

Dr. Enid H. Campbell with Dr. Frank Erath, 1991, Oral History

Erath: Welcome to the Oral History Series at Trenton State College. My name is Frank Erath, professor of English, and I've come this afternoon to sit down with Enid Campbell, a professor of psychology, to talk not necessarily about her distinguished career as a professor in that department, but about something that both of us have a great deal of interest in and have spent a lot of time with: the Faculty Senate. We have each served two terms as president of the Faculty Senate. As a matter of fact, I succeeded you, Enid, in that office and I think if we can perhaps spend a little time recreating some of those golden days, if in fact they were golden, we can add something to this series. Before we came here into the studio, I was thinking about the beginning of the Senate and I wondered if you could talk about your recollection of how governance in this particular form came to be at our college.

Campbell: Well, the whole thing was kind of interesting because the development of the senate came about, as you know, when the college was undergoing what for that time were pretty major transitions. You know, we had been Trenton State College Teachers' College or Trenton State Teachers' College and had been exclusively a teacher training institution and our name had been changed to Trenton State College, but nothing much else had and we were very much-

Erath: That would have been when? About the time I came here we were just beginning the transition to other than strictly teacher training, and so that was 1964 so it would have been shortly after that, right?

Campbell: Yeah that was and we were originally under the Commissioner of Education. The same person oversaw the state colleges, and all of the high schools, and elementary school, and public schools in the state, and so when the chancellor was brought in, Ralph Dungan was the first memorable chancellor we had. He was a politician although he didn't have some of the qualities we usually associate with politicians, and we started to emerge really as an academic institution of higher education. I think in the earlier years we were very much dominated by people who had all had a lot of public school experience and certainly Roscoe West, who preceded me as president of the college, ran it pretty much as if it was his own private fiefdom from the stories I've heard.

Erath: I heard that's true. Certainly goes back before my time, but I've heard some wonderful stories particularly from Al Holman and Bill Hausdoerffer about Mr. West. But anyway when lets say the middle- the late sixties, that five year period in there, are you able to recollect why around 1966-67 the interest, the need developed for participatory governance on a part of the faculty?

Campbell: I'm not entirely clear what all of the factors were but certainly one of them was that some of the members of the School of Education, I think, felt that decisions might be made that would in some way not be in their best interest because, of course, they had had the whole pie up until then and they foresaw quite correctly that there might have to be some cutbacks or changes that they might not welcome, and so it made a lot of

sense to start to organize and have a faculty voice that was an in house group such as is typical in many, many faculty colleges and universities.

Erath: Right and if my recollection serves, the way we went about this was to begin by forming a constituent assembly which wasn't a faculty senate but a kind of pre-senate body. You remember that, were you in it?

Campbell: I was the chair of the Constituent Assembly and its very funny Joe Carroll asked-

Erath: How did you get to be chair?

Campbell: Oh that's an interesting story. Joe Carroll asked me if I would stand for the- to run for the chair of the constituent assembly, and he probably couldn't have chosen a more naïve but well-meaning member of the faculty to do this. I'm not knowledgeable about the bigger political scene, and he was himself, of course, active in county and state politics, and I think he had a model based on that that he was hoping to put in place. But at any rate a lot of us were elected and we divided up our various tasks, and I don't think any of us knew what we were doing. Joyce Brodowski was absolutely heroic. She got copies of constitutions from other institutions, but I was too naïve to see the implications of some of the different organizational patterns that we were reviewing.

Erath: I think everybody was, almost everybody perhaps I should say, was in a position of having to sort of feel one's way along. I recollect the Constituent Assembly sessions as being very long, very tedious, sometimes painful, but if my recollection further serves the main purpose of the assembly was to establish a constitution.

Campbell: That's right. Was to draw up a constitution that would then be in place and would allow us to have a meaningful voice that the central administration would listen to with respect because even though they legally have the right to make the decisions about our budget, and our organization, and our future it's in their best interest to know what our perspectives are, what our values are, and what the things are that are going on in our specific fields that are changing on the national scene that they might have no knowledge of without that input, so we really saw ourselves as- and also being a group to be spokesperson for faculty rights within the contexts, again, of the college. We didn't have a union. We weren't organized at that state of our development.

Erath: Do you have any specific recollections of the Constituent Assembly days, the meetings some of the personalities involved in?

Campbell: Oh yes, well, you know, Jessie Turk was in her element!

Erath: I knew you would mention Jessie Turk, first person that comes to my mind, and the second is Bill Goldstein.

Campbell: Yes, yes. Very, very, very.

Erath: What do you recollect of Jessie?

Campbell: Well, she was marvelous, at whatever things were proceeding, of presenting effectively her position of what was wrong with it. That was one of her you know...

Erath: One of her unique qualities.

Campbell: One of her special qualities. But she didn't do it in a way that had any malice or aggressive quality to it. I mean, she really was in there working hard and she wanted to do it right, but she sure was the one who saw what all the problems were in everything and she was very young, she was very articulate in making those clear.

Erath: Jessie had a wonderful way of letting you know exactly where she stood on whatever the issue was, and the chances, I think, were very good that she didn't stand any place where anybody was standing.

Campbell: Right. Yes.

Erath: But you need the contributions of a person like that when you're starting from square one, absolute zero. We needed everybody's input no matter how extraneous it might appear. I don't recollect for sure but I would be willing to bet that a number of the details that appear in the constitution, which essentially is unchanged...

Campbell: Well except for the amendment that-

Erath: Well the basic document is still there now some what 25 years later, but bet you a good deal of whets in there, well, a part of what is in there's Jessie's, sure.

Campbell: Tell me what you remember about Bill.

Erath: Bill Goldstein was always, it seemed to me, the naysayer. He's one of the most negative people I can recollect, and again that was not necessarily meant as a criticism. I mean, you need to have people who say, "Well no, this isn't right. This wont work," so you that can find the way to make it work best or better with whatever item is under discussion. Was Jack McCullough the principal author of the constitution?

Campbell: I would say so I think Jack was one of the-

Erath: Sort of our Thomas Jefferson, Madison...

Campbell: Yes. He was one of the most constructive. I was just going to say that. I also think about him in a very constructive context. He was the principal architect of the constitution and that was a very special piece of work.

Erath: It was. It was extremely difficult, as we've indicated. Every word, not just clause or phrase, but every word was gone over intensely by some 30 or 40 people. I'm not sure anymore how many people there were in the membership of the constituent assembly, but eventually we did get through the writing and the gratification of the constitution, and it was accepted by the administration, and I think that was one of the first years that we had a Board of Trustees just about the same time.

Campbell: That's right, yup. The president and the Board of Trustees, and the Trustees took a little while before they accepted it. It was one of the parts of the process that I remember. It was difficult because we didn't really start a dialogue with them early enough and our meeting, when we were hoping to adopt the final form of the constitution, we had Clayt Brower and some other people from the central administration present, and they had serious objections, and questions, and what have you, and some of the senate members or the constitutional assembly members were pretty restless and critical about this. And I've forgotten his name, but one of the members of the assembly, I can picture the man I just don't recall who it was by name, got to his feet and made a motion that we stop the clock just exactly like they do in Washington, and we stopped the clock, and then proceeded to work for another four or five hours to iron out some of these differences and it was really a very creative thing that he did.

Erath: It was the day time stood still at Trenton State College.

Campbell: Yes, that's right.

Erath: Do you recall the first election when the first 45 people were elected to Session #1 of the Senate?

Campbell: No, not in any great detail

Erath: I guess I do, perhaps because I somehow got appointed to the election committee.

Campbell: Ah great. Okay, you better tell me about that first election.

Erath: No, I was there counting votes, but since we were electing all 45 that first time around...

Campbell: In different time slots, some three, some two, and some one year senators.

Erath: The counting process took a long time before we finally were down to the 44th and 45th people. We never had, of course, another election that was quite so complicated, but I do recollect that not only were there a lot of people there to help count, but there were even some people there sort of observing because obviously it was a matter of great interest, since we were giving birth to something brand new. At any rate the following year we went into business, that is to say the Faculty Senate went into business. You and I were both members at the first session.

Campbell: And Joe Carroll from Educational Foundations was the first president.

Erath: Did you have an elected office in the first session? Were you a council chairman?

Campbell: I think I was a council chairman. That's my recall.

Erath: Faculty affairs, I think.

Campbell: Faculty affairs sounds like it, but I couldn't swear to it, and I didn't have a chance to check my notes.

Erath: Are there particular things that you recall being involved, you in that role as council chair during the early years, the early sessions of the senate, things that you or you and your council brought to the senate for consideration? ... Well, particular pieces of legislation, issues that were hot and burning? We always seemed to have some of those.

Campbell: Yeah, I was just trying to think what they were because a lot of those issues were generated from crises of one kind or another we had a number- I remember one of the hottest ones involved the 5 year tenure situation, and there was even some discussion of removing tenure completely from the faculty, but that was later. I think that was when I was president of the senate because I did address the state legislators in Trenton with a position paper on that issue of which I must have 50 copies still left in my office upstairs, and it wasn't bad, you know, in retrospect, but a lot of us talked that over and were very concerned about these issues. I think, many of- there was a lot of concern, I think, about the one year, that each appointment was only for one year, and some of us were hoping we could get maybe two one-years and then a three year appointment or something, so that the person wasn't forever being evaluated observed and so forth.

Erath: And pressured.

Campbell: Yeah and pressured. It's not a comfortable feeling to be under that type of scrutiny.

Erath: Do you have-

Campbell: That was a big one. The other big one was the student evaluation of faculty performance. That was very tricky because a member of my department, Henry Wang, who's one of our measurement specialists, was very active in a committee working very closely with Wade Curry to develop a really first rate instrument to do this, and then I think there was a lot of feeling among the faculty that it would not be used in a way that safeguarded the individual differences among. It may seem sort of silly until you stop and think about it, but there are some people who teach very difficult courses where the students have to work awfully hard, and often students don't appreciate that course until they are five years out of the college, whereas somebody else who comes in and may even be tempted to pander to the student, you know, entertains them, makes it fun doesn't

make too many difficult assignments. That person may get very high student ratings, and therefore student ratings alone are only a very small part of the picture, and I think we were all afraid that this would distort the evaluation of faculty work. Certainly, we did have peer observation and, of course, that's very variable, too. There's some peers everything they say they like, you know, sorry, everything they see they like and there are other peers who are very critical of everything, so it's tricky.

Erath: The whole evaluation matter was obviously one of great concern and high controversy. Still is, I guess, you'd have to say. You've had a number of years, I think we won't say how many, could we just go back and maybe you could give a thumbnail sketch of the presidents you've served under?

Campbell: Quite a few.

Erath: Who was your first- who hired you?

Campbell: My first president was, oh I'm getting a block on his name, oh just a second.

Erath: Well, it was probably Ed Martin, wasn't it?

Campbell: Yes, of course. It was Ed Martin who had newly come after Roscoe West, and he was a very- he tended to have pretty tight control over the faculty, and also was very interested in minutia which from our perspective today he didn't like men to teach in Bermuda shorts in the summer. And I became pregnant for the second time during his administration and I knew very well that I had better get in there and talk this over with him because if he were to see me pregnant, showing all of a sudden, it would raise a lot of questions. So, I did go in and I told him that I was pregnant and the baby was due in July and I was feeling very well, and had no anticipation of any problems, and would certainly serve out the semester, and we had a very nice chat and at the end of the chat I got up to say good-bye, and he said, "Well, it's been wonderful that we've had this nice talk and we're going to miss you very much." And I said, "What? I'll be back in September," and his face really look quite crestfallen. And, I think, what it was a sign of was more of the times than of Ed's own attitudes about these matters. Although, everybody tended to be more conservative in those days.

Erath: Sort of thing nobody would give a second thought to right, right now.

Campbell: Exactly. Today, that's right, it's one of our inalienable rights.

Erath: Exactly, then came Warren Hill who was president when I came.

Campbell: Right, and he was famous in our department for giving one of our faculty members a promotion when she had another offer, and that was pretty unheard of in the educational circles that most of the faculty belong to here. I was not too surprised by it because I had come from the private sector where a lot of that kind of thing goes on. She has since left us and is at Rutgers, but it certainly was a sensitive issue. He was a very

gregarious and solid kind of person, and then, as you know, went on to be the Commissioner in the state of Maine, which was...

Erath: And from there to the Education Commission of the States, which he ran for a number of years a very, very sensitive and high level group.

Campbell: He was a very solid, good listener, took in what was going on, and then even informed decision was very much his own and that's a nice quality.

Erath: Yeah he was. He was there for a short time.

Campbell: Yeah that's right. Was just two years was it?

Erath: Yeah, I think it was. Gave us, well, I as a new faculty member and really a very little chance to get to know him.

Campbell: Now what do you remember of the Heissler Affair because didn't Heissler follow Warren Hill?

Erath: I believe so.

Campbell: Now that was a curious sentiment.

Erath: We had a brief period of sort of interregnum, then Heissler came on in the late sixties very, very late sixties, when, as you say, there was a Faculty Senate in place. Turned out to be the, what should we say, sort of the focal point of the opposition that developed to him in his relatively short stay with us. I think that the faculty senate grew up in the Heissler years. I think, that's when it really found out what it could do. It really found out that it was a serious body, that it wasn't just a debating society, and in the turmoil it became a mature, not that everything that went on during that time was necessarily mature and sensible, obviously the emotions were extremely high, but it became as a body a mature and deliberative group. So when Heissler left, and the new president eventually took over, the senate was positioned at that time, I think, to begin serious deliberative work, serious participation, serious legislation as the faculty's representative and as the faculty's voice.

Campbell: Well, I agree with you because, I think, I don't know if you remember well, but there were depositions taken from members of the senate and other people in opposition to Heissler and everybody was aware that there were legal implications to this, that one had to choose ones words very carefully and make sure that they were accurate and just, so that it not only gave us a sense of power but, I think also a sense of enormous responsibility that went with that power that, I think, had not been felt in the same way earlier, you know.

Erath: It was certainly a matter of having to do things at that point, beforehand maybe it wasn't so much that we had to and so the attitude wasn't as pressing. In from my

perspective, and I don't know whether coincides with yours or not, but from my perspective, once Heissler had left and the brief period between administrations occurred and Clayt Brower was finally selected as his successor, that once that all happened the senate then began the truly most significant period of its existence. Because it did, it was responsible for not just talking about, but initiating and deliberating over some really important things, issues, ideas many if not most of which we still use as guidelines for operations right now. Tell me about Heissler from your perspective. How did he fail?

Campbell: Oh, I think he was not of an administrative disposition, I think, is probably the easiest thing to say. He was scholarly, and he had clear ideas about where he wanted to be, and he did not understand what John Kennedy discovered. I've often quoted this, John Kennedy said one day after he became president of our country that, "I don't know what's going on around here. I send orders down and everybody does everything exactly the way they've always done it, nothing changes." And of course that's what Heissler didn't understand. He'd have to explain to the faculty, to the people actually doing the work, what it is he is wanting to do. Get they're input and realize that you take it in small steps. You don't change an institution overnight by flipping a switch or telling people that they're going to do everything different, which is what he was inclined to do, and, I think, it was so sad because some of the values that he espoused were ones that we have since achieved at a much slower pace.

Erath: What were some of those?

Campbell: He was very high on scholarship, particularly faculty scholarship, and without support given he wanted everybody on the faculty to have a doctoral degree or an appropriate terminal degree for their field, and, as you know, one of the crises that occurred was when one of the historians who was going to be tenured was a person who did not have a doctoral degree, so in a sense that's one of the things that's really happened dramatically. He was interested in increasing the quality and the scholarly content of the work that our students were doing and attracting better students, and, of course, that's gone beautifully year by year, but, again, were talking, you know, many years after he served.

Erath: After his tenure, yes. One of the big recollections I have of Heissler is standing on the steps of Green Hall making a speech one day in which he announced that the college could get along without an administration, although he never gave any evidence that he truly believed that, but it could get along actually without any students, but it couldn't get along without a faculty which was one of the things, you know, it sounded very good, but I don't think he ever saw the connection between the theory and the practice in regard to that statement, and from my perspective his failure to understand and respect his faculty was one of the principle reasons that he had so much difficulty. Be as it may, after a relatively short period of time he left us and then there was a, yet again, an interregnum, and finally Clayton Brower became president and gave the office some stability for about a ten year period, during which time each of us had the opportunity to work with him because those were the years during those years we served as president of the senate. Some recollections about your interaction with Clayt Brower.

Campbell: Well, the other thing that was going on at this time, of course, was that we had become, for the first time the faculty had become organized, and we had AFT, so that the role of the senate became somehow subtly different, maybe not so subtly different, because the AFT suddenly had jurisdiction over the terms and conditions of employment which are always something that are themselves negotiable, as I understand it. And I was president of the senate when we had our first strike, led by Phil Malloy who was then president of the AFT, and I can still remember in a rain suit picketing in the main entrance, and you know, having- I've forgotten who all the people were but certainly one of the was Clayt Brower, having his car slow down, and Phil Malloy shouting something at him. And I later called Clayt about it because I was very fond of him, and he was the kind of person you have a good working relationship, and I'd forgotten all about it, I saw him not too long ago in Sun City, Arizona where he's now retired, and he said, "I've never forgotten that day you called me from the picket line," and he said what I had said of course was, "Now Clayt, this is not as bad as it looks. Please don't lose your cool and do anything that's going to get people more upset. This is Phil Malloy's first strike and he needs to do it in this energetic way. We're trying to calm him on our side."

Erath: We all needed to learn how to have a strike.

Campbell: Yes. You know, and it was tricky and, you know, I wasn't the most enthusiastic person about the strike, but I felt that I had a responsibility as the head of the senate to be supportive in that regard, but also to be a double agent in the sense of getting in touch with Clayt and urging to not upset the apple cart that it was going to get worked out.

Erath: One of the things that I've found during my term of office as president in regard to Clayt Brower was that he was generally able to keep an open mind, even about issues that were highly controversial and about which he felt fairly strong or strongly, and I wondered if- does that coincide with your view, of your recollection of Clayt as an administrator,

Campbell: Oh yes very much, and I really credit him enormously for the Student Center which I know he was so enthusiastic about it, and his son had gone, I think it was his son, had gone to college in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.

Erath: Bucknell.

Campbell: Bucknell, where they had a beautiful student center, and he saw what a wonderful thing this was for the students. And I was sort of skeptical. I could picture other uses for the money, as is appropriate for the representative of the faculty, but I must say when I saw what a change it made to the campus, I think that was- it's very appropriate for that- there's his name and that it was one of his really visionary contributions.

Erath: Yeah, I agree. I think I shared your skepticism, as a matter of fact, about the building of such an edifice for such a purpose. I had been down various campuses and so forth and thought, "Well you know, you can probably get along without it, a student center." We were doing just fine without one, but you're absolutely right, and so was he, that it was a necessary thing, and that it has his name is certainly appropriate. I felt, also, that his understanding of consensus had a good deal to do with the fact that he came up through the ranks, that he had been one of us, and that therefore, not necessarily that he knew you, or me, or Tom Faughnan, or Bill DeMeritt personally, but that he understood what it was to be a faculty member and had a good deal of respect for that idea. As a consequence of which, when we went to him as members of the senate of the executive board, during my term at any rate, we had a regular every two week meeting with Clayt and sometimes other members of the higher level administration who he might invite if we had a purpose for having an individual there on a particular day. One of my favorite stories, and it's of a matter of really little consequence, was had to do with snow. Clayt grew up in northern New York state where they didn't close anything, I guess, when it snowed. It was just something that happened. We went to him once and, of course, it was one of our meetings, and said, "You know, you've got to think more carefully about closing up when we've got all these people on the roads. Students who attend night classes are almost all commuters, some of them coming a great distance and ice and snow and so forth." He was very resistant to the notion of closing the college because there was a little snow on the road, but when we had a little conversation about it, it took a little while and he finally said, "You know, you guys are right," and we had a different snow policy after that, and as I said it's a matter of little consequence probably in the great scheme of things, but it is an indication of how he could take someone else's point of view, think about it, and come back later and say, "Okay, you might be right."

Campbell: You know what helped him do that, I had a couple of long talks with him when he had some kind of deanship or I don't even remember his position in the Heissler administration.

Erath: He was a dean then, right.

Campbell: He had an office tucked away somewhere and he was totally frozen out from everything going on, and we had a couple of talks where he, off the record kind of, where he was talking about his frustration at not being included in any important meetings, not being informed about anything that was about to happen, where the president and whoever were his immediate advisors just went ahead, and he talked on the possibility of his resigning and going back to the department. He had, as you remember, been chair of the Education Department earlier, and I encouraged him to hang in there, but we had a couple of good talks about that, but I think he knew what it was to be totally disempowered, and I think that kind of experience sensitizes one, or at least it did with him, to our different perspectives and the importance of hearing us and thinking about what our perspectives were, because he really was a very healing president from where I sat.

Erath: Particularly in the beginning of his administration the healing idea was crucial, and I think his great care in attempting to see that those who had differing points of view during the previous two years, and that includes not just the Heissler administration but also the interregnum when we both, I'm sure, recollect that passions were frequently heated to a pretty high degree, but in the early years of his administration that he did spend a good deal of time effectively bringing, I hate to use the expression but, bringing us together, so that we could begin to proceed in, you know, in a time when the college was going through an enormous and continuing energetic change, begun with the change to a multipurpose institution. Well, those were the years when it was beginning to take effect, serious effect. And leading up to the crucial decision in 1976 when I was president, no credit to me on this, but I mean, when Clayt made the decision to change the admission policies, which is really the reason why we are what we are today. When we were told we were no longer going to simply keep expanding trying to bring in more students that we were going to try quality instead of quantity, and here we are in 1991, the descendants of that decision.

Campbell: We are now the institution which has as its major competitor for students Rutgers College, and, I think, we've surpassed Drew University the last time I was talking with faculty.

Erath: My understanding is that our major competitors now are private schools. No longer- we've superseded our sister state colleges, and Rutgers College, and Douglas college, and we are now competitive with places like Lafayette and other private colleges of that sort, and it goes back to what was a very courageous decision. We had a piece of it, the faculty senate had certainly had its say on that, and Clayt was very careful to make sure that it worked its way through the senate's processes, but it was his leadership, I think, that was principally responsible.

Campbell: And Gordon Goewey helped a lot. Gordon did a lot of work in that direction, too, and they were both very accessible men, informal, and friendly, and open to check. You didn't feel it was-

Erath: Right, you could pick up the phone and call. When I was president of the senate, and I'm sure you had the same experience, you could pick up the phone and if he was in the office you could expect to talk to him, and that I thought, I always thought, was very important. Sometimes the matters were relatively trivial, but nonetheless needed kind of a decision or someone to address it on the spot, and those were both men who would respond even those kinds of manners. Would you comment on the post Brower era? Now, were you still a member of the Senate when Clayt retired and Harold Eickhoff came to the campus? I had retired from the Senate by that time.

Campbell: Yes, I think I had decided that I needed to refocus in the department somewhere in all of this.

Erath: Well that's about the time you were chair of the department.

Campbell: That's what I was going to say, I was chair of the department and I found that a fair amount of work and with its full share of political excitement, let's say, so that became the focus of my interest. Other psychology people have become very involved in the senate, but I pulled back. I became one of the many people who get to look at the minutes and see what's going on.

Erath: Is there a general comment that you might be able to make about say, the Senate in the last ten years, where it has been, and what it has employed its energies on? Is there a difference between the Senate of the 80s, let's say, as compared to the Senate of the 70s?

Campbell: That's a hard one to answer because I'm sort of more remote. When you're in the trenches it really feels like the work you're doing is extremely important, and I think we were going through such a formative period, when both you and I were associated with it either as chairs of various councils, or presidents, or whatever. That we can't help but feel that those were pretty exciting years.

Erath: In fact, I do feel that way. They were exciting.

Campbell: And they're hard to duplicate.

Erath: Yeah that's right. Sometimes it seems as if, up until very recently, that the issues of the 80s were not as burning as the issues of the 70s, and I know that's not right, but it's a matter of perspective, you know. When as you say, when you're down there with your hands on the issues because you are president of the body or council chair as we both were for a number of years, you can't help but get involved in a very particular way. I was thinking, as you were answering a moment ago, I was thinking of the years when we closed down in the time of Vietnam, and Cambodia, and the years, I guess it was in the same year, when we've all been fire watching, and things like that. I mean, those were tensing and difficult days. Do you have recollection of those?

Campbell: Oh, I can remember going over to Green Hall when it was being occupied by students, and it was in the early evening, I don't know what I was doing over there in the early evening except hoping to talk to some of them and see if we could de-escalate some of what was going on. They had taken over the President's Office, and I felt that every one of them was seven feet tall. The guys in particular all seemed like a basketball team, they were so tall. But I was so lucky, I had a class where a number of these leaders were, and when they recognized me, they were just very sweet and very willing to talk. I would not want to have gone in there as a stranger because they were feeling, I think, very scared about what they'd done and very determined to kind of hold on to these rights that they had gotten, but we sat down and talked, and one of them went and got me a soda. We really had a good kind of what-could-be-done and then I had been very active in the senate in trying to get us to make some arrangements, so that the students would get credit for the final- for the whole semester.

Erath: For the semester, because if I recollect we closed up about the first of May.

Campbell: That's right. It was bad news, but we finally agreed the students could either have the grade that they had thus far or they could take a final exam, but that it was an option. Many people had gotten so far away from their work at that point, and, I think, we were mostly, again, wanting to heal, to get the students recommitted to their work and the institution, and to have the faculty and students working together, and of course, this was at a time when a lot of the faculty feeling, not only at Trenton State, but in California and elsewhere, was that the students were probably right, you know, that Nixon, and Kissinger, and knowledge were not the way to run the country, and so people were already saying to students, "You choose your own grade, and I'll give it to you," essentially, so the issue of trying to work out some kind of compromise was not as radical in that theory as it might seem today.

Erath: Particularly difficult time. I recollect that as being one of the, maybe one of the darkest moments I went through.

Campbell: What happened to you?

Erath: No, not a particular thing, but the atmosphere was so tense and there clearly was little learning going on. It seemed to me that the particular problem was we had just lost the focus on what were supposed to be here for.

Campbell: I think the country had to a large extent, you know.

Erath: You're right. It wasn't just the atmosphere here, but, as I say to my classes, in the world beyond Pennington Road the same kind of pressure existed, and we were only feeling its manifestations in our own particular and peculiar way.

Campbell: And we had students and faculty who thought these kids should be lined up and shot, probably, just as much as we had others who sort of wanted to join them, so it was a very tense and difficult time.

Erath: I think we were kind of microcosm of the whole national situation, not international but certainly the national situation. Yeah, there were radicals on both sides and a lot of us who weren't, you know, sort of in the middle, which is really where most of the students were, I believe, and nevertheless it made for a peculiar, if not I supposed almost perilous, end of the spring semester. When we finally closed up, I think about, if I remember, it was about two weeks early, having offered, as you say, a grade depending on a number of circumstances. Those were difficult times, and as I say, maybe the worst what were- Dickens wrote of the worst of times and on the other hand the best of times, from your perspective what were some of the best of times during these years, not necessarily, I suppose, restricted to the senate?

Campbell: Connected to the Senate, right, but I was just wondering if that was... I guess, even at that time one of the most exciting things were the students who were so totally involved in their studies and in the sense that they were going to sort of be empowered to change the world in some sort of marvelous way. The kind of belief that the Vietnam era

student had about not just through learning, but through caring for each other, and love, and good music, and so forth. That there was something very beautiful and there was also a nice breakdown of barriers. I remember in particular, the English department had some faculty who were running student sensitivity groups, and there was just a lot of really hopefully permanent breakdown where the faculty were sort of on a pedestal and the students were there only to learn. There was a sense that we were all learning together about how to deal with something in the world that was really difficult for all of us, and that students had a lot to contribute, and I thought that was a beautiful time.

Erath: Good, good. I guess, that would be certainly one of the more positive aspects of something in an experience that had all too many negative aspects about it. We probably tend to recollect the negative more than the positive, so I'm glad you mentioned that. Where do you think the Faculty Senate, or perhaps the larger question is, where do you think governance should be going in 1991 and what follows down the road for the next five or ten years or so?

Campbell: Well, I think we have a president now who has a managerial style that does require a strong, but also a good cooperative voice. Now whether that's going to be possible or not is going to depend a lot on what kinds of adjustments he makes. I see an awful lot of polarization again, where people are taking positions, and I know because I asked them about it, not because they necessarily they believe in it, but because the opposite side believes differently, so their sense is that if the opposite side takes this position there must be something wrong with it that they can't see clearly, so they've got to oppose it on principle, and I think when it gets into this escalating adversarial situation that everybody loses.

Erath: Do you think there's any comparison to be made between the current situation and the Heissler days? What made me recollect that, or think about that, was your using the world polarization because there was an awful lot of that in the Heissler period, and I wonder if there isn't, in some sense, if the same sort of thing isn't happening now in the past year or so.

Campbell: Well, except that there are a lot of things about it that seem to me to be more responsible on both sides, and I think, also, there is some blurring and muddying in terms of what the best role is for the senate and what the best role is for the AFT, and there have been some overlap there where key AFT officers have also had high responsibilities in the senate, and I'm wondering if that's a good combination because it's very hard to take off one hat and put on another, but certainly there is that kind of thing going on, and I think it's going on, however, nationwide right now, that faculties are under various kinds of pressures, students are under pressures, and administrators are trying to tighten up what's going on, and if they're not trying to tighten it up themselves they're under the kind of pressure that Kennedy at Stanford is under, where the federal government comes in and says, "How are you spending the overhead on your research grants?" and it looks like they're not doing it very responsibly.

Erath: Are the pressures, in your perception, are the pressures largely economic?

Campbell: No, I think they're multinational. I mean, okay, maybe economic, if you look at it cutting it one way.

Erath: Is it only dollars that creates these pressures that you've been referring to?

Campbell: No, I think there's several things. Dollars is certainly part of it. The other is that we are really living in a global village, as Ted Turner says. You know we're buying Japanese cars, and a lot of things are imported from Europe, and we have kind of lost the industrial supremacy that we had, fairly recently, that we somehow thought was going to go on forever, and the educational pressures have to do a lot with the Japanese schooling, with Korean schooling. My son just got a Ph.D. from Princeton in applied physics and electrical engineering and his graduate class, actually the office he was assigned to, there were four students and three of them were Chinese and so he came in and they were all talking Chinese. So the oriental, the Korean, the Chinese, the students who come out of a culture where they really are pressured to work enormously hard and not do anything else. I'm not saying that that's the best way, but they're being integrated into our system, and I think we're having to figure out how we're going to have our students compete and still be the kind of well-rounded people that we want ourselves and them to be as Americans. It's tough, so I think that's part of it. Are there other things you see?

Erath: I was thinking about, specifically, about the issue of- when I asked the question, specifically about the issue of governance, campus governance, participation, you know, how are the pressures exerted, perhaps from outside the campus related to issues of governance as they exist here now, and as our colleagues who are presently members of the senate are trying to deal with them?

Campbell: Did you have some thoughts on that?

Erath: Only that given the external pressures it seems much more difficult to arrive at a consensus, an agreement between faculty and administration about issues that are important to us, those people who are faculty members, and then perhaps some of the which relates back to our discussion previously of polarization, and some of that is occurring because of factors that are not necessarily and only local, although certainly there are some of those as well, and the money issue always seems to be the one in the last few years that creates the greatest amount of pressure and most significant influence in regard to something that is not necessarily local.

Campbell: But the other thing that's so tough is the multicultural pressures, where we always assumed, you know, that the basic liberal education was pretty much spelled out. You've learned about the Greeks, and you've read Shakespeare, and you've read some French and German literature either in translation or whatever, but now we're really dealing with a whole different scene in terms of the inclusion of African-American literature, both from Africa and produced here, Oriental, South American, and the whole political- we haven't gotten the full pressure yet, I think, of the P.C. teaching that is going on in many universities where to be politically correct you have to take a hard line pro-

third-world and pro-multicultural position on everything, and there are words that are forbidden on the Stanford campus. You cannot use them to another human being. I don't know if you can use them in a lecture because probably Norman Mailer did in one of his books, but, so I think, there is, you know, whether we turn out to be a melting pot or whether we turn out to be a Balkan region, I think a lot is going to depend on how we all manage these things, and Affirmative Action of various kinds is going to affect faculty, affect faculty decisions.

Erath: These, you think, are the issues that our colleagues are going to have to deal with?

Campbell: Oh boy, yeah I think it's going to be tough sledding in the 90s, I really do.

Erath: There are certainly some larger issues to be dealt with, as well as the local. This is not to minimize the local, the campus, issues as well, but perhaps, you know, we speak now in particular of the Senate, there is another of our successors has just been elected. Chuck Hill is now president and a new administration takes over. There are, from my view of the quick look at the members of the new executive board, there are many new faces. Even though some of the new faces are also old ones such as Bill DeMeritt, for example, on that board, and I think it will be a matter of considerable interest to all of us where this particular session of the senate and its leadership is going to be able to take us.

Campbell: Well, I think that, and it needs to be balanced also by the president having a strong, and effective, and faculty sensitive Vice President of Academic Affairs because, I think, you cannot have the sense that you're negotiating with one person and that the other people around that person have no power, so I think somehow, hopefully, if we can get that administration looking stronger and more effective, but not clones of the president's position, and get a responsible senate, problems are such that, boy, with people working together we're going to be lucky to solve them.

Erath: It's interesting though that you mentioned the matter of the new president of the senate having a particular individual to approach at the step below the college presidency, the need to fill that office, which has been taken for a good part of this year. I know if I were president that I would not be very comfortable having to talk to six people, you know, the six-headed vice-presidency that presently exists. This committee vice-presidency is not a good idea, I don't think. And I'm not sure it was even a good idea as a stopgap measure, but it's there. And if I was president of the Senate right now or had been during that year, I think I would find it extremely discomfiting because I don't think no matter which of the six you talk to you could never be sure that he or she speaks for the other five. That's a difficult way to do business at the level that we're talking about here. To fill that office is a matter of some concern. I feel that- I certainly don't know. I'm utterly unaware of what kind of progress has been made on that count. Perhaps Chuck Hill does know, and I hope he finds someone occupying the other end of the telephone when he picks it up in September and needs to have an answer.

Campbell: I think both of us did a lot of our work with the Academic Vice President. I know I worked closely with Gordon Goewey, and as a chairman of the department,

chairperson of the department, I worked closely with Tony DiGiorgio, and, you know, everything doesn't have to go to the president. It just is too much. He's got a lot to do, but he obviously has to have the right good people around him to make this really work.

Erath: It's just a matter of good management, I guess. You have to have a person doing something and a committee can't do it. Government by committee does not work.

Campbell: No matter how good they are.

Erath: Nope, as hard as they might try, and in fact I'm sure they've worked very hard in many things they have done. Certainly served to keep the finger in the dyke, but we'll hope that that changes. Concluding remarks? Summary of your feelings about our Senate, about college governance in general?

Campbell: Well, I guess my sense is very strongly that it's always a very dynamic situation, and it's going to depend on not just the Senate itself but on the interplay and the openness between the central administration, and either one of them can make it very difficult. I'm not saying it's all the administration. Please don't misunderstand me.

Erath: No, no, I absolutely agree with you on that. Sure. As it can be made easier on both sides it can be made more difficult on both sides, and I think we both know that that's happened, certainly, but anyway I interrupted, as you were saying.

Campbell: Exactly. So that would be my first thought, and then, I guess, the other thing is that we have so many other things to do that hopefully- unless there are major crises and I suppose there are going to continue be major crises for a while to come.

Erath: I'm afraid there always seems to be a major crisis.

Campbell: But hopefully we can get some established good working relations between the Senate, because I think, ideally, I would like to see the senate as the loyal opposition. I know an atheist who says of himself that he's a member of the loyal opposition. I didn't mean to make that quite as, anything about the religious attitudes of the Senate, but to see that group as the loyal opposition and really through a give-and-take process that working together they're going to be able to make the college, and the faculty, and the students' experiences richer.

Erath: If you were president of the Senate on September fifth or sixth or whatever it is the first day of classes will be in the upcoming fall semester, what would be the first thing you think you would want to do?

Campbell: Well, I suppose it would be literally to take stock. I mean, this particular year we don't know how many faculty are going from each department, how many schools we're going to have, colleges, what our situation is, and then find out where people want to go from here with that. I think it's going to be a very tough year because of the fiscal situation in the state. It's not just the central administration of the college. There's also

our governor who is a focus right now of a lot of criticism and discontent because of the type of cuts that are being made, and also, I was going to say the peek candidness with which it's being done, maybe that's not the appropriate word. But so I think we've got really that- Chuck Hill has very heavy responsibility, and I would think that he'd try to find out where things are, also try to find out from the administration what they're happy with and what they're not happy with, so that he looks for possibilities where they could work together on external forces as well as where they have to confront each other and try to find some equitable agreement. What would you do?

Erath: Now, I'm interested to hear you say that because I understand that Chuck, subsequent to his election, has already had a meeting with the president. Which I take it among other things was trying to do something of the sorts of things that you were just talking about, but maybe there is, as we pass the torch so to speak to one of another of our successors, there is going to be a possibility at any rate that the climate will change enough so that the Senate will continue to do its business, and that business will be matters that affect us faculty members and students, which is really what we started out to do back there all those years ago. I think this has been an enjoyable opportunity. We don't do this enough, but those who have the opportunity to see it, I think, will be enlightened about the time that you and I were involved in the faculty senate. Thank you.

Campbell: I hope so. I've enjoyed it very much too.

Erath: Good, good.