

Reflections of a University of Missouri Peace Activist

1962-1970

By

Bill Wickersham

Prologue:

The Four Seasons of Bill Wickersham

(1) Bill graduated from St. Joseph Central High School in 1951. His was a relatively privileged background. He was an only child and his father owned and operated a restaurant in the downtown area, especially famous for its hamburgers. At Central, Bill played varsity basketball and baseball, and won the Missouri boy's tennis singles championship. After graduation, he enrolled at Missouri University (MU) where he pledged a prominent national social fraternity. He also found time to be a "walk-on", practice team member of the MU basketball squad and a conference champion tennis player. A gifted tenor, he was a member of the University Singers.

(2) A decade later Bill had earned a B.S. at MU, an M.S. at Indiana University in Bloomington, a doctorate at MU, and was a tenured member of the MU faculty. He was also a cautious anti-war neophyte.

(3) Between 1962 and 1967, Bill became increasingly involved as an anti-war activist and protestor, learning the difficult lessons of practicing non-violence in public demonstrations. His commitment steadily increased and by 1968 he was ready to take a leave of absence from MU to work full time for peace. He soon became recognized as one of a handful of MU leaders of the peace movement.

(4) Finally, by 1970 Bill became recognized as the leader of the MU peace movement, and in spite of his insistence on non-violence in all protests, he was terminated from his faculty position. By this time the course of his life had been set and Bill has spent the ensuing years as a peace activist, educator, and protestor. With no sense of bitterness, Bill returned to MU in 1995 as an Adjunct Professor of Peace Studies and in 2004 was named the MU Peace Studies Professor of the Year. This accolade is better late than never.

*John Galliher, Director
University of Missouri Peace Studies Program*

Reflections of a University of Missouri Peace Activist 1962-1970

By

Bill Wickersham

In 1962, I was employed as Program Director of the Memorial Student Union at the University of Missouri-Columbia (MU). In that position, I served as staff adviser to student leaders who planned and conducted a variety of social, informal educational, and recreational programs for the MU student body. One of our popular programs was the Classic Film Series which brought to campus films such as "Potemkin Village", "Citizen Kane", "Birth of a Nation", etc.

In the spring of 1962, I met with a young communications graduate student, Bill Mackie ((later a professor at the University of Texas-Austin), to discuss the upcoming Classic Film Series schedule. As our meeting ended, Bill asked me a question that was to radically change my life. He said, "Bill, what are the conditions under which you would be willing to kill several million people in a days time?" My response was, "NEVER, but why are you asking me such an absurd question?" He replied, "It's not absurd, your country is in the process of planning precisely such killing." He went on to say that if I wanted additional information I should attend a meeting later that week at the home of MU Professor of Surgery Dr. John Schuder, a Quaker pacifist. As Bill Mackie left my office, his question kept turning in my mind and continued to do so for the remainder of the day. The next morning, I phoned him to get additional information, and made plans to attend the meeting.

The gathering at Dr. Schuder's house was sponsored by a small group of university faculty and Columbia, Missouri townspeople known as the Committee for Informed Opinion on Nuclear Arms (CIONA). The speaker for the evening was Dr. Kurt Hohenemser, a former German aeronautical engineer, who at the time of our meeting was employed as chief aerodynamics engineer of the McDonnell Aircraft Corporation's Helicopter Division in St. Louis, MO. In his speech, Dr. Hohenemser described the recent deployment of 150 U.S. Air Force intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) in 14 west central Missouri counties. Local control of those missiles was directed by the Air Force's base commander of the 351st Strategic Missile Wing at Whiteman Air Force Base in Knob Knoster, Missouri. According to Dr. Hohenemser, each missile located near a cornfield, a high school, an interstate of state highway, or some other site, contained a one-megaton hydrogen warhead with 50 times the potential destructive power of the A-bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And, because the missiles which represented 15 percent of all U.S. deliverable land based nuclear warheads were located in Mid-Missouri, our area was unquestionably a prime target for Soviet ICBMs which were on hair-trigger alert. Thus, it was possible for Missouri missiles to be launched near towns like Boonville, Sedalia, or Higginsville, reach the Soviet Union in about 30 minutes and kill millions of women, men, and children. In a like manner, the Soviet Rocket Corps could launch its ICBM's at the Whiteman complex, the result of which would be a hole called Mid-Missouri.

In summarizing his talk, Dr. Hohenemser predicted that the recent Soviet and U.S. missile deployments would inevitably lead to an arms race, which would increasingly threaten life on Planet Earth. That night, I joined the local CIONA group and became a dedicated nuclear disarmament

activist. That was also the starting point at which peace education was to become a central part of my personal and occupational identity.

At the time, I was completing course work on a doctorate in education with areas of concentration in educational psychology, curriculum and instruction, and administration of health, physical education and recreation. I was also completing my contract as program director of the student union, and was in the process of transferring to a position with the University's Extension Division, where I eventually achieved the rank of Professor of Extension Education. As luck would have it, the last course to be completed for my doctorate was the graduate educational philosophy course taught by an outstanding professor, George Ferree. In that course we studied the writings of Lord Bertrand Russell, and I wrote an extensive paper on his life and work, including his active opposition to militarism and preparation for nuclear war. It was this concentration on Lord Russell's social, political, and educational philosophy which led me to seriously consider ways that public education at all levels (K-graduate) might address issues related to war and peace. It also introduced me to concepts of non-violent direct action and civil disobedience on behalf of peace and nuclear disarmament, such as Russell's famous sit-down strike on a British air force runway, which was used for take offs and landing of bomber planes carrying nuclear weapons.

By December 1962, President John F. Kennedy had ordered 11,300 U.S. Special Forces to Vietnam for purposes of "advising" members of the South Vietnamese Army in its civil war with the National Liberation Front (Vietcong). In that year, most Americans, including my fellow Missourians had little knowledge of Vietnam's history, or its political and military dynamics. Fortunately, one of our CIONA members was a University of Missouri Assistant Professor of Political Science, David Wurfel, whose specialty was the politics of Southeast Asia. David had visited Vietnam and was a recognized expert on the history and politics of Vietnam, including the French occupation and Ho Chi Minh's leadership in the formation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. David warned against the U.S. intervention and convinced many of us to speak in opposition to Kennedy's Vietnam folly. At that point, CIONA began a two-track effort of working for nuclear disarmament, while at the same time protesting U.S. involvement in Vietnam. In December 1962, U.S. military personnel in Vietnam reached a level of 11,300 and by the time of Kennedy's assassination in November 1963, troop levels were surpassing 16,000. This upward escalation stimulated increased efforts on our part to reach students, university faculty and local townspeople to inform them of the deepening U.S. involvement which promised to be a no-win situation for everyone involved.

In early July 1964, I was participating in a University of Missouri sponsored anti-poverty research project in a housing project in one of the poorer areas in St. Louis. As part of that project, I attended a program planning meeting at a local hotel. As I exited the meeting and walked across the hotel lobby, I came face-to-face with a U.S. Army officer who had been my commander at the Army's Quartermaster School at Fort Lee, Virginia. In 1956 and 1957, Lt. Colonel Augustine Fragala commanded the school's Headquarters Battalion where I worked as one of his assistants. In addition to my regular duties, I played point guard on the headquarters basketball team, whose foremost fan was Col. Fragala. We had not seen each other for about seven years, and our chance meeting brought back many fond memories of basketball tournaments and other activities of fellow soldiers during our assignment at Fort Lee. And even though our reunion was very pleasant, it was obvious that Col. Fragala was troubled. As we continued talking, he invited me to join him for a drink.

As we sipped our Scotch, the Colonel, a Korean war veteran, said that he was very disturbed by his current assignment which was to be one of his last projects prior to retirement. He went on to say that he was a member of a logistics team that was “filling the pipeline” for Vietnam. By that, he meant his team was planning the acquisition and distribution of large quantities of materials and equipment for war fighting in Vietnam. His overall message to me was that an expanded U.S. involvement in Vietnam would be one of the worst things that could possibly happen to both Vietnam and the United States. As we concluded our conversation, he said, “We’re looking for an excuse to expand the war and we’ll find one.” Upon hearing that statement I knew something had to be done to alert others to the impending expansion of U.S. intervention in Vietnam. The question was, what could one person do?

Upon my return to Columbia, I contacted our CIONA leader, Dr. John Schuder, and MU Anthropology Professor Jim Hamilton to let them know what Col. Fragala had told me about his logistics team and the likely increase in U.S. troop deployments in Vietnam. As we discussed the situation, we decided to call for an appointment with our Democratic Congressman Richard Ichord, who was chairman of the infamous House Internal Security Committee (known in the McCarthy witch-hunt era as the House Un-American Activities Committee). We made the call and arranged for the meeting to be held in his district office in Columbia.

At the meeting, we told Rep. Ichord about Col. Fragala’s logistics team, and expressed our concern that preparations were being made to substantially increase U.S. involvement in Vietnam without adequate Congressional debate of the issue. His response was that further Congressional discussion was unnecessary, and in fact, if it were to take place, the mood of the Congress was such that they would probably endorse even greater increases of U.S. military activities in Vietnam. We told the Congressman that we thought our country was headed toward a military disaster, and strongly encouraged him to seek further congressional debate before sending young Americans to their deaths. He was not convinced and indicated no real interest in the concerns we had expressed.

As we left his office, we knew that we would have to do something else to call attention to the potential disaster in Vietnam. Sometime later, as the situation in Vietnam worsened, Rep. Ichord criticized Lyndon Johnson for not requesting a Congressional Declaration of War against the North Vietnamese. The criticism was made in a speech at the University of Missouri. During the question and answer period, I raised my hand with the intent of setting the record straight regarding the Congressman’s past failure to encourage Congressional debate as U.S. troop involvement in Vietnam was expanding. Unfortunately, I was not recognized by the moderator, and as is often the case, a slick political performance went unchallenged.

On August 7, 1964, the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives passed a joint resolution (known as the “Gulf of Tonkin Resolution”), which gave U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson a blank check to widen the Vietnam War. With a November election on the horizon, few members of Congress had questioned the President’s call for broad authority to counter an alleged attack on U.S. warships in the gulf of Tonkin. The Congressional debate lasted only two days. No House members objected, and only two Senators, the late Ernest Gruening of Alaska, and the late Wayne Morse of Oregon, voted against the resolution which later proved to be based on false charges. Clearly, Col. Fragala’s concerns had been prescient.

In February 1965, the Pentagon announced that it would launch a sustained bombing of North Vietnam whenever such action was deemed essential. As the bombing increased, and as the U.S. sent more troops to Southeast Asia, most U.S. college campuses began to develop serious movements to protest the war. On May 5, 1965 some 350 colleges and universities joined in teach-ins, which were held in conjunction with a nationwide radio broadcast sponsored by the Inter-University Committee for a Public Hearing on Vietnam. The broadcast featured a debate between McGeorge Bundy, President Johnson's advisor for national security affairs, and Professor George Kahn of Cornell University. Following the debate, discussions representing all points of view were held on local campuses. Discussion questions which were addressed at MU included:

- Under what conditions would our government agree to a cease-fire?
- What sort of government would be acceptable to the United States in South Vietnam?
- What role should the United Nations play in resolving the present conflict?
- Are the continued bombing attacks on North Vietnam likely to achieve the stated objectives?

Given the conservative climate at the University of Missouri and Columbia's Stephens College, the event turned out an unusually large number of students and faculty from both institutions. Preparations for the teach-in had included a petition, which was published in the MU student newspaper. One hundred ten students and faculty signed the petition. In 1977, when Illinois Congressman (later Senator) Paul Simon helped me to secure my FBI file, I found that the names of all 110 petition-signers were included in my folder.¹

As activities began to heat up at MU, CIONA, The Fellowship of Reconciliation, and other peace groups began to picket the local Post Office to protest the war. And, while I had been moderately involved in earlier civil rights activities, including one test sit-in at a local café, I had never been on a real, live picket line. That event changed my life greatly. As an American educated athlete and soldier, I possessed more than my share of arrogance and machismo. During the course of my life I had been involved in several serious fist-fights and as we used to say, "didn't take crap from anybody". So, when a group of U.S. Marine reservists taunted us on one of our early demonstrations, my tendency was to "kick ass and take names". Fortunately, my fellow demonstrators, especially Dr. Schuder, were highly disciplined peace activists who were completely devoted to non-violent direct action. With their guidance and training, I slowly learned to overcome the violent urges in a way that was compatible to genuine peace education.

In 1965, while working at MU as Professor of Extension Education, I continued to be involved in a variety of anti-war and nuclear disarmament activities. Early that year, I also wrote "A Proposal for Peace Education and Research Centers to be Established on the Campuses of the State Universities and/or Land Grant Colleges". The introduction of that proposal stated the following:

"Presently much of our society's major intellectual resources are fused into establishments, most notably defense, which are not primarily geared to imagining and finding a way towards a war-free world. In 1963, two-thirds of our scientists and engineers were involved in defense related activity; and the Department of Defense was responsible for some forty percent of the annual sum of \$1.2 Billion in Federal revenue going to universities to promote research.

State universities and Land Grant universities over the country spend millions of dollars for the Reserve Officers Training Corps, and thousands of young men study military science as a means to cope with war.

Most of the Cooperative Extension Services of the Land Grant universities maintain statewide Civil Defense Programs to collect civil defense information and disseminate educational materials to the civilian population. Some of the Land Grant universities are receiving Federal funds to help wage the “war on poverty”, but how many of these universities are receiving Federal aid to provide personnel to systematically and cooperatively wage a ‘war on war’?²

The body of the proposal drew heavily on the work of peace educators Thomas Hayden and Richard Flacks, historian Arthur I. Waskow, and MU social psychologist Bruce Biddle. The major functions of the proposed peace research and education centers included receipt, storage, retrieval and dissemination of data related to conflict resolution and peace education. Additional center services would include publication of newsletters and reports dealing with selected war/peace problems, and, finally, the centers would provide a variety of training functions including:

- 1) Sponsorship of seminars and conferences for peace educators and the general public.
- 2) Meetings involving educators, researchers, church organizations, and others engaged in peace education.
- 3) Training of University personnel who were involved in public affairs programs in the various states.
- 4) Informal seminars and “training” sessions for University staff members.
- 5) Professional training involving graduate students who might work as research assistants while completing dissertations or other studies related to center sponsored operations. Although graduate students would be candidates for degrees in their own academic departments, it was possible that their research efforts could stem from the Peace Research and Education centers.

The proposal called for federal and state funds to be allocated to individual Land Grant institutions, with funding depending on the individual University’s unique mode of operation. However, in every case, the Land Grant University was to receive sufficient funds to hire a Center Director and Assistant Director, both of whom should have knowledge of methods and principles of inter-departmental and interdisciplinary educational programming.

Upon completion of the peace education and research proposal, I discussed it with MU’s Dean of Extension, C. Brice Ratchford (later President of the University of Missouri System, which includes campuses in St. Louis, Kansas City, Columbia and Rolla). I asked Brice if he would forward the proposal to Dr. Elmer Ellis, who was then President of MU’s Columbia campus and a nationally recognized member of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. It was my hope that Dr. Ellis would facilitate the appointment of an ad hoc committee of the Association to carefully review my proposal and explore ways to fund peace education and research centers on Land Grant campuses nationwide. Brice did forward the proposal, but Dr. Ellis refused to present the proposal to the Association, and it appeared that my work had been in vain.

Later in 1965, the Methodist Church of Missouri sponsored a Bishop’s conference, which focused on matters of peace, justice and world order. One of the persons attending the conference was a political

scientist from New Mexico, James Speer. Jim was impressed with my Land Grant peace proposal and took a copy with him on a trip to Washington, D.C., where he provided a copy to Democratic Senator Edward Long of Missouri, who was then exploring a variety of approaches to peace. Upon reading the proposal, Senator Long cited it in a statement in support of the “Planning for Peace Resolution” – U.S. Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, May 1965, and had it placed in the Congressional Record. Senator Long’s staff then forwarded copies to constituents in the State of Missouri. One of the members of the Senate who received the proposal was Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania who would later assist me greatly in my search for a peace career. Another peace minded person who received Senator Long’s mailing was Dr. Theo. F. Lentz of St. Louis, who was known by some as the modern day father of the international peace research movement.

The day that Dr. Lentz (Ted) received Sen. Long’s mailing, he called me at my office in Columbia and invited me to St. Louis for a discussion of peace related issues. As a peace education neophyte, I had never heard of Ted Lentz nor his St. Louis based Peace Research Lab.

Following the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings, Ted Lentz retired early from the educational psychology program at Washington University in St. Louis to devote full time to the development of a “science of peace”. In 1955, he published his first book, Towards a Science of Peace, It was an appeal for the application of human sciences to the discovery of better methods for social and economic cooperation. He continued to pursue this theme in his other books, Towards a Technology of Peace (1972), and Humatriotism (1976). Through his dialogues, writing and leadership, Ted Lentz challenged the minds of many students and social science researchers, some of whom founded peace research centers in North America, Western Europe, Japan and Nigeria.

My meeting with Ted was the beginning of an 11-year friendship, which resulted in several cooperative projects in which he was the mentor and I was his research associate. One project in particular will be discussed in a later section of this chronology.

In 1966, I was asked by MU Extension Dean Brice Ratchford to serve as Assistant Director of the University’s Community Action Training Center, a one year, Columbia, MO based project to train the first 300 rural community action program directors for Lyndon Johnson’ anti-poverty program, officially known as the U.S. Economic Opportunity Program. The Director and overall manager of the program was a wonderful human being named Leo Cram. My duties included program/curriculum development and supervision of various instructors and trainers who taught and implemented a rigorous two-week curriculum, which included community organization methods and financial management techniques. Near the end of the Center’s contract period, I was asked by the Native Association of Alaska to serve as Director of a 10-day training session in Anchorage for community organizers from all over the State of Alaska. With the completion of that tour of duty, we closed out the operations of the MU Center. Given the Center’s very busy schedule in 1966, my peace work was somewhat curtailed, but I did lend assistance to some of CIONA’s protests and other activities, and I also maintained regular correspondence with Ted Lentz.

Upon completion of my work at the Community Action Training Center, I was asked by Arthur Nebel, Dean of MU’s School of Social and Community Services to take a position in MU’s new Department of Recreation and Park Administration. I did so, and assumed duties as Assistant Professor of Recreation and Park Administration in early 1967. My background in military recreation and work as

St. Joseph Missouri's City Recreation Director (1957-1958), plus four years as coordinator of MU's Extension Youth and 4-H recreation program provided a strong professional underpinning for the new position. And, my masters and doctoral studies in administration of health, physical education and recreation were good preparation for teaching and other academic pursuits in the field.

In the negotiation that led up to my hiring, Dean Nebel indicated that, in addition to my new job title, I could retain my title as Professor of Extension Education with tenure. I declined that offer because I did not want the University's Extension Division to have any claim on my work time, especially for assignments which would involve statewide travel. I had had five very good years with Extension, but was ready to "get off the road" and focus solely on classroom teaching and research. When I signed the new contract as an un-tenured assistant professor, I also signed a waiver, which denied any claim to the tenure I had achieved with the Extension Division. Later events would prove this to have been a serious error on my part.

From January of 1967, until the fall of 1968, I taught both undergraduate and graduate courses in recreation administration and one introductory course in the MU Department of Physical Education. I thoroughly enjoyed my new teaching duties, as well as the daily interactions with students and faculty. However, the Vietnam War continued to escalate, and I had the feeling that my personal commitment to the peace movement was being side tracked. And, as much as I liked the new position, in my heart I knew that I really needed to do full time peace work.

In the spring of 1968, the Director of our University YMCA, Farley Maxwell, wrote a proposal for the establishment of a new Missouri Peace Study Institute to be located in Columbia. The Institute had the blessing of the organization known as the Ecumenical Ministry in Higher Education, which was a cooperative effort between two local congregations, the Calvary Episcopal Church and the United Church of Christ. The ministry employed two campus ministers, Bill Kerr (UCS), and Maury Kaser (Episcopalian), who had offices in its Ecumenical Center on Maryland Avenue, about one block from the University's Army and Air Force ROTC headquarters. In response to a request by Farley Maxwell and other peace minded Columbians, the Ecumenical Ministry's Board of Directors agreed to provide office space and secretarial assistance for the Missouri Peace Study Institute (MPSI). Very shortly thereafter, MPSI formed a board of directors and began the search for a volunteer program director. As the search process progressed, I was approached by the MPSI board to see if I would be interested in the job on a part time basis.

I was very interested, but given my full time teaching duties, it was clear that I would not have time to take on additional work responsibilities. As I pondered the offer, I placed a call to Ted Lentz at the Peace Research Lab in St. Louis and explained the job offer and overall situation with MPSI. Ted suggested a way that I might be able to assume the position with MPSI. He said he had set aside about \$5,000 to hire a research associate to assist him with a "Dialogue for Peace Research" project to be undertaken in the St. Louis area. The position would require three, eight-hour days of work each week and would involve interview sessions with St. Louisans who were members of various peace organization, and others who had expressed interest in the work of the Peace Research Lab. The job would involve a Columbia to St. Louis commute each week (240 miles round trip), arriving in St. Louis by 9:00 a.m. on Mondays and returning to Columbia after work (about 5:30 p.m.) on Wednesday. Ted suggested that I could then spend the remainder of each week in Columbia as part-

time director of MPSI. This was a “bolt from the blue” which offered me a chance to work with one of the great peace pioneers of our time.

I was somewhat stunned with the offer and told Ted I would have to discuss the matter with my family and get back to him. My university salary at the time was \$12,500 per year. That night my wife and I thought long and hard about Ted’s offer, but came to no decision on the matter. The next day I called Farley Maxwell and explained the situation to him. I asked him if MPSI might consider hiring me as its director if I were to work for Ted Lentz Monday through Wednesday, and for MPSI Thursday through Saturday, including some evening activity. I also indicated that I would request a one- year’s leave of absence without pay from my university job with the provision that I would be reinstated at the end of the leave period. This would allow me to kick- start the MPSI program, but would also enable me to keep ties with the university. I also explained that I would need at least a nominal salary for my work at MPSI.

Farley approached the MPSI Board with my offer and they accepted the work schedule I had suggested. They also agreed to pay me a stipend amounting to about \$2,000 per year. After consulting with my wife, I called Ted Lentz and he agreed that if my leave from the university could be secured, he would make arrangements for the dialogue project to commence on September 1, 1968. Later that week I met with Dean Nebel and my department chair, Dr. Keith Roys, to request a year’s leave of absence without pay. Needless to say, neither of them was overjoyed with my request, but in the end both agreed that the leave would be granted. Thus, all the pieces were in place for an upcoming year of full-time peace work.

During the period September 1968, to June 1969, Ted Lentz and I conducted an experiment which was designed to investigate the attitudes of various “peace minded” individuals regarding the possible development of a systematic grass roots movement towards a science of peace. Dialogues were conducted with 117 individuals in St. Louis, MO, and Columbia, MO, who in one way or another had been identified with the peace movement, or other efforts known to have social concerns and humanistic goals. Several participants were members of organizations such as the United Nations Association-USA, the United World Federalists, the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, Friends Meeting, St. Louis Ethical Society, etc. Most of the participants were business or professional people, and in a few cases, undergraduate and graduate students were included. The study also included prominent Missourians such as U.S. presidential candidate and Washington University (MO) scientist Dr. Barry Commoner, Missouri Lieutenant Governor Harriet Woods (then a radio talk show personality), and Washington University (MO) Chancellor William Danforth, M.D.

During the dialogue sessions, each participant was asked to respond to and discuss the following questions:

- 1) In your opinion, how great is the danger of World War III?
- 2) If World War III comes, how disastrous will it be?
- 3) Do you believe war is preventable?
- 4) Are we likely to abolish war on the basis of present know-how?
- 5) Costs? How great an investment of manpower and money power would probably be necessary to solve this problem?

- 6) How much would you like to help (What percentage of time? What percentage of gross income?)
- 7) Assuming that you agree that more research is needed, what kinds of studies would you want us to do if you were paying to have the studies conducted?

A general conclusion of the study was that most of the dialogue participants did not see research as an urgent prerequisite in securing peace. Several individuals felt that we already knew how to get peace, we just needed the political will to do so. When asked how that political will could be secured, most respondents had no substantive response. Another interesting observation was the wide variety of definitions and meanings given to the word peace. When it came to prescriptions for peace, the ideas ranged from Christian pacifism to democratic world federal government and several positions in between. This fact, in itself, opened my inexperienced eyes to the individual perceptions, attitudes, and difficulties, which had to be addressed in the search for peace.

My work on that project also helped me to see that the “political will for peace” problem was at the heart of the search for peace. In fact, one of Ted Lentz’s propositionaires summed up the problem:

- Peace requires political change.
- Political change requires attitude change.
- Attitude change requires education.
- Education requires research.
- Research requires time, money and energy.

One of the most useful outcomes of the dialogue project was the recruitment of the services of several people who volunteered work time for peace. Some assisted the Peace Research Lab In St. Louis, MO, and other provided assistance to the Missouri Peace Study Institute in Columbia, MO. In addition to secretarial and publicity help, five individuals actually conducted studies related to peace and peace attitudes. One study was “Social Work’s Contribution to Peace Education and Peace Research”. Another was a factor analysis study of peace attitudes that used items from the Peace Research Lab’s International Opinionaire. That study involved an analysis of the responses of 991 college students.

From a personal standpoint, one of the best outcomes of the project was the training I received in conducting peace dialogues, or as Ted put it, “democratic conversations”. I have used Ted’s techniques in many settings for about 35 years, and those dialogues have literally resulted in tens of thousands of man/woman hours of work by my conversation mates. In 1970, a “dialogue for peace studies” between Jim McGinnis and myself resulted in the establishment of the Institute for the Study of Peace (ISP) at St. Louis University. In 1975, ISP left that institution and was incorporated as an ecumenical Institute for Peace and Justice (IPJ). In 1980, IPJ created the parenting for Peace and Justice Network, which over a 20-year period conducted workshops in forty-nine states, five Canadian provinces, and Northern Ireland. Parenting for Peace and Justice (PPJ) books have been translated into Portuguese, German and Spanish. PPJ programs also flourished in the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland. IPJ also established solidarity projects in Nicaragua, and family exchange programs in Russia and Jamaica. The dialogue “mustard seed” clearly grew into a fruitful tree.

Documentation provided by Jim McGinnis indicates that the original “dialogue for peace studies” resulted in over four and one half million contacts/activities on behalf of peace during the period 1970-1995. Included were 25,000 teachers who attended IPJ workshops and reached one million students.

Another 25,000 teachers used IPJ peace manuals to reach another one million students. (Note: This mustard seed effect is often the result of dialogues for peace. What, of course, is so unusual here, is the extent of the documentation provided by Dr. McGinnis).

September 1968, to August 1969, was one of the busiest and most interesting periods of my life. As previously noted, the first three days of each week were devoted to work with Ted Lentz, and the rest of the week directing the activities of the Missouri Peace Study Institute in Columbia. At the outset, I worked with the MPSI Board of Directors to write the following “MPSI Statement of Purposes”:

“The Missouri Peace Study Institute is founded on the beliefs that:

- 1) Peace is possible if the energy of mankind is directed towards that goal, and;
- 2) The means are not separate from the ends; therefore, in furthering the end of lasting peace, peaceful means must be used. It is with these basic assumptions that the Institute endeavors toward the larger goal of peace.”

“Although the Institute functions to discover new means to bring about peace, there are several means that are now available which the Institute hopes to implement as effectively as possible. Some of these are:

1. To promote and encourage the study of peace. The Institute hopes to aid in answering the question, “What is it we need to know and understand to bring about peace?” It is believed that this question can be answered at least partially through peace research and furthering the science and technology of peace. The Institute also carries out research and publishes results.
2. To promote and encourage peace education, the Institute hopes to make common knowledge to as many people as possible the facts and information of peace study and science. Peace education more specifically includes such things as:
 - a. Sponsoring monthly programs, symposiums and forums on peace issues and problems
 - b. Maintaining a speaker’s bureau
 - c. Serving as a resource center for all individuals, organization and institutions interested in the study of peace or some aspect of it.
3. To serve as a communication link between local communities of Missouri and the organizations, agencies and institutions around the world which promote peace.
4. To provide information and counseling to those individuals who are interested in pursuing a peace career.
5. To provide an opportunity for students to participate in a work study program at the Institute.”³

During the first year’s operation, MPSI developed, sponsored and promoted the following programs which were held in Columbia:

- “Towards a Science of Peace” – a series of speeches and discussions led by Dr. Theo. F. Lentz, psychologist and peace researcher.
- Seminar on “The Science and Politics of War and Peace” conducted at the University of Missouri Newman Center in cooperation with the “Faculty Roundtable”. This seminar involved

fifteen college and university professors representing “dovish”, “hawkish”, and moderate points of view.

- “Prospects for Peace in Vietnam” – a speech in MU’s Jesse Hall by Tran Van Dinh, former acting South Vietnamese Ambassador to the United Nations.
- “Chinese-Vietnamese Relations” – a speech by Tran Van Dinh.
- “Myths and Realities in Vietnam” – a series of speeches and discussions by Donald Kreutzer, M.D., a former Green Beret officer.
- Conference on “The China Puzzle” in cooperation with the Columbia, MO League of Women Voters and the University of Missouri Department of Political Science.
- The “Economics of Violence” – a speech by Professor Kenneth E. Boulding, Professor of Economics, University of Colorado, and President of the American Economics Association, co-sponsored by MPSI and Omicron Delta Epsilon Honor Society in Economics.
- “The Prevention of World War III” – a speech by Prof. Kenneth E. Boulding.
- “The Military, Industrial, Academic Complex Today” – a speech by Dr. John Swomley, Professor of Ethics, St. Paul Theological Seminary, Kansas City, MO.
- “The War Disease” – a speech by Bill Wickersham to the Grand Order of Pachyderms.
- “A Dialogue on War and Peace”, Bill Wickersham with Marine Reserve Officer and MU Professor of Military History, Dr. Alan Millett, at the First Presbyterian Church.
- “Medical and Social Conditions of the Hiroshima A-Bomb Survivors” – a speech by Dr. Earle Reynolds, anthropologist and captain of the ship “Phoenix”. In 1958, Dr. Reynolds, his wife and two children sailed into the H-bomb testing area near Eniwetok atoll. Their act of civil disobedience was in support of Albert Bigelow and four Quakers who had been arrested for sailing their ship the “Golden Rule” into that forbidden area.
- “Order of Humanity” – a speech by Alfred Hassler, National Executive Director of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, co-sponsored by the Columbia Council of Churches and presented at the First Christian Church, Columbia, MO.
- “Why Americanism?” – a speech by Colonel Frank H. Skelly, Chairman, State-Wide American Legion Americanism Commission.
- “Is There a Basis for Patriotism?” – a speech by Columbia Attorney Raymond C. Lewis, Jr.
- “The Paris Peace Talks” – a speech by Leonard E. Tinker, Jr. of the American Friends Service Committee, co-sponsored by the Columbia Fellowship of Reconciliation, Columbia Friends Meeting and the University YMCA.

My assignment with Ted Lentz and the September, 1968 to 1969, stint as Director of MPSI passed very quickly. In September 1969, I began my final year of teaching for the MU Department of Recreation and Park Administration. It was the final year because Dean Arthur Nebel had decided to end my employment by way of a terminal contract, a method of firing which required no explanation of cause under MU’s academic regulations. Following my previously noted request for a one-year’s leave of absence without pay he decided my services would no longer be needed. This was despite the fact that my courses attracted more students than any other in the Department’s curriculum, and the fact that I received an “Outstanding Professor” award presented by the Department’s undergraduate students. This situation later resulted in a “denial of academic freedom” case against MU by The American Association of University Professors. More will be said about that issue in another section.

Shortly after my firing, I had a conversation with my jogging buddy, Merle Hill, who was then President of Christian College in Columbia, MO (in 1970 the institution’s name was changed to

Columbia College). At the time, he was searching for an individual to serve as the College's Director of Intercampus and Community Service Programs, a position which involved off-campus internships for students who would be involved with "service learning" projects with local social welfare and other community service agencies. Following our discussion, Dr. Hill offered me the job at an annual salary of \$15,000. In addition to the community service duties, he asked that I develop and be prepared to teach new courses in "Educational Psychology", "The Future and Social Change", and "Peace and World Order". Given my pending unemployment, and my desire to continue to reside in Columbia, I jumped at the chance to pursue a new job with Christian College. However, later anti-war activities on my part jeopardized the new career. That point will be addressed in the 1970's section of this report.

In September 1969, I began my final year of teaching at MU, and also agreed to serve as a part-time, unpaid MPSI research associate. The MPSI Board of Directors sought a new director and was successful in securing the services of Jerry Rosser, an M.A. graduate of MU's fine Department of Community Development. Over the next few years, Jerry proved to be an outstanding program manager and peace educator.

By 1969, there were over 500,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam, and campuses throughout the country were teeming with student and faculty anti-war protesters. And, while MPSI's focus was on intellectual paths to peace, much of its work focused on Vietnam and other war related issues of the day. One of the most interesting programs sponsored by MIPSI was the previously noted series of speeches and discussions by Donald Kreutzer, M.D., who served as a Green Beret medical officer in Vietnam.

Prior to his service in Vietnam, Dr. Kreutzer and I met regularly at MU's Rothwell gymnasium to play one-on-one basketball. As our games continued, our friendship grew. Consequently, during his period of service in Vietnam (1967-1968), he and I corresponded regularly on a variety of personal matters, as well as happenings in South Vietnam. The following is a quotation from Don's letter of January 13, 1968:

"One of the A teams captured a "VC suspect", a 15 year old Vietnamese girl. They decided she knew valuable information, so they made her talk. The way they did it was they burned her with a hot electric wire on the tongue, breasts and genitalia. The reason I know about it was that later that night they brought her in for me to treat. I couldn't believe it. I can't believe people can do this to their fellow human beings. She could not talk or swallow, and her perineum was extremely burned. I was really sick. Then later I learned... the interrogator had invited all of his friends so that there were 20-30 ghouls from the compound here to watch this girl strip and be tortured. The sickening this is that you and I are as guilty as they, for they represent the U.S. and you and I are part of it. It is the first time I have ever seen something like that, that was deliberate and done by a person who is by any medical terms not mentally deranged."⁴

That torture episode was just one of many anecdotes that Don offered in his presentations. MPSI arranged for Don to make several public appearances at local service clubs, including the downtown Rotary Club of Columbia. He began his talk at Rotary by saying, "You gentlemen just said a prayer and recited the "Pledge of Allegiance". Where I have just come from, those are incompatible ideas." Later, on December 16, 1969, Don and I did a half-hour presentation on local television (KOMU-TV). The program was titled "Conversation with a Green Beret" and ended with Don's recommendation for a quick withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

During the 1969-1970 school year, MIPSI formed a statewide organization known as “Missouri Coalition Opposed to ABM and MIRV” which promoted a series of town meetings to examine the U.S. Department of Defense’s plans for the deployment of the “Safeguard” Anti-Ballistic Missile System (ABM) in Mid-Missouri, and to protest the 150 U.S. Air Force Minutemen missiles located throughout the area. DOD also intended to put three nuclear warheads on each of the Minutemen instead of the single warheads that were then attached to each missile. This process was known as Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicles (MIRV), a very destabilizing weapons system as it related to the mutual assured destruction (MAD) standoff between the U.S. and U.S.S.R.

In the case of ABM, the U.S. would use a 5 megaton H-Bomb to intercept Soviet weapons of the 9 megaton variety (at high altitudes). In the event the 5 megaton missile missed its target, a smaller warhead was to be used to destroy the Soviet warhead (at lower altitudes). In either case, the U.S. Air Force would detonate H-Bombs directly over Mid-Missouri. Thus, blast, radiation and nuclear fallout would be caused by U.S. anti-missile systems, even if they destroyed the incoming Soviet missiles. This was “crackpot realism” at its worst.

A section of my FBI file explains some of the activities that our Anti-ABM-MIRV group planned for one of the protest meetings. Dated April 7, 1970, a teletype message to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Assistant Director William Sullivan was titled:

“CITIZENS CONCERNED ABOUT THE ABM, ANTI-ABM RALLY. LIBERTY PARK, SEDALIA, MISSOURI, APRIL EIGHTEEN SEVENTY; IS-MISC.”

The message stated:

“On April Six Seventy, Chief of Police W.E. Miller, Sedalia, MO, PD, advised he was recently contacted by William Wickersham, Columbia, MO, identified as spokesman for the Missouri Branch of the ‘Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy’, in company of Robert Scherer, employee of KSIS Radio Station at Sedalia, identified by Miller as one of the leaders of a Vietnam War Moratorium Committee March in Sedalia in the Fall OF Sixty-nine, regarding planned ANTI-ABM Rally. Chief Miller said the group, also identified as “Citizens Concerned About the ABM”, currently plans to hold a rally from one to three p.m., April Eighteen Seventy, at Liberty Park, a Sedalia City Park.”⁵

We held our meeting in Liberty Park and it turned out to be an anti-nuclear war protest, coupled with speeches, singing, laughing, dancing and celebration of life. We released helium filled balloons with tags, which included a message concerning nuclear fallout. The message noted that if the Air Force ABM System were to be activated, any individual who discovered one of the balloons would likely be a victim of nuclear fallout. We put a request on the tag, asking the balloon finder to mail the tag back to the Missouri Peace Study Institute. Unfortunately, only a handful of the tags were returned, but the balloon idea did draw some attention to our protest/celebration.

One of the highlights was the performance of a comedian from Berkley, CA, who called himself “General Waste More Land”. The “General”, fully decked out in a green Army General’s uniform spoke to the absurdities of the Vietnam War and the insanity of the upward escalation of the nuclear arms race. He truly provided some badly needed comic relief, and somehow he seemed to have

escaped the long arm of the FBI. Nothing in my file provided evidence of the “General’s” well-accepted performance.

In keeping with its research and publication responsibilities, MIPSI associates completed the following studies in its first years of operation:

- “Peace Attitudes: A Factor Analytic Approach” by Fred Haley.
- “Is There a Sociological View on the Possibilities of Peace?” by Donald Granberg.
- “The size of the Latitude of Acceptance Regarding the use of Nuclear Weapons” by Donald Granberg and Norman Faye.
- “Hiroshima Comes to Missouri” by Bill Wickersham and Donald Granberg.
- “Hydrogen Bombs in Mid-Missouri” by Bill Wickersham.
- “The Dialogue for Peace Experiment” by Bill Wickersham.

In addition to the above publications, MIPSI associates worked closely with undergraduate and graduate students to encourage their writings on a variety of peace issues.

To say the least, 1969 was an active year for those engaged in anti-war and peace activities at MU. A review of my own FBI file indicates a sample of such efforts. Pages 10 through 12 of the file includes statements by an FBI informant known as “KCT-1”. One of the FBI’s concerns was the student operated Free University at MU. Page 10 contains the following statement:

“On November 26, 1969, KCT-1, who has furnished reliable information in the past, furnished a publication entitled “Another SDS Newsletter” dated November 13, 1968. On page 2 thereof appeared the following notice: “Help the Free University rise from the irrelevant dust of Jesse Hall. Call Sheila at 449-5139”.

“This source said the Free University is a name given to an organization sponsored by Students for a Democratic Society to discuss any subjects desired by the group. It would meet irregularly at various places off campus and have no connection with the University of Missouri at Columbia.”

Page 12 of the report refers to an earlier statement by KCTI regarding an SDS notice of March 19, 1969 titled “Free University is Back”:

“The Free University is to meet weekly at 209 Waugh, top floor at 7:30 p.m. on Wednesday nights starting March 26, 1969, for the course named ‘The Women’.”

“A course entitled ‘An Economic Interpretation of American History is being organized by Rory Ellinger, a graduate student in History, also a leader of SDS, according to KCTI and will meet weekly at 207 Waugh at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday nights beginning March 25, 1969.”

“The third course “The Possibility of Peace’ will be given by Dr. Bill Wickersham, head of the Missouri Peace Research Institute. This course will be given at the Ecumenical Center, 813 Maryland Ave., 7:30 p.m. on Monday nights starting March 24, 1969.”⁶

From the aforementioned FBI file entries, it would appear that the Bureau was deeply concerned with student discussions of women, economic history and peace. I'm not sure whether or not KCTI attended my course, but he/she would have been quite welcome to have openly attended. One of my concerns with such investigations was the amount of federal resources expended on activities, which were all clearly guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Another item in my "file" was titled, "Proposed Demonstration at Scheduled Appearance by General Maxwell Taylor, Missouri Historical Society, October 4, 1969, Columbia, Missouri". That enclosure stated: "On September 28, 1969, Mr. Frank Conley, Prosecuting Attorney for Boone County, Columbia, Missouri, advised that a meeting was held by a student group at the University of Missouri at Columbia known as the Committee of Concerned Students (CCS). He said the meeting was held on September 25, 1969. He also opined that CCS is the successor to Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) at the University since the latter has lost recognition as a campus organization. Mr. Conley said at this meeting, the CCS decided, according to John Kriegshauser, chairman, that some type of demonstration would be held when General Maxwell Taylor addresses the Missouri Historical Society at their annual luncheon meeting on October 4, 1969. A characterization of the SDS appears in the appendix."

"On October 4, 1969, at 12:30 p.m., a special agent of the FBI observed twenty-three students in front of the Student Memorial Building where General Taylor was scheduled to speak at 12:30 p.m. These students marched in a circle around a black coffin bearing signs criticizing the war in Vietnam. No confrontation with General Taylor occurred, and he addressed the Missouri Historical Society at a meeting between 12:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. General Taylor thereafter held a press conference and departed from Columbia at 3:07 p.m.."

"During the luncheon, the CCS transmitted a telegram to General Taylor requesting he address a 'teach in' being held by the CCS during the same time on the first floor of the Student Memorial Building, where General Taylor was addressing the Missouri Historical Society on the second floor. He did not respond. A small group of the CCS members requested admission to the second floor of the Student Memorial Building, but were denied admission. No violence was noted and the CCS group complied with all instructions issued by University security officers."

"It was noted in addition to the students bearing signs in front of the building, a group of about 100 other students, not identifiable, sat on the steps of the building adjacent to the picketing group."

"Following the picketing with the signs, a 'teach in' was held on the first floor of the building by the CCS. Anti-Vietnam literature was passed out. This 'teach in' lasted until about 3:30 p.m. No incidents occurred. This room, the auditorium, has a capacity of 288 persons. It was full and various persons stood at the rear of the auditorium and various students came and departed from time to time...."

"The CCS sponsored group at the 'teach in' was addressed by Dr. Paul Wallace, University Assistant Professor of Political Science and by Dr. Bill Wickersham, Assistant Professor in the University Parks and Recreation Administration and Director of the Missouri Peace Institute. These speakers encouraged those in attendance to support the nationwide moratorium October 15, 1969."⁷

“The Columbia Missourian, a daily newspaper at Columbia, Missouri, for October 5, 1969, quoted Mike Malevan, University senior and chairman of the demonstration and ‘teach in’ as stating, “We will have to wait to see what kind of support we get October 15,” when asked if he felt the ‘teach in’ was a success.”⁸

The moratorium mentioned by Mike Malevan was to be a nationwide one-day strike by university students, faculty and others to demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. On October 9, 1969, in preparation for the moratorium, I sent the following letter to my Dean, Arthur Nebel, who had previously expressed concern about my anti-war actions on campus: “In accordance with the Board of Curators’ rule concerning Administrative Procedure of the University, Section 2, I am filing notice that Recreation and Park Administration Course 10, Section 2, “Introduction to Recreation” and Recreation and Park Administration Course 151, “Community Recreation” will not meet in the classroom on October 15, 1969.”

“These two classes will be dismissed so that students who wish to attend the moratorium on the Vietnam War may do so.....”

“As you know, the problem of war in general, and the Vietnam War itself, is of special interest and concern to the students of Social and Community Services, and it is my professional judgment that the subject matter to be covered at the moratorium will be of more relevance and significance than that which could possibly be presented in the conventional classroom setting.”

“My personal responsibilities in connection with the moratorium include a speech to social work students and a speech to medical and health sciences students.”

“In the event that any of my students feel that they have been academically slighted as a result of dismissal of classes on October 15, I will meet with them at their leisure until they are satisfied there has been adequate make-up time put forth on my part.”⁹

Dean Nebel failed to respond to my letter, but he did instruct Dr. Keith Roys, our Department Chair to let me know that under no circumstances was I to dismiss my classes on October 15th. I told Keith that I was going to honor the moratorium and gave him a copy of my letter to Dean Nebel. Unfortunately for Keith, he had planned to attend a professional meeting on October 15, but Nebel instructed him to stay in town to be sure I did meet my classes on that day. I assured Keith that I would not attend classes, and strongly encouraged him not to miss his meeting. I was sorry that my activities had complicated his life. He was an excellent departmental chair and a very experienced recreation administrator who strongly supported my professional development.

October 15th proved to be a nationwide success as tens of thousands of students and faculty at some 300 colleges and universities refused to attend classes and promoted various anti-war activities. Activities on the MU campus were not as widespread as we had hoped, but at least we had tried to do our part.

Early in 1969, MU Sociology Professor Donald Granberg and I were approached by MU Honors College Director Bill Bondeson to develop a new “Peace and World Order” course to be taught to undergraduate students during the spring of 1970. Once again, Arthur Nebel attempted to stymie peace

education on campus. When he learned of Prof. Bondeson's request, he told me in no uncertain terms that I was not to teach the course. My response was "fire me". In fact, the Dean's hands were tied because I accepted the Honors College appointment with the provision that I would accept no pay for the course, which would be taught during evening hours. He had considerable control of my life, but not of my leisure.

Normally, enrollment in Honors College courses is limited to about 20 students. When word of the peace course offering began to circulate, Don Granberg and I were inundated with requests for admission. Bill Bondeson was hesitant to open the course to more than 20 students, but because so many students applied, and because two of us were scheduled to teach the course, we finally settled on 50 students. The text we used was a reader by Elizabeth Jay Hollins titled "The Possibilities of Peace" which included chapters by Robert Jay Lifton, Kenneth Boulding, Gunnar Myrdal, Jerome Frank, Grenville Clark, Hans Morgenthau, Richard Falk, Saul Mendlovitz and others.¹⁰

The course format was highly interactive in spite of the large number of students. And, given the spirit of the times, a significant portion of the course dealt with issues and techniques of non-violent, direct action such as those taught by Henry David Thoreau, Mohandas Gandhi, and Martin Luther King. The course also dealt with basic peace theories ranging from "Peace Through Strength" to Christian pacifism, to notions of peace through collective security. The students were seemingly satisfied with the course content and format, but several of them were chomping at the bit to put theory into practice. An opportunity for such practice was not far off.

On May 4, 1970, following the U.S. invasion of Cambodia and the deaths of four students at Kent State University (Ohio) (and later student deaths at Jackson State University in Mississippi), students and faculty anti-war protests broke out on well over 300 college and university campuses throughout the U.S. On the night of the Kent State slayings, MU protesters painted the words "Kent State" on the base of two of the six columns on MU's Francis Quadrangle. The student newspaper "Maneater" called for the impeachment of President Richard Nixon and U.S. withdrawal from Southeast Asia. Two thousand student protesters burned Nixon in effigy on Rollins Field amid shouts of "burn baby burn" and "Peace now". Protesters then marched south on Maryland Avenue carrying a black casket with a painted gold cross and placed it on the steps of Crowder Hall, the Army and Air Force ROTC building. In addition, a fire had been started at the Naval ROTC building on Stewart Road. Fortunately the fire scorched only one corner of the building and caused minimal damage.

On Wednesday, May 6th, members of the MU Sociology department voted 16 to 6 to cancel their classes on Thursday or Friday and give their support to a student proposed strike. Campus protesters directed their attention to MU's Chnancellor John Schwada after he refused to join other college officials across the nation, including President Seymour Smith of Stephens College, in denouncing expansion of the Vietnam War into Cambodia.

I had personally missed all of the MU protest activity that occurred in the period immediately following the Kent State killings. From Sunday, May 3rd until Thursday, May 7th, I had been in Washington D.C. attending a small meeting with U.S. Senators Mark Hatfield, George McGovern, and Eugene McCarthy. They were proposing an amendment to the Senate military procurement authorization bill which, after December 1970, would allow no funds to be appropriated by Congress for military assets or activities in Laos or Cambodia unless there was a declaration of war by Congress.

In addition, funds for Vietnam could be used only for withdrawal of American forces, in the absence of a declaration of war. The purpose of our meeting was to explore ways in which the Hatfield-McGovern amendment could be utilized on college campuses to energize student political activity in concert with non-violent protest activities.

I returned to Columbia on the evening of Thursday, May 7th, and soon learned that there had been considerable reaction and protest on the MU campus, and that there would be an anti-war protest at the intramural sports area (Rollins Field) the next day. I also learned that students had gathered signatures in support of sympathetic faculty members after a letter from MU Dean of Faculties Herbert Schooling asked Dean Armon Yanders of the College of Arts and Science to remind faculty members of a Board of Curators regulation prohibiting suspension of classes without written administration permission. The implication of the letter was that those who did not secure such permission would put their jobs at risk. Clearly, the letter was aimed at the faculty of the Department of Sociology.

Following the Friday morning rally, tension built on campus as students assembled about noon outside a meeting of the MU Board of Curators at the Memorial Student Union. Students were chanting and asking that Chancellor Schwada and the Curators meet with them to discuss four basic demands:

- 1) That the University discontinue threats of job removal or loss of tenure of professors who had decided to strike;
- 2) That the MU administration take a moral position on the war in Vietnam and Cambodia;
- 3) That amnesty be granted for all those arrested in peaceful activities;
- 4) That MU accept no more, and attempt to discontinue all defense contracts on the campus.

When the Chancellor left the meeting, about 200 students followed him to his office in Jesse Hall, and began a cross-legged "sit in" immediately outside his quarters. At the time I was walking across campus and encountered one of my colleagues who said, "Bill, you had better get over to Jesse Hall, your students are blocking the Chancellor in his office." "Which students?" I asked. "Those in your Peace and World Order Honors Course."

I immediately changed direction and quickly headed to Jesse Hall. When I arrived, I saw Tom Dubois, Pat Smith, and other members of our honors class sitting directly in front of the Chancellor's office waiting for him to appear. As he tried to exit his office, his path was solidly blocked in a hallway filled with students, and a few faculty. The Chancellor spotted Tom and said, "Get his name, that's Dubois." I was standing over on the sidelines and knew that something had to be done to support the students. So, I stepped over and said, "I'm not moving either." The Chancellor replied, "What's your name?" And I said, "My name is Wickersham." He said, "Yes, I know you." We stared eye to eye and then rather than move over me, campus security officers cleared a path. There was some jostling and one security officer struck Professor Ted Vaughan on the head as Schwada made his way to his home on Francis Quadrangle.

A crowd that grew to more than 2,000 soon gathered outside his residence, demanding that he come out and listen to their demands. Nevertheless, he didn't appear. At that point, I invited all the crowd to join with me, and fellow members of the MU Veterans for Peace, for a full-blown university strike the next Monday at 8:00 a.m.

On Monday morning, my friend Dale Kindred and I, who were members of MU Veterans for Peace, and another veteran whose name I have forgotten, huddled in the rain by the MU Columns at Francis Quadrangle. And even though we had planned a hunger strike until Chancellor Schwada agreed to meet with the protestors, I wore a blue suit with striped tie. That costume was not very practical for a long term hunger strike, but it occurred to me that police officers were probably less likely to put knots on the head of a “straight looking” guy in a blue suit than on the heads of those dressed in the hippie style of the day.

As luck would have it, a slow drizzle started soon after our arrival at the Columns. So, I held an umbrella in one hand and a bullhorn in the other. During the next hour I made loud announcements aimed at all individuals in the area of the Quadrangle, asking them to join us in our hunger strike or to simply express their support for an overall strike. At one point, a Columbia police officer approached the Columns and said, “Sir you cannot use that bullhorn in this area.” “Why?” I asked. “Because you’re violating the law”, he said. “Which law”, I asked. “Disturbing an educational assembly. You will have to stop.” “Am I under arrest?” I asked. “No, you’re not.” “Okay, until I am arrested, I intend to use the bullhorn.” The officer then left the scene and several students joined us to see what was going on. Little by little the crowd grew. By 10:30 a.m., at least 500 students and faculty had joined our party, and we decided to move our demonstration south to the steps of Jesse Hall. Then we began singing peace songs, saying the Pledge of allegiance to the American Flag, and I led the group in singing “America”. What had started as a small hunger strike was growing into a full-blown demonstration. Individual protesters then came forward and made statements over the bullhorn.

In a very short period the crowd increased to about 1,000. Then a voice boomed out from above. It was that of my friend, MU Dean of Students Jack Matthews (I had sung in his daughter’s wedding), who was standing on the balcony of Jesse Hall saying that emergency regulations were in effect at the University prohibiting any gathering of three or more persons.

Dean Matthews’ statement met only resistance from the students. Several in the crowd called the emergency regulations prohibiting assembly and closing the campus to visitors “police state tactics” and martial law. During the next hour, tension built and the crowd grew to over 3,000 participants. As things heated up, I strongly admonished the students to keep cool and to protest non-violently with dignity. Fortunately, they adhered to my request.

Soon, officers of the Columbia Police Department, MU Campus Police and Missouri State Patrol, along with Boone County Sheriff’s Deputies approached our gathering. Some were decked out in full riot gear with protective helmets. One by one, the deputies moved individual protesters to a waiting school bus. As the arrests began, I instructed the crowd not to “go limp” or resist arrest in any way. This ran contrary to some pacifist arrest resistance tactics, but it also minimized the chances of reactive crowd violence. The arrests were made in a very straightforward non-abusive fashion. Years later, I learned that the Boone County Prosecuting Attorney (my friend and college fraternity brother Frank Conley) had gone to great lengths to ensure that the arrests were made in a non-violent, professional manner. He had actually assembled the Sheriff’s Deputies and carefully spelled out the way the arrests were to be carried out.

When the arrests began, I stepped over in front of a Sheriff’s Deputy and asked that I be arrested with the students. He granted my request and I boarded the yellow school bus, which was bound for the

Police Headquarters in downtown Columbia. The arrests and emergency regulations imposed by Chancellor Schwada served as a stimulus to expand the rally into an all-day demonstration, which attracted over 3,000 people.

Following the arrests, Prosecuting Attorney Frank Conley told Dave Keyes, reporter for the Columbia Daily Tribune, that consultations between his office, the State Highway Patrol, and the office of Missouri's Attorney General John Danforth determined that there had been no violation of state statutes, and there was therefore no basis for filing charges. Conley also told Keyes that charges might still be filed against me for disturbing an educational assembly.

When the bus arrived at police headquarters, no one was asked to exit the bus. We sat there for about 30 minutes until Lt. Bud Jones of the highway patrol boarded the bus and asked if anyone had been mistreated. We assured him that everyone was fine and we even complimented him and his fellow officers for the professional manner in which they had handled our arrests. Lt. Jones left the bus and returned about 15 minutes later, telling us, "As far as we are concerned, you have broken no law. We have no complaint against you, and you may leave."

I, however, was taken into custody in an office inside police headquarters, where I exchanged pleasantries with Frank Conley, and an African American police lieutenant, Ray Palmer, who asked for an explanation of what we were doing. I told him we were simply following the philosophy and example of Dr. Martin Luther King in protesting an illegal, immoral, murderous war.

Back on campus, tension began to mount both inside and outside where the students continued their protest. I was still downtown with Frank Conley and his aides, so I cannot speak from personal experience as to what was going on at Jesse Hall. However, Henry J. Waters III and Larry Gruebner of the Columbia Daily Tribune wrote an article titled "Inside Jesse Hall: Carving out a Compromise", which appeared in the Tribune on May 12th, the day after our arrests. They wrote: "Jesse Hall was locked yesterday while 2,000 students waited impatiently outside and 50 university officials fretted inside."

"The old administration building had been closed up before noon. Unusual for a Monday, but then it was not a usual Monday. For days protesting students had been milling around Francis Quadrangle in the shadows of the Columns, upset about United States' action in Southeast Asia and anxious for Columbia campus Chancellor John Schwada to make some sort of statement on the war."

"A little before noon a reaction came, but it was not what students had in mind. Schwada announced the closing of the campus and handed out a set of emergency regulations. They forbade visitors on the campus and gatherings of three or more people, among other things. Arrests would be made for violations."

"The crowd did not disperse and shortly before one o'clock police started making arrests. About 30 protesters were peacefully escorted away, among them Assistant Professor of Recreation and Park Administration Bill Wickersham, who had emerged as the leader of (the protest)."

"Tension built in the crowd and was reflected inside Jesse Hall."

“Over the next couple of hours, an unstructured drama would unfold within the locked building, acted out in an atmosphere of uneasiness, informality and incongruity. At times, some of the players would appear to know not what roles they were playing, or were expected to play. Some would not be summoned until the action was well underway.”

“As we stood inside, we could see perhaps 20 campus security officers lounging against the walls near the doors. There were small knots of people huddled in a half dozen conferences in the main hallway, and other meetings were going on in several of the offices. Every few minutes Schwada would appear, talk to one of the groups, then duck back into an office somewhere.”

“The faculty council on University Policy had just gotten into the act. Several members of its executive committee, under the leadership of law professor Bill Murphy, were frantically trying to carve out some compromise between Schwada and the dissident students. The job was being made harder because the most effective student leader, Wickersham, was in police custody. Heads were shaking and brows were furrowed. The students, while showing no signs of violence, likewise showed no signs of leaving, and Schwada was adamant.”

“Finally, it was decided that the faculty would announce a meeting between Schwada, the students (represented by Wickersham who was to be gotten out of jail) and members of the policy council. Schwada and Murphy went outside to make the announcement.”

“The mood of the crowd was belligerent when the chancellor spoke. Student leaders repeatedly called for quiet, and Schwada was heard, but his remarks were met with comments of derision. He made no headway, although he insisted that he had always been, and always would be, willing to meet with student groups of reasonable size to discuss matters of concern to students.”

“Then Murphy laid out the policy council’s plan, saying the meeting would be held soon as he could get the council together and a meeting place determined. He told the crowd that Wickersham would be brought back to talk to them.”

“While a car was sent for the jailed peace leader and Murphy summoned more members of the policy council’s executive committee to Jesse Hall, the crowd outside and the people inside waited.”

“By this time several newsmen had been let through the locked doors. The atmosphere among officials was not antagonistic toward the press, although reporters were not allowed in the most private sessions. Most of the administrators and faculty were willing to talk off the record to newsmen they knew, but Schwada did not.”

“Not long after Murphy and Schwada came back inside, a student spoke through the crack in the locked door saying that a delegation of five of the students had been picked. Taking literally the Chancellor’s expressed willingness to meet with student groups at any time, they wanted to have an audience with Schwada immediately. Would he see them?”

“The message was delivered and the answer was returned negative. The details of the tripartite meeting would be announced soon, and Wickersham would talk to them. Everyone waited.”

“Additional members of Murphy’s policy council began to trickle in. There was mixed feeling about the way the Chancellor handled the whole affair. Word got around that one of the conditions of the meeting that was promised should be that the crowd disperse and go home and that another mass meeting be called for Rollins Field the following afternoon. Would the crowd outside go along with the idea? Where was Wickersham? There should have been time for him to get there. Would he go along with making crowd dispersal a condition of holding today’s meeting?” Everyone waited.”

“Inside, sandwiches, coffee and soft drinks were brought in. Many of the people there had been locked in since before lunch and had had nothing to eat. It was after 3:00 p.m. Schwada was in his office.”

“Outside the students waited. A few played guitars. Others talked in groups. There were no signs of impending violence or impatience, but few had left.”

“Wickersham was finally brought in a side door. The plan was presented to him. Would he go outside and tell the students that if they went home today, the meeting with the students, faculty and administration would be held early in the morning?”

“Before answering, Wickersham wanted to talk to a few of the leaders from outside. Four were brought in, three students and the head of a campus student organization. They were to advise Wickersham what they thought the crowd reaction to the suggestion would be.”

“A hurried meeting was held in the Dean of Faculties’ office where Wickersham explained the plan and received the student leaders’ reactions. Then he and members of the faculty walked around the corner to Schwada’s office and as they hurried past, those standing in the hall watched with apprehension.”

“Ten minutes later Wickersham came back into the faculty office and said he would like to call in four more students, this time those considered among the most radical in the big crowd outside. They were brought in. Student representatives now numbered eight. Wickersham talked to them. The decision was made. Wickersham would go out, make the announcement, and try to get the crowd to go home.”

“Would it work? How could Wickersham ask the students to leave without appearing to have compromised too much? Would the promise of a meeting with an uncertain outcome be enough? Certainly nobody but Wickersham could hope to get them dispersed under such conditions. Could even he do it?”

“He took the bullhorn in his hands, “Some of what I am going to say is going to appear to some of you to be a cop-out. I can assure you it is not. What we have agreed to is that we will have a meeting tomorrow in the Student Union of the following groups: The Faculty Council, five students and myself, and representatives of the administration, including Chancellor Schwada and some of his aides. What we are going to do at that meeting is to do exactly what we’ve been trying to do all along, to discuss our demands. O.K.? Those are the demands that have been passed out on the sheets that everyone has had, with regard to amnesty, with regard to grades, with regard to faculty considerations, and so on. And we will probably talk about some other relevant business. What we also plan to do is to have a meeting with you tomorrow afternoon at 1:30 at Rollins Field. We’re giving a little bit here. It doesn’t mean we can’t come back here to Jesse Hall. If things don’t go right, I assure I’ll be right back

here with you. At that meeting, we will bring back to you either the progress of tomorrow morning's meeting, or the outcome of that meeting to discuss with you for your approval. I think we're reasonable, I think we're getting our demands, I think we're going to win. What we have agreed to do in order to have the meeting tomorrow morning is to disperse this crowd right now. I can't tell you what to do, but I'm going to tell you what I'm going to do and I think we'll get much farther on the road in doing what we really want to accomplish, and that is to focus attention on that bloody war to get this university to take a stand, to get our faculty and administration to talk with us. I am going to ask you to disperse. We will be back at Rollins Field at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow, and if we are not satisfied with the outcome, then I will personally come here with the other people and we'll be willing to go right back down to the city jail again."

"When Wickersham first mentioned going home, there were heated protests from a few of the more radical students. Murphy and others stood in the background anxiously waiting to see what the thousands would do. There were clearly mixed feelings. Wickersham was still a hero, and they recognized the agreement to a meeting as a victory of sorts. But they were loath to give up their homestead on the Jesse Hall steps."

"Wickersham started down. The crowd parted, slowly at first. As he walked through, students began to follow and drift away in other directions. Within ten minutes only a few hundred were left."

"There were sighs of relief and official thoughts turned to the challenge of the morrow. Inside the pressure was off for the time being, but there remained the sinking awareness that the crisis was clearly not over."

"Outside a handful of students was busy picking up the small pieces of litter the crowd had left behind. Cardboard boxes had been scattered through the area, and all of them were of soft drink cans and papers. The stray trash that had escaped the makeshift receptacles was being collected, and even cigarette butts were gathered by hand, one by one."

"At 5:30 everyone was gone, and Francis Quadrangle looked almost normal."¹¹

The next morning at 9:30 a.m., the Faculty Council convened a special meeting to discuss the various issues surrounding the student protest. Participants included members of the Council, Chancellor John Schwada and his administrative staff, representatives of the Missouri Student Association, a representative of the Graduate Student Association, members of the "Peace Coalition" (five student protesters), and me.

Following nine hours of negotiation, the group achieved consensus on a "Joint Statement on Campus Problems":

Faculty Dismissal of Classes

"The Faculty Council agrees to represent the interests of those members of the instructional staff who dismissed classes on any day May 7 through 11, inclusive. The Chancellor agrees to make no recommendation concerning these staff members without consultation with the Faculty Council. The Council, the administration and student representatives urge and expect all instructional staff to continue normal operations for the remainder of the semester."

Student Disciplinary Proceedings

“Before disciplinary proceedings are brought against any student for protest activities between May 6 and issuance of this statement, the appropriate administrative officials will consult with a committee composed of 3 representatives of the Faculty Council and 3 representatives of the MSA. In deciding whether disciplinary action is to be instituted, due regard will be given to the nature of the offense, and particularly whether the student conduct involved force, violence, personal injury or property damage. In its consultation, the Faculty Council and MSA would expect to support the general proposition that no disciplinary proceedings should be instituted for completely peaceful activity. All decisions on whether to institute such disciplinary proceedings shall be made as expeditiously as possible and in no event later than May 22.”

Class Attendance Options

“Matters of class attendance, course requirements and grading are recognized as being within the prerogative of the faculty. Present regulations, including Article XV, 3 of the Faculty By-Laws, provides a sufficient number of options for grading of credit and the assignment of grades.”

“In the case of students who decide not to attend class for any part or all of the remainder of the semester, the decision as to arrangements for the completion of the course and the determination of the final grade can be made by consultation between the individual student and faculty member.”

“The Faculty Council advises that the following options are among those presently available:

- granting of a grade on basis of work completed to date,
- granting of a grade based on a final examination, without requirement of class attendance,
- or a grade of incomplete.

The Faculty Council urges that member of the instructional staff, departments and divisions make at least one of these options available to the students.”

Peaceful Assembly – Rights and Limits

“The rights of free expression of opinion and peaceful assembly are recognized and will be respected. They provide legitimate avenues for members of the academic community to express their views on the war and other public issues. These rights are qualified, however, by an obligation not to disrupt or interfere with the normal and regular activities of the University. Specifically, students should refrain from blocking free access to University facilities. They should also refrain from the holding of mass meetings and the use of amplification devices except as authorized by normal procedures. The above principles are set forth in existing University regulations, but their reiteration and observance at this time of tension is particularly important. This statement in no way limits the applicability of present University standards of conduct.”

“I certify that the foregoing Joint Statement was unanimously adopted and endorsed by the forty-four persons present at the meeting.

William P. Murphy
Chairman, Faculty Council on University Policy¹²

On Wednesday May 13, 1970, about 3,000 University of Missouri students assembled at Rollins Field to review and make a decision on acceptance or rejection of the “Joint Statement on Campus

Problems”. Bill Murphy read the statement, which received a very mixed reaction from the crowd. Some students were upset because the statement failed to address two of their original demands, i.e., that the University take a moral position on the war, and that the University eliminate its military contracts. The fact was that those demands were never thoroughly discussed in the student-faculty-administration negotiations. So, a few radical students were upset that I, and their fellow student representatives had “copped out”. One graduate sociology student later wrote me a letter stating that she hoped a person like me never again assumed a position of leadership in any protest activity requiring bargaining or negotiation.

From my point of view, the protest activity on campus had accomplished several positive objectives:

1. It forced a very authoritarian Chancellor who was unresponsive to student concerns about the war to actually sit down and listen to their complaints.
2. It established some form of due process, which would prevent automatic administrative punishment of student and faculty protesters.
3. It put the University of Missouri’s name on the list of over 300 institutions of higher learning who had engaged in substantial student protest of the Vietnam war.
4. It provided a platform for anti-war protesters like myself to promote solutions to the war, such as the previously mentioned Hatfield-McGovern Amendment to cut funds from U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia.

Eventually the campus community voiced approval of the “Joint Statement”. However, the May 13th meeting got quite messy. While it appeared that most of the crowd favored the “Statement”, a sizeable number did not. What to do? How could we actually determine the majority will of the protesters.

It occurred to me that we had to take some kind of vote. I remembered that Professor Loren Reid of the MU Speech Department was in the audience, in fact, I saw him standing at the rear of the crowd. I called him to the platform and instructed everyone to sit down on the ground. I then told them that Professor Reid would put a motion for acceptance of the provisions of the “Joint Statement” to the crowd for its acceptance or rejection. I told them that those who wanted to vote approval of the measure should stand, and those who disagreed should remain seated. In this way we would determine the rough percentage of those for and against acceptance of Professor Reid’s motion. He in turn stated a proposition regarding the “Joint Statement”, but indicated that there would be no additional discussion prior to the vote.

The vote was taken with about two thirds of the crowd voting approval and one third disapproving. I then told the crowd that I was leaving and that as far as I was concerned the protesters had accepted the “Joint Statement”. Most of the crowd then left Rollins field, while several of the dissenters remained to make plans for future protests, none of which ever approached the magnitude of the early May events.

On May 18th, the University’s Board of Curators met to discuss the recent protest events on campus. According to a report of the American Association of University Professors, which was published in the spring of 1973, the Board adopted the following resolution:

“.....that the (MU) administration be requested to give the Board a complete report as to the names of any university personnel that may have been absent from duty without proper authorization through the

days of May 4th to May 16th, together with a report of action taken by the administration in each case.”¹³

The AAUP report went on to say: “Chancellor Schwada was designated as the Curator’s agent in this matter, and he promptly instructed the various deans to procure the names of those who ‘illegally dismissed classes’.”

“About the time of the Curators’ meeting, several members of the Missouri State Legislature expressed indignation about aspects of the campus disturbances. Two state representatives voiced dismay about class cancellations. One of them called upon the University “to put an immediate halt to the dismissal of classes for any political demonstrations...”¹⁴

The AAUP report also indicated that: “On May 20, Governor Warren E. Hearnes sent a letter to Faculty Council Chairman Murphy in which he criticized the ‘Joint Statement’ and stated that the document should first have been presented to the Curators for their approval or disapproval. He chastised the faculty for excusing students for purposes of protest: “You have created a situation that is discriminatory. Some students will be getting grades that were not earned While other students who chose not to protest are required to take final exams.” Professor Murphy replied to the Governor on May 22, defending the Faculty Council’s role in developing the ‘Joint Statement’. He contended that the ‘Joint Statement’ averted the possibility of disorder and contributed to bringing the campus back to normal.”¹⁵

The AAUP report also noted that: “Soon after this exchange between the Governor and Professor Murphy, Chancellor Schwada commented on the controversial ‘Joint Statement’. The Chancellor, who had originally expressed approval of the document, now stated that he did not agree with the statement on alternative arrangements for completion of courses. The arrangement on grades, he said, “Was not in accord with the intent and spirit of the faculty by-laws and the administration was not involved in that section.” His statements are reported as having been made before a faculty meeting on May 26.”

“By the end of May, most students had left the campus for the summer and the atmosphere on the Columbia campus was again calm. Commencement exercises were scheduled for June 2, and on the same day the Board of Curators gathered for its regular monthly meeting.”

“The Curators adopted a series of resolutions on June 2, without warning, apparently without consultation with campus administrators, and apparently even without much discussion.”

“The Board adopted a four-part motion proposed by Curator Robert G. Brady (a judge from St. Louis), which stated:

1. The ‘Joint Statement’ developed at the University was completely repudiated.
2. Authority was granted the administration to initiate disciplinary action against students and faculty who participated in the ‘blocking’ of Chancellor Schwada’s office.
3. Students and faculty who participated in ‘blocking’ the Chancellor’s office were to be suspended immediately, pending the completion of disciplinary proceedings.
4. The degrees and/or final grades of students were to be withheld. Faculty members were to have their salaries reduced for any days that they participated in activities which were in violation of University rules.”

“The Curators also voted expenditure of funds to hire personnel to conduct an investigation of the May disturbances. Additionally, the Curators decided to invite Mr. William C. Sullivan, then Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to meet with them, “to discuss trends in College and University disruptions so we may have his advice and counsel on steps we might take to help meet these problems as they arise.”

“One proposed resolution, calling for expulsion of those students involved in the May 8th blocking of the administration building and the Chancellor’s office, was voted down, 4-2. Another motion, providing for the non-renewal of faculty contracts for those who failed to meet their scheduled classes from May 4 on was tabled by a 4-2 vote.”¹⁶

The faculty members most affected by the Curators decisions were seven sociologists and I. Professor Daryl Hobbs, Chairman of the MU Department of Sociology at the time of the May 1970 events was temporarily suspended and docked \$584 from his salary. The other Professors, J. Kenneth Benson, Ted R. Vaughan, John F. Galliher, Donald Granberg, Charles H. Mindel and Ronald Miller received pay reductions ranging from \$40 to \$110. Salary increases from \$400 to \$800 were denied Professors Benson, Galliher, Granberg, Miller, Mindel and Vaughan. Recommended tenure was denied to Professors Galliher and Vaughan (although notice of non-reappointment was not issued), and a recommended promotion for Professor Galliher was cancelled. In my case, my last paycheck was docked \$834.69.

In October 1970, the sociologists and I filed a complaint with the American Association of University Professors requesting an investigation of the University’s policies related to academic freedom and other matters of academic due process. AAUP assigned two prominent American professors to conduct the investigation. They were Dr. Walter Adams, Professor of Economics at Michigan State University, and Dr. Lewis A. Coser, Professor of Sociology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

In 1973, Professors Adams and Coser issued their report, which appeared in the AAUP Bulletin, Spring 1973. In a section of the report titled “Ramifications for Academic Freedom” they stated: “In the judgment of the ad hoc investigating committee, the administration and the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri overreacted massively and ominously in dealing with the cases that have been discusses. The penalties, which were imposed, and the manner in which they were imposed, cast a pall on the freedom with which faculty members at the University conduct themselves in and out of the classroom. By their actions, the administration and the Board have demonstrated their preparedness to intrude in issues and problems best dealt with at the departmental or college level, and to take serious disciplinary action without benefit of the findings and recommendations of faculty bodies performing their roles under an appropriately structured system of academic due process. Given what occurred, one cannot expect any faculty member at the University to feel immune from the imposition of summary discipline by a provoked administrative hierarchy, nor to feel secure that his basic rights to know what he may be charged with, to be heard by his peers prior to the implementation of any sanctions, and to be able to appeal to a governing board that has not previously involved itself will be observed. Consequently, academic freedom, dependent as it is on an untrammled sense that faculty members may speak their mind, without fear that adverse action will be taken absent demonstrated cause, stands impaired.”¹⁷

Professor Adams and Coser ended their report with the following conclusions:

- A. Professor Daryl Hobbs was officially suspended without pay by the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri, and was threatened with discharge, without claim or demonstration of threat of immediate harm as required under the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings and without the affordance of requisite academic due process. The provision for a later hearing on appeal did little to mitigate the serious denial of due process inherent in the unilateral imposition of the sanction.
- B. The six other members of the Department of Sociology whose salaries were reduced for May 1970, were denied adequate opportunity to defend themselves before an independent faculty hearing body. The sanction immediately imposed upon them was relatively light, but more severe sanctions, related to tenure, promotion, and salary increments, and inflicted by the administration without due process, were to follow.
- C. Professor Bill Wickersham's rights to tenure under the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure were abridged by requiring a further period of probationary service upon his transfer from his tenured position in Extension Education to the Department of Recreation and Park Administration, and then by terminating his services through simple notice of non-reappointment. His salary for his final month at the University was significantly reduced by unilateral administrative action, and subsequent assertions by the administration in explanation of this action were not accompanied by evidence and were not subjected to test through the procedures of academic due process.
- D. The sanctions unilaterally imposed in these cases by the administration and the Board of Curators at the University of Missouri serve to jeopardize the exercise of academic freedom by the faculty of the University."¹⁸

On April 23, 1973, the American Association of University Professors voted unanimously to censure the University of Missouri-Columbia for its treatment of the seven professors of sociology and myself following campus anti-war demonstrations in May 1970. As AAUP's strongest measure, censure indicated that "unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure" were found to prevail at the University. AAUP's stated policy on its censure list is that it does not serve as a boycott or blacklist, and that it has no effect on the AAUP membership eligibility of faculty members at a censured institution. The organization does, however, urge that before accepting appointments, prospective faculty members seek information on present conditions of academic freedom and tenure from AAUP for other faculty members at a censured institution.

Another purpose of a censure is to help the bargaining position of a specific faculty member. In an April 29, 1973 statement to The Columbia Missourian, William VanAlstyne, Chair of AAUP's committee on academic freedom said, "I think the effectiveness of censure is evidenced by the extent of effort by university bodies to get off or stay off the list."¹⁹

At the time of the censure, letters from MU's new President C. Brice Ratchford and MU's Board of Curators argued that the University's regulation on administrative personnel had changed and urged that AAUP not censure the University. In September of 1975 I sued the University for the portion of my May 1970 salary that had been summarily docked for purported neglect of duties. I was

represented by a recent MU law graduate, John B. Larrimer. The University was represented by Marvin (Bunky)Wright. The following is a verbatim account of the settlement rendered by Joan M. Pinnell, Magistrate in William Wickersham vs. The Board of Curators of the University of Missouri, Case No. 75-910.

“Gentlemen, the court has this day entered judgment for plaintiff in the amount of \$745.00 and assesses costs of \$11.00 against the defendant.”

“The Contract between plaintiff and defendant does not specify duties to be performed. The defendant having presented no evidence to the contrary, the only testimony before the court is that of the plaintiff, that duties to be performed were advisory and supervisory; and that, with the exception of two days, those duties were fully performed. On the uncontroverted testimony of plaintiff, the Court finds that the contract was substantially performed and that plaintiff is entitled to recover for defendant’s breach in failure to make payment.”

“”Under 172.340, V.A.M.S., defendant is required to withhold compensation for such time as plaintiff failed to discharge his official duties. The court finds that plaintiff failed to discharge his official duties on May 8, 1970, and May 11, 1970.

Very truly yours,
Joan M. Pinnell
Magistrate²⁰

Note: The above reference to: “duties to be performed were advisory and supervisory” had to do with my 1969-1970 employment arrangement with the MU Department of Recreation and Park Administration which called for my supervision and advice to two highly experienced graduate students who were basically the teachers of my undergraduate courses. And, while I frequently attended those classes, I was not expected to be present on a daily basis.

Clearly this was not an earth shaking financial settlement, but it did allow John Larrimer to gain additional court experience, and it was another confirmation of the University’s arbitrary treatment of my employment situation. To me it was the principle of the matter, not the money, which really counted.

Following my move to Carbondale, Illinois in 1975, the University’s Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Melvin George, visited me in my campus office at Southern Illinois University to negotiate a settlement to my AAUP case against MU. Following our discussions we agreed upon arrangements which were later outlined in a May 13, 1976 letter to me by Owen Koeppe, MU’s Provost for Academic Affairs:

“Dear Bill,

The University of Missouri-Columbia is pleased to offer you an appointment for one year as Adjunct Associate Professor of Education (social-philosophic foundations) from September 1, 1976 through August 31, 1977. You will receive a base salary of \$1800 (\$150 per month). This salary will be for up to 12 days work at UMC carrying our responsibilities to be arranged through Professor Christopher

Lucas. These responsibilities can include consulting on curriculum in Social-Philosophic Foundations and the UMC Peace Studies Program and participating in conferences and symposia. Further, we hope that you will be able to teach a three-hour course during half or all of the 1977 Summer Session. We hope that the course will be in the broad area of Education for Human Survival. Your salary for the summer course will be \$2000. We will pay you up to \$500 toward travel expenses associated with your visits to Columbia.

I hope that you will be willing to accept this offer because I feel that you can make important contributions to the academic programs of several colleges on this campus. Please let me know your decision so that if you do accept, we can initiate appointment papers as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Owen J. Koepp
Provost for Academic Affairs

OJK: jb

Enc.

Cc: Vice President George
Chancellor Schooling
Dean Woods
Dean Yanders
Professor Lucas²¹

In connection with my appointment in the College of Education, Provost Koepp issued an announcement to the University's Office of Public Information:

"The University has offered to Professor Bill Wickersham a one-year, part-time appointment as Adjunct Associate Professor in Social-Philosophic Foundations of Education, effective September 1, 1976 through August 31, 1977. Professor Wickersham will work with Professor Christopher Lucas, Coordinator of the Social-Philosophic Foundations program in the College of Education. He will be on campus for a day or two a month during the academic year, consulting on curriculum in social-Philosophic Foundations and in the UMC Peace Studies major and, participating in conferences and symposia from time to time. In addition, plans call for him to teach a special topics course in the summer of 1977 in Education for Human Survival, a course similar to one Professor Wickersham taught at the University of Iowa."

"Professor Wickersham was a member of the UMC faculty until 1970. He was one of the figures in the events of that year which led to the University's censure by the AAUP. Though negotiations leading to this appointment have been carried out with full knowledge of AAUP, the offer was developed through campus procedures. This included full involvement of faculty in Social-Philosophic Foundations of Education. Professor Wickersham's long-standing interest in this area goes back to the time he was on the UMC faculty. The course in Education for Human Survival is of real interest to this area and it will, in addition, complement the Peace Studies Program."

While the University hopes that this action will illustrate again its commitment to open inquiry and academic freedom, there is no agreement between AAUP and the University concerning the impact of

this action on the University's censure. UMC looks forward to its renewed association with Professor Wickersham next year."²²

Obviously I did not drive a hard bargain with the University. I could have demanded reinstatement as a tenured professor of Extension Educations as suggested by AAUP. However, at that point I had no desire to return to MU. I was not interested in revenge. It was my university from which I held a bachelor's degree, a doctorate, and ten years of professional service. And my main adversary, John Schwada had moved on to greener pastures at Arizona State University in Tempe. (There were reports that he was offered the job because of this strong stand against dissidents, especially anti-war protesters).

Some of my colleagues were disappointed that I was not insistent on more concessions from the University. However, from my point of view, it was time to settle the conflict.

Following the AAUP censure, all of the punished sociologists who remained at the University after the 1970-71 academic year received salary increments and tenure was granted to Professors Galliher and Vaughn. Professor Galliher received the promotion that had been recommended. Professors Granberg, Benson and Hobbs all continued as highly successful and well-known scholars, and Professor Galliher eventually was appointed Director of the University's Peace Studies Program.

Unfortunately, I lost track of our honors students who were leaders of the May 1970 anti-war protests. But, to the best of my knowledge none was ever subjected to the draconian measures put forth by the MU Board of Curators following the May demonstrations.

Editorials by the Columbia Tribune

Unquestionably, much of the conflict on the MU campus during the May 1970 anti-war protests centered on the behavior of MU's Chancellor, John Schwada. The Columbia Daily Tribune's editor and publisher, Henry J. Waters, III, (in a May 12, 1970 editorial) titled "The Chancellor and the students", had this to say about his behavior:

"Chancellor John Schwada is not at his best in situations of stress between students and the university administration. He never developed much rapport with the people on his campus, and this chasm shows up most clearly in times of stress."

"Practically all of the students and many members of the faculty view him as an antagonistic or at least distant figure who has little real interest in communicating actively with them. He is widely mistrusted and has lost practically all of the potential effectiveness he should have in dealing with students."

"There is a small palace guard which participates in creating this image. This cadre has never demonstrated a deep understanding of how to deal with concerned students or faculty on a human level."

"It is fine to sit in Jesse Hall and make grand plans for handling dissident students or potential trouble on campus, but this is not enough. Student confrontations are highly personal and emotional affairs which will not respond to textbook methods and cloistered councils of war alone."

“Yesterday the University made a mistake in issuing a set of ‘emergency regulations’, which were ill founded and unenforceable. One of the requirements read that no visitors would be allowed on the campus except with special permission, and another prohibited gatherings of over three people. Both violations were to result in arrest.”

“The peaceful crowd of some 2,000 students at Jesse Hall did what anyone should have expected it would do – nothing. It did not disperse, assuming that students have a right to gather on the campus as long as they are not violent or disruptive. When officers came into the crowd and started actually making arrests, the students remained absolutely cool and made no resistance. Those singled out went with the officers peacefully. About 30 were loaded into a bus and carted downtown. All this time visitors, of course, roamed the campus either unaware or unworried about a campus edict that was unworkable.”

“Somebody got wise and stopped the ill-fated arrest procedure after the first busload had been taken. None of those people were charged, and the abortive police action was abandoned.”

“It’s to the credit of the law officers that they did not make an untenable situation worse by entering into their enforcement of the ‘emergency regulations’ with more zeal. Their restraint coupled with that of the protestors avoided what could have deteriorated into an ugly conflict indeed. But it was nip and tuck for a while, and unnecessarily so.”

“The confrontation on this campus has had a completely non-violent tone. There are constant reminders to the crowd about keeping the peace. The tactics of the dissent have been legitimate; no building occupations, no building burnings. Under these conditions, the most effective chancellor, it seems to us, would have been one of the first ones to join the crowd on its initial day of protest. He would have talked as long as necessary to the students, asked them questions and displayed clearly his sincere concern for them. Such proof of real involvement from the top leadership would have done more to ease tensions than all the carefully laid plans from behind closed doors could ever do. In its reaction to other speakers, CBS newsman Harry Reasoner for example, the crowd has repeatedly shown that what they wanted most was an active response and communication with leaders they have reason to trust.”

“But the sad fact is that the one person on this campus who is least able to fill this role is the one man who has the opportunity, and indeed the duty, to use it, the Chancellor himself.”

“It is a mark of good leadership to be open and responsive to the masses. The self-assured holder of power is eager to deal personally with his people. He is not afraid of them. He lets them know he welcomes their ideas.”

“Based on this ready proof of responsiveness and interest, the leader then has rapport enough to maintain an enlightened influence. Since he is willing to listen and respond positively to their good ideas, the followers will listen to him when he has counter suggestions.”

“Such a give and take of respect and understanding does not now exist between the Chancellor and the students on this campus. Much of this situation has arisen because of stubbornness in high office, and this makes it infinitely harder to resolve student problems when they arise.”²³

On May 14, 1970, Mr. Waters wrote another editorial titled “The Protestors and Wickersham”: “The entire Columbia community including both its campus and off-campus areas has much to be thankful for today. The delicate state of affairs on the university campus has passed through its most critical stages.”

“Through the exhaustive efforts of those who carved out the agreement between students and administration, the mass demonstrations are over. It is to their credit that all parties were able to show the degree of flexibility necessary to bring accord out of near chaos.”

“One of the tragedies in situations like this is that so many members of the general public are unable to grasp the central problems involved and the roles individuals play. They tend to support or condemn out of hand using only their ill founded preconceptions as guides.”

“Protesting students are nothing more than anarchists bent on destruction, and the faculty is little better. People like Dr. Bill Wickersham only fan the fire by making impossible demands backed up by threats of violence. The greatest heroes are those who would immediately send helmeted riot troops through any sort of protest gathering, knock heads, and put the troublemakers in jail. Thank God the people closest to the trouble, or at least enough of them, knew better.”

“One of the most misunderstood people in Columbia today is probably Dr. Wickersham. To be sure he holds a heartfelt opposition to the war, which he is willing to express in public, and it is clear he wants support for his view from wherever he can get it, including mass meetings on the campus. But he did not organize the recent rallies, and there is absolutely no question in our minds that if he had not assumed a posture of leadership with the student crowds, the chances for trouble would have been vastly greater.”

“Moreover, he was indispensable in getting the compromise hammered out and, most important of all, getting the students to give it a fair hearing. Under the conditions that developed on the campus during the last five or six days, it is doubtful anyone else could have done it. One Wickersham expressing rational views to a tense crowd about how it must conduct itself is worth 500 policemen who would seek to keep things under control by force.”

“When the terms of the agreement were announced at a mass meeting yesterday afternoon, the crowd overwhelmingly supported them. They were fair in terms and did not include anything the university cannot live with. There were a meager handful of crazies who were not satisfied and vowed they would go back to Jesse Hall and demand more, but they clearly lack any sort of broad support from the rest of the students, and they cannot cause the kind of serious trouble that arises when wide and deep discontent is allowed to fester. All through the preceding days, Wickersham had openly and repeatedly opposed the rash ideas of these few, and went so far as to heatedly denounce them in Wednesday’s Rollins Field rally. The fact that practically all of the students got his message is responsible for the peaceful results that finally came.”

“There is plenty of room for differing with Dr. Wickersham’s opinions about the war, and he is the first to recognize this. But it is misguided opinion indeed to brand him as a radical violence monger. Those who saw him in action at the closest range, regardless of allegiances to the students or the administration, cannot have failed to understand the vital role he played in keeping things calm on the Missouri campus.”

“But alas, the more one does the more he is misunderstood, and so it shall ever be.”²⁴

On Thursday, October 8, 1970, Mr. Waters wrote a third editorial titled: “Must We Kill Charlie Chicken?”

“Charlie Chicken’s dead and gone,
But his memory lingers on.”

“When we were attending summer camp in Minnesota in the early forties, we used to have skit days. During one memorable year there was in our cabin a young man of unusual talent who wrote a quickly forgotten melody to which he put the eternal words quoted above. For some reason, though events surely more important have come and gone, the first two lines of his lyric have become lodged eternally in our mind’s lockbox never to be disinterred.”

“For some fascinating reason, this obscure couplet seems appropriate in response to the news that Dr. Bill Wickersham has taken a job with the World Federalists, U.S.A., which will apparently end his career as a member of the Columbia academic community. Perhaps the insignificance of the rhyme fits the occasion. And yet again, perhaps both are in the way eternal.”

“The case of Bill Wickersham has a classically tragic air about it. Though he is dead and gone in one immediate sense (his employment status in local higher education is indeed nonexistent now), what happened to him represents part of what is wrong with much of American higher education. Even more, it represents a basic failure in American society at large. As such, it is bigger than life, and its memory will linger on.”

“What the demise of young Dr. Wickersham shows us is that we are as yet unable to really face the conflicts that plague us, and a conflict un-faced is a problem unresolved.”

“Wickersham has been a controversial man. He displayed honesty, perception and guts in speaking out on a critical issue that troubles us all more deeply than we can let ourselves admit. He has been insistent to the point of irritation in trying to make us contemplate the insane condition that exists in the world today, as we go on blithely building nuclear overkill and waging a senseless war in the jungles of Indo-China. With our outmoded concepts of war and peace firmly in mind, we trundle blindly onward toward possible oblivion; refusing along the way to even pause for truly honest reflection. Because Wickersham brought this disturbing news with more than ordinary energy, he was the type of messenger whose head must roll.”

“We cling to our old ideas about war and peace as a liturgy to drag up and parade in order to justify going on with familiar, easier to live with policies of national ‘security’. Our minds are only big enough for war in its historical mold with countable casualties and riskable dangers. We know in the

shallowest sense there is a new era of horror upon us, but we cannot contemplate it. To really let soak in the awareness that we live under a literally constant threat of instant and complete annihilation is to raise the horrifying spectre of blithering personal madness.”

“The thing that Wickersham somehow grasped before most of use is that such emotional and mental evasions will do nothing to solve the problem. When backyards all up and down the Elm Streets of America are directly threatened by hydrogen bombs already in place and loaded, the time is past when we can conveniently shift the responsibility for war to some remote clutch of cloistered planners. For the first time the human race is really threatened, and Dr. William Wickersham has been insistent on our knowing it.”

“Yet, when such conflict is laid out on the table, we panic. We cannot stand it, and if the party responsible for intruding so forcefully on our serenity is vulnerable, he must go. The Wickershams of the world are troublesome and upsetting, attendant rationalizing notwithstanding, on that narrow ground alone. We will gladly put them aside if we can.”

“For a nickel’s worth of temporary peace we sell our souls, and a Wickersham or two will readily be tossed in as boot.”²⁵

Hank Waters’ mention of my job with World Federalists, U.S.A. will be expanded very shortly, but my firing at Columbia College preceded that arrangement. The following is an account of my short-term relationship with the College.

The State Patrol

According to St. Louis Post Dispatch reporter Margie Freivogel, the Missouri State Patrol often sent agents to observe campus protest activities during the 1960’s.

“Undercover agents for the Highway Patrol were sent to the University of Missouri campus frequently in the late 60’s and early 70’s to observe protest demonstrations, patrol officers say.

The agents obtained some photographs of protesters and made reports on the size and temper of the crowds, Lt. Col. Richard Gehrig said yesterday.

The agents’ primary purpose was to gather information so that the patrol would be knowledgeable if it were called for assistance, he said. At the time, Gehrig was commander of Troops F, the unit in the area that includes Columbia.

He called the undercover agents “liaison officers.” He said such officers were sent to observe any trouble spot in the state where the patrol might be called for assistance.

“It’s common practice,” said Capt. F.A. Jones, current commander and former operations lieutenant for Troop F. “During the Union Shake-up on the campus a year or so ago, our men were in the crowd looking like union people and shouting and throwing things at us. At the rock festival in Camdenton, they looked like rock fans.

“We don’t treat the university any different than anyplace else in the state,” Jones said. “When we think we should know what’s going on, we send someone in.”

There has been no need to send undercover agents to the campus since the strike of Public Service Employees Local 45, he said. At the time of frequent campus protest, however, undercover agents were sent repeatedly, Jones said.

No more than two were on campus at any given time, Jones said. They attended protest meetings and made assessments on whether the patrol would be needed, he said.

In some cases, he said, the agents noted the identity of certain protest leaders and kept track on their activities in demonstrations.

“One name I remember was Prof. Wickersham,” Jones said. “He was out there one day with a bullhorn, trying to cause the students to demonstrate.”

William Wickersham, a faculty member and political activist, has since left the campus.

Wickersham’s name might appear in summary reports of patrol activity on the time, Jones said. But the patrol maintains no file on him or any other person individually, Jones said.

Gehrig said that extensive surveillance was not conducted on any individual because no one was considered dangerous enough to warrant it.

Pictures taken at demonstrations included crowd shots and close-range photos of those making speeches, Gehrig said. He said a photographer had been among the agents assigned to the campus, but he could not recall whether the pictures had been taken by the photographer or obtained from campus police.

Gehrig said he did know for certain but assumed that the pictures had been placed in a general file in Troop F headquarters in Jefferson City.

Reports from men in the field were passed through the chain of command to Gehrig. In some cases, he informed his supervisors of the situation, he said, so they would be prepared to send men when necessary.

On several occasions, patrolmen were on campus to assist local police, but they were used only rarely.

In addition to gathering information for the patrol, the agents consulted with the campus police, Gehrig said. That department engaged in more extensive intelligence activities relating to the demonstrations, campus sources have told the Post-Dispatch.

University policemen entered three offices without search warrants to look for information about demonstrations, the sources said. In addition, campus policemen maintained intelligence files that included several hundred names, the sources said.

Meanwhile, chief of the campus police at the University of Missouri at Columbia says to the best of his knowledge no member of the university family has been subjected to surveillance since he took the job.

Chief Ronald E. Mason acknowledged four exceptions.

He said there was surveillance in connection with a rape investigation in February 1972 and a special watch on some campus neighborhoods to combat rapes in October and November. Efforts to identify vehicles around the Black Culture House as belonging to suspected criminals were discontinued in April 1972. In December 1972, a watch was kept on a men’s restroom at the Student Union after a student complained he was solicited by a homosexual.

Mason’s report covered the period after he was named chief on March 1, 1972, and he said the surveillance was limited to preventing and stopping crime.

“The activities cannot in any way be related to espionage or spying,” he said.

Mason’s letter was in response to questions posed to Herbert Schooling, the school’s chancellor, by its Faculty Council on University Policy.

Schooling said he was reviewing campus police activities before Mason became chief.

“In reviewing past practices of the department,” Schooling said, “it should be recalled that the period 1969 to 1972 was one of much unrest on college campuses. The police on our own campus very properly investigated all reports of possible violence and interference with scheduled activities.”²⁶

Columbia College

As previously noted, following the receipt of a terminal contract at the University of Missouri, I negotiated with Dr. Merle Hill, President of Columbia College (in Columbia, MO) for a job with the College. The following account of my dealings with the College are taken from an Academic Freedom and Tenure report on Columbia College which appeared in the Winter 1971 American Association of University Professor (AAUP) Bulletin. The report was written by economics professor Donald C. Cell of Cornell College (Iowa), and philosophy professor Merrill Proudfoot of Park College (Missouri).

“On September 16, 1969, Dr. William Wickersham signed an employment agreement with Columbia College, Columbia, Missouri. Dr. Wickersham was at that time beginning a terminal year of service as Assistant Professor of Recreation and Park Administration at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The agreement with Columbia College, which had been negotiated with President Merle Hill, also bore the signature of the President, and it made no reference to any further action needed for the agreement to be binding. It called for Professor Wickersham’s service on the faculty at the College to begin in July 1970; in addition to teaching, he was to serve as Director of Intercampus and Community Service Programs.”

“On June 13, 1970, the Columbia College Board of Trustees disapproved the appointment. In informing Professor Wickersham of this action, President Hill referred by way of explanation to the concern of the Board for the College’s public relations situation. Much of the controversy surrounding the withdrawal of Professor Wickersham’s appointment at Columbia College relates to events which took place in May (anti-war protests) on the nearby campus of the University of Missouri, in which Professor Wickersham played a prominent role.”²⁷

“...The May events at the University of Missouri were given substantial publicity in the local press. A June 25th letter from President Hill to the attorney for Columbia College, a copy of which he also sent to Professor Wickersham, sets forth the following sequence:

‘On May 12, 1970, during campus demonstrations at the University of Missouri, trustee, local, parent’s and alumnae opposition to Dr. Wickersham’s being on this faculty increased. At a meeting of the board officers, acting with authority vested in them by the College’s charter and bylaws, it was indicated that Dr. Wickersham’s contract would not be approved by the full board. Expressing concern for good public relations for the college and for Dr. Wickersham, board officers agreed that it would be unfair to Dr. Wickersham to make public announcements that the board of trustees would not approve his contract and that this information should be given to him by the president of the college.....’

‘(at a further meeting of Professor Wickersham, President Hill and a trustee on May 14th), the board member expressed the board’s concern for the financial position of the college, for its dependency on operating funds through local gift sources, and for public relations with the community. He suggested that the college, in its present precarious position, could not afford to alienate so many important publics and sources of financial support by employing Dr. Wickersham.’

‘At the above meeting Dr. Wickersham expressed a desire to meet with some trustees to explain his position. On Monday, June 22, 1970, several trustees met in the office of the president of the college. Dr. Wickersham stated that he wanted to teach at the college and indicated that he felt his political

activity should not influence the board's decision about his teaching ability. He suggested that he was ready to fulfill his teaching contract....'

'The board members present.... suggested that the college could not afford to have Dr. Wickersham teach on our campus because of local opinion expressed to them verbally and in writing, even if they agreed 110 percent with Dr. Wickersham's political viewpoints....'

'Early in July, Professor Wickersham sought the assistance of the American Association of University Professors, whose Washington office staff sent a telegram to President Hill on July 16, 1970, urging that the September 1969 agreement of appointment be honored. On August 3rd, the Washington office wrote to the President setting forth its preliminary assessment that very serious issues of academic freedom and due process had been raised. With respect to academic due process the letter stated:

'The apparent unilateral abrogation of Dr. Wickersham's appointment, without issuance and establishment of cause through appropriate hearing procedures, would seem tantamount to a summary dismissal, an action sorely out of keeping with the standards set forth in (AAUP'S).....1940 Statement of Principles.'

'President Hill responded on August 18th:

'Although employment agreements are ordinarily issued by the president of the college and the dean of faculty in the spring of each academic year, all contracts are approved or disapproved by the Board of Trustees in their annual June meeting.'

'Prior to the annual meeting this year, I was informed by the Board of Trustees that they would not approve the employment agreement with Dr. Wickersham....'

'There was no attempt to issue and establish cause through hearing procedures because Dr. Wickersham was not to begin employment at the College until the 1970-71 academic year. The Board did not participate in a 'summary dismissal', but refused to approve the contractual arrangement between the president of the college and a prospective employee.'

'The trustees of Columbia College are in no way attempting to limit the academic freedom nor to limit the authority of the president of the college and the dean of faculty. As is true with most small private colleges, Columbia College is faced with a serious financial problem; and it is the trustees' concern for the college and their belief in academic freedom for an entire faculty and the financial welfare of over one hundred twenty-five individuals and their families, I believe, that led them to act in the manner they have. The administrative officers of the college, with whom I have discussed this situation, are in agreement with me that the Board of Trustees is acting in the best interest of the college in this particular situation...'²⁸

'In a September 11, 1970, letter to the Association, President Hill states, 'the Board of Trustees did not question Dr. Wickersham's political views ,and based their decision not on 'controversial' political issues, but on his role at the University of Missouri.' As has been stated, the specific events at the University of Missouri are not the concern of this ad hoc committee. This committee, however, is aware of nothing that transpired at the University of Missouri which would warrant the refusal of the

Columbia College trustees, without providing due process, to give formal approval to the agreement of appointment which President Hill had signed the preceding September. Indeed, there is some question as to whether President Hill himself believed the Board's action to be justified. He told the ad hoc committee that, in his judgment, 'No man is less of a threat to democracy than Wickersham', and when Norman Cousins (then editor of the Saturday Review) wrote to a local newspaper in July 1970, in defense of Professor Wickersham, President Hill replied to Mr. Cousins:

'It is unfortunate for American education and our society in general that reliable and substantial spokesmen for dissent can find no forum for their utterances....'

'Is there any way you can assist this fine young man and help him out of his present predicament? His position in mid-America, in an area called Little Dixie, is misunderstood and grossly misinterpreted, but there must be someplace in this country of ours where a talented and dedicated young man can secure a satisfactory position'."²⁹

Note: I don't think there's any question that Merle Hill anticipated some conflict when he decided to hire me. But he did not anticipate the furor that would occur. He was working with very socially and politically conservative trustees who had little appreciation of the principles of academic freedom, and I certainly did not expect him to commit occupational suicide on my behalf. Needless to say, I greatly appreciated his comments to Norman Cousins.

In summarizing their findings, Professors Cell and Proudfoot of the AAUP investigating committee stated:

"The correspondence quoted earlier, together with the testimony to the ad hoc committee summarized above, clearly supports the judgment that the assessment of Professor Wickersham's conduct by the Board of Trustees of Columbia College was based, in significant measure, not upon academic considerations, but upon what was viewed as the public relations position of the College. The ad hoc committee does not consider this a proper basis for a decision of this kind. A decision so based essentially removed the authority for academic decisions from the faculty and administration to the community and thus seriously jeopardizes academic freedom, the exercise of which frequently results in community pressures. It is a primary obligation of the Board and the administration to protect the academic community against such pressures."³⁰

Professors Cell and Proudfoot concluded their report by saying:

"In taking summary action to deny Professor William Wickersham his appointment because of concern over community reaction, the administration and Board of Trustees of Columbia College denied Professor Wickersham the basic protection to which he was entitled under the 1940 statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure."³¹

Following the submission of the report on Columbia College to AAUP's Washington office, the Association censured the college for failing to honor the contract that Dr. Hill and I had signed.

In August 1972, upon the recommendation my lawyer, I entered into a financial settlement with Columbia College. The settlement amounted to five thousand dollars, one third of the \$15,000 salary I

would have received for the one-year teaching assignment. In April 1973, the College was removed from the AAUP censure after having met all of the Association's requirements for provisions for future matters pertaining to tenure, academic freedom and due process.

World Federalist U.S.A.

Sometime in late August or Early September 1970 the World Federalists U.S.A. (WFUSA) organization held its national assembly at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. WFUSA, previously known as the United World Federalists (UWF) was a nationwide non-governmental organization whose motto was "World Peace Through World Law with Justice". Norman Cousins, editor of The Saturday Review and well-known international peacemaker was keynote speaker for the WFUSA assembly. His topic that day focused on the dangers of the U.S./U.S.S.R. arms race, much like the material Dr. Kurt Hohenemser had presented to CIONA at Dr. Schuder's house back in 1962. As Norman continued, he discussed the U.S. missile configuration and some aspects of their operational systems. As he did so, he looked down from the podium to the third row of the audience and spoke directly to me and said something like the following, "Bill, you live in the midst of these hydrogen bombs, you have studied the problem, why don't you come up and tell us about the situation in Missouri?"

Although I was a bit surprised, I was not totally taken aback. Since I first met Norman in 1965, he had been aware of my personal activism in opposition to the hydrogen bombs that had been positioned near my home in Columbia, Missouri. I had also given him a copy of my 1969 study titled "Rethinking the Unthinkable", which described the missile deployments.

In response to Norman's invitation, I went to the podium and noted that Missouri was unquestionably a prime target for Soviet ICBMs which were on "hair-trigger alert". I also presented information I had obtained from interviews with several young Air Force missile launch officers who had told me that the Minuteman missiles had no destruct mechanisms that could destroy the "birds" if they were ever launched accidentally in an "illegal" manner. One young Captain also told me that he and three other launch officers could "illegally" launch 50 missiles with no higher orders from anyone. (Later research proved both statements to be absolutely true). In all my presentation lasted about 10 minutes.

Following my comments, Norman Cousins and former U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark, President of WFUSA, huddled in the back of the room. Later that day they both approached me with a job offer. The WFUSA Board of Directors had given them directions to hire a new field director and they wanted to know if I would take the job. Considering that I had been effectively exiled from the Columbia, MO academic community and was unemployed, I readily accepted the offer. And, because the job required coast-to-coast travel, it was agreed that I could reside in Columbia, as long as I spent one week per month in Washington, D.C. My salary was to be \$15,000 per year, plus expenses.

After one year's service as WFUSA's National Director, I was offered the position as its Executive Director. Personal family requirements at the time would not allow a move to Washington, D.C. However, the field director position did put me in contact with the kind of information that laid a firm foundation for my future work in peace education. In 1981, Norman Cousins, who was then President of the newly named World Federalist Association, hired me as the organization's Executive Director. Many years later, after a career involving several universities and non-governmental peace

organizations, I returned to Columbia in 1996 and was hired by my friend John Galliher to serve as Adjunct Professor of Peace Studies at MU, a position I still hold today.

Bibliography

1. United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation documents pertaining to Bill Wickersham, June 11, 1965, pp. 1-9.
2. Bill Wickersham, "A Proposal for Peace Education and Research Centers to be Established on the Campuses of the State Universities and/or Land Grant Colleges", unpublished document, p. 1.
3. Missouri Peace Study Institute Brochure, 1969, p. 1.
4. Donald Kreutzer, M.D., Letter to Bill Wickersham, January 13, 1968.
5. United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation documents, op. cit, p. 24.
6. Ibid. pp. 10-12.
7. Ibid. pp. 19-20.
8. Ibid. p. 20.
9. American Association of University Professors "Academic Freedom and Tenure: Columbia College (Missouri)", AAUP Bulletin, Winter 1971, p. 514.
10. Elizabeth Jay Hollins, Editor, Peace is Possible: A Reader on World Order, Grossman Publishers, New York, 339 pp.
11. Henry J. Waters, III, and Larry Graebner, "Inside Jesse Hall: Carving Out a Compromise", The Columbia Daily Tribune, May 12, 1970.
12. William P. Murphy, "Joint Statement on Campus Problems", Columbia (MO) Missourian, May 14, 1970, p.4.
13. American Association of University Professors, "Academic Freedom and Tenure, University of Missouri, Columbia", AAUP Bulletin, Spring 1973, p. 35.
14. Ibid. p. 35
15. Ibid. p. 35
16. Ibid. p. 36
17. Ibid. p. 45
18. Ibid. p. 45

19. William Van Alstyne, Statement to the Columbia (MO) Missourian, April 29, 1973.
20. Joan M. Pinnell, Magistrate of Boone County, Missouri, letter to John B. Larrimer and Marvin E. Wright, Re: William Wickersham vs. The Board of Curators of the University of Missouri, Case No. 75-910, September, 16, 1975.
21. Owen J. Koeppe, Provost for Academic Affairs, University of Missouri, Letter to Bill Wickersham, May 13, 1976.
22. Owen J. Koeppe, Provost for Academic Affairs, University of Missouri, "Information on Appointment for Bill Wickersham", (news release), May 13, 1976.
23. Henry J. Waters, III, "The Chancellor and the Students", an editorial in The Columbia Daily Tribune, May 12, 1970.
24. Henry J. Waters, III, "The Protestors and Wickersham", an editorial in The Columbia Daily Tribune, May 14, 1970.
25. Henry J. Waters, III, "Charlie Chicken's Dead and Gone", an editorial in The Columbia Daily Tribune, October 8, 1970.
26. Margie Freivogel, "State Patrol Undercover Agents Often Sent to Campus Protests", by Margie Freivogel, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 4, 1974.
27. American Association of University Professors, "Academic Freedom and Tenure, Columbia College (MO)", AAUP Bulletin, Winter 1971, p. 513.
28. Ibid. pp. 514-515.
29. Ibid. p. 515.
30. Ibid. p. 517.
31. Ibid. p. 517.

Biographical Sketch
Of
Bill Wickersham

Bill Wickersham is an educational psychologist and peace educator. He received a doctoral degree in education from the University of Missouri-Columbia in 1963, and did post-doctoral work in peace psychology under the direction of Dr. Theodore F. Lentz of the Peace Research Lab in St. Louis, Missouri. His undergraduate work in physical education and vocal music was also completed at Missouri, and his M.S. degree was from the Indiana School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. His military service was in the U.S. Army, where he served as an enlisted man and was a graduate of the Army's Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia.

Bill was a University of Missouri staff and faculty member from 1959 to 1970, serving as Program Director of the Memorial Student Union, as Assistant Director of the Community Action Training Center, and as Professor of Extension Education. He also taught in the School of Social and Community Services and the Department of Physical Education.

Upon leaving MU, he served as an assistant to former U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark who was President of the World Federalists, U.S.A., and founder of the bi-partisan Congressional Caucus known as Members of Congress for Peace Through Law.

From 1973 to 1975 Bill was employed as College Program Coordinator of the Center for World Order Studies at the University of Iowa's College of Law, and was also an Adjunct Associate Professor of Education and Social Work.

During the period 1976-1977, he was Visiting Associate Professor of Community Development at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, and later served as Executive Director of Southern Illinois' thirteen county area Agency on Aging.

From 1981 to 1985, he was Executive Director of the World Federalist Association in Washington, D.C. and was an early leader in the National Nuclear Freeze Movement. He was a leader of the 1984 "Fate of the Earth" conference, and was also a founding supporter of the Washington, D.C. based Center for Defense Information.

From 1985 to 1989 Bill was a program analyst and training manager for the U.S. Customs Service in Washington, D.C., where he provided administrative leadership for Customs' Management Development System, including its Senior Executive Service (SES) Incumbent and Candidate Programs. Also, while with Customs he won the Grand Masters Tennis Singles Gold Medal at the International Law Enforcement Olympics held at Ohio State University in Columbus. From 1989 to 1994 he was employed by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management where he served as Manager of Nationwide Training Courses.

From 1994 to 1996 (following retirement from U.S. Government Service) Bill worked at Prescott College in Prescott, Arizona as Interim Dean of the College's Center for Indian Bilingual Teacher Education and as Professor of Social and Cultural Studies.

In 1996, he returned to the University of Missouri-Columbia and served for a period as President of the College of Arts and Science's Friends of Peace Studies. In 2001, he was awarded the Gandhi, King, Ikeda Peace Award by the Martin Luther King, Jr. International Chapel at Morehouse College in Atlanta. In 2004, he was inducted into that institution's Collegium of Scholars.

Bill Wickersham is currently Adjunct Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Missouri-Columbia.