



WASHINGTON STATE ORAL/AURAL HISTORY PROGRAM
WASHINGTON STATE ARCHIVES.

ACCESSION NO. 241 MR WCT 75-10	TAPE NO.
INTERVIEWEE'S NAME DR. ARTHUR HICKS	

RELEASE

I, the undersigned, hereby consent to the tape recording of conversations given in connection with the Washington State Oral/Aural History Program on MARCH 6, 1975 and to the divulging of said tape recordings and/or transcripts made therefrom.

INTERVIEWER MICHAEL LUNESTRAND / Don Eklund	DATE 5/15/75
COMMUNITY ADVISOR Don Eklund	DATE 5/20/75
PROGRAM COORDINATOR Timothy Fredes	DATE 6/2/75

Arthur C. Hicks
SIGNATURE (INTERVIEWEE)



WASHINGTON STATE ORAL/AURAL HISTORY PROGRAM
WASHINGTON STATE ARCHIVES

ACCESSION NO.	TAPE NO.
INTERVIEWEE'S NAME ARTHUR Hicks	

RELEASE

I, the undersigned, hereby consent to the ^{PHOTOGRAPHS} ~~tape recording of~~ conversations given in connection with the Washington State Oral/Aural History Program on AUGUST 1976 and to the divulging of said ~~tape recordings~~ ^{PHOTOS} and/or transcripts made therefrom.

INTERVIEWER	DATE
COMMUNITY ADVISOR	DATE
PROGRAM COORDINATOR	DATE
<i>Janetty Fredrick</i>	<i>2/22/77</i>

Arthur C. Hicks

SIGNATURE (INTERVIEWEE)



TAPE ARCHIVE SHEET

INTERVIEWEE'S NAME Dr. Arthur Hicks BIRTH DATE 1901

HOME ADDRESS _____

INTERVIEWER Michael A. Runestrand/Don Eklund

INTERVIEW TITLE A HISTORY OF EDUCATION AND WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE AT BELLINGHAM

INTERVIEW DATE March 6, 1975 TIME _____

INTERVIEW SUMMARY Family background; Education, classical music and English; Early years at W.W.S.C., conflict and the Fischer dismissal; Curriculum and changes in student attitudes; Changes in educational values, student dissent; Unionization among faculty members, educational quality, budgetary issues; College administration and conflict between college and community; McCarthy era and the Red Scare; Loyalty oaths and conservative backlash; Civil liberties and education in 1960's

RESTRICTIONS None

PROPER NAMES OR COLLOQUIAL EXPRESSIONS USED Jerry Flora; Frank Sefrit; Joseph McCarthy; House Committee on UnAmerican Activities; Klu Klux Klan; Mitchell Palmer Raids; Watergate, Dr. Haggard, World War II

INTERVIEW AND RECORDING QUALITY His book Western at 75: A History of W.W.S.C.

DOCUMENTATION _____

Dr. Arthur Hicks

March 6, 1975

"HISTORY OF EDUCATION AND WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE"

Interviewed by: Don Eklund/Michael Runestrand

Washington State Oral/Aural History Program
Washington State Archives, Olympia, Washington

Accession No. WCT 75-10mr/ek, Tape No. 1&2, Tape Sides 1, 2, 3, 4, No. of Pgs: 41

Dr. Arthur Hicks
March 6, 1975

Accession No. WCT 75-10mr/ek, Tape No. 1, Tape Side No. 1

Dr. Don Eklund: All right sir, we wanted to talk to you about your educational experiences in the main. I'll introduce Mike Runestrand, who will be our interviewer in an oral history project conducted by the state archives branch, out of Olympia. This is Glenda McLachlan, our transcriber; and for the purposes of those who listen to the tape, we are interviewing Dr. Arthur Hicks, and Arthur, why don't you tell us where you were born and the date.

Dr. Hicks: I was born in a small town in Eastern Oregon about 100 miles Southwest of Baker. The town of Canyon City. And I was born on December 28, 1901. It was the birthday of Woodrow Wilson, and also Holy Innocence Day... (Chuckles) A little girl once said to me, "Oh, you're not guilty anymore."

Mr. Eklund: Well, you look pretty innocent to me. What would stand out in your childhood...great remembrances or impressions. Maybe in growing up in Oregon, or wherever you went from there?

Mr. Hicks: Well, I was a hometown boy til about the age of sixteen, when I went off to the University of Oregon. Although Canyon City, my hometown, only had about 350 people, it had an usually high proportion of intelligent and gifted people. People interested in culture in a broad, comprehensive sense, interested in literature, music, the drama. I remember attending many a session of the Shakespeare Club held in my mother's home and in other homes in the community.

Dr. Eklund: To what do you attribute this cultural aliveness or interest to, in a small town like that?

Dr. Hicks: It's difficult to explain...there just happened to be, for instance, a man like our family doctor, Ashford, was his name, he had the custom of reading Henry Fielding's masterpiece of fiction, Tom Jones, at least once a year.

There were some very intelligent people in the legal profession, including, well of course, my father, and I remember there was a George Catenall. There were other professional people who were interesting, not only because of their professional achievements, but just purely as personalities, people who were widely read. I felt that I was greatly..a..very lucky indeed to be born in the midst of such a community.

Dr. Eklund: There wasn't any type of industry that would draw this type of person to your....community?

Dr. Hicks: No...very little in the way of industry...oh, farmers would live on their farms you see...a good deal of cattle raising and sheep farming, and so on. My hometown happened to be the county seat and I suppose that was it's chief claim to distinction and source of income. The courthouse was there...although there was a larger town only two miles away, still Canyon City managed to retain it's position as county seat of Grant County. That was it's main support, I suppose, all of the county officers were there. Most of the lawyers lived there..very few lawyers lived away from Canyon City. Canyon City was the place to do legal business. Now there was a good deal of legal business...litigation, both civil and criminal. I remember when I was a boy..hearing the shot that was fired on our main street that resulted in murder, and you may be sure that there was a good deal of legal work on that occasion. And um...not faraway from Canyon City, there was a resort called the Mt. Vernon Hot Springs. A man and his wife were staying there for a vacation and the wife suddenly died. And it was very mysterious. It was claimed that she was killed by her own husband, and evidence was very difficult to run down; a good deal of it was medical evidence. My father was in on that case. One of the most celebrated cases that he ever got involved in. He was for the defense...usually, he was for the defense... and he won the case. Mr. Potts was found not guilty by the jury.

Dr. Eklund: You're sort of intimating that you were a...I guess to use the contemporary phrase, "turned on," by this form of intellectualism. I know you as a humanist. Were you directed in your high school studies to become that type of person, or oriented in this way? Or, were you somehow grasped or grabbed by education later on? What developed your interest in going to college, let's say?

Dr. Hicks: Well, a..all of my teachers in the grades and in high school were intelligent and were quite conscious of whatever intellectual abilities I manifested. They were encouraging and all that. I'll give you, well perhaps the most striking illustration would be a young man who was the son of the chairman of the English department at the University of Oregon. His name was Henry Howe. He came to my hometown as Principal one year, and fell in love with one of my classmates in high school, a little older than I, but in the same class, and married her. They had a raft of children as the years rolled by. He was particularly encouraging in my interests..give me extra assignments. He assigned to me..John...was it John Richard Green's, "Short History of the English People".. He had me read that! And in our connection with study of both literature and history, he gave me very special treatment. He encouraged me to abbreviate my career in high school from four years to three. So the result was, I went off to the University of Oregon in the fall of 1918, about three months short of my seventeenth year.

Dr. Eklund: And what did you major in, at the University of Oregon?

Dr. Hicks: Well, (Chuckles) I had difficulty making up my mind. My first thought was, well....my father's a lawyer...I might at least consider the possibility of becoming a lawyer. My family always thought, all of them, except perhaps my father, who was rather impartial, he didn't want to over influence me in favor of his profession, although I think that he would have been pleased had I turned out to be a lawyer. My mother and my two brothers,

they were very insistent that that was the logical career for me. So, I undertook a pre-law course, which involved basic courses in history, in the various sciences...I had one in biology, one in physics...a certain amount of English, and so on. What we would be likely to call here, now...general college requirements. Not specifically directed towards the study of law, but necessary as a preparation. But, my first year, I got into a French course my first quarter, and I latched on to French. I had never had any French in high school. I had some Latin. I got through Caesar, the equivalent of two years in Latin, but no other acquaintance with languages. I found French fascinating, and by the end of the year I had committed myself to a major in foreign languages, the romance languages. So, I had a good deal...a great deal...of work in French, a lesser amount in Spanish, and a still smaller amount in Italian. Of course these are all closely related languages. They are a good bunch of languages to study together. And I got my bachelor's degree...I completed the work actually, by the fall quarter of 1921, and I was just twenty years old. And by that time, I decided I did not want to continue work in romance languages. The field of English had attracted me by this time. Henry Howe's father, Herbert Howe, was an inspiring teacher. The best reader of poetry I ever heard, emphasized the auditory values of poetry. I was in some of his courses. But I think the best teacher I ever had as an undergraduate, was a woman. Her name was Mary Watson Barnes. I had her in several literature courses. She just sparkles...you know...she was a rather striking person to look at...bright, sparkling eyes, an animated manner, and a way of getting over to the students, of communication with them in an extremely meaningful fashion. I'd say, she was my best teacher as an undergraduate.

Dr. Eklund: And, then you went on to graduate school?

Dr. Hicks: Well, now the story really gets complicated. I also got interested in music at the same time. I mean, in a serious way. Now I had been playing the piano ever since I could remember. I don't suppose I was older than four

years when I was playing...you know...working with the keyboard. My mother encouraged me and gave me whatever help she could. She was not a skilled pianist herself, but I learned my notes. I browsed through a good deal of literature for the piano. I became really an addict for the music of Schumann. I discovered him quite early on, and that particular enthusiasm remained with me all through my musical life. Aside from the instruction I got from my mother, I might have had a half dozen lessons from people who had more claim you might say, to the title of professional musician than my mother; but very little, I was practically self-taught up to the age of twenty. I decided now I'd better get a teacher and go at this if I really mean business. So, in January of 1922, I became a piano student of George Painter Hopkins, of the music faculty. And then I was carrying on graduate work simultaneously in the field of English. And there was a struggle that went on from 1922 to the fall of 1929 whether I would be a musician or a professor of English literature. It took me that long to make up my mind. I gave music a whirl. I took lessons from George Hopkins for over a year and a half before I ventured to Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore, where he had been, and which he recommended. I spent a year there, the year, '23 - '24. Heard a great deal of music of course, as well as working hard at it myself. I was considered to have promise, I played in a number of student recitals including the first movement of a Beethoven Concerto, with my teacher playing second piano in the orchestra. And I was asked to play at the end of the year in a series of... I think there were five exhibition concerts. Now only the best students would be asked to play in those and it really was a thrilling experience to play Rachmaninoff's Prelude in G Major and Franz List's Forest Murmurings, near the end of that particular concert. Some of the best playing I ever did, was on that night. That was in the spring of 1924. And I was accorded the honor of standing at the head of my class of piano teachers certificate students. So evidently, I made some impression upon the faculty of Peabody Conservatory as

a musician. And I had opportunities to go to Eastman Conservatory, for instance, at Rochester, and others. But by that time...the end of the academic year, 1924, I was desperately homesick and I couldn't consider taking a job in the East. So I went back to my hometown actually, and I thought of starting a class, a music class there. And the first thing I knew, I was asked to become the Principal of the high school in my hometown. They were in desperate need of a Principal. I had not one hour of credit in education. Well, the office of education at Salem was very accommodating, a...very cooperative. They allowed me to fulfill the education requirement by taking three correspondence courses...(Chuckles) And thus, I became, in their eyes, qualified to teach in high school. I met my wife...there's a picture of her up there, a little older than when I first saw her. I met my wife during the first year of my high school teaching experience. She was teaching in the adjoining town, John Day, two miles away. And then we were married. We met each other at the beginning of the academic year and we got married just before the end of the academic year. And a...we got a job being the high school faculty at another town in Grant County, called Monument, to the North. Of course, we had to make a living, you know. We both were qualified to teach and that led in 1925, to my return to the University of Oregon to resume my graduate work in English. I had not had many English courses as an undergraduate. So, I had to do a great deal of reading on my own. But I was enrolled as a graduate student, and in that year, in addition to the work I'd had before, I went off to Peabody, a total of two years and two quarters, I earned my master's degree. That would be in 1927. No,...I have my dates a little wrong...I remained in Eastern Oregon until 1926...from '24 to '26. I was two years, you see, in Canyon City, one year in Monument, and then I went back to the university. I had a fellowship there so that I had a year's further graduate study in English...with a history minor, so that in the spring of 1927, I was awarded a master's degree in English, and in the meantime, I

was still playing the piano. As soon as I came back to the University of Oregon, I resumed my lessons with George Hopkins. And I was fortunate in being able to secure an extension scholarship. The Julliard Conservatory, one of the major music schools in the country...a representative of Julliard appeared on the campus and I had to perform for him. I remember some Bach, some Beethoven, and so on. He seemed to be impressed with my musicianship. So Julliard granted me this scholarship. I continued studying under George Hopkins from 1926 until 1930. Then, of course I'd had before, a year and two thirds from George Hopkins, and then at Peabody, I'd had as a teacher, Alexander Scorigsky, a very fine pianist, a Russian, as the name would indicate, from whom I learned a good many things that I did not get from George. Of course, George taught me a great deal, but certainly, my year as a student of the piano was not wasted at Peabody. I'm sure I acquired a new dimension in my playing during that year. And then George was able to build on that, you see, until I left him in the spring of 1930. But before then, in the fall of '29, by this time, I had a little girl, and she was about three years old at the time, I went out on a walk with her during that fall quarter of 1929, and had a little dialogue with myself as to what I wanted to be, a musician, making my living teaching for the most part, young children. The way, at least, I would have to start, unless I were fortunate enough to get a position in a college, and I was not in a good position to do that just then, or go for a PhD in English. And on that walk, I made up my mind. And immediately got to work to do the necessary things. I decided to go to Stanford, and they required there, not only a working knowledge of French, but German, I didn't know a word of German at the time, and a rather respectable knowledge of Latin. So, I spent a good deal of my time working.....exploring German, and improving my Latin. Going into Virgil and Cicero, in addition to the Caesar I'd already had. I was gung ho.. (Chuckles)...for that PhD., and in 1930, I enrolled as a graduate student at Standord. And in two years, I had it.

Dr. Eklund: What was your dissertation, may I ask you?

Dr. Hicks: Well, I had previously been very much attracted to the field of English romantics. I liked all of them, but my real passion was Shelley. This feeling for Shelley developed...oh, during the years between my getting my bachelor's degree and the rest of the decade. And so I went down to Stanford with an idea for a dissertation, not knowing, of course, whether I'd be allowed to take that particular subject, to explore it. A candidate may propose, but the professor, the advising professor, may dispose, otherwise. I wanted to discuss the Christian Dimension, what I called the place of Christianity, in Shelley's thought. That was the title of my dissertation. I worked long and hard on it, and there's a copy of it in the library.

Dr. Eklund: When did you come to Whatcom County?

Dr. Hicks: Well, not long after I received my phD., in English, I had also some work in history, and some courses in what they called a philological minor that included Gothic, old, high German, middle, high German, old French, and not to speak of course, of the other language requirements. I got my phD., done in 1932, it was in the depth of the depression. Jobs were scarce. I understand that I was the only phD., of 1932, at Stanford who got a job. And that was only for one year, since a man was leaving the San Jose State Normal School...state teachers college, I should say. It was past the stage of, Normal School....San Jose State Teachers College, I should say. One of the faculty of the English department was taking a leave for a year, and I filled in. And although I kept applying for jobs, by the end of the year, none of them had materialized in my field. And so I began my second year as, shall I say, a college instructor, having to shift my field from English, my major, to history, my minor. As it happened, a young historian was leaving the faculty at San Jose, for a year's leave of absence and President McQuory assigned me to take his place. I taught for about two weeks in the history

department at San Jose when came this S. O. S. from, it was then, Bellingham State Normal School. It really was a college by that time, but the name was not changed until 1937. By October, 1933, Mr. C. H. Fisher, got in touch with me and asked me if I would be willing to go to Portland and he and I would have dinner together and talk over the possibility of my becoming chairman of the English department at Bellingham. We had a very fine sociable, meaningful evening together. By the end of it, Mr. Fisher was convinced that I was the man for the job, offered it to me, and so in October of 1933, I came to Whatcom County.

Dr. Eklund: And you've been here since?

Dr. Hicks: I've been here since.

Dr. Eklund: On the job. What have been your, well, you've been in the English department all the time?

Dr. Hicks: Yes.

Dr. Eklund: And as I knew you in the humanities, or the Gen. Ed. Program, you were working out the language, I mean, the English department, to do discussion sessions?

Dr. Hicks: Oh yes, yes. As a matter of fact, while I was not on the committee that drew up the humanities program, the original proposal for the humanities program, I was very early in on the process of constructing the curriculum for it. Keith Murray, of history, you department, he was chairman of the history department at that time, and Alvord Carlson of philosophy. There was, see, Hazel Plimpton, of art, and it would be Frank Gandry, in music, you see, all these diciplines....literature, philosophy, and art, music, and even a bit of social studies were included. Well, these....I and these other people worked out a program that would involve quite a substantial amount of work during four quarters, we started on a four quarter system. That turned out to be unworkable finally, so we had to change the pattern and reduce the four quarters to three, as is now the case. And I was the first chairman of the

humanities staff. I was chairman for two years, and I will cite Dr. Clapp, who was also in on the program, had special interest in it, he came here the very quarter the humanities program was launched, and was appointed first chairman of the general education council. That council system was explained in my history by the way, and he participated in the program, watched over it very carefully, and when it came time for me to turn over the reins to another chairman, Dr. Clapp said that under my leadership, the humanities program had got off the ground.

Dr. Eklund: What was the motivation for this type of program? Why did Western or whatever the school went under at the time decide for this type of offering?

Dr. Hicks: Well, by the time the humanities program was shaped up, the school had a very, very strong commitment to general education. In 1926, the first general education program was set up. It was called, "Introduction to Contemporary Civilization", and it started out with science in civilization... three quarters in science, just science, you know. Of course, if you talk to Leona Sundquist, she'll tell you that's not a menialist distinction. We didn't teach biology, physics, chemistry or geology as such, we taught them as components of this great broad.....

Dr. Arthur Hicks
March 6, 1975

Accession No. WTC 75-01de/mr, Tape No. 1, Tape Side No. 2

Dr. Hicks:Well, a good deal of very hard work was done, in the first place, by this group of people representing the various disciplines included under the heading of humanities. And then we had to have quite a large staff to implement the program, which began in the fall of 1960. We had really, in terms of teaching methods, three components to the course, lectures on history or art or music, and then discussion sections which would be very numerous indeed, there would be all of us having 25 or 30 students. The lectures, of course, would be delivered to the whole class. And then there was some laboratory work done too, particularly in art, a lesser extent in music. Well, we had some of the, I would say, some of the finest teachers in the school work on the program. Some of them came into it, at the very beginning. Graham Cotter, for instance, from England, turned out to be an admirable lecturer on art and the humanities, I think the best we ever had. And of course we had quite a number of people on our own faculty who had been here for some years, who were very capable, and I would say for James Jarrett's administration, that is the last four years of his administration, that program was enormously successful, judged by any criteria that we could set up, and we made a strenuous effort to evaluate what we were doing as we went along. The main evidence we've had that the program was succeeding was the student's liked it. That is, they liked it perhaps not at the time they were taking it, it was a demanding program, involved a good deal of work, a good deal of comp-
lection to it, but at the end of their experience with humanities, perhaps several years after they'd had the humanities, they would be asked what impact it had upon their education. And we had a surprisingly high percentage of positive responses to that question. I feel myself quite proud of what the

humanities program accomplished during those four years.

Dr. Eklund: I guess what I was asking you, as far as motivation, did this come out of...sort of the great books concept or the Black Mountain concept of education in the '30's? Or, was this something that just sort of grew here at Western? Or, did anyone come here with the initial ideas of setting up such a program?

Dr. Hicks: Well, there were a number of people on the faculty in the '20's, Lucy Kangly being an illustration, who were very familiar with the concept of general education. President Fisher understood it very well. I think it was one of the best things he ever did as President of this college, to institute the program. And I had it scrutinized and criticized and improved as time went on. It was initiated long before the great books idea became current. And there has been some quarters that think, that have the mistaken impression that Dr. Jarrett was responsible for the creation of the humanities program. He was, only to the extent, that he encouraged the faculty to work on it. Frank Gandry and his committee, sub-committee, had started work on it a year before Dr. Jarrett came, and made considerable progress, and then rounded out their work in, it would be the first quarter of Dr. Jarrett's administration. And winter quarter it was presented to the faculty, and after, oh, long, heated discussion...there was considerable objection to one portion or another of it, ...I had some reservations regarding even the humanities program. But these differences were finally, roughly reconciled, and by the end of spring quarter we were committed to launch that program in the fall of 1960.

Dr. Eklund: What were the objectives of the program? To make the student a so-called better citizen or did this leave him room to specialize on the side? Or, was the idea that he came out with a sound liberal arts education? Was that the objective, or would you care to elaborate on this?

Dr. Hicks: I think I would define the objectives of the course, largely in

the terms that John Henry Newman uses in his lectures on university education. Which, I've used by the way, in my English literature course, briefly, written lectures they were. And for Newman, the ideal of the liberal education meant a great deal. I've always used that term, I liked it myself, a liberal education should be the best possible preparation for whatever specialization the student might enter after his program of general or liberal education. Basic to the whole concept was, "Some things are more important than others", and in the general education courses we attempted to establish that as a conviction in the minds of the students. Our approach was of course, a generalist ...things of general importance. We are not thinking merely in terms of interdisciplinary courses. They are not necessarily general education. They may be highly specialized, even though their content may come from a half dozen different disciplines. General studies, today I think, has a program, interdisciplinary education, which is not necessarily general education, at least we conceived it. We had the ideal of exposing all of our students, whether they're going to teach, or whether they're going to enter some other profession, or if they only want four years of a college education, to expose them to the things that we thought they should know, the important things.

Dr. Eklund: Would you now care to comment on perhaps the desire of students to specialize today, or those educators who might say to resolve dropping enrollments to incorporate more of a specialized type of training, or to give the students an option, that more specialties? What do you think of this trend? Is it a trend?

Dr. Hicks: Yes, undoubtedly, it is a trend in this institution, and it's one I do not approve of frankly. I think the institution's lost something very important in giving up the program of general education. It's not used anymore in college catalogues. We have general college requirements, which are by no means, the equivalent of what we tried to give the students under the rubric

of general education.

Mike Runestrand: A question on a...you've been involved in the area of higher education since the '30's; and the question has been brought up about general studies, or an overall view of areas of interest that the student was involved in. In a time period after the depression, early '40's, during the war, and then again, as you were talking earlier, about the '60's. Where did the changes occur in the emphasis of the student? Did you notice when you were going to school, the interest of a student? Was it in the humanities, or was it in a broad expanse? Was going to college trying to get a lot of knowledge, or were people going into school for a certain reason, a certain type of employment afterwards? And then, has this thing, have you noticed changes, saying, in certain portions of the decade from the late '30's, '40's, after the war, in the '50's, and then again with the general Ed...In the '60's? Is it always the institution that changes it, or is it part of the motivation of the students that perhaps makes these changes occur?

Dr. Hicks: I think in the long run that the students call the turns. That is, the teachers wouldn't be here if it weren't for students. Students wouldn't come to this institution unless they felt they could get at least part of what they want in the way of an education, a higher education. And I've been around the educational scene now, for well...it's been more than fifty years actually, since I taught as a graduate student, as a fellow in English, and as an instructor in English, and then chairman of department, and professor, and so on and so forth. I think students have always been difficult to classify in regard to their aims and objectives. Now doubt, a good many of them come here with a vocational objective, and our school began with a vocational function, at least that was it's chief function, teacher education. Of course you go to a university, people want to become lawyers, or doctors, or pharmacists, or what have you, engineers, etc., etc., So, I'm sure that the professional

motive has been very strong all down the years with students. Some students, well, I suppose particularly the women, want to have you might say, the status of being a college educated person. They're thinking, I think, more, many of them, in terms of personal development, intellectual and otherwise, and I'm sure many of them have thought of college as an experience which might very well lead to a good marriage for many of them. There are social reasons of that sort. And of course, I daresay, there are some students who have always been in colleges and universities who didn't know what else to do to fill out this period between 18 and 22, not being under any financial pressure to go out and make a living, give college a whirl. Many of those of course have become dropouts. They found out that they were not suited to college education. Some of them, I think, hang on longer than they should. They should drop out before they finally come to that sort of conclusion. I daresay, a good many of their motives are rather trifling and trivial that bring students to college in the first place. Of course those are the ones who are likely to drop out after some exposure to college or university life. I can't see, as I have observed students now five decades, this mixture of motives as changed essentially. Now at Western, a conscientious attempt was made in 1926 to relate the general education to the professional education. We told the students "You cannot really be good teacher unless you are well-educated in a general sense, unless you know some important things about all the major disciplines of college or university curriculum." We thought of our general education program as being of value, not only in itself as a preparation for becoming a teacher. And I think that's a statement difficult to contravert. In general, a teacher, other things being equal, is a better teacher because he or she is generally well-educated. They're more likely to stimulate interests in the students and be effective as a teacher. And at Western, that has always been the idea. Of course after the arts and sciences came in, it was assumed, and

at first explicitly stated many times that a person who wanted to become a lawyer or a doctor or a college professor in a given discipline, needed to have this general education also. Just as important for him as for the teacher. So we didn't think of general education necessarily in isolation. We thought of course, of two years of it, would be very fine for anybody, but they would be even more important for a person who's going to specialize, become a professional man of one sort or another.

Dr. Eklund: Are we not talking about general education here, to re-inforce, I suppose, certain values we have or have maintained as a nation, certain virtues? Would you comment perhaps on, say, a specialization like, well, the law profession as being maybe not introduced to the type of knowledge that would help them maintain a system of ethics as they practiced law? I'm thinking here in terms of what we've seen in our own times, very recently, in reference to Watergate?

Dr. Hicks: Well, I'm sure before the sixties, at least, and well into the sixties, our faculty would, most of them be convinced that through a general education, students would be exposed to systems of value, ethical, ethetic, and intellectual, and so on that would be relevent to what they were going to do in a profession. Take the law, it certainly would be the hope and the expectation of our faculty that a student who planned to enter law school would acquire some notions of good moral, ethical behavior. That a study in ethics, you see, ethics would loom quite large a part in general education, that the study to which he was exposed in the field of ethics would be of great value to him in his career as a lawyer. Since one can't define law in any meaningful sense without taking into account ethics. Right and wrong, good and evil, crime, crime and misdemeanors, and so on. No I daresay, obviously, it hasn't always worked out that way. I do think there's some other special circumstances underlying the development of the Watergate scandal. I have, well, I have read, McGruder's book for instance, In the American Life. And

here we have an interesting example of a man who was exposed as an undergraduate to certain ethical concepts under a very distinguished teacher. And yet, when he was tempted to do some dirty work by his superiors in the Nixon administration, he lost his ethical perspective. I think he, to a large extent, regained it, to judge by this book. He's hit the sawdust trail. He's admitted that he yielded to temptation. Of course, I think this is a...one of the most dreadful aspects of the Watergate scandal, that so many men of legal backgrounds practicing law, or at least qualified to practice law, ignored some of the basic values and ideal of their profession.

Dr. Eklund: What would be your methodology as a suggestion to, maybe reacquaint people with those values or ideals? Do we go back to a general education type curriculum, or do we do something beyond that?

Dr. Hicks: Well, it seems to me that there should be room in any of these legal curriculums for a course in legal ethics. And that should build upon whatever basis in ethics, a student had previously acquired. Now, I don't know a great deal in detail about the curriculum of law schools. There may well be such courses in the legal...but it seems to me there should be such a course in every law school. And I'll cite Watergate as a good reason for making that sort of demand. Not, of course, that they will necessarily be ethical if they take the course, but at least they'll be in a better position to think through the consequences of their behavior as professional people in ethical terms, than otherwise. Education doesn't always take, of course. Everyone knows that.

Mike Runestrand: A question on...I was thinking about when you were talking about ethics and things. How was the McCarthy period...just McCarthy and the oaths of allegiance and things taken at this institution, Western Washington State College. And then again, if you can't give an overall view of that for the institution, by yourself. And how do you view that type of deal as almost a forced ethic upon the faculty itself, saying this is the way you must, or this is the way we'd like you to believe, and you must say this to insure you

position. How do you view that type of control, and how did you view it at the time? If you can look back and think on it.

Dr. Hicks: Well, of course that's an extremely long story. It is true that after the war, the First World War, there developed a kind of hysteria about Communism in this country. That was shown in the Mitchell Palmer raids, and so on. The activities of the Klu Klux Klan, and other...oh, there was a good deal of prejudice against minority groups, religious minorities such as the Catholic, or racial minorities such as the Negro and the Jew, and there was considerable upon higher institutions to include in the curriculum, these prejudices, or don't touch upon certain areas of controversial subject matter that might open the institution to suspicion. Well, at this...our college has a record to be proud of in that area. All through the twenties and the thirties, up to 1939, and to a lesser degree since, although there was the McCarthy business that arose in the early '50's. There were red baiters, reactionaries, who, oh, they would be critical if the theory of evolution appeared in a course of science, and they called a teacher who taught evolution an athiest. That was one of the most frequent accusations. Irreligious or immoral, they said we were teaching ideas about free love and we were opposed to capitalistic system, and so on. Those charges that were made by the Committee on Normal Protest in 1935 pretty well indicate the kinds of pressure that were brought to bear upon, not only Western, but many other institutions. Many of them were thought of as just hotbeds of what you might call subversive activities. And they got so bad that one legislature in the '40's passed a law requiring all servants of the state, including college and university teachers, to take a very special oath, not just the oath of allegiance, to the constitution and laws of the United States, and so on and so forth. But what amounted to a non-disloyalty oath, an oath that I have never belonged, or had any connection with, or made a financial contribution to an organization that

was interested in overthrowing the government of the United States by force or violence. There was some such phraseology as that. It was, after being on the books for more than ten years, it was found unconstitutional and just nullified. Don, you don't have to sign that oath. And those of us who were here when that law was passed, signed it under mental reservations. We knew that we were taking a certain chance in signing the oath. That if we wanted to be active, we wanted to join organizations that we thought had a good aim or purpose or motive, we would have to be very careful that that organization was not on some blacklist or other, in some way tied up with this particular oath. And then a person so charged would be brought up on a count of perjury. In signing the oath, he would have perjured himself, because he did belong to an organization that, according to Albert S. Canwell and others, had as its ultimate objective the overthrow of the government of the United States by force or violence. That was really what all of the agitation centering around Mr. Fisher in the '20's and '30's was about. We were hopeful that when the board allowed the Committee on Normal Descent to make all the charges they wanted to against the institution, and the board had weighed them and found them wanting, that that would stop them. It didn't, it just turned their energies from the campus to Olympia. They'd gotten the ear of the governor and he listened, I'm sure with awareness of the political implications of all this. And finally in the fall of 1938, for mainly, if not entirely political reasons, he told the board to fire Mr. Fisher. He wanted to make a third term run for governor. But of course, it didn't turn out that way, and I think that firing Mr. Fisher did him far more harm politically than good. Well, the institution wasn't concerned with the politics of the matter. We understood the institution was interested in giving a good education and it did not welcome this kind of interference from outside, whether it came from the editor of the Herald or from the governor's office, and so the faculty and the students and the alumni, they

stood up and fought. They did not have sufficient clout to overturn the governor's decision, but at least, they made their position plain, that they believed in academic freedom in the pursuit of knowledge, and they were not going to tailor their curriculum to the prejudices that were so ripe in society at that time. Well, our main ordeal came in the '30's with the Fisher case, then, of course, there was World War II, and before the end of the '30's, incidentally, the House Committee on Unamerican Activities was appointed, 1938, and has only recently been dissolved. It's had a run of almost thirty years. Well, more than thirty years actually, and that exercised a good many of the faculty...I was one...I was prompted during that McCarthy Act period, when this Senator from Wisconsin was running around the country and pointing the finger of suspicion at a great many people who were not necessarily all in the state department. Many of them, he thought, were on college faculties. Well, that was something that deeply disturbed a great many of us, and I was prompted by what McCarthy was doing, to read a history of the inquisition of the middle ages by Henry Charles Lee to learn something about the psychology of McCarthyism, and I learned a great deal from that work. Oh, that was written decades before McCarthy and I personally stood up time and again in public and denounce McCarthy.

Dr. Arthur Hicks
March 6, 1975

Accession No. WTC 75-01&02de/mr, Tape No. 2, Tape Side No. 1

Dr. Eklund: Let's see now, you were picking off about saying that you were accused of perhaps being a potential Communist or ignoramous. I don't know if we got all of that statement on the last tape, so if you can maybe sort of recover from there...?

Dr. Hicks: Yes, I was saying that after I'd delivered this speech before the Rotary Club in the summer of 1951, at a time when I was a member of the Rotary Club...(Chuckles) I aroused some negative reaction in the audience. McCarthy was riding high, and he came to Bellingham in the early '50's.

Dr. Eklund: He did?

Dr. Hicks: And he had, I guess, standing room only audience at Bellingham High School auditorium. And he delivered a speech giving his usual line. Some of the faculty members, out of sheer curiosity...I had a conscientious scruple against being in the same room with him...that man...so I, all I knew of the speech was second hand. But we had a little McCarthy in this state. Albert S. Canwell, who, in 1946 was elected to the legislature, and in the ensuing legislative sessions, he succeeded in getting passed, this law involving the non-disloyalty oath, and also setting up the Committee on Unamerican Activities...usually called the Canwell Committee, which really played hob at the University of Washington. It didn't investigate us, but it might well have for very similar reasons.

Dr. Eklund: Was this individual from East Side? West Side? Or, did he reflect any regional or geographical location? We sometimes hear that the East Siders are more conservative. I don't know if that's a trueism, or not.

Dr. Hicks: I think there's some truth in that. Actually, Canwell came from the Spokane area, and I've understood that to be kind of a stronghold of conservatism.

Mike Runestrand: Speaking of conservatism, my father was in the public school district in Bellingham for about 15 years, and this was from, say, the mid '50's into the mid '60's, and then he taught down in Seattle for a time. And he used to mention the fact to me, that at least in public school, a public school instructor was not to be seen in places like a bar in the evening. That was just something an educator was not to be. Was that same type of community view placed upon those educators at a college level in this town? Were they viewed as...were their extracurricular activities in town, say, just going out for a drink at night...if someone was a person who would like to go out for a drink ...was this something that was just involved in this area, or all over the state, or just in that period of time?

Dr. Hicks: I wasn't aware of any such expectations in the part of the Bellingham community. But certainly, if a member of the faculty was instrumental, say, in bringing, say, a speaker, even who spoke off campus. There was a leading Socialist, I've forgotten now, his name, he was brought to Bellingham through the efforts of a number of liberal-minded people, including some members of the faculty. Now, he spoke in an auditorium on State street, and that was held against the faculty members who had participated in making his coming possible. Of course, he was not a Communist, but he was a Socialist, and he didn't pull any punches in his speech. And it was considered practically as bad to be a Socialist as it was to be a Communist in those days. Well, to get back to my experience with the McCarthy problem, or the Canwell problem, if you will. I had taught, oh, I suppose, I'd delivered a dozen or more speeches focusing on civil liberties. I remember I gave one on the Ninth Commandment.. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor...and so on. And I had McCarthy in mind...(Chuckles) ...when I delivered the speech. And then the speech I gave at the Rotary, in the summer of '51 was, "The Clear and Present Danger to our Civil Liberties", and I was referring, not only to

McCarthy but to the House Committee, and the presence of loyalty oaths, or rather the President's loyalty order and the, all of the administrative set-ups that accompanied this business of checking on subversives in government, etc., etc. It was one of the most vigorous speeches on the subject I've ever delivered. But, as I've previously indicated, most of the Rotarians were McCarthyites. They were defending the sin. Now perhaps McCarthy doesn't always properly, the Communists, but you must admit he's against Communism, and they considered that sufficient defense of McCarthy, which I don't. Well, some of the brothers were so irate about my speech that they got next to the chairman of the program committee and they insisted that Canwell be brought to address Rotary Club sometime in the near future to refute my speech. To tell me off, in effect (Chuckles). I don't know whether they told him to identify me clearly as an individual, but certainly they wanted the poison of my ideas to be eliminated from the environment, so to speak. And Canwell came and delivered a typical red-baiting speech. And he singled me out, he didn't call me by name, but he knew that I had spoken to Rotary two months before and he knew that practically everybody in Rotary would know the individual about whom he was speaking, and he characterized me as either an Ignoramus or a subversive (Chuckles) and the brothers cheered, most of them, and they clapped. They applauded. And of course I felt betrayed that I, of course I'm not afraid to talk to Communists. I've talked to many of them in my life as a private citizen and even as a college teacher. But I've not had the slightest indication ever, to become a member of the Communist Party, U. S. A. And some of my most lively arguments have been with the faithful of the party. What...the main line I took was.."Don't confuse a person who is liberal, progressive in his views, with a Communist. Stand up for the right of people to speak as they think and as they desire to gain an audience and so on..... Don't abridge, well, shall we say, the Bill of Rights, the right of free press, free speech, and so on..."

That was the position I was taking. I'd call it a liberal position in that field. But in 1951, most of the members of Rotary were so reactionary in their ideas about politics that they thought that because I did not approve of Joseph McCarthy that there was something suspicious about me. They went to the president about it, and I was very grateful to Dr. Haggard for saying, "That man is not a Communist, I know him too well to swallow that kind of characterization of him." And he...I often talked politics with Dr. Haggard, and I expressed frankly my ideas, and he didn't try to shut me off or contradict me or anything of that sort. And he stoutly defended me. Yet, I felt that atmosphere of Rotary Club was so foul after that speech that I pulled out.

Dr. Eklund: Would you care to comment, now Mike asked you the question awhile ago about one decade being different from the others as far as student interest and reason to go to school are concerned. Do you agree or disagree that there was anything peculiar or different, really, about the '60's, as far as student activism was concerned?

Dr. Hicks: Oh yes, it was noticeable on the campus. Students in the '50's were not as inclined to commit themselves to a cause, shall we say, as the.. as they were...particularly in the middle or later '60's. That's true. Now, of course I don't know what proportion of the students in the '60's were disposed to carry flags for some cause for which they believed. They were certainly more conspicuous. I think there were a good many more of them around than was the case in the '50's. In the '50's, I remember, students expressed the idea of good life in terms of getting a good job, having a good, comfortable retirement income, and talking a good deal about retirement before they'd even entered an occupation. Well, that represented, I thought, a excessive concern with the occupation itself, and not sufficient interest in other values that a college education might bring.

Dr. Eklund: In a sense, do you think that the students in the '60's were asking

for, sort of a new type of liberal education? The onus was off, or maybe I shouldn't use onus, or maybe the emphasis was off specialization once again. Of course we had the war, which we can't fit that in all of this...

Dr. Hicks: Well, I think you've hit on something there, that is pretty solidly based on the realities of life on our campus, in well let's see.... It began really, in the fall of '64, as I recall. It started at Berkeley, you know, and spread all over the country. I remember it had an impact on the humanities course. The humanities course, at the beginning, had to deal with a relatively small student body. I think we might have had as many as 2000 students....'59'60. But then you know what happened in the '60's, the enrollment mounted up. And that of course was one of the chief sources of the problems that institutions had to face ever since. But it is true, I think, that in the humanities, there was an effort made in the late '60's by quite a number of the instructors themselves, who were...they were new. They were brought in to staff this course because of the pressure of numbers. People like Dr. Murray, Alford Carlson, and myself, and Ed Collier, etc., and so on. So quite a number of relatively young instructors were brought in, who, I daresay, many of them were genuinely convinced...these issues involving the war in Viet Nam, the racial desegregation decision of the Supreme Court, and others, were of terrific importance, and so, in the selection of texts, many of these instructors, especially, in the third quarter, would make it, not a course in humanities, but a course in current social problems. Like sole on ice and that sort of thing, do you see?

Dr. Eklund: Well, this was a great cry for relevancy. What do you think they were really trying to ask for as really being relevant? You say, social... information on social issues? Or, was it a demand to see great progress and great leaps at this time?

Dr. Hicks: Well, I think both student sympathetic to this point of view, and

the instructors simply thought that they were enlisted as it were, in a great cause against a foolish, stupid, wicked war, or against racial inequality or whatnot. And they should fight that war whenever and wherever they could, and particularly in the classroom, even if it was a course in humanities. Now, Eldridge Cleaver, I don't think, will go down in history as a tremendously important writer. He certainly had a certain importance for our times. But, the literature of the 20th century certainly doesn't deal exclusively with problems like that. And the humanities was not intended to be a course to indoctrinate students concerning good causes to join and promote...throw the rascals out!...and so on. I thought it was a terrible perversion of the humanities from its proper objectives. Now, of course, I wouldn't object to the choice of a writer who might have a concern with ethical, moral, social issues. We actually did include, in the third quarter, from time to time, John Stuart Mill's essay on liberty and that sort of thing. But that was written more than a century ago. But these young instructors, they wanted things just hot off the press, you see, dealing with a current issue....the Nixon move into Cambodia...or anything of that sort. And it got mixed up too, with what you might call the counterculture. Drugs got mixed up, opposition to war against Viet Nam...you had that district in San Francisco that was populated by these so-called hippies of the time. There was a great deal of confusion, I think, in the minds of many of these students, and while it was their right, I think to speak their peace outside of the classroom, they had no right to go into the classroom and divert the professor and his students from the appointed curriculum for the course that was being taught, and I think they had...I think those instructors of humanities had no right to make their discussions study classes simply forums for current causes for which they believed. I was in opposition, I considered that a perversion.

Mike Runestrand: Was your class ever entered by any of the different, not

militant groups, but activist groups? Either the war, or when the B. S. U. first came in to campus? Were any of your classes, at that time entered? A few of mine were entered by different groups saying may we have the...

Dr. Hicks: I didn't have many....I didn't have many.

Mr. Runestrand: How did you react to.....

Dr. Hicks: I think for one reason, I, those days, I was wearing a white shirt and a tie, though once I forgot a tie. (Chuckles) And after lunch, I put on two ties instead of one. (Laughter) But that was unintentional. I didn't bear any physical signs, you know, of being committed to these advanced kinds of thought. But by the time this agitation developed, I was one of the senior members of the faculty. I'm nearly as old as the century. I was actually born in the first year of the century, and I suppose many of these students had thought of me as an old fuddy duddy who's ideas were strictly behind the times. I felt that they were doing me an injustice because I think I've shown more of a passion for liberty, and freedom, and preservation of social values than a good many of my younger colleagues have shown. And I got up on my two legs and spoke my peace to that effect, on campus and off.

Dr. Eklund: What would you prophecy the future of higher education, let's say in the year 1975, given a recession that might, potentially, become a depression. Would you care to comment on that?

Dr. Hicks: Well, I'm very hazy about the direction of higher education, even in the near future. I do think there will be a cut-back in the percentage of young people who will find it mandatory to have a college education. I think that tendency has already begun to manifest itself. And I'm hoping that some of the traditional values of the college education such as I have been, was exposed to in the late teen's and early twenties, and as I have attempted, with my colleagues, to practice since. That these will regain their status...will

in the face of the wind, and I don't think I've ever been so cold in my life. That put an end to my jogging, but I've done a lot of walking.

Dr. Eklund: Are you really saying by reading while walking that we should not misuse time, in effect? That every moment's important as far as learning?

Dr. Hicks: Yes, you see, I have quite a variety of interests. I spend hours and hours, and always have at the piano. Of course, more on some days than on others, depends upon my schedule. And then I love to read, I have a wide ranging set of intellectual interests. I'll never get all the books read that I want to read, I know that. I'll never get to play satisfactorily, all the music that I would like to play satisfactorily. So for me, "The world was so full of a number of things, I ought to be as happy as kings;" as Stevenson put it. That is, I think, for me life is just full of opportunities for interesting activities. And I've not lost my enthusiasm for those activities, chiefly intellectual and artistic.

Dr. Eklund: How would you comment, now, on given budgetary troubles, given the recession here in 1975, on unionization among faculty members?

Dr. Hicks: That is a difficult question for me to respond to, and perhaps here I'm showing my age. I was prominent on the campus and to a certain extent off campus from 19...well, particularly in the '40's, in the work of the American Association of University Professors. That was the chapter, the Western chapter was established in 1939, prompted by the dismissal of Mr. Fisher. It was the A. A. U. P. who did the most effective work in counteracting what the governor had done. We didn't save Mr. Fisher's job for him, but the association did make clear what the issues were. Why he was fired! And in so doing, it staunchly upheld the principles which the president and the faculty had been fighting for all during that really exciting year. So, um.. let's see, I digresses for awhile. You bring me back to the question we wereyou were asking.

Dr. Eklund: Well, unionization or union coalescence maybe...their programs and....

Dr. Hicks: Oh yes, unionization. I'm very strong for organizational activity by college professors. And, heavens knows, I've participated in it a good deal.... several different organizations...N. W. E. A., a state organization, and the faculty forum, a local organization, and others. I will make this one statement, that these organizations were not oblivious to the questions of faculty welfare, and the need to upgrade faculty salaries, and the greatest work down along that line was done by the A. A. U. P. chapter and the faculty forum, which was organizationally independent from the chapter and a much larger group. These two cooperated in the years '46 and '47 to secure the largest single increase of salaries in the institution during it's entire history. And the American Teachers Union was not in the picture at all. I don't think there was a single member on the faculty in 1947. And I remember that I was a member of the national council for years, that would be representatives from different districts, as they were called, would assemble. It would be a group of around thirty, I suppose. We had in those council meetings of the A. A. U. P. discussions of the union approach to the solution of problems of education as a business or industry, but as a service. And that for the method appropriate for any union, trade union, industrial or not, would not be properly applied to college professors. There are other ways.....

be recognized as important values. That is, I think, it's kind of the swing of the pendulum here, and I can detect it. It's swung out about as far as it can go, and it's beginning to swing back. I have that impression, anyway. Although of course you bear in mind, I retired in 1969. I've only been... I'm not on the campus all day. I come usually in the afternoons, and stay for an hour or so. I get out on the campus as a rule to get my mail, and some of the students are aware of me for one reason or another, chiefly because of my habit of reading as a pedestrian.

Dr. Eklund: May I ask you why do you do that? Isn't that a...(Laughter) I mean, isn't there a potential of falling as a result of walking while reading?

Dr. Hicks: Oh, the hazards of reading while you walk.

Dr. Eklund: Yeah! (Chuckles)

Dr. Hicks: Well, bear in mind that I've done it for a long time. My chief form of exercise, since I started to earn a living, has taken the form of walking. I never had a car until I was fifty years old. I had, of course, the advantage of motor transportation when I was a boy. My father had a car. My older brother had a car. But, I never owned a car until 1951.

Dr. Eklund: Oh, really!

Dr. Hicks: And of course I could take the streetcar, bus, and frequently would, but there would be times when it would be inconvenient to do that. I'd have... want to get someplace, and the only way I could go would be by shank's pony. That would take time. I wasn't, I've never been a particular enthusiast for jogging. I just had, oh, a few weeks experience at that soon after I came here. I jogged from 216 South Forest up to Victor Hoppy's residence, which is up to the South about seven or eight blocks, I suppose, and back. I did that religiously every morning, well, until a Northeaster came along. Well now, it wasn't too bad when I was running South, as I started you see, going out. But coming back, oh, that Northeast wind came in at me. I was running

Dr. Arthur Hicks
March 6, 1975

Accession No. WTC 75-01&02de/mr, Tape No. 2, Tape Side No. 2

Dr. Eklund: Okay, I think we were to the point where you were saying that maybe the unions methodology would not be applicable to people in higher education?

Dr. Hicks: Yes, that was the viewpoint, at least, that was generally held in the A. A. U. P. circles in the '30's and '40's, and well into the '50's, I think. I think the A. A. U. P. itself has somewhat changed it's position on the subject of collective bargaining. It seems to be an inevitable development in college government, and while I find it difficult, in terms of my general theories and ideas about, particularly public higher education, to reconcile union methods with what college professors are doing. Evidently, the union is here to stay.. and I think it's unfortunate in this way particularly, the stance of a union, as I understand it, any union. It could be a teacher's union, or the Steele worker's union, is more or less adversarial, as far as the employer is concerned. It's something like a trial in court, you might say, although it's not so extreme. You have the taking of sides, and to assume, in the solution of financial problems or otherwise, that necessarily the interests of the employee group are different from those of the employer. I think it's a terrific mistake. I think it's to the interests of the people of the state, and to the regents and trustees who represent them, the administration of higher institutions. to have good working conditions for teachers, to have them get salaries that are comparable to salaries in other professions. Therefore, it's always seemed to me, that the way we worked back in the '40's particularly, that's the year I remember most distinctly in this connection, when we had wholehearted cooperation with members of the administration, with the trustees, and so on, on such questions as this, that that kind of approach is the more civilized approach. It's a more professional approach, I think, and it's likely, perhaps in the long run, to achieve even greater rewards for the professors themselves.

Dr. Eklund: Would you say that perhaps the coming of unions, or the increased militancy of the A. A. U. P. is because the administration, perhaps, did not lead for the faculty, let's say in the '60's, or going into the '70's, do you think? The administration might have become viewers of higher education as big businesses in the late nineteenth century?

Dr. Hicks: That may be true. I don't really pretend to be speaking with authority on this question, because I've not been involved much in councils on this question since the '40's. I did my ... I was most active on those questions in the '40's, particularly when I was a member of the A. A. U. P. council **from**...national council...from 1945 to 1948. Now the A. A. U. P. was interested not only in the economic status of the profession, it was interested in free speech, it was interested in academic freedom and tenure, and so on. And it was along those fronts that the A. A. U. P. was waging it's great battles at that time, and one of them, in behalf of the faculty and students of this institution. But, evidently, thinking has changed even in the A. A. U. P. regarding the concept of collective bargaining. Now, I would hope that as that concept might be handled in the A. A. U. P. it would not involve an exaggeration of this adversarial business...relationship. My feelings are rather strong on this because as the son of a lawyer, and my father has often said to me that the law is a difficult field to work in because you will find people often behaving at their worst, rather than at their best. They disagree, they get angry with each other, they call each other names. Sometimes, of course, they commit crimes at each other's expense. And it is a good policy for a lawyer not to encourage litigation. He implied that it would be very unethical for an author...a lawyer to go after business, so to speak. To encourage litigation, to be an ambulance chaser, to get lucrative suits for damages, and so on. His principle was quite to the contrary, that, if a client came to him with a....some grievance against his neighbor, he would encourage him to negotiate

with his neighbor, start a dialogue with him, to see if they couldn't come to some sort of arrangement or compromise so that litigation wouldn't be necessary. The effect of it was...stay out of litigation if you can. It's expensive in a variety of ways. In many cases, a lawsuit may mean tragedy or heartbreak, or emotional disturbance, prolonged emotional disturbance. You don't need to read the fiction of Charles Dickens to get the truth of that. And there may not have been a good reason for the litigation in the first place. My thinking is somewhat colored by what my father has told me about the practice of law.

Dr. Eklund: Do you foresee maybe faculty and administration coming back to work together, rather than at odds? I think we would both agree that administrations are certainly caught in a bind, given reduced budget, and yet, it seems to me, maybe the whole gist of keeping higher education, in particular education of quality, that maybe it should be the administration that would stand, as you put it, to see that faculty were comfortable in their position, that they weren't overloaded, and that they were paid a sufficient salary to live a life that sometimes does demand research or attending conventions, or this type of thing.

Dr. Hicks: Yes, I think, although I think that it's the responsibility of both faculty and administration. I don't know which had the greater responsibility. But I'm profoundly convinced that unless there is some true communication between the administration and the faculty, and it should be continuous, and arbitrary decisions by the administration should be avoided as much as possible, and explanations of administrative decisions to the faculty should be very carefully and lucidly presented. I think on Western's campus during these last years, during years in which Jerry Flora was virtually given a vote of no confidence by the majority of the faculty, or at least a plurality of the faculty, that the great problem has been one of communication. Lack of trust in each other. Now, of course, I admit the problem is much greater when

you have a large institution, a greater number of administrators and so on, but it has been a tradition at Western that administration and faculty could work together, could understand each other, to communicate. And, in fact, in the earlier days, the distinction between being a faculty member, a teacher, or an administrator, was not made a great deal of. The administrator would call himself a member of the faculty. It's only in relatively recent years that the distinction between administrator and instructor has been made.

Dr. Eklund: Would you suggest anything like perhaps having administrators at least teach to some degree during a year? To once again know the students, rather than being removed?

Dr. Hicks: I think that's an excellent idea when it can be arranged. I really do. It would have the effect, I think, of bringing the administrator closer, not only to the students, but to the faculty. Engage with the faculty in a common enterprise.

Dr. Eklund: Because our reason to be is to teach the student as well as we know how, which is not always...you might say, good..(Chuckles) but at least that is our common objective.

Dr. Hicks: It's our duty to do the best we can.

Dr. Eklund: Well, are there any other things, perhaps, you'd like to perhaps remark on, off the top of your head? I don't know if we need to talk about a town and gown gap? Maybe that's sort of a cliché that holds in any college or university community. Do you want to say anything along those lines?

Dr. Hicks: Well, I would say that there have been times when there has been serious rifts between Western and the local community, and a good many otherwise worthy people have had, really, highly mistaken ideas about what was going on on the campus. Of course, the most drastic experience of that sort occurred in connection with the Fisher dismissal, and, I think the trouble was mainly due to a few people. Now, the editor of the local newspaper is in a position

to create a great deal of misunderstanding, and create a great deal of trouble for a public institution if he adopts the sort of policy Frank Siefert did back in the '30's. He obviously did not trust the Normal School, or the College of Education, as it became, with doing a good job in the teaching of students. It was leading them down the primrose path, so to speak. He was a man of violent prejudices, and had a great gift for hatred. And I'm sure he influenced a good many people against the institution, from the president on down because of his attitude. Thank God, we don't have that kind of attitude now.

Dr. Eklund: You were talking about maybe the need to keep avenues of communication open between community and college community and...

Dr. Hicks: Yes, I think that's highly desirable. And I think that perhaps our faculty, at times, I don't want to be unduly censorious here, have not taken as much interest in what's going on in Bellingham as perhaps they should. Now, I have not found it difficult to get involved in what I consider to be interesting and meaningful and valuable activities in Bellingham. I have worked with, it used to be called the Bellingham Community Chest. I was on it's board for several years, chairman of the campaign fund committee. I've worked with various music groups, including the Bellingham Chamber Music Society. I must say my life, had my life been confined to strictly campus affairs, it would have been seriously impoverished during the forty some years that I've been here. Of course, that's a decision every faculty member must make for himself. Does he have the time, the inclination, the interest, to get involved in these affairs. I certainly wouldn't want to make it a formal requirement. But I think the more that happens, the better understanding is bound to arise between the institution and the surrounding community.

Dr. Eklund: You've never been attracted to the administrative side of education?

Dr. Hicks: No, not beyond the level of chairing a department. And I, when the department started to expand rapidly I resigned. I had thought of myself

all along as primarily a teacher, even though I was twenty nine years chairman of the English department.

Dr. Eklund: That's a long time. (Chuckles) Well you obviously like it here in Bellingham. What would you list as some of the reasons, well, other than maybe the job situation. I mean, what is appealing to you about the locale?

Dr. Hicks: Well, I like it, oh, for a good many reasons. I think, of course, that the community itself has many scenic advantages. I like the bay for instance, the mountains, etc... It's a delightfully picturesque place in which to live your life. My life...I built my house in 1937 on a location overlooking Bellingham Bay. I don't know, I think that's been quite important in keeping me on a even keel...the sight of that body of water. And of course not everybody can get that advantage in Bellingham. Such views aren't always available. And then I like Bellingham because there is a great deal of interest in the arts in Bellingham, music and painting, the ceramic arts, and so on. And since I happen to have a particularly strong interest in music, I am thoroughly delighted with the fact that there are a number of musical organizations in Bellingham, I've been very happy with, and a wide opportunity for musicians to express themselves, to perform; Then I have found it very stimulating, this applies particularly to the period before 1951. I was asked to speak, I don't know how many times, before I don't know how many groups, between 1933 and 1951. I've not been in so much request since 1951... I think I know why.... it was because of that confrontation with Mr. Canwell.

Dr. Eklund: I see.

Dr. Hicks: Some people, I think, have regarded me perhaps as a dangerous man. (Chuckles)

Dr. Eklund: Well, I think maybe we'll end this interview for the day. I guess it's a rather trite question perhaps, but suppose maybe you were put on Orcas Island with only ten books of your choice. What would be some you would choose?

For all time. Readability or message or whatever?

Dr. Hicks: Well, in English literature, of course, Shakespeare, the authorized version of the Bible, which I think is the best from a literary standpoint, the book of common prayer which preceded the authorized version by some sixty years. I happen to be a member of the Episcopal Church, but the Book of Common Prayer includes people far beyond the confines of the church. It's a great work of literature. I couldn't get along without Shelley, who is my favorite poet next to Shakespeare. How many have I given? Three? Four? I'll want at least one novel, and Dickens would cheer me up. I think, oh yes, and I'd want a volume of Greek tragedy. I could probably dispense with Aristophanes because Shakespeare provides so much comedy. I'd want some more great English and American fiction, say work like Moby Dick, Huck Finn. I'd want Adam Bede or Middlemarch by George Elliot. That would be just about the list.

Dr. Eklund: Um hum. Well, Mike, do you have anything you'd like to ask, or comment on?

Mr. Runestrand: Not right this second. But there is, perhaps at a later date, I'd like to go in, perhaps in a little more detail, to the Fisher case. Which I think maybe important for those later, when there will no longer be the knowledge.

Dr. Eklund: Well, I purposely stayed away from asking about that because you have included, I think, in your history of Western.

Dr. Hicks: Well, the essence of what I know about the Fisher case is in the history actually. Of course there are details which you might question me about.

Dr. Eklund: Okay! We sure thank you, and maybe you can follow that through if Dr. Hicks is willing here.

Dr. Hicks: I'll be glad to cooperate, if you'll just let me know. And you know the way here.

Dr. Eklund: One other thing, you know, you can reflect on this interview, and anything, you know in reflection, you think you would have liked to have said that looms as important, well maybe we can include that the next time too.

Dr. Hicks: Well yes, I'll do just that, although I think the questions you have put to me have been very important ones.

Dr. Eklund: Well, we've been maybe general but (Chcukles) we've given a good gamut of....you could say 74 years.

Dr. Hicks: Well, I've been able to express some of my most cherished and deeply felt convictions.

Dr. Eklund: Well, we sure thank you then.

Dr. Hicks: Well, it was a pleasure for me, I assure you.

Dr. Eklund: Fine!