



6-19-1923

Interview with Dr. R.S. Radford Questioned by Dean James D. Hoskins

R.S. Radford

James D. Hoskins
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Follow this and additional works at: http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dabn

Recommended Citation

"Interview with Dr. R.S. Radford Questioned by Dean James D. Hoskins" President's Papers, AR-0001. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Special Collections.
http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dabn/119

This University Policy is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of the President at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Charles W. Dabney, 1887-1904 by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

IN RE
DR. R. S. RADFORD

(SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OFFERED BY THIS MEMBER
(
(OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE FACULTY.
(

This member of the University Faculty, upon being examined by Dean Hoskins, made the following material statements:

1. Shortly after learning that Dr. Sprowls had been notified that he would not be reappointed, Dr. Radford called a meeting of various members of the Faculty in his room, to inquire into the case, believing that the question of "University freedom and full tenure of a University professorship was involved." (p.1,2)
2. He insists that the meeting was in no wise hostile to the University although he admits that it was called and held, before any attempt was made to ascertain the true facts of the case from the authorities (p.2)
3. He refuses to disclose the name of the person who approached him on the subject of signing a letter addressed to the American Association of University Professors seeking an investigation of Dr. Sprowls' case. (p.4,5)
4. He feels that the University authorities are not "free from all criticism" in respect to Dr. Sprowls' case. When asked to explain, he reverts to the subject of "academic freedom" and "independence on the part of professors" (p.7) Although he had just stated that Dean Hoskins had given him full information about the Sprowls case which had convinced him that these questions were not involved. (p.2,3)
5. When further pressed, he undertakes to base his criticism upon the fact that "perhaps" the authorities should have given Dr. Sprowls "a year or two years warning and letting him find another place." (p.7)
6. The American Association of University Professors wish a certain form of procedure followed before a professor is dismissed; they want specific charges filed and an opportunity given the professor to answer them (p.8,9)
7. He thinks that the present organization of the University is objectionable, believing that in the matter of dismissing a professor the recommendation of the Head of a department should not be followed "without consultation with the heads of one or more allied departments", or "with some standing committee." (p.11)
8. He contributed to Professor Mulvania's "suggestions", advocating a form of student government and believing that the students should be made to feel that they were being consulted for advice by the authorities (p. 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21).
9. He thinks he can work harmoniously under the present organization of the University but he prefers "certain modifications". As to just what modifications he has reference to, it is quite impossible to gather from the language used. (p.15).

INTERVIEW WITH DR. R. S. RADFORD
June 19, 1923.
QUESTIONED BY DEAN JAMES D. HOSKINS.

Q. Doctor, I want to ask you about a few things with regard to trouble we have had here in the University. Will you tell me what arrangements you made for meetings for the purpose of having an investigation of Dr. Sprowls' case?

A. I never made any arrangements, Professor Hoskins, with this one exception that when I first heard about his dismissal- his non-reappointment- not knowing what the services were and wanting to know I asked a number of members of the faculty to meet in my class room probably the same afternoon that I heard about it. Dr. Gordon was there, Professor Perkins, Professor Glocker, and those who were present simply asked some questions. I learned more about the situation-- it was in the formal meeting-- I learned more about the situation that afternoon and afterwards. I learned a good deal at that meeting I did not know about the services.

Q. What was your object in calling that meeting Doctor?

A. Let me make it clear, Professor Hoskins, when that meeting was held--

Q. Yes?

A. I learned about Doctor Sprowles failure of reappointment-- we will say-- just assume it was one Thursday. It was about two days after the matter was decided. Dr. Sprowls thought he was unjustly treated. I was not a close friend of his but I knew him. Two or three members of the faculty who were friends of mine thought-- not that they had any definite judgment but they thought that the question of University freedom and the full tenure of a University professorship was involved. I wanted to find out whether that was the case and without taking any definite position or stand at all but after talking with certain of the professors who were right next to me- Professor Glocker, Professor-- let me see-- Mr. Glocker, Professor Frantz, Professor Ellis. I asked also Professor Shaeffer and also Professor Gordon and Perkins to come around

and they did. I told them that it was not a meeting for any decision but simply an inquiry. Dr. Sprowls represented his case as one involving the freedom of university teaching and it was perfectly proper to make some inquiries and find out whether that was the case. I knew nothing about the case- did not intend to take any position in the case without a pretty definite understanding of the facts. The meeting was not hostile to the university authorities because it was a meeting of inquiry. Someone in this meeting suggested that Professor Sprowls be called in and be allowed to make a statement. The majority did not think of that for a moment because if we ever heard a statement from Professor Sprowls we would also want a statement from Professor Thackston or yourself. It was a meeting of inquiry but nothing decided at all and there was no intention to go any further without some very definite grounds. It was not a meeting that was hostile to the University authorities.

Q. Why didn't you come up here and ask us first about it?

A. I did come later because I decided that was the thing to do.

Q. Why did you not before holding the meeting?

A. I might and we might very well have followed that plan.

Q. You did afterwards?

A. I did.

Q. And I explained fully to you the reasons why we told Dr. Sprowls that we would not recommend his reappointment?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you not tell me that my explanation made it clear to you?

A. Much clearer, yes, but I want to make this perfectly clear because my own position was perfectly clear to my mind in that- not in the remotest hostile to the University authorities. Those attacks against the University seemed to me most absurd and unjust. This was a meeting of inquiry and the question proposed was, has there been any real interference with the unity of teaching in the University and should we petition the constituted authorities for Professor Sprowls' reinstatement or had we no

Dr. Radford -3-

grounds for doing so, and there was not anything in that meeting that was hostile or critical of University authorities.

Q. Well now did you come to the conclusion that you would not be justified in petitioning the authorities to reinstate him?

A. We did come to that conclusion that we would not be justified and that we should ask for further information from you or Professor Morgan.

Q. You found when you came to me to get that further information that I gave you all the information you wanted?

A. You gave me the information I did not have before and it had never been my disposition to question or be in doubt as to the fact that authorities of the University had the power to remove and not reappoint professors.

Q. What I meant by that question, Doctor, is that when you came up here and asked me for information I gave you all you asked for?

A. You did, and I would like to say this too because I don't mind anything that I did or said in the matter- I don't mind reporting or saying in full. I happened to hear that the Knoxville News was going to make a publication on the subject. I called up Mr. Menan and I urged him not to make any publication on the case and thought that the publication would not do any good while by ~~his~~ withholding publication if there was anything to be cleared up or any adjustment to be made it would be better made without publicity. He told me that his point of view was different and that he believed in publicity. I urged him not to make any publication upon the matter and later when someone in town asked me to meet Mr. Menan I said I liked Mr. Menan casually pretty well but I had no desire to meet him at that time.

Q. Doctor, did anyone hand you a letter written to the American Association of University Professors asking for an investigation with the request that you sign that letter?

A. No one ever handed me such a letter. Someone said to me

"Would you sign such recommendation?" I said I would have to consider that very carefully before I would answer it.

Q. Who was that Doctor?

A. I don't think I am called upon to say that, but I decided afterwards that I would not want to do that- that he might do it but I would not want to do it.

Q. You are head of the Latin Department?

A. May I tell you what conclusion I came to after that-- I am interested in this American Association of University Professors and believe it a good thing. On the whole these professors are very conservative and judicious people. I soon came to the conclusion that if an investigation was made the Society of University Professors would find themselves up against a personal element in the first place and very largely all the way through. They would find themselves against personal antagonism and antipathies of two professors.

Q. What two?

A. Professor Thackston and Professor Sprowls. I don't think they would find primarily a question of University teaching or academic freedom or the question of ordinary continuance of a full professor in his ~~own~~ position unless there was some positive dissatisfaction with him but would find a personal and deep rooted antagonism between two men.

Q. Where did you get that impression, Doctor?

A. I have mighty good reasons for that impression I know the men.

Q. You have talked with both of them?

A. I have talked with Dr. Sprowls. Dr. Sprowls came and talked to me. He was a close friend of mine.

Q. Did you talk with Dr. Thackston on that question?

A. I did not talk to Dr. Thackston but very briefly. I spoke of it at the time and he said "You are mistaken." I said something to Dr. Thackston about the grounds of university or academic freedom and he

Dr. Radford -5-

said "you are mistaken, there are other grounds."

Q. You did not talk with Dr. Thacksten about alleged personal feeling between him and Dr. Sprowls did you?

A. No I did not. He did not tell me anything of that sort. That was just my conjecture and I know of some of Dr. Sprowls personal characteristics. I was not taking any personal sides in the matter.

Q. What I want to know, Doctor, is whether or not you got this impression of this personal relationship between Dr. Sprowls and Dr. Thacksten from Dr. Sprowls or Dr. Thacksten or both?

A. I got it from Dr. Sprowls primatily because he told me various things he said to Dr. Thacksten. My impression came from Dr. Sprowls' reports of conversations and his statements.

Q. What we want is this- just the facts of the case. I would like for you to tell me who it was that asked you if you were interested in signing a letter asking for an investigation of Dr. Sprowls case?

A. I don't think, Professor Hoskins, it would be quite just for me to state that.

Q. Why?

A. Because I don't want to be personally mixed up in that way in the affair.

Q. Suppose the Board of Trustees should ask you that?

A. May I make a statement there? I don't think that a member-- I want to make my position clear-- I never assumed any hostile attitude toward the University. I had been here and knew what this administration had done for the University, and I knew the fact that personal administration was indispensible to the University and nobody could be found or thought of that could fill the bill. While I read those articles in the "Truth" I knew that they were most outrageously unfair and unjust in their criticism of the constituted authorities of the University, and that in attributing undue harshness or pettiness of any kind or lack of breadth of view in a high sense of justice to the Dean of the University they were most wide of the mark, and under the appearance of attacking

the Dean they were quite ready to attack all of the faculty of the University. I don't think-- I would like to mention this-- I don't think, Professor Hoskins, it would be an impropriety for some one who is a member of this Chapter to petition for an investigation if he wanted to and if his conscience urged him. I don't think it would be a violation of University ethics if his conscience led him to do so but for my part I think that the Society of University Professors would find a complicated problem to wrestle with- one that they could not make an adverse report on with respect to the authorities of the University. I saw that I did not want to carry the matter any further but if anybody associated with the Chapter of University Professors wanted to petition for an inspection I did not consider that they would be doing an unethical or unprofessional thing.

Q. Did you attend any other meetings than that one?

A. I did not.

Q. Do you know of any other meetings that were held?

A. I can't say that I do.

Q. This meeting, Doctor, ^{that} was held in your office was not a meeting of the A. A. U. P?

A. No it was not.

Q. That was just a meeting of members of the faculty?

A. Yes, it was a meeting of the members of the faculty and after some discussion lasting for half an hour they decided that the only proper thing to do would be to ask President Morgan and yourself about the matter.

Q. You and one or two others came up to see me and inquired, as you have indicated, and as a result of this meeting, and I explained to you as Heads of the Departments that I was perfectly willing to tell you about the ordinary transactions of the University in making changes in the departments- the method of doing that because that method would, of course, be the same method employed by any head of a department if he met a similar condition in his department. Now when I made that explanation to you that settled it so far as you were concerned did it?

A. I want to be perfectly frank. I was satisfied, and am satisfied that there were serious and difficult questions at issue there. I am not prepared to say, Professor Hoskins, that the method pursued by the authorities in handling that specific case is absolutely free from all criticism and I am not prepared to say that the same end could not have been obtained by some indirect means.

Q. Will you explain what you mean?

A. I think I can make clear what my meaning is. I value very highly in a University the tradition of academic freedom in teaching and a certain amount of independence on the part of the professors.

Q. I explained to you, Doctor, that academic freedom was not involved in this at all?

A. Let me go on. I want to make clear just what I mean. I am being perfectly frank in my statement. I did not question the full authority of the constituted officials of the University to dismiss Professor Sprowls. I know, however, that the constituted authorities had made Dr. Sprowls a full professor and if their judgment showed them that he was not a desirable man to keep I thought that perhaps-- I would like to put in that "perhaps" for possibly because I am in doubt, they might have obtained the same end by giving a year or two years warning and letting him find another place. Now don't understand that to be -- I am saying I am not prepared to say that there was no other method of their obtaining the way or purpose which they felt to be for the good of the University. There is one question in my mind. I am asking myself the question whether they could have obtained--

Q. Suppose we had told Dr. Sprowls a year before that he was not succeeding in his work then what?

A. Then I would say it was up to him to find another place if he could.

Q. And if he did not find another place then what?

A. Why then the authorities would have fulfilled any possible courtesy or obligation that they owed him or could have been supposed to

Dr. Radford -8-

have owed him.

Q. You mentioned back at the first of your statement, Doctor, about the question of tenure of a professor. What did you mean by that?

A. I can state that too. There has been a distinct tendency on the part of the American Association of University Professors, which is quite a conservative body taking it as a whole, to wish a certain form of procedure to be followed in the dismissal of a man who is a full professor. As I understand it, they want certain specific charges made which are free from being too vague and they want an opportunity given him of answering those charges.

Q. Is it the object of the American Association of University Professors to look into the changes that are made in University faculties throughout the country?

A. Only in a very limited way-- very limited.

Q. Is it their object to prescribe the methods by which the authorities of a University shall proceed in making changes in their faculties?

A. Not entirely by any means but they do want the faculty to take a moderate part in the administration of the University. The majority of them are very conservative. There are some extremists or hot heads among them but I will say that the American Association of University Professors is a very responsible and judicial body.

Q. Are they proposing to put a form of constitution in the Universities?

A. I don't think they are. I think they are proposing a few simple privileges which most persons and most Boards of Trustees will grant without being incensed or inconvenienced. I think that what they have asked for-- are contending for-- is quite moderate and not going very far. I am not authorized to speak for them, but I think that their aims and plans in most cases will not clash with the administration of the average university as it stands today in

in many if any particulars.

Q. Have they organized for the purposes similar to those of Unions?

A. No, I don't think so.

Q. What you have just stated- don't you think that has some similarity to the method of procedure by labor unions?

A. It is rather a matter of- if you want me to state my opinion-- it is a matter of formality that they are interested in and I believe that if the course which they do stand for is carried out that there will be very few cases, though perhaps occasionally one or two, in which any different result will be reached. I don't think that the adoption of that particular request or demand of theirs will make much difference. It is more a matter of formality.

Q. What do you mean by formality there, Doctor, formality of what?

A. On their part. I interpret it- the observance of formality which would insure a little slower and more deliberate action and guard against an effort, I will say, in a few cases, against a very hasty or precipitate decision.

Q. The method of procedure in the University in the employment of professors is for the Head of the Department in which the professor is being employed to make recommendations to the Dean of the College and the Dean to the Dean of the University and the Dean to the President and they all agree on this recommendation before the recommendation goes up to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. The recommendation is then taken to the Board of Trustees and finally passed upon by the Board of Trustees. Now when changes are made the Head of the Department makes recommendations with regard to the changes stating reasons why the change should be made. That recommendation then takes the same course as in the case of employment. Are you in sympathy with that organization?

A. Why, Professor Hoskins, some of the large universities instead of having A Head of A Department have a Committee in charge of the Department

where the department is large enough.

Q. But we have Heads of Departments and have had them ever since President Morgan has been in as President of the University. That has been announced to the faculty- the method of procedure- are you in sympathy with that?

A. I have never understood the method of procedure before.

Q. It was stated to the faculty?

A. It was stated but a statement as full as you have given has not been made. You had a very full explicit statement.

Q. President Morgan made that same statement that I have made here to the faculty meeting here when the regulation went into effect?

A. Professor Hoskins you may be correct but ~~ix~~ was it as lengthy a statement- as detailed a statement as that?

Q. He made a general statement that the Head of the Department would have charge of all of the affairs in that department and recommendations would come through that head.

A. That statement was made by President Morgan with the exception of employment of professors.

Q. Well that includes the whole thing. Are you in sympathy with that?

A. I am in sympathy with it as whole and with reference to the efficiency of the administration and the getting of things done.

Q. Is it not efficiency that we are working for?

A. I am inclined to think though that one or two minor limitations might be put upon the power of the head of the department.

Q. Will you state that?

A. Yes, I would like to state that. Where a department is sufficiently large it seems to me that there is no reason why the head of the department should not be assisted by a committee or council in his department. For example, in the English Department.

Q. What should this committee or Council include?

A. Before which-- very important- serious questions of the

department could be brought up.

Q. Are you through with that?

A. I just want to say one other thing with respect to the employment of professors. It seems to me that after the head of a department has recommended a man and continued him as full professor then his recommendation as to dismissal should not be followed instantly without a consultation with the heads of one or more allied departments.

Q. Explain, please, what you mean by instantly. How long would you consider "instantly" covering?

A. I don't think that- I think that- I think that ordinarily there should be consultation by the Dean either with some standing committee or with the heads of several departments who would have the best opportunity to know something about his work.

Q. Explain what you mean by "instantly", Doctor?

A. About instantly! How do you mean? In my mind-- I meant that the recommendation of the head of the department would not be completely sufficient without-- some confirmation on the part of two or three other heads of allied departments.

Q. Suppose the heads of allied departments disagreed with the head of the department who was most concerned in the change then would you recommend the retention of that professor?

A. Not necessarily-- not necessarily. The responsibility would come eventually to the Dean and the President.

Q. I was just coming to that. If the heads of the allied departments disagree with the head of the department directly concerned and the Dean and the President agree with the head of the department directly concerned and a recommendation went up to the Board of Trustees for the change to be made what do you think the situation would be in the faculty then in a case of that kind?

A. The proper responsibility belongs to the Dean and the President and their recommendation must finally be followed and carried out.

Q. Could we have harmony then in this faculty in a situation of that kind?

A. I think so. I think that the -- that the one or more men-- whom I have suggested-- should be consulted. If they are sensible men and if the decision of the authorities was against their judgment -- and should acquiesce in it.

Q. Are there not just as likely to be sensible men under the arrangement as it is as there would be under the other, and acquiesce in it if the responsibility rests primarily on the Dean and President?

A. Excuse me for expressing my own opinion -- it seems to me that the form of procedure that I have mentioned is to be preferred as a possible safeguard against error in a very few cases. The decision of the authorities of the University must have final weight in the end.

Q. Did Professor Mulvania bring a paper to you?

A. Yes sir. He told me about his paper-- he told me about its contents rather fully. Owing to accident I never saw the full paper. It seemed to me that- perhaps I ought not to state that without being asked- but it seemed to me that Professor Mulvania had a good and sound purpose in view and that his object was not destructive but to be constructive on some minor details. It never seemed to me that there was any need in the University for construction except upon matters of minor details as the University was expanding and increasing its number of departments so greatly.

Q. Did you contribute to that paper?

A. What paper?

Q. Professor Mulvania's?

A. Orally I think I did contribute two or three suggestions.

Q. What suggestions did you make?

I- I thought a suggestion coming from- coming originally from Professor Glocker that there should be a committee on student morale or cooperation an extremely good one. Believing that our student body had no really serious grievances at all but that a few concessions in regard to the method of procedure on the part probably of the administrative council and faculty rather than the Dean might be pleasing and satisfactory to their student pride and corps de esprit if they should appear to be consulted in certain things.

Q. Students consulted?

A. If they should appear to be consulted or asked advice and counsel.

Q. Advise about what?

A. To be frank, the student body, it seems to me, has a certain natural sensitiveness and class spirit and a certain not unnatural pride in their status as a part of the University.

Q. Now Doctor please state just what you are talking about now with regard to the students' advice. What do you mean by that? Advice in what??

A. There are some matters, I am speaking somewhat sarcastically or cynically- there are some matters on which to be consulted would please them and gratify their pride even where they know that in very few cases can their judgment be followed.

Q. Now illustrate that?

A. I am not going to give an illustration because I don't know the running of the students' relations but if some things were not decided until they had been asked for this--

Q. Whether or not the decision should be made?

A. No they had been asked about this or told about this in advance-- if some things were not decided until they had been asked about them or told about the question in advance. If some things were not

decided until they were told about them in advance, until the question was first explained to them they would probably in some cases accept the same decision a little more cheerfully.

Q. Do you think students should have a voice in the government of the University?

A. Only in a very limited and restricted way, more with respect to assuring them what they sometimes do not believe that their elders or superiors really have their welfare and their good most of all and first of all at heart.

Q. Do you think we should have student government?

A. I am going to express myself frankly. I think there should be a student self government body with powers strictly limited and defined-- the aim being that the student self government board shall cooperate with the authorities and assist the authorities. That means in point of fact the authorities never referring the most weighty questions to the decision of students but are willing to hear the suggestions of representative students.

Q. You are a member of the administrative council?

A. Yes sir. May I ask just one thing there? This student self governing board would, however, have a few minor matters which might seem of considerable importance to them on which they could take action-- May I say this-- Mr. Thompson, of the Chattanooga School, McAllie School- said they had a student government there and that of course the two principals of the institution and himself as principal disciplinary officer keep the account and decision of the main matters-- that they invited the cooperation of the student self government and that none of the chief questions naturally were very fully or mainly in the hands of the students.

Q. You are a member of the Administrative Council?

A. Yes sir.

Q. Have you not witnessed time and again my bringing in committees of students before the Council to discuss regulations

that concern them?

A. I have witnessed it.

Q. Is it not a fact that frequently I have recommended to the council that regulations might be modified to suit the views of the students?

A. You frequently recommended that.

Q. Is it not a fact that the council accepted those modifications?

A. The Council very frequently accepted those modifications and on occasions where more severe or drastic action was taken against a student in a large number of cases it was the council instead of Professor Hoskins the Dean, who was in favor of more severe measures. The students' criticisms of Professor Hoskins, as Dean, were written in ignorance of the true situation. They would have had much more reason for criticising various members of the faculty who sent in reports relating to students' grades and successes in their work than in criticising the Dean.

Q. The point I am trying to make is, Doctor, has not the Council responded to the requests of the students in almost all cases?

A. It has responded in very many cases, I won't say always. It has responded in very many cases and is disposed to respond in all cases where it sees good reason for doing so. In a few cases it has seemed to me that the Administrative Council was sometimes a little too severe with students and it may be that in a few cases, not many, it may be that in a few cases that the student opinion might be more fully known by the administrative council. I can't think of a single concrete case-- I can't think of a single concrete case-- it might be that with a student self government attending to some matters or taking the first action on some matters that the administrative council would in that way be more in touch with student opinion and be felt more sympathetic by student opinion. It is not a question here at all of the justice of the administrative council but if about some cases student self government were consulted beforehand or simultaneously the students might feel better. I beg to qualify that

the restive and headstrong students who are well meaning might feel better and believe that they had more to do with the University

Q. Doctor, did you ever attend any meetings held at Dr. Schaeffer's house?

A. No I did not. I attended no meetings.

Q. Have you ever discussed this question of student government with the students?

A. I have not said a word to any student about student self government which, however, I think perhaps faulty on my part. My general idea is that the students would like to take some part even if a minor one in University affairs under the name of self government in the way of natural development and in view of their natural human feeling of self importance-- it is a useful feeling too.

Q. Do I understand you to say that we should let the students think that they had some part in their own government rather than give them any real part in it?

A. You understand me in the main but I think they really ought to have a real constructive part in a very small field but within that field real.

Q. Don't you think they have that already?

A. I do think they have it already largely in substance but there may be certain additional powers or appearances that would please them in a natural way. I am not really sarcastic about it because I think in a minor sphere that they ought to have some responsibility.

Q. Are you acquainted with the All Students Club?

A. Only by name.

Q. You have never attended a meeting of the students when the All Students Club was discussing affairs of interest to the student body?

- A. I have never been to a meeting but I have been to the door of the chapel once or twice when that meeting started.
- Q. You did not remain through a meeting?
- A. No sir I did not remain through a meeting.
- Q. Do you think there would ever be a time even though we should give the students a degree of self government when they would be satisfied?
- A. No not wholly.
- Q. You are of the opinion that if we should give them a little self government this year they would want more the next year and continue to want more until they had the whole thing in their hands?
- A. There are some of them who would naturally never be satisfied.
- Q. Just as they are now?
- A. Some of them would naturally not be satisfied.
- Q. Then it would be impossible for us to satisfy them even though we gave them a degree of self government.
- A. It would be impossible to satisfy all of them. I think that-- just as a matter of conjecture-- that probably some wellmeaning and essentially sound students would be satisfied if they had a few privileges that they don't have now-- I can't say what they are-- that are not after all of very great importance.
- Q. Doctor, were you not considerably excited when the Sprowls case was first announced to you by him?
- A. Very possibly I may have been. I am a good deal interested in the question of academic freedom and always have been a good deal interested in the theory of evolution.
- Q. You knew that the theory of evolution had nothing to do with this did you not?
- A. Not absolutely at first but later I did.
- Q. You knew that the matter of academic freedom had nothing to do with it later?

Dr. Radford 18.

A. I knew later- I came to the conclusion later that the theory of academic freedom was there only in the form of the situation between two quarreling professors in the same department.

Q. And you get your information about the quarreling professors from only one of them?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you think you could work harmoniously under the organization of the University as it is at present, the method of procedure as I have explained it to you this afternoon?

A. Yes I think I could-- I think I could.

Q. Will you.

A. Let me finish my sentence. I prefer a certain amount of modifications-- I prefer a certain amount of modifications-- and I want to be careful what I say-- I prefer a certain amount of modifications especially with reference to the-- especially with reference to the powers now given heads of departments, or given under the present system to heads of the departments though that organization makes absolutely no difference to me personally in a smaller department, and in my department where I am harmonious with allied professors. I should prefer a slightly different form of organization with respect to the heads of departments, but it is only a matter of more or less preference. The system of giving a fuller and more unrestricted power to heads of departments is an efficient system but seems to me in a few exceptional cases to admit of possible injustice. I could work harmoniously under the present system though I should not wish to see that system applied to-- let's see-- I should not wish to see that system applied to make it a closed system and a test of loyalty-- a closed system and a test of loyalty. It seems to me that, Professors might have differing opinions within moderation- differing opinions within moderation-- in a proper organization of the University and yet be fully loyal to the University administration.

Q. Is there anything else you would like to say.

Dr. Radford. 19--

A. If a professor felt it was a matter of moral life and death that the present system should be entirely recast and remodeled I would then consider him as out of touch or sympathy with the present organization of the University.

Q. What is the extent of your knowledge of the trouble we have had here, Doctor, that is, the difficulties that we have had- you know we have had this stir and more or less publicity about it?

A. I think that is due to-- I think our student body and faculty too are markedly free from real grievances. There may be some minor and unordinary grievances and a series of accidents-- a comedy of errors--

Q. A comedy of errors on the part of whom?

A. Suppose I say on the part of everybody-- a series of accidents- that would express my real meaning- affecting quite a large number of people.

Q. Will you name one of those accidents?

A. I think that we think things move so- in such order- but usually they don't. Usually a lot of coincidents happen. I can't name any one.

Q. I don't see just how you call it a series of accidents if you can't name any?

A. Well perhaps I could name some. This is so immaterial, but I saw in the paper that the Dean Tolman, in Vanderbilt, had withheld degrees from two or three students, publishers or editors of the Vanderbilt comic paper, because in the last number they inserted an improper drawing involving too much nudity, but apparently there was no hubbub raised by students about the proper discipline administered to the offending students. It is an accident- a coincidence, in my opinion, and Professor Sprowls' failure to receive reappointment and the allegation that it involved academic freedom occurred at the time that some of the students were discontented with some minor matters, one or two of them relating to form and not to substance might be ^{conceded} ~~conceded~~ to them by the authorities without any loss of dignity on their part.

Q. Name those one or two now, Doctor, please?

A. I can't name them, Dean, because I don't know what they are but

Dr. Radford -20-

in a general way I say that if their self importance, which I consider positively natural and legitimate, were consulted or encouraged by arranging to consult them beforehand in an advisory and diplomatic way they would be better pleased.

Q. That is a very general statement. I would like for you to be specific about it.

A. If they have a student self government association to which some minor matters are consistently and statedly referred.

Q. Name some of the matters?

A. If I knew just what-- I am not very cognizant-- it is a weakness but I can't name them. If I were in my office, or Dr. Porter's office and had a note book I could name some-- and they were consulted on others- not the most important matters-- they were consulted on others- I mean merely consulted not given authority, they would be better pleased. Some things I refer to my classes. Julius Caesar was a most lenient and generous ruler.

Q. And he got assassinated?

A. He was assassinated because he assumed too much of the appearance of power. Augustus was a much colder and more calculating and less unselfish ruler but he pleased nearly everyone by appearing to consult them and share his authority with them which he really did not do.

Q. You think then that the students would like to have the appearance of having some authority and that they should be led to believe that by the faculty when they really had very little?

A. I do say, Dean Hoskins, that they should have a little restricted area which was real.

Q. I understood you to say that they should be led to believe that they have authority?

A. No, I know there should be something real there.

Q. But that they should believe it is more than it really is?

A. They will believe it because people like to think so.

Q. Do you not think that would be practicing deception on them?

A.- I don't think so. I have questioned it several times and nothing in it. The saying of Machiavelli believe that there is

whether a statesman should be a lion or a fox -- the answer is both but the qualities of the fox have more frequently brought remarkable success and escape from difficulties to the statesman than the qualities of the lion.

Q. We should be cunning then in dealing with the students?

A. Professor Hoskins, I don't hold that we should be cunning.

Q. That is the quality of the fox?

A. The fox has some good qualities.

Q. Cunning is a quality of the fox?

A. I am willing to quote the bible-- what is the quotation "Be ye harmless as doves but wise as serpents." I do think that Machiavelli was not wholly cynical.

Q. You think it would be wise for people in authority to follow Machiavelli's teaching as set forth in the Prince?

A. I think at times he is immoral and unscrupulous but I think he is wise.

Q. Wise in that he acted in such fashion as to escape the results of his own conduct?

A. The Prince if he assumes always to be a lion when sometimes the qualities of the lion are not needed and are injurious will do himself injury. I don't think a fox is a despicable animal in all respects. "Be ye harmless as doves and wise as serpents."

Q. It was said that you attended a meeting in Dr. John R. Neel's office. You say that you have not attended any meetings except the one you held up in your room?

A. I have been in Professor Neel's office but have never been in his office at a meeting at all. I have been in his office several times. I never had any intention of secrecy.

Q. Would you tell me whether or not that visit was for the purpose of discussing this trouble?

A. I want to remember what I went to see him about. It was not

Dr. Radford p--22-

directly for that purpose. It was not directly for that purpose-- and if the matter was mentioned it was mentioned only incidentally and so far as I know Professor Neal never had any set or formal or any informal meeting in his office.

Q. by Dr. Porter: Were any others there at the same time when you were there.

A. I think not. I saw Dr. Sprowls once in his office. There never was to my knowledge any either formal or informal meeting in Dr. Neal's office.

And further saith not.