Helfferich, by then a successful bank officer, to be the college's vice president in his "spare time." McClure ran the educational program. Helfferich managed business and finance as a part-timer. Slowly and painfully, owing to this efficient allocation of responsibilities, the financial stability of the college returned.

By the time Helfferich reached the presidency in 1958 (he retired from his banking position), the college could begin to undertake the costly job of renewing and expanding the physical facilities. Helfferich said he had grown tired of keeping the plant together by "putting patch on patch." Ursinus, like other colleges, was anticipating an unprecedented demand for higher education when the baby boomers hit college age. Helfferich knew that Ursinus would be able to absorb its share of the cohort effectively only if its plant
improved greatly. Step by step in his twelve-year presidency, he walked the campus through a radical transformation. (Radical though it seemed in execution, his grand vision of campus development rather closely followed a dream published in 1918 by his predecessor and mentor, Omwake.) The optimism surrounding the baby boom and the unquestioned hegemony of the American economy in the free world made these forward-looking steps easier to undertake. Helfferich received aid and encouragement in his expansionist plans when he recruited a number of professionally knowledgeable alumni and Philadelphia-area business people to join the board.

A list of building projects of the Helfferich administration creates an informative backdrop for the analysis of subsequent financial development in the 1970-1976 period. Completed were the power plant (1963), Wismer Hall (1965), Wilkinson Hall (1966), Reimert Hall (1967), a supply store/snack shop—a pre-fabricated structure behind Bomberger Hall (1966), the demolition of the "old main" of Ursinus, Freeland-Derr-Stine (1967), Corson Hall (1969), Myrin Library (1970), and Thomas Hall (1970). In the case of Reimert, Corson, and Thomas, the memorial names came some time after the buildings were in use.

When the board elected Pettit to succeed Helfferich in November 1970, the transformation of the campus was not complete. There were plans for a new physical education center (to be named for Helfferich) and the renovation of the old Alumni Memorial Library into a college union. Also, Pfahler Hall and Bomberger Hall were overdue for renovation and restoration.

Helfferich had unleashed the later part of this explosion of plant improvement through a so-called staff long-term planning committee. He had been cautious when he first assumed office in 1958. As the centennial year 1969-70 loomed on the horizon, however, he became eager to complete as much as he could of what had become his comprehensive vision for the advancement of Ursinus. Appointing Richard Richter chairman of the committee in 1966, he encouraged it to clarify and present plans as fast as possible. ("I'm a man in a hurry," he said.) The committee obligingly studied needs and packaged a series of plant improvement resolutions for him to take to the board for consideration and approval. Simultaneously, it identified non-plant needs for program improvement. Following Helfferich's direction, the committee in this way acknowledged that the heavy expenditures for buildings deprived the educational budget of improved support. The plan emphasized the need for "faculty development" (which meant professional improvement as well as increases in salaries), library acquisitions (a recognizable indicator of institutional quality), educational equipment and programs, student aid. The plan linked some of these goals to projections of endowment growth, and incorporated all items in a comprehensive two-phase plan covering the decade from 1967 to 1977. Having identified the major items of expense for improving Ursinus across the board, the plan showed where the funds would come from to bear the expense.

The plan was supposed to dovetail with the annual budgets of the college. Helfferich, however, tolerated a certain incompatibility between the annual budget and the fund-raising goals. In short, the ten-year projections were expressions of hope and optimism intended to motivate donors; they were not rigorous estimates emerging from the likely income and expense budget. As Helfferich's assistant, Richter thought more in promotional than financial terms, and he was still learning the institutional prerequisites for mounting a major fund-raising program. He and his committee members, urged on by
the president, were reluctant to caution Helfferich against over-optimistic plans. The board, meanwhile, had come to regard Helfferich's views on all finance issues as definitive.

The college ran two back-to-back fund-raising campaigns to generate the gifts needed to realize the ten-year plan. The first phase was the All-Ursinus Anniversary Drive for $2.9 million, completed under Paul Guest's chairmanship in 1970. This was a concerted search for building funds. The annual giving program of the alumni sustained a flow of gifts for other purposes.

A convergence of events at the 25 September 1970 board meeting highlighted the intimate link between Pettit's presidency and Helfferich's financial development plans. This was the special meeting to elect Pettit president. But the board also transacted some other business.

Included was a final report from Guest on the successful completion of the All-Ursinus Anniversary Drive, with more than $2.9 million counted. Uses for the funds were the administration building (Corson Hall), the Myrin library, the life science building (Thomas Hall), and the physical education building. Guest also reported on the success of the college in borrowing $4.4 million in public funds for the physical education facility. The source of funding was the Pennsylvania Higher Education Facilities Authority (HEFA) on a forty-year lease with favorable interest. He capped that with the promising news that Ursinus would probably win approval for its application for an interest subsidy grant. This would bring a forty-year flow of federal government funds to help carry the HEFA loan.

Guest's comment on the successful campaign captured the optimism felt by the whole board—indeed, the whole campus community—regarding capital finances. Guest said that the funds from the Drive and the loan funds "should be adequate to accommodate all reasonable need for physical facilities at Ursinus College for at least the next ten years. You [the board] ...are justified in claiming credit for lifting Ursinus College to the plateau it now occupies." And he thanked them. This optimism enabled the board to turn its attention toward the improvement of the academic program—although there was much capital construction remaining to do. Destiny's glitter, showering out from Helfferich's star, seemed to be illuminating the whole college.

Following Guest's report, William Heefner spoke. He already had accepted the role of chairman of a new ad hoc "Academic Development Committee." He said he spoke to faculty members and would speak with students. He was attempting to inform them of the board's interest in advancing financial support for the educational program, now that the All-Ursinus Anniversary Drive had taken care of capital needs. He was inviting feedback from both groups. He would report at a future meeting on the directions recommended for further fund-raising. He returned to the board meeting on 5 March 1971 and recommended approval to go ahead with "Century II (1970-1975)--The Case for Academic Development at Ursinus College." Heefner enumerated the academically related targets for funding improvement and declared that Century II aimed generally at "the preservation of the high levels of undergraduate teaching" commensurate with the college's reputation. The total came to $5.5 million, much more than the previous effort. This action by the board effected the transition into the second phase of fund-raising to fulfill Helfferich's ten-year vision. The new campaign, already well along behind the scenes, became public knowledge.
The enthusiastic plans of his predecessor, now etched into board policy for his administration, thus came to Pettit’s agenda on the very day of his election and the follow-up meeting. While he had had much to do with the study of needs and alternatives leading up to this decision, the energy for the comprehensive plan came from Helfferich. Just as the board turned to Pettit to hold the line on the social code, to maintain order, and to keep a tight grip on the management of the college, it now turned to him to lead the most ambitious phase of the Helfferich legacy.

As things turned out in the 1970-1976 period, the college in the aggregate met the goal for new funds that it set. Because of flaws in the planning assumptions, the absence of a well-staffed and matured development function, and the fury of inflation in the national economy, this success failed in its primary goal—to bootstrap the professional educational program of the college to a new level, commensurate with the first-class facilities created in the first phase of the Helfferich plan. The funds raised through the Century II campaign, though in total equal to the goal set, were insufficient to bring improvement. (Of course, without the funds raised, the college would have been worse off than it was by the end of the period.) The Century II campaign became a point of contention in itself, as we saw in the bill of particulars in the faculty’s 17 October 1975 letter.

In addition to the ten-year plan’s promotional tilt, it contained some flawed assumptions that almost guaranteed that hopes and realities would not converge.

Because baby boomers were driving college enrollments up all over the country, the plan assumed that Ursinus would be able to grow from an enrollment of about 1,000 to about 1,250 students. The additional tuition payments, even at a moderate rate of annual increase, would generate a sizable increase in disposable operating income. The enrollment never grew as projected.

The plan did not account for the full cost of debt service incurred in the expansion of the physical plant. This debt was internal as well as external. That is, Helfferich had persuaded the board, not without opposition, to borrow the earnings from the modest endowment (about $6 million at the time of Pettit’s election) to pay off plant debt. This meant that those earnings would not go to the direct support of educational activities.

The additional burden of the external HEFA debt—even with the help of a federal interest subsidy grant—further tightened funds available for educational and general expenses.

Moreover, the non-capital goals of Century II lacked roots in rigorous program planning. They were numbers, more or less grabbed out of the air. They had the virtue of saying in a broad-brush manner that the college wanted to give new priority to the professional educational program. But they were hazy figures to faculty. They failed to draw a sharp line between ongoing operational income and add-on income for program improvement generated by fund-raising. Faculty could take heart from the declaration of a new priority represented by the figures. They could feel scant ownership of the numbers, however, and had no clear understanding of what they would mean in their daily professional lives.

The board compounded these planning flaws by deciding to count all non-operating income toward the total goal of $5.5 million in the Century II program. This was a step forward in the conceptualization of the fund-raising obligations of the board. Yet, it had several misleading effects. It allowed the campaign results to swell with federal dollars received for student financial aid. It allowed the general campaign total to include the
continuing flow of gifts toward building projects of phase one that were not listed in the Century II goals. It allowed the counting of some irrevocable estate plans when donors and the college entered into them. The college could not spend these resources until the donors died at an unknown future date. At the end of the campaign, these accounting decisions made it possible for Heefner and Pettit to announce that Century II was a success. The log showed $5.6 million raised. But of the specific targets for advancing the educational program, Century II met only one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>NET GOAL SET 1 JULY 1970</th>
<th>RAISED 30 JUNE 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>1,653,958</td>
<td>600,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Endowment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>278,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Current Expense)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research Funds</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Endowment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Acquisitions</td>
<td>281,760</td>
<td>107,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Current Expense)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs</td>
<td>281,760</td>
<td>538,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Current Expense)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty had a hard time reconciling such numbers with the claim to general success.

Along with faulty assumptions for planning and counting gifts, the absence of a well-staffed and matured development function at Ursinus contributed to the problems of Century II. Helfferich's belief that fund-raising was a college president's peculiar responsibility reflected the common wisdom in higher education. In the penurious history of his vice-presidency (when he often acted as surrogate for McClure in seeking funds) and in his tenure as the president, however, Helfferich took this concept quite personally. As a banker, he thought of money as the key to administrative authority. The consequence was that he was reluctant to institutionalize fund-raising.

He was slow to build a professional staff with focused responsibility for systematic prospect identification and cultivation. Reimert and others had pushed him to hire Richter as a general aide in 1965. Helfferich gave him responsibility for fund-raising, but this move fell short of the need. Richter was in a learning mode. Helfferich gave him a full portfolio of duties beyond fund-raising. Helfferich added development staff members grudgingly and sparsely. He held onto the final responsibility for fund-raising in a way that relieved Richter of accountability.

These conditions prevailed when Pettit stepped into the presidency. He was in no position to halt the decision to go forward with Century II. Richter by then was in place as administrative vice president with major responsibility for fund-raising. Helfferich remained sitting on his cryptic bench as chancellor. Expected to keep a tight hold on expenses, Pettit sought to follow Helfferich in keeping the professional development staff
at a modest size and in personalizing the fund-raising function. He worked hard to bring dollars into a campaign he had not initiated. But Century II went forward with only limited research into the wherewithal and the interests of prospective donors, with a limited organization of campaign volunteers, and with a limited schedule for cultivating new donor interest. All these activities would have gone into a matured development office. The campaign's best supporters were board members and other prospects to whom they and Pettit and Helfferich had direct access. Beyond that generous but limited circle and existing sources of annual support among alumni and friends of the college, the campaign did not break much new ground for support.

Even if the planning had lacked flaws, even if the organization and execution of the campaign had been at a high professional level, the fury of inflation that accompanied the disruption of the economy of the nation and the world in the mid-seventies would have made the outcome of Century II unsatisfactory. The same force that hurt the pocketbooks of faculty members hurt the operating budget of the college. Endowment income benefited from rising interest rates, but a large percentage of the money earned went into payment on the capital debt. Consequently, there were no double-digit increases in operating income to cover double-digit increases in operating expenses. By 1975-76, the board was approving an operating budget showing a half-million dollar deficit. The physical plant director was estimating 70% increases in annual energy costs. With the cost of energy going ballistic, the board urged the administration to effect economies in the operation of the plant. Ursinus probably cut the expense of operating the physical plant more than many comparable colleges. It did this through ingenious mechanical changes wrought by Howard E. Schultze, director of physical plant, and through successful efforts to motivate students and staff to live and work more frugally. Still, nothing could stop the drain on the value of the college's hard-won dollars in Century II.

The 1974-75 fiscal year closed with a small operating deficit of $7,000—the first in many years. Insignificant in amount, the deficit symbolized the difficult operating conditions of the time. In his grand vision of a better future, Helfferich had not anticipated this.

Century II thus failed to generate the real added value it originally set out to find—even when it brought in new gifts.

When faculty members in the 17 October 1975 letter accused the administration of misleading the alumni about the success of Century II, it was evident that they had missed or were ignoring clear signals about the limits to Century II's success. Within the board, Heefner warned of two negative trends in 1973. One was inflation: "we would not have dared to project the runaway diminution in purchasing power of the early 70s even had we realized it." The other was the flattening of incoming gifts after initial success: "the curve of the giving has turned downward. If this continues, we will not reach the goal." Richter rang the same cautionary note that year in an alumni magazine article: "When we embarked on Century II, we thought that $5.45 million would do more to advance the academic program than in fact it will. Continuing inflation and the new 'no-growth' conditions within higher education itself will diminish its effect somewhat. Century II nonetheless is an important step along the broad road of improvement. It is taking Ursinus in the right direction." Pettit made similar statements in his ongoing communications with faculty and other constituencies.

Ironically, Heefner spoke about Century II in the September 1975 issue of the alumni magazine in a way that may have caused faculty members to include Century II in its list
of concerns. Heefner did claim general success for the program. But, he said, "because of inflation and other changes unforeseen when the goals of Century II were set in the late 1960s, the program may not have done all that was originally hoped." Faculty evidently saw the headline but missed the disclaimer in smaller type. In light of the hopes and dreams that it represented at the outset—nothing less than the completion of Helfferich's vision of an improved educational program—this was understandable.

The story of Helfferich's second great legacy, then, can read as a failure to provide significant financial advancement for the professional practice of the college. Yet it is possible to see his plan in a more positive light. While it missed its short-term targets, Century II, under William Heefner's leadership, succeeded in expanding the vision of the college. Heefner stressed the importance of setting high goals. He believed that they would raise sights and spirits and tilt the institution deliberately in a desired direction. He endorsed Helfferich's willingness to take a long and comprehensive view of the college's fortunes. He exhorted his fellow board members and alumni to "reach" in their thinking about the future of Ursinus and their role in its development. Century II gave him an official bully pulpit for education in the hard game of institutional advancement, something he knew from other charitable activities in Bucks County and beyond. The ad hoc "academic development committee" that Heefner chaired became the board's permanent development committee after Century II. For future fund-raising needs, this was an essential transformation. It focused the eyes of the board permanently on its obligation to lay large plans and to garner new resources in support of them.

In the dispute over priorities, the board's decision to conduct Century II unequivocally announced that the college prized its professional academic practice. It stressed the importance of developing the faculty and the resources that supported their teaching. Nothing in the Century II program directly enhanced the parochial agenda at the expense of the academic enterprise. Because of its failure to bring substantial improvement to that enterprise, all parties by 1976 could agree on one thing: the college had to put more money into the academic program in the next phase of development. Whatever controversy remained over the priority of professional practice thus was in terms mainly of execution: how could the college gather new resources as fast as possible to improve the academic program? Faculty criticism of Century II faded quickly after Pettit announced his retirement. Faculty seemed to believe the board when it said it would not stop in its search for new funds to support academic improvement. It gave some substance to this resolve when it mounted the Ursinus 76/80 program immediately after the 1970-1976 period.

Helfferich's second great legacy, then, his ten-year development plan, was an overall success that failed to bring specific advancement. Yet, it established a more comprehensive way to envision the advancement of the college. It began to mobilize the board for the long term evolution of Ursinus.

**RESTATING THE COLLEGE PURPOSE—A NEW PAROCHIAL TWIST**

If Donald L. Helfferich saw the entire centennial year as an occasion for a dramatic climax to his administration, he saw the formal dinner celebrating the centennial as the setting for the drama's defining action. The setting for the dinner on 15 January 1970 was the grand rotunda of the venerable Franklin Institute in Philadelphia. Looking on from a
perch above the proceedings was a massive marble statue of Ben Franklin himself, America's most ingenious secular saint. The Newcomen Society in North America acted as official sponsor of the event. This lent an air of external significance to this uniquely intramural event. Of the more than 200 persons attending, the majority were from the Ursinus community, with some guests from the sponsoring Society. Among the attendees were two noteworthy Philadelphia-area executives: William B. Murphy, President of Campbell Soup Company, and Warner S. Shelly, board chairman of the city's largest advertising agency, N. W. Ayer and Sons. Ursinus honored them because their companies also celebrated centennial anniversaries in 1969. Absent but accounted for was a third honorary degree recipient, Rudolf von Miller, Managing Director of the Deutsches Museum of Germany—the original home of the Pennsylvania Germans whose Reformed church convictions led to the founding of Ursinus.

The formal finery, the hallowed memorial to Franklin, the relevance of center city Philadelphia (the original organizing meeting leading to the founding took place in the old city), the ceremonial-sounding name of the sponsoring group, the presence of notable outsiders, the sense of structure and tradition, even the snap in the winter air outside—everything converged to make this the right setting for Helfferich to speak his most dramatically memorable lines of the whole year of celebration.

He was less than ten months away from leaving the presidency. He had not yet told the board leaders whether he thought Pettit should succeed him, but the logic of the choice was clear by then in his mind. He had pushed hard to complete the first phase of improvement in the physical plant. He had turned the wheels of planning that would produce a vision and resources for the start of the second century. Tonight he would drop into place the missing piece of his legacy. It would be a sweeping statement of the philosophic temperament of Ursinus. He wanted to stamp the purpose of the college so firmly that it would continue after his presidency on a path distinctively different from that of most similar liberal arts colleges.

Helfferich came by stages to the decision to make such a speech. He shared with many in the college community and beyond an aversion to the social revolution and the excesses of anti-war activism of the late 1960s. He sometimes affirmed publicly the expanded freedom of expression that came with the flowering of the baby boomers. But he did that mainly for dramatic effect or tactical advantage at a given moment. It masked his conviction that the changes in attitude and values were diminishing the ability of colleges to educate young people as effectively as before. He disapproved when neighboring liberal arts colleges of national reputation appeared to sanction the activism of their students and to give broad license for their "hippie" social behavior on campus. In his mind, they were moving farther and farther from a firm position on student behavior that he believed was the desirable one for small liberal arts colleges.

In his last couple of years as president, Helfferich found himself called upon more frequently than ever to defend the parochial purpose of Ursinus in disputes with students. One of his last encounters saw him yielding to their pressure (abetted by faculty) to do away with the requirement to dress for dinner that had come down from past decades. Faced with protests over social rules, he had felt it necessary to organize retreats off campus where students had the newfound privilege of telling board members how they would change the college. He had a certain sympathy with the anti-war sentiments of students but stood foursquare against them when they sought to stop classes as a protest.
His commanding presence on the campus scene enabled him to hold the line. One day, for example, a rider for the Students for a Democratic Society arrived by motorcycle on campus. He was on a recruiting mission. Helfferich descended the steps of the administration building, entered a crowd of students surrounding the visitor, and told him to leave. When the visitor in due course turned his bike around and departed, students dispersed, unsurprised at the forceful effect of the president's directness and self-confidence.

Despite his success in holding the line by dramatic gesture and by some behind-the-scenes manipulation, Helfferich knew that the line was sometimes thin. One of the stock quotes in his arsenal of speech material showed up more and more frequently in his last years in office. The Angel Gabriel was speaking in the play The Green Pastures: "Everything nailed down is coming loose." Like many people in leadership positions in 1969, Helfferich had a secret sense that he could lose control after all--although he would make such an admission only behind a closed door. As disorder on campuses across the nation continued and Ursinus students continued changing in appearance and attitude, he worried that the line might break after he left the president's office. The last thing he wanted to see was an Ursinus that caved in to liberalizing social and political changes. He did not want to preside over the demise of the parochial culture that had nurtured him and that he had championed throughout his life.

Helfferich's concern went beyond the effect on students that the "liberal" reorientation of colleges was creating. He saw evidences that the leftward political swing of such colleges was alienating the people of wealth on whom they depended. In one instance, he recruited for the Ursinus board a well-known local business leader after he cut his ties with his alma mater, one of the Main Line Quaker colleges. That college had closed for a day to allow students and faculty to go on a protest trip to Washington--for its conservative alumnus the last straw. Other people of means on the Ursinus board reinforced Helfferich's growing concern about the widespread disarray on college campuses and its roots in the youth revolution. They included William Elliott, president of the Philadelphia Life Insurance Company. Helfferich looked to him for friendship and validation in the heat of controversy. It was Elliott who would introduce him at the centennial dinner. Paul I. Guest, '38, an attorney in Philadelphia, came to the fore as the pivotal voice of the board in negotiations with faculty and students. Of all the board members, he was the most committed to preserving the traditional parochial purpose and most willing to defend it in meetings with students. The most important board influence on Helfferich probably came from Mabel Pew Myrin, then the college's most generous benefactor. The Pew family had a reputation in the Delaware Valley region and beyond for its conservative stance on social and political issues. Her generous support of the new library and other projects made Helfferich especially attentive to her perspective on the unsettled state of the nation and its effect on colleges.

She and others on the board applauded Helfferich's pluck in setting himself against the prevailing winds. They saw hope in his defense of Ursinus's parochial purpose. By this time, they were seeing in that purpose values that extended beyond a code of student social behavior. They saw in it as well a commitment to order, obedience, institutional loyalty, and prudent fiscal control.

Faced with the flying debris of change on campus and off, supported by people who strongly disapproved of much of the change, and eager to hand his successor a tool for
guiding the college, Helfferich decided that he should make a bold statement of purpose. By enunciating a formal policy, he believed that he could reinvigorate the tradition of the college in new terms. This would secure a strong and distinctive position for it in the years following his presidency.

The speech came together in the month preceding the centennial dinner. He and his administrative aide had been toying with a letter to an imaginary prospect for board membership. It was supposed to tell the prospective member—a person of means, of course—why, of all the choices, the Ursinus board would be the best place for him or her to give service to higher education in those troubled times. Helfferich blended this message with his vintage aphorisms on the state of the world. By the night of the dinner on 15 January 1970, few beyond immediate staff members and a few key board members knew what he was going to say. By then, he was eager to stride forth and deliver a mighty blow on behalf of his alma mater. Even lacking the compelling reasons he had marshaled for giving the speech, he would have wanted to give it anyway—for the sake of the show. It would be sheer enjoyment for him to send a dramatic wave through the Ursinus atmosphere at the climax of the centennial celebration and of his administration.

As Helfferich was delivering his speech, a photographer captured him on film at the lectern from his right side. Behind him in the photo, a fluted classical column of the Franklin Institute rotunda defined the traditional setting. The frame of the photo excluded the audience from the shot, this left him alone, appearing to address the wide world. His white mane of hair flowed from his upraised face, contrasting with his formal black suit. His left hand was just rising at arm's length, reaching gracefully but firmly in the direction of his uplifted gaze. His magisterial gesture seemed to capture the essence of his speech—and something more, the meaning of his entire last year in office. He was commanding the future. He was pointing the way the college should go. For many in attendance, it was a magical moment, resonating with his praiseworthy past deeds, promising that deeds yet unknown would come after him. For some who listened carefully to the substance of his remarks, though, it was a puzzling if not unsettling moment.

The speech broke into two distinct parts. The first part came from Helfferich's stock of trenchant phrases designed to capture the imagination of audiences over the years. It sought to put the moment into historical context by reviewing the changes that had occurred in higher education since 1951, when the Newcomen Society last honored Ursinus at a luncheon on the campus. The second part, he announced, was a position statement on the philosophy of Ursinus College. This was what had come of the draft letter to a prospective board member. Here, Helfferich sought to rebalance the two energizing forces of the college, its parochial purpose and its professional academic practice.

Up front, he gave a ringing affirmation to liberal education and unfettered academic freedom. A research university could not have asked for a more accurate statement of its position:

*Like all liberal arts institutions of any distinction, Ursinus holds that a professor of a discipline has the freedom to profess his knowledge without hindrance.*
Ursinus advocated "no closed ideological system." Any answers about "God, man, nature and society" were open to honest scrutiny and free discussion.

With that assurance to the faculty that the freedom of professional practice was secure, Helfferich went on to explain how the college, nonetheless, had an institutional orientation—a parochial purpose—that was essentially ideological (he said philosophical). He resolved the apparent contradiction by drawing a distinction between the institution’s method of academic pursuit and the content of its institutionalized life in society. The method of academic inquiry at the heart of professional practice was, as he said, value-free. The content of Ursinus's life as an institution, however, was not value-free.

As a discrete social and legal entity, [the college] makes decisions about courses to be included in the curriculum, about the size and shape of the physical plant, about the extent of community involvement, about student rules, about candidates for faculty positions, about students seeking admission, and about those seeking release. Taken together, these decisions express an institutional point of view. This point of view, essentially philosophical, is the product of the attitudes and ideas of those governing and operating the college—about the nature of man; the aims of educating men endowed with that nature; the ways of regulating human affairs in general and in an academic setting.

Since an institutional point of view was inescapable, a responsible college necessarily had to choose its particular orientation. Ursinus, he said, was historically "conservative." And he was there to tell the dinner audience what that meant and why Ursinus should remain conservative.

Ursinus began with a pietistic purpose, which evolved into a less strident but decidedly moralistic collegiate way. Helfferich deliberately detoured the religious foundations by granting them as "given." (A little farther along, he did claim Jesus as a kind of crypto-conservative with a revolutionary mission—but this insertion lay outside the gist of his argument.) Then he gave his new twist to the parochial purpose. He wanted this twist to revalidate the social code of good behavior on the campus, to make it newly relevant to students and faculty. He wanted it to stake out a distinctive position for Ursinus among its institutional peers.

He made it clear at the start that Ursinus did not stand against change ("change is everywhere"). Rather, Ursinus looked to a conservative rationale to help it "manage change."

His new rationale was a conservative outlook on the nature of humankind and on the social structures best suited for such a nature. This outlook was receiving attention through the writings of scholars such as Clinton Rossiter and Peter Viereck. Guided by such writers, Helfferich reached back to Edmund Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France for antecedents. He declared against "simplistic rational formulas" for solving human problems, against "pat theories for change or emotional calls to new revolutionary vistas," against "the doctrine of natural goodness." Following Burke's lead, he said the Ursinus temperament relied on custom and experience as a test and favored
restraints on human passions.

Helfferich then declared that Ursinus should preserve a conservative orientation because of the contrary path of "permissiveness" taken by many similar colleges. He said it would be good for the public to have a conservative alternative when choosing a college. And it would be good for Ursinus to offer it, because it was in the spirit of "its own best traditions." He acknowledged that this would make Ursinus unattractive to some students and their families but maintained that others would come precisely because of the conservative tilt.

Toward the end of his speech, Helfferich again endorsed "academic quality" and denied that conservatism equated with dullness. Most significant from the standpoint of the history of Ursinus's parochial purpose was his return to the business of shaping good behavior:

[We] see [Ursinus] as a reasonably decorous place, where basic good manners are valued because they tend to be civilizing (we hold civility to be one of the hardest and highest-valued goals). We do not see it as an irrelevant haven for the sons and daughters of people who cannot accept the complexities of contemporary life; we see it as a full partner, along with institutions of a liberal persuasion, in showing young people how to approach those complexities, we from a conservative posture, they from a liberal.

Befitting his reputation as a master fund-raiser, Helfferich concluded with a statement of belief that such a college would attract adequate financial resources to allow it to do its work.

For all the drama surrounding its delivery, Helfferich's centennial dinner speech did not become a rallying point in the college community. A faculty member who had heard it quarreled in public that Ursinus had no right to declare against human goodness. Another faculty member found fault with Helfferich's use of the word "philosophical." He argued that the correct word was "philosophic" (failing to suggest that "ideological" might have suited even better). A few students, such as Alan Novak, reacted in print to the restrictive implications of Helfferich's conservative view. Over time, students in letters to the editor made knowing references to the college's determination to remain conservative. An embittered recent graduate sent Helfferich a long objection to the speech. When the student newspaper reprinted it, some campus readers nodded in agreement. But neither faculty nor students undertook any concerted action pro or con in response to the speech.

Yet the speech established a tone and set boundaries that had a pervasive influence through the 1970-1976 period of dispute over college principles and priorities. As Helfferich had envisioned, the speech interlocked with and reinforced his other two legacies—the election of Pettit to the presidency and the plan to develop the college's resources.

When the board met on 15 May 1970, on Helfferich's recommendation, it adopted the statement in principle as the policy of Ursinus College. The president had launched the statement on Philadelphia's wintry air, out of the blue, we might say. Faculty and students had had no prior knowledge of its contents, much less a chance to influence its
formulation. Yet, by this action the board made the statement an official condition for the development of the institution. As such it influenced in two ways the 1970-1976 dispute over principles and priorities.

A. For one thing, it sent a clear message from the board to the next president, whoever that might be. The message was that the parochial purpose of the college remained of paramount importance. The Middle States team that visited in 1968 had already noted Ursinus's contrary stance amidst similar colleges, when many campuses were in turmoil. The visitors reported on the college's "pervasive kindliness and concern for the well-being and growth of the students" and attributed this to a strong identification with the values of the church. They also observed a correlative of this quality, "an insistence upon a strict code of personal conduct and conformity somewhat unusual in today's permissiveness." The tact of the visiting team led it to write the latter sentence so that a given reader could interpret it positively or negatively. Either way, it was an accurate description. Helfferich wanted the whole picture—kindness and strictness, pinned to religious values—to continue after he was out of office. He believed that his speech provided the conceptual reinforcement for its continuation at a time when social and political upheaval in the national environment threatened to undermine it. By making his statement an official policy, the board in effect created an added criterion for the presidential search that overrode the criteria endorsed by the faculty. Helfferich had not thought to seek faculty endorsement of the statement. Had he done so, chances were high that the faculty would have rejected it, at least in its existing form. The record has not revealed what the dozen outside presidential candidates thought about the statement when they came to campus that spring. But the in-house candidate knew the genesis and intent of the statement. Helfferich and board members could feel confident that he could live comfortably with it.

Helfferich's statement, then, underscored the board's expectations of Pettit when it elected him president. If he or any other would-be president had had thoughts of critically reviewing the parochial purpose of the college, the board's adoption of the statement would have presented a significant deterrent. This constraint tightened the other limiting conditions set by the board when it appointed the new president in the fall. Together the board's actions and statements prepared the setting for the dispute we saw above between the college and students over the significance of the social code. If it had not adopted Helfferich's statement as board policy, the board might have appeared to Pettit and others less clear in its direction. The dispute about the social code on campus might then have had a somewhat broader latitude. It might have come closer to resolution by 1976 than in fact it did.

In the long run, Helfferich's statement did little to revitalize the parochial purpose embodied in the social code. Indeed, in grasping for a new rationale, Helfferich had merely nodded in passing to the old religious foundation of the code. This had the virtue of acknowledging present reality but did nothing to retard the continuing movement away from a religious foundation for the parochial purpose. If anything, it conferred official status on a parochial foundation that was secular and civic—Burkean—rather than Christian.

B. Helfferich's centennial dinner statement influenced the dispute over principles and priorities in yet a second way. In the tension between parochial purpose and professional practice, it had the effect of further reinforcing the importance of the
faculty's domain of academic pursuit. This effect grew from Helfferich's strong endorsement of the freedom of inquiry. The irony was that he had a different intention. His point was that the special parochial tilt of Ursinus would set it apart. The evolution of the academic disciplines at Ursinus was so far along, however, that he had no choice but to stipulate at the outset their independence of parochial intrusion. When his new rationale for a conservative parochialism, rooted in Burkean thought, failed to win allegiance in the college community, it left his unbridled support of academic freedom standing in place. It was a formal reminder of the integrity of the college's academic program. It stood as a defense in case the board or administration threatened the status of the academic enterprise.

The faculty and students did not buy into his new rationale partly because he had invited neither group to the table to help develop it. Ownership lodged at the top and never trickled down. And the day of unquestioning obedience to the voice of authority was in the process of dying. Students were the immediate object of the statement, but nowhere had Helfferich explained how his new rationale would make their familiar social code more understandable and more supportable. They could ignore the statement while continuing their argument against the code. The faculty too could ignore it with impunity or accept those parts favorable to the academic program. The affirmation of academic freedom was clearly welcome. The attempt to reinforce the social code was of less moment to faculty than to students.

In the end, Helfferich's promotional intent put the statement into comfortable perspective for most faculty. The text originated, as we saw, as a letter to a hypothetical prospect for board membership. It was a development document. It ended on a development theme:

*We see Ursinus as the object of interest of a group of public-spirited, thoughtful men of affairs who believe that the moderate intellectual temper must survive if the nation whose fruits we all enjoy is to survive whole.*

(The substitution of the word "moderate" for "conservative" in this final sentence of the speech demonstrated the uncertain but always threatening ability of a ghost writer to shade the meaning of a speech.)

This promotional conclusion gave faculty the clue they needed to dismiss the document as a fund-raising ploy. Helfferich, they assumed, was saying what a president had to say in his relentless search for new resources. This, plus Helfferich's ritual endorsement of academic freedom, persuaded a good percentage of faculty that the statement posed no real threat in their campaign for greater professional status. There was no concerted opposition at that point among faculty to the social code that Helfferich was clearly trying to rationalize on new grounds; their concerns lay elsewhere.

The statement produced another unintended irony in the academic realm. Although it reinforced academic freedom, it set a tone that restrained innovative thinking about the curriculum. Helfferich saw Ursinus "cultivating academic quality second to none--and that means cautious trial and error in new techniques as well as a holding to the informal, personal approach that traditionally has characterized Ursinus education." This careful statement did not capture Helfferich's true feelings about curriculum development: he had
prodced faculty through many of his years in office about injecting excitement and unorthodox combinations into departmental offerings. After Helfferich left office, the new president, pinched for dollars, and his new academic dean, Richard Bozorth, were not disposed to push for sweeping change in the curriculum. In this they were being consistent with the Helfferich statement. At the 3 March 1972 board meeting, Bozorth reflected the conservative tone of the statement in a report on academic planning. He stressed "deliberate study and change" rather than "experiment for the sake of a progressive image." "Consolidation, refinement, and occasional amalgamation should be our immediate curricular aims." Watching from his cryptic bench, Helfferich might have observed that a conservative temperament did not limit itself to the parochial side of the institution's life.

It is worth noting that Helfferich's strategy did work to attract some support from key board members and alumni. Declaring forthrightly for a conservative position in the hot political climate of the time gave him and then Pettit a focused message. Some Philadelphia-area business leaders liked what they heard and came aboard or reaffirmed their support. An example was Russell Ball, head of Philadelphia Gear Corporation. A West Point man, he liked the structure and discipline in the parochial vision held out by the statement. He deepened his board service when he accepted the invitation to be vice chairman of the academic development committee, the vehicle for the Century II program. As another example, Helfferich's message struck receptive ears on that very night in the Franklin Institute. One of the corporate leaders being honored became a contributor to the college for many years afterward. There is no way to measure the negative effect of the statement on more liberal leaders and alumni who might have wanted to support a less conservative Ursinus.

This polemical note may be the appropriate one on which to conclude a look at Helfferich's policy statement on the college's conservatism. If the upheavals of the time had not threatened the parochial orientation of Ursinus, Helfferich would not have spoken as he did. He would not have felt compelled to reach out to a different formulation of the parochial purpose. He would not have had to stipulate the faculty's freedom to pursue their professional practice. That he gave the centennial speech that he did suggests the extent of Helfferich's concern over the rampant threat to the college as he knew it.

In the running dispute that we have tracked through the 1970-1976 period, then, Helfferich's third legacy encouraged a new administration to hold onto the social code embodying the parochial purpose. It failed, however, to arouse student or faculty commitment to it. The argument from a Burkean perspective did not take hold. The statement, as we have seen, somewhat inadvertently reinforced the importance of the faculty and the academic program. If it had any effect on faculty activists, it would have told them that their cause--advocating the improvement of the academic program--was just. As a grand stroke to ground the institution on fresh foundations in the revolutionary atmosphere of the time, it did not really succeed. As a fund-raising tool, it helped Century II somewhat.

In summary, the third legacy of Helfferich, his conservative philosophy statement on balance enhanced the professional practice of Ursinus, probably in spite of itself. It helped create a climate in the six-year period that inhibited change in the parochial program. This remained as an unfinished agenda for change when the 1970-1976 period drew to a close.
In the fall of 1970, the men's soccer team defeated Haverford College, coach Donald Baker's alma mater, for the first time in 25 years. In the spring of 1971, the faculty approved the constitution of a new Black Student Alliance.

In the fall of 1971, freshman orientation took a sharp turn away from traditional harassment by upperclass students. The old hazing customs began to give way. New arrivals in their first days of the fall semester received help rather than grief from sophomores. The Alumni Association mounted "the biggest Homecoming celebration in the history of Ursinus." It included a visit by the 160-member Mt. Carmel, PA, Mounties High School marching band, four skydivers, the big band of Arlen Saylor for a dance in Wismer Hall, and a chicken barbecue cookout. By December 1971, the student ecological concern group completed its first round of collecting glass and delivering it to a recycling center. In the spring 1972 semester, Maya Angelou, author of the 1970 best-seller, *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*, spoke in the forum program. Also on the spring semester forum program was a former inmate from nearby Graterford prison. Protheatre presented Peter Weiss's *The persecution and assassination of Jean-Paul Marat as performed by the inmates of the asylum of Charenton under the direction of the Marquis de Sade* in Bomberger Hall. Meanwhile, Chancellor Helfferich directed the 1937 comedy by George S. Kaufman, *You Can't Take It With You*.

In the fall of 1972, Gerald M. Edelman, '50, brought notice to the college when he received the Nobel Prize for medicine. President Pettit crowned Homecoming Queen Susie Powell with a garland of flowers for her hair. Sororities and fraternities continued to dispense good feeling among students, non-members as well as brothers and sisters, when students finished studying for the weekend. The football squad ended its season with five wins against three losses. In January 1973, the men's basketball team heroically rescued victims of an explosion at a motel after playing Juniata College and won praise from across the nation. Albert Reiner, head of the French Department, received approval for a summer study abroad program in Europe for academic credit. In the spring of 1973, The Travelin' VI student concert took place in Wismer Hall, perpetuating a talent show in memory of Scott Pierce, who died some years before in an accident before graduating. Former student workers in the dining room and kitchen set up a scholarship fund to honor veteran steward Joe Lynch. In the summer of 1973, an American Studies Program for Japanese students from Tohoku Gakuin University in Sendai, Japan, began, giving Ursinus summer students an opportunity for intercultural learning.

In the fall of 1973, the old snack shop made its debut as the venue for campus theatrical offerings. The newly opened College Union organized the creation by the college community of a giant U-shaped banana split 600 feet in total length—the first of a series of annual "record breakers." Some students organized a Conflict Simulation Club. In spring 1974, the women's gymnastic team took second place in the first intercollegiate gymnastics meet in Ursinus history. A Festival of the Arts lit up the campus with music, poetry, and theatre. Bruce Springsteen, still emerging as a rock star, wowed students in a concert in Helfferich Hall. Two new English professors received post-doctoral research grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The college offered a summer course in Pennsylvania Dutch ethnic studies. In that summer of 1974, Robert F. Sing,
'75, won the national NCAA Division III javelin championship.

In the fall of 1974, the women's field hockey team defeated West Chester State College in the "mythical" national championship game. Ursinus took a forward step in its computer program by starting as a long-distance user of the services of Dartmouth College's Kiewit Center. A new course in computer programming appeared in the curriculum. Brendan Gill of The New Yorker spoke at the 1975 commencement. Students that summer read two current best-sellers for their assigned summer reading, Peter Benchley's Jaws and Piers Paul Read's Alive!

In the fall of 1975, David Liscom returned to campus after his junior year abroad in Scotland on a scholarship from the Philadelphia St. Andrew's Society--one of a long line of Ursinus winners of the competitive award. In the spring of 1976, the National Endowment for the Humanities awarded $39,000 to Ursinus for an experimental program in interdivisional studies for seniors.

In a word, life at Ursinus in the period 1970-1976 did not resemble the bare analytical grid laid out in this essay. The days were rich with learning and with colorful experiences. Even the disputes over principles and priorities set up a heightened awareness that helped some students to think and learn and grow. Healthy personal self-interest motivated nearly everyone. Students, faculty, and staff alike prized the college, with all its needs and imperfections. It was the essential medium for their teaching and learning. Virtually everyone wanted it to function well and to move ahead. It was possible for people to isolate the disputes while they went on working together, valuing in common the place, the program, and the patterns of human exchange in and out of classrooms.

This pervasive sense of institutional connection was part of the parochial identity of the college no less than the disputed social code. It grew out of the intense feelings of hundreds of individuals in the college community, not out of policies or prescriptions. As such it gave the college a strength that framed the effort to find a new interrelationship between the parochial and professional forces of the institution. The undiluted strength of these feelings of community, of concrete connection, conferred on the college a basic assurance. The college had inherent human resources that would tide it over from the 1970-1976 period to another that began in November 1976.

As that new period began, Donald L. Helfferich, sitting on his cryptic bench, could not fully foresee that the college's traditional parochial agenda--its compulsion to shape moral behavior--would soon find a new rationale. It would not come from the conservative ideology he advanced in his centennial speech. Nor would it come from a revival of Ursinus's religious heritage. It would emerge out of the academic study of cognitive development and hierarchies of human motivation. The findings of scholars such as Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, and Lawrence Kohlberg would become the guides to new student life policy. This would bring the parochial and professional ideas of the college into closer concord. With new conceptual foundations in solid university research, the idea of character development would find renewed life more in harmony with professional academic practice. The disputes over principles and priorities that marked the start of the college's second century would recede. That would allow the Ursinus community to refocus its energies in a renewed consensus. The college would then quicken its pace along the trajectory toward status as a university college with aspirations for national recognition.
APPENDIX I

THE PILLARS OF PAROCHIAL PURPOSE:
Religious Piety, The Collegiate Way, And The Moral Curriculum

This excursion through Ursinus College catalogs from the early days to the 1970s seeks to trace the themes that supported the parochial purpose--religious piety and the collegiate way. A report on the old "moral curriculum" in nineteenth century American colleges supplements this excursion. The report casts light on the parochial emphases that would have characterized Ursinus's original curriculum but that waned as academic professionalism rose.

The newly founded Ursinus was as sanguine as any religiously driven college in giving primacy to the moral development of students. The founders started an institution "where the youth of the land can be liberally educated under the benign influence of Christianity." After Ursinus's first shaky decade, its 1881 catalog touted recent additions to the spare curriculum. It held them up as evidence that the college could equip students for "any worthy calling in life." The moral fervor behind Ursinus's educational program then rang forth in the following passage (opened with an awkward diffidence of phrasing):

"But it is desired to emphasize its [the college's] aim to give chief prominence to the moral and religious element of education as of supreme value. Without true views of life, and right principles for its government, the acquisitions of learning only increase man's power for evil." (p. 24)

Early on, Ursinus began to hire professors from graduate schools where the research disciplines developed on the European model. Professional practice, however, had to take second place to the faculty's "highest duty." That was to attend to the religious interests of the students. The college expected faculty to labor for the "spiritual welfare" of their students. The day of classes opened and closed with "suitable devotions." And every student had to attend--the start of a chapel requirement that lasted almost to the 1970-1976 period. (p. 27)

Ten years later, the 1891 Ursinus catalog still was affirming that the college had the right fix on truth and morality based in religion. It continued, however, to cast its religious principles as a kind of matrix for education in "modern civilization." That modern note becomes more prominent when we see that the 1891 course offerings included a new scientific course of studies running parallel to the original classical course. Course offerings with university-sounding labels appeared in the curriculum as markers of the rise of professional practice: inorganic chemistry, botany, psychology, physics, zoology, social science, English literature, history of philosophy, astronomy, geology.

Another significant change appeared in the 1891-92 catalog, the first to appear after the retirement of the first president, John H. A. Bomberger. A verbatim excerpt from the 1869 act of incorporation by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania made its first appearance in the opening section. However, statements about "Apostolic Christianity" and the faculty's "highest duty" to look after students' religious welfare remained. The daily religious devotions morning and afternoon remained a requirement. Required religion study for all undergraduates continued, with the focus on the sophomore study of "English Bible." Students continued to live by
requirement in college dormitories under the "benign influence." These requirements, without rhetorical fanfare, became the principal vehicles for perpetuating the parochial purpose as time went on.

In the 1896-97 catalog, prose about the religious basis of truth disappeared almost completely. The legislative excerpt, appearing since 1891-92, after Bomberger's departure, seemed to move the college's mission from a Biblical to a civic foundation.

Meanwhile, the professionalizing of the college continued. The 1900-1901 catalog listed five courses of study, up from the two of a decade before. (The "Literary Course for Ladies" that appeared in the 1891 catalog as a third variation disappeared by 1900-1901.) The five courses of study (we would call them majors) were classical, mathematics-physical, chemistry-biology, history-political, and modern languages. Graduation requirements now included a course offering in psychology and philosophy and a laboratory course.

By 1930-1931, when President George L. Omwake's long administration had matured, the balance of parochial purpose and professional academic practice appears to have reached an equilibrium. That equilibrium lasted until America came unhinged in the late 1960s. The V-12 program in World War II and the influx of veterans after the war temporarily and superficially disturbed the balance but without lasting effect. The 1930-1931 catalog highlights the parochial purpose by quoting the founders' familiar reference to "the benign influence of Christianity." Students still had to attend daily chapel, down from two sessions to one a day. However, the course in English Bible disappeared from the set of graduation requirements in the 1929-30 catalog, just the year before. Psychology and then philosophy became requirements. Students still had to live in dormitories under the supervision of Christian men and women who would guide their moral behavior.

It is worth pausing over this persistent requirement. It lies at the bottom of the social code that became such a sticking point between the students and the administration in the late 1960s and in the 1970-76 period. The college touted the beneficial effects of its student living conditions from the early days. The 1883-84 catalog, under the rubric "Internal Arrangements," stated:

*The Domestic Department is under the immediate supervision of the Faculty, giving to the household, so far as possible, the character of a well-ordered Christian family.*

This vision of intentional orderly Christian living persists throughout the college's history. President Omwake must have valued it highly. As soon as he became president in 1913, the new catalog (1913-1914) gained a wholly new section on "Domestic Life." This celebration of the residential experience--of "the collegiate way"--gives us a reference point for understanding the parochial purpose of the college as it moved away from a direct religious formulation:

*The college aims to provide thoroughly healthful, wholesome and homelike conditions in the residences for both young men and young women. The boarding department is made an educational asset in the institution. All resident students take their meals in a large, cheery dining room constructed on artistic and thoroughly sanitary lines. The meals are prepared in a spacious, well-lighted, sanitary kitchen with complete*
modern equipment.

This paragraph lasted for many years in the catalog. The paragraph that followed it in 1913-1914 explained the educational rationale for the amenities so glowingly described:

*By controlling the conditions under which the students live, the college provides a physical basis for its higher functions that insures not only health of body and joy of life, but greatly promotes mental efficiency and success in intellectual pursuits.*

Perhaps it was unfortunate that this explanation dropped out of the catalog when Norman E. McClure became president in 1936. It might have made it easier for students to understand the college's stand on the social code when they objected to it in the 1970-1976 period.

Omwake's revision of the parochial purpose in his first year in office extended well beyond the valued living arrangements. The 1913-1914 description of "College Principles" shows that the pursuit of the collegiate way moved Ursinus away from the fervid assertion of Apostolic Christian truth in the earlier years. It appears that Omwake broke off the explicitly religious expressions of the parochial purpose and segregated them into the specific requirements of chapel and Bible study. The catalog discussion of college principles shows that the purpose survived in social custom, attached by only tenuous strings to basic denominational tenets.

The college, it asserted, "opposes unnatural distinctions among its students. Equal opportunity for all is provided and a wholesome spirit of fraternity throughout the entire body is encouraged." After explaining that self-governance took place by students through their organizations for men and for women, the passage turned to the hard facts of student social commitment:

*Since the institution is organized on the group basis, class rivalry and its attendant evils are extraneous.*

Later in the Omwake era a pledge taken by each student gave teeth to this vision of "equal opportunity" in the social life of the campus: "Each student pledges himself on admission to abstain from every form of rushing or hazing." (1930-1931 catalog) Italic type emphasized the pledge. (Perhaps the pledge was so important because the threat of rushing and hazing was so real!) At some religiously founded colleges, students still would have been signing pledges of belief in specific religious doctrines rather than pledges to behave themselves. The emphasis on a wholly social concern and the absence of a religious reference both speak to the change that had taken place in the parochial agenda of Ursinus by the 1930s.

The "College Principles" section of the Omwake-era catalogs concludes with a statement of aim that is equally strong on social obligation and barren of religious reference. It asserts that the aim of Ursinus is to train its students, through the performance of their social and civil obligations and duties, in those virtues which will fit them for the extraordinary responsibilities of educated men and women in after life.
Because of this expectation, the college said it reserved the right to exclude students from its enrollment—a disciplinary sanction that would resound into the contentious 1960s and 1970s.

The college's social expectations of students and graduates expressed in the 1930-1931 catalog still appeared intact in the catalog of 1950-51. However, the college no longer required the pledge.

The scales holding the college's parochial purpose on one side and its steadily enriched academic offerings on the other side clearly tilted greatly in favor of academic professionalism by this time. But the college's lack of doctrinal narrowness, of specific religious formulation, did not mean that it had abandoned its parochial purpose. For the several decades leading up to the centennial, the combination of behavioral expectations we have traced in the catalogs fulfilled that purpose. Students had to go to chapel and take a religion course or later a course in philosophy, a formal requirement that was free of any doctrinal constraints. And they had to meet a set of demanding requirements for responsible social behavior in their living arrangements. Under this regimen, students who kept up an appearance of decent social behavior were free to develop their moral and religious convictions on their own.

The college was able to reach a modern balance in this way perhaps because its parochial purpose from the beginning reflected the simplicity of "low church" German Reformed theology and practice. Of even greater importance may have been Ursinus's freedom from ecclesiastical control. There was no governing authority above that of the college's independent, self-perpetuating board of directors. Early catalog copy declared for a breadth of religious inclusiveness and against narrow sectarianism. The 1881 catalog said that the faculty watched over the religious welfare of students "in no sectarian spirit, but in full accordance with an enlarged charity which recognizes the claims of all branches of the Evangelical Protestant church, as the only representative of Christian Catholicity." Bomberger may have drawn the line on Roman Catholics in his view of Christendom, but he took in more of the flock than other Protestant denominational leaders of his time.

The 1891 catalog copy may have come from a pen other than Bomberger's, for it uses some new language; but it reaffirms the openness:

"Apostolic Christianity" was the biblically centered expression of Reformed theology championed by Bomberger in the controversies leading to the founding of Ursinus. It lacked the disciplinary rigidity that might have come to Ursinus if the college had been under the control of an ecclesiastical body. The college was never a creature of Bomberger's denomination, the German Reformed Church. From the start, it was free of church control. The catalog of 1881 pointedly informed its prospective students that Ursinus was "not under any formal Ecclesiastical or Synodical control." It went on to say, however, that it had the "approval and endorsement" of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States. The need for
the distinction lay in the rift that the Bomberger movement had made in the Reformed church leading up to the college's founding. But for this review, it is important because it emphasizes Ursinus's independent status.

This cursory look at catalogs of the past shows that the parochial purpose of Ursinus established conditions from the outset that would allow its professional practice to advance with less intrusion than might be found at colleges more closely identified with particular religious organizations. At the same time, it shows that the freedom of the college from narrow doctrine did not release it from a persistent compulsion to shape the social behavior of students.

Indeed, the very lack of discipline by an ecclesiastical authority allowed programming for moral education to veer away from the religious emphasis found at the outset. As academic disciplines gained identity in their own right, and were thought of less as instruments of moral education, the college had little difficulty in shifting to social behavior as the expression of its parochial purpose—that is, toward the "collegiate way." The college was free to redefine this purpose pretty much as circumstances demanded. This became critically important in the late 1960s, when President Helfferich undertook to draw over the purpose of the institution a cloak of secular conservative ideology unimagined by his religiously oriented predecessors.

By 1970, the purpose to shape the social behavior of students might have appeared to be unconnected to the original parochial purpose embodied in "Apostolic" or "low church" Christianity. But as this sampling of catalog copy suggests, there was a line of descent. The debate over principles and priorities from 1970 to 1976 demanded much time and energy partly because of past institutional experience. The college had clearly tilted to favor the professional practice of the scholarly disciplines at the expense of its parochial purpose. Its parochial purpose, on the other hand, still counted for something, although it manifested itself now in social rather than in religious terms. Many felt that it informed the unique style of the college, its ethos.

***

Dennis O'Brien, former president of Bucknell University and the University of Rochester, usefully provided us with a supplemental view of the parochial purpose of colleges in an article entitled "The Disappearing Moral Curriculum" (The Key Reporter, Vol 61, No. 4, Summer 1997). His study complements the above analysis of piety and the collegiate way at Ursinus by describing the old curriculum of "mental discipline." That curriculum--dubbed the "moral curriculum" by O'Brien--combined with religious piety and the collegiate way in support of the parochial purpose of nineteenth century colleges.

When he read the old catalogs of a group of colleges, O'Brien found what he calls the "moral curriculum" of a century ago. The moral curriculum centered on study of the Bible and the classics. Its reason for being was to recover from the canon, both sacred and profane, the truth about human life. By imitating in class the best ideas about life and by practicing these ideas outside class, students would become morally upright and socially productive citizens by the time they graduated.

O'Brien explains that the moral curriculum weakened and changed under the pressure of the research revolution in universities. Taking place in the second half of the nineteenth century, just as many liberal arts colleges were opening and dedicating themselves to the moral curriculum, the research revolution set up a powerful counterforce. It began transforming study of the traditional canon into the study of new intellectual disciplines. It began making
researchers into professionals with primary allegiance to their disciplines. The objective of the new disciplines and their new professional practitioners was not to facilitate recovery of received truth. The objective was to discover truth piece by piece through the emerging methods of inquiry in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Philosophically, the new professional practice posited that final truth was currently unattainable, a future goal laboriously to strive for. This contrasted with the certainty of truth on which the moral curriculum, with its definitive interpretations of the Bible and the classics, rested.

For O'Brien, the contradiction between recovery of certain truth in the moral curriculum and discovery of a conditional and problematic truth in the modern professional disciplines explains the metamorphosis of curricular objective in the colleges he surveyed. For us, his findings augment our account of piety and the collegiate way at Ursinus.
THEMES FROM THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

Generalizations about the history of American colleges are difficult to make because the country has never had a single source of educational philosophy or followed a uniform path of development. Colleges had diverse origins and individual paths of development. Nevertheless, the accounts by historians give us a workable understanding of the main outlines of their development. From these accounts, we are able to draw several significant themes that bear upon the two complementary and sometimes conflicting ideas at play in the Ursinus disputes of the 1970-1976 period.¹

1. FOUNDATIONS IN RELIGIOUS PIETY

From the founding of Harvard in 1636 to about the time of the Civil War, there was hardly a doubt about the purpose of evangelical Protestant colleges in America. They were the offspring of religion. Their founders believed in a Christian (usually Calvinist) view of the world and the heaven beyond. They started colleges to serve that view. These Christian leaders held that the human soul activated a composite of "faculties." Intellectual was just one faculty. Another essential faculty was variously thought of as the emotions or the will, those inclinations that led to right or wrong behavior. It was the duty of Christians to discipline all the faculties of the young as a way of serving and ultimately saving their souls. They considered it essential to discipline both the intellectual and the moral faculties. If the intellectual faculties developed without a corresponding development of the moral faculties, an imbalance in the soul would result. The person so educated would be prone to use his intellectual skills for evil purposes. The correct program of education would avoid such a graceless outcome; it would produce graduates whose faculties of intellect and emotion were properly disciplined. They would have learned that "earthly knowledge reflected ultimate truths."² They would go forth to serve the higher purposes in society as fully formed Christian believers.³

The president of Trinity College (later Duke University) put the matter concisely in

---

¹ This overview depends on the following works:

² Veysey 26.
³ Veysey 22-24. "Taken together, the faculties constituted the divine recipe for a successful human being. If one or more of the elements were stunted, the result would be grotesque. It was particularly important that the intellect not gain an absurdly ill-balanced maturity at the expense of one's other capabilities." (23)
1868: "Without religion, a college is a curse to society."[^4] Another president, at Amherst College, in 1872 said, "Character...is of more consequence than intellect."[^5]

Succinctly stated, the everyday objective in this age of "mental discipline" was, in the words of one historian, "the inculcation of moral character in a religious context."[^6]

The expressly religious purposes of American colleges gradually declined through the nineteenth century. The pervasive importance of new science, particularly Darwin's theory of evolution, the higher criticism of the Bible coming out of Germany, growing wealth and comfort in a growing democratic nation, the establishment of purely secular public institutions—all combined with other developments to displace religious piety with a more secular tone and style.[^7] Presidents in the beginning had almost all been members of the clergy. As the nineteenth century progressed, fewer came from the clergy and more from the rising class of academic professionals. Furthermore, colleges rarely imposed denominational tests on their applicants, giving the student bodies a more ecumenical or non-sectarian flavor than the sponsors of the colleges themselves might have envisioned.[^8] Jencks & Riesman, applying their special notion of natural selection to the life cycle of colleges, characterize many of the denominational reasons for starting a college as "freakish and almost random," as if they were merely mutations in the natural order. If the colleges survived, in their view, it was owing to their adaptiveness through the process of natural selection over time, not to their origins.[^9]

Still, the legacy of the religious purposes of colleges remained evident long after the pietistic style faded. Combined with the idea of mental discipline, this legacy later revealed itself in notions of educating "the whole person" and of educating students for "service."[^10]

### 2. THE CURRICULUM OF "MENTAL DISCIPLINE"

American colleges through much of the nineteenth century gave their students a course of study designed to discipline their intellectual faculties, using prescribed texts. In the beginning, colonial colleges borrowed the classical curriculum of Oxford and Cambridge virtually intact. Religion and the classics thus went hand in hand. The Enlightenment, the spirit of the Revolution, and pragmatic impulses in a new land gradually diluted and changed the emphasis on Latin, Greek, and Hebrew in varying ways at many colleges. However, the core of the old curriculum of mental discipline, which in

[^4]: Rudolph, *History* 139.
[^5]: Rudolph, *History* 139
[^7]: Schmidt 41.
[^8]: Jencks & Riesman 325.
[^9]: Jencks & Riesman 3-4. J&R return to their Darwinian metaphor much later when they discuss the decline of denominationalism at the hands of rising secularism and professionalism: "The net result of...changes in the internal dynamics and external pressures on Protestant colleges was that while most started out as narrowly sectarian establishments very few remained that way. In part this was probably a matter of natural selection. Colleges founded to preserve a particular kind of orthodoxy had a much lower life expectancy than colleges whose founders possessed a more expansive and more academic view of their role." (327)
[^10]: Veysey 54.
turn buttressed religion, remained intact for much of the nineteenth century in most places. It received renewed life when in 1828 the "Yale Report on the Classics" presented a ringing defense of the classical curriculum against the rising desire for more practical courses. The Yale Report rejected stirrings at Harvard and the University of Virginia against the classics and for modern subjects relevant to the interests of a developing America. It limited the curriculum to the classics, mathematics, and philosophy, while conceding the cultural values of science. Yale declared for the old goal of education--"the discipline and the furniture of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge," with the emphasis on discipline. Discipline meant the study of the same texts through class recitations in a traditional order, with no electives. As small colleges opened and developed across America, the majority followed the powerful example of Yale. The classical tradition remained entrenched until after the Civil War, despite some abortive attempts at change at such places as Brown University and the University of Michigan.

But in the years after the Civil War, innovations precipitated by growing academic professionalism and new national values eroded the hegemony of the classical tradition. Yet, its reverence for the best that was thought and said, its commitment to "hard" recitation, its freedom from changing fashions, and its authoritative stance on cultural taste left lasting marks in American colleges. These marks remained visible and influential long after college curricula moved toward electives, modern subjects, and experimental methods. Most notably, the old classical tradition of mental discipline perpetuated the humanistic reverence for the classics. When the influence of modern "liberal culture" arose in American colleges and universities, its advocates could look to the old tradition as a complement or an antecedent. They could even view the Yale Report of 1828, the ultimate voice of traditional authority, as an influence in the making of "liberal culture." We will look more fully at "liberal culture" as a historical development in a subsequent paragraph.

3. "THE COLLEGIATE WAY"

If mental discipline determined the experience of students in the old American college classroom, an equally demanding discipline ruled their lives when they were not reciting in class. This style of residential living, usefully dubbed "the collegiate way" by one historian, was essential for disciplining the emotional faculty of students, just as the classical curriculum was essential for disciplining their intellectual faculty. Its reason for being, aside from practical necessities, lay in the same religious view of the soul and its faculties that inspired the classical curriculum. A remnant of the old collegiate way peeps

---

11 Rudolph, History 131. Also, Schmidt 54-58.
12 Rudolph, History 132.
13 Veysey 54.
14 Veysey 194.
15 Rudolph, History 194-5: "The Yale Report was a magnificent assertion of the humanist tradition and therefore eventually of unquestionable importance in liberating the American college from an excessive religious orientation. In the meantime, however, the/report gave a convincing defensive weapon to people who wanted the colleges to stay as they were."
16 Rudolph, History 87-109. This is an entire chapter under the rubric of "The Collegiate Way."
out at us from the idealized promotional pictures of today's residential colleges. But the ancestral original had a sterner appearance: it aimed at moral suasion, not consumer satisfaction. New Englanders at the start imported the collegiate way from England, where students and tutors lived in rural isolation from the city. Americans found the residential model to be compatible with their sparsely populated surroundings as well as their pedagogical goals.

Above all else, the old colleges tried to put all students into a common educational experience. The point was to expose all of them equally to the influences that would discipline and form their behavior as well as their minds as good citizens and devout Christians. The common social experience of the collegiate way and the common academic experience of the prescribed classical curriculum went hand in hand. The collegiate way was the mortar that solidified the complete educational offering. Like the prescribed course of studies, by compelling all students to strive together, it created a social bond among classmates that prevented them from becoming "one-sided." The rural isolation, common purpose, and intimate regimen of the collegiate way moved educators to speak of the old college as a large family.

In typical Victorian fashion, the old college, as family, thrived on a mixture of paternalistic nurturing and stern regimentation. The residence halls and commons (dining halls) in a quiet sylvan environment, away from distractions, were the principal settings for the care of students. Here the college authorities vigilantly saw to the living arrangements because of the value of each developing Christian soul. They typically expressed their paternalistic concern for students' welfare, however, by minutely regimenting their lives. "The hallmark of the college disciplinarian was an elaborate codification of rules and regulations," reports one historian.

Colleges used all manner of means to control the animal spirits of their tight little communities of students. A widespread tool was the application of religious restraint to student behavior. Even the more liberal institutions attempted to keep students under control by bringing theology into the everyday presence of the students. The centerpiece of regimentation was compulsory attendance at chapel. Here in the beginning the
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17 Rudolph, History 87.
18 Veysey 40. Veysey here discusses how opponents of course electives argued for prescription on the grounds that it gave a socially beneficial common experience to students. The same argument supported the collegiate way.
19 Jencks & Riesman, 29-30. "The nineteenth-century college was in many ways a logical extension of the nineteenth-century family. Colleges tended to be small, financially shaky, and extremely authoritarian. The life of the mind was not unknown, but neither was it usually central." See also Rudolph, History 88: "For the adherents of that tradition, the college was 'a large family, sleeping, eating, studying, and worshipping together under one roof.'"
20 Veysey 33. Veysey elaborates: "A glance at college rules during the decade after 1865 reveals the extreme particularity with which the conduct of students was prescribed. At Harvard the listing of such regulations required eight pages of fine print. Students there were prohibited from leaving the college on Sundays without special permission, and they were forbidden to lotter in groups anywhere on college property."
21 Schmidt 87. Schmidt suggests that presidents and faculties stood not only in loco parentis but also, by inference, in loco dei. They made use "of morning and evening prayers to appeal to the better instincts of their captive audience, or to threaten them with the wrath of God." Jencks & Riesman depict the steady decline of this robust chapel life through the nineteenth century (326).
founders preached their faith. As colleges accepted students outside the founding denomination and as narrow piety lost favor through the nineteenth century, compulsory chapel weakened but did not disappear. Rather, it evolved in many colleges into a discipline for "family" unity instead of devotional purposes. Over time, it also became voluntary at many Protestant colleges.

The heavy-handed paternalism of the early colleges, justified by a Calvinist religious view of humankind, could work against the intellectual potential among students. The debating clubs and literary societies initiated by students themselves counterbalanced this effect of the collegiate way on intellectual vitality. With roots in the eighteenth century Enlightenment, such student groups arose outside the official concept of the collegiate way. They enriched the intellectual and social experiences of students. Colleges accepted them once they came into being (a process repeated later in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when students brought Greek-letter fraternities and athletics to the collegiate scene). This receptivity to change also led colleges over time to moderate the excessive rules and to treat students more like would-be gentlemen and less like depraved sinners.

After the Civil War, new winds from within the nation and from Europe were bringing revolutionary changes to institutions of higher learning. The emergence of the modern American university and a new academic professionalism were chief among the forces that modified the conditions for pursuing the collegiate way of a simpler era. Eventually they altered even the style of colleges that did not expand into universities.

However, as the contemporary glossy promotional pictures illustrate, the ideal of the collegiate way persisted. Many presidents and faculty by 1970 would not have connected it with its roots in religious piety and the pedagogical philosophy of "mental discipline." That did not prevent them from seeking to perpetuate the more visible features of the collegiate way, however disconnected those features might have become from their roots. To the extent that they valued the residential experience for undergraduates, academic leaders and faculty of 1970 envisioned something like the old collegiate way in action, modified to accommodate new tastes and new freedoms.

4. THE RISE OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

Before the Civil War, the professors in American colleges for the most part were not
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22 Veysey 204. "Compulsory chapel was long kept at many of the small colleges, as well as at Princeton and Yale, but more for the purpose of maintaining a unified student 'spirit' than from unambiguously pious inclinations."
23 Jencks & Riesman 326.
24 Schmidt 97-100. Rudolph 137-138. Rudolph finds a greater commitment to intellectuality in the student organizations than in the college course of studies: "The classroom, while officially dedicated to disciplining and furnishing the mind, was in reality far better at molding character and at denying intellect rather than refining it. The literary societies, on the other hand, owed their allegiance to reason, and...they imparted a tremendous vitality to the intellectual life of the colleges..." (138)
25 Rudolph, History 106-7. "...before the nineteenth century was half over, many of the leading institutions had abandoned the strict discipline and the extended code of laws which had characterized so many of the colleges."
"professionals" in their subjects. Normally they were members of the clergy who believed that by serving knowledge and truth in the college classroom, "they were serving the cause of religion" itself. Instructors with varying degrees of mastery could handle the regimented system of class recitation that typified the old college course. This method of instruction supported the objective of "mental discipline." It was a generic exercise that in theory would equip a student for any vocational pursuit after college. Clergy-instructors, of course, knew the link between their own classical studies and their pastoral vocation, which depended on knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. In the old college the professors espoused a Christian world view and felt no conflict between it and the subjects that they taught. Professors could even teach modern science comfortably within a religious world view, certain that the truths of the natural world reflected ultimate Christian truth. They identified themselves first not as practitioners of a subject matter but as enlightened Christian gentlemen. They were mostly innocent of the idea that they had a right to academic freedom to profess their subjects as they thought best. Indeed, they served at the pleasure of the president and typically avoided a fight with the institution and moved elsewhere if conflict arose.

After the Civil War, this picture of professors in American colleges changed. Numerous developments caused the change.

Mental discipline declined as the defining purpose and method of colleges. The methods of modern science—laboratory experimentation, lecture, and advanced seminar—claimed increasing allegiance. Many old colleges entered a road that would transform them into accommodating habitats for such methods. They became modern universities with graduate degree programs and an array of separate schools and institutes. Harvard led the way under the leadership of Charles W. Eliot, who began his long presidency in 1869. New institutions arose that were committed from the outset to a definition of scholarship unknown in the old colleges. Among the pacesetters were Johns Hopkins University, founded in 1876, and Cornell University, which opened in 1868 to fulfill the wish of its benefactor, Ezra Cornell: "I would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study." New state universities, fueled by funds from the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, dedicated themselves to utilitarian fields of study removed from the narrow limits of the old classical curriculum, these areas required professors who

26 Jencks & Riesman 6
27 Rudolph, History 159.
28 Veysey 37. "The recitation was not a discussion group in the twentieth-century sense; it was utterly alien to the spirit of Socratic byplay. Rather it was an oral quiz, nearly an hour in length, held five times per week throughout the academic year. Its purpose was to discover whether each student had memorized a grammatical lesson assigned him the day before."
29 Veysey 39.
30 Veysey 26. Veysey's discussion of the orthodox view of God and man describes the reflection of ultimate knowledge in earthly knowledge: "The universe was orderly as well as being divinely ruled. Knowledge led to the comprehension of law, and law, despite the exceptional interpositions of miracle, made of creation something glorious. Insofar as the college furnished the mind as well as sharpening it, it could do so with a firm sense of propriety born of reverence."
31 Veysey 47.
32 Jencks & Riesman 6.
33 Quoted in Rudolph, History 266.
commanded special expertise.  
Far-reaching pedagogical change lay behind these broad institutional developments. Enterprising Americans came to emulate the advanced research methods of German universities, with their focus on laboratories, lectures, and seminars, and with their goal of objective truth. (That Americans seemed to misunderstand the German research ethos did not diminish their enthusiasm for it.) They borrowed from Bismarckian Germany a belief in the mystique of disinterested scholarship, which subjected sacred as well as secular texts to the rigors of the higher criticism. This combined with the influence of Darwin's theory of evolution to affect both the content of the curriculum and the academic approach to truth. Fueling all the changes was an American bullishness about democracy and service in a nation embarked on an unprecedented experiment in self-government.

The emergence of universities and their new pedagogical priorities paralleled the emergence of "a new kind of professor." The university became the home of the expert in a well-defined discipline. This "rise to power of the academic profession" in the view of Jencks & Riesman in 1968 constituted nothing less than an "academic revolution" in the twentieth century. They found that the central significance of this revolution was that it placed the academic profession solidly behind the rise of meritocracy in American society. Professors correspondingly became less committed to the old role of student disciplinarian in a parochial setting. Academic professionals who earned the Ph.D. came to define their academic disciplines and subdisciplines through national and regional meetings and journals. They reinforced their commonality with peers through an informal system of job placement. Jencks & Riesman found that "large numbers of Ph.D.s now regard themselves almost as independent professionals like doctors or lawyers, responsible primarily to themselves and their colleagues rather than their employers, and committed to the advancement of knowledge rather than of any particular institution."

Not every old college became the nucleus of a university, and not every college teacher became a publishing scholar. Nevertheless, the emergence of universities and the rise of the academic professionals dominated the story of American higher education in the twentieth century. The academic values of the professionalized faculty trained in a university setting affected most of higher education.
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34 Schmidt 148.
35 Veysey 133.
36 Veysey 61-2. Veysey's entire chapter on "Utility" explores the pervasiveness of "real life" in the emerging universities of the late nineteenth century.
37 Schmidt 147. Schmidt describes the academic professional of the latter part of the nineteenth century as "a new type of teacher and research specialist who explored a limited segment of some science or art and passed on his findings in lectures to his students or in publications to the world at large."
38 Jencks & Riesman xiii.
39 Jencks & Riesman 12. With meritocracy came what J&R call "the national upper-middle class style: cosmopolitan, moderate, universalistic, somewhat legalistic, concerned with equity and fair play, aspiring to neutrality between regions, religions, and ethnic groups."
40 Jencks & Riesman 38. "Professors at the better universities and university colleges are usually scholars or at least pseudo-scholars and have much less emotional investment in their students' social and moral development than did professors a century ago."
41 Jencks & Riesman 14.
42 Jencks & Riesman 27. "While the old special-interest colleges and the energies they embody may give the present much of its flavor, they do little to shape the future. The model for the future is the university
By the time America entered World War II, academic professionals from the graduate schools of American universities taught the majority of the nation's college students. The academic professionals had a transforming effect not just within the universities but also on colleges that did not become universities. While they retained the appearances associated with the collegiate way and still occupied themselves with the social and moral development of students, those colleges became internally more departmentalized and less homogeneous. Localisms, denominational ties, and provincial attitudes, while surviving, came under increasing pressure from the more cosmopolitan presence of academic professionals. This contributed to an institutional tension unfamiliar in the old college of the nineteenth century.

The rise to power of the academic professionals—with their allegiance to cosmopolitanism and meritocracy—had a particularly strong effect in what became the leading "terminal" colleges (those that did not add graduate programs and attain university status). Along with undergraduate schools of arts and sciences within universities, they developed into "university colleges" primarily concerned with the undergraduate preparation of students bound for graduate school.

The academic revolution thus turned the top five percent or so of undergraduate colleges into national institutions, largely dedicated to giving academic professionals a venue for preparing students for graduate study at a university. (This priority, however, never eliminated their intentions to offer a high-quality terminal undergraduate experience.) At other colleges, special priorities based on local traditions, along with limited resources and leadership, kept ambitions at more modest levels. Yet, many of them aspired to be more like the national leaders—or yielded to the demands of competitive pressures to be so. As their faculties became a composite of academic professionals from graduate schools around the nation, they changed to one degree or another. The claims of their denominational ties and of the remaining "collegiate way" grew less insistent as the expectations for academic distinction, pushed by their more cosmopolitan faculties, grew greater. By the time they did their research, Jencks & Riesman found that "virtually all terminal colleges want to hire faculty of the kind now hired by the university colleges." Significantly, they also observed that it was secondary "whether or not these faculty come out of the subculture to which a college has traditionally been tied." Professionalism overrode the local allegiances of homegrown professors (without, presumably, erasing their sentimental warmth for old school ties).

Mainstream Protestant colleges were in the vanguard of those that became university colleges with aspirations to national or seminational status. Jencks & Riesman found that they were "caught up in the academic revolution and have accepted the academic profession's views about what, how, and whom a college should teach." They found also
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43 Jencks & Riesman 21.
44 Jencks & Riesman 21.
45 Jencks & Riesman 24.
46 Jencks & Riesman 24.
47 Jencks & Riesman 25.
48 Jencks & Riesman 25.
that the influence of clergy by 1968 had become correspondingly minimal. The effect at such colleges was that "academic work came to be seen as an independent activity, to be evaluated in its own terms rather than in terms set by a religious denomination. The eventual result was that professors were selected for their academic competence rather than for their theological views or moral probity." 50

These generalizations about the role of the academic professionals in the changing American college gloss over many gradations and distinctions, as Jencks & Riesman attest. Meritocracy was not unalloyed or universal. They reported the existence of colleges where faculties still included no scholars or even anyone who had studied under a scholar. As in non-academic pursuits, they identified "many roads into the lower levels of professional practice, and on some of them academic competence counts for less than persistence and animal cunning." 51 But the dominant effect of the academic revolution was clear across the broad front of American higher education. Any college with any aspirations could not escape the reality of power lodged in academic professionals, who pursued paths determined more by their graduate training than by the colleges that employed them.

The Emphasis on Learning Derived from Scientific Research

Much of the story about the emergence of academic professionalism focuses upon the development of the natural science and social science disciplines from the 1880s onward. Practitioners in the natural sciences gave new importance to the rigorous methods of experimental science. The scientific "spirit of inquiry" became an increasingly dominant note not only in the study of the material world but also increasingly in the study of society, history, and language. 52 The essence of this spirit was a zeal for investigation—for finding objective and enduring truths about the experienced world. The methods of modern scientific research, at the same time, fostered certain values—honesty, hard work, and impartiality. 53 These correlated with some of the goals of the old residential college, but stood on their own without the underlying justifications of religious doctrine. The emphasis on scientific research in the universities drove the trend toward specialization of knowledge. It also created a new confidence that the human intellect, through inductive investigation, would make permanent additions to the sum of human knowledge of the world—a characteristic note of optimism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. 54

In the twentieth century, investigative research leading to the Ph.D. became the standard mode of preparation for college teachers in all disciplines, not just the sciences, as Jencks & Riesman documented. Those with the inclination and aptitude for a

---

49 Jencks & Riesman 322.
50 Jencks & Riesman 323.
51 Jencks & Riesman 20.
52 Veysey 135.
53 Veysey 139.
54 Veysey 142. Veysey usefully links specialization and the growth of graduate-level academic departments justified by research (142-144). The consequence of their emphasis on research was that "the old-time professor who was jack-of-all-disciplines rapidly disappeared from all but the bypassed small colleges" (142). He then elaborates on the second revolutionary effect of research, that of confidence in human intellect piece by piece to discover lasting truth (144-149). "...academic believers in research revealed a confidence that knowledge could be firmly unearthed. Facts had to be sought for painstakingly, and on the basis of concrete evidence, but they could be progressively discovered." (145)
continuing life of investigation in their specialty stayed in the university milieu. Others saw the Ph.D. as a terminal license for college teaching and gravitated to the undergraduate colleges. Although their first calling was to teach, they brought to that work the habits of mind and disciplinary definitions acquired in their graduate departments.

The spirit of scientific study led to the development of modern social science disciplines in the post-Civil War universities. A new class of professionals arose in those areas of study as well as in the "hard" sciences. Economists, historians, sociologists, political scientists, and anthropologists replaced the old college presidents in the curriculum of mental discipline. That is, they came to deal with the subject matter once the province of the course in "moral philosophy" typically taught from a moralistic viewpoint by the clergymen-president. The faculty in the social sciences, like their counterparts in the sciences and the humanities, became professionalized through their graduate preparation in the universities. Because they dealt with issues of human social behavior, they were also, to some extent, the heirs to an older attitude of "service." As such, their courses sometimes reinforced the moralistic goals of undergraduate colleges while they remained fully professional in their allegiance to their disciplines. However, the moral certitude of the old course in moral philosophy yielded to a more disinterested approach to knowledge about society.55

**The Emphasis on Learning Derived from Liberal Culture**

Research on the modern scientific model was not the unchallenged single agent in the making of the modern academic profession and its strong graduate school departments. In the late nineteenth century and after, academics outside the sciences pursued an idea of "liberal culture" in their fields that had an important effect upon American higher education, especially in the undergraduate colleges. This idea is the root of the modern emphasis on undergraduate "liberal education" or "general education." It arose after the old American college, dedicated to mental and social discipline in a religious context, declined. It arose more particularly in reaction to the spread of science, with its emphasis on empirical research, and to the utilitarian purposes to which universities were turning. In historical terms, the movement accompanied the appearance before 1900 of university departments of modern languages, English literature (as opposed to philology), and philosophy— the core of what today we call the humanities.56

At the heart of the difference between leaders of the study of liberal culture and their scientific colleagues lay their approach to truth. Those in investigative research were seeking to discover general laws about the material universe by the disciplined study of particulars. Influenced by Hegelian idealism, the early advocates of liberal culture thought that a person judiciously exposed to the evidences of Western civilization would discern an Absolute, the universal mind.57 In both approaches, the scholar scrutinized discrete subject matter. But each began his scrutiny with an opposing idea about the nature of the outcome. In the case of a successful scientific search, scholars would take one of a thousand steps toward the discovery of the world. In the case of a successful examination of cultural evidence, humanists would reach an underlying and unified truth that
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56 Veysey 181-183.
57 Veysey 192.
transcended time, place, and person. The details of the Absolute, though presumably approachable, remained somewhat shrouded, and they were free of residual denominational definitions. With their presuppositions about the Absolute, however, humanists could feel above the pedestrian struggle of science to get at particular truths. "The idea that natural science might account for the whole of reality remained as unacceptable to men of culture as it had to the religiously orthodox."

Certain educational consequences flowed from the philosophical idealism that launched liberal culture in the early modern university. It sought to rescue the Latin and Greek classics, the centerpiece of the old college curriculum, for their proper place as the centerpieces of civilized culture, but no longer harnessed to religious goals. It committed the humanists to identifying a canon of the best literary and philosophical expression in Western civilization—the artistic avenues by which one approached enduring truths. The need for students to study "the best" led to the need for course requirements and resistance to an all-elective system such as that initiated at Harvard under Charles W. Eliot. It provided a platform for the charismatic lecturer, who replaced the old supervisor of recitation. The idiosyncratic professors who had a special insight into the significance of literary works and who gave memorable classroom performances with their "gifted tongues" came into their own. Such professors exemplified the value of cultivated breadth. They held the study of humankind to be superior to the study of mere matter.

At the extreme, the movement for liberal culture led in the twentieth century to what Jencks & Riesman labeled "anti-university" movements. By this they meant expressions of resistance to the hegemony of the research-oriented academic profession based in the universities. Among the best-known examples of liberal culture at the level of anti-university resistance within the university were the Columbia program of general education in the 1920s, Robert Hutchins's "Great Books" program at the University of Chicago in the 1930s, and Harvard's Committee on General Education in the 1940s. Jencks & Riesman end a review of the numerous small-college anti-university initiatives with a rather negative assessment of their ability to make a difference in the larger scheme of things. "The disciplines, like other forms of chauvinism, have proved more durable than many reformers anticipated."

In a certain sense, liberal culture in the college and university seemed to represent a link with the old American college, with its moralistic and religious priorities. Liberal culture implied when it did not assert a set of values that emerged out of ancient Greece and developed through the Christian era into cultural fixities. American academic men of letters at the turn of the century, in Veysey's view, "made a religion out of civilization."
Yet, this tendency to connect with an underlying ethical Absolute did not prevent the professors in the humanities from valuing the free exercise of intellect as such. They sought "to associate intellect with imagination and intuition rather than with tedious research into particulars," as Woodrow Wilson said at Princeton.\textsuperscript{66} In brief, liberal culture, despite some connections with the old college, developed as a special case of the academic revolution. It was not a throwback to an older pietistic time.\textsuperscript{67} The ideas of culture and civilization no doubt perpetuated a concern in the modern college for the moral behavior of students. But the basis for that concern now resided in the humanistic disciplines themselves rather than in religious piety. The practitioners of liberal culture would have softened the heavy-handed paternalism of the old way.

Reflecting on these several themes from the history of American colleges, we might recall the metaphor of natural selection loosely employed by Jencks & Riesman. Adaptation in the interest of survival is an untidy process. The evolution of American colleges did not follow a neat outline. The decline of one theme and the rise of another in that evolution occurred at any given institution in obedience to peculiar inner tendencies as well as strong outward imperatives. No two institutional patterns were identical in their details, however similar they might appear to the historian seeking to generalize. As in nature's messy way, an early educational adaptation did not usually disappear without a trace in favor of a newer and more efficient adaptation. It left its evidence somewhere in the culture of the college, however disguised it may have become. A college's educational themes persisted together, the new building on top of the old, sometimes superseding it, sometimes transforming it, and sometimes enabling it to continue existing in some new way. A college could preserve and innovate at the same time, making of itself an amalgam of old and new.

\textsuperscript{66} Veysey 212

\textsuperscript{67} Veysey 197. "...the camp of liberal culture evinced a cosmopolitanism which set it sharply apart from the insulated (or at best Scottish) piety of the mid-century college divines. Thus the academic outlooks which were most European in their perspectives were those of [liberal] culture and research...."