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Today is February 28, 2006. This is Karen Blair, about to interview Dr. Ed Harrington.

I've jotted a few notes down here – my own history.

Good.

I joined San Jose – then State College – in 1955, and it was interesting – while I had received a letter of appointment from the President, Dr. Wallquist, I was appointed by the State Board of Education. That still was, in effect, a large Normal School. Really can’t get around it. Even though we had Engineering, and Technology, and everything else. It took two years to get tenure. Just then, the Bachelor arrives and Education degree was out except for those currently enrolled – and that would be the Bachelor of Arts in Education in Biology, for instance, that Central had. And the M.Ed.s were out except for those currently enrolled, and I suppose [inaudible] a Master’s degree in Administration, or there was a Bachelor of Education degree for people in pre-school, and elementary school up through the third grade.

Did you teach Biology there?

Yes.

And did you have an advanced degree at that time?

Ph.D.

From?

Cornell.

Cornell. Are you a New Yorker?

No, I’m from Greenfield, Massachusetts, through Cornell, to California, and up here to Central.

Was your Bachelor’s – all your degrees at Cornell?

No, no. Bachelor’s and Master’s were at Tufts.

Tufts.

But anyway, the lab schools were also on the way out, and they had Divisions, not Schools. Interesting enough, there were, I think, maybe 16 or 17 – I think up to 19 at the time – State Colleges in California, and then the University of California system, and all but one President had an Ed.D – no Ph.Ds. And in the time I was there, they replaced all the Ed.Ds with Ph.Ds, and they hired a lot of Liberal Arts faculty, all of whom proclaimed that now we were a Liberal Arts College, which we weren’t. We were a comprehensive University, not a Liberal Arts College.

Attendance at the President’s meetings were [sic] also obligatory. If the Presidents held a meeting you had to go, and you were handed a card at the door, and you had to sign it, and drop it in the box. For
graduation, the Deans took attendance. If you weren’t there, you were docked a day’s pay, theoretically. That was pretty impressive, watching 1500 people with caps and gowns marching to graduation, but –

KB: Was this in the Fifties, or did it continue – you stayed ‘til ’68, there?

EH: I was there until 1970. No, it changed. It was practically in the first three or four years that I was there – very, very radically.

KB: So you’re describing the beginning years.

EH: Yes, I am. Very definitely. Anyway, you’ve got my record that came in with the notice about the files up in the library. I think about eight years later I’d made full professor, and I was quite happy. I was going to have my summers off to do research, or something, and I got called to the President’s office – Dr. Robert Clark – and he told me, “You’re the new Associate Dean of the College.” No, no, no – I don’t want administration. I told him I had classes of 200 and 100, and I had the Mamology [?] class, and the lab, and the lab for the Natural Science class, and I couldn’t do it. He said, “No, you’re it, and all your classes have been taken care of. You start Monday.” That doesn’t sound like affirmative action. [Laughs] The search was pretty – pretty determined.

KB: It sounds like your predecessor was fired rather quickly.

EH: No, it was a new position created to develop the first Academic Master Plan for the College, and that was the term that gave me, Associate Dean, which would be an Executive Vice President, then there was the Dean of the Faculty, and then the Associate Dean. I –

KB: And what year was that? How long had you been there?

EH: That was – I don’t know – about 1970 – ’63, been there, I think – it’s in that record that I gave you that’s written. Later on, after I was all done – it was very flattering – told me the reason he had hired somebody from Science was Sydney Hook. Sydney Hook’s History of Education – do you know the name?

KB: Yes.

EH: Well he gave me the copy and said, “Read this,” and in it there was a passage that said if you want somebody to do planning in a College or University, get someone from Science. And he called the Science area, and I guess I was seen as the pigeon, because he said that he called six or eight departments, and he only got one name. So that was flattering. So I did it, and then I figured well, after one year I’d get out.

KB: Had you Chaired your department?

EH: In the summers, but no, I didn’t want any part of administration, and I got out at the end of that, and he shook my hand and said, “Now I’ve arranged for you to have an interview with the American College of Education Academic Internship Program. So I got interviewed by, of all people, by a fellow by the name of Strong who had just been dropped as President of the University of California at that time – they had pushed him out, and he wished me well, and I had an assignment in Albuquerque, once I got approved, at the University of New Mexico, and I was starting to go out there, and Clark called me in again and said, “You’re the Dean of our new Graduate Studies, in charge of our General Education program. It needs total revision.” Burns became – Burt Burns became an acting President. So I went over to Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and they sent me down to the workshop on Liberal Education – the Danforth Workshop at Colorado Springs – came back, and spent about three years – again, the timetable is here
somewhere – as Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Then Burns, who was the acting President, called me in and said he wanted me to be the new Dean of Academic Planning – to try to combine the Physical Plant and the Academic areas, which were kind of beating heads. And I had no more than been in there, when all of a sudden he calls me in and the fellow who had been named as Vice President for Academic Affairs had left for Hawaii, and he said, “You’re the new Vice President down here on the interim basis.” Now that was the 17th largest school in the country, with 1500 faculty, and I – well I did it, but I wasn’t exactly enthralled, and I particularly wasn’t enthralled when the Cambodian situation hit in the spring of 1970. They had a riot, and riots – you may remember that. I don’t know where you were in 1970. Maybe you were still in school.

KB: I was in college, yeah.

EH: At any rate, I was in the Administration Building and a mob came outside – really a big mob – a nasty scene, so I sent the secretaries home. And I had a retired Naval Commander as my assistant, and we put desks against the door, and I sat down and figured, “We’ll just sit it out. We can’t get out, but we’ll just wait and see what happens.” Pretty soon the phone rang, and it was Harry Braitbell in the Chancellor’s office in California, and he had a team down there who were advising the people in charge at each of the Universities – because there was rioting down, I think, in San Fernando – the Black students took the Vice President away at knife point. It got ugly. Really ugly. And – don’t mind the tears. I just had cataract surgery, and weak eyes, emotionally. At any rate, there was somebody else on the line – we never knew who – from Sacramento – could have been Reagan, could have been [inaudible – could be “Garth”] Riley, who was a Senator – with a message for all of us: we had to have the Administration Buildings cleared out by 5:00. The Chief of Police called up and said, “Ed, I can’t help you. We got wiped out at Stanford last night. They catapulted bricks with a rubber inner-tube, hit one of my officers in the knee, and crippled him for life.” It was, as I say, very, very nasty. And I said, “Well, I’ve got five door-knockers – elderly men, unarmed – security. How would I get them out of the building?” And bless him – fellow down there said – an attorney – said, “At 5:00 go out, and tell them you’re going home, and please leave.” And he said, “Say please. Nobody’s tried it.” And so I went out at 5:00, and was confronted by this very ugly mob, and I said, “Well, I’m going home. Would you please leave?”

“What did you say?”

I said, “Please leave. I’m going home.” And just then a fellow by the name of Nick Kotke, who had been a leader on the campus in all this unrest, had a bullhorn, and he started shouting at them, “Don’t go home. Don’t listen to him.” And then he turned around and put the bullhorn in my ear and blasted it. Really nasty. And as I turned away, then he hit me over the head with it. And the people looked around, and first of all, there was no television there. They had all gone home for the 5:00 report, so they weren’t around, so they couldn’t get on TV. And I knew a number of our students, and they knew I knew them, and they were gone. So I went to the hospital, got checked – got the bruise checked in. Next day I signed a piece of paper complaining, and signed for workman’s compensation, [inaudible] I’d been in the hospital. Nick Kotke got arrested, and his attorney wanted me to write to the judge and tell him, “Oh, the poor fellow – it was an accident that he put the horn there. I bumped into his horn.” And I said, “Oh no.” And I figured, that’s it. I’m through with administration. And then two days later – I had been interviewing here at Central – been nominated up here – two days after that I got a phone call from Central – Brooks – way past the courtesy deadline date – it was probably three months after they interviewed me – offered me the job at Central, and so I took it in August, 1970, and that’s how I got here.

KB: Well that Spring of 1970 must have been one of the scariest times of your life.

EH: Uh, yes, it was scary, believe me, and it was quite different. You’re not used to being assaulted.

KB: Well you must have developed a taste for administration. You say that you were reluctant, but –
EH: Well frankly I wanted out of California. You know, the 17th largest school, 27,000 students, unrest, no place to park, except as Vice President I had a parking space, which was interesting. But when I got there the skies were clear. When I left, if you stood in the middle of the city and looked over towards the Santa Cruz Mountains you couldn’t see the smog. If you looked towards the Mt. Hamilton range you couldn’t see – the smog was 5000 feet deep. Drugs everywhere, hideous traffic, crime – I wanted to get my kids out of there, and I had interviewed up here, and I was quite impressed with the College. I was impressed with the city. I thought, “Gee, it would be just great. It would be a wonderful place.” So we came up here, and Ruthie was unhappy for a year because she’d been so active down there.

KB: What were the qualities that you had that Brooks liked?

EH: I shall be candid. When I got here, the Search Committee told me that I was the second choice – that he’d preferred somebody else who took a job as Vice President of [barely audible – I think it’s “Golden Gate University.”] So I don’t know – he never said. He’d been on the campus, and Phil Dumas had, both of them. It’s an interesting point. Leads to the point later on of another President here at Central. Dumas had walked all over the campus, and he said, “Do you mind if I talk to any student I meet, any civil service person, any faculty member, any administrator, and ask him about you?”

“Go ahead.”

He came back, and he was impressed. Brooks came down, and he did the same thing, and I don’t know – he never said, [inaudible – could be, “like he had, good job.”]

KB: Well what were the aspects of administrative life that you enjoyed and cultivated down there?

EH: Well, getting things done. That was an important consideration. And I just – the summer before the September that I became the Dean of Undergraduate Studies I stood up in our Academic Senate, which would be comparable to the Faculty Senate here, and I said I felt sorry for the student – the freshman coming in – the registration system was an abomination. And I made a commitment (big-mouth) that I would register every single freshman myself if I had to. They gave me two young ladies from the Registrar’s area, we printed up thousands of cards, and asked each department to say which cards do you want to send to them – we weren’t on the computer at the time – so Biology would say, “You need to take Biology, Chemistry, Physics and English. We mailed 2200 students their registration. I went over to Registration that day in the Faculty, well, [makes cheering noises] – very nice, satisfaction. Then – we finally got something done. The next year we started on our first computer registration. And I always enjoyed it when we were able to get something done. It was satisfying, I would say, honestly, if you could get things done. And down at San Jose I was treated kindly, with respect, whereas when I got to Central I became a pariah. The faculty did not like the administration. I can tell you more about that, and some of them were pretty nasty.

KB: Let’s hear.

EH: Well, I can get to that in a minute, here. When I arrived at Central a fellow by the name of Gillam, who had been released as Dean of the Arts and Sciences College, and he advised me not to come. He said Central was an extreme mess. The Gillam case is an interesting one. You might want to get into the history. It happened before I got here. When I got here the school was divided into Arts and Sciences, and Education. There was no definition of the character of the units. I said, “Are these Divisions?”

“No.”

“Are they Schools?”

“No. Don’t you understand? We’re Arts and Sciences. And we’re Education.”
And I said, “Well then what’s Art and Music doing in Education?”

“Oh, we prefer to be in there.”

KB: Well Education had also left its – lost its Dean – Green. Am I right?

EH: No, he left about two years after I got there. No, [inaudible – sounds like “poor John,”] and we had a talk, and he resigned. The Dean’s Counsel – it was formerly the Dean’s Council – D – e – a – n – ’ – s. And they advised Charlie McCann. When I got here, the little sign on the Door said “Deans Counsel” – no apostrophe – and John, when I got here, told me, “Well, welcome aboard. You get a vote, too.” And I said, “I beg your pardon? This is the group that’s going to advise me, and I get a vote? No. I don’t think that’s going to work that way.” And I looked over the group – nice people. The only one who had any outside experience as a Dean was John Green as an Assistant Dean. The rest of them were home-grown.

School situation – they’d had rapid growth with no advising. General Education was not well thought out. I think they thought [sounds like “schedule education”] back then was how you balance a checkbook or change the oil in your car, and I’m literal about that. That was one of the options.

KB: You’re saying the courses were not rigorous.

EH: They were intended to be, but the students had a number of options. You could look in the catalog, and you’ll find – not the sort of Liberal Education that I heard about down at the Danforth Workshop. So the first thing I did was to send Don Schliesman who by then I’d designated as Dean of Undergraduate Studies –

KB: Which was a new post here at Central, too.

EH: Well it had been my Assistant. I re-titled it. Tony Canedo, Ken Hammond, and Hosford from the Biology Department to the Liberal Art Workshop – to the Workshop on Liberal Arts down to Colorado Springs, and we got lucky on that one. They had long-since closed the date for application, and I called up, and the woman in charge of it remembered me, and I said, “Well I’d like to get them in next year.” And she said, “This is the final year.” I said, “Uh-oh.” She said, “I’ll tell you what. You seem to have some problems up there. We’ll take them.” So they went, and they came back, and then Don and the group worked on it, and revised the General Education program.

I didn’t have a budget. I was told that the Dean has control of the budget, which would be Bernie Martin. If I wanted money, see the Dean. Curriculum flow was really confused, and there was a big stack of minor changes on my desk that had been sent to McCann, and I told [inaudible] “Take a rubber stamp and stamp them. I’m not going to go through all these.” They’d already been through the Faculty Senate, and they seemed rather minor. So I brought in a fellow by the name of Hal Hodgkinson as a consultant, and that’s a report that you might want to look for up in the library, because Hal Hodgkinson told me that the feeling against the administration was the most intense he’d ever seen in any school. And he said, “Don’t make a move unless you post your intent on every telephone pole on the campus. Don’t make a move without telling everybody in advance.” He also told me – and this is a good one – it would take ten years before the changes – and I had a list a mile long of changes that I wanted to make – he said, “It’ll take you ten years to accomplish that. Ten years.”

KB: Was he right?

EH: Well, I accomplished the last one at the end of 18 years.

KB: What was that?
EH: Presidential portrait. Did you ever see a school that didn’t have oil paintings of the President? You saw one here. You go over to Seattle University, and here are all the Jesuits in their formal robes in the hall. You get out in the hall, and they’re looking at you from all sides. Every school I knew had oil paintings of the Presidents. It took 18 years to get that done.

KB: What was responsible for this animosity?

EH: Well I think if you want to do the history of Central, you’re going to have to look at the period between 1966 and 1970, when I was not there, and I heard about it only second hand, and I didn’t really push into it. Part of it had to do with the Symposium. The place was awash with money, and they had the Symposium. You’ve heard of that, I’m sure. And I think it became Liberal v. Conservative, and became, with the Viet Nam situation – confrontation between groups of people. And there’s one group that were anti-Brooks. They made that very clear. The other group – I don’t know what they were.

KB: Was Brooks on the Conservative, or the Liberal side?

EH: I would say he was on the Conservative side. If you read the history by Sam Mohler, he had the problem with the Communist leader – the Long Shoresman [?] coming here, and he had to back down on that.

KB: Mm-hmm.

EH: And he was a graduate of Central, and he and – I think I can get at it another way. One of the changes I thought we had to make – it seemed so obvious that if we wanted to get away from the Central Washington College of Education mentality – and they still had a rubber mat out in front of the SUB that said CWCE – that we ought to change the degree designations, which would be a Bachelor of Science in Biology with a parallel sequence of courses in Education if you’re going to be a teacher, which ultimately happened. And he wanted me to talk about some of these proposals to the Deans, and I went in, and I think there were 14 administrators there, or people who were some type of administrative role at Central, and I said, well, the only way to go is to go for your Bachelor of Science, your Bachelor of Arts. And your Bachelor of Arts in Education would be very suitable for pre-school and maybe for the first three years of school – for Elementary teaching. And you could see the icicles forming on the ceiling, and the frost on the window, and I figured every single one of them, including Brooks, had their degree as Bachelor of Arts in Education. Several of them were graduates – Schliesman, Comstock, Martin, and Brooks were all graduates of Central, and here – heresy! I’m insulting them – running down their degrees. Brooks’ conclusion was, “Well there are lots of things you can do with a degree in Education. There’s nothing wrong with that.” And that didn’t change until Garrity got here, and Garrity, coming out of California, was shocked, too. [Sighs.] Oh, I don’t know.

KB: Are you saying that the Biology courses were strictly preparation for school teachers?

EH: Not necessarily. But your degree was Bachelor of Arts in Biology in Education.

KB: I see.

EH: And the emphasis was on Education. The implication was that you would be a teacher, and in fact, I suspect that most of the graduates of Central went into teaching, and it was known as the premiere teacher education school, and it had an image. I went hunting that first year over on the basin, and I met a fellow that didn’t know who I was. I told him who I was, and where I was from, and he said, “You know, my daughter went there, and she’s a teacher, and she thought it was great.” And he said, “I’ve got another daughter, and if she wanted to go into Education I’d send her to Central, but I sent her off to some other school because she didn’t want to be a teacher.” So that was the whole thing. If you wanted to be a teacher, the number one school in the State for Teacher Education, and the old school wanted to keep it that
way. You can’t blame them. They were very proud of it, and they should be. It was good. But the concept of limiting that – I’d had it out with NCATE – you know, the Teacher Education Accrediting Council.

KB: When did that begin?

EH: I’d had it out with them at San Jose State. They came in and they said that if there were going to be teachers, the Education Department would determine what the English curriculum would be. And I said, “No way.” This was when I was the acting Vice President. “The English Department will determine what it takes to be an English major, and I’m sure that they would, in their provisions, knowing that people are going to be teaching, make provision for some course options for people who wanted to be English teachers, to assist them, and work with the Ed Department. But the determination of the major will be made by the major department.” Boy, the fur flew on that one. NCATE, at that time, was pretty adamant that the Education Department should determine what the courses would be. In History – how would you like to be in History, and be told by the Education Department, “This is what you’re going to teach.”

KB: When did NCATE begin to be involved with our campus at Central? Before you came?

EH: No. I have to think back now. Con Potter had had a Master’s Degree in Education, and NCATE came in to review it, and they had serious questions about it, and Con alleged he couldn’t go to Denver to defend the deal. He wanted me to go, along with Roy Ruebel, who had been Graduate Dean and had stepped out. And I went there, and the Deputy Director of NCATE was there, and he had a token minority member, and another teacher before me, and it was pathetic. In fact Ed Hull, who was the Executive Director, resigned the next year, or maybe that year, going out to open a hardware store. It was not good. And well, we got it approved, and Roy Ruebel was admonishing me because I hadn’t really been adamant with the people, but that poor fellow was in over the head. NCATE really wasn’t a bit entity at that time. NCATE shows up in the history of Central later on, as I’m sure you’re aware, when they came in here and the woman who was in charge of the accreditation group – her husband, as I understand it, had a heart attack, and she had to leave before they completed accreditation, and that would have been in 1971, because she – oh, no – I think Edington was here, but this was right after I left, not ’71.

KB: Ninety, I think.

EH: Yes, ’90, you’re right. You see, I’m losing track of the time. [Inaudible], now it isn’t. It’s very vivid. Anyway, NCATE then came up here, and it became quite a mess, and we [inaudible] straightened out later on, but the story was that Central had lost its accreditation. It didn’t. And they lost students because of that story. But at any rate, let’s see, where are we? Okay.

KB: Well –

EH: I thought we ought to have the degree change. That was one of – I must have had 30 or 40 items that I thought should be changed, and Jim Brooks asked me for that list, and he said he was going to mark them, and I didn’t give him the whole list, because a lot of them were fairly minor. I’d send him the list of suggestions and he’d mark them: plus, he agreed; zero, he didn’t know; or minus, he didn’t agree. And that list is in the library, so if you want to know where I was, and where Brooks was, and where the faculty was, that list is up there somewhere.

KB: Well tell me – McCann – Charles McCann yesterday in Olympia told me that he thought that Brooks gave his Provost or Vice President a lot of leeway – that Brooks focused on the externals, and that the position that you held – that they were compatible. That they had divided up the tasks. Did you feel that way about working with Brooks? What kind of a team was that?
EH: Only in part, because here’s what happened – and I don’t want to denigrate anybody. You had a school that was dedicated to Education. Charlie McCann became the Provost and Vice President. If you look at the list of people that were hired in 1970, and that was the August Board meeting of 1970 – a tremendous list of people hired by McCann, and you’re going to find a predominant number, I believe, in the Liberal Arts. And it was his intent to swing it over into more of a Liberal Arts School. And I don’t think Brooks objected. That was it. But each and every one of those people that was hired came here thinking that this was going to be just like San Jose State – now we’re a Liberal Arts college – and they really believed that this was a major change. And they also alleged, when they hit me – and I don’t know whether this is true or not – I have no way of checking. I didn’t call McCann. Person after person came in and said, “I was told that I’d be on a ten-hour teaching load, and that I’d have time to research. I was told that I would have a secretary and a typewriter, because I’m the new scholar in that area, and that we’re pleased to be here, we’re going to be moving into the Liberal Arts,” and they all believed it. So then you began to get a schism. You had the traditional Education people, who were very proud of what they’d done, and they remembered the Symposium, and then you had the group of newcomers – just as we saw at San Jose State – really proponents for – with emphasis on the Liberal Arts – and then, out of the clear sky Jim Brooks suddenly decided that the emphasis should be on Business, and [laughs] –

The other action that I got into – I mentioned this intense feeling about the administration – how shall I express this? You had three factions, and the old-timers also remembered the Symposium, and they split in half – that’s the Liberal v. the Conservative – and half of them wanted another Symposium. We didn’t have any money. We were broke. Boeing had crashed, Seattle had signs up, “The last one out, turn out the lights,” the budgets were crumbling all to hell – everything was going downhill, so we couldn’t have a Symposium. But you had another group just as adamant that whatever happened during the Symposium – and it got politicized – they didn’t want any part of it, and they were right in demanding that we never had this again. And there had been an altercation before I got here, where Jim told me about it, and he told me that “I became kind of unpopular.” There was a demonstration around the flagpole. I don’t know where the flagpole was – it’s in the east corner of the University – and the flag pole got bent, and you had choosing up sides. You also had, apparently, some student and faculty coming in with the SDS, you know – you remember the SDS?

KB: Mm-hmm.

EH: And so you had a strong political bit to it. So now I had inherited three groups – the Traditional Education that didn’t see why we should change that – and they had some good points, and they had a good program. You couldn’t fault them. And you had the new group who were very anxious to become a Liberal Arts institution. I can’t fault them for that. And you had Jim, who thought that this really should be Business.

KB: How come he went for Business?

EH: I don’t know. You’d have to ask him. It may have been part pressure from the Board. You had some business – you had one strong business person on there. But I think it’s more that nationally this was going – down in Reno there was a big pressure for Business, and the Dean couldn’t get the faculty that he needed or wanted – he went to the newspaper and smeared the President, and the President, I think, from the University of Nevada at Las Vegas was a former Biologist from Central, which is beside the point. So now you had three groups, and Brooks was very adamant.

KB: Pappas told me that he thought Brooks was supportive of Technology and Engineering. No, not to your recollection?

EH: No, no. He really was Business – absolute Business. And it’s a good point. We had more students who wanted to get into Business than we really had seats. UW solved the problem by just raising the standards: you want to get into the Business program, you had to have higher standards and improve the program. Here we were not in a position to tell students, “Well, if you can’t get into Business, go
home.” We needed every student. We had gone from a head count of 7500 in the first few years I was here, to – once the Viet Nam War ended – to 5000, and we eventually, in the time that I was here, and I kept telling people, “Don’t confuse cause and effect.” – we went from 404 faculty positions when I left, to 296 – and I could be wrong on those figures, but I think that was right. They had a staffing formula when I got here. Jim would say, “Well it’s like a yard-stick. We’re at 90% of formula.” When I left they were down somewhere around 60% of formula, and every percent cut in formula cost us 5 faculty positions, and every time we lost a group of students they had a formula for – you got so many faculty for lower divisions, so many for upper divisions, so many for graduate programs. We lost the students, we lost the formula, and we were in terrible shape. And Jim was constantly after me to really build the Business program. He really was pushing that. If he was interested in Technology, and he may have been dealing with the Dean in that area, I don’t know, but his big emphasis was on Business. Business. We’ve got to go into Business!

KB: To pay the bills.

EH: Well, that would have helped, but where were you going to get the faculty from in order to enlarge Business? There was an option. I could have told all those people who were hired in 1970, “Sorry, we’ve changed our mind. You might as well leave.” Can you imagine how that would have gone over? And when we had John Harrison come on board and do a lot of computing, Jim would say, “Go ahead. Now you’ve got the figures. What are you going to do?” No, I’m not going to lay anybody off. And I talked to a lot of Vice Presidents in other schools. Nobody did that. They didn’t overtly say that, but the implication was there that we can only change – the Dean of Business at the time told me “Well you’re winning the battle, but you’re going to lose the war. I need more faculty.” And the way we handled it – the Education Department was at 70, I think – 72 positions – and if somebody retired from Education, where they had lost a substantial number of their majors and minors, we replaced that position as we could with a person in Business. We did it by transition, which I think was the only way to do it, and in fact, it was the only way I would do it.

The faculty response was interesting. Colin Condit retired. He’d been in Psychology, and he did a nice address, but he pointed out something the faculty [inaudible – sounds like “knew there.”] Colin was well-liked, and they all laughed. He said, “Here’s the administration driving the bus – ‘Turn right!’ [Makes bus noise.] ‘Oh no! Turn left!’ [Bus noise] ‘Go straight ahead! No, go – ’” We were whipping all over the place, and laughing. It wasn’t anybody’s fault. Things were changing, and the Business program evolved into a very fine program.

One thing did happen, and I was talking to Jack Purcell Saturday night. He had one of those scholarship dinners here. I, at the end of two years, had managed to break the place down into a School of Arts and Sciences – Natural Science and Mathematics – a School of Social Sciences, Education – this is where I [inaudible – sound of pages turning]. We had – where’s the line-up? Reorganization.

KB: Arts and Humanities?

EH: February 29, 1972 – we had Natural Science and Mathematics, Arts and Humanities, we had Education, and we had Social Sciences.

KB: Four Deans, then?

EH: And we had the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Dean of Graduate Studies. But not long after I had done this – and I had to work with the faculty committees, and it took a long time to convince people that this was the way to go – if you look in Sam Mohler’s history, they had tried before in the past – they had tried Divisions, and they had divided it into different units, and then they always went back, and they finally ended up with these two units: Arts and Science, and Education. And the faculty wasn’t too thrilled about having all these Deans. In fact, the English Department – one of the wags up there said, “We don’t have a nunnery here, we have a Deanery.” And then Jim, out of a clear sky – and he didn’t tell me about it as I recall – he announced we were going to have another school. We were going to have a School
of Business, and that meant another Dean, and the whole place blew up. I mean, talk to Jack Purcell. He described it as an explosion. The faculty were resenting the fact that we had so many Deans. They said that [we were] taking away resources from teaching to put in administration, and Jim added another one. Well-intended, but I could tell him it was not well timed. There was a lot of controversy – and it went on to be a successful school. I won’t knock it, but the timing wasn’t too good. It wasn’t too good at all. No.

As I’m going over these quickly, I’m not sure that I’ve covered the questions, but I’ve got quite a bit else I could say here.

KB:  Please.

EH:  After 18 years, I could spend a couple weeks here. Day one at Central Washington University gave me a real insight. Now I’m in my office, it’s the first day, and I had three visitors. The first one was Herb Frank, who could have been the Chairman of the Board of Trustees. He was a very strong member. And he came in to shake my hand, and [inaudible – sounds like “walked”] with me and was very gracious, and then he told me that I would be personally responsible for all faculty and administrative people hired, and made it very clear that if there was a mistake, I was in big trouble. No question – “You are responsible.” Well, what the heck was that all about? It turns out, it has to do with the Chambers case. Are you familiar with the Chambers case? You should get that one in the history. It was a classic.

Dwight Chambers was hired as the Chairman of the Foreign Language Department, and he came in, apparently, with strong credentials. And he got here, and the allegation that – I’ll use the word allegation because he’s not around anymore – the allegation was that he had been at five previous schools, and fired from every one. That was the allegation that I was told. Whatever happened, he did not have a good background. Further, it was alleged that he had behaved inappropriately towards a co-ed who happened to be in a wheelchair. That was the story. And when he was fired – and he was – even with – he had been given tenure – Dr. Joe Panetoni, “Oh, we hired him because we were told he had to have tenure to get here.” He hired a fellow by the name of McDonald, who was the number-one left-wing attorney – that’s the way he was described – I don’t know his political leanings – he was a very tough attorney – to represent him, and the Chambers case was the biggest mess this place had ever seen, and the people in [inaudible] were scared stiff. McDonald was not the attorney you wanted to go up against. And Chambers wrote to the Board members, he wrote to their wives, and I saw the literature. I don’t know if they burned it, but it was about that thick in the library. You wouldn’t want to read it. It was foul. He just wrote these things – it was obvious there was a problem. Well the Chambers case ended up when he was found dead in the Nevada desert with an overdose of drugs. Well, that was the Chambers case.

KB:  This is before you got here?

EH:  Just before I got here. And that’s why Frank was in there telling me, “We’re never going to have this again.” Because his wife had gotten those letters, he’d gotten the letters – it was just plain nasty, and I don’t know that crops up again later on, because I remember that one very well.

The second visitor was Eldon Jacobsen. Eldon came in, and he welcomed me on board. He’d been the acting Dean of Faculty – they’d just changed the title to Vice President of Academic Affairs – and he told me, “I’ll be candid. There’s a strong faculty element out there that don’t like the administration,” and he said, “They’re very anti-administration. You’ll get used to them. You’ll probably work it out with them, but you’ve got this element.” But he didn’t tell me why. He didn’t pin it on anybody. He just warned me to be prepared. And when I left San Jose, the Senate – when I excused myself to get ready to leave, the whole Senate stood up. When I went over to Registration, the faculty applauded. That gives you satisfaction. I got up here, and I said I was a pariah – walking down the street the Chairman of one department saw me coming, crossed the street – didn’t want to pass me on the street. And I’m not being paranoid. He did that several times, because he lived near me. He’d never – and he was always anti-administration. He really was fanatic about it.
I attended a retirement party for a member of the Music Department – and – Wayne Hertz – Cathy Hertz and Wayne Hertz [inaudible – sounds like “Hawthorn”] – had John Green, the Dean, seated at the head table, and he put Ruthie and me way in the background. Then during this retirement dinner he proceeded to make very – let me choose the words – negative comments about the administration, and glaring over at me. The next day he came to my office, and he said “I think I – I shouldn’t have said that last night. I hope you – didn’t think that was appropriate, so I want to apologize.” And I said, “Happy – Wayne – that’s not appropriate. You don’t criticize me in public and then apologize in private. That’s not acceptable.” Well, he showed up again not long after that when he didn’t get a promotion in his department – the committee turned him down. He came in and said, “Hey buddy.” I said, “Wayne, you can’t call me Buddy. You can call me Vice President Harrington, you can call me Dr. Harrington, you can call me Ed, but you’re not going to call me Buddy.” He laughed, and we shook hands, and he was one of my greatest supporters. But that’s what you had to do. And Clark, who got me into administration, taught me one thing – you can’t do anything with a stick. You need a carrot. You need persuasion. And –

KB:  On what grounds did Hertz object to administration?

EH:  Uh, I don’t know. He never made it clear. I know he’d personally attacked me at the Lucile Doersch retirement party. He was furious when he didn’t get his own way. He was a very good person, but he was anti-administration, and I don’t know why. He wasn’t anti-Brooks, he was anti-administration.

KB:  And what was your official title? Were you called Provost at this time?

EH:  No. Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Provost later on. So –

KB:  How did the title change come about? Or was that just the fashion?

EH:  No, that was Garrity, I believe. I could be wrong on that. But this Frank situation – after that I signed every contract coming through, and I checked them as it seemed reasonable. I told the people to hire an assistant professor, the Chairman had to call and assure the Dean that there was no problem. For associate professor, I wanted the Dean to call and make sure there was no problem. For a full professor, the Chairman, the Dean, I would call, and I asked the President to call to make sure that we weren’t really getting – we didn’t hire that many full professors. And the Deans really didn’t like that. Burt Williams used to run around saying, “When’s a Dean going to be a Dean? We don’t need your name on that recommendation.”

“Yes, you do. There’s somebody with a club over my head insisting that I be personally responsible.”

In 18 years, we never had a mistake signed by me. Not one. We had one mistake. I went on vacation, and Bernie Mart and his team signed a proposed contract for somebody in Audio/Visual in Education, and Abe Poffenroth, who was the Chairman of the Physical Education area signed for Jim Erickson, who was Dean, and they offered the job to a fellow from Australia who didn’t have a green card. And he immediately got the Washington Education group – I don’t know what their name was at the time – to support him, and he filed a suit against us, and Judge Cole downtown said “The contract is invalid,” and the fellow said, “Okay,” and he came down to my office and said, “Well I’m sorry I created all this problem,” and he went off to Canada, and several months later he came back down again with the same attorney from the Education group, and something had gone wrong in Canada, and so he instituted a suit, and he went to the Court of Appeals, and the Appeals Court ruled for him, saying the poor man had put down earnest money on a house, and he had a wife and several kids then, and we had done him wrong, and I think he caught [cost?] $25,000. But nobody from the Board came around. I think they understood that that was the one mistake. But we did have a good record on that, so we’d never had another Chambers case. But that – if you find out more detail on that – was a hair-raiser.
KB: What were the essential differences between Central and San Jose State?

EH: They both started out in Teacher Education, and they both evolved into modern, comprehensive universities. And it’s just the time element. It started, and San Jose State in 1955, and by 1970 we were well on our way. It started at Central in 1970, and it took ten years before Garrity got here and pushed through the degree designation change, and it was an 18 year period in which we were evolving all the way through. We went from Industrial Arts into Technology, which was another fight. UW and WSU did not want us to use the term Engineering Technology. No, no! They can’t have it! They were going to fight it. I went over to see the then-director of the – [inaudible] still CPE – Council on Post-Secondary Education – took him out to lunch and said, “I’d like to go to the Board and request the name change,” and he said, “Don’t bother. I like the way you do business.” It’s changed. So we became Technology, which was kind of funny. At any way –

KB: It was a lot of competition, I guess, between the three former normal schools in the State for limited resources.

EH: Uh –

KB: And as you suggest, turf with the other colleges.

EH: Well, we get into this off-campus two-plus-two program. The other thing I found out when I got here, as you’d expect – look at the five schools – UW by themselves over there, King of the Hill, no question. Fine university. WSU was trying to get out from their land grant designation, where their Vice President told me that they were doing all the research on raspberries, and blackberries, and cows, and grass. They were trying to move into a broader aspect, and they were hitting head-on with UW. In fact, the two Trustees – the Trustees of UW and the Trustees of WSU clashed on occasion trying to define WSU’s role, but they saw themselves as number two. Then Western openly, all the time called themselves the Harvard of the West. They’re number three, and UW’s the flagship – we’ll follow them anywhere. The Evergreen State College – “We’re unique and different. We’re not into this.” That was Charlie McCann that started, as you know, a whole new institution. Quite different. And that left Eastern and Central down at the bottom of the heap, and Eastern had a good population base in Spokane, and they weren’t having enrollment problems, and Phil Marshall, who was the Vice President over there – a good friend of mine – used to say, “Ed, you’re problem is the population base. You’ve got cows to the north and jackrabbits to the south, and he was right. He was absolutely right. And we were having population problems because we drew from the West side of the mountains.

But that was the pecking order, and so here I came in as Vice President for the 17th largest school in the country, and came up here when we had these meetings, to be regarded as the bottom of the heap. I’m sorry. They were pleasant and polite, but they made it very clear in the pecking order. I’m reading a book now on ravens and pecking order in birds – we were at the bottom of the heap in the pecking order. I’m sorry, but that was the way it was with the universities. Now with the public, that could be another matter. Everybody has critics, and that’s the way it was. But I’m not sure what else. The second person, Eldon Jacobsen, said there was a serious problem with many faculty – with Jim Brooks. It had something to do with the Symposium – the Conservative v. the Liberal – had to do with that confrontation on the flag pole, and I don’t know what it was about. I didn’t inquire. I didn’t have time. But they were all worried about their confrontation up here, and I gather it was a small number of the faculty, and they were against Viet Nam, but I couldn’t be too sympathetic. This is the way we did it at San Jose State – that was one of the first, and that was a Dow Chemical, and that particular one I was out on the street along with the Executive Vice President who wanted to observe what was going on, and the police came charging through, and we stood right there. I thought they’d block us. They were swinging their truncheons, and firing tear gas, and –

KB: Central’s demonstrations didn’t spiral into that degree.
EH: When I got here, though, I had brought in the Washington State Patrol chief officer around here, and asked him how long it would take to get here if we had trouble. Paranoid. But on this one, I was standing here, the President was yelling, “Don’t use tear gas!” Dave Barry and I stood there as observers – I’m Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the police came charging through, and they pushed everybody out of the way, but they went around us. They didn’t bother us. I figured, well, they’ll probably bring us in prior to tear gas canisters, and they had one of the English Professors who was right out there screaming and hollering, and pushing the students around – he got hit in the head with a tear gas canister and knocked out, so it got nasty down there on occasion. And the second was that Cambodia one – this was Dow Chemical, the second one was Cambodia, which convinced me that there had to be a better life. And I found it. I’ve been happy here at Central all the time.

The third one that came in to see me that day was Walter Berg, the Historian. Have you ever met him?

KB: Once.

EH: Yeah, he wanted to meet the new fall guy, and I said, “What?” He said, “You’ll find out. You’re going to be the fall guy.” And I said, “Really?” Well, in the Chambers case I got the after-effect of it. The Chambers case was a mess. I don’t know who made the mistake. [Inaudible comment – apparently about phone ringing in the background.] In the Chambers case, the day of the Barge Hall fire, which was in 1970, the Board quoted me as to whether I was checking, and they were pretty nasty about the whole thing. “Did you do this? Did you do that?” They’re all valid questions, but they were questions that should have been asked of the people who hired Chambers, not me. I had nothing to do with it. And Brooks was right up there with them – “Oh, we’re checking. We’re checking.” And so I had five Board members and Jim all – went on for, oh, a long period of time, and it got very nasty. “Was he married?” Come on. They asked all the questions you couldn’t ask under Affirmative Action. They were sincere, and they were all worried. It was quite obvious that they’d all been impacted by the Chambers case. The next day Jim Brooks’s Secretary came down – Millie Paul, who gave me that nice painting there when she retired. It’s done by her brother-in-law. Wanted to know if I felt humiliated. I said, no, but I wasn’t too happy. So – fall guy.

And the Gillam case. I got here. Gillam, who had been the Dean of Arts and Sciences, had came in, and he was obviously setting us up, because he showed me his contract, and he had a contract, which was valid, signed by Eldon Jacobsen, Bernie Martin, and Larry Danton, and it said that his teaching load for the year would be Fall, full-time research; Winter, normal load; Spring, 18 units; and the Fall would be independent research – he could do it anywhere he wanted. A valid contract. I showed it to Jim, and Jim became quite upset by it, and he sent a memo. You’ll find that up there in our [inaudible] – my letter to him, he wrote across, “I object!”

KB: On what grounds?

EH: Two personalities. He just didn’t think that was right.

KB: Because the instructor should be teaching more?

EH: No – just – I’m sure, just the animosity between Gillam and Brooks. And I told him, “Well it’s a valid contract. It was signed by your Vice President, so what –”

“I object.”

He came by one night in the office, and shouting, “What are you doing about Gillam?” He was – it really upset him. I mean, it was terribly upsetting. I don’t know what happened when Gillam was forced out, but as I say, I thought we were being set up, and that went on for maybe three years, until – and I was checking – I found out that he’d accepted a teaching position in Canada. So now in the fall his independent research
– he’d told me originally he was going to move something, and I think that really upset Jim, that this fellow – and he had clashed with Gillam, and Gillam was “getting away with something.” So I got that, and I sent Gillam a letter – a single letter. I had it checked by our Attorney General, [in] which I said, “The contract is no longer valid. You can’t go out and teach. That’s not independent research.” And of course, that triggered it. The doorbell rang, and there was the Sheriff, and he handed me the subpoena. Gillam sued us for $500,000. He sued me, he sued Ruthie – community property state – he sued Brooks and his wife, he sued Larry Danton and his wife, and he sued Burt Williams and his wife - $500,000. And I did a little checking. The interesting thing about it – had he won the case, he could have gotten the $500,000 from any one, or all of the individuals. In other words, if he’d found out that one of us had $500,000 to take it from us, then we’d have to sue to get reimbursed.

And so Gillam showed up with his attorney, McDonald – the one that I told you about – and everybody was shaking and shivering, and I didn’t think we had much to worry about. It seemed pretty precise to me. And we went on in depositions for the better part of two weeks, and McDonald was really upset with me. He’d gone and he’d found a standard file on recommendations that he was hired, and the dismissal, and maybe something else, but the only thing he’d found about Gillam that I’d written was this letter saying that it was an invalid contract, and he told me I was a terrible Vice President. I didn’t put anything in writing. Where’s all this in writing? Of course, they were also suing for libel, and contract default, and he just was looking around for all these details, and he couldn’t find anything. So he had me for two weeks, I think – deposition – all kinds of nasty questions, pushing – and Larry Danton, and Williams, and all three of us took the position that no, in the fall, independent research did not include teaching at another school. Okay. Jim Brooks came in, and he got the question, and he kind of shocked me, his response. When he was asked about – and it’s a matter of record on the transcript, he said, “Well I had to depend on Ed Harrington.” Fall guy? Oh, brother. Well, we won that case.

So I got the aftermath – I got the aftermath of the – I got the Gillam case, and then we had the Barnes case in History. You never met Barnes, but he was in the History Department, and I think it is concise that the History Department voted not to give him tenure. And I don’t know where he came from, but he went around and he talked to all the people in History, and he talked to the Dean, and he somehow came to the conclusion that I was the one that was forcing him out. And I don’t know – he filed a complaint against me, and he made it an issue in the Faculty Senate. We had a Grievance Committee, supposedly – Marco Bicchieri and Frank Collins came around and interviewed me, and then supposedly they interviewed him – that would be the grievance committee. And then we went to the Faculty Senate, and he had filed a case against me, and the Faculty Senate was going to debate it, so I could just stand out in the hall, and Barnes stood out in the hall, and when they got all done, they said oh that they’d ruled in favor of Barnes. And I mean – there’s a group that wants faculty self-government, who after a department has clearly designated they didn’t want to give tenure, reversed it in the Faculty Senate. I said, that doesn’t make any sense. So after that was over, I called in the Chairman, and I said, “You know, the next time this happens, if we have a legal problem, you’re coming with me.”

KB:  Who was the History Chairman?

EH:  Floyd Rodene. And Barnes – we lost out on that one. Here I was, left out in the hall, and the Faculty Senate like a bunch of little kids – “Hee, hee, hee – we got the administration!” You look at the Faculty Code at that time, there’s a whole list of [inaudible – sounds like “Jocks, walks”] and a whole list of people – anybody that had a problem went to the full Faculty Senate, which effectively acted as a Grievance Committee. It was a whole – that’s the only way I can interpret it.

KB:  Did Barnes stay very long?

EH:  Well he stayed for another year. And why? Because when we got into this, I pointed out to Jim that the Faculty meeting, which was – I’m sorry, the Trustees meeting, which was on the other side of the mountain, was on the day that the personnel had to be notified in writing that they would not be re-appointed. And Jim says, “No, that doesn’t matter. We’ll tell them the next day.” I said, “It does
matter.” And I said, “The AAUP will come right in and support him.” “No,” he says, “The AAUP doesn’t run the school. I do.” [Laughs] Dang! Than night I had Bernie Martin call Barnes at home and tell him on the phone that the Trustees had agreed that he wasn’t going to get tenure. But then the next day we sent him a letter, and that became the big issue. And I talked with some of the members of the AAUP – and I had been in touch with some of the members of the AAUP down in San Francisco. There was no question that the AAUP was going to come in on his side, because we had not notified him on the proper date. And after that, I made certain that we never had a faculty – excuse me, Trustee’s meeting on the day that notice had to be given for anybody – faculty member or administration. So I ended up the fall guy on the Barnes case, and we put him in as Assistant Dean in Bernie Martin’s office. He did a good job, I recommended him, and he went off to be a Dean somewhere.

Then another one – the Jaffrey case – and I’m kind of rambling on here [inaudible]. Did you ever hear of Jaffrey?

KB: Yes, yes. From India. Fake degree from his parent’s house?

EH: Pakistan. Uh, the Art Department had hired him as a distinguished Muslim scholar, and – [sounds like, “Well, we had a piece of paper in the Jaffrey case that you might want to see.”] [Tape is turned off, and re-started.] In August of 1970, the first Board Meeting I attended – the Art Department, of course, [inaudible] get him, but by Spring they had decided that Mr. Jaffrey was not all that he said he was. Somewhere I’ve got the book on Jaffrey [inaudible comment – sound of pages turning] and they implied that the Administration was doing this, and not firing him. And I said, “Well, it’s not done that way. We need to know more about this.” So I started investigation to find it. And I called Harvard. “Ha, ha, ha, he has a law degree from here. Why are all you people calling?” And I called the Embassy in Washington, D.C. – “Snicker, snicker, snicker, Oh yes, we know about Mr. Jaffrey.” No information. And so I wrote to the Consulate General of the United States of America in Lahore, Pakistan, and asked him to check on Jaffrey’s record. He said,

Dear Mr. Harrington:

I sent my Senior local employee to check on the existence of Sir Herbert Read College, Lahore, supposedly located at 128 E1 Sharharee [inaudible] Uberg 3, Lahore, West Pakistan. A copy of the repot to me is attached for your information. The son of [inaudible] Jaffrey did not come to the office as promised.

So that’s interesting, and here’s the report, and I can make copies. They may already have them.

To Central Washington State College:

I visited 128 El Sharharea [inaudible] Uberg 3 on May 26, 1971. These premises are owned and lived by Singh [?] Jahicbau [phonetic] Jaffrey, Advocate. There are no signs of any educational institution in operation. People in the vicinity have no knowledge of such and institute in existence there. Even the servants working in the house are unaware of it. Singh Jahicbau [phonetic] Jaffrey, however, told me on the phone this morning that his son is managing a college on these premises, but he does not know more about this. He’d tell his son to see me in the office sometime today.

That was Sir Herbert Read College, and here’s his transcript, which was – oh, just excellent. This was the sort of thing that the Art Department saw when they hired him. There’s his [inaudible] – well, inevitable conclusion. Singh J. Icbau [?] Jaffrey was the Trustees of the school, he was the faculty, he gave himself the degree, and he said that that’s valid because he had it validated by a Notary Public on the streets of Lahore. So much for [inaudible – sounds like “flat aide.”] but not that easy. He then sued us for $2 million – two, and I think four tenths. We never understood why it would be four tenths. And then it really got to be – Bruce Keats was the Chairman of the then Committee – that was the Lectures and Assemblies Committee, and they had awarded him, in effect, Distinguished Professor, they gave him money to buy Art
slides, which we never could find – he said that they weren’t delivered to him – and they paid for publishing this book. And I have probably the only copy left. You’ve not seen it, have you?

KB: No.

EH: Do you want it?

KB: Sure.

EH: Well I’m not sure you do. [Inaudible – sounds like Wookey] thought she was shaken. It turned out Sir Herbert Read is a valid Art Historian in England, and supposedly the forward:

Jaffrey was born 22 years ago in a remote valley of Pakistan, and that he should have already established a reputation as a painter in Europe seems as miraculous as if he had safely crossed the intervening ocean in a rowing boat. Only an acute sensibility and an imperious will to self-expression could have led to the successful conclusion of such an enterprise, but now that he’s among us, this artist had quickly assimilated the techniques of modern painting, and has gradually discovered a style of his own, universal, as every contemporary style tends to be, but retaining still some suggestion of Oriental richness and spirituality. I enjoyed his sensitive explorations of form and color.

That story gets repeated by a whole series of authors back here, all of whom have the same pitch – that makes one wonder who wrote them. Then –

Before Jaffrey Art had more solutions and no problems. Jaffrey created problems: problems that are aesthetic from beginning to end; problems that transcend aesthetics completely; problems that counteract, rather than contain solutions; and Art that supercedes consumerism. Bert Dahl was in Boston in 1966 to find himself an egg and make a sandwich of Art and Syrian bread.

KB: We’re running out of tape here. I think we need to move on to the Garrity years and talk about the Centers.

EH: Okay, well, we can. Anyway, if you take this and read it, it is very, very interesting – how language – the F word – if you put two “k’s” on it it’s all right in Pakistan. Read it, and you’ll see what we were up against. It was a problem. He sued us, then he left, and we had a hearing here, then Steve Mylon had to pick it up and take it. What size tape does that take? I’ve got some tapes down here.

KB: I have another tape that we can use for the Garrity years.

EH: All right. I got a phone call from [Gerald] Cleveland. He was suing them for $4 million for discrimination. I got a phone call from Central Michigan – he was suing them, but he was suing them prior to the time that they’d received his papers, and he was suing them. This went on, and on, and on – numerous cases of Jaffrey suing them. Just pathetic. He never won any of them, as far as I know. I don’t know where he went to.

KB: Could we talk a little bit about the vote of confidence against Brooks that – or the threat of it – that the Faculty Senate halted? Was that – how do you explain that? Was that a culmination of this divisiveness you’ve talked about on campus?

EH: Well Jim was always saying, “Ed, I’m never – I’m not popular.” He knew that there was this group out there that were anti-Brooks. And he used to say, “You know, I could never survive a vote of confidence, and neither could you. And I’m just not very popular.” He was worried. And so it came up, and it was led by a number of faculty members, and it was a proposed vote of no confidence in the Senate. And I talked to a number of the Senators before in a little political aspiration, and I said, “You
know, this is the last thing in the world we really need – to have a vote of no confidence in the President in the time of our falling apart all over the place.” And they agreed – [inaudible] a little pressure from the side. So I went up that day, and I had the first vote, and I said, “No,” in a very loud voice, and looked around, and then the vote was taken and the whole thing was dropped. Now what precipitated it other than the fact that two faculty members didn’t get promoted, and there was some other dissent and political [inaudible – ends in “ation”] – I think that was it. There was no problem. The vote of confidence disappeared.

KB: I know that there was quite a fuss when you proposed to postpone tenure for 22 professors.

EH: Yes.

KB: That was part of the budget crunch time, as well, as I recall.

EH: Did I? Yes I did, but that’s an interesting story, too. Brooks called me into his office and he said, “We can’t give tenure to him.” And we had five people coming up for tenure, and I said, “It’s not a problem.” But he said, “No, this is from the Board of Trustees. You’re going to have to defer tenure. You.” And I said, “Really?”

KB: To save money?

EH: So they wouldn’t get tenured in. That was the theme, at the time.

KB: You mean too many tenured people on staff? I don’t understand.

EH: Everybody tenured, so you had no option to bring in new people.

KB: Uh-huh.

EH: He said, “This is from the Trustees. They’re not going to accept any tenure recommendation. You’re just going to have to say that we’re going to have to defer tenure until the Board makes up its mind that it’s safe to start granting tenure again.” That was from Brooks to me. And so I went in, and sure, there was a big storm, and a big stink, and the Union sent letters, and everybody was griping and complaining, and of the five, the next year four got tenure. But I thought it was very curious. After it was all over, the Chairman of the Board said to me, “Boy that was a nasty meeting. I hope you knew what you were doing.” So who was the one that was against tenure? It certainly wasn’t the Chairman of the Board. So I don’t know where that story came from, but Brooks was very clear that he’d gotten his instructions from the Board – they couldn’t do it. Who knows?

KB: What about the Union in those years? Was it pretty healthy?

EH: You heard about them all the time, but they weren’t a strong influence. They were just making noise in the background, unhappy about this and that. So I never knew about that deferred tenure. To me it wasn’t that big of a deal, because I was sure that they’d get tenured. To the five of them, of course, it was quite a blow, and one left, and it didn’t make any difference. But who originated this against tenure? Whether it was the Board, or it was Brooks, or a combination – I don’t know. It was never made clear. I was only told unequivocally that they would not consider it – couldn’t be on the board for tenure. And that’s what brought that about.

KB: I know that Brooks, when faced with this thread of a no-confidence vote, offered a resignation for 18 months later.

EH: I don’t know about that.
KB: Well, I guess – I wonder – at – did leadership change with the arrival of Garrity? The college also changed its name at that time, did it not?

EH: Uh –

KB: It became a University at the time that Garrity became President.

EH: No, it was a University before Garrity got here, which is a story unto itself. It was quite obvious that Central Washington State College was not a State College – it was a University. And so Western, Central and Eastern all pushed for the University. Charlie McCann and the Evergreen State College, immaterially, didn’t want to be known as a University. That left a problem. WSU – and I cannot for the life of me think of the name of the President of WSU at the time – John Hoagness was President of UW – but our friend at WSU did not want the State Colleges to become a University. He was very adamant about it.

KB: And UW felt the same way?

EH: No, they did not. And so our hero was John Hoagness. Now I get this only from the Vice Presidents they had at UW and the other schools – that – and you could ask Brooks about it – when the fight – when push came to shove, that it was John Hoagness that really overrode the vote coming from WSU and saved us – made us a University. That was the story. I can’t confirm it. I can’t deny it. But that happened before Garrity got here.

KB: And you’re suggesting that it didn’t change things? That actually the name change was later than the policy changes.

EH: Oh – good [inaudible phrase – could be, “we kept evolving”]. When Garrity came, a lot of things changed.

KB: Let’s hear about that. You must have had a different working relationship with Garrity than with Brooks.

EH: Uh, yes. Brooks was a proponent for pushing for Business. When Garrity came in, and – it was interesting. When he was inaugurated, I finally got through one of the things I wanted to do – the mace. We got that done. He was presented with a mace, not the usual medallion they give a President. And he looked the whole thing over, and I had an interesting situation at that time. We were told that – how do I express this? I want to be very careful, because I’m on tape. But the Board was going to issue all the senior administrators a letter saying that next year was their last year. And that is in the Board minutes, if you look at the time that Brooks was resigning, it’s in there. I inadvertently saw it once, when Don Groten was retiring. I got the full Board. Prior to that time you got only the public Board meetings, and the Executive was hidden, but in [the] Executive minutes, there’s no question about it. The Board was going to send a letter out at somebody’s urging – I can’t pin it on anybody – that all of us would get a letter saying the next year was the last year, because that would allow Garrity to choose his own administration. I took Don Groten over to the Chair of the Board op, and I said that was the most unethical, unprofessional thing I’d ever heard of. The way it’s done – when a new President comes in, the existing administration – up to a point – tendered their resignation, and that’s what we were going to do. And I told the Trustees that – some of them said – not the Trustees, the Deans – said I’d taken him out, that that wasn’t going to happen. You wouldn’t get the letter, but it’s expected that you would go in when Garrity came here, and resign – offer to resign. I did. I made out my resignation, I brought it in, presented it to Garrity, and he said, “No, I’ll tell you when.” And bless him, he kept me on for another – what? Ten years?
But his big drive was for Foreign Studies, and he spent a lot of time on that. He made his trips to China and Japan – he started a program out there. He operated a little bit differently. He left most things up to me, and when it came to Athletics and Foreign Studies, I’d see either Director. I’d just go by my office, by the Dean’s office, by my office, right to Brooks, [?] who took an intense personal interest in Athletics. And it was all with him. He spent a lot of time on it. And the Director of the Foreign Studies program would talk to me once in a while – Dieter Romboy, but he’d go right down to the President’s office, and he took a hands-on operation for the Athletics, and for the Foreign Study. And he was very much interested in Politic. He brought about the change in degree terminology. He sharpened up a number of points, and he let us move ahead on a lot of them that we’d wanted to do along the way that hadn’t been done before. He was a good influence on the University. But just as Brooks’s big drive was for Business, Garrity’s big drive was for the Foreign Study program.

He also spent a lot of time away from the school, going to California, which was not his crediting move [?]. But they brought him in for accrediting. He was very good at that. He spent a lot of time away from the University on accrediting. He was also a very gifted speaker, and he just excelled at greeting the parents and the students in the fall. He was excellent any time he had to make an address. He was very, very bright – very articulate, and he saw himself as the leader, and he demonstrated good leadership qualities, but by then things had pretty much shaken down. There wasn’t a lot to change, and he was pretty much happy with what we had.

He did have one feature that people didn’t like. I’ve got a letter in here from Bob Case II, who was a Trustee, who said that he did not suffer fools lightly, and if he didn’t like something, he’d say so. I remember when we were meeting with the Deans for the first time. I did something he didn’t like, and he criticized me openly in front of the Deans – something I never would do. I’d feel like it was better, if he didn’t like what I did – call me into his office and remonstrate me there. But he did so openly, which didn’t make friends for him. Because I was not the only one who suffered this not suffering fools lightly. And if we had somebody coming in with complaints about the University, they met Garrity and they left. He just didn’t mince words. He was direct, and to the point. So you knew where he stood, but sometimes I thought it a little inappropriate when he became critical, because the people on whom he was critical, including me, were present there, and at one time I know that he was critical of me because I didn’t [inaudible – sounds like “a pop”] to something on the West side. I couldn’t, because the fellow I went to see had just gotten fired, and Jimmy Applegate – the Chairs from the Education area were all sitting there, and Jimmy said, “We’re going to leave.” They didn’t like it. And that didn’t help his image as President – this being very, very critical.

KB: Don Schliesman had suggested to me that that’s one of the things that got him into trouble and escalated his departure.

EH: Really? Well – I’m going to choose my words wisely on this one. I know I’m holding you up. I hope you have the time for this.

KB: Sure.

EH: He was also quite adamant that we had to do a better job in minority hiring, and we hired a lot of very good faculty – excellent faculty – and I think in 1987, it would have been - somewhere in there – he asked me to make a presentation at the final meeting of the year, and describe to the Trustees the attributes of all the new faculty they’d hired. And I walked in – we went through the whole thing, and I reviewed the hiring for all these new faculty, and extolled their virtues, and he just sat there, and at the end of it he said, “Well Ed, I don’t think you did a good job at all, and neither did the Deans. We didn’t get any people of color.” [Laughs] And whoops! Here we go again. Speaking his mind. That’s what he believed, but I thought it was inappropriate for him to address me that way in front of the Trustees.

So the following Monday I went in, and I said, “I think we’d better have this out. We’ve got a little disagreement. I didn’t appreciate that. I know what you said was from the heart, but I think the timing was
poor.” And I said, “We sent out probably a thousand applications for the positions, and we welcomed minorities applying, and encouraged them, but some of the largest schools outdid us, and we didn’t get any minority people. And I’m sorry.” He said, “Well, we’re going to change that. In the future we’re going to look at the applicants, and if one is a minority we’re going to hire him as an Assistant Professor, but if necessary we’ll give him salary up to an Associate Professor.” I said, “Are you clearly serious about that? That you’re going to bring somebody into a department as an Assistant Professor, and you may have three recent hires there at this salary level, and you’re bringing them in up here?” And he said, “Yes, that’s the way we’re going to do it.” I said, “You’re going to buy them?”

“Yes, and other schools are doing this.”

And I said, “I’m not.” And I resigned, and I handed in my resignation. Then I went out to work in the Cooperative Ed office. I had seen that happen once. We hired a person in Economics, and it’s hard getting Economics people, and we brought somebody in who was possibly one step higher than the existing Economics professor, and Boom! I just didn’t believe that was the thing to do. Maybe I was wrong, and maybe I was right, but I didn’t want to do it. So I resigned, and then after that I saw him only maybe twice, when he was President, and he told me he didn’t know what was wrong, but the Trustees were certainly getting agitated. So whatever was going on between him and the Trustees, I was not party to. Shortly after that, he offered his resignation. But I was out of there. I was happily working with the Cooperative Ed office, out of all of that. And whether I was right in my position about hiring people, or wrong, I don’t know. I understand that they did hire one person after that on that basis, and it caused a lot of friction, but I don’t know.

KB: Who was Provost after you?

EH: Edington.

KB: There was no interim?

EH: No, I don’t think so. Edington was the next person in, and –

KB: I thought you retired for health reasons.

EH: Oh, that was the story. I did. It’s a good thing I did, because I had a bad heart, but I lasted a year over at the Cooperative Ed office, and then I finally went in – the Cardiologist ran a catheter up the femoral artery into my heart. He couldn’t get the smallest catheter through the aortic valve, so I went to [inaudible], and the Cardiac surgeon replaced the aortic valve, and the only thing – he was very taciturn – the only thing he said – he looked me in the eye – “I didn’t know a human being could live with a valve that bad.” So it’s a combination, sure. I would have gone for another – I wanted to go one more year, and I did at the Cooperative Ed office, but the reason I did it over there – I was opposed to this concept of hiring. I would not have any part of it. And after that, Edington, and then Schliesman was interim, I believe, then Moore, then Dauwalder, and now it’s Soltz.

KB: Soltz is a Biologist, too.

EH: Yes. So I don’t know if that answers your question. Yes, publicly I made no bones about it. I retired from the University because of the health condition, but I had only intended to stay one year anyway. I retired as Provost, and as Provost I [inaudible] Vice President for Academic Affairs, clearly on the basis that he and I had a little disagreement as to how we were going to hire the faculty.

KB: Surely that was only the straw that broke the camel’s back?
EH: No, this – this not suffering fools lightly – every year he evaluated everybody. I’d get my letter of evaluation, and whhhhh! He always emphasized the negative. And when I was working with teachers in San Jose State we were all told if you evaluate somebody, you start off the evaluation with all the positive aspects, and then mention the negative. But Don, not suffering fools lightly – he was very direct. He’d start out, and brrrrrrr, and maybe, if you got lucky you got one good mention at the end. He was very honest, very direct, but that didn’t go over too well with some people.

KB: Did that carry through with faculty as well, or strictly with his administrative team?

EH: No, uh – his administrative team, and he got carried away on another one. They brought in a specialist from outside who said, “Here’s how you evaluate people,” and we went through a whole series of steps, and you had the Most Distinguished, Distinguished, and salary level would be determined on the category you got. And each administrator could only name one person. So Garrity would [inaudible] those reporting to him – Jerry Jones, Larry Lind, Don Guy, Ed Harrington, and so forth – but only one would get the maximum pay raise, and the rest would get less. And that wasn’t too difficult for him, he only had five people. But I had all the Deans. He was adamant that I had to go through, and – which Dean gets the big salary increase, and the rest get less – and that did not go over well with the Deans. They didn’t like it at all. And I remember Burt Williams coming in and throwing his folder down and saying, “I wasn’t treated fairly.” He didn’t get it that year. That was not a good way to do business, as far as I was concerned, but it was something that was sold to him by, I think, a very convincing salesman.

KB: Looks to me like a lot of the Garrity years were spent coping with budget cuts from the State, and –

EH: Yes.

KB: And the minutes make it look like you were scrambling for ways to bolster moments of [sounds like “handicapped er”] on the East side, or the minorities, or whatever, to expand areas of Central that may not have met their potential quite yet.

EH: That’s for sure. Maybe we should talk about the off-campus.

KB: I’d like that! Thank you.

EH: Well never mind Gillam. Enjoy that book. Don’t be too soft. Ruthie was really upset. She didn’t want to see it.

KB: Am I right that the Centers really exploded in the Seventies, or was there serious action when you – before you got here?

EH: No, there was none. [Sound of rustling pages.] Here’s a classic picture that you probably ought to put in the History book. Brooks was very good. Brooks always had the Trustees to his house for dinner before the meeting. I don’t know that Garrity ever did. I wasn’t invited, if he did. Brooks was very good about bringing legislators to his house – Sid Flannigan, [inaudible – could be Chuck] Vance, and so forth – and giving them dinner, and I was invited. And Brooks was very good – the person in the background here is Dixie – he invited her over for a river float. And there’s Courtney, and there’s I, and Don Wyse – but the interesting thing that – we had just gotten in the raft, and Courtney had sat on Jock’s – Governor Dixie Ray’s dog. [Laughs] Either stepped on him, or sat on him.

Okay, the off-campus. This write-up by Libby [Street] is very good, and should be almost complete. I couldn’t find a great deal wrong about it. But we did not have any off-campus Centers until [more rustling of papers] late in the Seventies, which – she’s got dates, I’m sure, and she tells about all the work off-campus. But here’s where we made a major change. One Monday I met with the Deans and told them about the extended degree, and Don Schliesman had read the same book, and it related to Harvard in 1946
sending regular faculty off-campus to teach regular courses in Worcestershire, Massachusetts. And I told them about – San Francisco State had sent regular faculty for years up to Santa Rosa, and down to Stanislaus, and you could get your degree on a two by two basis – the extended degree.

KB: Two by two meaning you accomplished two years at the Community Colleges?

EH: Right, and then two years with the – and in situ, right there in the Community College, but with a four-year degree. Now that was a big thing in the country. A lot of schools were doing it. Michigan was really going. And two days later I got a note from Jim Brooks – it was a note that’s up there in the library. He suggested we consider off-campus, he didn’t direct us to. So now I had the Deans in agreement – and you won’t find that in writing, because after the explosion of the [End of Tape]

**Transcription of Tape Two:**

KB: The Deans called it Fascism? What was that?

EH: No. Jerry Olson and – accused the Deans of academic Fascism in the early Seventies. He came to my office and complained about the way they were working. That’s when they thought they were the Dean’s Counsel – TDANS – and they were passing all kinds of rules about attendance, and staffing, and so forth and so on. I don’t have his paper here, but he said that was academic Fascism, and – [sound of pages turning].

KB: Because they were passing so many rules?

EH: Right.

KB: And Jerry Olsen’s title was what?

EH: Chairman of the Sociology Department. And he came to me – to my office – and he always called me Mr. Harrington, and I’d heard rumors that he was going to make a big fuss about their actions, and they used to keep very minute notes, and they’d decide about the hours for the final exams, and the way that things were conducted – which was interesting. I didn’t think it was all that crucial, but it was all in the form of minutes, and they kept them, and he came to my office, and he had a briefcase, and he said “There’s no worry. I’m not concerned about any of this anymore. Thank you for your explanation.” And then he went out and he passed out hundreds of these sheets accusing the Deans of academic Fascism. And we countered by – we sent one out annotating what he had done, and pointing out numerous errors in what he had done, whereupon he allegedly had a problem, and took a year’s leave of absence from the school. But both of those documents are around: his document, and our rebuttal, and they’d be up there. I made a copy of our response – I don’t know. At any rate, not long after that I went to a different approach. I had at least one member of the Union – a woman – who was going to meet with the Dean’s group, because we were a policy-making group, and the State law said you had to have open meetings, and she was going to move in. If you’d known them, you would not have wanted it there, I’m sorry. She was from a different state of mind – not academic. And others wanted to join our meeting. I invited the Chairman of the Faculty Senate to join us. But at any rate we stopped coming out with full minutes. I explained to people that the Deans would meet, we would discuss current problems. If we thought there was a change in policy, we would put in on a piece of paper and send it to the Faculty Senate, or we’d send it to the Board of Trustees, and anybody who wanted to debate it or hear about it could go to the Faculty Senate open meeting, or to the Trustees, but they weren’t coming en masse and sitting in on the group. I didn’t see any point in that. So we established the fact that we were not establishing policy, therefore for a long while we would have the reading of the minutes of the Dean’s meeting, but after that, then I would summarize everything in the form of a letter, and send it out to the Deans saying that here’s what we’re going to do, and here’s how we’re going to handle it. It was, in effect, minutes, but we were not subject to the open meeting law, according to the attorney, if we did it that way. That may seem sneaky, but I just
really couldn’t see a room that held 10 people with 15 invited guests. It didn’t make any sense. The Faculty Senate and the Trustees were very good for considering those things.

Okay, I went to the Inter-Institution Committee of Academic Officers, and if you go to the library there’s a whole series of bound books with all the minutes. It was held on the campus of the University of Washington. Peggy Maxie – and I’m not sure how to spell her name – M-A-X-I-E, or M-A-X-Y – I think it’s Maxie – she was the Chair of the House Higher Education Committee, and she wanted the schools to get out, off the – “Get out of your ivory tower and help the people.” She wanted to know what we were going to do about it. So I asked Zoë Marshall, who was the Chair, to explain to her Continuing Ed correspondents, in service, and the extended degree, and we threw in the bit about Harvard and Worcestershire. We threw in the example of San Francisco State, and she said, “That’s what I want. I want these two-plus-two programs. Thank you, Peggy Maxie.” She saved us. We ought to have her picture up on the campus – really should. And then after she heard about this two-plus-two proposal she said, “All right, who’s going to do it?” And about that time they and Bud Schinpol, who is a very important person in the Appropriations Committee in the Legislature came in, and I said to Phil, “Ask him if we’ll get State’s [inaudible – sounds like “subvention”] and so Phil, who was Chairing this, so it was appropriate that he ask Bud Schinpol, “Walt, if we go off campus will we get State subvention?” And Schinpol thought about it, and he said, “Well, if it’s part of the regular load, yes.” And then Peggy asked the question, “Who’s going to do it?” UW? They didn’t care about it. WSU? Not interested. Western? We wouldn’t do anything like that. Phil smiled at me, and said, “Take it. We’ve got our population base.” I was ready anyway, and I said, “Central will do it.” She said, “Thank you.” So now I really had stuck my neck out. That really, basically was a unilateral decision on my part, and it had never been discussed in the Faculty Senate, never been discussed in any Faculty Committee, had never been discussed with the Board of Trustees, had been discussed with the Deans, and with endorsement, so to speak, from Jim Brooks. And I came back, and Jim said, “Well you have to tell the Faculty.” So indeed I told the faculty that henceforth we were going to be teaching two-plus-two programs off campus in concert with the community colleges, just as Harvard had done, and San Francisco. It didn’t go over too well. I got a letter from two members of the Education Department – a joint letter that’s in the file up there – saying that this was totally inappropriate, and they had told their families that since it’s dangerous to go off campus nights, that if they were injured, they were to sue me personally.

KB: So the grounds of objection were the inconvenience and safety of traveling to another location.

EH: Yeah, and these were people who had taught continuing education off campus for extra money for 20 years. And so the Attorney General laughed and said, “You don’t have to worry about that.”

KB: The difference was that now they would be required to go?

EH: In part, yes.

KB: And how far away were the Centers? Are we talking about Yakima? Or –

EH: No, I will go through that very quickly here – I know you’ve got a time problem. At any rate, after having done that I came back to the Deans and said, “We got it, but I think the emphasis in this report should say that ‘in an ICA meeting, Central was the only school in the State that agreed to work on two-plus-twos. We were the only one, and I think we should get credit for it, and I think Peggy Maxie should be recognized as a leader in the legislature who brought this about.’” Well now my neck was stuck out by a mile, but the Deans came through, and each and every one of them – Bernie Martin and Burt Williams, Mile Dahl and Jack Housey – went to their faculties and said this is the only thing that’s going to save us. Otherwise we were going to go down like that in staffing. We were – I mean we weren’t talking just two or three people, we were talking tens of people, the way it was going, and the people over in Olympia were just convinced that we were doomed.
And the first thing I did, I went over and talked to Courtney [Jones] and said, “We’re going to have to have some more money in the instructional budget,” and Courtney found 20, maybe $30,000. And I sat down with Lou Bovos [the Registrar] and I looked at all the Continuing Ed offerings, and I said, “Now we’re authorized to have regular faculty teach off campus, and we’re entitled to those student credit hours.” And I moved a substantial portion of the Continuing Ed program, taught by non-regular faculty, largely in Education, and I said, “We will claim these, because they’re now Adjuncts,” is the term I used for them. “And these Adjuncts taught first quarter, and we’re going to pay them from the regular budget, and we’ll get four Adjuncts for each faculty position, and they won’t have benefits, but that’s it.” And I added those student credit hours into our mix for the year. Everybody was waiting for us to fall on our face, and that brought enough upper division student credit hours in to pay for them, and leave something over, so that we immediately stopped the incipient faculty cut.

KB: And what year was that? I can check the record.

EH: Then I won’t give an exact date. Okay, so then having nailed that down so we got a few extra student credit hours, I got with Don Schliesman and we started off in the field. The first one we hit was Edmonds, and while the Deans were very supportive on campus, and quite a few faculty understood what was going on, and were helpful – including the chair of the then Faculty Senate who pitched in to help us.

KB: Who was that?

EH: I think it was Carlson, from the Education Department. I could be wrong, but – we got a lot of support. The Edmonds people, “Oh, welcome aboard!” The President at Edmonds offered us classroom space, library facilities, cafeteria, and parking, and that became our strongest program, at Edmonds, and Bob Benton from the English Department went over to be the Director of it, and that evolved into an outstanding gem of the Centers, and that’s written up here. Then I went down to Highline, and I’m sorry, I can’t remember the woman’s name – she was the President. “Welcome aboard,” and she pitched in, and we had a Center at Highline. And later on, when they didn’t have enough [inaudible], we went to Normandy Park. And I don’t know the details on that, but I can give you a reference on that. Then I’d been working with the President down in Yakima – and it was hard getting to him because every morning he was in collective bargaining, the poor fellow – and intermittently I’d meet with him for lunch, or in the afternoon, and we’d decided we’d start a Liberal Arts program in Yakima.

KB: Because it had been mostly technical courses previously?

EH: No, because it didn’t have – anything. Just [inaudible] – we were going to go for a Liberal Arts program. And then I went to a meeting called by the CPE down in the Tri-Cities, and they had caught onto this two-plus-two, and caught on in kind of a nasty way. They wanted to know who was going to do it in the Tri-Cities, and again, I volunteered, and I think in retrospect that it wasn’t the brightest idea.

KB: Why?

EH: Terribly competitive – backstabbing. Eastern had wanted it, and when I agreed to do it the fellow from Eastern didn’t say anything, but two days later he got fired by the President for not pitching in. Eastern wanted the Tri-Cities, just – people were beginning to see the value of the program in the terms of getting out there. Then I went to Ft. Steilacoom, and that’s a key one. That’s where Boeing wanted us to start the Technology programs, and we also mentioned that we’d be offering these programs in what we then called the Liberal Arts, or General Studies – whatever you want – Liberal Arts program. But on the Ft. Steilacoom area we were up against two private schools – PLU [Pacific Lutheran University] was one, and I don’t know what the other one was. I’ve forgotten.

KB: St. Martin’s?
EH: No. I could be wrong. But anyway, I got there and it was a mob scene. The auditorium was full, and the majority in the background, I think, were opposed to having Central come in because we were competing with two private schools – maybe three.

KB: UPS [University of Puget Sound] is there.

EH: UPS and PLU. And I had been told that their Presidents were going to be there, and protest strongly. And so here I showed up at Ft. Steilacoom, and this time I was by myself, and Phyllis Erickson greeted me at the door, and there were 150 students from Ft. Steilacoom with placards saying “Support Central.” [Laughs] It was a mob scene, and she said, “You did this. You did this. You’re going to testify.” So I stood there for about half an hour. I introduced myself, and I went through the whole bit about Harvard, and what we were doing in the other schools, and how this would benefit the people – why we needed the Technology program in response to Boeing, and then she called for rebuttal. I turned around, and the auditorium was empty. There was one fellow sitting there, and his name was Johnson. He knew me from San Jose State, and he got up and he criticized Central for our Education in Aviation Education program that we’d offered that previous summer – and a poor example – and he got dismissed. But there was another person there – Dan Grimm – he had on a sweatshirt and khaki pants, and I can remember him, and he was just starting to get prominence in the legislature. And Dan started to object to this, and the students shouted him down. Every time he’d say something, they’d say “Listen to Dr. Harrington.” And whoops! They were offending a member of the Legislature, and Phyllis was sitting there - one other member of the Legislature - he was from East of WSU – I can’t remember the name – Peosta – he was from there, and so we got into Ft. Steilacoom. They welcomed us, and that wasn’t a problem, except that Dan Grimm was there, and he remembered me. So now we had Centers at Edmonds – very strong – we had Centers at Highline, we had Centers at Ft. Steilacoom, we had Centers at Yakima, and we had Centers in Tri-Cities.

KB: All specializing in different kinds of courses.

EH: Edmonds, I would have said, was Education, Business, and eventually Law and Justice, and that was pretty much the pattern, except for the Technology down at Ft. Steilacoom. And these are the ones that we were – really going.

KB: What ignited the students to show up at – this was at Olympia, the hearing?

EH: No, it at Ft. Steilacoom. They wanted Central there so they could get their degree in place, and that was our argument – that all these people – many of them mature people with families who could not go to another school, who couldn’t afford the private school – wanted access to a four-year institution. That’s what we provided.

KB: I see. So PLU and UPS were not trying to build a facility on a community college campus.

EH: No, they just didn’t want us there.

KB: I see.

EH: We were trespassers on their territory, but I never heard from – if the Presidents were there, they disappeared. Anyway, Dan Grimm remembered me, and then after that another woman who should have her picture on the campus – Leonora Lambert, whom I believe was a County Commissioner in Yakima – and she approached Don Schliesman, not me – Don would remember about it – and she said, “Do you know there’s a big Law Enforcement Advancement program – LEAP Program – to enable the law enforcement people to get a Baccalaureate degree? I think that Central should do it, and it’s also possible to get a grant.” So Don was approached, and he approached Phil Avery at Everett, and Phil Avery had a very strong program – lots of people at Paine Field who wanted to go into this LEAP program, and they got
subsidized through – they got their tuition paid. So we were then at Everett. We were doing quite well in these Centers. That’s where all the Centers started, and it’s all spelled out here. But – Dan Grimm problem – I – not long after that Garrity got interested in all these off-campus – and he supported us, that’s one thing I can say about him. He was in full support, because he’d done it for years at San Francisco State. And he said, “Ed, I want you to go over and testify in the Legislature.”

“Who, me?”

“Well golly – you know, in the positive sense. And we need our own building at Edmonds, because we’re using up all their space.”

And so I went down to testify in the Legislature, and I’m sitting here, and here’s this huge stadium up above – you know how they sit and look down at you – all kinds of Legislators, and Dan Grimm was in the foreground, and he said, “Dr. Harrington’s here to testify about a building at Edmonds, to be joint between Edmonds and Central. And who wants to ask questions?” All the hands went up. Every one of them. It was going to be a bad scene. And then Dan said, “Oh no, this isn’t necessary, Ed. We’re going to take care of it. Thank you for coming.” He didn’t want to debate me, and he made up his mind, and I said, “Well, that’s very nice.” So I went back and told Don, “I didn’t get a chance to testify.” Well it’s in here, but it’s not directly the way it turned out. Dan Grimm, we always thought, wanted Rainier College in Tacoma. He wanted another school down in Tacoma – a four-year school – and by excusing me and getting rid of this joint building he was paving the way – and it’s written up in here – for another school down there, which turned out to be the branch of UW down there in Tacoma, and one up in Bothell. I bring this up because we did get that joint building, Snoqualmie, at Edmonds, but we were cut out of it. I went down there to argue for it, and Dan Grimm said, “Forget it.” But – this should be in the – Edmons, obviously, carried forward. I asked Duane Skeen – over at a friend’s house for dinner the other night – I’d heard Ivory at one time tell him “Now make sure we get that building.” – I said to Duane, “Were you responsible for this? Did you work on it?” Duane said, “I didn’t. I don’t know who did.” I know who did – our friends at Edmonds were pushing it when we wanted UW to offer branch campuses in Bothell and Tacoma, and UW did not want to. So I went to the hearing, and it was debated and discussed, and UW was being told to do it. And of all people, George Beckman, who was a Provost and Vice President at UW, stood up in that meeting and said, “Central should do it.” I about fell over. But he didn’t get anywhere. UW got down there. And the reason, I think – I’m just speculating – he’s a graduate of the University of Michigan, and he remembered that Ann Arbor was the big school that got all the resources, but then they had two subsidiaries that moved out from Ann Arbor, and that drained resources from the main campus. And so I don’t think – and this is speculation – I don’t think UW was too thrilled to open up those two branches, but that’s what happened. But it did not cut us out of our branch campuses. We continued, we expanded, and we enlarged. We did very well.

The one that really saved us was Leonora Lambert and the LEAP Program. She came in, and she wanted it done – talked to me, and I said, “Okay, we’re going to do a Law and Justice program, and we’re just going to do it, and we’re going to offer it as a degree offering by virtue of the fact that when I set up the Dean of Undergraduate Studies I proposed and then got everybody to agree that he could do a range of degrees.” And the thought would be a person would come to Central, and would want a degree in Restaurant Management – could take courses in Business, and in Home Economics. And it was not listed

KB: David Dauwalder told me that Ivory was very important by agreeing to give some of Ellensburg’s capital budget.

EH: Now that I wouldn’t know. But I thought that our friends at Edmonds were pushing it when we couldn’t. Where are we on this? I mentioned the UW. Now, Dan Grimm was pushing for Rainier, and it came down to push and shove, and the legislature – I think it’s written up in here – wanted UW to offer branch campuses in Bothell and Tacoma, and UW did not want to. So I went to the hearing, and it was debated and discussed, and UW was being told to do it. And of all people, George Beckman, who was a Provost and Vice President at UW, stood up in that meeting and said, “Central should do it.” I about fell over. But he didn’t get anywhere. UW got down there. And the reason, I think – I’m just speculating – he’s a graduate of the University of Michigan, and he remembered that Ann Arbor was the big school that got all the resources, but then they had two subsidiaries that moved out from Ann Arbor, and that drained resources from the main campus. And so I don’t think – and this is speculation – I don’t think UW was too thrilled to open up those two branches, but that’s what happened. But it did not cut us out of our branch campuses. We continued, we expanded, and we enlarged. We did very well.

The one that really saved us was Leonora Lambert and the LEAP Program. She came in, and she wanted it done – talked to me, and I said, “Okay, we’re going to do a Law and Justice program, and we’re just going to do it, and we’re going to offer it as a degree offering by virtue of the fact that when I set up the Dean of Undergraduate Studies I proposed and then got everybody to agree that he could do a range of degrees.” And the thought would be a person would come to Central, and would want a degree in Restaurant Management – could take courses in Business, and in Home Economics. And it was not listed
in the Catalog. It was an arranged degree. I said, “We’re going to have the Law and Justice program that hasn’t gone through the Senate – hasn’t gone through the faculty, but we’re going to offer it, and once we get it in place, then we’ll bring it back and run it through the normal channels, but in the interim, we’re going to get on board.” And we did, and I don’t think the Faculty Senate was too happy with me – the fact that we’re offering this. But I stipulated the following conditions: the first Police Science in the United States was at San Jose in 1930, and they had a special building for it – Gunnery One, finger printing, high-speed driving outside – none of that. We’re going to have our program in Sociology, English, Psychology, Education, if necessary, and we’re going to put a package together. But all this other business is going to be at the Police Academy. So we announced it, and Bill Benton is the one that can tell you all about it. He – I think he was the one that really built the program, and all over the place. We were in Moses Lake. We were in Wenatchee. We were everywhere, this LEAP Program, and we had huge enrollments. And we used –

KB: Lead Program?

EH: LEAP. Law Enforcement Advancement Program. And these people got their tuition, as I understand it, and we got a grant, and it shot our enrollment way up. Way up. I asked Bill about it, and he said he’d be happy to help, but his daughter Jody was having a child within the next week – she was due – she was having serious problems, and I didn’t want to impose on him, so I haven’t called him since then, and Schliesman isn’t around to talk to. But we had the LEAP program, and we had a large enrollment. Well, the side effects of all of this – and it’s spelled out here, and I just was puzzled about one thing [turns pages] – it said, “Bachelor of Science degree in Electronic Engineering Technology was the first two-plus-two program approved in the State,” and we had all these other two-plus-two programs – Accounting at Edmonds, Education, the whole thing. I think what this is intending to say – Bachelor of Science degree in Electronic Engineering Technology was the first program in Technology approved in the State for off-campus, but not for the other –

KB: You’re referring to Libby Street’s summary, and I will check with her about that.

EH: Yes, right. But all these others – but the backlash in all of this – we had no more than started than Gail Norris, who was the head of the CPE appeared at an ICAO meeting and launched a vicious attack on me – ad hominem attack – [laughs] he never says anything – boy, he was mad! Just furious. We had bypassed the CPE, no question, and three weeks later he was gone. He’d taken a job in Colorado. I don’t know what happened, but he was not my friend. Then shortly after that the State Auditor showed up, and he gave me a letter, and I had a copy of it, but inadvertently I think I lost it. I gave some newspapers to a friend, and I think it went there. But the accusation – the letter had no official heading – the name had been blocked off, but I recognized the style of writing – and they accused us of falsifying our student credit hours in order to gain State subvention to support the faculty. And I said, “Well that’s not going to work out,” because I knew that Jack Purcell, Duane Skeen, and [sounds like Ali Mary Fair] counted the student credit hours accurately, and even those I moved over from Continuing Ed were in regular programs that – it was all on the up and up.

And to his credit, he came back, oh, a week later, and he shook my hand and said, “Ed, no problem.” He said, “I’ve been auditing the other schools, and Central is the only one that’s counting the student credit hours correctly. [Laughs] I can’t prove that, but it was just the – if there’s a report, I don’t know where it would be. But I do know that Western got into big trouble all the time. At one time they counted a huge number of Continuing Ed student credit hours – directly? Inadvertently? I don’t know what it was, but they counted them, and they got nailed by the State for miscounting. We know that that happened. I don’t know about the rest of them. Then we showed up for the Budget hearing, and Dan Evans, who was a good friend of Central – he was deep red, and he’s tired, he attended all the budget hearings and he was exhausted, and he said, “Ed, what’s this about off-campus?” And so I spent another hour explaining it to him, and interestingly enough the man had a tremendous memory. When he got to be President of the Evergreen State College he started a two plus two program in Tacoma, and he had a full page in the Seattle Times – one full page explaining what they were doing and how it worked. I was going to write to him and
say, “Hey Dan, you should have given me credit for the wording of this because that’s the argument I used with you,” and he remembered. And I’ve got in here somewhere when I retired he sent me a very nice letter thanking me for all the time we “worked” together. Can you believe that? Well, that’s about where I’m at. All these other things that I wanted to do originally one by one we got done.

The honors convocation – the first time we had that – I don’t remember the date – it didn’t go off as smoothly as it could, but Jim Brooks was not impressed at all with it at that – I wanted a situation where we would honor all the students. Not just the top three who won the Medallion – all the students. So we would have an introduction. I would MC it, and each Dean would present the Dean’s Scholars and give them a certificate. The Graduate Dean would recognize the outstanding graduate student, and the President would present the Medallions to the students, and then the President would talk for 20 minutes, and we’d have it all over in one hour. And I don’t think that Jim thought that was a very good idea. In fact, he told me I’d “Wasted an hour of his time.” He’d probably deny it, but that’s what he said: “You wasted my time.”

KB: Who started using that form to celebrate the Distinguished Professors of Research and Teaching and Service?

EH: That’s another one. After the Jaffrey case there was not much enthusiasm on the campus for Distinguished Professors. There was very little. But when the Code was re-written we debated that for a long time, and the Deans and I came in very strongly saying to the faculty – one of their big complaints was that they never got recognition, and that we would insist that there be a Distinguished Professor of Teaching, Research, Public Service. And Brooks put it in the Code, and we had it. Then we had the Honors Convocation to honor them, so that was a package deal. But we knew that the faculty were quite resentful over getting recognition.

KB: What about the Faculty Code? Why don’t you tell us about that? Any opinions about it, or its evolution?

EH: As I said in the Barnes case, it became quite clear that – Dean Kosy, who was the Chair of the Business Ed Department said, “Forget it.” He pointed out that the Faculty Senate was acting as a huge grievance committee, really. If a faculty member had an argument, they brought it to the Faculty Senate. Even Jaffrey got an advocate. Charlie McGehee showed up at the hearing representing, I believe, the Senate. He was his advocate, and Jaffrey would sit there, and he wouldn’t take any paper we handed to him. McGehee had to pick it up with a piece of Kleenex and pass it over to Jaffrey, who took the piece of Kleenex, and he wouldn’t touch it. [Laughs] Anyway, the Distinguished Professor program worked out well. That’s one of the things that emphasized, and that we would insist that there be a Distinguished Professor. The Mace. I mentioned that. I couldn’t conceive of a school without a Mace. Every school I went to had – Eastern didn’t. They got one after we did, and it was very handy. When the students were having a problem at Cornell, the faculty member leading the graduation procession was pressured by the student, and he took the Mace and hit him. So, a handy device. We got that for Garrity.

KB: What are you proudest of, of your accomplishments?

EH: Oh, just a whole series of them. Not so much pride – satisfaction of getting it done. Phi Kappa Phi, the Honor Society – we didn’t have one. After we got 11 Phi Kappa Phi members on board, and I watched every year, David Lygre of Sigma Si signed on, and I put up the money to pay for the initiation fee – $150, which they repaid me over several years – to get an honor society. There was no emphasis on this campus on recognition of students, let alone recognition of the – pardon my eye, it’s going to water all day. Guess I’m carried away by all of this. But lack of recognition was one of the problems, and I think that we helped on that. Pictures of the Distinguished Professor – I put them up in the library, and there was – with all the [End of Side One]
Our Distinguished Professors got their picture in the library, and then later on they showed up in – after I left, a smaller version – down in the Administration Building. So there’s just a host of little things that Central didn’t have that we were able to get in, and some of them pretty minor, but the Honor Society, and the whole improvement of Graduation –

When I got here, a student came up to the graduation facility in a wheelchair, and you had to run down and hand him the graduation certif [breaks off] – folder. There was no diploma in it – I think that came later. But that was kind of embarrassing, to have to go down and call attention to them, so I had them build ramps so that the people – and the first one was a motorized wheelchair – he rolled up onto the platform and down again, and everybody applauded. Little things like that, where you try to give consideration to people. It was important.

KB: Who would you say were important leaders? You named earlier Larry Danton and Burton Williams. Are there any individuals who stand out in your mind as shaping the institution?

EH: Oh, I think Dale Comstock did an excellent job of converting all of the Graduate degrees from Master of Education in whatever you have, to – example: MA and MFA. Before that, it was a Masters Degree in Education in Art. And when he got through – we ran them through the CPE and everyone else and took care of that – we had the Master of Arts and Master of Fine Arts, which was normal for a University, not a Master of Education in Art. But that backfired, and – poor Reino isn’t here. Reino Randall, for whom the Randall building was named, had a Master’s Degree in Education in Art. He was very proud of it. Just very proud of it. And he wrote me a letter saying that it would be wrong to drop that degree – we had to keep it. And I wrote back and said, “No, it’s going to be MA or MFA. Your choice.” And so pretty soon the same letter reappeared, but this time it was signed by the Chairman of a Statewide History Committee – the identical letter, but addressed to Jim Brooks – and Jim called us in, and here was the person, Buddy Avreno, and he said, “Well look what you’ve done now. These people have –” [Laughs] No, no, that was Reino. He was being crafty.

But Dale changed all of them. Dale also was able to – when the roof fell in on us, they had been converting faculty positions into “graduate assistantships” who were not assistants. They were given a scholarship, really, is what it boiled down to. I don’t think they were doing any work out there in their departments. They could have. I didn’t know about it. And one time I think we had to drop 16 graduate assistantships, which was the equivalent of four faculty positions, and Dale was very upset, but Brooks said, “Well Ed’s right. I support him on this. We’re not going to fire faculty to keep scholarships for graduate students.” And one of your colleagues in History came storming up, and he was the only faculty member who ever came to my office and told me I should quit and go get a job somewhere else. He was furious he’d lost his graduate assistant.

KB: History Department was also furious to have two tenured professors RIFted in ’82, when Hebeler Hall was closed.

EH: We can get into that. Okay. We’re getting into the –

KB: Gordon Warren, and Refai.

EH: Okay, but on the first one, before I lose my train of thought. The –

KB: The graduate students?

EH: Yeah. This professor from the History Department really read me off, and then after I retired I called – I wanted to talk to Beverly [Heckart] on some issue. He answered the phone, and oh, he was just gracious and he said, “Ed, we really miss you!” Whoops! That was a change.
Okay, Warren and Refai, and here I’m going to appear to point the finger. One of the tenets that Phil Marshall had at Eastern, and I had, and I think most Vice Presidents had, was that we were not going to fire tenured faculty. But two, maybe three times we got into RIF, when it became obvious that positions were threatened. And we went – I had to meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and we had to draw up a plan, and it really got sticky. But I had a list of maybe 20 faculty and the priority in which – the rule in the Code would be who’s the Senior member? They would go first. Okay. And we avoided it a couple of times. One time I avoided it by transferring money – which I can do – out of the library budget into the instructional budget to get us through. Then, at the end of the year when we had money left over – we always had something left over, both we and the Physical Plant – we moved money back into the library. So no harm, no foul. But Garrity was always very critical of this. He never said it to me in my face, but on the phone once he said, “Oh you should have fired these people when you could. Then I would – ” he implied, “I’d have had positions for the Foreign Studies program.” So he called a budget meeting, which was never done before, and he had all the Deans come in, and Frank Schneider, and he said, “This is the way we’re going to handle it.” And he took away from me that power to move money around – salary savings in the library – so we would not have had a cut, but he took that over, and Frank Schneider said, “Oh you can’t take my money! That would have made you a thief.” Oh gee, thanks Frank. And so when we got into RIF that time, there wasn’t any money, and Gordon Warren and Refai were the two Senior members, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had made out a RIF list of priorities, and they were at the head of the list. Biology would have been right up there too, but I went down to teach in Yakima, and punishment fit the crime. I ended up with the largest off-campus class – 71 students – that generated two positions. So I told the RIF committee, “Come on now, you’re looking at student credit hours by department, and the importance of the University – a whole host of characteristics – but the one you’re looking at is student credit hours. Now Biology is off the hook.” Which I’m not sure was appreciated in the Biology Department, but it worked. But History got left out there because their enrollment had fallen way down. And so we went through that, and –

KB: You’re suggesting that if you had retained the power to move money from the library, that might have been averted?

EH: Might have. I’m not sure. It was that close. Maybe not. But Garrity was not in favor of that. He wanted to protect the library. And I didn’t intend to harm the library, but I thought I could – maybe I could have, maybe I couldn’t. We’ll never know. But at any rate, by that decision that I didn’t have that power anymore to switch budgets, then that put us into RIF, and that time it was Warren and Refai.

The other time that we got into a RIF where we had to make a cut was, of course, Hebeler. And each time we got into RIF and I was served with them, I furnished the Faculty Senate Executive Committee – and again, these papers all should be in the library – an analysis of every department – the number of faculty, the number of positions that they were generating under the State formula, their status in the University – whether or not you could afford to cut this department because they were absolutely essential – which was true of most of the departments. You couldn’t pick and choose. We were that tight. And the expenses in the departments – just the total financial analysis. And here’s how much we have to cut. And the Faculty Senate Executive Committee looked it all over, and they looked at Hebeler, and they said, “Well you know, it just happens we have to cut $200,000-$300,000, and that’s what it costs to run Hebeler, so we recommend dropping Hebeler – a not-instructional program. Well Brooks was not too happy with that, because he was very proud of Hebeler. It had been around for years.

Now here’s a school, Hebeler [Lab School], had been around for a long time, and as I told you earlier, in 1955 they were dropping them in California. And the people in Hebeler were all excellent teachers. I felt sorry for them, but Hebeler was cut. The Trustees went along with it. It was a very stormy meeting. But Garrity stood up on that one. Instead of deferring to me, he defended it. And the one who tipped the whole angle as to whether we should drop Hebeler or not was Linda Clifton, who was a Trustee, who asked the people from Hebeler, “Please tell me how you differ from the Elementary School down the street. What’s different?” And they said, “Well, we’re on the cutting edge. We’re only one of ten in the country.” Yeah, one of ten left, I think, is the truth of the matter. And Jim Erickson, who had come in as Dean of Education, had written a letter saying that Hebeler was intended to be a research facility for the Education
Department, and they weren’t doing research. And Con Potter, who was part of the triumvirate – it was Psychology, Home Economics, and Education that had the three of them that were sort of supervising Hebeler – Con Potter wrote me a letter congratulating me on dropping Hebeler, and that circulated through every Education Department box. It showed up. I don’t know how he got a hold of the letter. It somehow came up in the hearing, because we had again the Attorney coming in, McDonald, defending the ladies in Hebeler who claimed it was an affront to Affirmative Action. Well it wasn’t, because if we’d had minority members over there we’d have had male members, and it was all female. But if the unit goes, I didn’t see anything in there in Affirmative Action that said you had to have all this, or all that. So poor Hebeler went. And that was a good program, but Linda tipped the scales that day when she brought that question up, and the Trustees voted to drop Hebeler, and the Faculty gave a sigh of relief, and it was unfortunate, but Hebeler was not a research facility, it was an Elementary School on the campus. And a good one. That was a big – you must have heard about that – the fracas on that one.

So we lost Refai and we lost Warren, and it’s too bad. Refai went off to teach at some Religious School in the East, as far as I know. Warren went off, I presume, to be an attorney. I used to hunt with him, but I never heard from him again. But when – Gordon wrote a letter, and it’s up there in the library. He attacked Garrity. He didn’t attack me – oh no. Very “don’t suffer fools lightly” letter to Garrity, personally, for whatever reason. A lot of reasons. You know.

KB: Well do you have any last thoughts before we close down this machine?


KB: Now Schliesman told me that you had a nickname, Chuckles.

EH: Um, yeah. Chuckles. Read this. I had been at San Jose State, and I was in Building R, which was a barracks from WWI, and I got up here and we had a whole series of barracks from WWII, and we had a lot of temporary buildings that the Urban Renewal had left some behind. And the Paleontology Building was left, and I said, “We better get rid of it.” The building itself was so bad, the wallboard had been punched out, the wiring was defective, the heating system didn’t work, but it had a nice roof on it, and nice siding, and they kept it well painted, and I said, “I think we better get rid of this building, or they’re going to stick us with it over in Olympia as square footage that we’re responsible for. Let’s get rid of it.” And he agreed. I went up there. Duane Skeen called me once. He said, “We’re having a party up here in the Paleontology Building. We want you to attend.” And here’s this building that’s just terrible on the inside, and I got up there, and they gave me a hard had and a sledge hammer, and the door was rigged, and I hit the door and it fell in, and a big cloud of dust came up, and then you could hear the bulldozers starting up, and on it, the signs on there said, “Harrington Hall.” And so Garrity read that pronouncement.

KB: Official declaration of destruction. Where was this Paleontology Building?

EH: Just north of the present Science Building. He was a comedian. Another attribute of him. He was pretty clever. Sometimes it blew up – I’m reminiscing here. Sometimes it was a detriment. A lot of times it was very funny. Name the building for me, and tear it down the same day.

KB: Nineteen eighty-eight, huh?

EH: Oh yes. That was something [inaudible].

KB: October, ’88.

EH: His sense of humor sometimes did not do us well. I went to his house one day. They’d had advisors from the Community Colleges all day, and I had taken them all over the campus, and one of the ladies was very, very friendly, and she’d asked me all kinds of questions – quite obviously convinced her to
send her students to Central, and she was just as friendly as could be. I don’t know if we had something in common in the background. Got to Garrity’s house that night – he was having a little soiree for them, and he said, of course, “Here’s Ed Harrington, and you know, he wouldn’t be where he was today if we hadn’t sent him to the Schick Institute.” And all the regular faculty laughed – Schick Institute for reforming alcoholics. And she got a sick look on her face, and she said, “Is that really true?” And I said, “No, that’s not true.” But it was that type of humor that I think did him in. I showed up at Applegate’s retirement party and he was there, and he said, “Oh, here’s Ed Harrington in his faded blue coat,” and the audience didn’t like that. And when we had the Central Investment Fund he’d go over there, and he’d crack some of these jokes – they didn’t go over too well. But –

KB: Well, final question. What should Central be proudest of?

EH: I don’t know. One other than Chuckles? Because of the physiological, anatomical problem, you notice, I don’t smile. I can’t show my teeth. And it’s always been a problem. I don’t smile. It’s either the musculature or the [inaudible, sounds like “elevation”] – it doesn’t matter. But that’s why I was Chuckles, because I never smile. Another one that’s priceless – just to throw in here – I went to a – another thing that I did. I thought we ought to give Certificates to all retiring faculty. And interestingly enough, Brooks stopped going to all those, and I went to all of them, and he didn’t go to any of them. Every faculty member that retired, I had to be there to speak on his behalf, and if somebody died, I got to do the eulogy. It was sort of [inaudible]. What he did before then, I don’t know. And I had all the faculty down to the house for dinner to try to get some camaraderie going around here. But at one of them, for retired elderly ladies, I would hand them the Certificate, and Don Garrity would shake their hand, and then they would sit and we had refreshments for them. And I went to hand the Certificate to one lady, and she said, “I don’t know you!” You know how people get sometimes. And all of a sudden she came to, and she said, “Oh, you’re Ruth Harrington’s husband!” And everybody laughed. The next day Duane Skeen – always the comedian – had taken down the sign that said Edward J. Harrington, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and –

KB: [Apparently reading] Ruth Harrington’s Husband.

EH: And that’s the headline that appeared in the Ellensburg Record the day that I retired, which I thought that Garrity had a fit. He didn’t like that at all. What am I most proud of? Well, I’m going to brag. When I came here there was this terrible schism between the faculty and the administration, and I’ve described some of the details. Some of them were pretty nasty. Even the Biology Department – I’d go up there, and some of them refused to work with me – “You’re administration. We’re not going to work with you.” And I said, “I just bought you twelve trees for you silver [inaudible] program. Let’s go put them in.”

“Well Harvey, how are you?”

And I’m not kidding. I had retired. I was up here on the roof, working on holding the trusses in place while my sons were roofing it. My two oldest sons and I built this house, which is interesting, but of course, the oldest son is a contractor. And a car drove in, and this is March – this weary eye of mine – it was Harvey Veneer, and he was a Trustee at the time, and he’d just resigned. Now this is March, 1990, and I’d been gone since 1988, and Harvey showed up.

“Okay, but we don’t like working with people from the administration.”

And he walked in, and he was an architect out of Moses Lake, and he looked at all the work that we were doing – “That’s very nice.” And he said, “You know, this lumber they’re using? In the old days we would have characterized it as ‘Quality C,’ and today you’re paying prices for Quality A.” Then he said – here I’m bragging – he said, “I wanted to come by and shake your hand,” he said, “I’ve been out on the campus, and I’ve talked to –” and he implied many, many faculty, and he said, “You’re the only administrator that got a good word.” And I don’t think that was quite the case, but at least when I came here I was hoping we could build the camaraderie, and get this administration/faculty rift out of the way, and Larry Lowther
subsequently told me that he’d gotten a lot of letters which I never bothered to read – he had them at his house, and they were very complimentary. And so if I’m proud of anything, it’s the fact that I think we finally got to the – a working team, rather than “bang!” And I didn’t make it all the way. The final evaluation of the administration there were 20 faculty all rated me totally zero, and I think they’re all out of one department. But I had good rapport. Every year I worked with the Faculty Senate Chairperson and say, “Let’s not get into a fight. If you’ve got a problem, bring it here. We’ll try to resolve it before it gets out in the Senate, and get into all these messes. Let’s try to avoid it.” And people – our Chairs – Anderson, Beverly Heckert – all of them were very helpful – very cooperative. But if there’s one thing I think I may have accomplished, it’s getting over this miserable head-on butting all the time. And I won’t say we didn’t have it at San Jose. Good Lord, they had a strike down there – the Union. They picketed and closed the campus. But I walked through the picket line, and some student said, “Hey, don’t go and teach!” And I said, “Guarantee, I’m not going to.” I was Vice President at the time. I said, “I can guarantee you I’m not going to teach today.” And he said, “I think you are. I think you’re a cop.” And I said, “What makes you think that?”

“You’re shaped like a cop.”

And the police over there were laughing and laughing. Oh, that’s it. So if there’s one thing that I’m proud of it’s overcoming this terrible, terrible anti-administration feeling. And maybe I’m wrong, and that when you talk to the faculty you may find that that’s not the case. I don’t know. But Harvey Veneer, a year and a half later comes by, and he also said – and this is not too positive – he said that he was very politically active, and he was, and he said, “Central’s position in Olympia and the Governor’s office is not good.” He said, “In the House and the Senate, in the Education Committees, Central’s image is not good,” and he said, “In the HEC board,” he said, “It’s terrible. All I get are complaints.” And he said, “I think we’re going to have to do something.” Maybe that had something to do with Garrity, maybe it didn’t. I don’t know. But I know that he personally did not like Garrity. He was opposed. So who knows what [inaudible]? So I’ve wandered all over the place, here.

KB: But I’ve learned a lot. Thank you very much.

EH: There’s a lot more to be said. I’m trying to think of all the things we a accomplished. Oh, there’s another Harrington Hall – you’ve seen it on the campus. Tall guy. They built a new library – now the Brooks library – and before they were through, because it had been delayed so long in construction, they were running out of money, and they didn’t know what to do. And so Jim asked me to go up and meet with the library committee, and the physical plant people. What are we going to do? There’s no money to finish the building. And I looked at the plans, and here’s the whole library – so – which exists today, but a little bit larger. And then there were two huge auditoria over here that would have seated hundreds of students – two separate auditoria. Then connected to that is what became the Soc/Anthro Building. And I said, “Well, I think the obvious thing to do is just cut it off here, put the extra money and get the library where you want it,” which they did, and then leave this building standing where it is – but it had to be rotated 90 degrees and moved because there was an old lake bed. And there’s two of them today – that and the Soc/Anthro Building. But I think this whole area in-between is Harrington Hall. It never – [laughs]

KB: Ah.

EH: And because of me, again. It was kind of a unilateral decision. I couldn’t see anything going out, and then everybody was, “Oh, that’s pretty good. Now we don’t have the problem any more.” It was the obvious thing to do, except that when I designated Soc and Anthro – this building – the Chairman of one of your departments said to me he wanted the building for his department. He said, “Damn you, Ed Harrington, I’ll never forget this!” And stormed out the door. Too bad. So it goes. But now I’ve wandered all over the place, but then –

KB: Well thank you for your thoughts.
EH: I don’t know. I’ve got all this stuff in here that’s –

[End of Interview]