

The Governance of Athletics at the
University of Minnesota:

Eras and Episodes in the
Administration of Sports

Gary Engstrand

Copyright 1986

Author's Note

This manuscript is not in any publishable form; I left the University and ran out of the time and ambition to bring it to completion. It badly needs the red pencil of a good editor; it also needs the wise comments and questions of good reviewers. Because I have not the inclination to take these final steps, it remains a manuscript to be duplicated primarily for internal use by University administrators and faculty.

The manuscript also suffers from another failing, but one which is not of my own making. There were no files from either the faculty representatives or the athletic directors for most of the events I described. The files of the University presidents, however, were voluminous; as a result, this history is told to a large extent from the perspective of those presidential files. There were, of course, other sources, including the newspapers, the participants, and minutes of groups and meetings.

There are no footnotes in this manuscript, by my conscious decision: All of the materials quoted or cited are available, primarily in the Archives of the University or in other public documents.

There are other chapters that should be written: On the rise of women's athletics, on the history of basketball and hockey, on the basketball scandals beginning in the early 1970s and running through 1986, on the role Minnesota played in ousting Iowa from the Big Nine in the early 1930s, and perhaps others.

I am deeply indebted to several individuals for their extensive help: Judge George MacKinnon, Clifford Sommer, Pug Lund, Babe LeVoir, Julius Perlt, Jaye Dyer, Bill Maddux, Harvey Mackay, Max Schultze, and others I cannot recall. A special thanks, too, to Chuck Walcott, who reviewed an earlier draft of the manuscript, and many of whose suggestions must yet be incorporated into the text.

Finally, a comment that this text was printed on a machine which is not programmed to do long manuscripts and which contained no brackets. This is no reflection on Ellen Downing, Paul Giel's secretary, who was kind enough to type and print the document. To Paul, and to Ellen and her staff, I owe a great deal for their help.

Gary Engstrand
October, 1986

CONTENTS

1.	The Early Years: Faculty and Students	1
2.	Creating an Athletic Director: 1921-22	29
3.	Choosing and Losing Directors and Coaches: 1921-1932	46
4.	President Coffman, the Football Coach, and the Alumni	79
5.	The Carnegie Report and the Special Committee	90
6.	Choosing and Losing Directors and Coaches: 1950-1978	101
7.	Financial Aid to Athletes	132
8.	The 1950s: Minnesota, Morrill, and Faculty Control	147
9.	Minnesota, Morrill, and the Rose Bowl	161
10.	President Morrill, the Football Coach, and the Alumni	189
11.	Choosing a Football Coach: 1983	226

CHAPTER 1

THE EARLY YEARS: FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Student games, in the late 1880s, did not attract any formal University involvement when they first began. As best one can tell from the pages of history now available, the interest of the faculty in the administration of athletics was born on January 13, 1894. It was on that day that the general faculty, in one of their regular meetings, voted "that a committee of three be appointed to consult with the athletic associations of the University with a view to faculty representation in the same." The three faculty elected were Charles K. Babcock (English and history, subsequently President of the University of Arizona), Frederick S. Jones (physics, later Dean of the College of Engineering), and William Appleby (mining and metallurgy, later appointed Dean of Mining). This vote can be seen as the first step in what eventually became "faculty control," because two weeks later Professor Babcock offered a resolution concerning athletics which was adopted. The text of the resolution is lost, but a reference to it in the Ariel (predecessor to the Minnesota Daily) on February 3 suggests that he proposed to establish a committee on athletics composed solely of faculty members. (The committee was appointed and had as members Babcock, Jones, and Conway MacMillan (botany). The article went on to note that the student "athletic officers" protested to President Northrop, who "assured them that the faculty would reconsider the matter to-day and would do what was right." The faculty did meet on February 3, and as the President had promised, "the Babcock resolution in regard to athletics, adopted at the previous meeting, was reconsidered and rejected." While "faculty control" was repudiated, faculty interest was clearly present.

Before proceeding, it is worth a few words to look at one of the faculty who had a profound influence on the growth of athletics at Minnesota. Frederick S. Jones was one of those people. Initially appointed in 1885, he came out from Yale to serve as an instructor in physics. Although there is probably no one left alive now who knew Jones, James Gray, in his history (The University of Minnesota 1851-1951) (hereinafter "Gray"), discusses him at some length. It was Jones who first brought the rugby traditions of Yale to Minnesota football, and he coached the team from 1886 to 1889; a later letter to the Ariel pointed to Jones as responsible for the first successful endeavors in the game here. Jones is described by Gray as a man of "prevailing temperament" with "a fine authoritative rumble in his throat." Jones served as president of the (student) football association twice, in 1887 and 1891, and went on to become Minnesota's third faculty representative to the newly organized group that later became the Big Nine and eventually the Big Ten. It was Jones, according to Gray, who brought

Dr. Henry Williams to Minnesota, after a trip to Chicago to consult with Amos Alonzo Stagg (who had played with Williams at Yale and with whom Stagg had collaborated in writing a book entitled Treatise on Football). Williams himself, writing for the 1927 History of Minnesota Football, described Jones as one "whose name is found inseparable with the growth and development of Minnesota football." The name of Dean Jones appears repeatedly throughout the meeting minutes, documents, and newspaper articles for the period up to 1906, and he must be counted as one of the central figures in this story.

Intercollegiate athletic competition, in 1894, was over a decade old, although the competition was not "intercollegiate" until 1882, with the first two football games against Hamline. There are anonymous "recollections" in the Archives which allude to baseball games in 1878, one against "Ritchfield." Through the late 1870s and early 1880s, the campus sporting events were primarily interclass games, and there were a number of brief editorial comments in the Ariel bewailing the lack of organized competition. The first reported attempt at organization is October of 1880: "An Athletic Association has been formed with a constitution and Set of officers." These associations were formed annually on a sporadic basis "to foster athletic sports of all kinds, but especially football." Each time an association was formed, it was a student effort, and the principal activities were to sponsor a "field day" and to seek out competition with other colleges.

Even these early efforts included participation of the faculty. The 1882 football teams that played games against Hamline had no coach of record, but Professor Thomas Peebles, newly arrived in the fall of 1883, was prevailed upon by the players to help them prepare for a game. In 1880 the Athletic Association president and officers were students, as were they in 1882 and 1883. In March of 1884, however, Peebles was elected president. The Ariel, on April 23, 1885, reported that "Professor MacLean" (English language and literature) was elected president. In April of 1887 the Minneapolis Tribune commented on a recent meeting of the Athletic Association and referred to the president F.S. Jones (the same F.S. Jones described earlier). The Tribune, in October 1887, reported that Professor H. P. Judson (history, later President of the University of Chicago) had been elected president for the following year. In 1886, 1889, 1890, and beginning in 1892, the presidents were not faculty members; none of the other officers were ever faculty (there is no record for 1888). Until 1922, when the Athletic Association voted itself out of existence, the officers and a majority of the executive group were students.

An article in the Ariel on January 7, 1893, provides a hint about the problems which had plagued athletic endeavors. Apart from finances, which were recurring, there had apparently not been a general athletic association. Each sport seems to have had its own organization. It is not clear what the responsibilities or activities of the earlier associations were, but the most plausible guess is that they existed mostly to promote football. By winter and spring of

1893 there was agitation to create an umbrella association to manage all athletic endeavors.

On Saturday, April 15, 1893, a new constitution was adopted by the Athletic Association. The first three articles and the first four sections of Article IV, are lost; the Ariel printed the constitution beginning with "Art. IV. Sec. 5." That Section 5 introduced a concept which was to define the structure of athletic governance on the campus for the next 29 years; it was critically important that it survived.

Section 5 called for "an advisory committee consisting of one (student) representative from each department of the University and one from the general faculty" to be appointed by the president of the association. The 1893 constitution was the first time the faculty were given a formal role in the student organization administering athletics.

The 1893 document was replaced nine months later by a revised constitution and by-laws (which were printed in their entirety in the Ariel on January 20, 1894). An article in the Tribune on January 16, 1984, reported on the development of the new 1893 constitution; it was drafted by five people, none of whom were faculty (and all of whom were students, it is reasonable to infer). The author commented that the new Association could be expected to put athletics on a firmer basis by uniting all the sports (football, baseball, tennis, and track) and because of the addition of an advisory board. Article VI, Section 1 of the new 1894 constitution read as follows: "There shall be an advisory board of athletic control consisting of the president, vice-president, and secretary of this association [students] and two members of the faculty to be chosen by that body." A contemporary view of the advisory board is contained in the January 16 Tribune article:

It has long been thought that, inasmuch as the faculty were more or less held responsible for the acts of the student body, that they should be represented one way or the other. . . . This plan, it is believed, is a long step in advance, and while it leaves the practical control of affairs with the students, will give them the advice of the faculty and [on?] matters where mature deliberation is necessary.

The faculty constituted 40 percent of the voting members of the advisory board.

The authority of the advisory board (which became known as the Board of Control) was enormous. Besides being charged with "general supervision and control of the athletic interests of this institution" (Article VII, Section 1), it also had: responsibility for authorizing all expenditures of the association and auditing the accounts of the treasurer every three months (or more); power to suspend any manager of a sport; the duty to resolve all protests from participants in events; and the task of setting, holding, and managing an annual field day.

It is interesting to speculate about the actions of the faculty. On January 27, 1894, as noted previously, they apparently adopted a resolution creating an all-faculty athletic committee. But on or about January 18, the members of the Athletic Association adopted a constitution giving wide powers to a committee with two faculty and three students. On February 2 the students complained to President Northrop, and on the next day the faculty reversed itself. At that same February 3 faculty meeting they implicitly endorsed the new constitution because "Professors MacLean (George E., English Language and literature) and MacMillan were elected as the faculty members of the advisory committee on athletics." One can wonder if the faculty backed down, deciding that two of five seats of the advisory board were sufficient. One might also ask what prompted Professor Babcock to move to create a faculty committee in the first place. (A report 36 years later alleged that Babcock offered the resolution after the Athletic Association got into a quarrel with the Fortnightly Scientific Club over the use of a room. That, however, appears to be inaccurate, because the faculty meetings were usually at 4:00, and presumably was so on the twenty-seventh; the squabble did not occur until about 6:00 in the evening of the same day. The minutes of that meeting on January 27 do not suggest it was an impromptu late evening session called to deal with a crisis.) And one can also muse that perhaps the students conceded to the faculty resolution by giving two of the Five advisory Board of Control seats to them. Also of interest is the role President Northrop might have played in the change of heart exhibited by the faculty. (It was he who usually presided at the faculty meetings, and he did so the day after the students visited him.) Unless other sources can be discovered, it is unlikely we will know what motivated the participants in this early quarrel about who runs athletics.

If the faculty were satisfied with two of the five seats on the advisory council, they were shortly disappointed. In December, 1894, constitutional amendments were proposed which increased the number of student members from three to nine. There is no report on the outcome of the vote on the amendments. But as events will show, the proportion of faculty members on the Board of Control shrank in the next few years. Whether or not faculty control was reduced, however, is a different matter.

What is now the Big Ten Conference is generally considered to have been born on January 11, 1895. In response to a call from President James Smart of Purdue, the presidents of seven midwestern universities met in Chicago to formulate twelve "rules for the regulation of Athletics." The first rule adopted, and the only one that concerns us here, was this:

1. Each college and university which has not already done so shall appoint a committee on college athletics which shall take general supervision of all athletic matters in the respective college or university, and which shall have all responsibility of enforcing the college or university rules regarding athletics and all intercollegiate sports.

Although there is no mention of who should serve on the committee, Minnesota, at least, apparently concluded that it should be a faculty committee. On January 21 President Northrop reported to the faculty on the Chicago meeting. On February 4, 1895, slightly less than a year after the faculty voted to reverse itself on Professor Babcock's motion, an Advisory Committee on Athletics was appointed, consisting of five faculty members: MacLean, MacMillan, Jones, Woodbridge (F. J. E. Woodbridge, philosophy), and Appleby. Further, this committee acted as though it had authority, because the faculty, one week later, voted to suspend for one year the fifth of twelve rules that had been adopted by the presidents (that rule dealt with professionalism). On September 21, 1895, Professor MacLean resigned from the faculty committee and was replaced by Frederick Denton (mining). There is no note of the appointment of this committee in the Ariel, so it is unclear what impact it was expected to have on the Athletic Association and its Board of Control.

On January 18, 1896, the Ariel reported that Professor Conway MacMillan had written to the six other universities represented in Chicago the previous January to suggest a meeting of representatives of the athletic committees from each campus. All six responded affirmatively; the meeting was held on February 8, 1896 at the Palmer House. (The record of that meeting is entitled "Minutes of the First Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives--the formal name of the Big Ten Conference--and those minutes confirm the role that Professor MacMillan played, so one might reasonably conclude that it was Minnesota that actually caused the Big Ten to be created. Professor MacMillan was, therefore, Minnesota's first faculty representative, and is so considered by the Big Ten. MacMillan was also elected permanent chairman of the meeting. It was the only one he attended.) The meeting was devoted to a review of the twelve rules adopted by the Presidents in 1895 as well as "Rules for the Guidance of Athletic Committees" (appended to the "Minutes" of that 1896 meeting referred to previously). One of these rules expressly sought a faculty role in financial matters by stipulating that "all athletic association accounts shall be audited by committees of the respective universities upon which there is a faculty member of the athletic committee." Once again there is no statement about membership on the "athletic committee," but the faculty committee of five at Minnesota, fulfilling this requirement, was distinct from the Athletic Association Board of Control--although two of the five faculty also sat on the Board of Control and, now, one of them had to be involved in auditing. Because the Board of Control already had that responsibility, this rule represented no change for the University of Minnesota. On March 9, 1896, Professor MacMillan brought the amended rules to the general faculty, where they were approved without change. There was no comment from the Ariel.

The second meeting of the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives took place in Chicago on November 27, 1896. Professor Denton now represented Minnesota (and served as secretary to the meeting) and reported back to the faculty

on the rule changes. The faculty voted on December 5 to accept them. The Ariel, on December 12, reported on the Chicago meeting, the action of the faculty, and commended the rules as "admirably adapted to the correction of existing evils and it is to be hoped that they will be widely adopted."

On February 27, 1897, the faculty athletic committee was appointed by the (also faculty) committee on standing committees. It had shrunk to three members: Professors Denton, Woodbridge, and John Downey (mathematics, and later Dean College of Science, Literature, and the Arts). Why not Jones is unknown. Also in 1897, reported by the Ariel on December 17, the Athletic Association adopted a new Constitution. The duties and powers of the "Board of Athletic Control" remained largely the same, but the membership was significantly altered. Now there are seven students (the three elected officers--constitutionally required to be students--and four others chosen by Association members), the two faculty, and two alumni, chosen by the "board of directors of the athletic alumni association." The Board of Control also chooses the treasurer and may pay the appointee a stipend it deems appropriate. Previously the treasurer had been an elected officer of the association; now he is responsible to the Board of Control.

Two final events before the turn of the century of which there is a record bear comment. Early in 1897 eleven Presidents of state universities met in Madison, Wisconsin (including President Northrop). Although athletics was not the purpose of the meeting, the subject came up. They adopted a resolution that said that "Intercollegiate Athletics in general, and football in particular, should be subjected to more careful and constant supervision" and they appointed a committee of three of the presidents to draft rules to be recommended to the institutions represented. That committee reported on June 28, 1897. They submitted three recommendations, one concerning boards or committees having control of athletics, one concerning eligibility rules, and one concerning the rules under which certain games are played (that is, football). With respect to boards or committees, the three presidents commented as follows:

We believe that athletic affairs cannot be successfully managed by a board or committee made up exclusively of professors, or exclusively of students. Experience seems to have shown that a hearty spirit of wholesome cooperation . . . can hardly be secured without opportunity for the full and free interchange of opinion on the part of the various interests involved. While ultimate authority should, in our opinion, rest with the Faculty, there should be abundant opportunity for every athletic interest to be fully and freely heard and considered. . . . We recommend that there be constituted at each University 'The Athletic Board,' whose duty it shall be to administer and enforce the rules that may be adopted by the University for the government of

athletics.

They went on to suggest that team captains constitute the student representation, that alumni be represented where practicable, that the faculty membership equal the student and alumni together, and that the University President serve as ex officio non-voting chairman (except that he should vote in the case of a tie). They then asked all eleven schools represented in Madison to respond to five questions arising from their recommendations. The first question was "Will you, if you have not already done so, take action looking to administrative or faculty supervision of the make-up of athletic teams playing intercollegiate games?" This Committee report appears to be the first unequivocal call for "faculty control" of intercollegiate athletics. Somehow, President Northrop discussed the results of the committee's work with the faculty on May 22, a month before the date of their report. The faculty answered all five inquiries affirmatively (including administrative/faculty supervision) except that they would not apply the rules when having "practice" games against schools not bound by the same rules.

Because the question, as phrased, did not require an affirmative answer to the specific suggestion about Categories and numbers of members on "The Athletic Board," we cannot tell if the Minnesota faculty endorsed that concept.

There now existed two groups, the faculty committee on athletics (last reported, as noted, in February of 1897, to have three members) and the Board of Control of the Athletic Association, with an overwhelming student majority. The faculty committee seems to have dealt with rules and the Board of Control with mechanics and money, and it was from the faculty committee that Minnesota's representative at Conference meetings was drawn (although he also served on the Board of Control). While the situation, from this distance, appears muddled, in retrospect there was movement toward greater faculty control.

The second event worth brief note, in 1899, is that the Athletic Association rejected a constitutional amendment to increase the number of faculty on the Board of Control from two to three.

Unfortunately, the "Records of the Meetings of the General Faculty," in University Archives, stop at the end of the 1896-97 academic year. The available minutes of the Board of Control do not begin until 1900, so there is a period where information is scanty. We can determine this much:

1. Professor Woodbridge represented Minnesota at the third Conference meeting, in Chicago, in November, 1897. At that time the representatives agreed that there would be an annual meeting of the representatives during the Thanksgiving recess.
2. Professor F. S. Jones represented Minnesota at the fourth Conference meeting in November of 1898 (and continued to do so through the academic year 1905-06). At each of these meetings there was increasingly detailed discussion of the rules

governing eligibility for competition.

3. The Faculty Athletic Committee, by October 4, 1899, was down to two members (Jones and Woodbridge), the two faculty who also sat on the Board of Control.

In May of 1900, the Daily issued an apologia of sorts. It berated the students for having refused, the previous December, to add a third faculty member to the Board of Control "without reason or sense," and observed that "what the student members of the Board of Control did last fall and last spring, we don't believe amounted to anything at all--they were hardly ever at the meetings--and the brunt of the work was left on the shoulders of Professors Jones and Woodbridge." The reporter also noted that had it not been for the efforts of Jones, Denton, and Woodbridge in the Fall of 1899, President Northrop might have abolished athletics. The Daily lauded the support of the faculty at a time when students "refused absolutely to back up athletics."

As a general comment, it should be pointed out that the Board of Control had committees on "M"s, the Field, the Banquet, Auditing, etc., and was actively involved in reviewing and approving budgets, personnel, facility uses, and every other kind of decision. If the weekly minutes are an accurate reflection of the activity, the Board of Control was a management committee.

It was in November, 1900, that Professor H. S. White of Northwestern University, Chairman of the Conference, offered his resolution which provided: that each school authorize its representative to cast votes on measures and rules; that the committee on each campus reserves the right to reject any specific action of the representatives; that rejection by any one committee will cause the Conference to reconsider the matter at the next meeting; and that any campus committee rejecting the same measure twice will be suspended from Conference membership. This became known as the "White Resolution" procedure. Interesting, for these purposes, is that Professor White's resolution continued this language: "Resolved, that we recommend to the faculty committees on athletics here represented. . . ." (emphasis added). This is the first explicit assertion that the Conference meetings consist of representatives of the faculty.

It seems, however, that the Board of Control did play a role in the position Minnesota took at meetings of the Conference. At the February 16, 1901, meeting of the Board, it was "moved and carried that Professor Jones, as our representative, be instructed to uphold the conference organization of 9 colleges as it now exists" (emphasis added). One week later, with applications for membership pending from Notre Dame, Drake, and Nebraska, the Conference voted against expansion. There is no record of Professor Jones's vote, but the Board clearly felt it could direct the vote on Conference matters. What role the faculty committee might have played--if it existed--cannot be ascertained.

Foster, in his history, declares that "the Student Athletic Board [Board of Control] was at the zenith of its

reign in the early [1900's]. It had long since dropped its membership feature, with its \$1.00 fee, and had come to depend entirely on the spectator for its resources. It had also dropped its responsibility to the student body, except in a general way, and had centered its power and authority entirely in the Board."

On April 4, 1901, in a vote the significance of which was not apparent until later, the Regents "voted that Professor F. S. Jones be faculty supervisor of athletics and that the Board (of Regents) recommends that he be paid \$300 per annum out of funds of the athletic association." No other comment about this vote appears, and there is no record that Dean Jones ever received any money.

In a step toward a delegation of authority beyond that indicated by designating an "athletic supervisor," the Board of Control, in January 1902, voted to eliminate team managers and consolidate the responsibilities into a salaried position ("business manager") and chose Mr. M. J. Luby at a salary of \$1000. The Board also stipulated that he would "at all times be under the direction of the Athletic Board of Control and the advisement of the Athletic Director and his duties . . . shall be such as they may order and direct." This was one of the earliest steps toward institutionalization of management; a month later the Board voted to begin meeting only twice a month.

Dean F. S. Jones tried to resign from the Board of Control and as "faculty director" in February 1902; the Regents refused to accept.

The Board of Control got in a small wrangle in December of 1902 about reappointing Dr. Williams as football coach, but decided to do so and appointed a committee to negotiate a contract with him. (The business manager was reelected at the same salary.) The dispute was over a contract provision for a specific term as against an indefinite period. Dr. Williams apparently wished an indefinite period, and he sat through the Board discussion of his contract. The Minnesota Alumni Weekly (12/22/02) covered the subject, and made mention of several faults in the football coaching. The committee first recommended a five-year contract, after talking to Williams, but the Board did not act on it. Finally, on February 2, 1903, the Board voted for a three-year contract with Williams beginning September 1, 1903 as football and track coach. It was signed by the President and Secretary of the Board--both students.

On March 10, 1903, there is a note in the Daily about the appointment of a faculty committee on athletics and military affairs: Professor Jones, Professor Henry Eddy, (engineering, later Dean of the Graduate School) and Professor Frank Wesbrook (bacteriology, later Dean of the Medical School).

On December 9, 1903, the Board of Regents again refused to accept Dean Jones's attempt at resigning from the Board of Control. Members of the Board of Control and some of the coaches had sent a letter on December 7 to the President

urging him to reject the resignation and to persuade Jones to stay on.

On January 14, 1904, the Board of Control elected F. E. Reed as business manager--whose name, along with that of Dr. Williams, appeared on the new stationery of the Association.

The Daily reported, the next day, that "Dr. Williams wishes it stated that he does not wish to participate in university politics or use any influence in favor of any Candidates for election to the coming board. He believes such matters should be entirely in the hands of the students, and that if his name is used in connection with any candidate it is without authority and contrary to fact." Elections for the Board were held in late January.

Beginning in 1905, there was increasingly rapid movement to confirm and consolidate "faculty control" of athletics. While it appears that effective control was being wielded through the influence of Professors Jones and Wesbrook on the Board of Control, that informal arrangement was to shortly come to an end. Foster comments that Jones and Wesbrook were outstanding. "They were much beloved by both students and alumni and were deep in their confidence. This gave them a great deal of influence and all athletic problems sought and heeded their advice [sic]. Up to this time the benevolent and friendly attitude of faculty representatives toward athletics was one of the brightest spots in all of Minnesota's history." Then, foreshadowing his opinion of James Paige, Foster concluded that "their devotion to this cause was so outstanding that it magnified the nightmarish aspects of what was to follow a few years later." Foster, according to his athlete Julius Perlt, detested Paige violently.

On January 4, 1905, the Daily reported on the creation of a "Faculty Athletic Council," with representation from all colleges. The purpose of the group was said to have been to take action on new rules of the Big Nine Conference. The comment was also made that "this is the first time a body representing the faculties of all the colleges has been assembled and is regarded by many as a step toward a University senate." If true, the meetings of the general faculty must have ceased some time previously.

Perhaps one of the more significant steps in the history of the University, apart from its impact on athletics, was the adoption, by the Board of Regents, of a resolution May 31, 1905, creating a University Council. The membership consisted of the President, the Deans, one faculty representative from each college for each 400 students, and one representative from the General Alumni Association. Included in the five standing committees created by the resolution was a Committee on Athletics. (The creation and existence of this Council came as a surprise to the University Archivist, and there are no records on any of its activities.)

At this point in the review of the evolution of faculty involvement in athletics, things get all mixed up with the national outcry about violence in football. It was in October of 1905 that President Roosevelt intervened and threatened to abolish college football if it were not reformed. That din and hue led, at Minnesota, to a series of tumultuous events which signalled the end of student control of athletics.

Foster gives an overview of the situation at Minnesota, as he saw it.

The situation was bad not only at the National and Conference level; it was bad at the local level.

Every student member of the Board came to power after having made a lot of pledges in order to get himself elected. The people to whom these pledges were made hovered in the background waiting for their cut. Various ventures struggled for benefits. All members of the Board had to face election each year, and for that reason served only one or two years. It was exceedingly rare for a member to be popular enough to get elected before his junior year. By the time the boys learned what the score was, they were out of office and a bunch of green members were in their places. This made the Board more or less ineffective, and allowed wily and aggressive coaches and athletic managers to become too powerful. This was especially true if they were backed by influential and friendly alumni and had several members of their own team on the Board to help them pull the strings from the background. Everybody was promoting themselves for bigger and better things. Many college organizations and some commercial ventures exerted their influence on the course of events. It was much like national politics on a minute scale. As our system flourished there were soon tens of thousands of dollars in the Board's treasury. This large fund being totally under student control offered all kinds of temptation to graft and extravagance. There were a lot of bees buzzing around looking for their share of the honey.

Our faculty relations were poor because many of our brightest minds were not friendly toward athletics. They were backed in this by the religious and older element of the state, in whose scheme of things play had no part. In fact many of them thought it was sinful. Even the President of the University belonged to this group. . . . The screaming headlines [from Roosevelt's intervention] woke this element up and they gave athletics and especially football a very bad time.

The salary item for a football coach was a sore spot with many faculty men. They could not stand the idea of 40% more pay for about 10% of the time they put in.

In the Midwest, a meeting was held in Chicago on January 19, 1906, at the call of President Angell of Michigan. It was a meeting of the Big Nine, with Dean Jones representing Minnesota, to discuss football reform. Out of that meeting there came a number of proposals, the details of most of which are not germane here. One, however, led to a major eruption on this campus: That the football coach be a member of the faculty, appointed in the usual manner (i.e., on recommendation of the faculty and with regental approval) and paid a salary commensurate with that of other faculty. The Daily, on January 23, summarized the changes, noted that the Conference action was a recommendation to the faculties of the member universities, and said that at Minnesota the changes would "be placed before the students for discussion

before any action is taken." Events which followed showed this to be an inaccurate prediction.

On January 24, 1906 the Board of Control approved a new contract with Dr. Williams for three years, at \$3500 per year, beginning September 1 later that year. It contained a revocation clause: "If the Regents or the State legislature abolish the game [football] the contract shall be null and void."

John Gleason was elected President of the Board of Control in early February, 1906. Foster, who was one of his law school classmates, described Gleason as "a popular fellow and a good leader."

On February 6, 1906, the Daily reported that the University Council (not just the faculty committee on athletics) would consider the recommendations of the Big Nine and that President Angell would be notified immediately about the action of the Minnesota faculty. On February 9, the day before the Council was to meet, the Daily again carried a lengthy article, which included comments from Dean Jones to the effect that he favored the recommendations but preferred that the football coach be a professional.

Four days later, on February 13, 1906, the Daily reported that the University Council had approved the Conference recommendations, including the requirement that the football coach be a member of the faculty and appointed routinely. It continued, saying that "this came as a surprise not only to students but to football enthusiasts of the whole northwest, who had thought the local powers would fail to join in the extreme movement." The following day there appeared another article, accusing the faculty of merely following the lead of Wisconsin, Chicago, Iowa, Northwestern, and Illinois in approving the changes. The reporter made a number of sarcastic comments, including castigating the faculty for not having consulted the students.

It is necessary to back up four days, to the day before the Council met. On February 9, 1906, the Daily also contained an article noting what appears to be, in retrospect, the abrupt resignation of Dean Jones as faculty representative to the Big Nine and as a faculty member on the Board of Control. Gray, in his history, writes that:

Dean Jones, who had been for so long the benevolent honorary uncle of all athletes, returned from the [Angell, January 19] Chicago session to find that he had become an enemy in the eyes of the student group. He had, they thought, gotten himself undue authority in committing Minnesota to the new rules without consulting the board of control, on which students had had majority power. Wronged and unready to do battle with men who should have understood better, Jones resigned. (at p. 551.)

The acrimony or mistrust that Gray alleges existed are not reflected in the minutes of the Board of Control, on which

Jones continued to serve until the end of April.

Foster, however, reports that "when Dean Jones came to the next [Board of Control] meeting, following the January Angell Conference , he found himself in hot water. The Board questioned his having committed Minnesota to the changes made when no such authority was given him by the Board.

Jones did offer a defense to his support of the rules changes in a February 15 Daily article, an article which also contained another hot rebuke to the faculty. The author of a note to the paper declared that the faculty action was a "hysterical" reaction to the "frenzied wave of football reform," reflected a lack of nerve, and that "people are beginning to realize that the faculty won out over student sentiment by a masterful . . . campaign . . . cleverly planned and executed[;] after gaining the students confidence that nothing but sane and common-sense action would be taken regarding football reform, the astute faculty climbed on to the band wagon along with the rest of the Big Nine." The note continued with a description of events:

The students were completely off their guard and are just beginning to wake up. It is understood that many of the [faculty at the Council meeting] were very radical, being inspired by an overwhelming desire to reform the sport with a meat axe. The real friends of the game were outnumbered, and silenced or bamboozled. Dissatisfaction among the students is practically unanimous. . . . Something must be done.

The reporter writing the article interviewed Dean Jones about the apparent usurpation of the authority of the Board of Control. He said:

It was the only chance we had to save the game. If we had not shown a disposition to reform it here it would have been abolished. At the last meeting of the Regents a motion to abolish the game failed of passage by a vote of 5 to 4. All the other big nine colleges have adopted these resolutions. If Minnesota had stood out alone it would [have been] dropped from the big nine and then where would our football be?

The minutes of the Board of Regents for December 12, 1905 confirm Dean Jones' assertion. One could ask why these issues were not brought to the Board of Control sometime between the January meeting in Chicago and the February 10 meeting of the University Council, in order to at least solicit the views of the students. The minutes of the Board meetings for that period do not contain reference to any discussion. The Daily raised this very question on February 16. But although the students were upset, there was more to come to cause them additional dismay.

Following the February 15, 1906, Daily interview with Dean Jones there were a spate of articles addressing the issues. There was to be a "mass meeting" of the students to

protest the action of the faculty, but it was postponed indefinitely (due, one infers, from the apathy of the students). One reporter called for joint student-faculty representation in conferences. Another article observed that it was the faculty (University) council that took the action, not the general faculty, wondered how wisely that group could deal with athletics, and concluded -- whether accurately or not is not known -- that "Minnesota holds the unique position of having the subject of football reform settled without bringing the matter up either before the student body or the faculty proper."

After the individual members of the Conference acted on the recommendations of the first "Angell meeting," a second meeting was scheduled for March 9, 1906. The Board of Control met on March 6 and passed a motion that Dean Jones vote, contrary to the sentiment of the (faculty) University Council, for a training table, against retroactivity in certain rules changes, and for a longer football season (8 games instead of 5).

We do not know how Dean Jones voted. We do know that the views of the Board did not prevail. The Daily summarized the results of the meeting; all of the changes opposed by the Board were adopted. Eight days after the second Angell meeting in Chicago, the University Council met and approved the recommendations in their entirety, changes which Dr. Williams later described as "a wave of inter-collegiate athletic repression." But the Board of Control was overridden on more than the rules changes.

Recall that in January, 1906, the Board had approved a new contract with Dr. Williams for three years at \$3500 per year. At the same meeting the Council adopted the Big Nine rules changes, on March 17, they also chose to exercise the authority contained in the recommendation that coaches be faculty members appointed after peer review. The Council revoked the contract with Williams, reduced it to a one-year term, and cut the salary by \$1000. The Daily was outraged; the article is worth quoting:

Clothed with their newly adopted powers, the university council turned to the task of making clear the way of reformed football at Minnesota.

The council took no half way position, they had according to their own statements considered the matter thoroughly, they rescinded the contract that had been adopted.

And just what does this action mean--The question is not between the paid coach and the faculty. The council members have stated that the coach is highly esteemed. Perhaps he is. It makes little difference whether he is or not. The question is one that concerns the Athletic Board of Control and affecting them, it becomes a matter of concern to every Minnesota student.

The athletic board of control acting in good faith,

as the representatives of the student body, made a contract with the athletic coach. They have not seen fit to rescind or change this contract.

The question is not shall the coach's salary be \$5000 or \$500, but it is whether the Athletic Board of Control or the Faculty Council shall be the power to decide. The students of Minnesota elected men from among their number to act for them and decide matters pertaining to the athletic affairs of the students of the university.

We question the right and the power of the Faculty Council to say just what that action be--

The issue, interestingly, did not come before the Board of Control, which met on March 20, 1906, three days after the University Council. The only action of note was that the Board members voted to pay Dean Jones's expenses for the trip to Chicago (as they had done in January as well), expressed their thanks for his efforts on their behalf at the Chicago meeting, and also expressed their thanks for his service and contributions to the Board. Dean Jones first appeared in the records of University athletics on March 6, 1887; he exited on April 24, 1906. (And he left the University in 1909 to become Dean at Yale.)

The faculty were not done. On March 21 the Daily revealed that the faculty athletic committee had recommended to the University Council sweeping changes in its own charge. The Council accepted the proposals; they are worth reprinting in their entirety because they are the genesis of the language in the current by-laws of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

The committee on athletics presents the following recommendations to the University Council:

- (1) That the Committee on Athletics be increased to five members.
- (2) That two of the five members shall be elected by the Committee to serve on the Board of Control of the Athletic Association.
- (3) That the Committee shall elect a subcommittee of two members to be known as the Ticket Committee. They shall have charge of all tickets and other sources of income and shall file with the Treasurer a complete ticket report, for each game, showing tickets issued, tickets sold, complimentary tickets, and unsold tickets, together with a statement of the actual cash received. The chairman of this subcommittee shall be one of the two faculty members of the Board of Control.
- (4) That the Committee shall elect a subcommittee of two members to be known as the Auditing Committee. They shall have general

supervision of all expenditures and no athletic bills shall be paid unless approved by this sub-committee. The chairman of this sub-committee shall be the second faculty of the Board of Control.

- (5) That the Athletic Committee of five shall constitute the eligibility Committee and shall decide upon all questions of students' eligibility to participate in athletic sports.
- (6) That all proposed expenditures after being recommended by the Board of Control shall be submitted for approval to the Athletic Committee and no expenditures shall be made and no debts shall be incurred without such approval.
- (7) That the Athletic Committee shall have supervision of Northrup Field, the grand stands and seats thereon. They shall satisfy themselves of the safety of all stands before allowing them to be used.
- (8) That the methods of administering in detail the business of the Athletic Association shall be subject to the approval of the Athletic Committee; that this committee is given the entire control of University athletics subject to the constant revision and ratification of the University Council.

This resolution was forwarded to the Board of Regents which approved it on May 3, 1906. Dean Jones, interviewed March 20 and quoted March 21 in the Daily, said that the resolution would not change the situation, and said (as quoted by the reporter):

For the past seven years, I have had authority from the regents to veto any action of the Board of Control any time I thought it right and proper to do so. But I have never found it necessary to use this power and I don't anticipate that the new committee, of which thank goodness, I am not a member, will ever have to use its powers. The vetoing of Dr. Williams' contract was done by the Council as a whole and not by the [faculty athletic] committee.

Dean Jones is apparently referring to the 1901 action of the Board of Regents making him "faculty supervisor of athletics," although the grant of a veto power was not made explicit in minutes or documents now extant.

The tumult on the campus continued. The Daily continued to carry a series of articles, using terms that were inflammatory and apocalyptic, inveighing against the right of the faculty to interfere with the actions of the Board of

Control. The President of the Athletic Association, John Gleason, called a special meeting of the Association. The meeting took place in late March, 1906, and was billed as a debate over student versus faculty control of athletics. The morning of the day before the meeting, "in chapel," President Northrop talked to the students. One infers, from the Daily account, that he attempted to be conciliatory and indicated he was still open to arguments on the questions.

The outcome of the frenzy was anticlimactic. The Association passed a resolution that was mild in tone: 1) The faculty should not have acted without consulting the Association; 2) the University Council should respect the Association constitution until it is revised; 3) the Association President is to appoint a committee to propose amendments to make the Board of Control more responsible to the entire Athletic Association (and have them ready in one month); 4) the Board is to contact other western universities about establishing a league for the supervision of athletics (presumably by students, although neither the resolution nor the meeting minutes say so); and 5) the Association goes on record endorsing the new Big Nine rules except the ones the Board of Control had asked Dean Jones to oppose and except the one calling for increased faculty control. The committee to formulate amendments was also directed to consult with the University Council on matters regarding athletics.

The committee drew up amendments which were duly approved. They were also largely insignificant, having to do with full Association meetings, publicizing of expenses, and requiring no employment contract longer than two years, or in excess of \$500 per season without one week notice.

It is difficult not to conclude that the faculty were rapidly taking control and that student control was receding in the face of the faculty onslaught. While there remained one last struggle, the only group that could speak with final authority, the Regents, had made it clear that that faculty were to hold the reins of power. The Fourteenth Biennial Report of the Board of Regents, for 1905-1906, summarized the events arising from the violence in football:

The steps subsequently taken by the [University] Council and approved by the Board of Regents, were intended to reform but not to destroy football. . . . The University Council is now the ultimate authority directing and controlling athletics as the Court of Appeal--though the general direction is still in the hands of the students. The Council, in taking into its own hands the ultimate authority in athletics, does not intend to interfere with the freedom of the students so long as that freedom is not used to the detriment of the University.

As a final comment on this period, it should be noted that on November 30, 1907, the representatives to the Conference unanimously adopted a resolution which still stands as the fundamental law of the Big Ten: "Resolved, That it is the sense of this body that membership can not be

retained in this Conference by an institution which does not have full and complete faculty control of athletics." That language, slightly rearranged, remains in the handbook of the Big Ten Conference.

Beginning with the Board of Control meeting on May 1, 1906, the two faculty members serving on it were James Paige and William Brooke (mathematics). Apparently Professor Wesbrook resigned with Dean Jones. Foster's analysis of the evolution of control over athletics at this time is the same as the one offered here. "The faculty moved in on the situation and Professor James Paige of the Law School became all powerful as Faculty Chairman in the new set up."

Again, it is necessary to halt in order to look at a faculty member who played a commanding role in Minnesota athletics. Following the resignation (from athletics) of Dean Jones, it was necessary to choose a new faculty representative. Professor James Paige of the Law School assumed the role; according to a 1934 University News Service review of Paige's career, he was appointed by President Northrop to the Board of Control and as faculty representative. Paige served as faculty representative until his retirement in 1934. He also served as chairman of the University Council Committee on Athletics, as well as the Successor Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, until 1922. Gray has only one sentence describing Paige, and it is in his somewhat purple prose that he describes Paige. Recounting the upheavals that led to Dean Jones's decision to quit, Gray says:

In the midst of the drama [over control of athletics] stood the chairman of the faculty committee, James Paige, a man so inflexibly dedicated to what he considered to be right that his mind became a gladiatorial arena in which virtue had constantly to be defended against the assault of savages. There was little opportunity in such fierce engagements for the exercise of tact and many men of the physical education department felt themselves to have been injured by Paige's surveillance of the most minute of their activities. There can be no question but that the university was fortunate to find in so critical a moment a faculty guide for athletics whose conscience could neither be stretched nor shrunk.

Gray goes on to describe the contretemps with John Gleason, the details of which will follow shortly.

The 1934 News Service summary quoted Paige about his views on athletics; his comments lend some credibility to Gray's observation. Paige said, apparently to the News Service writer, that "athletics could be ideal, perfect, beautiful. It seems a shame that they should attract so many evils to themselves. They seem to have that capacity, however, so there must be constant, close supervision."

The Senate's eulogy for Paige, on October 17, 1940, adds more to the picture. He is described as representing "a

stern insistence upon high standards both in the classroom and on the athletic field." Further,

"he exemplified the strong sense of duty which he sought to inculcate in his students and applied rigorously to himself the standards which he insisted the students must meet. It was no objection in his mind that faithful discharge of a duty might involve unpopularity. Although repeatedly, in his work connected with athletics, he faced adverse student and alumni opinion and newspaper attack, it was sufficient for him to know what the right was and he held to it. It was his good fortune to live to win general approval of what he had done in the face of opposition."

Also noted in the eulogy, and echoed in the memorial resolution of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, was Paige's skillful and faithful management of business affairs. He shepherded athletic funds for many years, and it is he who is credited with prompt action in purchasing the land upon which the new stadium could be built (Memorial Stadium).

Although Paige died in 1940, there remained, when this was written, at least two people who knew and remembered him. One was Maynard Pirsig, both student as well as faculty colleague of Paige; another was Robert McClure, one of his students in the late 1930s when Paige was officially retired but still teaching. Their comments about Paige, when interviewed in April, 1983, were strikingly similar. Both described him as a man of high moral and ethical standards, stern and gruff in his appearance and demeanor, and absolutely rigid in his expectations about adhering to those high standards. But both also said he had a soft side; McClure said he was a "softie" if you had a sob story--but if you didn't, Paige was unbending. Both, upon being read Gray's description of Paige, laughed and said that was too strong. We do not know from whom Gray, writing in 1951, drew his impressions of Paige, and Pirsig and McClure are recalling a man who was elderly when they knew him (Paige was born in 1863 so he retired at 70 or 71 in 1934), but there is nonetheless a hint at the character of the man who served as Minnesota's faculty representative for nearly 30 years. About him little more can be said, because there are no "Paige papers" available at the University.

Foster wasn't sure why Paige was chosen. "We down in the ranks could only surmise why this particular selection was made. It could have been a routine choice of someone from the Law School, or it could have been that the boys at the top expected that a lawyer would be needed before the job was done. . . . At any rate Professor Paige was given the job, and Athletics and Athletic Personnel at the University were in for the wildest and most unnecessary roughing up that ever happened to a University department."

In Foster's opinion, "the first to feel [Paige's] wrath was John Gleason." Gleason, in being elected President of the Board of Control, "made certain pledges . . . and fought to carry them out after the faculty decided to take over." Gleason's stand set the stage for the dispute that followed.

In reading the minutes of the Board of Control for the period after Paige joined it, one can infer that the meetings were often heated. There was continued squabbling over Dr. Williams's contract; it was finally approved in October, 1906. At the same meetings, a resolution was adopted instructing one of the faculty members to protest the action of the University Council on the Williams contract and Board of Control President Gleason was requested to accompany the faculty member to the meeting (there is no record of what occurred). In November 1906 Gleason asked Professors Paige and Brooke to resign as committee chairs; he appointed two others as chairmen of the auditing and ticket committees. They must have resolved the disagreement, because Paige and Brooke continued to attend meetings and report.

On January 9, 1907, there were four recorded split votes on a variety of issues; these split votes were becoming increasingly common in the minutes at the Board of Control. The following week the Board adopted a motion condemning the University Council (or its Committee on Athletics, chaired by Paige; the minutes are not clear) for disregarding the wishes of the Board and putting the University in a bad light. The vote was 2 ayes and 5 abstentions (including the two faculty members). Twelve days later the full Athletic Association considered four different motions addressing the hostility between students and faculty on the control of athletics. Jones and Wesbrook reappeared on the scene to speak on behalf of the faculty; the two more moderate of the four resolutions were adopted. At its April 12, 1907, meeting the Board consented to the two faculty as chairmen of the auditing and ticket committees. (Interestingly, Paige carried the wishes of the students on one issue to the Conference. At the June, 1907, Conference meeting, he moved that the football season be seven games, not five. Presumably he consulted with the University Council beforehand; the motion lost on a 6-3 vote at the Conference.) From that point until the end of the 1906-07 academic year, the meetings seem to have been relatively calm and business was conducted normally. The Daily articles for January and February of 1907, however, are replete with reports of Gleason's challenges to the faculty

on the Board.

According to Foster, it was only shortly before "the battle narrowed to the Chairman of the Student Board and the chairman of the [Council] Committee on Athletics." He also reported that "there was not too much enthusiasm either way in the general student body. . . . There was considerable feeling in the law school, but it was the usual hatred of the Faculty Chairman that prompted it rather than loyalty to the student cause."

Before proceeding to review the events surrounding Mr. Gleason's departure from the University, it is worth reviewing the controversy as viewed through the eyes of the two chief protagonists, Gleason and Paige. Both were repeatedly quoted at great length in early 1907, and it is this period that marks the high-water mark of student attempts to retain control of athletics.

It was Gleason's view that the constitution of the Association had been arbitrarily discarded by the intervention of the faculty. Until it was amended, Gleason maintained, he could not both uphold the constitution and submit to the faculty committee. He argued that he was not "questioning the legitimate exercise of faculty supervision in educational matters" but was, instead, calling into question "their assumed authority in a matter which, though lying quite within their field of interest . . . is quite outside their jurisdiction as arbiters." He claimed that "the faculty as a body is neither possessed of the right to exercise, nor fitted for control of athletics at Minnesota." As for the Association, he averred that the Board of Control is "the business agent . . . for the management of its local athletic interests, . . . the instrument . . . for expression and realization of its wishes anent intercollegiate relations, . . . [and] the functions of the Board are confined to [these], unless they are interfered with; in which case, if the interference is unwarranted, the Board must adopt defensive and protective tactics." He concluded, in his campaign platform for reelection as president for 1907-08, that he did

not concede the right of anyone not authorized by the constitution . . . to interfere with the Board's activities, but should forcible interference by the faculty or by the president be justifiable and necessary, no one [would be] readier to invite such interference than I. But should such interference take the form of surveillance of purely business matters, the violation of contracts, or legal contracts, or legislation of such a character as to prohibit the participation in athletics of bona fide students, . . . such interference ought to be resented, and . . . I have resented interference of character during the past year.

Paige, on the other hand, said that Minnesota gives more control to students than any other Big Nine university, with its bifurcated system whereby the faculty, through the

faculty committee and the University Council, have only a supervisory veto. The growth of athletics, moreover, made pure student control unacceptable.

In its infancy it might possibly have been regarded as a pastime and presented few problems to the executive heads as involving questions of general university welfare. Athletics are now . . . a department of university work and life, closely connected with all other university activities and presenting complex problems, the solution of which affects the scholarship of the university, its relation to sister universities and to the general public.

He went on to note the large amounts of money now being handled by the Board (over \$50,000 per year) and noted that every dollar must be used wisely--something that had not always been the case in the past. Further, the University is responsible, in the eyes of the public, the parents, and the students for "honest, sane, and pure athletics; . . . the Regents, the President, [and the University Council] cannot be expected to meet the responsibility unless they have sufficient control." Finally, to eliminate faculty control would have required that Minnesota withdraw from the Big Nine, leaving no group available for athletic competition. Paige commented that "confidence should be reposed in the student body [;] when they know the facts they act wisely and intelligently." His view can be summarized by his observation that "the present unnecessary discussion is the result of the agitation of two members [of the Board]."

Gleason ran for reelection and won. But a Daily analysis said the victory was personal, and that the other students elected were not opposed to faculty supervision. Then, following the stable next few months, the Regents refused Gleason readmission to the University, after receiving notice from the law school, according to the Daily, that he had "failed to keep up his classwork." The Regents adopted a resolution in June, 1907, apparently gave Gleason no hearing, and refused to permit him to register for the 1907-08 academic year. The Daily hints strongly, although adduces no evidence, that Gleason was dismissed because he kept clashing with the faculty over control of athletics and that Paige, on the law faculty, had something to do with the dismissal. Gleason sued the University. The case dragged on through the 1907-08 academic year--Gleason was not enrolled--and on September 22, 1908, he won. The Minnesota Supreme Court ruled he could not be dismissed without a hearing--but by that time Gleason had decided not to attend the University. He had attended several meetings of the Board in early fall, 1907, according to the Daily, but the minutes do not record him as present. They do, however, record at one meeting that:

Prof. Paige asked Mr. Gleason as follows: 'Mr. Gleason, as a gentleman I ask you in the name of the Board of Regents to quietly retire from acting.' Paige moved that Mr. Gleason be declared not a member of the Board of Control. Not acted on

--no quorum.

And there ended, as best we can now tell, the last attempt to resist "full and complete faculty control."

It was Foster's opinion that "from the start Gleason fought a losing battle." When even Gleason perhaps realized that, "he tried to rally the students behind him at mass meetings and finally challenged the Faculty Chairman to a debate and later challenged him again, but the faculty had moved in and that was that." Foster concluded that "everyone knew that it was a lost cause and cared little until the Faculty Chairman and the University Authorities proceeded against Gleason personally and not only made a martyr of him but made themselves look bad in court."

It is disappointing to have a legitimately interesting disagreement on a fundamental issue end on such a sour note because of the apparent clash of two strong individuals, but the outcome was probably inevitable. Whether it was Paige and Gleason or a group of faculty and students who were the best of friends, it is unlikely that Minnesota could have resisted the move to firm faculty control sparked by the problems in football. The universities felt compelled to intervene in the governance of sport in order to prevent the situation from becoming more scandalous than it was. The students had not shown an ability to act. But even had the violence disappeared, institutional control would have come, because athletics was simply getting too big, and attracting too much attention, for the authorities not to want to intervene.

Foster agrees. He related his own view.

It is regretable that the University did not have better guidance in this struggle. The taking over of Athletics was laudable and necessary. It was accomplished with little trouble. I was in Gleason's class and was conversant with everything that went on. I attended all the mass meetings but like the rest of the students did not take part in them. There was no thought of insubordination anywhere in the situation in so far as I knew. We did hate the Faculty Chairman but that had already become a law school tradition when this scrap came up. It is probable that the Regents did not know of this and thought that it was a part of the present ruckus. It is true that the individual members of the Student Board tried to hang on to the prestige and power that their position gave them, but their following was personal and small. If any coach or member of our Department took any part in this fight I never knew or heard of it. . . . These men were not in a position to put up any kind of behind the scenes fight. They were appointed to their positions from year to year. If they failed to get that appointment they were automatically out of the picture. I believe that everybody concerned, including the Regents, the Faculty Chairman and the Student Chairman knew that the proponents of student control had espoused a lost cause.

The rest of this history is, in a way, a chronicle of the decline of faculty control. Precisely because the enterprise was growing so large, no faculty committee--or any other committee, for that matter--could devote the time and attention required for the detailed administration of the program. Even the minutes of the Board of Control reflect increasing professionalization, as evidenced by the hiring of a business manager and more and more frequent entries noting that "Mr. Reed is authorized to . . ." or "Dr. Williams is authorized to . . ." The gradual withdrawal from administrative duties, however, took place over many years. In 1908, the Board of Control was still a management committee.

The years following the Gleason-Paige dispute were uneventful. The Board of Control conducted the routine affairs of athletics under, one gathers, the watchful but not active supervision of the Committee on Athletics of the University Council. The minutes of the Board of Control meetings reflect no controversy. (There are no records for 1910-11, 1911-12, and 1912-13.)

In 1912 the University Senate was born, and with it the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (hereinafter SCIA). That committee still exists, known as the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics following the reorganization of the Senate in 1969. By-law I of the Senate, adopted at its second meeting on January 29, 1913, reads as follows:

Athletics -- There shall be two standing committees on physical activities, (a) committee on intra-mural sports and physical education, (b) committee on inter-collegiate athletics.

(a) The Committee on Intra-mural Sports and Physical Education shall be composed of seven members, five recommended by the president from the Faculty, and the heads of the department of physical education for men and for women. It shall have supervision of the gymnasium and the athletic grounds of the University including Northrop Field, except so far as and at such times as these grounds and this field may be used for inter-collegiate athletics. It shall have the supervision of intra-mural sports and physical education for men and women. It shall have no jurisdiction over inter-collegiate athletics.

(b) The Committee on Inter-collegiate Athletics shall be composed of nine members, five faculty members to be recommended by the President of the University, two alumni members to be recommended by the athletic committee of the Alumni Association, and two student members to be recommended by the student members of the Athletic Board of Control.

This committee shall appoint one of its faculty members to have supervision of tickets. He shall

be responsible for all tickets and other sources of income and shall see that the tickets committee of the Athletic Board of Control files with the treasurer a complete ticket report for each game, showing tickets issued, tickets sold, complimentary tickets and unused tickets, together with a statement of the actual cash received. The member so appointed shall become one of the two faculty members of the Athletic Board of Control and serve as chairman of the ticket committee of said board.

This committee shall also appoint one of its faculty members to have supervision of auditing. He shall have general supervision of all expenditures, and no bills shall be paid or debts incurred unless approved by him. The member so appointed shall become the second faculty member of the Athletic Board of Control, and serve as chairman of the auditing committee of said board.

This Committee on Inter-collegiate Athletics shall constitute the eligibility committee, and shall decide upon all questions of students' eligibility to participate in inter-collegiate sports. It shall have supervision of Northrop Field and the grandstands and the seats thereon, in so far and at such times as it may be used for inter-collegiate athletics. The committee shall satisfy itself of the safety of all stands before allowing them to be used.

The method of administering in detail the business of the Athletic Association shall be subject to the approval of this committee; this committee is given entire control of inter-collegiate athletics, subject to the constant revision and ratification of the University Senate.

The five members chosen from the Faculty at large to serve on these two committees, (a) and (b), shall be the same persons.

The chairman of the Senate Committee was James Paige. He also continued serving as chairman of the ticket committee of the Board of Control. The Board, it is to be noted, was explicitly recognized and implicitly granted wide authority by the bylaw.

From 1913-14 to April 19, 1922, there are no minutes or records for SCIA. Those that do exist, for that period, are for the Board of Control. What the Committee did can only be inferred from the actions of other groups (the Big Nine and the Board of Control) and its own reports to the Senate. It must be realized, too, that there was significant overlap in membership between SCIA and the Board. Only once in the Board minutes for these nine years is there any reference to SCIA, and that was an occasion upon which Professor Paige explained the overlapping jurisdiction of SCIA, the Committee on Intramurals, and the Board of Control over the use of Northrop Field (the football field). The Board continued to

approve budgets, sign contracts with employees, grant "M"s, review traveling squads in the sports, manage facilities, and so forth--all with the apparent blessing of SCIA. That the relationship between faculty and students is at least cooperative, if not warm, is perhaps indicated by a February 17, 1915, entry in the Board of Control minutes that Professor Paige "expressed gratitude to and confidence in the student members of the Board."

The relationship between SCIA--Paige--and the athletic program, however, was perhaps less cordial. Recognizing that Foster hated Paige, it is nonetheless worth reciting a few bits from his manuscript in order to convey at least the flavor of one point of view.

In spite of the basic principle of American jurisprudence that one is innocent until proved guilty, this professor of law had a fixed obsession to the contrary. He labored under the perpetual delusion that the other fellow, no matter who, was always prompted by some ulterior motive and as a result all of us from the ground keepers to the head coaches were treated with arrogance and unreasonableness. The routine was the same in all cases. A situation or an issue came up and a formula was proposed by the party concerned for handling it. The Faculty Chairman issued a cease and desist order and instead of trying the issue on its merits he shifted the attack to the proponent in person. He was eternally belaboring somebody over an assumed wrong. Poor old Mrs. Felton, the secretary in the Athletic Manager's office, spent half her time crying because of the unreasonable and overbearing treatment that she was subjected to. Why she ever stayed on the job as long as she did I will never know.

During my whole stay at the University the Doctor [Cooke] and I found ourselves every now and then confronted with a problem that we had to try to handle. To do so never failed to bring us into violent head on contact with the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Athletics with his recriminations and charges of crooked dealings and dishonesty.

Julius Perlt, a gymnast under Foster and later on the staff, also knew Paige but did not share Foster's opinion of him. But Perlt did say that Paige was "very autocratic and dictatorial about athletics at Minnesota. . . . He was very jealous of his power to control what happened athletically."

Most of the reports of SCIA to the Senate during the period concern rules changes promulgated by the Conference (and, conversely, such matters do not appear in the discussions of the Board), eligibility matters, and the disruption caused by World War I. The Senate did vote to support SCIA, in 1919, in disapproving a three-year contract with Dr. Williams that had been approved by the Board. The Board then revised the contract to satisfy SCIA. Apart from that disagreement, the two groups seem to have worked together harmoniously.

CHAPTER 2

CREATING AN ATHLETIC DIRECTOR: 1921-22

Lotus Delta Coffman was offered the presidency of the University in March of 1920. His inauguration took place in May of 1921. He was confronted with difficulties in athletics before he was formally installed in office. As was usually the case, football provoked the storm, but it soon led to an intense examination of the governance of athletics on the campus.

It started rather innocently. The Minnesota Alumni Weekly ran an editorial on January 20, 1921, questioning whether or not Minnesota was "treating her athletes fairly." The Board of Directors of the General Alumni Association had discussed the issue recently, and the Weekly editorial reported that the faculty who had been present at the meeting said that athletes were held to higher academic standards than non-athletes. The editorial writer also criticized the eligibility committee (of SCIA, presumably) for degrading investigations and the enforcement of a ridiculous standard of professionalism. "Our committee on eligibility is one of those scrupulously honest bodies that believe in enforcing the letter of the law. And it enforces that law a trifle too often and a trifle too well for its own popularity or that of its canny chairman, Professor 'Jimmie' Paige." While supporting the efforts of the committee, the editorial called for scrapping the current Big Ten rules on amateur status. Football coach Henry Williams was also interviewed, but he expressed support for the rules and for high academic standards.

The Weekly editorial prompted John B. Johnston, Dean of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, to write to Coffman on January 25, 1921, saying faculty should not make such statements without furnishing proof. He pointed out that to give the alumni the impression that the faculty discriminate against football players will only arouse hostility toward the faculty and could create pressure to lower academic standards. Johnston also disputed the statement itself, telling Coffman that he "always made great allowance in favor of the football man and . . . have always thought that that was the attitude generally throughout the faculty."

While there was no mention of the won-lost record of the football team for the 1920 season, it had been disappointing. Minnesota fans were used to winning teams; the record, since the arrival of Dr. Williams in 1900, had been outstanding.

	<u>W</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>Tied</u>		<u>W</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>Tied</u>
1900	10	0	0	1910	6	1	0
1901	9	1	0	1911	6	0	1
1902	9	2	0	1912	4	3	0
1903	13	1	0	1913	5	2	0
1904	13	0	0	1914	6	1	0
1905	10	1	0	1915	6	0	1
1906	4	1	0*	1916	6	1	0
1907	2	2	1	1917	4	1	0
1908	3	2	1	1918	5	2	1
1909	6	1	0	1919	4	2	1

*Reduction in number of games reflects decision arising from Angell meetings.

In 1920 the record was 1-6-0 and the team won no Conference games.

The same day that Johnston wrote to Coffman, January 25, 1921, there appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune an article titled "Senators to Hear of Financial Side of Athletic Policy at 'U'" and subtitled "Legislators Given 'Inside Facts' on Poor Showing of Gopher Football Team." The article reported that some members of the Senate Finance Committee intended to interrogate University representatives on the business affairs of athletics when they appeared to defend the University request. The legislators apparently believed that athletic funds had been invested at four percent but then the department had subsequently borrowed money at six percent to buy football equipment. This allegedly led to frugality, which in turn caused inconveniences to which opposing teams were not subject.

Paige wrote to Coffman the day the article appeared, for it was he who was responsible for athletic finances. Paige explained the investment practices, said they would not lose money, and noted that the Board of Control acted with the advice of Regents' President Fred B. Snyder. He also dismissed the other charge: "So far as the statement that our financial acts affected the equipment provided for our athletes and their comforts, that is ridiculous. Our athletes have the best equipment that can be bought." Paige concluded by suggesting that:

the psychology of all the present agitations is due to two facts: There is a terrible derth [sic] of material just now for the mind of a sporting editor, [and] second, we did not have a winning team last fall, and Minnesota people are very poor sports; they are not good losers.

The Minneapolis Tribune and the Minneapolis Journal both carried articles the next day, January 26, 1921, reporting on the circulation of a petition among students calling on the Senate Finance Committee to request President Coffman to

remove James Paige and E. P. Harding as the faculty representatives on the Board of Control. The Journal article cited recent editorials in "student and alumni publications urging a general house cleaning" and reported that "students are asking why Minnesota has not won a conference football championship since 1911." It also quoted at length from "a prominent" but unnamed alumnus, who pointed to friction between athletes and the faculty who direct athletics and the fact that at Minnesota, year after year, athletes leave school "from sheer indifference, . . . merely because of a lack of interest in the welfare of a team." The Journal also said that alumni who had volunteered to act as scouts in football were "so disgusted with the parsimonious supervision of their expense accounts and the delays in recompensing the accounts that they have said that they would never again undertake the task." The unnecessary economy remained an issue.

The Tribune article gave more prominence to the alumni role. The students, it said, understood "that influential members of the Alumni association were behind them" and that alumni were "outspoken in their recommendations for a change in faculty administration of athletics." The Tribune also reported that while the football players were divided on the question of whether or not they suffered from classroom discrimination, they agreed on the poor relationship between the athletes and faculty supervisors.

The Journal also printed a copy of the petition addressed to the Senate Finance Committee, which began

Whereas for the past two or three years the University of Minnesota has been unable to uphold its past standards in athletics, particularly football; Whereas it is felt by a large majority of students and alumni that the reason for this condition can be traced directly to the poor management and lack of cooperation on the part of the athletic board of control.

The petition then recited failure to provide funds for adequate equipment, scouting, assistant coaches, travel accommodations, and unwarrantedly high scholarship standards. The petition closed with "we, undersigned students and alumni of the University of Minnesota" etc. (emphasis added).

Articles appeared in the Daily over the next two days, January 28-29, 1921, addressing football and governance. Coach Williams again disputed the charge of academic discrimination and was quoted as saying that athletics were "on a sound, healthy basis." Williams had written to the Daily on January 28, 1921, which published his full 14-paragraph letter; he reminded students and alumni of the proper role of athletics in a University, defended the current status of athletics at Minnesota, and concluded by declaring that

the enthusiastic athletic supporters on their side must realize the necessity on the part of the

president and faculty to maintain a high standard of scholarship and require that men on college athletic teams keep up to this standard, and not disturb the cooperative spirit between students and faculty by unjust suspicions and unfounded charges. No good can come of ill-considered agitation along these lines and much harm can result.

The Daily, in the same article, also reported on an upcoming meeting between some students and the alumni committee on athletics, the goal of which was to review the entire situation.

The following day, January 29, 1921, a Daily editorial rebuked the students who had started the petition addressed to the legislature, calling it unethical not to have gone first to President Coffman. The Daily also rebutted most of the substance of the petition and joined Coach Williams in calling for a halt to spreading vague rumors. The 1920 football captain wrote the same day also disputing the contentions of the petition and praising Paige.

In a brief article on January 30, 1921, the Tribune reported that those who had circulated the petition decided to withhold it pending the outcome of the meeting between students and alumni, scheduled for two days later.

On February 1, 1921, the editor of the Weekly, Vincent Johnson, wrote to Coffman about the January 20 editorial. He relayed his surprise when he had been told, at an earlier meeting, that Coffman "attributed the agitation to [the] editorial," and said that he had since investigated the matter. Johnson went on to relate:

1. That the petition was part of a plan by certain legislators to lend plausibility to their wish to investigate the athletic board of control;
2. That the legislators instigated the petition; and
3. That the non-students involved were either not alumni at all or alumni not involved with the alumni association.

He apologized for "the difficulty that your office has been put to by the circulation of these charges" but also then commented:

Personally, I have talked with a large number of students and alumni, and find that their sentiment is almost unanimous in favor of a change of faculty members on the board of control. The hostility in certain influential quarters is so marked that its continuance cannot but be of possible detriment to the standing of the University. The idea is already surprisingly current among high school athletes that the University of Minnesota is a bad place to attend. Resist the idea as we may, there is no escaping the fact that the maintenance of a

school's athletic prowess has much to do with the interest and loyalty of its alumni body. I am not sure, therefore, that another postponement of definite action in the present situation may not have very serious effects.

On the same Tuesday that Johnson wrote to Coffman, students and alumni met in the Union. The Daily reported that there were a dozen people present and that it--the Daily--had been chosen to convey the sentiments of the group. The students were apparently campus leaders and not those who had led the petition drive, and included the president of the Board of Control. The alumni included J. F. Hayden, who served on both SCIA and the Board, and E. B. Pierce, who was Secretary of the Alumni Association. They offered no formal statement; the Daily, on Wednesday, February 2, 1921, made the following comments.

The petition which was circulated on the campus and around which the agitation rallied does not represent student opinion. In the first place it proceeds over the heads of the administration without reason or justification. The matter is one that can be settled on the campus and should be settled on the campus in fairness to the student body, the faculty, the administration and the people of the state.

Secondly, the charges of mismanagement, discrimination and opposition to the interests of athletics made against faculty members of the athletic board of control are without sound foundation. Further, the charges confuse the faculty members with the board of control and the management in several of the five assertions made.

Therefore the petition in its entirety, including the avenue of approach which it suggested, is repudiated.

The friction in the athletic situation is held to be based upon midunderstanding, a lack of cooperation between athletic authorities and athletes and a failure of the athletic administration to seek such cooperation.

The remedy suggested is joint consideration of the problem by student representatives from every extensive student organization meeting with the President of the University or such a committee as he shall name, the student delegates where possible, to be the same as at the student-alumni meeting yesterday. Recognizing that the question is vital to student life and the name of the University of Minnesota, an early meeting of the group is suggested.

Professor Paige also wrote to Coffman on February 3. Whether he was chastened by the events is difficult to tell

from his opening paragraph:

I think I can see, certainly, two lessons to be learned from the recent athletic discussion. First, it will be adviseable for me to cultivate the friendship of the newspaper reporters. Second. That I should, as far as possible, try to come in contact with athletes and those molding the thought of student athletic sentiment.

Paige did say he would try to improve the relationships among the athletes, coaches, students, and board of control, and expressed regret at what had occurred.

According to Tribune and Journal articles, however, the Senate Finance Committee was not deterred from its intention to ask questions. The Tribune on February 5, 1921, reported that students who talked with the legislators said that

since news of the proposed senatorial investigation had been published influence had been exerted by certain of the school's 'constituted authority' to minimize the sentiment favoring a change and to deny some of the reasons advanced for the demands of the petition signers.

The Journal noted that some senators were "in sympathy with the policy of requiring biennial changes in the athletic board." The Journal article amplified on the request for personnel changes.

Several members of the [Senate Finance] committee have expressed themselves as being in favor of changing the faculty representatives on the athletic board of control every two years. They believe that, inasmuch as the student membership is changed yearly and the alumni representatives have a comparatively short tenure, the continued presence of the same faculty members gives them a dominating influence entirely out of proportion with the actual voting power given them by the bylaws of the board.

There is also objection on the campus to the fact that the faculty member of the board is its only spokesman before the university senate, the next highest administrative body, and is also the only spokesman of the senate before the athletic board. It is pointed out that this arrangement makes it impossible for the ideas of the two organizations to be transmitted from one to the other without the bias of the spokesman influencing the decision in the matter up for discussion.

The Daily had called, on February 2, for a meeting with President Coffman; on Tuesday, February 8, 1921, he wrote to SCIA (including the alumni and student members) calling for a

meeting with students on the following Monday. There are no minutes for that meeting, but the Daily reported on it two days after it took place. The gist of the report was that those present agreed to cooperate more in the future, that the Board of Control and SCIA would meet regularly and jointly with the coaches to discuss problems, and that there would be more openness in the conduct of athletic affairs.

E. P. Harding, one of the two faculty members maligned in the newspaper and by the students, wrote three letters to Coffman about what had been occurring; Harding was on sabbatical in Oklahoma. The third one, dated April 17, 1921, carried his resignation from SCIA and the Board of Control. In all three letters he defended himself from the various allegations he had been reading in news clippings; Regent Snyder read the correspondence and wrote to Coffman, following Harding's resignation, to tell the President that "everything Harding says is true. I am satisfied that he did his whole duty. I blame the system and not those who have been honestly endeavoring to work under it." Harding's final letter also alluded to a possible reorganization of athletics (which had not been mentioned elsewhere) and his wish to give the President a free hand in such a step.

The Monday meeting with SCIA, the student leaders, and President Coffman seems to have ended the controversy, at least for the time being. Harding's replacement on SCIA was H. S. Diehl, director of the Health Service and later Dean of the Medical School, who was to remain on the Committee until 1958.

The available files contain nothing on the subject of athletic administration or the football team until the close of the 1921 season. Walter Eckersall, "dean of American sports writers," wrote an article for the November issue of Ski-U-Mah in which he defended Coach Henry Williams. According to the Daily, on November 12, 1921, Eckersall said Williams was a superb strategist but did not have the "tools to work with"; he needed organized alumni support "to boost athletics." This prompted a tart response from Vincent Johnson in the Alumni Weekly, who suggested that Eckersall was not competent to "make charges against the alumni in regard to Minnesota's football situation."

On November 22, 1921, the Tuesday following the last game of the season, the Daily carried a long editorial bemoaning the status of the program. The record had been 4-4, which was better than the 1-6 of the previous year, but the scores against Minnesota made many unhappy. (In 1920, Minnesota had been outscored 62-92 in seven games; in 1921, the Gophers scored 60 against their opponents 141 in seven games.) The Daily invited students, faculty, alumni, and football players to write in to a "Pigskin Post Mortem."

The November 26, 29, and 30, 1921, issues of the Daily carried several letters. Several writers criticized Coach Williams; others saw the departure of high school athletes from Minnesota to attend other schools as the problem, which was linked to the "athletic policy" of the University. The 1921 football lettermen wrote to defend Williams. But most

interesting, from the viewpoint of this history, are those who criticized the structure of the organization. A few excerpts follow.

1. It seems that it is time to get out the old battle-axe. An invitation from the Minnesota Daily recently for a free-for-all "Pigskin Post-Mortem" has called the lumberers to the woods. Axes are being ground, and the time to swing them is coming. But, let's swing the axe at the right tree. Why pick out Coach Williams when it seems that the rock-bottom trouble is "Jimmy" Paige?

For years there has been an under-current of dissatisfaction, humbling constantly--a stunting spirit that bars the progress and expansion--a spirit that makes co-operation impossible. At times, it rumbles close to the surface. Last year it broke out but was quickly smothered--smothered temporarily, for it will continue to break out with ever increasing fury until something is done about it. There seems to be but one way and only one to remedy the ailment, and that is to decapitate the Athletic Board of Control, and to find, for Prof. Paige's successor, a man who will work with Minnesota player, student, coach, and alumnus.

This article seconds the motion made by Harold Hoppe and the petitioners last year. It calls for Prof. Paige's scalp. Some adjustment may be necessary in Minnesota's coaching staff, but the fundamental trouble--the prime thing that is sending the Gopher gridiron to the rocks is the prevalent athletic spirit--and Prof. Paige is the cause.

Athletes leave Minnesota in disgust. They feel the lack of co-operative spirit of the Athletic Board; petty grudges and grievances breed the feeling of dissatisfaction; all talk about the way it's done at other schools and I have only heard one express a good word for Prof. Paige. Antagonism exists between him and half of Minnesota's athletes. The other half never see him and none feel a boost from him.

2. The first step in the athletic improvement at Minnesota should be the removal of that individual, Professor James Paige. Temperamentally unfitted for the position that the fates over at the big school have boosted him into he is a bar sinister to athletic progress at Minnesota.
3. I believe that while the students are striking for one thing they might as well include in their demands that there be a general housecleaning of the Athletic department, and that a few of the members detrimental to athletics at Minnesota be removed. By this last, I have a special reference to Professor James Paige who has in my estimation

been of more harm to athletics and the University in general than any other man connected therewith.

4. Go back several years, picture Minnesota as having many great teams, they all have had one obstacle to meet, Prof. James Paige.

Personally I have no ill feeling towards Mr. Paige. All during the investigation last spring, I respected him as I do now. But, as long as Mr. Paige is connected with Minnesota Athletics in any official way, that long will athletics be on the decline. The man has entirely the wrong attitude.

Take a petition on the campus, officially recognized and in two days you will have 90 percent of the students' names on it, including the law students, if they were not afraid of a flunk, who want to see Prof. Paige removed.

Student control at Minnesota is a failure, as far as athletics are concerned. Mr. Paige working "For Minnesota" has the final word. What we need is a general clean out as far as control. Adopt the Director System of Athletic Control, and put Dr. L. J. Cooke in as Athletic Director, with the same powers as a Dean.

5. To me it looks like the faculty control athletics and "Jimmy" Paige controls the faculty in this matter and in fact the coaches too.

I believe the four greatest factors holding Minnesota back are:

1. Too much "Jimmy" Paige.
 2. Inefficient or overworked coaches with,
 3. Inadequate salaries and,
 4. Too little voice in her affairs by students and alumni.
6. Many want either Dr. Williams or Prof. Paige removed, many want them both retained, while some are in favor of keeping one or the other. Of course, I am against Mr. Paige as head of the Athletic board, he should be removed, but, more than his removal is needed. The department should be reorganized and a Director appointed. There are others who are finding fault with the way that the coaching staff works and the results obtained, so I want to devote a few lines to the Director system of Athletics, as worked out by Nolan, Regnier, and myself last spring.

It is proposed to reorganize and unify the departments of athletics into the Director system.

The Director is to be directly responsible to the President.

Vested in the Director of Athletics and an Athletic Council, composed of two faculty members appointed by the President, two students (upperclassmen) selected by the student body, and one Alumnus, elected by the General Alumni Association. The President of the University to be an ex-officio member of this council.

The last letter was signed by Harold Hopp, who graduated in 1921. He was also one of the people who, as reported in the Tribune on January 30, previous, had agreed to withhold their petition until they could meet with the alumni.

In the midst of the "Pigskin Post-Mortem" there appeared in the Journal an article reporting that President Coffman "recently reappointed the law professor [Paige] to the athletic position" as faculty representative and that Paige has the support "of practically all high officials at the University." Paige had announced that he did not intend to resign. The Journal also said that while there was no attempt to interfere with the Daily's post-mortem, "pressure of alumni leaders and others has been brought to bear on the editors in an effort to quiet the campaign as fast as possible"; the Daily later denied this. The other conclusion was that Williams would be retained for the final year of his contract.

The same day that Hopp's letter appeared in the Daily post-mortem, November 30, 1921, there also appeared an article in the Tribune. It reported on a demand formulated by "a group of prominent alumni that met at the Andrews hotel in solemn conclave to find a way out of the tangled athletic situation at the University." They called for a change: Williams and Paige should be thrown out ("stripped of power") and an Athletic Director hired who would report to the President. The alumni "went on record as being opposed to any criticism of Dr. Williams or Professor Paige. The 'old grads' rather chose to thank them for long and loyal service, but they believe it is now necessary to have a complete housecleaning." They saw the need for an athletic director as paramount to reversing Minnesota's declining athletic fortunes, and noted that a director had been installed at most other Big Ten schools.

The Tribune writer commented that "compared to the present movement, all previous athletic upheavals in the last 20 years at the Gopher institution pale. There was grim determination written on the faces of the alumni present." This group of "grimly determined" alumni did not act, however, because they were informed that the Athletic Committee of the Alumni Association was preparing to act within a week by forwarding a resolution to the Board of Directors, the President of the University, and the Regents. The article concluded by noting "a promise that the plan would go through, if the alumni can put it across, was made and the men present were the sort that accomplish things."

A Journal article summarizing the same alumni meeting at the Andrews Hotel made additional points. Although those (forty) who met had no authority, they represented a cross-

section of alumni who would, thereby, have credibility. Further, they thought that a new director should have authority analogous to that of a dean, although they agreed that there should still be a faculty-student review body. These alumni, rather than acting, forwarded their recommendations to the Athletic Committee of the Alumni Association.

On December 4, 1921, the Journal printed a lengthy article with the headline "Looking for the Football Goat at University of Minnesota." That article is appended to this history and warrants reading in its entirety; it presents an admirable summary of the circumstances. (Duplicated with permission of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.)

The Executive Committee of the Alumni Association Board of Directors received the resolution from its Athletic Committee on December 6 and approved it unanimously. The full Board of Directors did likewise the following day. On December 8 the Weekly carried another editorial and reprinted the resolution, which is reproduced below. The Weekly began by asserting that "the Alumni of Minnesota have declared for a complete reorganization of Minnesota's athletics" and reported that the recommendations were adopted unanimously by both the athletic committee and the board of directors of the General Alumni Association.

To the Board of Directors, General Alumni Association:

After a careful study of the athletic situation at the University, particularly as it relates to football, your athletic committee offers the following report and recommendations:

May it be understood at the beginning that we believe judgment should not be based solely upon the past two unsuccessful seasons, excepting as they reveal defects in a coaching system which fails to lay a foundation for good results in proper training in fundamentals.

But, because the sentiment is practically unanimous among the alumni who have volunteered their opinions and others whose opinions have been sought, and persists upon the campus, that the athletic system at the University is out of date, and because it appears that a continuation of the present system and regime will prolong and accentuate the present unsatisfactory conditions, thus causing athletics at the University and the University itself to lose prestige, we are convinced that the interests of athletics and of the University will be best served by a change in the entire athletic system.

We therefore recommend:

1. That the President and the Board of Regents of the University be urged to take immediate steps to

organize and establish at the University an athletic department along the lines followed at a number of other western universities, and employ an athletic director who shall give his entire time to that work, further details to be worked out in accordance with the best practices obtaining elsewhere;

2. That the president of the General Alumni Association appoint a committee of five members who will offer their assistance to the President and the Board of Regents in planning and organizing such a department, and in the selection of an athletic director; and

3. That in furtherance of this plan, the Athletic Board of Control be asked to assist the President and the Board of Regents in organizing this new department and therefore to take the necessary steps to terminate the contracts of all athletic coaches at the end of the current year.

Two other alumni chapters, in Chicago and Minneapolis, added to the call for change.

The resolution of the Alumni Association was forwarded to the Board of Regents and to the Board of Control, where it was discussed at the December 9, 1921, meeting of the Board of Control. With no debate recorded, the Board of Control voted to adopt two resolutions. The first acknowledged the sentiment for a rearrangement of structure, expressed the Board view that the "University authorities should have a free hand in such reorganization," concurred with the Alumni resolution, terminated all contracts effective June, 1922, and appointed a committee of five students, with Paige as Chairman and sixth member, to work with the President and Board of Regents "to represent the interests of the students" in the reorganization. The second resolution commended the coaches to the new organization. (Three days later the Secretary sent a letter to Dr. Williams notifying him of the termination of his contract. It was not renewed.)

Henry Williams wrote an article for the Journal, published on December 11, in which he endorsed the proposal for an athletic director. The coach presented his views on why the 1920 and 1921 seasons had been unsuccessful, and listed ten changes which should be made to improve the competitiveness of the football team. An athletic director who could devote all his time to management and detail would greatly assist the football program.

On December 10, 1921, E. B. Pierce, Alumni Association Secretary, formally transmitted to President Coffman the actions of the Board of Directors. The Alumni resolution, along with the two adopted by the Board of Control, were presented to the Regents on December 13. John Hayden, chairman of the Alumni Athletic Committee, along with E. B. Pierce, appeared officially before the Regents to speak for the proposal. They then adopted a motion, according to the Journal on December 13, "that the creation of the department

of athletics and the appointment of a director be placed in the hands of a committee of three (Coffman and two Regents) to report back at the next meeting. That same day Coffman then wrote back to Pierce informing him of the regents' action and said:

I note in the resolutions that the General Alumni Association suggests the appointment of a committee of five members who will offer their assistance to the President and the Board of Regents in planning and organizing such a department and in the selection of an athletic director. I wish to assure you that we shall be pleased to have the assistance and cooperation of such a committee.

He wrote a similar letter to the Secretary of the Board of Control also inviting the participation of the committee it had recommended.

There is no indication, in President Coffman's files, that he was in any way either pleased or displeased by what had taken place.

As the Daily pointed out following the Regents' meeting, there were now three different committees working on plans for a reorganized athletic department:

- 1) the three-man committee of Coffman and two regents;
- 2) the Alumni Association committee;
- 3) the Board of Control committee.

The Daily also let go a sigh of relief; in an editorial it exclaimed that "when we come back after Christmas our athletic troubles will be over. . . . The students, the faculty, and the Daily all have complete confidence in the committee named by the board [of Regents]." It advised readers that the question would be settled and urged everyone to "quit worrying about the matter and leave it up to the men who are empowered to act as well as talk."

By and large the press took the advice; there is little comment over the next two months on developments. There was, however, a great deal of speculation on who the athletic director and coach would be; that aspect of the period is covered in Chapter Three. The Journal observed, on Christmas Day, 1921, that the work was being done, and commented rather sarcastically

Nothing is being done hastily and everything is being done thoroughly.

At present, there is no organization at Minnesota. The coaches have all been discharged. The board of athletic control has obliterated itself and there exists a dull void which, after all, is as competent as the frenzied aimlessness that existed before.

The solution, however, is to come soon, and when it comes it will be complete.

Although the Regents did not discuss athletics at their January 13, 1922, meeting, the announcement of the appointment of Fred W. Luehring as Director of Physical Education and Athletics on January 16 was reasonably interpreted as confirmation of the reorganization. Further evidence came with the selection, on January 23, of William Spaulding as football coach.

At their February 13, meeting, the Board of Regents approved the appointments of Luehring and Spaulding. Two days later President Coffman wrote to Dr. Williams informing him that, with Regent's approval, he was appointed as advisor to the President on football.

The Board of Control continued to meet through April of 1922 and conduct business. On February 24 it voted to approve the moving expenses of the new Director of Athletics and the new football coach as well as to continue their salaries on a month-to-month basis. It also voted, at that same meeting, to resign effective May 1, 1922, or before, and asked the Board of Regents to transfer its functions to the new organization. The last meeting of the Board was held April 19, 1922, at the Dyckman Hotel, where Professor Paige bought dinner.

On March 30, 1922, at a special meeting called for the purpose, the Senate approved a revision of the by-laws chartering SCIA.

1. The membership was enlarged from five faculty to:
 - 5 faculty (to be nominated by the President and approved by the Senate)
 - 2 students (to be recommended by the students)
 - 2 alumni (to be recommended by the Athletic Committee of the Alumni Association)
 - 2 ex-officio members, the Director of Athletics and the University comptroller (except that the Director may not vote on eligibility matters)

II voting members

2. A ticket subcommittee of three (chaired by a faculty member; to include the Director of Athletics) to supervise tickets and all income and to receive reports of tickets issued, sold, complimentary, unused, and the cash received. The subcommittee was also responsible for Northrup Field and the safety of the stands.
3. An auditing subcommittee of three (chaired by a faculty member and to include the Director) to

supervise all expenditures and approve payment of all bills.

4. All personnel decisions are to be made by the President and Board of Regents (all, except the Director himself, on recommendation of the Director).
5. The Athletic Director is "in general charge of and responsible for the detailed administration of intercollegiate athletics subject to the supervision and approval [of SCIA], which Committee is given entire control of intercollegiate athletics subject to the constant revision and ratification of the University Senate."
6. The President appoints the faculty representative to the Conference.
7. Physical Education and intramural athletics are entirely under the Director of Athletics (not SCIA).
8. The full Committee remained the Eligibility Committee.

The Daily, the day after the Senate adopted the change, said that "President Coffman expressed himself as highly satisfied with the new plan of athletic control."

The Board of Regents approved the action of the Senate on April 26, 1922. The President nominated the faculty and the entire committee membership was endorsed by the Senate on May 18. Paige stepped down as chairman. E. B. Pierce, Director of Alumni Relations, was appointed chairman, a position he held until his retirement from the University in 1948. The student president and secretary of the defunct Board of Control were the student representatives; the two alumni members were also from the Board. With exception of occasional changes in the size of the Committee, and the charge to it from the Senate, the structure created in the spring of 1922 is the one that survives to this day.

This rush of events requires some additional comment. Perhaps most noteworthy, student involvement in the administration of athletics is now permanently diminished to voting on a larger committee. Second, the hiring of the Professional Director of Athletics signals the beginning of the end of the actual management by anyone other than staff members hired for that purpose (note especially point #5, above). Although the minutes of the newly constituted SCIA (which are available from 1922 to the present) do not differ very much, in details, from the Board of Control, it is easy to plot a decline in the number of items which might be considered "management" that are discussed by the Committee. And finally, the faculty are in a minority unless one considers the Athletic Director and Comptroller to be faculty (and the former did hold a faculty appointment).

The tumult had, with one exception, achieved the results desired by those who had been dissatisfied. The one exception, of course, was that James Paige remained the faculty representative. The criticism of Paige, however, was not only now muted, it was perhaps even to be dismissed, if the final comment of a Daily editorial of April 27 can be taken as an expression of prevailing opinion.

It is only fitting to call attention to one commendable feature of the old order which was overlooked in the clamor for the new. Minnesota lived up to conference rules.

A month or so ago when the professionalism scandal was at its height, every morning's paper carried a story about colleges dragged into the mess by the discovery of professionals on their athletic teams. Minnesota came through it all with record unsmirched.

Much of the credit for the clean record of the Gophers belongs to Professor James Paige, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Athletic Relations. In spite of the fact that strict enforcement of rules has at various times meant a serious loss to the Gopher eleven, in spite of the unpopularity of some of the decisions among the so-called sporting fraternity, Professor Paige has been guided by spirit of the regulations in every instance. Hard though it was for the campus to accept the rulings at times when the men affected meant much to the squad, the real worth of the policy of conscientious enforcement of the Big Ten regulations becomes apparent when housecleaning time comes around. Thanks to Professor Jimmie Paige, Minnesota aired no dirty linen.

CHAPTER 3

CHOOSING AND LOSING DIRECTORS AND COACHES: 1921-1932

In a 1930 letter to Board of Regents Vice President Fred Snyder, following the considerable public controversy which preceded and followed the appointment of Fritz Crisler as head football coach, President Coffman let go a sigh of relief; he told Snyder that "I certainly hope that we shall never have to elect another football coach during my administration." He may have been expressing a sentiment universal among college and university presidents. Crisler was Coffman's third football coach but it would not be his last; he still had one more to go.

Two appointments in athletics have, with few exceptions, generated widespread public interest: Head Football Coach and Athletic Director. Six times the University has chosen a Director and, since 1921, ten times a coach; this chapter and the sixth will focus on the process, and the controversy, that surrounded those appointments from 1922 to 1978.

It must be noted that some records designate Henry Williams as Athletic Director in the years preceding 1921. There is little evidence that he ever held any administrative responsibilities similar to those which came to be associated with the position. Moreover, the University itself did not formally recognize, and pay a salary for, an athletic director until Fred Luehring was appointed in the wake of events in late 1921 and early 1922, recounted previously. Julius Perlitz, who was an athlete in the early 1920's and on the staff afterwards, affirmed this interpretation. "Dr. Williams was never athletic director; he was strictly a football coach." For the purpose of this history, therefore, there have only been six athletic directors.

The other position which causes much publicity, always when vacated and sometimes when not, is that of head football coach. As with the athletic director, events prior to the tumult of 1921-22 have been reviewed earlier. This book will examine the selection of nine of the coaches. (It will not review the appointment of John Gutekunst in 1985).

A brief summary of what occurred will help to understand the history.

1. University reorganizes SCIA and Athletics in 1922; Fred Luehring appointed Athletic Director and William Spaulding appointed Head Football Coach.
2. Spaulding leaves in 1925; Clarence Spears appointed to succeed him.

3. Spears leaves in January, 1930; H. O. (Fritz) Crisler appointed as Head Football Coach.
4. Luehring resigns in February, 1930; Crisler assumes position of Athletic Director in addition to being Head Football Coach.
5. Bernie Bierman chosen Head Football Coach in December, 1931.
6. Crisler resigns as Athletic Director in February, 1932; Frank McCormick becomes director.

This ends a decade of turmoil; no changes occurred until 1950 (with the exception of acting appointments when both McCormick and Bierman went off to military service during World War II). The sixth and eleventh chapters will examine the post-World War II choices.

7. McCormick retires; Ike Armstrong appointed Athletic Director in May, 1950.
8. Bierman resigns as football coach in November, 1950; Wesley Fesler appointed.
9. Fesler leaves in 1954; Murray Warmath appointed.
10. Armstrong retires in 1963; Marshall Ryman became Athletic Director.
11. Ryman and Warmath both resign positions in 1971; Paul Giel chosen athletic director and Cal Stoll hired as football coach.
12. Stoll leaves; Joe Salem hired in 1978.

That is as far as two of these chapters will go. The University, since then, has had to twice choose a new football coach. The appointment in 1983 will be covered in the last chapter.

That rather dry recapitulation of personnel changes does not, of course, reveal any of the flavor of what happened or how it happened; it is that flavor which this chapter will attempt to convey.

1922: Fred Luehring and William Spaulding

The events which led to the creation of a position which Fred Luehring could accept have been recounted in "Creating An Athletic Director."

As might be expected, and the Daily "Pigskin Post-Mortem" made clear, the first consideration in the minds of many was whether or not Henry Williams would be retained as head football coach. It was football that had provoked the storm, so one question, in the beginning, was who should coach. The Daily, the Minneapolis Journal, and the Minne-

apolis Tribune contained a number of articles in late November, 1921, expressing the views of a variety of factions on the wisdom of retaining or releasing Williams. The alumni, who met on Tuesday the 29th and who called for the administrative reorganization--appointing an athletic director and the removal of Professor Paige--also demanded a new head coach. The Board of Directors of the Alumni Association endorsed the same proposals, from a committee of its own, and forwarded them to the Board of Regents on December 8.

On the following day the Athletic Association Board of Control adopted its resolution also requesting reorganization and terminating all coaching contracts. It was expected that the Regents would approve the reorganization plan. Even before they had done so, speculation began about who would be athletic director and who would be football coach. In a Journal article on December 9 reporting on the contract terminations, the reporter wrote that students were talking about who would be director. "It is generally believed that the regents will appoint Professor James Paige to the position but for the fact that it will require full time and it is not thought that Professor Paige would abandon his law classes." To say that the selection of Paige would have been surprising is an understatement, in light of the controversy about him immediately prior to this.

At their meeting on December 13, 1921, the Regents appointed a three-man committee (President Coffman and two regents) to meet with alumni and Board of Control committees that had been created to work with the Regents on the new department. Both the Journal and the Daily reported that the Regents' committee would investigate the plan and, if approved, perhaps "suggest a man for athletic director." Minnesota Governor A. D. Preus, an ex-officio regent himself, was quoted by the Daily as making clear "that we are not to understand that this is an attempt to get rid of anybody." The Journal said the first question was whether or not to combine the positions of director and coach, because the only way to avoid faculty objection to the salary that would be required "to attract a big man to Minnesota" would be to justify a high salary by appointing one man to fill both.

Early in January, 1922, the press carried a few articles reporting that the three committees were working and that a report would be made to the Regents at a meeting on January 13. That did not happen, but the newspapers offered advice and recited possible candidates. A sampling:

-- January 4, 1922, Minneapolis Journal

"Although no men have been definitely engaged yet, the [Regents'] committee has been in communication with many prominent men and has found several competent directors who have expressed willingness to undertake the task of putting athletics on its feet at Minnesota."

-- January 8, 1922, Minneapolis Tribune

A Harvard football star applied to be football coach. But, "one of the major questions which is still unanswered is whether the football coach to be appointed shall be also the athletic director." If separated, three leading director candidates are L. J. Cooke (basketball coach), E. B. Pierce, and O. S. Zelner (professor of engineering and chairman of the Intramural Committee).

-- January 11, 1922, Minneapolis Journal

The University need not search beyond its alumni roster for a capable man to serve as director.

-- January 13, 1922, Minneapolis Journal and Minneapolis Tribune:

Both reported that Hugo Bezdek, Penn State football coach, and Fred Luehring, Nebraska athletic director, had visited Minnesota to be interviewed for the directorship. Bezdek wanted the job, but would only take it if the coach and director positions were combined and the salary commensurate. Luehring was quoted as saying that "the situation at Minnesota looks pretty messy and I don't believe I care to jump into the center of it."

The two papers reported different views of alumni. The Tribune said one group was organizing to try to arrange to obtain Bezdek. The Journal commented on a strong feeling "among the alumni that a Minnesota graduate should be appointed" (Bezdek and Luehring were both alumni of the University of Chicago).

-- January 14, 1922, Minneapolis Tribune:

"Rumor has it that Fred Luehring . . . would be selected for the position" of athletic director; "alumni of Minnesota last night were of the opinion that the Nebraska man had practically accepted and been accepted." He would not coach football, and the alumni still wanted a Minnesota man for that job.

-- January 14, 1922, Daily:

That Luehring had been "virtually selected" was "emphatically denied and denounced . . . by President Coffman."

-- January 15, 1922, Minneapolis Tribune:

Fred Luehring is the favorite of the regents, alumni, and student committees, and the sentiment of all is to divide the coach and director positions.

-- January 15, 1922, Minneapolis Journal:

E. B. Pierce had refused the position, but now was reconsidering. "While Fred Luehring . . . an-

nounced . . . after a conference with Minnesota officials that he would not accept the Minnesota position, another rumor is that he has the inside track."

On January 16 both the Journal and the Tribune had articles telling of the appointment of Luehring as athletic director; it had been announced that morning by President Coffman's office. According to the Journal, the alumni were now intensifying their efforts to obtain a Minnesota man for football coach; Coffman, Regent Fred Snyder, and others were in Chicago interviewing coaching candidates. After accepting the job, Luehring must have left promptly to join the University contingent in Chicago to participate in the sessions with potential coaches, because the Journal, on the 17th, reported that neither Luehring nor any of the others would "divulge the names of the men interviewed." But the news accounts over the next few days made it abundantly clear that Luehring was extended a warm welcome on the campus and in the community.

Foster, who was close to L. J. Cooke, records that when Luehring was appointed head of the new department, Cooke "was pushed into the background." Foster wrote this "was a tragedy for Doc because he was a number one spot man. . . . He felt great disappointment at not becoming head of the combined departments."

Now that it was clear that there would be two positions, and that one of them was filled, the gossip, rumor, and speculation about the identity of the new coach began in earnest. The Daily confirmed the implication contained in the Journal report on Luehring's presence in Chicago; on the 18th it quoted Coffman's statement that "Mr. Luehring will have an important hand in picking the football coach." By the 20th both the Daily and the Journal were reporting that John McGovern, Minnesota All-American, was going to be selected as head coach and that Luehring supported his candidacy. The Daily editorialized, the same day, against using graduation from Minnesota as a primary criterion, and the next day reported that student groups would oppose McGovern's appointment on grounds of lack of experience.

On Monday, January 23, 1922, the Daily carried a two-word headline, in 1 3/4-inch print: "Spaulding, Coach." He had been chosen the day before after "four strenuous hours of the most secretive deliberations on the part of the committee." Luehring had joined the group and endorsed the selection. The newspapers were astonished at the choice, albeit not antagonistic, and described Spaulding as a dark horse. The Journal, the next day, reported that many coaches had been considered "but it said that Luehring was strongly in favor of Spaulding and that several members of the committee also favored him and were anxious to give Luehring the man he wanted in his effort to rebuild Minnesota athletics." President Coffman denied that Spaulding had been a dark horse, according to the Daily on January 24; the committee had been considering him for a long time and he was the only one to whom an offer was made.

According to George MacKinnon (who played football in the mid-1920's and coached part-time thereafter for several years), "it was said among those close to Minnesota football that Coach Knute Rockne of Notre Dame had recommended Spaulding." Spaulding had been at Kalamazoo State College for a number of years, and had played Notre Dame. MacKinnon points out that Kalamazoo "had been the opening door mat game for Notre Dame since 1917, who ran up scores as high as 56 points in 1920. Kalamazoo had never scored a point against them."

Both of the Minneapolis newspapers expressed some frustration at their inability to discover what was happening during the searches. The Journal observed, although not with very much evident rancor, that

secrecy by university officials has surrounded every move since the start to reorganize athletics at Minnesota. With the exception of one or two men, nobody was informed as to the progress made. Candidates for athletic director and football coach have come into Minneapolis in the shadows of the evening and left at dawn.

The Tribune had similar observations. Compared with the antagonism and furor that confronted Coffman in the matter of athletic appointments for the next decade, however, the selection of Luehring and Spaulding was accomplished with relative ease.

1925: Dr. Clarence Spears

The contretemps surrounding the renewal of Coach William Spaulding's reappointment will be told in the following chapter. Also noted will be his departure three months after receiving a two-year contract extension; the University thus had to choose a new football coach.

President Coffman's files have no record of his role in the selection process: There is not a single piece of paper to be found. As a consequence, the newspaper coverage of the Search serves as the only source of information available.

The minutes of SCIA record a special meeting called on May 18, 1925. The Committee voted, in accord with its authority in personnel matters, that "Mr. Spaulding be released as of November 30th, 1925, or such date prior to September 1st, as might be acceptable to the University." They also approved a motion authorizing the chairman to appoint a subcommittee, to include Fred Luehring, to "work with the President or any committee that he may appoint in the selection of a head Football Coach."

Athletic Director Fred Luehring announced publicly May 21, 1925, that Spaulding had resigned. The Daily, recalling the events of the previous winter (in the next chapter), published an editorial entitled "Hands Off!" The editorial writer observed that

at the time of Coach Spaulding's election [reappointment] it was suggested, apropos of the 'M' Club and its activities, that any attempt to dictate in any way what shall constitute the personnel of the coaching staff cannot help but be misconstrued.

The writer went on to say that

This sentiment warrants reiteration. The vigor and enthusiasm of the alumni "M" club was noticeably diminished with the re-election of Bill Spaulding. Its raison d'etre had been served--or, more exactly, had been defeated--and its evanescent fame came to an abrupt end. Now that the issue has been reopened the members of the organization have again discovered that they are alumni of Minnesota, and, after a brief withdrawl from the activities of the University, have re-entered the field with definite candidates for head football coach.

Unless the utmost discretion and impartiality are exerted, these alumni efforts can result in no good to the University. Minnesota has suffered in the past from too much alumni interference.

Part of the agreement Spaulding reached with the University was that he would stay on to coach the football team for the 1925 season if a replacement could not be found soon enough to take over. The Daily headline for June 6, 1925, declared that Spaulding would coach the following fall. The text of the article contained the justification for that conclusion by noting Luehring and Coffman were out of town, that Spaulding was running spring practice, and that "athletic officials at Minnesota have been making a feeble attempt to secure a successor."

According to the Minneapolis Tribune on May 22, the day after Luehring's announcement, Spaulding had been vigorously pursued by other schools during the controversy surrounding his reappointment, but at that time he had turned other offers down. Now, however, he had received such an attractive position that he could not refuse it. The President and regents "showed splendid sportsmanship by releasing him" from his contract with Minnesota. Coffman's only public comment was "We are sorry to lose Bill Spaulding. That is all I can now." The Daily observed that after the battle over his new contract, "it may be that Coach Spaulding did not care to fight against the type of spirit exhibited by the minority of the student body."

President Coffman was said to be amenable to the use of an "advisory committee composed of alumni, students and faculty members" to help select the next coach, according to George Barton in the Tribune on May 23. The committee would include members of the "M" Club. Barton also made the same point that the Daily did:

Having started a fight against Spaulding last fall and lost the argument, many alumni and students of the university would watch for opportunities to find fault with Bill's work during the next two years.

He would be laboring under an inevitable handicap and was wise to move on to a better position, Barton concluded.

On May 28 the Tribune reported that the subcommittee of SCIA, authorized in its May 18 minutes, would consist of Arnie Oss (of the "M" Club and member of SCIA), chairman E. B. Pierce, and Fred Luehring.

Newspaper speculation about Spaulding's successor appeared sporadically over the next several weeks. Of most interest, in light of what happened five years later, are the reports that Fritz Crisler of Chicago was almost signed to a contract. The Tribune, from June 16 to June 23, followed the progress of the negotiations. Fred Luehring had talked with Crisler during the controversy about Spaulding the previous January but broke off discussion when Spaulding's two-year

contract was approved. Whether accurately or not cannot be ascertained, but certainly ironic in view of what would ultimately occur--see the next section--the Tribune also reported that "it is understood that interested alumni, faculty members and athletic officials are united in support of Crisler" (Crisler did come to Minnesota for an interview, but subsequently withdrew his name from consideration for the position).

Friday, July 2, 1925, President Coffman announced the appointment of Dr. Clarence Spears as head football coach. Barton reported that Spears was one of many who had been considered, that Spears had visited Minnesota two weeks before, and that he had immediately become the first choice of University officials. On July 4 the Tribune reported that Coffman had met with Spears while the President had been in Ohio; after a diligent search, he "virtually brought the long negotiations to a close."

MacKinnon recalls having talked with Mike Lynch, a "top salesman" with a company, O'Shea Knitting Mills, that sold sweaters and jerseys to colleges. Lynch knew a lot of coaches, and was from the same town as "Doc" Spears. "Mike told me that he went in to see Luehring and told him he had been all over the country and he [Luehring] could not get a better coach than Spears. Mike also said that to have a doctor as head coach could carry on the national prestige that Minnesota had enjoyed for so long with two doctors, Dr. Williams and Dr. Cooke." MacKinnon believes "that this fact was a definite factor in Doc Spears's selection, plus Doc's courage in being willing to come to Minnesota in the middle of summer without a spring practice behind him."

Spears was very much respected by MacKinnon, who played under Spears for three years. He comments that "those who played for him received a real education in the game--from fundamentals up He never let football trespass on a boy's education. He was a surgeon himself. He was great to play under and those who did went through an experience they treasured the rest of their life." MacKinnon also views the selection of Spears in 1925 as similar to the choice in 1983. "The Spears era at Minnesota came at a time much like what Holtz is presently facing. Minnesota football had lost its national standing and Spears, like Holtz, was hired to bring it back."

The Daily, publishing in September again after the summer break, said that Spears' appointment had been hailed by everyone associated with the football program. There is no evidence to dispute that description.

1930: H. O. (Fritz) Crisler

The last item in the SCIA minutes for the meeting of January 16, 1930, record a Committee vote that the chairman was to "appoint a subcommittee to select a football coach." Chairman E. B. Pierce appointed himself, Professor Paige, and Comptroller William Middlebrook; Luehring was designated as an ex officio member of the subcommittee. This Committee minute represented the response to a situation which many had

been frantically trying to avoid in the preceding few days.

The Minneapolis Tribune, on January 9, 1930, carried an Associated Press story that Coach Spears had stopped at the University of Oregon on the way home from a California vacation to interview for the head football coach job there. The following day the Tribune quoted Spears as denying the possibility and asserting that "I will remain at Minnesota in 1930, all reports to the contrary notwithstanding."

A day after his denial, however, it became known that Coach Spears might seriously consider leaving the University. J. C. Lawrence, assistant to President Coffman, wrote a memorandum to the files on Sunday, January 11 summarizing a conversation he had had with Spears. He had received an offer from Oregon, Spears told Lawrence, which included a 28-percent salary increase, the opportunity to practice medicine (Spears had his M.D.), and a position where he reported directly to the president and could devote all of his time to coaching because Oregon had staff people to handle academic advising and public relations for athletics.

Spears told Lawrence that he had earlier discussed with President Coffman several problems he saw with the athletic department at Minnesota and that he did not want to talk to the President again. The problems still remained:

- (1) An athletic director who does not direct; who does not build up public good will or faculty good will for athletes.
- (2) Control of athletics by a committee: "I have eleven directors any one of whom can say 'no' although the only ones who really count are the director of ethics and the director of finance [probably James Paige and William Middlebrook, respectively]."

Problems three, four, and five were an inadequately-sized coaching staff, poor relations with sports writers, and no departmental staff who could work on academic eligibility for athletes. The Oregon offer contained elements which remedied these Minnesota shortcomings.

President Coffman was out of town, but on Tuesday the 14th he sent a telegram to Lawrence instructing him to talk to Mr. Snyder--presumably Regents' President Fred Snyder--about his conversation with Spears and the changes the coach sought. The entire text of the telegram reads as follows:

Please tell Mr. Snyder of your conferences, of the demands made, and inform him that I will confer with him about the matter upon my return. Meantime, I hope will reserve his judgement. L. D. Coffman [all punctuation marks inferred].

Unless one reads that text to imply that Snyder had to make some sort of decision, the most reasonable construction is that Coffman told Lawrence he hoped Spears would "reserve his judgement."

By the next day Coffman had learned that Spears could not wait. At some point early in the day on Wednesday, January 15, Coffman sent a telegram to Pierce:

have just sent following telegram to Dr. Spears:

Regret Oregon insists on immediate decision on your part so that you can't wait to discuss your problems with me. Am wiring E. B. Pierce to call meeting this afternoon of Committee on Inter-collegiate Athletics so that you can present your proposal to it.

L. D. Coffman

Coffman also sent a telegram to Lawrence asking that either he--Lawrence--or Pierce call him in Washington that evening to let him know if SCIA were inclined to grant any of Spears proposals "so that I may know what is under consideration."

Either Pierce received a separate telegram or he got the hint, because he quickly convened SCIA that Wednesday afternoon with Spears, "at a closed meeting for more than two hours" according to Daily and Tribune articles the following day. There are no formal minutes for that meeting on Wednesday, but the President's files contain a five-point resolution with a footnote "Meeting held January 15." The Committee voted to respond affirmatively to most of the coach's requests.

1. That the Committee favors full time freshman end and backfield coaches, provided that the Department of Physical Education can be so organized that such coaches may be used full time.
2. That the Committee favors arrangement which would permit starting of practice at 4 p.m. for the reason that such an arrangement, in the Committee's opinion might result in better grades of athletes.
3. That the Committee favors appointment of necessary assistance to provide prompt and frequent reports on athletes grades.
4. That the Committee favors and is willing to recommend athletic funds to provides publicity assistance, chiefly for athletes, upon request of the University News Service.
5. That the Committee is ready to consider at any time any projects presented in person or in writing by the Football Coach.

That this was SCIA action was confirmed by the Daily two days later, which published the text of the resolution in slightly revised form.

That all was not peaceful in athletics is further implied in a Tribune article on Thursday the 16th. Spears

said that he would insist on an agreement with Oregon officials so that "he will have free rein in handling the school's football affairs and assurance that he will be given proper co-operation from the school authorities in all matters pertaining to athletics." This, apparently, in contrast to his situation at Minnesota.

Wind of Spears' possible departure prompted some sort of public or alumni response, because Coffman's files contain an undated, unsigned, typed statement which was apparently issued to either Coffman or Pierce (and probably the President).

We are sure that we voice the sentiment of the Alumni and the business men of this community when we say, we believe it will be a great calamity . . . to have Dr. Spears leave Minnesota at this time.

Whoever wrote the statement went on to say that although Spears was offered more money at Oregon, that is not why he would leave. Rather, it would be "due to the unsatisfactory, internal situation in our Athletic Department." That this document was contemporaneous with the situation is further evidenced by a plea that "you wire him immediately that such condition will be remedied by placing him in charge of the Football department."

All of these telegrams and meetings came to naught. The Daily reported, on Thursday, January 16, that neither Spears nor the members of SCIA would discuss the outcome of their two-hour meeting the previous day, that Spears was leaving for Oregon to discuss the offer he had received, and that no decision was reached. On Friday the 17th the Daily headline told the outcome: "Spears Admits Accepting Oregon Post." The article carried the text of a statement from SCIA which expressed regret at his departure and said that the Committee had unanimously voted for the changes Spears wanted (the January 15 resolution) and that the changes would be recommended irrespective of Dr. Spears's decision.

Lawrence had noted, in his January 11 memo, that Spears did not wish to talk to the President again. MacKinnon says the reason, as expressed by Spears to others, was that "he has lied to me for the last time." MacKinnon explains that "Coffman had been promising to get rid of Luehring but never did. Spears correctly saw Luehring's inability to fill his job of organizing the state and public support behind the athletic programs and getting University staff cooperation as poor working conditions that a coach of his first class standing did not have to suffer under. He saw Luehring as the stumbling block to successful teams at Minnesota. I also believe that Spears and Coffman had an earlier meeting at which Spears told him he was leaving Minnesota. It might have been possible to retain Spears, says MacKinnon, "'by placing him in charge of the Football department,' i.e., removing Luehring from any control over football."

Ultimately, observed MacKinnon, Spears left because "Coffman was insisting on keeping Luehring." This was due to "personal weakness" of Coffman, who refused "to live up to

director who was attractive to the faculty and a complete failure at his job." "Spears bore the burden for five years of unreasonably high eligibility requirements, lack of administrative cooperation and assistance from the athletic director before he quit in disgust with Coffman and Luehring."

Others have echoed MacKinnon's view, in varying ways. Perlt described Luehring as "the first mistake in athletics--a nice guy, but totally inept." Perlt suggests, however, that part of Luehring's problem may have been James Paige. Perlt commented that Paige "was more an athletic director than Fred Luehring. Fred was a fine, honorable person, but I think he was a little hesitant about what he should be doing as an athletic director, with Paige dominant."

Clifford Anderson, student manager in football under Spaulding and Spears, recalls Luehring as "a thorn in the side of athletic people, especially Spears." Luehring would not go to bat for them to get things done, especially if they needed money. Anderson remembers that Luehring's nickname among some of the athletic staff was "pumpernickel" because "he was so tight with his nickels." Perlt recalled this same characteristic.

While Perlt is not as certain as MacKinnon that Spears left out of frustration, the recollections plus the file tidbits suggest that all was not running smoothly in the department.

So, on January 16, 1930, SCIA met once again, and Pierce appointed the three-man subcommittee to work with Coffman to find a new coach.

The press speculation about the successor began immediately. The Tribune, on Friday the 17th, noted the appointment of the SCIA subcommittee and listed six coaches "whose names have been mentioned in connection with the position." President Coffman, in the same article, was quoted as being surprised at Spears' departure (contrary to MacKinnon's view). On the following day the Tribune Sports Editor, George Barton, in his editorial column, cautioned University officials to "bide their time" in selecting a new coach because "the public will be overly critical in the matter."

On Sunday, January 19, Barton reported that

prominent alumni are emphatic in their expressions that the university athletic department needs a decided shake-up and will make every effort to bring it about. Persons closely in touch with the athletic situation at the university have been aware of the fact for several years that there has been a lack of harmony . . . and they feel a thorough housecleaning is necessary.

This comment, of course, lends credence to the recollections cited earlier.

Five days after SCIA set up its subcommittee, on January 21, the Daily reported that the search would begin as soon as President Coffman returned from Washington. The article also noted that

a meeting of the 'M' men will be held tonight to discuss the athletic situation. . . . It is expected that this meeting will mark the inauguration of a campaign to place an 'M' man in the position being made vacant with Dr. Spears departure.

The Regents were another group expected to review the situation, although the minutes of their January 24 meeting reflect no discussion.

Over the next several days the Daily and the Tribune contained articles about the progress, or lack of it, in finding a new coach. Excerpts and summaries:

-- January 22, Daily:

"Indications have been made that the senate committee will have free rein in making a choice of a new coach. A meeting of the group will not be called for at least a week, according to a statement made yesterday by President L. D. Coffman."

[Quoting Coffman] "I have several applications for Dr. Spears' place, and I am giving them serious consideration. However, it is my opinion that the man who is finally selected will not be among the applicants. We will probably have to reach out and get him."

-- January 23, Daily:

"Fred W. Luehring, director of athletics, is investigating all possibilities in the way of available coaches throughout the entire nation, according to rumors in circulation yesterday, and it is hinted that he will have a report to make to them when the senate committee meets."

-- January 23, Tribune:

Arnie Oss, "brilliant halfback" from the 1919, 1920, and 1921 teams, and an alumni member of SCIA, reports on an informal meeting of "M" men; it was their view the University should "get the best coach possible regardless of whether he is a Minnesota man." Oss also said that the "M" Club "will not assume the role of dictators in the matter of selecting a head coach for their alma mater;" they would hold a formal meeting shortly, however, to examine the athletic situation at greater length.

-- January 24, Daily:

The football players were almost unanimously in favor of assistant football coach Arthur "Dutch" Bergman, and signed a petition to Coffman asking that he "be given serious consideration."

"Every day the list of candidates is increasing. Candidates for the office are now being considered

by the Senate committee. . . . A number of men who have been under discussion are placed in difficult situations in their own schools because of reports that they have received offers from Minnesota. Coaches in all parts of the country are making press statements to the effect that they have not been approached by Minnesota officials."

-- January 25, Tribune:

George Barton says that SCIA, in evaluating candidates, looks at "his record as a coach, his methods, his stand on the matter of proselytizing and subsidising of athletes, his willingness to adhere to the conference rules in every respect and his disposition to co-operate with the university authorities, and his character."

-- January 26, Tribune:

An article reports that about nine men are on the final slate. Barton, in his column, discusses each one briefly. He also warns that it "behooves [SCIA] to exercise proper judgement and caution" in picking a new coach because "followers of Minnesota's football affairs are considerably riled over the loss of Spears and will voice strong objections if he is replaced by a man whom they do not regard as rating the position."

-- January 28, Daily:

"Speculation as to who the new mentor will be is rife and many names of possibilities have been put forward. . . . Twin Cities sports writers . . . had narrowed the field down to two or three [Bergman, two others, and Fritz Crisler]."

-- January 29, Tribune:

Barton says Crisler would not accept the Minnesota job if it were offered because he will succeed Amos Alonzo Stagg at Chicago as head coach and athletic director. Crisler, according to Barton, had been recommended by Luehring in 1925 as a successor to W. H. Spaulding, and Crisler was one of the two final candidates, along with Spears.

-- January 29, Daily:

Three listed as serious contenders, none of them Crisler.

-- January 29, Tribune:

Both an article and Barton's column say that Pierce and Coffman are being very close-mouthed. Barton learns from his "operatives at the University" that there are four candidates; Crisler is not among the names he reports.

-- January 30, Daily:

"All rumors that any one candidate is being favored above others are false. No member of the senate committee has made up his mind in the matter," Mr. Pierce reported."

-- January 30, Tribune:

According to Barton, "a howl of protest" went up against one of the odds-on favorite candidates, Tad Wieman of Michigan, so SCIA may "seek to appease university and public sentiment" by appointing Bergman.

-- January 31, Daily:

"Rumor had Bernie Bierman, head football coach at Tulane University and a former Minnesota gridiron great, as the most prominent candidate of the day for Dr. Spears' old post."

-- January 31, Tribune:

A number of "M" men want Bernie Bierman to be considered, said Barton; they fear he isn't being given a chance because Minnesotans who remembered him as a player thought he had no personality.

-- February 1, Daily:

The West Point track coach wants the job.

-- February 4, Tribune:

A reporter writes that those who keep track of public opinion say that students, alumni, and the public are "becoming impatient over the [Pierce] committee's methods. Some of them are even said to be openly dissatisfied." This in spite of statements that the committee has worked hard the previous two weeks and is conducting "an exhaustive survey." Barton, the same day, says Bierman is the favorite and the committee will let him have the job if he wants it.

-- February 5, Daily:

"Bierman Confers at Chicago With Gopher Officials"

"Reports from Chicago yesterday also indicated that James Paige . . . had conferred with Fritz Crisler . . . Lately second-guessers have been of the opinion that Crisler had been dropped from consideration. In spite of the fact that the Chicago assistant had been interviewed by Paige, the belief persists that he will not give much consideration to the job event if it is offered to him."

-- February 6, Daily:

Paige and Middlebrook are in Chicago interviewing Bierman and Crisler; Bierman is seen as likely and Crisler is not.

-- February 7, Daily:

"Bierman Reported Certain Choice for Grid Coaching Job"

"Other rumors current yesterday indicated that Fritz Crisler . . . will be signed up at Minnesota as director of intercollegiate athletics, and that Fred Luehring will become director of physical education. . . . Questioned as to the truth of the reports . . . E. B. Pierce . . . laughed heartily, said, 'it makes a good story. But I wouldn't bank too strongly on it.'"

-- February 7, Tribune:

The athletic director at Tulane says Bierman will be released from his contract if he wishes to take an offer from Minnesota.

-- February 8, Daily:

"U. Waits Regents' O.K. on Reported Selection of Crisler as Grid Coach." The Daily recited a Minneapolis Tribune report of the previous day declaring Crisler the coach.

"The reports concerning Crisler . . . were not accepted enthusiastically on the campus yesterday. The M Club and a great number of alumni and many of the students had been backing Bierman's candidacy . . . the football squad and hundreds of students have been behind . . . Bergman."

On February 8, as the Daily noted, the Tribune (George Barton's byline) reported that President Coffman would recommend the appointment of Fritz Crisler as head football coach, that he had been Luehring's choice from the outset, that the committee concurred with the choice, and that the Regents would approve it two days hence. The Minneapolis Journal, the same day, reported "a violent public reaction" to the selection of Crisler. The "M" Club was said to be "unanimously resentful" not only of the choice but also of the methods used; other alumni shared this view. The article went on to recall the events surrounding Williams Spaulding's retention in 1925, that Coffman had said he would "resent any attempt of the alumni to influence the university's athletic policy," and quoted on "influential alumnus" who said that Coffman's decision "is accepted as a deliberate slight given to demonstrate his determination to establish his independence." The "M" Club opinion, according to the Journal, was that Coffman was making a mistake, that the University had blundered twice (in both the selection and "in

employing evasive methods to reach their decisions,") but that Crisler was not to blame and should be given a fair chance. The article closed by reporting "that the university is now trying to trace to the source the premature revelation of its intentions."

The Journal, on February 9, the day before the Regents met, said the appointment was "a smashing victory" for Luehring, "harassed athletic director who has been under intermittent fire from alumni and from his own department for many years." The university supposedly had to choose between firing the athletic director and starting over or hiring people who would work with Luehring. With the selection of Crisler, support was being thrown behind Luehring. The Journal writer suggested that

calm second thought will doubtless persuade the fair minded students and players to give [Crisler] a fair opportunity, but, for the present, the sentiment on the campus and particularly among the football players is extremely antagonistic.

In another report, the same day, the Journal said that the two alumni/"M" Club representatives on SCIA were going to resign from the committee in protest because of the selection method and because they were allegedly not consulted about the choice until the other members of SCIA had already approved. These resignations were made public two days later.

Dick Cullum, writing in the Journal, also on February 9, repeated the sentiment that objection should be directed against the method of selection and not against Crisler. A big objection was that Crisler was an experiment--he had no head coaching experience--and that the University should not be experimenting. Cullum's conclusion was that "the university had made a not entirely acceptable choice and has made it in such a way as to embarrass itself and the candidates." George Barton, in his Tribune column the same day, opined that Pierce, Paige, Middlebrook, and Luehring brought grief on themselves by the selection and said they ignored SCIA until after the choice had already been made. He described the "M" Club as "bitter." Barton also said that pressure would be brought on the regents to reject the recommendation.

The Tribune, of course, was correct. At their meeting on February 10, 1930, the Regents approved the appointment of H. O. Crisler as "Professor and Director of Physical Education and Athletics" effective February 16. (The title will receive attention shortly.) Whatever pressure may have been placed on the regents had no effect, apparently, because the Journal, reporting on the meeting, said that "in spite of violent protests from alumni the regents took their action without hesitation in the routine procedure which invariably respects the right of the president to choose his own staff." The vote was unanimous, and the regents once again backed President Coffman (see the next chapter) despite strongly-expressed outside views that they should not do so.

The Journal article reported that alumni and friends who had provided jobs to football players would no longer do so.

One said that "the University has served notice upon us that it resents our interest in athletic affairs, and we shall take the hint."

Dick Cullum, in his Journal column the day the Regents met, February 10, questioned the expertise and judgment of the committee. He said a panel of experts on football might have been able to decide in favor of Crisler, but wondered "how the University committee [of Pierce, Paige, Middlebrook, and Luehring] which has blundered repeatedly in its selection of men could be so confident of its knowledge of football?" Cullum listed six outstanding coaches who had not even been considered, and declared that "the committee cannot know that Crisler is superior to these experienced men." He said that "there would be justification for the recommendations in spite of their unpopularity but it is clearly impossible for the committee to have that knowledge." Cullum concluded that Crisler and his staff did not deserve criticism--in part precisely because of the "obscurity and incompleteness of their records," and summarized his views as follows:

It gets down to this: That the committee was incompetent to judge football talent, that it studiously refrained from interviewing men with experience and winning records, that it made an unpopular selection without possibly being able to know that it had picked the best man and that, therefore, it has deliberately invited public disfavor.

By its methods the administration has told its alumni, its students and the public, to go throw stones at the moon, and there is no particular reason why the alumni, students and public should like it.

This affront to the public is traceable to the determination of the administration to remain utterly, even militantly, independent of outside interference.

Despite the Board action, Crisler did not immediately accept the position. The day after the Regents' meeting the Daily headline read "Officials Scoff at Report That Crisler is Hesitant Over Taking Coaching Job" and quoted Coffman as believing that Crisler would accept. The Daily said he was reluctant because of Twin Cities newspaper opposition to his selection. He finally did accept, on February 14; it was, according to the Daily, after

numerous telegrams from prominent student organizations, faculty organizations, businessmen and alumni began to pour in, urging him to accept the Minnesota post and pledging whole hearted support, that Crisler began to feel that things were not so bad as they had been painted.

Other press commentary, in the days succeeding the Regents' action, turned increasingly positive about Crisler himself while continuing to criticize the University along the lines already quoted previously. Another factor which may have persuaded Crisler was the appearance of two emissaries from the President, in Chicago, who met with him along with George Barton and another newspaperman. All four assured him of support, and told him, according to Barton, that all the protest "was due to the manner in which the special coaches committee bungled things by railroading the appointments."

The Daily sports columnist, writing the day after the Regents' action, condemned the public criticisms of the Crisler appointment. He observed there would finally "be harmony" in athletics because Luehring and Crisler were long-time friends. "One of the great troubles with the athletic department during the past few years has been the fact that there has been friction between Spears and Luehring." This confirms the comments of Spears to J. C. Lawrence early on, and suggests that Spears would have resisted all University blandishments unless part of the package included the removal of Luehring as athletic director.

As noted earlier, the two alumni members of SCIA resigned in public protest of the selection procedure. Apparently E. B. Pierce, who was secretary of the Alumni Association, was stung by their criticism, because the Journal reported, on February 12, that he was prepared to resign from SCIA if OSS and Rathbun, the two alumni, would reconsider their decision to quit. Pierce was quoted as saying that

I want to assume my burden of the responsibility for any criticism that has attached to the action of the committee, still professing, however, that what was done was in good faith. . . . It was my sincere belief that the committee which finally passed on the new coach, and his assistant, was only a temporary body formed for the purpose of interrogating, and then making recommendation to the senate body. However it so turned out that the sub-committee was in fact the group that took final

action. I merely say this in explanation of my position in the whole proceedings.

At some point very near the time the Regents approved Crisler's appointment, Fred Luehring resigned as Athletic Director; E. B. Pierce's "hearty laugh" was not completely justified. The title of "Professor and Director" for Crisler was approved by the Board on February 10; there is a letter from Coffman to Luehring on February 17 accepting Luehring's resignation, and the Daily reported on the 18th that Luehring had resigned the previous day. One explanation for this chronology is that the minutes of the Regents' meeting were amended before they were actually printed; Secretary to the Board of Regents Duane Wilson confirmed that in earlier years there had often been a six-month delay in printing.

Luehring, in his public announcement, said he had had the resignation in mind for awhile, and that "it has seemed to me an opportune time to ask the president to make public the request which I have had in his hands for some time past." There was no search for an athletic director; Coffman, in his February 17 letter accepting the resignation, told Luehring that "I have asked Mr. Herbert O. Crisler if he would accept the position of Director as well as that of Head Coach and he has consented to do so." That was the end of the matter.

A different explanation for Crisler's double appointment is offered by George Barton in his autobiography, published in 1957. Barton recalls that Coffman sent a delegation of alumni to Chicago to meet with Crisler when he was hesitating about accepting the Minnesota position; Barton himself was one of those who went. The group "learned during a visit with Crisler in Chicago that Fritz was sincere in his determination to pass up the Minnesota post." Barton recalled that they reported back to Coffman that it seemed unlikely Crisler would accept; in an article published in the Tribune at the time, however, Barton predicted Crisler would come to Minnesota. He finally did so, of course, but only, according to Barton's memoirs, after "Coffman assured him the dual post of athletic director and head football coach." If this is true, then Luehring's resignation may have been involuntary. The timing of the events makes Barton's recollection plausible, but there is no other evidence in the record to support it; Luehring's announcement either rebuts Barton or it was a very graceful and diplomatic choice of words to acknowledge his removal.

In MacKinnon's view, however, there is no doubt that Luehring's resignation was forced. "It resulted only after Crisler had indicated he would not come to Minnesota unless he was both coach and athletic director. He was wise. He knew from the Big Ten grapevine that Luehring was incompetent --impossible." MacKinnon remembers the events which support his judgment.

Spears, Coffman, Leuhring, Crisler. It was Coffman's insistence on keeping Leuhring and Leuhring's inability to do the job as an Athletic Director that was the bone of contention between Spears and Leuhring. . . . He

spent what time he should have spent organizing and running the Athletic Department buttering up the faculty. He had practically no rapport with the business men and his personality did not get across with ordinary people--sportswriters, businessmen, alumni or athletes. He was not a regular fellow. His aloofness fit in well with deans and scholarly faculty. His presence was rarely felt in public but he spent more than his share of the time at the Campus Club.

To understand the Coffman-Leuhring relationship you have to know about a certain Crisler event. . . . Leuhring was eased out as Athletic Director and Crisler appointed Coach and Athletic Director about February 10, 1930. Crisler immediately came to Minnesota and started Spring practice as soon as he was organized with his staff. I had been an Assistant Coach under Spears in 1928 and 1929 spending part time from my law position with IDS coaching from 4 p.m. on and doing necessary IDS work at night. Crisler asked me to continue on in the same capacity and I did. Crisler started coaching Spring practice as soon as the weather permitted, but he let Leuhring continue clearing up his office.

Finally about the middle of Spring practice, around May 5th or so, we were all in the Coach's room dressed for coaching and about ready to go onto the field when the phone rang. Crisler answered. The call was from Dr. Coffman. Crisler said "Hello Doctor" and then listened for a few moments. Finally in an almost angry tone he said "what, I'll be right over." He then told the rest of us to run practice and we all left the coaching room, walked onto Old Northrup, to coach practice. Crisler walked with us, his jaw set, and continued on, in his coaching uniform, cleats and all, directly across the field to the Administration Building. What had transpired on the telephone call was that Coffman had said that, "Leuhring had told him that he got along very well with Crisler and that he thought Fritz would be agreeable to Leuhring continuing as Athletic Director."

Crisler did not return to the football field that afternoon but came back from his meeting with Coffman in the Administration Building right after we had finished practice and were back in the Coaches room in the stadium. Either then or later we learned that Coffman had tried to put Leuhring back as Athletic Director and Fritz had told him that he had let Leuhring carry on some office chores so as not to cut him off too abruptly, but the agreement he had made with the University was that Leuhring was to be completely out as athletic director and unless Leuhring was immediately told that he was completely out, right then from any relationship to the University, and would not be continued in any capacity, that he, Crisler, was quitting. Placed in that position, Coffman could not stand any more heat over his adherence to Leuhring and he consented to Crisler's ultimatum. From that time on, Leuhring was completely out, even from heading intramural athletics. He eventually wound up in that

job at the University of Pennsylvania.

This illustrates why Spears had left--Coffman had continually told Spears he would get rid of Luehring and he never did--so the problem was Coffman and Luehring. Spears refused to continue under a President that continually lied to him and made him continue under unfavorable working conditions. Coffman showed a fatal deficiency when he tried to backtrack on Crisler with respect to Luehring the same as he had with Spears.

Mackinnon goes on to comment that "while Coffman tried to hang onto Luehring, and had refused to remove him from just the football situation, as Spears had recommended, he was required to go even further . . . and remove him completely to get a coach [Crisler] that was far below Spears in ability." MacKinnon concludes that "this points to the fact that Coffman's lack of leadership was really causing all the problems."

A kinder view of Luehring has been expressed by Perlt and Foster. Perlt points out that "Luehring was afraid to go to the bathroom without asking Paige. . . . Luehring was limited by his own inexperience as an administrator, plus the fact that he had an umbrella organization by the name of Jimmy Paige over him." Clifford Anderson, the student manager, shares MacKinnon's view that Luehring was aloof; Anderson described him as a man who was "remote" and who did not fraternize well with his athletic colleagues. Foster, writing about the creation of the athletic directorship in 1921-22, wondered if Luehring "would have left Nebraska if he had known what he was getting into. . . . In spite of his being granted considerable power and being given much latitude in running Athletics, the surviving remnant of our recent upheaval [i.e., Paigel] still expected to run the show from the background."

Perhaps Foster summarizes Luehring best when he describes him as "an educator rather than an athletic administrator" (and which may be why MacKinnon saw him as "attractive to the faculty" but otherwise inadequate for the job). Foster wrote that as an educator, Luehring was not equipped by training "to deal with the rabid mob and lunatic fringe of athletics which is so easily whipped into a frenzy and is always screaming for somebody's blood when a game is lost."

The Minneapolis papers expressed surprise at Luehring's resignation. George Barton was beside himself with delight. It would end the bickering between coach and athletic director; and he said Crisler "will make an ideal athletic director . . . ; he possesses the executive ability to make him a splendid administrator."

President Coffman himself provided an enlightening summary of the events to Regent Synder, who was vacationing in Cuba. The opening paragraph of this chapter quoted the letter; it is reproduced here in its entirety.

My dear Mr. Snyder

At last the air is being clarified over the football situation. There was quite a furore, as you know, when you left. The down-town quarterbacks were critical of the University because their coach was not selected. Certain newspaper men were likewise critical because they had tried to bring about the election of a coach by a popular vote conducted by the press; and two alumni members of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Rathbun and Oss, resigned in public statements. Of course the only reason they had for resigning was purely the technical one that there had not been a formal meeting of the committee to ratify the findings of the subcommittee. They had been seen and had been asked to ratify the findings of the subcommittee but that didn't satisfy them. They were members of a small group overtown who were trying to put over Bierman. They probably would have voted against Crisler if there had been a formal meeting of the committee.

I had feared all during the week that Crisler would not accept. I sent two or three emissaries to Chicago to see him; among others, Mr. Charles Keyes and Mr. Orren Safford. By Thursday night of this last week, however, he had received literally thousands of telegrams and communications from faculty, students, alumni and citizens of the state requesting him to come. The educational organizations, including the State Superintendents' Association, the State High School Principals' Association, the State Athletic Association, and so on, responded almost to a man. The papers began to show a certain cordiality toward him before he accepted because they began to realize what it would mean to the University of Minnesota in case he did not come. They saw that we would become a Conference problem.

And yesterday, Mr. Luehring and I exchanged letters with regard to his proposed relinquishment of the directionship of the department and these letters were made public; copies of them are enclosed. It seemed best to make this anouncement at this time so that Mr. Crisler could come here entirely unhampered. And may I say that Mr. Luehring was very happy to do this. A great load, he feels, has been lifted off his shoulders. He will, I believe, make us a good professor of physical education and we have need for additional assistance in that field.

I certainly hope that we shall never have to elect another football coach during my administration. If we do, then I think we should have an entirely different set-up. This business of having to work with committees is, in my opinion, illogical and administratively unsound. Some time I suppose we

ought to consider the advisability of revising the regulations governing the control of inter-collegiate athletics, but I do not believe that this is a propitious time to bring this subject up.

I hope you and Mrs. Snyder are having a pleasant vacation.

Very sincerely yours

L. D. Coffman
President

1931-32: Bernie Bierman and Frank McCormick

It was Coffman's wish that he not have to find another football coach, and, in a strange way, the wish was fulfilled. The President left the country in October of 1931 for a five-month tour of the Orient; Dean Guy Stanton Ford was chosen acting president.

Ford got off easily. The December 2, 1931, Daily included a UP bulletin which said that "Coach Bernie Bierman . . . had nothing to say of the rumors that he might go to the University of Minnesota." Crisler refused comment to the Daily.

Three days later the Daily headline read "Bierman Set to Coach Minnesota in 1932." No one at the University, however, would confirm the story. On the same day--December 5, apparently after the Daily went to press--Crisler issued a statement announcing the appointment of Bierman. In it, Crisler pointed out that

Last year I made the statement that whenever in my opinion I felt it was for the best interest of the University and Athletic Department, I would secure a football coach to share some of the duties of the capacity in which I was appointed.

Further, that whenever I was unable to do justice to two positions I would recommend an additional appointment providing conditions were such that it would not be unfair for a football coach to have every chance to succeed. I did not want anyone to start under the circumstances which I originally encountered.

So the selection of a new coach may have come as no great surprise. There was also apparently no administrative involvement, because both the files and the news accounts are silent on any role for SCIA or the Acting President. Crisler, as athletic director, and freed from the requirement of obtaining SCIA approval for appointments since the adoption of the Special Committee recommendations in December, 1930, (see Chapter 5) seems to have simply selected Bierman. (Other views, appearing shortly, cast doubt on that hypothesis.)

On December 7, 1931, the Daily carried a headline declaring "Reports Crisler Will Leave U Declared False." The headline was correct--at that time. Crisler's statement on the Bierman appointment, in fact, contained no indication of any uncertainty about his--Crisler's--expectations (as would be expected, even if Crisler were entertaining other offers); "I intend to devote my entire time to the Administration of the . . . Department," he said. But Coffman was not fated to miss the task of choosing another athletic director.

Reports began appearing in the local newspapers in late February 1932 that Crisler was being sought by other schools. Dick Cullum, in the Journal on February 22, reported that Princeton was tendering an offer and that Wisconsin wanted to talk to him. Cullum said "it is probable that . . . Crisler will resign . . . to accept a position as athletic director and head football coach at Princeton." He also quoted Crisler as denying he had accepted any offer and asserting that the Board of Regents were privy to all the facts about other jobs. In his column in the same issue, Cullum suggested that these offers present "Minnesota with a problem that can hardly be called insurmountable, however it is viewed." Given that neither Princeton nor Wisconsin had much to offer when compared to Minnesota, and that Crisler wanted to stay, Cullum said that the University "simply has to make a decision to do as much for exceptional executive talent as other institutions in its same class are willing to do." Cullum urged the University to meet any offers to keep Crisler.

George Barton echoed Cullum's sentiments in the Tribune the next day. "It will not set well with the vast majority of persons interested in the state university's athletic welfare if Crisler is permitted to go to Princeton without any attempt being made on the part of the regents and the senate group" to retain him. Barton described Crisler as "gifted with rare ability," "a natural leader," and one who has "a most remarkable personality." Barton said the loss would be "a severe blow to Minnesota."

University officials J. C. Lawrence and William Middlebrook had no comment when asked by the Journal on the 23rd if any attempt was being made to keep Crisler. Cullum berated the University for generally failing to keep good men; it was his rather bitter view that

strong, competent men are not wanted if they insist upon costing the University what they are worth. As a matter of fact, they are not much wanted anyway, being, because of their very strength and competence, a little more difficult to dominate than a weak administration fancies.

Cullum predicted there would be strong alumni and student demand to keep Crisler.

On Wednesday, February 24, 1932, the page one Daily headline was "Expect Crisler Resignation Hourly." There was a block statement, "Keep Crisler at Minnesota," which listed reasons for retaining him and which concluded that

Minnesota athletic affairs up to Crisler's appearance on the scene have been marked by instability and a complete lack of continuity in policy, particularly in regard to coaches. Fritz Crisler himself . . . by no means was given a fair deal. If Minnesota's administration doesn't show some will and back-bone in this crisis the lack of continuity will remain, Crisler will leave, and the chance to establish order and stability will be lost.

The reporter also took caustic note of the circumstances. The likely resignation "was expected" to plunge

Minnesota's athletic affairs into chaos for the second time in three years. And for the second time in three years, the highest administrative officials of the university were thousands of miles away from the . . . gathering storm.

Coffman was gone to the Orient and Ford went to a convention in Washington the preceding Saturday. In the absence of the administrators, the reporter went to Regent Fred Snyder, who was quoted as saying that Minnesota could not match the \$12,500 offer Princeton was making (Minnesota was paying him \$8,500). Three regents, including Snyder, and J. C. Lawrence met on Tuesday, and talked with Bernie Bierman, but said nothing about the results. Meantime, the football team, the "M" Club, and a number of student groups met and passed resolutions requesting support for Crisler and petitioning him to remain at Minnesota.

That same day, Wednesday the 24th, Dick Cullum reported that his sources told him "Crisler is gone." Barton again echoed Cullum the following day, lauding Crisler's performance when he had come to Minnesota under such adverse Circumstances.

One quarter that had usually been heard from, the "M" Club, had, according to Cullum on February 25th, decided to stay out of the controversy. They had chosen this course in an informal meeting, even though "entertaining the highest admiration for" Crisler, "the keenest appreciation of his work . . . and the strongest desire to have him remain." The reason for this stance, according to Cullum after talking with "M" Club members, was because their interest in athletics was

strongly resented and prejudiced the case in favor of any man it opposed or against any man it supported. The attitude of campus authorities was so antagonistic to outside interference that they would change their minds if they found outsiders agreeing with them.

On Friday the 26th the Daily told that the matter was settled. The headline--in print an inch high--was "Crisler Goes to Princeton"; the article detailed the unsuccessful efforts that had been made to keep him.

-- Crisler had met the previous day with "several members of the board of regents, who had reportedly offered \$10,000" and a greater control of athletics.

-- Nearly 100 students appeared at Crisler's office with petitions asking him to stay, including the members of the football team.

Acting President Ford issued a statement expressing both his "sincere regret" at Crisler's decision and his surprise that it came so promptly. Ford acknowledged that he knew of the offer before he had left for Washington but said he had "not foreseen so prompt an outcome." Ford commended the "magnificent job" Crisler had done. Crisler said it had been a difficult decision, given all the support he had received, and noted that "the Regents representing the administration were most cordial in urging me to remain and were entirely willing to make adjustments within the limits of consistency." But, he said, "Princeton presented such a far reaching opportunity that it was difficult for me to do anything but accept."

All of this had not been enough, so by the next day the Daily is reporting that Coffman and "regents" will "comprise the formal selection committee," although there was speculation they might not wait on Coffman's return, which was expected in about two weeks.

Before proceeding to examine the selection of Crisler's successor, it is perhaps worth reviewing the closing comments of Dick Cullum. He had castigated the University already, at length, about its retention battles. Following the confirmation of Crisler's departure, he again took the University to task. His new points were these:

There is no sense in confusing the issue. Crisler left the University in discouragement. He was a man of action who had a job to do and wanted to do it thoroughly but discovered that campus politics raised a barrier which was not likely to break down for years to come.

Nor did Crisler resign entirely because of the financial lure which Princeton set before him. He resigned in impatience with the red tape and confusion, with the politics and secrecy in which surged a constant squabble for authority by the court favorites of the administration who are favorites mainly because of an incompetence which makes them easy to dominate.

The suspicion quite naturally exists that the court favorites had undermined Crisler to the point at which the administration had determined months ago to make his work so distasteful to him that he would move along.

Barton reiterated one point. "Crisler is too good a sports-

man to complain openly of his treatment at Minnesota, but those conversant with the situation are well aware of the fact that he was hampered in his work by meddlesome University authorities."

Charles Johnson offered his view of the history of Crisler's short tenure at Minnesota; it is quoted, in part, here.

He agreed to come here when Dr. Clarence Spears resigned as football coach. So much opposition developed throughout the state to his appointment that there was a question whether he would go through with his promise. He had a perfect right to withdraw his acceptance when he learned that two alumni members of the athletic board hadn't approved his selection when he had been led to believe that they had.

However, Fritz took the big gamble, proved himself a sportsman and, to save plenty of embarrassment for the institution's bosses, agreed to reconsider his refusal to step into a fight against the most peevish public sentiment ever aroused in these parts.

Then, Crisler also found himself, on his arrival, football coach and athletic director. He stepped in and worked from 16 to 18 hours a day to get to the bottom of a bad mess.

One year after he had had his most disastrous football season, he had restored order out of chaos. In less than two years he had placed Minnesota sports on a sound foundation, outlined a constructive program for continued improvement and made friends out of the school's enemies. What's more, he was so optimistic about Minnesota's future that he actually wanted to remain here indefinitely. He had mapped out a 10-year program that couldn't fail to pay dividends to the university. That, even though he knew that certain authorities who only two years ago had begged him to come here were hoping he would accept a position elsewhere for petty, personal reasons of their own.

It wasn't money as much as healthy working conditions that Fritz Crisler wanted in return for his achievements.

University officials knew in December that Fritz Crisler wasn't satisfied. What did they do to improve the situation so that their admirable asset would continue to build in a way that meant nothing but healthy dividends for the institution? Nothing.

Barton, in his autobiography, offered a different view of Crisler's departure. He said the Regents had decided to

obtain a new football coach while keeping Crisler as athletic director. Crisler, however, was not satisfied with that arrangement, and when it became known that Bernie Bierman would be football coach in 1932, Crisler began to look for another position. Barton says Crisler wanted to "attain national prestige as a winning coach at a major university."

This suggests, contrary to Crisler's announcement on December 5, that the appointment of a coach was made over his objection rather than at his initiative. Professor James Quirk has commented that it would have been "truly an extraordinary act" for such a young man to retire as coach and hire his own successor. Besides, as Quirk points out, Crisler went to Michigan (and to Princeton) holding both positions, so it was clearly not the case that the demands of the dual responsibilities were too great. It may have been that Crisler was dissatisfied, although not for all the reasons propounded in the press at the time, and decided to leave because of the abrogation of his duties.

MacKinnon offers a much different interpretation of these events, and asserts that only a very few people knew what actually occurred. "Crisler had been fired privately" by Coffman, before he departed for the Orient in October of 1931. "All the rest, continuing as Athletic Director, was just temporary window dressing to give him time to get another job."

MacKinnon, who is no admirer of Crisler's ability as a coach, nonetheless says it was not Crisler's won-lost record that led to his demise. (Although, he says, "his record would have been enough to fire him. He had lost seven games in two years, against Spears' loss of four games in his last three years by a total of five points.) Rather, it was Crisler's unacceptable behavior as a womanizer. MacKinnon tells the tale.

President Coffman found out that Crisler, a married man, was carrying on a liaison with a leading lady actress at the Bainbridge Theatre in Minneapolis, and taking her on trips to Chicago. President Coffman called in Crisler and confronted him with the charges. Crisler denied them. Coffman then appointed an investigating committee with Dean Everett Frazer of the Law School as Chairman. The Committee hired a private detective to investigate the alleged liaison with the actress. He investigated and reported back to the Committee. Dean Frazer told me personally one night after a Law Review banquet, "You would have thought he (Crisler) would have had enough brains to pull down the shades." When the Committee reported their findings to Coffman he fired Crisler.

It is MacKinnon's view that "the die had already been cast for Crisler to leave and Bierman to replace him" before Coffman left the United States.

Moreover, says MacKinnon, it is highly probable that Coffman had already selected Bierman before he left for the Orient in late October, 1931. He observes that "from the facts you have recited about Coffman being on vacation when all of the changes were made, to me is practically conclusive proof that everything about Crisler leaving was all arranged in advance because no president of Minnesota would be absent from the campus if he was in the process of picking a football coach or athletic director." He also recalls that Henry Williams may have been at Tulane, as Bierman was preparing for the Rose Bowl, ostensibly to help an old player but "in reality . . . a messenger from the president."

Bill Daley, who played football at Minnesota under Bierman and then under Crisler at Michigan during World War II, does not believe Crisler was fired. By his own account, Daley and Crisler were great drinking buddies who also traveled and womanized together. Daley is certain that Crisler would have told him if he had been fired from Minnesota. Daley describes Crisler as an affable,

cosmopolitan, articulate, forceful, handsome man who did things, who mobilized people behind him, and who got the state to support the athletic program. But he agreed that Crisler engaged in behavior that some might have found unacceptable, including his dealings with women, and that Coffman might have brought pressure on Crisler to leave.

Julius Perlt knew Crisler when he was at Chicago, under A. A. Stagg, and was delighted when Crisler came to Minnesota. He described Crisler as "dynamic, well-spoken, and smarter than hell." Perlt says that Archie Jackson, President of St. Paul Fire and Marine and a Princeton graduate, had the job of birddogging good athletes for Princeton. "He birddogged Fritz Crisler for Princeton. Archie got Fritz to go to Princeton. And Fritz was getting unhappy; he had too much administration telling him what to do." Perlt added that "too much administration" was Jimmy Paige.

Both Daley and Perlt also believe that Crisler did select, or play a role in selecting, Bernie Bierman. As noted, MacKinnon avers that Dr. Henry Williams recommended him to Coffman. But Perlt says Crisler knew Bierman, and respected him; "Coffman didn't know Bernie from a load of hay."

In the same column that George Barton was wishing Crisler well at Princeton, he also began to bandy about the names of successors. So did Cullum and so did the Daily. Amidst all the guessing there came a comment in the Daily that "the selection of a new director would not necessarily hinge upon the return of President Coffman. The President is believed, however, to have left instructions last fall concerning the selection of a new athletic director." Acting President Guy Stanton Ford promptly issued a heated denial that Coffman had known that Crisler would leave. When the President did return, a few days later, he repeated Ford's denial himself. MacKinnon dismisses these denials as part of the "window dressing."

By early March, 1932, a number of names had appeared. Cullum said the campus opinion was that it would be an insider, and three people were being considered (Bierman, L. J. Cooke, and line coach Tad Wieman). Ford finally announced, on March 5, that no decision would be made until Coffman returned to campus.

If the report of the Journal on March 9 is accurate, Coffman had decided to follow his own advice, tendered in the letter to Regent Snyder at the close of the hiring of Crisler: "This business of having to work with committees is, in my opinion, illogical and administratively unsound." The reported related:

Up to now having played practically a lone hand in the process of finding a new athletic director, President Lotus D. Coffman of the University of Minnesota had left the impression among his associates the post will be filled without benefit of committee. Dr. Coffman is

reported to have whittled down the long list of candidates himself, making some decisions with the advice of staff members. Troubles encountered by the committee selection two years ago when Fritz Crisler was appointed are believed to have influenced Dr. Coffman against a similar procedure now.

By the end of March both Frank McCormick and John McGovern had been added to the list of possible candidates; Wieman had decided, by then, to go to Princeton with Crisler. Cullum bemoaned this loss, too.

On the morning of April 1, 1932, President Coffman issued a statement announcing the selection of Frank McCormick, baseball coach and assistant football coach, as the new athletic director. Coffman said he only considered men presently on the staff, and McCormick was the third person to whom the job had been offered. Wieman had declined and followed Crisler instead. L. J. Cooke had declined on grounds of age and health. (According to Foster, Coffman advised Cooke not to take the job, even though offered.) Everyone whom the newspapers could find to talk to was full of praise for McCormick, even that most persistent of critics, Dick Cullum.

This then ended President Coffman's involvement in the selection of athletic directors and football coaches. After three directors and four coaches, he was able to serve out the remaining six years of his presidency--the rest of his life--without another athletic storm.

A Note on Bierman's Football Successes

It is MacKinnon's opinion that Spears and Crisler, the latter inadvertently, paved the way for a talented coach such as Bierman. Even though Spears left, SCIA and Coffman had agreed to most of his demands for improving the football program. According to MacKinnon, "another factor that is not mentioned is that after the miserable showing of Crisler his first year, the University realized he was not able to fill Spears' shoes . . . and that they would have to relax even more their discrimination against athletics in order to aid Crisler (their choice) to make a better record and thus avoid further criticism for losing Spears. They then granted further concessions to athletes in the form of relaxed eligibility standards (same as other schools), campus jobs and general cooperation. Thus when Bierman came he walked into an ideal situation--all problems corrected. Football material then flocked to Minnesota." MacKinnon also thinks "the appointment of McCormick was a stroke of genius. He was the best organizer the school ever had. . . . A good athletic prospect practically never was lost." So, "Bierman started out with all Spears' complaints corrected and a great Athletic Director."

CHAPTER 4

PRESIDENT COFFMAN, THE FOOTBALL COACH, AND THE ALUMNI

The opening salvo of much-publicized alumni involvement in University athletics came, or so the files suggest, on November 14, 1924, from Richard L. Griggs of Duluth (who was to become a University Regent, "father" of the Duluth campus, and, still alive in 1984, perhaps the only person who can legitimately claim to have personally known every University president). Griggs merely dropped a friendly note "not . . . to offer any criticism . . . but to support a view which I have heard expressed among different alumni that . . . it would seem unwise to enter into a further contract with Mr. Spaulding, or at least not into a three-year contract."

Griggs' letter came on the heels of a Minneapolis Tribune article on November 11, 1924, by George Barton, who had learned "from an authoritative source" that William Spaulding's contract as head football coach would be renewed. The coach had the support of Luehring, Coffman, and SCIA in spite of a disappointing 1924 conference season. They were said to be satisfied with the record of Spaulding's tenure.

In his response to Griggs, Coffman set forth a number of his views about football, views that would guide him over the next two months.

The comments and opinions with reference to the efficiency of our coaching system is, as you know, somewhat divided. That, however, is a thing which is not characteristic of Minnesota alone. A similar situation prevails in practically every institution in this country, or if it does not prevail now it has in recent years. . . . Of course, the general situation raised a good many questions as to what we have football for. The members of the team at the University of Minnesota are loyal and enthusiastic in their support of Coach Spaulding. I believe they are for him almost to a man. I am also confident that the members of his department as well as a large majority of the faculty of the institution are loyal in their support of him. . . . On the other hand, we are having a certain amount of criticism from the outside insisting upon a change in coaches. My own opinion with reference to certain aspects of the situation is not at all clear. It is, however, perfectly clear with reference to other aspects. I am convinced that whenever the day arrives that educational institutions change their coaches in response to the demand for championship teams and that alone, football will have received its death knell as a college sport. I am sure you know me well enough to know that I like to see teams win as

well as any one. There is nothing I enjoy more than an exceptionally well coached team.

We shall give our situation all of the consideration that it deserves. We have reached no decision as yet, but our decision, when reached, will be based upon the relationships which football must bear to the primary purpose and excuse for the existence of a university.

Coffman's letter, on November 24, 1924, followed a front-page editorial in the Minneapolis Journal the preceding Sunday entitled "Wanted: A New Coach." The editorial criticized Spaulding's coaching, said he did not make good use of outstanding players, and accused him of "fumbling, indifferent teamwork." In response to the reported inclination of University officials to extend the coach's contract, the Journal said the people of Minnesota, who paid a lot of money to see the games and who thereby funded most of the program as well as the new stadium (built in 1924), were "entitled to see at least the best possible effort toward winning games." The Tribune ran an editorial the same day, but suggested that to place all of the blame for football ups and downs on the coach was not appropriate or fair. The paper did not exonerate Spaulding, but it did find other factors involved.

The team and the student body must share the responsibility with the coach. There is not in the university that will to fight an uphill fight, sticking together through thick and thin, win or lose. On the contrary, with the first signs of defeat the carping critics arise on all sides, shrill with denunciations, voluble with rumors, buzzing with whispered scandals from training quarters about jealousies, and contention among the players, whining about the coach and generally adopting the defeatist attitude.

Perhaps Minnesota does need a new coach. We are willing to take the word of self-admitted experts as to that, but if the Tribune may express a lay and decidedly inexpert opinion, it is this: That Minnesota needs a great deal more than a new coach. Minnesota needs a new spirit, a win or lose spirit, and if it doesn't get it, the smartest coach in the world will be useless. If we can only play football when we have a championship team, the stadium is a mighty poor investment.

The Daily, the following day, rebuked both the Minneapolis papers for suggesting that contributions to the funds to build the stadium meant that the public could dictate the selection of coaches. It did, however, otherwise commend the Tribune for a balanced view.

In early December of 1925 the Tribune reported a development which will be of particular import in this chapter but which will be of equal significance in following chapters as well. The four-paragraph article is reprinted

here in its entirety.

University of Minnesota "M" men seeking a voice in the administration of athletics at Minnesota will meet December 15 at the Minneapolis Athletic club to organize. The organization, which will be distinct from the "M" club, a purely social body, will be a state wide club.

Constitution and by-laws have been drawn up for adoption at the December 15 meeting, at which officers and directors also will be elected. The committee on organization meets tomorrow.

"The purpose of the club will not be to 'get somebody,'" it was said Thursday night by one of the organizers. "It will be our aim that all criticism of and suggestions to the athletic administration be constructive."

"We believe that the great body of 'M' men, numbering more than 600 persons, is capable of tendering helpful suggestions in athletics and that Minnesota athletics thereby will be benefited. We plan no interference except where we believe it will be of a helpful nature."

One cannot tell if President Coffman saw the article or, if he did, what he thought of the idea that the club would "seek a voice in the administration of athletics."

George Barton wrote that the creation of the club was a worthwhile step. He thought it could assist "in selecting coaches," that it would help all sports, and that "it is only right and proper that men who risked life and limb upon the athletic field for Minnesota should have a voice in the conduct of various branches of sport at the University."

On December 16 the Tribune reported on the organizational meeting. The group adopted a resolution to "render whatever assistance and advice in their power" in order to help the University athletic program. They called on their new president, Bert Page, to appoint a committee to meet with the University president.

Coffman received a few letters, pro and con, on Spaulding. His thought that the players and department supported Spaulding were confirmed shortly in writing. On January 3, 1925, he received a resolution, signed by 18 members of the football team, which noted that "whereas it is rumored that a certain University of Minnesota alumni group propose to recommend to the University authorities that Mr. Spaulding's football contract not be renewed," and which expressed confidence in the coach. On January 12, Coffman received a letter, also addressed to the Board of Regents, from the coaching and athletic staff requesting that Spaulding be retained.

The first written acknowledgement by Coffman of the possibility of organized external pressure appeared in a

January 9, 1925, letter to the president of Western State Normal School in Kalamazoo. Coffman implies that the written record does not adequately describe the situation:

It has proved to be very difficult in recent months and the smoke is not yet all cleared away. A number of newspapers attacked Mr. Spaulding's coaching most vigorously and at least two or three of them requested his resignation. An organization composed of former players has recently been created. Many of the members of this association are convinced that Spaulding's coaching has not been a success. . . . My support of him has been made perfectly clear. The suggestion that he would probably be recommended for reappointment has met with vigorous protest, much of which has been directed at me.

The group of former players to which Coffman referred was the new "M" Club.

On Thursday, January 7, 1925, Coffman apparently met with a delegation from the "M" Club, because he received a letter from one of its directors, O. N. Davies, on January 12 expressing appreciation for the meeting. The "M" Club Board of Directors "was gratified by your reception . . . and your evident interest in the club. It was the undivided opinion of [the directors] that your suggestions as to the possible fields of co-operation were very well conceived." Davies went on to pledge support for the University, asked the President to seek aid whenever he wished, and requested a letter outlining the areas of cooperation about which Coffman had spoken. Coffman responded two days later with a four and one-half page letter listing eight activities in which he thought the "M" Club could be of assistance to the University. They included such things as properly presenting University problems to communities around the state and to high school students, promoting the University, urging promising athletes to attend (without proselytizing or purchasing), officiating high school games, getting jobs for students, helping to improve athletic facilities, work to stop gambling on games, and lobby for better football schedules (which were a recurring headache for the Conference presidents during this period). Coffman cordially welcomed their interest and support.

The Spaulding appointment was scheduled for action at the January 27, 1925, Regents meeting. On January 9 Coffman wrote to Fred Luehring asking for his written recommendation on Spaulding and directing Luehring to take up the matter with E. B. Pierce, Chairman of SCIA, to ensure that appropriate Committee action was taken. He followed it up with a joint letter to Luehring and Spaulding four days later, telling them that he, and the Board of Regents, continued to hear many rumors of a breach between them and insisting that he have their views. "I must be in a position to refute unwarranted criticism," Coffman warned them. Both Luehring and Spaulding wrote back to assure them they worked well together and apologized for the controversy. Luehring informed the President that he had recommended to SCIA a

one-year reappointment with no change in salary.

The President also sought the views of other coaches. He wrote to Knute Rockne of Notre Dame, Bob Zuppke of Illinois, and Fielding Yost of Michigan, soliciting their confidential views of Spaulding's competence as a coach. All three responded with warm endorsements of Spaulding. Rockne commented that "I have noticed a tendency on the part of the alumni of most of our colleges to be chasing rainbows. That is, they are never satisfied with any coach, they want a miracle man, and there is no such animal." Yost concurred with Rockne and added: "As long as an outside influence can dictate the policy of a university in selecting coaches, I believe those coaches are working under a constant handicap and an unfair one."

On January 19, 1925, E. B. Pierce wrote to Coffman reporting a special SCIA meeting to consider a recommendation for Spaulding's reappointment. A representative of the "M" Club appeared to speak against the reappointment, but the Committee voted 9-2 to approve the recommendation from Luehring.

In the days preceding the Regents meeting, Coffman received a number of letters from the deans expressing strong support for Spaulding. Those who wrote individual letters included E. E. Nicholson (Student Affairs), John B. Johnston (Science, Literature, and the Arts), Frederick Wulling (Pharmacy), Frank Walter (University Librarian), M. E. Haggerty (Education), F. J. Kelly (Administration), Alfred Owre (Dentistry), George Dowrie (Business), Everett Fraser (Law School), E. M. Freeman (Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics), O. M. Leland (Engineering and Architecture), and E. P. Lyon (Medical School). They all followed up with a joint two-page letter to the Board of Regents on January 22, 1925, the day before the meeting of the Board.

Although not directly germane to the specific issue of governance, a letter from a former football player to one of Spaulding's assistant coaches made its way into Coffman's files, and it casts an interesting light on the situation. His opening paragraph was this:

Ain't it hell being a football coach? When you win you're a king and when you lose you're a bum and everybody wants to take your bread and butter away from you. You know alumni are the damndest people on earth. We won't let them on the field here [Berkeley]. . . . What about this new M Club? I'm holding out yet until I see what they do. Look a little Bolshevik to me but maybe I'm wrong and they are all right--but I don't like their present attitude--they look dangerous--no construction or open-mindedness. A coach has a bad year and out come the hammers.

The crescendo came at the Board of Regents meeting, on January 23. The "M" Club President, L. A. (Bert) Page, sent to the Board President, Regent Fred Snyder, an eight-and-one-half page typed, single-spaced letter reciting

Spaulding's failings, an "M" Club investigation into his coaching ability, and telling him that the "M" Club had a committee to present their views to the Board. Page informed Snyder that "the Board of Directors of the 'M' Club on vote recently taken was unanimous in the view that the present coach is unfit for the position which he now holds." Page went on to express his dismay that "a rumor has been circulated to the effect that the University authorities intend to recommend the re-employment of Mr. Spaulding not because of his fitness . . . but because such authorities wish to show outsiders that they cannot dictate the policy of athletics at the University." Page said the "M" Club did not believe the University would put personal pride above its own best interests. The letter was dated the day of the meeting.

On the day of the meeting the Journal described what would occur. Three different delegations had been called to make presentations: the deans, represented by Johnson, the students, and the "M" Club. Bert Page told the Journal reporter that "we are prepared to go to the mat in the matter of getting a new coach."

President Coffman's files also contain the text of his remarks to the Board of Regents--a ten-and-one-half page typed speech. The discussion meeting itself took, according to a Daily article the next day, three hours. In his comments to the Regents, Coffman reviewed his interactions with the "M" Club, their professed interest in helping, and his own long letter suggesting ways in which they could do so. He recalled attending a lunch with them, when "it became clear to me that this meeting was arranged for two purposes: (1) to urge that Mr. Spaulding not be reappointed and (2) to arrange for a hearing before the Board of Regents." Coffman said he told them they could provide him with all the information they wished, that he, in turn, would forward it to the Regents, and that he thought that was the procedure that would be followed. Coffman reviewed the approvals and endorsements Spaulding had received from SCIA, and concluded his opening comments by saying "and now as the final step in this series of events a special committee of the 'M' Club appears in person before the Board of Regents requesting it to decline to concur in various recommendations relating to Mr. Spaulding's reappointment."

Coffman continued: "As incident followed incident, and event event, it has become clearer and clearer that one of the primary purposes, if not the primary purpose of the 'M' Club, is to dictate the appointment of athletic coaches." Part of his text is crossed out, suggesting he did not use it; in it he condemned the methods used by the "M" Club, relying on "rumors, insinuations, and innuendos," and what it had done: "Great harm has been done the University by these various rumors and attacks. It will require a long time for the institution to recover from them. . . . In all my administrative experience this attack has been the most destructive, the most disintegrating, and the most demoralizing in its effect upon the University."

The President did, however, contrast the position of the "M" Club with others:

When one analyzes the consequences of this procedure of the "M" Club, what does he find? He finds that the judgment of this group is arrayed against the judgment of the deans of the institution, who unanimously endorse Mr. Spaulding, [and who] . . . declare that football . . . [is] maintained at the University as a part of our educational scheme and not primarily as spectacles for the public. . . . He finds that the opinion of the "M" Club is arrayed against that of the other administrative officers of the University . . . [and] against the recommendations of the assistant coaches . . . , against that of the boys who have played on the teams under Mr. Spaulding . . . , this group has arrayed its opinions against that of some of the leaders of the coaching profession [citing at length from the laudatory letters from Rockne, Yost, and Zuppke].

Coffman warned the Regents of the consequences of accepting the "M" Club recommendation:

The truth about the matter is that Mr. Spaulding is recommended by the deans of the University, representatives of the student body, his own associates, students who have worked with him, captains of his teams, the Director of Physical Education, the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, and the President of the University. These facts were known to the representatives of the "M" Club and yet in the face of them they appear in person and presume to ask the Regents of the University to set aside these recommendations.

If the demands of the representatives of the "M" Club are acceded to in this case, it means that the educational policies of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics are being discarded for the commercialization of college sports. Benefits which should come to the University from football will be discarded in the interest of building championship teams and of securing as large an income from football as it is possible for us to obtain. It means the injection of one of the most unfortunate influences into the football situation. A new atmosphere will dominate it. A new spirit will characterize its conduct. And that atmosphere and that spirit will be subversive to the best interests and to the greatest good of the University.

It means that football instead of being a college sport for college students on a strictly amateur basis with amateur purposes and motives, becomes saturated with the spirit of professionalism. When coaches are dismissed because they do not develop championship teams, when outside agencies are permitted to dictate the appointments of coaches because they have not developed championship teams,

the natural result will be the injection of a spirit of professionalism into the administration and direction of college games. This is the very thing which our colleges and universities have traditionally and vigorously opposed. It is opposed by every university in the Big Ten Conference. It is contrary to the best interests of the University. If this spirit be injected into college life it means the eventual destruction of inter-collegiate sports.

Coffman ended his remarks by endorsing a two-year appointment for Spaulding. After what must have been one of the more acrimonious discussions at the Board meeting, it voted unanimously to give Spaulding the two-year appointment recommended by the President. The text of Coffman's speech was printed in full in both the Minneapolis papers the following day.

Both the Tribune and the Journal, on January 24, also ran lengthy articles describing the meeting and the debates. The final action, apparently, came quickly, if the papers' reports are accurate:

Following the statement of President Coffman and his recommendation that Coach Spaulding be reappointed, the business of the meeting moved swiftly. Fred B. Snyder, president of the board of regents, in a brief talk in which he deprecated the situation, moved that Mr. Spaulding be offered a two-year contract. The motion was seconded by Dr. W. J. Mayo and immediately passed unanimously.
(Tribune)

"M" Club president Page took public exception to the treatment he and other club representatives had been afforded. He was quoted by a Journal reporter as saying that their actions had been "unjustly maligned and [their] intentions deliberately misconstrued." He said, however, that the "M" Club would continue and would try to help the athletic program.

The newspapers also had editorials, the same day they reported on the meeting. The thrust was a defense of the University. Excerpts:

Coach Spaulding's reappointment provided a swift climax to the hearing which took up three consecutive hours. President Lotus D. Coffman asked for "quick, sure and convincing" action. Fred B. Snyder, president of the board of regents, departed from usual parliamentary procedure to move the reappointment himself. Dr. William J. Mayo seconded the motion "to reappoint Mr. Spaulding for three years." Mr. Snyder corrected him with "two years" and M. M. Williams of Duluth put the motion. There were no "noes." (Journal)

The engagement and direction of the football coach

at the University of Minnesota is a function that belongs to the president and the Board of Regents and essentially and as completely as the engagement and direction of a professor of philology. The fact that the public at large, that certain special groups of the public, take a larger and more intense interest in football gives no additional warrant for interference in one case than in the other. . . . The Board of Regents out of its investigations has come to the conclusion that Coach Spaulding shall be retained in charge of the football affairs of the University. The regents unquestionably are the men and women best qualified to make this decision. . . . There has been an effort on the part of students and alumni to prevent the re-engagement of Coach Spaulding. That matter is now definitely settled. It was settled by the Board of Regents on whom the right of settlement rested. The decision of the regents will be accepted as final by all true supporters of university athletics. . . . The success of the university is of incomparably more importance than any private success or reputation that may come to Coach Spaulding. No one is compelled to believe that Mr. Spaulding is an outstanding genius in football coaching, but we are all compelled to give him just as much help as if that opinion of his ability were unanimous. . . . He has been the subject of bitter, unjust, and sometimes insincere, attacks, in the face of which he has maintained a good natured silence. He has shown himself larger than some of his critics. The Tribune extends to the Board of Regents its congratulations on its decision to retain Mr. Spaulding. (Tribune)

Several dozen people wrote to Coffman after the Regents' meeting, the vast majority of whom expressed admiration and support for the stand he had taken. In his response to one, Coffman gave voice to another concern that he had not explicitly noticed previously. "When the question of Mr. Spaulding's re-appointment was carried so far that it became an issue before the Board of Regents, then it really meant that if the Board sustained the representatives of the 'M' Club not only would it be turning down the members of the faculty, the leaders of the student body, Mr. Spaulding's own associates, many of the students who have played on teams with him, the captain-elect for the next year and the president of the University, it would, so it seemed to me, have made my own position in the University untenable." Or, as Coffman described it later in a letter to another who had written in support of his stance, the issue was "whether the recommendations of the regularly constituted University officers should prevail in the matter of appointment or the recommendations of the group of persons outside the University who have no official connection whatsoever with the University."

Despite the sharp rebuke Coffman administered to the "M" Club at the Regents meeting, he and Club President Page agreed to an exchange of letters afterwards in order to try to pave the way for amicable relations in the future. Although there is obviously no record of any conversations which might have taken place between the two men, it is apparent from the records in Coffman's files that the attempt to exchange letters of reconciliation was tinged with recollection of the adversity engendered by the meeting.

Coffman's letter to Page went through three drafts. It started out as a four-page defense of his own actions and contained a tongue-lashing of the "M" Club. The final version was one page which expressed regret at the misunderstanding, noted that "I am convinced . . . that the members of the Club did not attach the same significance to their procedure that my associates on the faculty and I did," and invited the Club to join in "a program of cooperation and assistance for the future." This letter went to Page on February 9, 1925.

That all of this preparation for a public exchange was not without some rancor is amply demonstrated by an undated pencilled note from Coffman to Regent Fred Snyder (from Snyder's files). The note is worth reproducing here, for it conveys more directly Coffman's own feelings. It was, as the text makes clear, written during the period when the exchange of letters was being negotiated.

Dear Mr. Snyder:

This note is confidential. Please do not quote what I say in it. I am writing and sending Mr. Page's letter because I have reason to believe that he will come to

see you this morning about his letter. I also believe that he may be willing to add an additional sentence or so covering the questions which have been raised concerning their procedure in this case. I have not talked with Mr. Page nor have I shown his letter to any, but a mutual friend intimated last night that Mr. Page would probably be willing to make a statement to the effect that they recognize that their methods and procedures were wrong. My judgment and that of my faculty associates that they wished to control or vitiate the appointment of the football coach was based entirely on their acts. Let them acknowledge that their procedure was wrong, even though their motives and intentions were as they maintain of the best, and there will be no difficulty in adjusting matters. If Mr. Page inserts an adequate sentence covering this point, he will be met more than half way.

I am preparing a letter which I shall bring to your office some time this morning-----

Cordially,

L. D. Coffman

P.S. It has come to me very directly since Saturday [probably February 7, since Page's original letter was dated February 5] that one of Mr. Page's associates has said that I am about to apologize, that I have already tried to do so twice, and that I am not only to do so in writing but at a meeting which they expect to call soon. I have no apologies to make. If I had the same facts and circumstances to face again I would do as I did this time. (All underlining in Coffman's note.)

The ironic footnote is that Spaulding resigned four months later to become athletic director at the University of Southern California.

CHAPTER 5

THE CARNEGIE REPORT AND THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Once again, following the flurry of activity of the reorganization in 1921-22, there came a period of relative calm insofar as the structure of athletics was concerned. SCIA devoted its attention, during the 1920s, to Conference rules, schedules, eligibility matters, and ticket prices and was, of course, deeply involved in guiding the Department on the management of construction of new facilities (the stadium and the field house--which is now Williams Arena). It also remained active in reviewing and approving expenditures, as it was charged to do under the Senate by-laws.

In the late 1920s the Carnegie Commission conducted a nationwide review of intercollegiate athletics and issued a 349-page report in 1929. The Commission had sent, in 1927, a field representative to evaluate the situation at the Colleges of the Big Ten; the correspondence makes clear that he received the full cooperation of everyone at Minnesota. On page 100 of the Commission report the following language appeared:

Among recent measures of athletic administration, none has received more favorable notice or spread more widely than the system that goes by the name of "faculty control. . . ."

A. PSEUDO-FACULTY CONTROL

Not infrequently "faculty control" exists in name but scarcely in fact. Although the regulations of the Intercollegiate Conference stipulate for complete faculty control and provide for an operating body of faculty representatives, the actual control often appears to rest with the directors or the coaches. Presumably the fact that such officers hold their appointments from university trustees is felt to make them thoroughgoing faculty members. One or two universities (Iowa, Minnesota) fix such authority in their presidents; in final decisions and in the execution of policies little regard appears to be paid to representatives of the faculty.

[T]he most regrettable aspect of the control of college athletics in the United States to-day is the meagreness of the responsibility that is entrusted to the undergraduate. . . .

The Daily carried an article on October 24, 1929, with the headline "Coffman Denies Charges that Faculty Control of Athletics Does Not Exist at Minnesota." Coffman's view was unequivocally echoed, in the text of the article, by Luehring, Spears (head football coach), an alumni member of

SCIA, and E. B. Pierce. And in fact, scrutiny of the files, minutes, and other documents available can only lead one to be puzzled by the Commission statement. While it is certainly true that President Coffman was more or less continuously apprised of events in athletics, and occasionally involved, it is not accurate to say that he controlled the outcomes or that he ignored the faculty. And it is not true that the final locus of authority rested with the president. Apart from the ever-present potential conflict twixt faculty and president or regents, the charter documents all vested control with SCIA.

The conclusion about Minnesota is even more puzzling in light of the correspondence between President Coffman and the Carnegie Commission staff member who supervised the study. On April 17, 1929--six months before the report was issued--Coffman received a summary of the Commission findings on Minnesota. Included is a description of the organization and control:

- A. Theoretical: 1. Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, appointed by President, concerned with eligibility and policies, composed of 2 alumni, 8 faculty including Dean of Student Affairs, Comptroller, and the Faculty representative of the Intercollegiate Conference as ex-officio members. 2. Department of Physical Education and Athletics manages details and routine.
- B. Active Control--rests with this Committee, although the faculty and particularly the President are dominating influence.

This language certainly does not accord with the final report, quoted previously.

Then, two months after the report was issued, President Coffman received another letter from the same staff member. In it he said:

So far as our information serves, it would appear that at the University of Minnesota, the President and faculty are in full control of the athletic situation. We like very much the spirit in which, so far as we know, rules are and have been interpreted.

Apparently, the attempt is made by the President and by all administrative and athletic officers to keep the spirit of regulations as well as adhere to their letter. [Does one see here the influence of James Paige?]

We regard the general athletic program as in many particulars one of the best-administered of all those we have had the privilege of studying.

Why Minnesota was damned in the report but privately commended is a mystery.

Following on the heels of the Carnegie Commission report in late 1929 came the resignation of Clarence Spears as head football coach. Although the details of his departure were covered in more detail in Chapter Three, it can be recalled here that he had a number of complaints about the organization and administration of athletics at the University. Two problems, in Spears' opinion, were a weak athletic director and, interestingly enough, a committee that was too strong. SCIA tried to respond affirmatively to the changes Spears sought for the football team, but there were no proposals to alter the operating structure of the University vis-a-vis athletics.

In the Daily on January 18, 1930, there was a front page story about a proposal to radically restructure the organization and competition of varsity athletics. The plan allegedly included, according to the article, these elements:

- 1) compulsory participation in athletics for "all able bodied students"
- 2) Big Ten competition only with Wisconsin and Michigan, other games with schools in the East and West
- 3) reorganization of the athletic department
- 4) only Minnesota men hired to coach.

Five other Big Ten schools were also reported to be considering such a plan. The four members of SCIA who were contacted by the reporter denied ever having heard of such a plan.

Reposing in the President's files, however, is a "Jan 1930" typed memo initialled by "JCL" (Coffman's assistant, J. C. Lawrence) which outlines precisely such a plan. In addition to the provisions reported by the Daily, it included many others, one of which read "Make the director of athletics direct, reporting to the president of the University. Abolish the Athletics Committee, and make this a bona-fide department of instruction." Although nothing ever came of the plan, either at Minnesota or elsewhere, there was clearly increasing sentiment to examine closely the way athletics were being conducted at the University.

In part because of the publicity engendered by the Carnegie Commission report, and perhaps in larger part because of the charges levelled by Dr. Spears prior to his resignation, on January 30, 1930, President Coffman appointed a panel of four national experts in athletics to review the athletic department. Their study was remarkable in that it was nearly identical, in method and scope, to the External Review Committee appointed by Vice President Nils Hasselmo in 1982. (They also did things in a grander style then; President Coffman provided his committee with special stationery, which included their names printed on it; Vice President Hasselmo was more parsimonious.) The four members of the Special Committee were:

H. M. Gage, President of Coe College, Iowa
John L. Griffith, Commissioner, Intercollegiate Conference
Grantland Rice, sports writer, author, editor
C. W. Savage, Director of Physical Education for Men at Oberlin

Coffman's action provoked a public letter on February 10 from his Administrative Committee applauding it (which included some of the more illustrious names in the history of the University: Ford, Johnson, Coffey, Fraser, Lyon, Appleby, Wulling, Nicholson, Diehl, Middlebrook, and Walter). The Regents, on the same day, approved an expenditure of \$250 per month from February 16 to May 16 for the expenses of the Special Committee.

The press also took note of the creation of the Special Committee. George Barton, writing for the Minneapolis Tribune on January 31, 1930, cited the decision as evidence for Coffman's unspoken plans "to make sweeping changes" in the athletic program. The Daily, the same day, made the same comment.

A Tribune article the next day attempted to analyze the possible outcomes of the Special Committee report. The reporter showed some prescience, because the possible changes predicted presaged the final report with some accuracy. It was said that the group might recommend

a number of changes in administrative functions and powers. . . . There is said to be a complicated system of athletics management at Minnesota, involving too much committee [SCIA] recommendation work and not sufficient executive power.

According to the article, the athletic director had no real power, but rather made recommendations to the SCIA. SCIA would discuss them, but was described as having final authority only on "minor decisions"; most recommendations went forward to President Coffman. Then, lending some credence to the Carnegie Commission report, the reporter told that

from information gained from various sources, it is understood that President Coffman and William T. Middlebrook, university comptroller, wield their veto power very strongly. Their ideas are said to influence the committee members into changing their votes even after they have agreed with good majorities on certain points.

The result was a cumbersome process that might be made more workable by having a department director who had authority, and it was expected that the Special Committee would call for such a change.

MacKinnon offers a less charitable interpretation of the motive for appointing the Special Committee. "In my opinion, the creation of the Special Committee in 1930 was a move

designed to take the heat off the president for the loss of Dr. Spears. Doc had been successful in bringing Minnesota back to national standing in football. . . . Coffman and the administration moved quickly, after Doc privately told them he was quitting, to stifle criticism, because of Doc's great popularity. In the whole they were successful in this respect." MacKinnon adds that "another thing they did was get all of the football players together at a meeting and some person from the administration, I think it was E. B. Pierce, told them they were glad to see Doctor Spears leave, he worked the boys too hard, etc. This is, of course, belied by the negotiations that the committee undertook to meet some of his criticisms."

At the request of President Coffman, the Special Committee presented, early, its recommendations concerning the administrative structure of athletics, on September 24, 1930.

The first eleven pages of the report were a paean to the University and athletics, with references to the Greeks, European writers, the philosophy of education and sport, and numerous other rhetorical flourishes. Then, in the last eight pages, the Special Committee got down to business. They recapitulated the history of faculty involvement in athletics, similar to this review, and then made a series of concrete resolutions.

Their history bears comment because it differs, in some respects, from this one. (The Special Committee may have had better records than are available today.) Of the creation of the University Council, in 1905, and its Committee on Athletics, they say that the

Committee directly expressed the University's sense of responsibility for athletics but directly intervened between the administration and the Board of Control. It instituted the subcommittee or bureaucratic form of management and control which has continued to the present time. A sub-committee to manage ticket and other income was appointed; also a sub-committee to supervise expenditures recommended by the Board of Control.

Inasmuch as there are no records of the Council or its Committee on Athletics now extant, it is impossible to determine if that is a valid view of what occurred. The Board of Control minutes do not reflect that faculty supervision, through the Council, but it may have existed.

The Special Committee also noted the creation of the Senate and SCIA, commenting that "the sub-committee form of management was continued, save that the entire committee passed on questions of eligibility. In general, [SCIA] managed the business affairs of athletics and also managed athletics, subject always to the Senate." Again, because there are no SCIA minutes available until it succeeded the Board of Control, there is no record that it was involved to the extent described. They qualify the role SCIA played by observing that "a practical, if not theoretical, limitation

of the Committee's power appears in the fact that the Advisory Board of Athletic Control of the Athletic Association (1907) continued to operate and did in fact control the appointment of coaches."

Continuing their recapitulation of history, the Special Committee briefly reviewed the events of 1921-22. They described the alumni resolutions, correctly, as looking "directly toward centralized and unified control." They went on to observe that even though SCIA was reconstituted, "the Sub-committee form of management and control was perpetuated and continues to the present." They wrote that "by reason of membership on the important sub-committees (tickets and auditing) the Director and Comptroller are possessed of much Power" but that the Director nonetheless is only (citing the Senate by-law) "in general charge of and responsible for the detailed administration of intercollegiate athletics subject to the supervision and approval of the committee" (compared to his complete control of physical education and recreational or non-varsity sports). Rather than viewing the appointment of a Director in 1922, and a business manager even earlier, as signs of increasingly professional management, the Special Committee viewed the changes as superficial ones which did not affect the basic "management by subcommittee" style it looked on with such distaste.

Before going to their final recitation of history and recommendations for change, one other finding should be mentioned. The Special Committee asserted, discussing events in late 1890s, that "organized alumni interest has been an active and sometimes controlling interest in Minnesota athletics since 1897." For a contrary view, the remarks of anonymous alumni in the "Coffman Denies" article in the October 24, 1929 Daily are amusing if not enlightening:

If the faculty did not have control of the athletics, the coach would have no difficulty in keeping linemen and backfield men eligible for important tiltz. There would be no difficulty about schedules. We would have inter-sectional games. The players would not have to worry about school work while away on trips.

On one major point, reflected in the first sentence of the extended excerpt that follows, the Special Committee did not disagree with the conclusion that appeared earlier in this book. And they had telegraphed the direction they would take in recommending changes, which becomes explicit here.

Student control has gradually receded as faculty control emerged. Old forms of organization have persisted while new and better ways were being devised and developed. The process of evolution always cumbers a body with a few vestigial organs which are useless, obstructive, and, like the vermiform appendix, an invitation to disease. The line of determinate evolution at Minnesota is quite evident.

Sentiment is especially strong in all matters

pertaining to athletics . . . but the administration of athletics at Minnesota has gone far beyond its sentimental period. As in the call of the alumni in 1922, the call now is for expert knowledge and centralized executive administration . . . conforming to the administrative principles that prevail throughout the rest of the University . . . In adopting such a program one's first inclination might be to regret the passing of "the good old days" when students organized, played, coached and managed the business affairs of their games. It is not probable they were in fact what they seemed to have been as they are casually viewed in retrospect. So viewed the glad abandon of youth at play is attractive. Less attractive on closer view of the past are occasional disorder, frequent organizational changes, suspicion of athletics, failure to realize that sound educational values are inherent in physical activities and competitive sports, and consequent failure to secure these values. . . . Probably the forbidding rigors of an athletic machine may best be avoided, spontaneity and general participation in sports may best be developed, an effective health service may best be conducted, and efficient instruction in physical education best given by a department organized to conduct its own program and manage its own business affairs as are other departments.

The fact that the Department of Physical Education and Athletics has receipts and expenditures which amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually is wholly incidental and entirely subordinate to the fundamental fact that the real affairs of the Department are a part of the teaching function of the University.

It must be remembered that the Special Committee was examining a combined department; athletics and physical education were not formally separated at this University until 1963.

Following this narrative review, the Special Committee made specific recommendations about revising the charter of SCIA.

1. The director should be elected by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the President. He should be responsible to the President and Regents. [The 1922 Senate by-laws called for the President to nominate the Director with the advice of the Committee; the SCIA role is now removed.]
2. It is assumed that all of the affairs of the department of Physical Education and Athletics will conform to usual academic and executive administration and control in the University. For the guidance and promotion of the Intercollegiate Athletics in particular it is recommended that a

Faculty Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics be appointed and that the committee be authorized to serve the director in an advisory capacity, and to assist him in the conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics, and that the committee be specifically composed of such members and endowed with such powers and duties as are required by the Intercollegiate Athletic Conference of which Minnesota is a member. [This basically reduces SCIA to an advisory body; the subcommittees on tickets and auditing are eliminated.]

3. The director should annually and according to regular procedure in the University submit his budget to the President. He should issue or cause to be issued by an assistant, vouchers on the regularly constituted officer for expenditures, which should conform to the authorized budget. [This eliminates a role for SCIA in the budget.]
4. The director should make the intercollegiate schedule of games which should be submitted to the University Senate for approval as respects conflicts with academic rules and interests.
5. Athletic department receipts should be deposited with the University Treasurer who should sign all checks upon vouchers issued by the director. Business affairs of the department should be conducted by the director through regularly constituted offices and assistants articulated with the general business management of the University. [Again, this eliminates SCIA from fiscal matters.]
6. The members of the staff of the department should be appointed by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the director to the President and by him to the Board. [This removes from SCIA any role in hiring; the 1922 by-laws required committee approval of the President's nominees.]

Not surprisingly, SCIA would be vitiated under these recommendations. The only concession to the Big Ten requirement for faculty control is the brief passage in #2, above, about giving them what they need.

A week after President Gage sent the administrative recommendations to President Coffman, Big Ten Commissioner John Griffith (who, it will be recalled, sat on the Special Committee) wrote a separate and confidential letter to Coffman. Because the Special Committee recommendations ran contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the fundamental law of the Conference, Griffith apparently felt obligated to write for two reasons. The first was to express his endorsement of the report, lest there be any doubt, even though "what I have written you would be considered heresy by some of our good people in the Conference." The second was to rebut in advance a lively response from "some persons who have been directly connected with the old organization at Minnesota." Griffith asserted:

The argument that is usually advanced in favor of control that is vested in a committee instead of the head of the department is the one that a committee composed largely of faculty men will be more inclined to safeguard the academic interests of the institution than will a man whose interests are primarily tied up with the athletic department. I have known a number of instances, however, which prove conclusively that the members of (athletic boards) do not always act independently or wisely and I am taking the liberty of mentioning a few such cases."

In all the instances, it was the athletic directors who acted decisively to protect academic integrity and amateurism, in spite of faculty inclination to the contrary.

At the risk of drawing arguable inferences, one might look at the background of the men on the Special Committee. Gage and Savage were from very small schools which did not then and never would have a "Division I/Big Ten" program (in today's parlance) but which doubtless did have educationally-based programs in physical activities. The notion of "faculty control" of their physical education programs would be redundant--they are faculty controlled. Grantland Rice, in his correspondence with Coffman and his colleagues on the Special Committee, repeatedly advocated the need for an educational program. It can be suggested that the Committee members' views on structure were predictable, albeit for different reasons.

We will never know what their other recommendations might have been. Despite working for nearly two years, and spending a lot of the University's money, the Special Committee never issued the rest (the vast majority) of its report. The correspondence, which finally just tailed off, revealed that the four were so badly divided that they could not agree on recommendations.

What they did provide, however, led to action: Within two months of the receipt of the partial report James Paige wrote to Coffman transmitting a revision of the Senate by-laws governing SCIA. Paige and his colleagues conceded to most of the advice of the Special Committee:

- a ticket subcommittee was retained, but with more general functions; auditing was abolished.
- financial matters were all transferred to the Comptroller's Office.
- responsibility for facilities was transferred to Buildings and Grounds.
- personnel matters were completely removed from Committee purview.
- the directive placing physical education and intramurals under the supervision of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics was repealed. (The impact of this change is not clear.)

Paige did not propose to delete the language whereby SCIA "is given entire control of intercollegiate athletics." It is not unlikely that may have been retained in order that the Big Ten would rest assured Minnesota still had faculty control. The wording Paige proposed to Coffman on November 26, 1930, was approved 22 days later, without change, by the Senate.

"Faculty control" is now on the decline, in the sense that control entails management review and administration. And in this instance, there is no indication that Paige was at the center of a controversy. A group of dispassionate evaluators issued findings to which the University paid heed.

At the Conference level at this time, "faculty control" was on the minds of the representatives. The University of Iowa was suspended from the Conference because of alleged financial aid violations (i.e., aid was forbidden but Iowa athletes were receiving it). The faculty representatives excluded the Directors and the Commissioner from their deliberations in May of 1929, but finally solicited their views. Iowa was readmitted in 1930, but the whole issue of "control" was doubtless on the minds of many.

The matter arose again, six years later; a series of events took place at the University of Wisconsin that led the faculty representatives to issue a warning. The Regents were continually interfering in athletics, and raised to conscious concern the residual potential for a clash between faculty governance of athletics and the legal or constitutional power of an institutional board of regents or trustees. Thirty-five years later the faculty representatives would clarify the situation as they saw it; in 1936 they said this:

An occasional or isolated refusal by a governing body to adopt or follow an expression of faculty desire in the management of its intercollegiate athletic program does not necessarily indicate a departure from the Conference requirement; but a persistent and consistent course of action in repudiating duly expressed faculty sentiment can only mean that the faculty of that member [institution] does not have that measure of control demanded by the basic law of the Conference. It is obvious that athletic control involves more than the power to determine such matters as rules of eligibility, extent of schedules and conditions of practice and participation; it must include also a considerable measure of control over the selection of personnel of the staff in active charge (emphasis added).

That measure of control seen as essential by the Conference, expressed by the underlined language, was, of course, precisely (part of) the authority completely relinquished by SCIA in the 1930 constitutional revision. Taking the warning at its face value, it would seem that Minnesota's standing should have been as seriously jeopardized as that of Wisconsin. The records evince not a murmur of discontent.

Before getting on through World War II and into more recent history, it must be noted in passing that Professor Paige retired in 1934 and was succeeded by one of his colleagues on the Law School faculty, Henry Rottschaefer. Although no one has ever matched Paige's 28-year tenure as faculty representative from Minnesota, Rottschaefer came close; he retired from the job in 1957, after 23 years on the job. With the policies presently in place, no one ever will achieve such longevity, because no one may hold the position for more than twelve years.

CHAPTER 6

CHOOSING AND LOSING DIRECTORS AND COACHES: 1950-1978

Two University presidents--Guy Stanton Ford and Walter Coffey--served out their tenure in office without having to hire either an athletic director or a football coach, although Ford had a brush with the experience while serving as acting president in 1931-32. Coffman was in the Orient and Fritz Crisler left for Princeton. President J. L. Morrill was four years into his service as president before being confronted with a major change in athletic department personnel.

One person whose name recurs repeatedly throughout the entire period covered by this chapter is that of Bud Wilkinson. He hovered--unintentionally, to be sure--as a spectre over Morrill, Armstrong, and their successors as personnel decisions in athletics were made.

1950: Ike Armstrong

Frank McCormick announced in the autumn of 1949 that he would retire at the end of the 1949-50 academic year. The Tribune carried the story November 21, 1949. McCormick gave no reasons, and Charles Johnson reported that President Morrill had not accepted it and was trying to get McCormick to change his mind. He did not do so. It was also said that McCormick had tried to resign a year earlier and had been talked out of it. After eighteen years of stable athletic leadership, Morrill was now confronted with the need to choose a new athletic director. Although Morrill said he had done nothing about doing so, Dick Gordon, in the Star, wrote that "the thought persists that [Morrill] . . . will bring in an outsider for the job." This despite the fact that four insiders were "being mentioned" as successors, including Bernie Bierman.

Why McCormick left Minnesota is not clear. At 56 years old, he was well under the normal retirement age of 68; moreover, he did not "retire"; he went on to become supervisor of officials for the Pacific Coast Conference and General sales manager of a brokerage office. But a few people who knew him have offered anecdotes.

Julius Perlt recalls that when Coffman Memorial Union was built, it was constructed on the site of tennis courts which had been paid for with athletic department funds. As a consequence, the department had to pay to have new courts built. Perlt maintains that this decision was made without consulting McCormick, and was the first of a series of administrative orders on how athletics would spend its money. This frustrated McCormick, according to Perlt, and was a factor in his decision.

George MacKinnon, who was a friend and poker buddy of

McCormick, recalls that McCormick asked him to see President Morrill, shortly after he became president, to sound out Morrill's attitudes about athletics. Morrill told MacKinnon, among other things, that he had never been at a school where the football coach was more popular than the president, or more well-known, and that he was tired of hearing so much praise for Bierman. MacKinnon says he was dumbfounded, and passed his impressions along to McCormick. McCormick, according to MacKinnon, told him that "athletics at Minnesota are in for a tough time." It was after that, in MacKinnon's view, that McCormick began making plans to leave.

Clifford Sommer--who, along with Babe LeVoir, Pug Lund, and Wells Wright, dealt with Morrill much more later--also remembers that Bierman and McCormick were not getting along well together. Neither man, however, permitted that discord to become public. And neither man, says MacKinnon, was the sort to depart on a note of openly-voiced discontent or anger. They merely departed in silence.

Early in December, 1949, the President apparently asked Academic Administration Vice President Malcolm Willey how they should go about selecting McCormick's successor. Willey wrote to Morrill, on December 8, setting forth his suggestions. He assumed, he said, that "the Department of Physical Education for Men is a regularly constituted academic department," although Willey acknowledged two differences in that its director reported to the President and that it attracted far more public attention than most departments. On that premise, Willey suggested an advisory committee--with "advisory underscored"--to help in the selection, and gave Morrill several names. The members of the group would include Middlebrook (who had served twenty years earlier on the E. B. Pierce-chaired SCIA committee that recommended Fritz Crisler), the Education Dean, an "M" Club representative, two department staff members, the chairman of SCIA, and three people selected by Morrill at large.

The President followed Willey's advice, more or less; he only selected one additional member, rather than three, and that one was the faculty representative, Henry Rottschaefer. Morrill wrote to the committee members on January 4, 1950, asking them to serve. He pointed out that it was his responsibility to make a recommendation to the Regents but wished to have the "counsel and assistance" of a small group. Morrill specifically told them that they would "not be charged with the responsibility of formulating the recommendation."

That President Morrill would not be subject to the press treatment that had attended President Coffman's selections in 1930 and 1932 became apparent with a memo that W. L. Nunn, University News Service director, wrote to the President at the end of January, 1950. Nunn told Morrill that he was curious about the lack of newspaper speculation on McCormick's successor, so he had inquired. He discovered that Gideon Seymour had written a note to the staff of the Minneapolis papers asking that the University "be permitted to fill this vacancy without any advice from the folks on the downtown papers" (quote from Nunn). This, Nunn concluded,

was a favor to the university. While the injunction did not hold up completely, there was notably less comment than had been the case in the early 1930s.

Later in the spring the candidates began to come to the University for interviews. The schedule for one, Philip Bengtson, in March, 1950, is remarkable for the contrast it presents with the selection process used by President Coffman. Mr. Bengtson's itinerary included meetings with reporters from Minneapolis and St. Paul and with representatives from the "M" Club. There was no secret about who the candidates were.

It was only in early May, 1950, when a choice was expected soon, that the reporters began to write much about the appointment. The Minneapolis Star, on May 4, reported that Bengtson was the choice of President Morrill. That one person, Bernie Bierman, was not being considered for the job started the speculation about what the head football coach would do--Dick Cullum reported, on May 5, that Bierman considered himself a candidate, said that Bierman should be given the job, and mused about whether or not he would quit.

More significantly, Cullum also noted that the "M" Club and two business/public groups backed Bierman. Talking to the probability that Bierman would not be chosen, Cullum quoted one supporter as saying that "the administration knows that it is going against public opinion and is, in fact, making a most unpopular move."

Additional speculation and reporting followed over the next several days. Charles Johnson of the Minneapolis Tribune, on two occasions, registered the complaint that the Caliber of the men being considered wasn't as high as it should be. But he did think there were four acceptable ("pretty strong") candidates. Johnson implied, in his criticism of the lengthiness of the search, that there was considerable public interest in the choice. If it "hadn't dragged out so long, general sentiment wouldn't have crystallized to the present peak, at which the entire state is most critical of the various candidates."

It was widely expected that Morrill would announce his selection at the Regents' meeting on Friday, May 12, 1950. Minneapolis Tribune writer Sid Hartman, on the preceding Wednesday, reported that the President wanted the candidate to have the unanimous backing of his advisory committee; in another article the same day it was said that "Morrill was expected to go into a huddle with himself" to make his decision. The President did not talk to very many people, it is certain, because the Tribune did not know, the morning the Regents were to meet, who would be chosen.

The Minneapolis (evening) Star reported that Ike Armstrong had been chosen and had received the unanimous support of the Board of Regents. Armstrong had been at the University of Utah for 25 years. According to the Star article on the appointment, the choice of Armstrong was a compromise between Morrill "and the administrative group" who wanted Bengtson, and "the faction backing football coach

Bernie Bierman."

Sid Hartman, writing in the Tribune a day later, reported several additional items about the search.

- According to Morrill, 45 candidates had been evaluated.
- Bernie Bierman was disappointed that he had not been selected.
- The "M" Club president issued a statement congratulating Armstrong and saying that their support for Bierman "was motivated, in part, by our desire for a strong intercollegiate program."
- The department was happy "that Armstrong was the man if Bernie couldn't get the job" and that the staff had sent a petition to Morrill asking that Bierman be appointed. (Although former football coach Cal Stoll recalls that among some staff members there was "tremendous resentment" at Armstrong.)

Dick Cullum, who had taken President Coffman sharply to task in 1930, offered his summation of the selection.

Ike Armstrong is the athletic director at the University of Minnesota. President Morrill made his own decision Friday and the regents accepted it.

Some sharp factional lines have been drawn during the hunt for an athletic director. The long delay and the maneuverings for control within the administration as well as the partisanship of alumni and downtown people all led to tension.

Most remarkable thing about it, however, is that there has not been more tension and there is no great hard feeling at the finish.

All in all, it seems to me, fans, old grads, press, athletic department people, and all others in any way involved, are to be commended for the restraint and tolerance in which this matter has been carried along.

At the finish there is no barrier to general acceptance of Armstrong and no reason why he should not receive united and spirited support.

Cal Stoll is of the opinion, however, that there were, and still are to this day, hard feelings that Bierman was not chosen over Armstrong. And there are some who never accepted Armstrong, according to Stoll.

For President Morrill, the selection had been, in the public eye, relatively painless. The sourest note had come,

midway through the search, from a Minneapolis Spokesman columnist, Percy Villa. In March Villa had published an open letter to Morrill, in which he attacked the role played by Vice President Middlebrook (charges akin to the ones levelled against him ten years later when SCIA was debating the Rose Bowl, mentioned in that chapter). Villa wanted Ed Haislet (alumni secretary, successor to E. B. Pierce) to be athletic director (Haislet was considered and was a candidate) and accused Morrill of appointing "a weak committee, a MIDDLEBROOK dominated committee. You permitted 'Little Caesar' Middlebrook to eliminate all the fine qualified candidates, including Bierman--except one ED HAISLET, and, brother, he's a tough one to eliminate." Villa said that McCormick had nominated Haislet to succeed him, and charged that "Middlebrook alone, on your committee, objected. Why, Mr. President? Because Haislet refuses to be a 'yes' man to Mr. Middlebrook" (capitals in original). That President Morrill read this column is clear, because the clipping was in his files, but it seems not to have greatly bothered him.

That the replacement had not been without stress, however, is indicated by a letter Morrill wrote to Charles Johnson in February of 1959, during the attempt to oust Armstrong and Warmath. The President recalled that "at the time of the appointment of a successor to Frank McCormick, the 'M' Club had just one candidate whom they insisted and demanded the University should appoint: Bernie Bierman." Morrill said he "spent many, many hours with 'M' Club leaders . . . and when I appointed a committee to counsel with me on the appointment I explicitly named Bob Shay to represent officially the 'M' Club."

Johnson wrote back to Morrill and discussed the 1950 search. "I recall your efforts with every group in trying to find a successor to Frank McCormick. I agreed wholeheartedly with the way you handled the Bierman situation. I still defend your methods." But, Johnson reminded Morrill, it was "M" Club leaders who had talked Bierman "into becoming a candidate sometime in February (1950) when you were away in Florida." Finally, Johnson agreed on Shay's role "and I can find no fault with his thinking at the time. However, in the final analysis he did not make many friends with the M Club because he did not battle to the finish with Bernie."

The role those "M" Club leaders played is worthy of note. At the request of President Morrill, part of the interview process, for the seven men who were finalists for the director's position, was a meeting with four representatives of the "M" Club. Those four, mentioned earlier, were LeVoir, Lund, Sommer, and Wright. Three of them (Wells Wright died before this was written) met in December, 1985, to recapitulate their involvement in those events.

In the words of Sommer, "we just were panic-stricken when we got through interviewing the seven; . . . we didn't think anyone--any one of them--came anywhere near qualifying." Moreover, Sommer observed, "I don't think that we four could be totally wrong. Because, after each time we met with them, we sat down and reviewed the people. And we just shook our heads." It was their view that selecting IKE

Armstrong had a "serious detrimental effect on Minnesota athletics for a long time to come, even to this day." Sommer believes that of the seven, Armstrong was the strongest.

Before the actual selection was made, Bernie Bierman became a candidate for the job. This, however, was after the names of the seven men became known. According to Sommer, he and LeVoir went to Bierman right after McCormick resigned. They "asked him if he wanted to be athletic director; he said 'no man can be athletic director and football coach, and I want to stay as football coach.'"

Later, after the interviews had taken place, Sommer related, "we heard rumblings that Bernie had changed his mind." So Sommer and LeVoir talked to Bierman--although he had not told them of his change in position--and "asked him why he changed his mind." Bierman's response was "if that's the caliber of men they're seeking for an athletic director, that means de-emphasis of football. So I might as well give up coaching football and be the athletic director, if I can make it."

LeVoir and Sommer urged him to talk with President Morrill. Arrangements were made, and he did so. The outcome did not lead, of course, to Morrill selecting Bierman. Stoll believes that Bierman was absolutely sure he would get the job.

LeVoir, Lund, and Sommer also concluded, immediately after the fact, that their involvement in the interviews was, in Lund's words, "just kind of a facade." Sommer pointed out that Morrill "never asked for our opinion; . . . no one to this day has asked us our opinion." Morrill may not have solicited their candidate evaluations, but he did give them his time, because LeVoir and Sommer recalled meeting one evening with Morrill for five hours, during the search. They emphasized their deep concern for the future of the program.

Morrill also agreed to contact them at the end of the search; the conversation, reconstructed by Sommer, was as follows. Sommer returned a call from Morrill the evening before the announcement:

JLM: Cliff, I'm going to recommend an athletic director tomorrow and I promised to call you when I selected the athletic director.

CS : Dr. Morrill, that may be your thinking, but my thinking is that you promised to call us before you selected an athletic director.

JLM: Well, if I did, I'm sorry. But I'm going to select him tomorrow.

CS : Let me call Babe and Pug and the others.

Sommer related that he did so, and "we decided there was nothing we could do." He then called Morrill back.

CS : You're in charge, you're the boss. You're going to

pick the athletic director. But we'd kind of like to know who it's going to be.

JLM: I've got to make a call to this person and settle a few things.

CS: (laughing) Well, Dr. Morrill, then you're telling us it's Ike Armstrong. Because [one candidate] would come without asking any questions, in my opinion, and obviously then it isn't going to be Bierman. So you're picking Ike Armstrong.

Dr. Morrill, I'm not asking you to confirm it or not, but I'm going to tell you something. That if you pick Ike Armstrong as your athletic director, you will be making the biggest mistake in your whole life, and that you'll live to rue the day.

Sommer concluded that "history proved I was prophetic--more prophetic than I had any license to be at the time." Stoll, who had been at Utah with Armstrong, also concurred with the judgment. He is of the view that Armstrong should not have been considered. He was "not qualified." In terse summary, according to Lund, "Ike was just a total disaster, from start to finish."

The judgment of other observers of Minnesota athletics accords with that of Sommer, LeVoir, and Lund. Perlt had a low opinion of both Morrill and Armstrong. Commenting on Morrill's selection of Armstrong, Perlt said that "I don't think he [Morrill] was qualified to pick anybody. Who in the hell would pick Ike, knowing anything? Here's a guy from Drake University that spends twenty-five years in the boondocks. You sit him down with Crisler, Biggie Munn, and these other guys around the Big Ten . . . they'd chew him up." Perlt's conclusion is that Ike was "a pleasant, nice, decent guy, totally unqualified for the job as athletic director at Minnesota."

MacKinnon notes an additional factor. "Morrill had an exaggerated idea of Armstrong's competency." MacKinnon points out that when Morrill was president of the University of Wyoming, Armstrong had been at Utah--which regularly beat Wyoming and most other conference schools in football. Morrill, incorrectly in MacKinnon's view, attributed this success to Armstrong, when in fact it was "due to the fact that most of the Utah players were two years older. A great many of their players were Mormons who had spent two years on a mission . . . and this extra two years of maturity is a great advantage in athletics."

The reason Morrill declined to choose Bierman, in the view of virtually all the observers, was because, in Sommer's words, "Morrill didn't want a strong man." Other reasons were proffered at the time. One was that Bierman lacked administrative skills. Another, Sommer remembers Morrill telling him, was that Morrill could not get along with him, would have no rapport with Bierman.

Finally, it is the strongly-held opinion of LeVoir,

Lund, and Sommer that the selection of Armstrong is what ultimately led to the upheavals of 1958-59 (recounted in the next chapter). By appointing Armstrong, and not Bierman, the University failed to get Bud Wilkinson as football coach. And apropos those later events, in LeVoir's words: "For eight long years, all you heard was 'they could have had Wilkinson if only they'd appointed Bierman' over and over again."

1951: Wes Fesler

Following the seventh game of what was becoming a disastrous football season, Bernie Bierman resigned on Monday, November 13, 1950. Bierman's post-war won-lost record had not achieved the heights of the 1930s accomplishments (five national championships), but it had certainly been respectable. In the three seasons of 1945, 1946, and 1947, Minnesota had won 15 games, lost 12, and tied none. In 1948 and 1949 the record was 14-4-0. In the midst of his sixteenth season, with a 1-6 mark with two games remaining, Bierman decided to call it quits.

All of the press accounts of the resignation quoted Bierman to the effect that he had thought about stepping down, off and on, for some time, but only made the decision on the Sunday before his Monday announcement. The sports writers, the football team, and President Morrill all expressed shock and surprise at the resignation. The President, writing to a prospective successor in December, said that "we were caught off balance, actually, by Mr. Bierman's resignation."

In comments to the "M" stag a few days later, Bierman, (according to the Tribune on November 18) made it clear that the decision had been his own. "There have been some rumors around town that I was pushed out as coach, but I want it clearly understood that there was no pressure from the University." His statement is not refuted or disputed by any existing documents or accounts. Although, said Stoll, Bierman was very disappointed.

At least one person, however, had been sure Bierman would leave; President Morrill received from Ed Haislet a November 15 memo summarizing interviews Haislet had been conducting with prospective coaches over the preceding several weeks. Haislet had a list of six "essential" candidates who had to be seen; by the time of his memo to Morrill, he had talked with four of them. One of the four was Bud Wilkinson. It was Haislet's opinion, after interviewing him, that Wilkinson would not come to Minnesota. While he was interested, Haislet reported that Wilkinson did not believe he could get out of his existing contract with Oklahoma and did not want to break it if the president of Oklahoma would not let him out willingly. Wilkinson told Haislet that he wanted to talk to President Morrill, whether or not he could come, because of his interest in Minnesota. Wilkinson, in 1985, said Haislet's report to Morrill about his position was correct.

As was the norm, the newspapers began immediately to

bandy about the names of possible successors. There were several besides Wilkinson. Dick Cullum, however, immediately jumped into the fray on behalf of Armstrong and Morrill. Writing the day after Bierman resigned, Cullum declared that "they are entitled to complete, unimpaired freedom to make the decision" about a new coach. Cullum warned his readers about the consequences of ignoring his advice:

If you look around at other institutions which have been in the job in which Minnesota finds itself, you will note that the incoming coach has been doomed from the outset because factions which got themselves thoroughly worked up in support of other candidates were in no mood to support the man who was not their choice.

The one sure way to fix it so that the Minnesota situation will never get mended is to let the next coach come to the job out of a background of factional strife in the alumni, or among downtown fans or old letter men. Any one who signs a petition in behalf of a candidate and gets his mind set on the notion that the only man to save the situation is his man, is doing the very thing that has wrecked similar situations elsewhere and would wreck it here.

President Morrill's correspondence with various individuals in late November and December note that the selection of a new coach would be left in the hands of Ike Armstrong. Anyone who wrote to express interest in the job, or to nominate someone else, was referred to the athletic director. Charles Johnson, in the Tribune on November 26, told his readers this would be the procedure: "Armstrong will carry the ball almost exclusively until he has the man he wants. His recommendation will be passed on to President J. L. Morrill. If acceptable to Morrill, the board of regents will make the final decision." Johnson commended this method, noting the difference from when Armstrong was picked with the help of an advisory committee. "Armstrong knows what a capable football coach must have to do a good job at this school. He has been in the same field for 25 years and knows what it's all about."

Johnson, in the same column, reiterated Cullum's warning about not interfering. He admonished people to stay out of the process. "Minnesotans should have learned during the long drawn out discussion over the directorship appointment that they'll make matters worse by choosing sides in behalf of one or more candidates."

That Armstrong was solely responsible for choosing his coach is belied by the existence of handwritten notes in Morrill's files with the names of coaches and sundry notes about each. The Tribune reported, on December 8, 1950, that Wilkinson had declined an offer from Minnesota, for precisely the reasons Haislet had predicted. An undated note in Morrill's handwriting, found with 1950 materials, is almost certainly from December 7; the President jotted down

Wilkinson

last night - yes

this a.m. -- "just can't do it"

In the Tribune article, Armstrong told reporter Sid Hartman that he had asked Morrill to talk to both Wilkinson and the Oklahoma president, which he clearly did. He also told Hartman that "Wilkinson was the first one we thought of to replace Bernie."

The next day Dick Cullum said that 99 out of 100 people who cared would be "sad to hear that Bud Wilkinson" could not come to Minnesota. But it is not the end of the world, he observed; there are other good coaches around and Armstrong would be left alone to pursue them.

Early in January, 1951, Armstrong went to the annual convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association; a week before he left Armstrong said, according to Dick Cullum, that he expected to have a coach chosen by the end of the convention, on January 13. In articles from Dallas--the site of the NCAA convention--Sid Hartman reported on the candidates with whom Armstrong was conversing. One was Bud Wilkinson, according to Hartman, to see if he would change his mind. According to Cullum, writing on January 13, Wilkinson, had "frankly disclosed that he would rather coach at Minnesota" than serve out his remaining three years at Oklahoma.

By the time the convention was over Armstrong had not succeeded in finding a coach. He told Sid Hartman that he had no candidate, and the sports headline the Sunday after it adjourned was "Ike to Return Minus a Coach." Armstrong had, wrote Hartman, talked to Morrill seven times while he had been in Dallas.

There was a small amount of guessing over the next week or so about who the leading candidates were, but Armstrong apparently remained closed-mouthed about what he was doing.

On Tuesday, January 23, 1951, Morrill sent "personal and confidential" letters, special delivery, to each member of the Board of Regents advising them that he would be recommending Wesley Fesler as the new head football coach. He asked that all of the Regents call him on Thursday to indicate their approval or disapproval; he wanted no premature leaks.

This appointment came as a bombshell because Fesler had quit at Ohio State the month before and had declared that he was done with coaching football. The second reason it was a surprise, according to Hartman, was because no one had ever thought of, or mentioned, Fesler as a possibility.

How it came to be Fesler is recorded in a contemporaneous "recollection" written shortly after he was hired and seemingly based on an interview with Armstrong. Dated April 12, 1951, it provides a different picture of what

occured during the search; the memo is reproduced here in its entirety.

DETAILS OF HOW IKE ARMSTRONG SIGNED WES FESLER
AS HEAD FOOTBALL COACH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Ike Armstrong, director of the department of physical education and athletics at the University of Minnesota, was finding his search for a head football coach to succeed the resigned Bernie Bierman more and more frustrating and discouraging as he headed for Dallas, Texas to attend the annual meeting of the National College Football Coaches' Association. Ike had already screened a long list of candidates in his attempt to find a man suitable to succeed the man who had brought 5 national championships and 7 Big 10 championships to Minnesota.

While Ike was scrutinizing the "field" at Dallas he happened across Dick Larkins, athletic director at Ohio State University and a staunch supporter and close friend of Wes Fesler. In the course of conversation between Ike and Dick, Larkins ventured the remark that he was not too sure that Wes was happy away from football and in his new occupation as a real estate man. No more on the topic of Fesler was mentioned at the time.

Then, on the long ride back from Dallas, Ike began to meditate and mull over in his mind the entire picture relating to his search for a coach. Fesler's name crept into his mind and ignited a spark of inspiration. Without a word to anyone else, Ike decided to call Wes at Columbus. The two conversed at length. Naturally the call caught Wes off guard, and he was in no position to render any kind of a definite answer as to whether he would or would not be interested. Ike suggested that he think it over for a while, after which he would again call Wes. This he did several days later.

The lure of working with kids and getting back into the coaching routine again was too strong for Wes to resist. He made both himself and Ike happy men by agreeing to take the job at Minnesota.

Morrill and Armstrong each issued statements on January 24 announcing the choice of Fesler and expressing their satisfaction that he had accepted. Hartman, reporting the next day, noted that Armstrong had never talked face-to-face with Fesler; all the negotiations had been carried out over the telephone. But there had been personal contact; Morrill knew Fesler well from days when he--Morrill--had been an Ohio State vice president and chairman of its athletic board and Fesler had been a star football player. Morrill told Hartman that he had personally talked with Fesler about taking the job, said their friendship had "a little to do with him coming out of retirement," and seemed generally delighted at what had occurred. As he told a correspondent later in the month, Fesler "is a keen coach and a wonderful chap personally."

The press and everyone else who could be found to express an opinion lauded Fesler in much the same fashion.

One footnote to the hiring of Fesler is contained in a letter Morrill wrote to Charles Johnson of the Tribune about a month afterwards. Johnson and Morrill had chatted at a cocktail party; the President wrote subsequently to thank Johnson for the help given the University "by the reception which you and Dick Cullum and all the other members of the Star-Tribune sports staff have given to Wes Fesler." Morrill went on to relate that Fesler had been very concerned about it, because he had been treated with "vicious and cruel punishment" in Columbus.

In one of the long telephone conversations I had with Fesler while he was making up his mind as to whether to come here, he queried me closely about the attitude of the local press. I told him I thought that our papers here would do for him, or any other new coach, what they had consistently done for Bierman all these years--namely, to give him every break toward University success in athletics, while at the same time, of course, reserving the right to be critical if they felt that way.

The delays and dithering that went on, during the search, are attributable to the weakness of Armstrong, in the opinions of LeVoir, Lund, Sommer, and Stoll. The first mistake had been the choice of athletic director; the second, following from the first, was the failure to hire Wilkinson.

1954: Murray Warmath

It did not seem likely that President Morrill or Ike Armstrong were worried about a football coaching vacancy after the 1953 season. Coach Fesler told Sid Hartman in late November that he fully expected to return for the 1954 season.

Fesler changed his mind, because he resigned abruptly on December 14, 1953. He told Tribune columnist Joe Hendrickson that his only reason for leaving was to accept a position in private industry that had more job security; the University had not pressured him in any way. Dick Cullum's sources told him the same thing. So did Hartman's; he said "the resignation came as a complete surprise and caught . . . Fesler's university associates flat-footed and open-mouthed." Morrill himself wrote to a friend and said "we are terribly sorry to lose Wes."

Both Cullum and Hartman, the day following Fesler's resignation, had the names of possible successors. Cullum also wondered if Armstrong would have a hard time finding a good man; recalling 1950-51 and the search for a coach to follow Bierman, Cullum said that "the word had got around in

the profession that this was no longer a good spot in which to build a coaching record." According to Cullum, the job had been offered to seven people, all of whom had turned it down; Fesler, he said, had been hired "on an impulse." Morrill backhandedly lent credence to Johnson's question; in a letter to a friend in New York who had written to Morrill to nominate someone to follow Fesler, the President said he would put the man's name "in the hopper for consideration of our coaching problem." Hartman said that "every indication pointed to the fact that the next Gopher coach" would be a Minnesota man; his five in a group of likely candidates included Bud Wilkinson (again).

In the same article, on December 15, 1953, Hartman explained to his readers how the new coach would be selected.

Armstrong, as athletic director, will conduct interviews and negotiations. He then will make a recommendation to J. L. Morrill, university president. Morrill can approve or reject. If the president approves the athletic director's choice, the recommendation is sent on to the university board of the regents for final approval. In the event of rejections by Morrill or the regents, the procedure starts over with a new name.

Morrill confirmed Hartman's description. As had been the case in 1951, the President was leaving the "screening and initiation of a recommendation in the hands of Mr. Ike Armstrong," he told one correspondent.

Another quarter consistently heard from at these junctures made its views known the evening of the day Fesler resigned. Bill Proffitt, President of the "M" Club, issued a statement adopted by the Board of Directors calling for the appointment of an "M" man. The Club had discussed the recommendation with Armstrong. In different letters to correspondents, Morrill affirmed that he was not in disagreement with the idea of hiring an "M" graduate. He told one, "we are strongly inclined to go for a Minnesota man, this time, but you never can be sure."

During early and mid-January, 1954, there was some reporting on who might succeed Fesler; most of the attention was focused on the negotiations with Bud Wilkinson.

Dick Cullum, on January 4, described Wilkinson as "one of football's most gifted coaches," and said "Minnesota will be wise to make every effort to get him." On the probability of his moving, Cullum expressed doubt; "the odds are less than even." Sid Hartman, at the NCAA convention in Cincinnati, reported the next day that Armstrong and Wilkinson would be meeting that evening to discuss Wilkinson's candidacy. Hartman quoted the Oklahoma coach as promising "to do a lot of thinking about the Minnesota job before making a decision." The next day, while nothing of the conversation was known, Hartman did report that Armstrong would not act pending talking more with Wilkinson. By the end of the convention they had met again; Hartman asserted that "reports that Wilkinson has rejected the job are not

true." But on January 11, as Hartman reported, Wilkinson confirmed "that I'm not interested in the Minnesota football job because of circumstances beyond my control."

Following Wilkinson's withdrawal, Armstrong went about the business of looking over possible candidates. On January 28, 1954, Hartman listed four people who had not been offered the job; Armstrong told him that he was "in no hurry."

Daily Sports Editor Dwayne Netland, on January 19, concluded that "it may only be a matter of time before long-time assistant coach Butch Nash was selected, in part because he knew Minnesota well, but more because "the all-powerful 'M' Club is behind Nash, just as they were solidly behind Wilkinson before he became unavailable."

The next day Hartman reported that Armstrong and Morrill met the preceding Sunday in Chicago to confer with a candidate, but he did not know who it was. He soon found out.

On Saturday, January 30, the lead Hartman article was on the appointment of Murray Warmath. Cullum praised the selection, suggesting that Warmath's background made him an excellent choice. In a remarkable turnabout, or perhaps with much more respect for the president and athletic director in 1954 than he had in the 1930's, Cullum noted that "university officials, being intelligent men, must have known that the first reaction to this appointment would be unfavorable." Expressing a confidence that had not been evident in previous columns, Cullum went on to note the usual ire that coaching choices usually provoked.

They must have known that the football squad would feel let down, that the "M" club would be violently indignant, that the public generally would be displeased, that there would be, throughout the state, a wave of resentment.

Warmath must have known it, too, if he looked the situation over at all before accepting the appointment.

Thus the agreement between them reflects courage on the part of the coach and confidence in their judgment on the part of the officials.

Hartman described, on January 30, how Armstrong had gone about making his choice. Armstrong "phoned Bud Wilkinson of Oklahoma the day after Wes Fesler resigned." The director was quoted as saying that "Wilkinson is our first choice. We won't make a move until he refuses the post." Armstrong met with Wilkinson three times, and the Oklahoma coach decided on January 10 not to come to Minnesota. Thereafter Armstrong began consulting with Wilkinson and other coaches, narrowed it down to two candidates, and selected Warmath. None of the people whose names had been bandied about in public following Fesler's resignation were ever considered for the job.

The President, responding to an individual who backed

Wilkinson, voiced his own agreement that the choice would have been desirable. "Let me assure you that I made the most sincere, persuasive approach to him personally, in concert with Mr. Armstrong, that I know how to make to anyone--and that financially the inducements we offered go far beyond anything we have thus far authorized." So for the second time, the attempt was made.

Clifford Sommer recalled a conversation he had had with Armstrong while the search for a new coach was taking place. Armstrong told him that he--Armstrong--had arranged for an appointment with President Morrill, Bud Wilkinson, and himself; it may have been a Sunday. Morrill passed blood that morning, "so he begged off until afternoon, so he could consult a doctor." There was no medical problem, but Wilkinson decided he could not wait; he left town without keeping the appointment. It is not clear whether the "persuasive approach" and "inducements" that Morrill mentioned were offered after or before this aborted appointment, or whether they ever met at all.

In the same Tribune issue that Hartman illuminated the "how," Charles Johnson offered some opinions on the situation now that Warmath was selected. Some of his words harken back to the appointment of Fritz Crisler. Noting that Warmath was unknown to most people in Minnesota, and that he was at a certain disadvantage, therefore, in reception and public support, Johnson went on to caution "it's well to remember that Murray Warmath is not responsible for any local situations that he walks into at this time." Despite the fact that he arrived "when too many people hadn't shaken their hostility toward the University because Bud Wilkinson wasn't persuaded to come here," and even though "some fences must be mended among Minnesota 'M' men who feel that their sentiments again have been ignored with another implied warning from authorities that 'We'll handle these things as we see fit,'" Johnson nonetheless called for support for the new coach.

Footnotes to the Warmath Appointment

This recounting of the events, both in 1951 and 1954, are somewhat at variance with Wilkinson's own recollections. Recalling these events over thirty years later, Wilkinson was firm in his statement that he had never been offered the job at Minnesota, either in 1951 or 1954. He talked repeatedly with Ike Armstrong, he said, but was always asked what it would take to get him to come to Minnesota. It was Wilkinson's view that it was improper for him to set forth demands for coaches, job programs, salary, and so forth; he felt the University--Ike--needed to decide what would be appropriate for the job and then make an offer. According to Wilkinson, this was (and is) a point he felt strongly about, so he and Armstrong kept dancing around the question. Wilkinson wished it clearly understood that he had never turned Minnesota down, because he had never received an offer of a job. He also told of the surprise he had felt at never having received an offer and his willingness to consider one had it been made. Finally, Wilkinson did not recall ever having spoken directly with President Morrill about the

Minnesota job.

Although discussed at greater length in "President Morrill, the Football Coach, and the Alumni," it should also be mentioned here that Alumni Secretary Ed Haislet wrote to Morrill about Warmath in the midst of the 1958-59 ouster attempt. Haislet had met with Armstrong. According to Haislet, Armstrong had told him that Warmath had not been his first choice. He had made several other recommendations to replace Fesler but Morrill had vetoed them. It must also be noted, whether apropos of this selection or not cannot ever be confirmed, that Armstrong told Minneapolis Star reporters, three months before he retired in 1963, that "I've never had one of my recommendations [for appointments] turned down by the president."

Dick Cullum, writing at the close of Warmath's coaching career at Minnesota, said in his Tribune column on November 21, 1971, that Warmath "came to Minnesota when nobody else wanted the job. Bear Bryant came, looked around, and decided it would be impossible to win here. Other prominent coaches came, looked, and backed away." Cullum also described Warmath as having been successful "in spite of never receiving cooperation from Minnesota's 'M' men." Both Pug Lund and Cal Stoll echoed similar assessments of Warmath.

Several days later, in another retrospective, Cullum related another incident that occurred when Warmath was hired. Cullum recalled that he and two staff members from WCCO radio had travelled to interview Warmath after he had been named head coach. The story warrants quoting at length.

While he was driving us to the airport Warmath asked, "What will be my chief problem at Minnesota? I said, "You will be playing Bud Wilkinson every Saturday afternoon." I meant that the performance of the Gophers would be compared weekly with the performance of Wilkinson's invincible Oklahoma.

This was so because Wilkinson was the first choice of every Minnesota alumnus or fan. If Bernie Bierman had been appointed athletic director, a position he wanted, he would have hired Wilkinson.

Wilkinson was available in spite of a recently signed 10-year contract at Oklahoma. When Wilkinson signed that contract he insisted on one stipulation--that he would be released if a vacancy occurred at Minnesota and he was offered the job.

The attorney for the Oklahoma regents said, "we can't put that into a contract. The document is public record. Therefore, it would be embarrassing to Oklahoma, to Minnesota, to you and to the present Minnesota coach. However, I shall consider the agreement made privately between you and me. If you receive and want to accept an offer from Minnesota, I'll tell the regents that your release is, in fact, a provision in your contract."

After the Sooners had beaten Maryland in the Orange Bowl, Wilkinson attended the annual National Coaches convention, then came directly to Minneapolis, ostensibly to visit his parents but, in all probability, to be offered the then-vacant football coaching post.

He met Minnesota athletic director Ike Armstrong, but was not given an offer.

Late in the day Charley Johnson, then executive sports editor of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, called president Lew Morrill of the University of Minnesota and told him that Wilkinson was in town, but there was no contact.

With Warmath chosen, President Morrill would have to make no more director or football coach appointments. But as will be seen in Chapter Ten, this did not mean he would be without athletic personnel problems. The choices he now had in place, Armstrong and Warmath, were to give him a great deal of trouble down the road in a few years.

1963: Marsh Ryman

That there would be a new director of athletics beginning with 1963-64 was known to everyone, because Ike Armstrong had reached the mandatory retirement age of 68. President O. Meredith Wilson, following the precedent set by Morrill, appointed "a committee advisory to me" on January 9, 1963, to help him select Armstrong's successor.

The preceding December the Board of Regents had approved a reorganization of physical education and athletics; the two departments were to be separated and each would be headed by a director. Concurrent with the search for an athletic director there was also a search for the director of the School of Physical Education.

The advisory committee was chaired by Louis Gross, a businessman and former Minnesota athlete. Also serving were two faculty members and the Education Dean, two other alumni, and the golf coach.

A year before the search began, on January 8, 1962, Vice President Stan Wenberg had written President Wilson a long letter setting forth his thoughts on the qualifications an individual should possess to be considered for the directorship (of athletics only, now). This letter is probably the only time that any criteria have been given serious consideration and actually articulated in print. Wenberg thought there were six principal qualifications that should be found in one chosen for the job; distilled, they were these:

1. He must possess a reasonably clear, realistic and defensible ethical framework, inside of which intercollegiate athletics can operate.
2. He must have an educational philosophy compatible

with the purposes of the institution in which he works.

3. The director should have a sincere institutional commitment which must be characterized not only by an understanding of the institution's mission, but by unusual courage of convictions and determination to maintain the athletic program as he and the members of his staff feel it must be conducted.
4. The athletic director should possess administrative competence.
5. He should have a commitment to the state, the institution of which he is a part and must serve.
6. He should possess familiarity with intercollegiate athletics. It is desirable that he have participated in at least one intercollegiate sport.

The only controversy about the selection of the new director, at least as evidenced by the files, was the possibility that Murray Warmath might be selected. This prospect worried a member of the Minnesota Student Association enough to prompt him to write to Wenberg to protest. The student cited two rumors that he and his associates found disturbing: that certain alumni were putting pressure on Wilson to appoint Warmath (and were spending money on a campaign), and that Wilson had directed the advisory committee to include Warmath's name on any final slate of candidates. The students opposed Warmath primarily because he would not be concerned for the whole program and lacked a "sound educational philosophy," and, conversely, because his selection would "keep 'King Football' in the driver's seat." While uncertain what to do, the students supposed they could "start a letter-writing campaign to the President to at least compare with the Alumni campaign." There is no record of what Wenberg's response was.

On March 20, 1963, Dick Gordon wrote for the Star that the advisory committee had submitted four candidates to the President, among them both Warmath and business manager Marsh Ryman, but reportedly had not ranked them. And, following a pattern begun thirteen years earlier, "it is also understood that Bud Wilkinson, athletic director and football coach at Oklahoma, was approached but evinced no interest in returning to his alma mater." Hartman apparently talked with Louis Gross, because the advisory committee chairman confirmed the names.

Reviewing the status of the search in mid-March, St. Paul Pioneer Press columnist Bill Boni took note of the various and opposing groups he saw worrying about the directorship. Two were those worried about someone with academic leadings too strong as against those who worried athletics would be served to the disadvantage of other departments. Two other opposing groups echoed a theme that recurred with every vacancy: those who wanted an "M" man versus those who did not.

Just before the Regents' meeting on April 19, there was a leak to the press that Ryman would be selected. The report was correct; Ryman was chosen. And finally the "M" Club got its wish; Ryman was an "M" man (he lettered in hockey 1930-32). The appointment was greeted warmly by those who had been at the center of controversies before; Jim Klobuchar, writing the day after the Regents approved Ryman, had approbative quotations from Bierman, Fesler, Tonnemaker, Fritz Crisler (who had, of course, been athletic director when Ryman was a student), and Frank McCormick (living in retirement in California and the one who had first hired Ryman in 1935). The ever-interested sports columnists also supported the choice.

Two columnists' comments after the announcement contained points worth noting.

-- Minneapolis Tribune, April 20, 1963 (Dick Cullum)

"The choice of Ryman was logical once Warmath was out of the picture. Warmath was the man on whom the first decision had to be made. . . . Warmath would have won the office in a state-wide election. The public expected to see him appointed. The supposition is that Warmath decided against seeking the office."

-- Minneapolis Tribune, April 20, 1963 (Sid Hartman)

Confirming the earlier report: "Louis Gross contacted Oklahoma's Bud Wilkinson about his interest in the athletic directorship position.

"The entire program and everything concerning the athletic department was explained to Wilkinson. Gross talked to Bud on several occasions to find out if the former Gopher wanted to be considered for the position.

"Wilkinson didn't say no to Gross at first. But, after thinking it over for some time, Bud decided coaching was his first love and that he wanted to stay in it."

1971-72: Paul Giel and Cal Stoll

At the end of November, 1971, Vice President Stanley Wenberg received a letter from a friend about athletics. The opening paragraph: "It appears that the University is not going to de-emphasize athletics again this year. Even the Regents are involved in the daily newspaper suppositions about Mr. Warmath's future. You all look stupid." This letter followed two weeks of press speculation that both coach Murray Warmath and Director Marsh Ryman would be replaced.

Central administrative contemplation of a change, at least of the coach, was underway in early November. Wenberg, on November 9, asked one of his assistants to find out what it would cost the University to provide Warmath's age 68

retirement benefits to him in 1971; Warmath was 58 when the note was written. The note was peppered with insistence that the inquiry be kept absolutely confidential.

In undated notes to himself from the same period, Wenberg evaluated the situation. He recorded that Warmath "has salaries he asked for, has staff he's asked for, has not been cut hard financially." He speculated on the reaction from various quarters if the University were to remove Warmath.

team	- would oppose us
"M"	- would probably be neutral
press	- Cullum single strong supporter; Sid neutral
ath.staff	- morale bad--no support for him

Wenberg concluded that "no one but Pres. can talk to Murray" and that "Murray will battle."

Sid Hartman, on November 14, reported the information available to him. Some regents and administrators wanted Warmath replaced. Others thought Ryman should also go, and there would be resistance to dumping Warmath among faculty, students, and other regents. Wenberg, the previous day, had issued a statement declaring the "regents and the administration have been studying the intercollegiate football program. . . . We are trying to find a responsible solution." According to Hartman, "Warmath has no thought of resigning; Ryman certainly is not going to quit." Warmath, according to the Daily a few days later, confirmed Hartman's statement in comments to the "M" Club. "'I plan to continue as I have been.' . . . Warmath refuted the rumors started by local media about a change."

On the Friday before the last game of the 1971 season, the Daily speculated that "Saturday's Minnesota-Wisconsin game may be the last for Gopher head coach Murray Warmath." The two possibilities were, it was said, that he would resign or that he would be moved to another position in the department. On the Sunday after the last game, Hartman asserted "Minnesota not only will have a new football coach in 1972 but it will also have a new athletic director." Hartman said a search was going on and he touted Paul Giel, former Minnesota All-American in baseball and football. "'I've been asked 15 or 16 times by people on the street if I'm going to be the athletic director at Minnesota,' said Giel. 'But so far nobody has talked to me.' . . . Giel would be perfect for the job." President Malcolm Moos was said to have no comment.

Larry Batson, writing in the Tribune the same day Hartman announced there would be a change, had some wry observations.

Word is out that people who are concerned about the University of Minnesota's football program and intend to do something about it.

But even the staunchest Gopher fan can derive a bit of rueful amusement from the spectacle of a mighty institution, the University, grudgingly, reluctantly and with many a disclaimer, prepare to concede publicly that it is in the entertainment business.

Now it appears that the University is going to face the fact that its long-running football production isn't drawing the customers anymore, the University is going to rewrite the script.

That might not be everyone's idea of amateur athletics, but it makes good sense in show business.

Wenberg's appraisal of Dick Cullum's support for Warmath was accurate; Cullum wrote several columns in mid-November lauding Warmath's character and courage.

A Daily reporter talked to Wenberg and quoted from the conversation in an article on November 22. The situation was such that Wenberg promised a statement one way or the other within a week. He said that he and the President had "discussed extensively during the past few weeks" the options open to them; "Wenberg mentioned a strong possibility that if Warmath were interested in moving to another position in the athletic department it could be arranged." Nothing had been discussed with either Warmath or Ryman in the preceding month, according to Wenberg.

A week after he mentioned Giel as a possible successor to Ryman, Hartman said Giel was not interested in the job. "Giel was recently sounded out by University authorities regarding his interest in the position. After giving the matter a lot of thought, he has asked not to be considered." Hartman also reported that Moos was "anxious to have winning football at Minnesota."

On Saturday, November 27, an article with Sid Hartman's byline reaffirmed, with supplementary information, what was going to happen. "Here are the facts:"

Neither athletic director Marsh Ryman nor football coach Murray Warmath will be fired or asked to resign. But they will be assigned to other duties and their positions filled by new men.

Ryman . . . was given the news officially last Monday by University Vice President Stanley Wenberg. Warmath . . . discussed his situation Wednesday with Dr. Malcolm Moos, president of the university.

Ryman will continue as athletic director until a new man is hired. . . . Warmath will be named assistant athletic director.

The administration wants to allow the new athletic

director to hire the football coach. So nothing will be done about naming a new football coach until Ryman's successor has been named.

Moos made the decision some time ago to make a change in the athletic department. . . . Elmer Anderson, chairman of the Board of Regents, assigned Regent Lester Malkerson, former chairman and the only "M" man on the board, to the task of sounding out the other regents to learn whether they would support the administration's plan to hire a new athletic director and football coach.

The financial problems of the athletic department were talked about at recent regent meetings. Malkerson found the regents almost unanimously in favor of a change.

Moos refused Friday to confirm or deny anything regarding the present status of Ryman or Warmath. "I hope to have something to say by next week," he said.

He added that a poll of the regents had been taken regarding the status of Warmath and Ryman.

It has been learned that the Board of Regents will go along with the recommendation of Moos.

The only person under consideration right now for the post of athletic director is Paul Giel, sports director of WCCO radio.

Giel met with Moos and Malkerson last Sunday and at that time the position was offered to the former Gopher All-American baseball and football star. However, on Monday, Giel visited with Moos and turned down the position.

Moos hasn't given up on getting Giel to change his mind. A lot of pressure has been put on Giel. Even some regents have talked to him about the position.

The next day Hartman reported the opinions of a long-interested group. "Now 'M' club members are back in action and are suggesting that Minnesota graduates be hired as football coach and athletic director so the state can be unified." Hartman mentioned Cal Stoll as one potential coach candidate whose name was being mentioned frequently.

In a press conference at the President's residence on Saturday, December 5, Moos announced that Giel would be the new director of athletics, replacing Ryman. He also announced that Warmath would not be coaching but would remain on the athletic department staff. Giel acknowledged that he had previously turned the job down, but then reconsidered; "It was a situation where if I thought I could help [the University], then I simply had to take it," Giel told Hartman. Upon taking the job, Giel also said that "his new

football coach would not have to be an "M" man," according to the Tribune.

The sequence of events was retold by Hartman the same day the news of the appointment appeared.

It all started two weeks ago today when University of Minnesota President Dr. Malcolm Moos asked Paul Giel to meet him at his house. With Moos was Lester Malkerson, a member of the Board of Regents and former chairman of the board and an "M" Club man.

After a 2 1/2-hour session, Giel was offered the position of athletic director at the university. Moos had called Giel the Friday before their meeting and told the former Gopher All-American that he wanted to talk with him about becoming athletic director.

Giel thought about the offer for 48 hours and turned it down at a meeting with Moos in his university office. But Moos never gave up. He didn't want to bother Giel during a period when his wife, Nancy, underwent minor surgery. But during this time he never interviewed anybody else and confided that he was going to hire Giel.

It came to a head Friday night when Giel and Moos met for the second time that day, at the St. Paul residence of the university president. Giel accepted the job and shook hands with Moos.

Hartman went on to report that Giel had accepted because he was assured he would be "the complete boss" and could "hire and fire all coaches with the blessing of the administration."

Finally, Hartman predicted a warm reception for the new director, saying "Giel doesn't have an enemy" and that he would have the support of every major faction interested in athletics.

Six days later Giel was no longer the director-designate. In further conversations, it became apparent that he would not have quite the authority over hiring coaches that Hartman had said he would. He withdrew from consideration.

The specific stumbling block was whether or not there would be a search or advisory committee used to hire a new football coach. Giel became concerned that he would not have a free hand in choosing a coach when the administration insisted upon appointing such a committee.

The appointment and withdrawal elicited titters from the press. Larry Batson commented that through it all, "one man kept his head and offered this lucid analysis: 'People on the outside will probably think we bungled this,' said . . . Wenberg. Mr. Wenberg does not agree with that conclusion, but it was instantly popular with the masses. It became the one point upon which all observers could unite." Wenberg was quoted elsewhere in the Tribune as explaining the University's tradition of consultation in hiring as the reason for the dispute.

President Moos and Giel continued to discuss the problem over the weekend and finally reached agreement. Moos would appoint an advisory committee the chairman of which would be Giel, so he would play the major role in choosing a coach. His now-final appointment seems to have met with virtually unanimous approval; Hartman even quoted the "M" Club president as saying that "We don't care who Giel hires as football coach. If it's Giel's choice we're behind him and we're solid behind Giel in every move he makes."

In seeking a new coach, Giel first sought to get someone who the "M" Club had vigorously supported in the past. He visited one evening in Tulsa with Bud Wilkinson. He had been out of coaching for some years, and declined any offer. Unlike the episodes of the 1950s, however, Wilkinson recalled later with a laugh, he did understand that he had been offered the job.

The manner in which Ryman and Warmath had been removed from their positions, and the way in which Giel had been hired, provoked a sharp reaction from the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA; successor committee to the SCIA). After first communicating their concern to Vice President Wenberg and receiving no response, the committee chairman wrote to President Moos in mid-December to protest. In his letter, Chairman Jerome Moss (College of Education) wrote:

Although responsibility for making final decisions about personnel and budgetary matters in the operation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics rests with the Administration and the Regents, the Committee feels strongly that it should be included as an integral part of the decision-making process. . . . It is our contention that major personnel, budgetary and facilities decisions cannot be divorced from policy and programmatic considerations, and that the Committee cannot discharge its responsibility to the University without involvement, in at least a consultative capacity, before such major decisions are made.

Recent changes in the administrative leadership of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, however, were made without any input by the Committee, or any other of the usual University sources, even though others outside of the University had apparently been consulted. The Committee was not even kept informed about the proceedings.

The Committee does not believe that the present By-laws of the Assembly intend to completely exclude it, and thus the faculty and students, from participation in resolving the major budgetary, personnel and facilities problems of the intercollegiate athletic program. We do not believe that our sole function should be to "legitimize" the intercollegiate athletic program. We sincerely hope that you can agree with this view.

Following this letter, a delegation from the committee met with President Moos and Vice Presidents Brinkerhoff (Finance) and Wenberg. One of those present was Max Schultze, the faculty representative, who wrote a "Memo for the Record" afterwards. The committee members repeated their "complete dissatisfaction" with the way the personnel changes had occurred. Schultze recorded points he then made.

- There was no quarrel with the selection of Giel; they approved and would fully support him.
- His Big Ten colleagues "expressed dismay, consternation and complete disbelief" that there had been no consultation on the decisions.

Moos's response, according to Schultze, was to first disagree with the committee opinion; "after it became evident that the Committee's representatives were not about to accept the President's position he changed his stance and agreed with us." After additional discussion, the matter was amicably resolved. Chairman Moss wrote to Moos in mid-January, 1972, confirming that ACIA would "be involved in a consultative capacity on major personnel, budget and facilities decisions."

Professor Schultze, writing in 1985 and recalling these events, concluded that an "inference that President Moos asked for no consultation about replacing Marsh Ryman and hiring his successor is correct." Schultze said Moos had not spoken either with him or ACIA. Schultze related that he was disappointed with the decision, and "said so by phone to Regents Andersen and Malkerson, pointing out that Marsh was held in high esteem in the councils of the Big Ten Conference." Schultze also remembered taking President Moos "sharply" to task at the meeting between ACIA members, Moos, and Brinkerhoff.

Despite his perceptions of the procedural flaws in Giel's appointment, however, Schultze echoed again the sentiments that then prevailed: The choice was a good one. Schultze observed that:

a search committee could have found glaring deficiencies in his qualifications: no administrative experience in fiscal or personnel management, no familiarity with intercollegiate policy, no acquaintance with the mode of operation in a large educational institution. Paul was fully aware of these limitations. But he proved to be very adaptable, he sought and received some guidance, he was easy to work with and developed rapidly into an extremely competent and effective Director of Intercollegiate Athletics.

In 1985, Schultze concluded, despite the faculty criticism that he and others had levelled at Moos at the time Giel was selected, that "it may be fortunate that a search committee did not have the opportunity to eliminate him as a candidate, as they well might have."

By early January the Tribune was reporting that Cal Stoll, head coach at Wake Forest, was considering his candidacy for the Minnesota job. According to Hartman, Giel had met twice with Stoll. It was reported on January 7 that Stoll had decided to remain at Wake Forest and that Giel was considering other candidates. The next day a page-one article announced that Stoll would be the new University coach. The director had to meet with the advisory committee to obtain its approval, after which Moos would forward the names of both Giel and Stoll to the Board of Regents for final approval.

Sid Hartman talked with Stoll, and said that Stoll had indeed withdrawn but then had changed his mind and called Giel back. (According to Stoll, he didn't call back. Hartman had called him to ask why he had changed his mind.)

"I knew after I called Paul Giel to tell him to withdraw my name as a possibility that I had made a mistake," said Stoll yesterday. "I know that a lot of football coaches have jumped contracts. But I felt a strong obligation to the officials and fans at Wake Forest. I didn't want to walk out on eight assistant coaches, who have done an outstanding job for me."

"But then I started to think that perhaps I owe something to the University of Minnesota. After all, if it wasn't for Bernie Bierman and the staff at the University, I would never have been able to afford the opportunity to get a college education. Frankly, the chance to sit in Bernie's old office and run the football program at Minnesota was something that provided a real challenge.

"When I first told my Wake Forest athletic director Gene Hook of my decision to stay, he was surprised. He asked me: 'Are you sure now that you can put the same enthusiasm into this job after you've turned down the opportunity to coach in the Big Ten?'

"Well, Hook brought up a point. The more I thought of it the more I was convinced that I may never get another opportunity to coach at Minnesota. That's when I told Giel, I'd like to talk to him again about the job." [Stoll remembers that Giel called him to ask if he would talk more about the job.]

Larry Batson provided a comic, if not altogether accurate, view of the events of the preceding month.

If the entire Board of Regents doesn't resign before Friday--a possibility that in light of recent events, cannot be totally rejected--the University of Minnesota has an athletic director and a football coach.

Happily, each man was bagged with the style and verve which Minnesota sports fans have come to expect. That is to say, each was laid by the heels and dragged into the athletic department while stoutly protesting that he didn't want the job.

It is a harmless custom, much like the ancient gypsy tradition of kidnaping the bride on her wedding night. Puzzled outsiders can follow the ritual if they keep one thing in mind:

Minnesota doesn't simply hire a man for its athletic department. It tracks him down until he turns at bay, then beats him unconscious with a five-year contract and calls for a press conference in time to catch the Sunday papers and the weekend sports shows.

"Our teams may not be very exciting," a loyal Gopher alumnus said last week "but our personnel recruiting ranks right up there with the Dempsey-Firpo fight for action, savagery and suspense."

Once the quarry has been chosen and his name officially announced in Sid Hartman's column, only one thing can save him: He can state publicly that he wants the job.

Giel's capture was a classic. He countered Moos's opening move by turning him down flat. Then he took the

job and sports fans relaxed. Zap! Giel quit. Zowie! Giel was in again. Talk about broken-field negotiating!

But there was a patch of trouble in the pursuit of Stoll. In fact, he almost blew it.

The selection process began properly. Stoll reminded friends that he had a 10-year contract at Wake Forest and ignored all suggestions that he apply for the Minnesota job. So far, so good.

Then about the middle of last week, a nasty rumor spread: Stoll was blabbing it around that he was interested in the Minnesota job. Moos, Giel and veteran observers were stunned.

"I can't believe it," muttered one sports writer. "Stoll seemed perfect for the job."

Then, with one masterly stroke, Stoll got back in the running. He announced last Thursday that he intended to remain at Wake Forest.

A jubilant Giel called Moos and relayed the news.

"Are you positive he doesn't want the job?" asked Moos.

"He says his decision is irrevocable," Giel replied.

"Hot dog!" cried Moos. "We've got our man! What's the next step?"

"We're meeting in Chicago tonight to iron out the details. Then I'll call a press conference for Saturday afternoon to make the announcement."

"Way to go, Paul. You've handled this beautifully. Just to keep the pot boiling, I'll state Friday that Stoll has not been offered the job."

"That's a nice touch, boss. It's a pleasure to work with you."

I am told that many other schools use a different system for hiring coaches. The candidates apply, are interviewed, and one is selected.

It sounds very dull.

Perhaps it was dull seven years later; it would most certainly not be dull a dozen years later.

Although not a candidate, he still influenced events, if Hartman is correct. When Bud Wilkinson talked to Giel, he commended Stoll to the director, and "it was Wilkinson who encouraged Stoll to take the job." Stoll also talked to Wilkinson, who told him to take the job "under certain conditions"; that is, if given a chance to win.

ACIA had reached an agreement with the President on how

these kinds of personnel decisions would be handled. This understanding, however, did not prevent two Minnesota Student Association leaders from declaring they would try to stall Regents' action on the two appointments. They said, according to a Daily article reporting on the press conference, "'the method of appointing Giel and Stoll was in direct contradiction to the University's consultation policies as stated by the Regents.'" They, like ACIA, said they had no quarrel with the selection of Giel and Stoll; it was the manner in which the choices were made to which they objected. They said the University was being hypocritical, first for refusing to hire Giel because he would not accept the consultative requirements of the institution but, at the same time, not making use of consultative mechanisms in the selection of Giel himself. The two students said they intended to ask the University to adopt a resolution "requesting that the Regents postpone" the hiring. The Daily chimed in with editorial support, but suggested that the protest was rather late, in light of the fact that the Regents would be acting on the appointments the following day.

The minutes for the January 12 meeting of the Senate do not reflect any discussion of the two appointments. The Regents, on January 13 and 14, approved the selection of the two men, although the Daily reported that at least one regent did say she "was bothered by the questions raised by the students." The President and other Regents defended the procedure, explaining that "there are times, and always will be times, when the University must act with great dispatch." Moos added that this was such a time; another Regent said an academic unit could operate temporarily with vacancies but that the athletic department could not.

1978: Joe Salem

Cal Stoll coached the Gophers for six seasons, from 1972-1978. In 1976 the team record was 6-5; in 1977 it was 7-4 and the team went to the Hall of Fame Bowl in Birmingham, Alabama, the first post-season football game for Minnesota since the 1962 Rose Bowl.

It was the view of Athletic Director Paul Giel, however, that there was a need for progress; that is, rather than won-lost records which bounced between 4-7 and 7-4, there should be steady improvement. It was Giel's understanding, following a conference with the coach before the season, that Stoll would resign if the 1978 record were not at least 6-5. Stoll did not share Giel's understanding. Going into the last game of the season, the record was 5-5; Minnesota lost game eleven to Wisconsin 48-10. Giel asked for Stoll's resignation, Stoll declined to give it, so Giel fired him. Stoll had sought support from President C. Peter Magrath, but Magrath told him the decision was up to Giel.

Stoll was relieved of his position on November 28, 1978; on November 29 the St. Paul Dispatch carried an article which said that Joe Salem, head coach at Northern Arizona, was the top contender to become the new Minnesota coach.

Robert Stein, Vice President for Administration and Planning, was appointed by President Magrath to chair a search committee; he, Magrath, and Giel consulted on the selection of the eight other members. They included the chair of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, the faculty representative, Vice President for Student Affairs Frank Wilderson, a student, a coach, and three alumni (including the incoming president of the "M" Club). The announcement of the committee membership was made on November 30 and the committee held its first meeting on December 1.

An unidentified set of brief meeting minutes on November 29 (attendees not recorded) laid out the procedure that would be followed: The Athletic Director would describe the characteristics and attributes that the coach should have, Giel would have the liberty to seek out candidates, the committee would screen all candidates and present 10-12 to Giel for review, and 5 or 6 of those would be interviewed. Then, with Giel absent, the committee would formulate an unranked list of 2-4 finalists, from which the Director would make his choice. Stein, in his letter of appointment to the committee, reaffirmed that the final list would be unranked (as was normal for University searches, but which was discussed at some length in the 1983 search). Stein also emphasized the need for confidentiality and expressed hope that speculation and rumors would be minimal.

The committee decided to set a period of one week for accepting nominations and applications; the deadline was December 8. The search was conducted with dispatch, because on December 12 the committee interviewed six finalists; one other candidate was interviewed on another date.

In deciding on its list of candidates to be interviewed, the committee "pored through the applications very carefully," according to one committee member, and "gathered information from resumes and calls . . . placed to persons who were in a position to know the candidates," according to another. Finally, the committee "screened the list and decided upon who should be interviewed through discussion and consensus," recalled one who participated.

According to later comments and the records now available, the committee apparently only contacted two individuals who had not formally applied for the job. For the fifth time in 27 years, an overture was made to Bud Wilkinson, who was, by his own account in 1985, definitely not interested. So he once again did not become a candidate. Wilkinson was then coaching professional football in St. Louis and told Giel he would not leave before his contract ran out. The other individual became a finalist. In view of one committee member, "there was no effort, nor did the Search Committee even feel that they had the right, to seek out others as potential candidates for this job."

Following interviews, the committee, "by discussion . . . and consensus," selected three individuals whose names were presented to Giel. He selected Joe Salem from the three.

CHAPTER 7

FINANCIAL AID TO ATHLETES

One of the most vexing matters faced by the Big Ten Conference, and by the University of Minnesota, was financial aid to athletes. Although primarily a subject dealt with by the Conference, and eventually also by the NCAA, it was nonetheless also a subject of great concern to the University. While this book is intended to be a history of events at Minnesota, much of this chapter must also necessarily include actions and events of the Conference.

There was, from the outset, firm opposition to aid to athletes. The seven presidents who met in Chicago in January, 1895, the meeting considered to be the birth of the Conference, adopted twelve rules "for the regulation of Athletics." Two of those rules read, in pertinent part, "No person shall be admitted to any intercollegiate contest who receives any gift, renumeration or pay for his services on the college team" and no one who had ever been a professional athlete could compete on a college team. The faculty members who met thirteen months later, in February, 1896, to discuss the rules reaffirmed the pay-for-play without amendment or lengthy discussion. The 1901 revisions left intact the first pay-for-play rule; the second had been broadened to read "No student shall participate in any intercollegiate contest who has ever used or is using his knowledge of athletics or his athletic skill for gain."

Despite the existence of the rules, concern about financial support to athletes was expressed at the first of the "Angell" Conferences, in January of 1906. Aid of any kind was not permitted, and almost universally opposed, but even so, Professor T. F. Moran, the faculty representative from Purdue, "mentioned the attitude which was developed by the large amounts of funds received, and he mentioned also the tendency to give students who had athletic ability of a high order financial support." Again at that same meeting, a committee of three of the faculty representatives, appointed during the meeting to "make a statement of the evils of the present situation," reported that one problem was "the zeal of many alumni who, loyal in intention . . . raise or contribute money to pay the expenses of athletes in college, thus professionalizing them, and corrupting the student sentiment." No new rules, however, were adopted.

A question was put at the March 10, 1906, Conference meeting (following the second Angell conference) about whether or not a student would be eligible if he had "received gain for participation in sports out of college." Each faculty member was asked to seek an answer from his committee or board. At the December meeting the same year, Professor Paige reported that Minnesota felt such a student should not be eligible. (Two schools were of a divided opinion, four voted that he should not lose eligibility, and

three voted that he should.) Presumably Professor Paige consulted with the faculty committee, because the Board of Control minutes reflect no discussion of the matter.

That unacceptable practices had not disappeared is evidenced in a minute from the April 6, 1912, meeting of the Conference; three faculty representatives were appointed to a committee to report on "(1) the inducements offered to athletes to enter the various Conference Universities, and (2) upon the payment of athletes for miscellaneous services about the University." The committee reported back the following November. They "made an elaborate statistical report" and recommended that high school athletic stars not be "rushed," that all University staff be passive even if their alumni recruit high school athletes, and that "none which are under the control of the athletic authorities shall be awarded to students." The recommendations were adopted.

For over ten years thereafter there is no record of significant Conference attention to the subject. In June of 1923, the faculty representatives were presented with a resolution from the General Alumni Association of Northwestern University, which noted that alumni everywhere were believed to be providing money to students only because they were athletes. The resolution asked the Conference to adopt rules prohibiting those who receive such aid from participating in athletics. A committee of three was appointed to investigate, and to meet with alumni from all of the Conference schools; it finally reported in December of 1925 that the alumni could not agree on any proposal to submit to the faculty representatives for consideration.

The idea of further discussion did not disappear. In November, 1926, faced with football scheduling problems, recruiting, and other difficulties, the faculty representatives voted to collect data and to have a meeting with six representatives from each institution: the President, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Representative, the Athletic Director, the Football Coach, and an alumni representative. The date for the meeting of the "Committee of Sixty" was subsequently set for January 28, 1927.

If the word of Conference Commissioner Griffith can be taken, as expressed in a confidential letter to President Coffman, it was Coffman who was responsible for the meeting. According to Griffith, it was a letter from Coffman to the Athletic Directors, prompted by discontent over football scheduling, that had caused the meeting to be scheduled. This had been a sore spot among conference schools for many years, and had caused a flurry of correspondence among the presidents over the preceding year. Griffith wrote primarily because he wanted Coffman or another president to preside over the meeting, because he wanted Coffman to know that the athletic directors had been working hard on recruiting, proselytizing, and other matters, and he thought they should be given free rein to discuss their problems at the meeting. Coffman wrote back to Griffith thanking him for his support and promising full cooperation and assistance.

The Committee of Sixty adopted five proposals addressing financial aid and recruiting. At the May meeting of the Conference following the Committee of Sixty, the faculty representatives adopted new legislation governing financial aid and a means of ensuring it was understood.

They also adopted corollary rules providing that writing articles on athletics and lending one's name to commercial advertising would constitute a violation of the rule. (Paige suggested the latter.) As part of the ban on recruiting also adopted at the same time, a rule against promising jobs to prospective athletes was enacted; it did permit employment after matriculation, but only at a "regular and reasonable scale" and the student was to "give full return in service."

By 1929 the abuses were apparently becoming so widespread that the athletic directors, at the May Conference meetings, asked the faculty representatives who had "the authority to enforce General Regulation III (a)." That regulation called on Big Ten schools "to sever athletic relations with any member that does not conform in full to the Conference rules." The directors maintained that the Commissioner had evidence against three schools, and "conclusive" evidence against Iowa in particular. The faculty representatives appointed a committee of three to look into the directors' charges; Paige was chairman. The three got together during the same Conference meetings and came back with two recommendations: First, that "athletic relations" with Iowa be terminated, and second, that a standing committee to receive and review allegations of violations be adopted. Paige's three-man group was designated to be that committee.

In the midst of the Iowa imbroglio, Paige and his 'Committee on Violation of Conference Rules' [the apostrophes are Paige's, recorded in the Conference minutes] reported that it had received all allegations and forwarded them to the institutions involved, and that all infractions had been satisfactorily resolved. Their report concluded that while "full and complete" adherence to the rules had not been achieved, "our condition is much better today than it has ever been before in the history of the Conference."

That Iowa was not the sole locus of violations of the rules is perhaps suggested by the resolution adopted at the May, 1930, Conference meetings commending the Commissioner for his thorough and impartial work "in investigating, sometimes under trying conditions, the situations in the various member institutions regarding recruiting and subsidization."

President Coffman was not persuaded that the spirit of the regulations were being honored. In a letter in the summer of 1930 about a North Central Association questionnaire on athletics, he suggested to the drafter that "where you are discussing the payments of money to students for athletic services, it seems to me that you might ask about the 'loans' made to students, and I think it would be worth knowing whether any of those loans have been paid. It seems to me you might ask about free tuition granted

athletes." Coffman went on to cite an example.

I heard a story this week which illustrates how some of the sporting element are undertaking to evade the rules of the Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. These rules, as you know, are very specific with regard to loaning money or in any other way compensating students for their athletic prowess. There are two boys of fine promise as athletes who are planning to enter a midwestern university, so I am told. Those who are interested in having these boys attend their university, in other words a group of alumni, have given the fathers of the boys enough money to pay their expenses at college. The boys are aware of this; they know exactly where the money is coming from; and the alumni are boasting that they have broken no Conference rules.

Seven years earlier, in 1923, Coffman had been optimistic about intercollegiate athletics. He wrote to a Chicago newspaperman that he favored athletics, and that while there were some evils, they were "rapidly disappearing or are being diminished. The hiring of players has been frowned upon by coaches and physical directors everywhere, and the Western Inter-collegiate Conference [the Big Ten] has been doing everything in its power to stamp it out." By December of 1930 he was less sanguine. Writing to a faculty member at Berkeley, Coffman said the danger to college sports did not come from faculties or regents.

It is to be found in the attempt on the part of groups lying wholly outside of the educational institutions, to dictate the appointment of coaches, to determine the personnel of the teams, and in other ways to determine, control and influence the athletic policies of the institutions. Players are subsidized both directly and indirectly. There is suspicion that many teams are largely professional in character. Schedules are arranged in the interest of championships. Most institutions are tainted with commercialism; they are more interested in receipts than they are in the relationship of their athletic programs to the educational functions of the institutions they represent.

It is my opinion that the situation is becoming increasingly more critical every year. (Emphasis added)

In this statement, Coffman set a tone to the presidential perspective at Minnesota which would be echoed at length by President Morrill two decades later.

In a contrary vein, at least as far as the Big Ten was concerned, is an entry in the minutes of the December, 1930, meetings. "Major Griffith reported that on the whole, conditions in the Conference were satisfactory, especially in the matter of recruiting and subsidization." At that same

meeting, Professor Paige introduced a motion indicating that "the Conference would welcome a meeting at an early date with the Presidents . . . for the discussion of matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics."

Coffman also expressed his views publicly, through an editorial in "Minnesota Chats" (a biweekly paper published by the University for parents of students). In a December, 1930, editorial, he suggested that players who thought "football was too much work for nothing" and who thought they ought to be paid should be barred from competition. He added that perhaps athletes should be required to fill out a questionnaire to determine their attitudes, and those who desired to be paid would be disqualified. The comments received notice in the metropolitan papers.

Early in 1931 Commissioner Griffith wrote to Coffman about the questionable state of athletic affairs at several Conference schools. He told the President that "so long as you are President of the University of Minnesota there will never be any questions about athletic policies at that institution." (It might be recalled that this is shortly after the Carnegie Report findings and the report of the Special Committee, and that Griffith was a member of the latter.) Coffman responded with interest to Griffith's statements about the Conference. He reported on a meeting of the Big Ten presidents, which had taken place a few days earlier, at which they had discussed athletics at some length. But they had concluded they did not wish to meet with the faculty representatives, for two reasons. One was that the presidents had "no constructive program." A second was that the presidents "should devote little time and give little consideration to the problem of intercollegiate athletics on the assumption that it is gradually settling itself and that it is becoming involved in such an intolerable situation that public sentiment will force it more and more under the direction and supervision of the administrative officers." He went on to note that "we are all smeared, more or less, with the spirit of commercialism," and opined that the situation could be improved by the Conference.

All these questions relating to charity games, the playing of post-season games, the playing of games with non-conference teams on neutral territory, a reasonable playing schedule among the members of the Conference, a refusal to permit students to play on Conference teams who change from one Conference school to another, the abandonment of all types of questionable scholarships, fairly definite salaries for the coaching staff, and a dozen and one other things, can and should be, so it seems to me, subscribed to by the Conference. Of course it may be said that they have been subscribed to by the Conference but the truth about the matter is that those who are closest to the situation know that this is largely a figment of the imagination. (Emphasis added)

Paige reported for his 'Committee on Violation of

Conference Rules' at the May, 1931, meetings; it was recommending an addition to the rules prohibiting aid. The new language would make ineligible for athletics any student who was the beneficiary of an institutional loan, however granted, or a remission of tuition, or a scholarship (unless such loan, remission, or scholarship was for superior academic performance and supervised by the university). The faculty representatives decided they ought to go home to talk about it before acting. Seven months later they adopted it, subject to the White Resolution procedure. A year after the proposal was first made, it was defeated 6-3 on the vote to reaffirm; one school had no instructions. (Paige had brought it to SCIA, which had approved it, and to the Senate, which did likewise.)

In December of 1934, Commissioner Griffith presented a four-page report on the "state of athletics in the Conference," of which one page was devoted to recruiting and subsidizing. Some excerpts from his report:

The recruiting and subsidizing problem will never be solved because there will always be a few who will attempt to cheat in this field. . . .

For the last few years the conference has had this matter well in hand. I would not suggest that there had been no attempted violations of the recruiting and subsidizing agreements, but in my judgment the pernicious recruiters have been less active in recent years than they formerly were.

When we undertook the campaign against illegitimate recruiting and subsidizing some years ago it was found that in practically all of the Conference universities employment bureaus that function solely in the interests of athletes were in operation. As a result of the educational campaign which was conducted, then and since, all of these duplicate employment bureaus were abandoned. It seems to me that we are reviving these special employment bureaus and if the practice is not curbed the universities will again be guilty of bidding for athletes, offering jobs as inducements.

At the December, 1936, Conference meetings the University of Wisconsin presented a plan for a summer institute, with tuition and fees paid by funds raised from alumni, to enroll Wisconsin high school graduates who qualified on the dual criteria of high academic and athletic achievement. Coffman had heard of the proposal early in the summer of 1936; T. E. Steward, the Director of the News Service, had forwarded to him a request for an opinion about it from a Milwaukee newspaper. Coffman's response to Steward was brief and tart:

Another nail in the coffin.

A rank and overt attempt at hiring a football team thinly disguised behind and associated with scholarships for scholastic ability.

When universities sell their honor for athletic prowess, the end of athletics or of university integrity is not far off.

There is no record of whether or not that response was forwarded to the newspaper. The Conference, in any event, decided the plan would violate the rule prohibiting aid based on athletic skill.

As he had two years earlier, the Commissioner presented another report to the faculty representatives about the state of the Conference in late 1936. Of the three-and-one-half pages, two were devoted to recruiting and subsidization. He discussed the "grand jury" and overseer functions of the 'Committee on Violation of Conference Rules' (no longer chaired by Paige, who had retired), and he commented generally on the problems. It was his conclusion that "athletes in the Conference are not being paid weekly or monthly salaries. So far as can be learned there are no slush funds in operation." There was however, one practice that Griffith saw as objectionable.

The chief problem in the Conference today as regards recruiting and subsidizing is the practice of offering to assist athletes by finding jobs as an inducement for enrollment. A boy who is out of funds is very often hesitant about trying to work his way through college unless he knows someone who will help assume the responsibility of seeing that the lad gets started. It is undoubtedly true that some boys solicit offers of jobs and then elect to enroll at the institution where the job seems most attractive. The rule relative to offering jobs to prospective high school athletes is being broken by one or more individuals in practically every institution in the Conference. The fact is that many feel that the rule is wrong and consequently they feel justified in ignoring it.

These job programs would explode in the Conference's face in twenty years.

Griffith noted, in this 1937 report, that the provision of jobs had expanded to include promises or guarantees of summer employments.

At the December, 1939, NCAA Convention, the delegates heard an address by Ohio State University Vice President James Lewis Morrill. The subject of remarks was "the institutional administration of athletics," but along the way he made comments which Coffman would have lauded and which Morrill himself would iterate many times during his own presidency. He began, however, by noting his support for athletics "as a college man, a layman, if you please, enthusiastic about athletics and loyal to the ideas of sportsmanship intrinsic therein." He also noted a "need to restudy our philosophy and to renew our fundamental faith in the values of amateur college athletics as a justifiable aspect of the total educational enterprise in which we are

engaged." Morrill then expressed his views about the more specific question of aid: The Western Conference recently has strengthened its code and put perceptibly sharper teeth in the enforcement of its regulations relating to improper subsidy and recruiting of athletes.

Calling the Carnegie Report on athletics declaration about the abolition of amateurism in college sport a "counsel of defeat," Morrill said

If this be true, the action of certain southern institutions in providing outright subsidy for athletes in the form of tuition, room, board, and books not only offers no aid in solving our problems but sets us back seriously in the attempt to solve them. Such a policy robs us of all chance to mobilize administrative and faculty understanding and sanction of the intercollegiate athletic program. It recognizes professionalism under the specious argument for "frank and open-ness"--and thereby places college sport in direct competition with professional sports, where certainly it doesn't belong.

Finally, Morrill endorsed a practice which, honored more in the breach, would later give him headaches.

We must be realistic in acknowledging more frankly the right to recruit, as an element in the phenomenon of American college loyalty. It is recognized in other academic areas through myriad scholarships and fellowships. It can be recognized in athletics on Professor Kennedy's "representative principle" provided such recruiting squares clearly with well-defined ethical regulations and a sensible interpretation of the amateur idea. There must be no subsidies in the sense of something for nothing, but the right of institutions to aid athletes by honest and fully publicized employment should be openly established and safeguarded.

One of the matters to which Morrill spoke at the NCAA convention was a series of constitutional amendments to establish "sound principles and practices" and "an unequivocal code governing aid for the athlete." Three weeks earlier, at the December, 1939, Conference meetings, the faculty representatives voted to completely revise and update the Handbook of the Big Ten. In addition to codifying actions taken over the previous several years, the new edition contained a complete rewrite of General Regulation XIV, the so-called "Directors' Agreement" on "Recruiting and Subsidizing." Eligibility Rule 6, banning financial aid based on skill, remained largely the same. But the agreements on recruiting and subsidizing were changed from five short paragraphs to ten numbered "do's and don'ts." Detailed reviews of legislative changes, which would be neither practical nor interesting, will not be provided here. The new General Regulation XIV was an attempt on the part of the athletic directors to clarify the acceptable and unacceptable practices in the provision of jobs, awarding of unearned aid (only through normal University offices), and solicitation of athletes.

The Daily described the new standards as outlawing subsidies; President Guy Stanton Ford wrote to Athletic Director Frank McCormick, telling him that the directors "certainly have set a high standard which, if observed, ought to keep the Conference clear of unethical practices." Ford added that "the interpretation of these rules will not be automatic and altogether easy."

Many of the rules were knocked into a cocked hat during World War II, especially as they applied to servicemen. At the end of the war, the Conference devoted much time to accommodating those who had been in the armed forces. The faculty representatives agreed with the presidents, at the 50th Anniversary dinner in December, 1945, that a return to prewar rules should be accomplished as soon as possible. The financial aid rules were among those which had not been relaxed during the emergency.

The March, 1946, minutes of the Conference record "an extended discussion . . . with regard to existing and proposed scholarships." The faculty representatives continued the discussion to the September meetings, and noted "certain new scholarships being set up which by their provisions appear to be in open violation of the Conference prohibition of 'athletic' scholarships. It was noted that various other scholarships, not restricted to athletes, could evade the spirit of the Conference rule, if not honestly administered." They asked Commissioner Wilson to collect data from all schools on jobs, loans, scholarships, tuition remissions, etc., and present them later.

In January of 1947, J. L. Morrill returned to the NCAA Convention, this time as President of the University of Minnesota. He once again called for a commitment to amateur sports, and talked to the question of aid.

And now these last two football seasons of postwar normalcy or of peacetime lunacy, whichever you prefer: this year of the nationally advertised "black market" in football players for hire; this year of release and reaction from wartime controls in public affairs; of typical postwar disillusionment and cynicism; of coaches and college heads catcalling like children over the kidnapping of veterans; of athletic conference cowardice in restoring normal eligibility requirements; of inflation and scrambles for stadium seats at any price.

Let me say in passing that players who threaten a sitdown strike for a better deal on athletic subsidies--and there was at least one rumored instance of that this year--will fall an easy prey to the easy-money approaches of unscrupulous gamblers. The possibility of a devastating betting scandal hovers like a black Harpy over the big-time intercollegiate athletic scene.

It seems to me sensible to recognize symptoms of a tendency which, unless checked, can grow like a cancer to choke out the clean tissue of intercollegiate sports.

No overnight reversal of present trends, contracts or commitments can likely be expected, things being as they are. No sudden and sweeping reform could, in fact, be carried through. But we had better begin working our way back to the main road of an intercollegiate athletic program consistent with common sense and with college aims.

The controlling criterium of college sports has been the amateur ideal. Under this concept the paid player is a professional.

There are those, I know, who think the battle for the amateur ideal has been lost, that the ideal is

not practical, that it is silly to shadow-box with reality. You can say that about any ideal, that it has never been fully won and never can be. There are always good excuses for the fainthearted and the insincere.

A respected Ivy League university president, weary of evasions and evidently discouraged by some happenings in that conference this fall, said to me a month ago he feared the fight against subsidies has been futile. "What athletic directors and coaches can't accomplish directly they can connive to get done by individual alumni and other groups," he said.

The athletic directors, graduate managers and coaches will be the indispensable front line of any real reform, with the faculties and the presidents in next rank support. Both will be backed up by a very large public and alumni constituency, little heard from until now, but ready to battle for the right things if the issue can be clearly stated and understood.

That issue is the issue of the amateur cult.

We have much to build upon. The great majority of the member institutions of this Association can be counted upon, I feel sure. Constructive consultation among the major athletic Conferences, following upon the Chicago meeting and this one, can end the unethical athletic scholarship racket and legalize the right kind of recruiting.

I have spent no time in these remarks in a justification of intercollegiate athletics or defense of their rightful place in our educational pattern, being, with you, a firm believer in their value.

Notwithstanding Morrill's please, in May, 1947, the faculty representatives approved "in principle" a plan which would permit aid to athletes. If in the upper one-half of his high school graduating class, a freshman could receive tuition and fees; if in the upper 20 percent, aid in excess of tuition and fees.

Later in the summer this action provoked internal correspondence at the University. The local sports columnists were writing about athletic scholarships; W. L. Nunn, Director of the University News Service, sent a long memo to Academic Administration Vice President Malcolm Willey reviewing the situation, conversations he had had, and Minnesota's options. Morrill saw the memo and wrote to Nunn that he "was alarmed, indeed, to read . . . about Western Conference athletic scholarships." There must be, Morrill said, "something haywire with the information which has agitated you." Morrill wrote promptly, also, to Frank McCormick and Henry Rottschaefer, asking whether or not athletic scholarships were under consideration. Morrill

recalled for them his own views, as expressed at the NCAA convention eight months earlier. He also told them that if it were true that scholarships had been proposed, the Conference and the nation would expect "some leadership from Minnesota" on the subject, and that he would be "strongly inclined to go to bat directly with my fellow presidents of the Big Ten--but I have the feeling, somehow, that Mr. Nunn has picked up some gossip that just isn't so."

Rottschaefer responded to Morrill's note with an excerpt from the Conference minutes and said that there was no intention of creating athletic scholarships. The proposal approved in principle was only intended to aid the Commissioner in determining whether or not athletes who received aid were in violation of the rules and to ensure that boys were not discriminated against because they were athletes.

Morrill took a less positive view. The "proposal looks dangerous to me," he told Rottschaefer. "It seems to me a somewhat oblique approach toward the legitimatizing of athletic scholarships." Morrill concluded that irrespective of the academic performance criteria, "We'll be starting down a path which will only make matters worse." Two days later, in another letter, Morrill reiterated his view and the strategy he would follow: "There is one question on which I do want to take counsel with the Presidents from the Western Conference institutions at least--and that is the dangerous prospect, as I see it, of Big Ten action authorizing the establishment of disguised athletic scholarships. I think there is dynamite in that one."

The Daily editorialized on the subject a little later. Minnesota must make its views on scholarships known, and would ultimately have three alternatives if it opposed aid. One, set up its own scholarship fund if the Conference legalized aid along the lines proposed. Two, refuse to give aid but stay in the Conference. Three, drop out of the Conference. If it chose the second alternative, the Daily observed, Minnesota would be in the same position the University of Chicago had been before it withdrew from the Conference: not competitive.

In February, 1948, the Conference minutes note "extended discussion" about aid to athletes, but the faculty representatives decided to wait to see what the NCAA would do.

Morrill, whose views had already been expressed to the athletic establishment, carried them also to the National Association of State Universities in May of 1948. Commending the NCAA for adoption of the "Sanity Code," he said that the conferences still had to provide rules and enforcement, but that "we have been weak--both at the institutional and conference level." He contended that "the present trend toward more subsidization of athletic team members, through athletic scholarship plans, for example, tends to blur the line between professional and amateur sport. This is most evident in football." He urged that schools and conferences take steps to "clear up the confusion between amateur and

professional sport" created, in part, by these aid proposals.

In May of 1948, one year after the proposal to permit aid had been approved in principle, Commissioner Wilson presented, as requested, a voluminous report on aid extended to athletes at Conference schools. The Conference decided that the earlier proposal was not in force, and judged the Commissioner's report in light of the long-standing language of Rule 6 banning subsidies for athletes.

In June, 1948, three weeks after declaring that the earlier aid proposal was not in force, the Conference voted to add lengthy provisions to Rule 6 governing unearned financial aid. This new language then implemented, with some revisions and codification, the May, 1947, standard: aid in excess of tuition and fees (but no more than \$300 in excess) would be permissible for students in the upper one-fourth of their high school class; aid up to tuition and fees if in the upper one-half and if there is a demonstration of financial need. This legislation was then referred to the Conference members under the White Resolution.

All of the discussion about aid and practices at other institutions were of concern to the athletic department at Minnesota. In late April of 1948 Frank McCormick sent a letter to Morrill transmitting a report prepared by a three-man committee McCormick had appointed. The three were coaches, the group had been chaired by Bernie Bierman, and McCormick had asked them to review "the problems surrounding our present athletic program and to make recommendations for changes for improvements."

The Bierman committee had reported to McCormick, item #1, that "this is an age of athletics and aggressive recruiting" and that regardless of what the NCAA or the Big Ten did, "aggressive recruiting and subsidizing in some form will remain." They then commented on the University. "We have not fallen in step. This has handicapped us. What attitude and policy is Minnesota going to adopt in this matter?" They recommended that "all possible steps" be taken to reduce the handicap. McCormick, in his letter to Morrill, suggested that the matter be taken up with SCIA.

The Bierman committee "report" was slightly over one page long. Morrill sent it on to SCIA with a letter more than four times that length. In his letter to E. B. Pierce (as chairman of SCIA), Morrill observed that "the recommendations propose a rather definite reversal of what I have believed to be the athletic policy of the University and of principles in both athletic and University administration to which I feel deeply committed." Morrill noted that anyone could be asked to help in an "aggressive recruiting" effort so long as that effort did not include illegal subsidization. While gratified that Bierman's report expressly urged working with the Conference and NCAA rules, Morrill was nonetheless troubled by an implication he perceived: that the University should "go beyond our present effort of limiting assistance for athletes to the organized efforts to find employment for them." Warning that "illegal and underhanded action elsewhere would not constitute, for

me, an excuse for imitation by the University of Minnesota," and recalling for Pierce his own strongly-expressed views at two NCAA conventions, Morrill asked SCIA to review the report.

SCIA held a series of three meetings in May, 1948, at which it heard from coaches, athletes, University administrators, other students, President Morrill, and Big Ten Commissioner Wilson. The Committee then issued a confidential report to President Morrill at the end of June. In its report SCIA concluded that

- (b) [The University] "has been at a disadvantage in competing with member schools of the Conference due to the fact that many of them have numerous scholarships to offer high school graduates while it has had none, and this condition bids fair to continue for an indefinite future period.
- (c) "This disadvantage had been accentuated by the occasional abuse of such scholarships in subsidizing athletes by member schools of the Conference and by non-member schools. The recent action of the conference in validating athletic scholarships and other grants-in-aid has worsened our competitive situation.

Paragraph (c) referred, of course, to the Conference action three weeks earlier adopting standards permitting unearned financial aid under specified circumstances.

SCIA decided that there was nothing wrong, per se, with scholarship programs, and that they should not be prohibited; rather, they should not be used "as cloaks for primarily athletic scholarships." The Committee suggested that the University should develop a scholarship and grant-in-aid program for all students.

While working on its report to President Morrill, SCIA was also informed by Professor Rottschaefer of the new provisions of Rule 6 about unearned financial aid. "After full discussion of the . . . revision, which disclosed that the Conference code would permit athletic scholarships, it was moved and carried that" SCIA recommend disapproval to the Senate. The Senate concurred with the SCIA recommendation.

The objection voted by Minnesota was noted at the September, 1948, Conference meetings, and it was agreed that the matter would be voted on again in December. Rottschaefer alerted Morrill to the vote he had cast; Morrill sent a note to him asking if a "plea, reasonably well spelled out" to the Conference presidents, "looking either to a changed vote or some kind of reconsideration," would be appropriate. Rottschaefer said no; only Illinois had joined Minnesota in objecting, that several presidents favored it, and the only hope was that the faculties would object when voting under the White Resolution.

At the December, 1948, Conference meeting the new legislation was reaffirmed, with Minnesota and Illinois again

the two dissenting votes. At the same time, the Conference voted--with Rottschaefer in opposition--to eliminate the \$300 cap in aid in excess of tuition and fees for athletes in the upper one-fourth of their class. It was a White Resolution matter, and the same act followed: SCIA voted to oppose the change, the Senate concurred, and the Conference reaffirmed the change in March of 1949. This time, however, Minnesota cast the lone dissenting vote.

The University established the Greater University Fund to award aid to students, including athletes. SCIA discussed the proposal but saw no reason to take action. The scholarships were in place.

CHAPTER 8

THE 1950s: MORRILL AND FACULTY CONTROL

For the purposes of this monograph, the period from the late 1930s are not characterized by the same dramatic changes that occurred earlier. The Big Ten Structure is largely in place, as is the structure that governs athletics on the campus. The major struggles over athletic issues continued to take place at the Conference level, and they shall now receive attention.

As noted, 1945 marked the accession of James Lewis Morrill to the presidency of the University of Minnesota; Morrill served as president until 1960. He came to Minnesota with a good working knowledge of intercollegiate athletics--he had served as chairman of the Ohio State athletic board of control. And he was not bashful about making his views on athletic matters known, publicly and to his faculty, as events showed. Morrill, it was pointed out in the preceding chapter, spoke to the NCAA convention twice. While the most important events occurred near the end of his term of office, it is necessary to briefly recapitulate the developments immediately following World War II.

On December 6, 1945, at the dinner celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Big Ten Conference, the Faculty Representatives, the Athletic Directors, the Commissioner, and the Presidents were all present. Because of the exigencies of the emergency, many of the rules had been relaxed, especially where they affected servicemen. The presidents at the dinner expressed pride and confidence in the Conference, but left to the Faculty Representatives and Athletic Directors the task of restoring normal practice.

For the next several years, the Conference minutes are dominated by discussions about how to administer the rules with all these servicemen returning with a variety of competitive experiences behind them. Also the subject of frequent debates were the Rose Bowl contact and television rules. Far surpassing all other topics, however, was the attention given to academic eligibility rules, recruiting, and "subsidiization." It would not be useful to recount the many twists and turns the Conference rules took, or the events that precipitated them, but a few of the salient points from the last chapter can be summarized.

The Big Ten had a reputation for being more purist about the amateurism of its college athletics than most other Conferences. The coaches, directors, and faculty representatives were clearly worried about the increasingly high-pressured, quasi-professional trends in college sport around the country, especially in football, and tried to reconcile the philosophy of the Conference with practices they saw as abhorrent. There were compromises:

- In 1948, the Conference adopted legislation permitting unearned aid, but linked it to scholarship and required that aid to athletes be in proportion and amount to that available to non-athletes.
- Beginning in 1948, athletic departments could pay for meals and two nights' lodging for a recruit visiting the campus.
- Athletes were permitted to work during the school term, although athletic department staff were not to promise jobs, and the work had to be performed and the pay at prevailing rates.

By 1951, the Commissioner is warning, in his annual report, that the rules are not being enforced well, that recruiting pressures are increasing, and that financial aid rules have been in flux since the end of the war. In early 1952, responding to a major report by the American Council on Education, the Conference affirmed its opposition to athletic awards as the worst evil in athletics and declared that what was needed were not more rules but more zealous observation and enforcement.

In 1952 the Council of Ten, the presidents of the Big Ten universities, was incorporated into the structure of the Conference. It is now they who hire the Commissioner, upon recommendation of the Faculty Representatives. The Council, in 1952, also called for action on eliminating aid to athletes, elimination of recruiting contrary to the rules, special favors to athletes, and an overemphasis on competition.

By 1954 the Conference had three different "Rules Revision" Committees working simultaneously on recruiting and financial aid proposals (numbered 1,2, and 3, by the conference members themselves to keep them separate). By and large, the Conference stuck to its basic positions on aid and recruiting, although coaches, presidents and the faculty representatives and athletic directors themselves kept calling for new rules.

Also troubling, to the Presidents, during the early 1950s, was the allocation of power and responsibility between the faculty representatives and athletic directors. In 1951 the athletic directors expressed dissatisfaction at the legislative and enforcement procedures. By the end of the year it was agreed that administrative duties as assigned to the directors were not subject to the White Resolution.

By mid-1956 events began coming to a head. Up until that year, President Morrill's files contain only sporadic correspondence about athletics and Conference business. On August 8 Professor Rottschaefer sent to Morrill a highly confidential Conference report of a Special Committee which was a critical self-evaluation of recruiting, financial aid, job programs, the "offer system" being used, and a general indictment of the schools for failing to live up to the rules and philosophy of the Big Ten. On August 18, 1956, Stanley

Wenbergs, Assistant to the President, wrote to Assistant Commissioner Bill Reed asking how the report of the Special Committee might be brought to the Council of Ten.

Also in August, 1956, the Joint Group voted that proven financial need become the basis for any unearned aid to athletes and appointed an ad hoc committee to report at the next meeting with specific legislative proposals to implement the change. An interim report in September proposed that there be no limit on the number of athletes who receive need-based aid and that any aid would be reduced by employment earnings.

Adding to the furor were two cover articles published in 1956 by Look magazine, about the Pacific Coast Conference and the Big Ten. The latter was denounced for carrying on a charade about jobs programs when in fact athletes didn't do any work. Minnesota was specifically mentioned. The articles pointed up the scandalous situation which had long concerned the faculty and directors.

On October 5 President Morrill wrote to the Secretary of the Council of Ten and commented on the August Special Committee report, describing it as "one of the most candid, courageous, and to me discouraging documents I have ever seen --and [it] . . . ought to have a mighty high priority on the agenda of the Council of Ten when we meet in Chicago in December." Six days later Commissioner Tug Wilson sent copies of the report to the Council as requested by President Morrill. The Conference also released the report to the press because Look had obtained a copy of it; the contents exploded on the front pages of the papers.

Later in the month Mr. Wenberg wrote a memo to Morrill analyzing the problems confronting the Conference. He cited Professor Rottschaefer's view that faculty influence is diluted by the "joint group" decision-making process, and that is even further influenced by the practice of permitting the coaches to sit in. Wenberg went on to voice a view that was to become the theme of many future exchanges:

One of the beginning points to reverse this accelerated trend toward prostituted intercollegiate athletics would be to get the educational business of the conference back into the hands of the educational representatives. Aren't the presidents in a position to request the faculty representatives to manage major conference legislation without the voting participation of coaches and directors?

Is there any way the presidents can reestablish faculty participation of the Senate type at schools where conference actions go only to faculty athletic committees? Are any of the presidents sufficiently concerned with this whole thing so they would be willing in their own institutions to re-examine the point at which the White Resolution is operative? If the faculty is being short-changed through committee rather than Senate

management of the White Resolution, for example, might it not be possible to move the endpoint of discussion in those institutions back to the faculty or Senate level to the end that fuller faculty participations once again became operative?

Wenbergs followed this up on November 29 with a lengthy critical analysis of the "need" plan for President Morrill. Vice President Willey concurred with the criticisms. On the same day, there appeared an interview with Morrill in the Chicago Daily News wherein he expressed strong reservations about the costs of the plan, the lack of any scholarship requirement beyond admission, and the likelihood that the Conference was creating a class of students who were automatically underwritten.

Professor Stanley Kinyon (Law School), chairman of SCIA, wrote to President Morrill after being provided a copy of Mr. Wenbergs earlier memo. Kinyon said he didn't disagree with Wenbergs, but wondered if a majority of the faculty representatives wanted to reverse the trends, and inquired if it was possible to eliminate the Joint Group after so many years. Kinyon's note was followed, ten days later, by a four-page letter from Max Schultze (Professor of Biochemistry, who would become faculty representative himself in 1962) to Kinyon. Schultze, too, diagnosed problems in the Conference; there are, he concluded, two different groups responsible for the two major sets of rules creating the problems: the Faculty Representatives (financial aid) and the Joint Group (recruiting). The failure to vest authority for both in one group was one weakness. Another is:

exemplified in the fact that although the by-laws [of the Senate] specify that [SCIA] is given entire control of intercollegiate athletics . . . , this committee, in recent years apparently has not asked for or been given information which would have acquainted it with the current problems of financial aid to and recruiting of athletes.

The Council of Ten met on December 3, 1956, and commended the Joint Group on the report of the Special Committee. They took no position on the "need" proposal, although did discuss it, and asked the Conference to do more. Specifically, they wished to see examined: the role of the Commissioner in enforcement; the role and responsibilities of the faculty representatives; the expenditures for the visitation and entertainment of prospects; the diversion of funds for scholarships; and staff understanding of the rules. Morrill was apparently an active advocate, albeit mildly disenchanted, because he commented a few days after the meeting that he had a hard time even getting the Presidents to go as far as they did.

On December 8, 1956, the Faculty Representatives voted to adopt the "need" proposal and sent it to the ten schools under the White Resolution. (It has been said by many that the need plan, which remained in place until 1961, dealt a blow to Big Ten football from which it never recovered.)

In January and early February, 1957, there was a flurry of correspondence among the Big Ten Presidents. Hannah of Michigan State wrote to his colleagues urging support for the plan when it came back for the required second conference vote. Morrill replied that he had met with SCIA and the athletic staff and there was complete agreement that the plan was unsatisfactory and declared that "the need plan is only one small step in cleaning up the conditions described in the long report of the Special Committee." He promised to discuss the issue more, but said he would be surprised if Minnesota would change its position.

While not of direct bearing on the occurrences at Minnesota, the response to Hannah by Iowa President Virgil Hancher is worth quoting for the perspective it provides on the operation of the Conference. Hancher opposed the need plan for an entirely different reason from Morrill; he advocated open, direct payments to athletes for tuition, room, board, books, and incidental fees because it was cleaner, simpler, and honest. He continued:

In recent years I have regretted much of the time devoted to intercollegiate athletics at the meetings of the Council of Ten. It has troubled me that we have not devoted more time to the almost overpowering problems of teaching, research and service. . . . But there is another danger of which I have been fearful as I have listened to the discussions in our meetings. Often in those meetings and often in reading the proceedings of the Representatives of the Western Conference, I have had the tragic feeling that I am watching admirable men lost in an impenetrable forest. These men clearly have become so mesmerized and hypnotized and fascinated by them that they are unable to cast off the spell.

Some time before I die or retire, I should like to have some Big Ten rules that I can understand without undertaking all of the labor which is involved in the preparation of a complicated legal brief. I say this as a trained lawyer.

(Morrill wrote to Hancher, after getting a copy of the letter, saying that the need plan was only the "anteroom" to the free ride Hancher advocated--and said that he just could not bring himself to accept Hancher's view.)

On February 22 the Faculty Representatives reaffirmed the need plan. The Joint Group created the Intercollegiate Conference Financial Aid Service and adopted for use a set of complicated forms in administering the legislation.

Following reconfirmation of the need plan by the Conference, we hear from a new quarter. On March 8 the Regents unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The athletic aid program recently adopted by the Western Conference is not conducive to sound and defensible development of the Minnesota athletic

program [and the Regents] . . . deplore the adoption of the plan. Accordingly, they instruct the President to enter promptly into urgent discussions with the presidents of other conference institutions to the end that the present plan may be vacated, and the problem of athletic aid recanvassed. And they further instruct the Chairman of the Boards of the other Conference institutions of their attitude and to transmit to them a copy of [this resolution].

This resolution prompted a newspaper columnist to observe that the University was going right to the top and, impliedly, was not going to mess around with faculty committees.

Morrill confirmed that faculty control was subject to presidential review, in his opinion, because he wrote to the chairman of the Council of Ten, and copied the other presidents, asking if he would object to having a subcommittee of the Council review the action of the Faculty Representatives committing the Conference to the need plan. There is no record of the response, or of any action (although Hancher wrote to rail at the plan again but said that as long as they were stuck with it they may as well try it).

Two weeks after the Regents adopted their resolution, Board Chairman Ray Quinlivan wrote to his counterparts transmitting their sentiment and asking that they review the matter. He also told them that

this action of our Board was not taken on a recommendation of President Morrill. Actually he neither anticipated nor recommended it; nor did he oppose it. Rather, the action reflects the sincere belief of my colleagues on the Board that the present plan is unsound, unworkable, and unenforceable.

He did not stop there. In early April Quinlivan discussed the need plan with the staff of the athletic department, and on April 18 sent a second letter to other Regents chairmen suggesting that they, too, meet with their athletic staff. All of this effort seems to have gone for naught; there is no record of the replies Quinlivan received, but there is also no action by regents or trustees to reverse the action of the Conference. So, after all the hurly-burly, the actions of the Faculty Representatives determined the direction of the rules.

One provision of the new legislation was that the Conference could require a university to suspend or terminate a staff member who committed infractions or its membership in the Conference would be at risk. Previously, the penalty fell on the institution; now it could escape sanction by treating the culpable individual in the manner requested. In mid-summer of 1957 the football coach at Indiana, Phil Dickens, was suspended on order of the Conference; that action elicited internal comments at Minnesota. On August

31, 1957, Professor Kinyon (now the faculty representative) wrote a long memo to Wenberg about the impact of the Dickens suspension:

There have been a number of developments which confirm my hopes as to what effect the Indiana decision has had, at least at Minnesota.

First, and perhaps most significant, is the fact that the coaches and athletic director have gotten a good healthy scare. The provisions of the new [financial aid rules] now make it possible for the Conference to put the penalty directly on the coach or staff member by requiring such penalty as a condition of the institution's continued standing and membership in the Conference. The coaches and directors understand this, if our staff is typical, and have little desire to jeopardize their jobs.

Kinyon also reported that there had been a marked increase in contact with the coaches about rules, in contrast to the period preceding the Dickens action.

It looks to me like we're going to have a good working relationship between the Athletic Department and the faculty representatives from now on with respect to adherence to the rules. I attribute this largely to the Indiana decision.

Second, and probably of equal significance, is the fact that the faculty representatives have re-asserted their basic authority in Conference affairs and appear to be back in the driver's seat. Beginning with the letter last December from the Council of Ten inquiring as to the role of the faculty representatives in Big Ten matters, the faculty group has shown a constantly increasing independence in determining rules and enforcement policy.

President Morrill read Kinyon's letter and seemed relieved. On September 4 he wrote to Wenberg. "To me the heartening thing is the re-assertion (too long delayed) of faculty-conference responsibility and authority. The faculty people had become acquiescent stooges of the coaches and directors." Morrill wasn't so sure about the actual significance of the sanction, however: "As to the Indiana penalty, I still believe it was a bit 'phoney'--in that Dickens, altho' 'suspended,' will still receive his full salary (and I surmise will still direct Indiana football strategy)."

Wenberg communicated Morrill's sentiments to Kinyon and added a couple observations of his own. He told Kinyon that he was disappointed that it took

something as fundamentally unsound as the 'need' program to bring about conditions of enforcement.

With respect to enforcement of regulations in the

conference, it seems the conference representatives are once again beginning to recognize that they have a great deal of responsibility for the integrity of Western Conference athletics. . . . It is the job of the faculty representatives to make the conference laws. It should be the job of the athletic directors and the coaches to carry them out.

In December of 1956, responding to the request of the Council of Ten the previous year, the Faculty Representatives received and accepted a report of a special committee on "The Role and Responsibilities of the Faculty Representatives." That eight-page document is a remarkably clear elucidation of the way the Conference was supposed to work. It contains such statements as:

- It has not been questioned that the Faculty Representatives could properly inquire into and if they so decide, modify or set aside any decision or enactment of the Joint Group or the Athletic Directors, or that they could transfer any particular Conference matter from the jurisdiction of one body to that of another.
- By and large the Faculty Representatives have abstained from assuming administrative responsibilities in the Conference. . . . If, however, developments in Conference should ever indicate a need for intervention by the Faculty Representatives at the administrative level, as for example in the enforcement area, it is certain that the Faculty Representatives would have the authority to discharge the responsibility.
- It is to them [the Faculty Representatives] that the faculties of our ten institutions have entrusted the ultimate responsibility for keeping intercollegiate athletics in a sound relationship to the entire enterprise of higher education.

Professor Kinyon sent the report to President Morrill, who was not particularly impressed:

This statement seems to me reasonable and logical in theory but I have the feeling that its philosophy has not been soundly implemented in practice--and I am a little disappointed that the Faculty Representatives seem to be quite satisfied and undisturbed by what has seemed to me a disappointing trend.

You will remember the earlier committee report which pointed up the defections of the Western Conference and which, as I recall it, rather rebuked the Faculty Representatives for not exercising the authoritative independence from the Athletic Directors which they should.

Well, altogether, I suppose this review will be

useful as a reminder to reawaken the Faculty Representatives to a sense of their real responsibilities and to an alertness to issues which are still far from soundly and sensibly resolved, in my opinion.

Eighteen months later, in June of 1959, Kinyon sent Morrill a summary of the functions and membership of athletic committees at Big Ten Schools. Morrill wrote back, saying that:

In many cases there appears to be a good deal of committee control over the fiscal operations of the departments right along with a pretty slim line between the general faculty of the institution and their athletic committees.

This is all grist for the mill, and I suppose for the time being, at least, it has satisfied the question of faculty control of athletics in the Conference.

There was soon to be considerable uproar over faculty control again. In May of 1958 the Faculty Representatives voted to try to clarify a piece of previously enacted legislation. At the September 18 meeting of SCIA, Kinyon moved that the University object to the change, which had not been under the White Resolution, and that the University request that the changes in Rule 5 (the one here in question) be considered under the White Resolution. The Senate concurred.

At the December meeting the chairman of the Faculty Representatives noted the Minnesota objection and ruled

that any institution's faculty may within sixty days after adoption of any proposal at a Conference meeting, interpose a rejection thereof on the ground that in their opinion the action was sufficiently substantive to have been properly under the White Resolution, thereby rendering the action inoperative and requiring a vote of reaffirmation at the next meeting.

The chairman was overruled on a 9-0-1 vote (Illinois abstained). Why Minnesota voted affirmatively, in light of apparent SCIA sentiment, is unknown. Professor Kinyon then moved that the Faculty Representative would, on objection from any school, reconsider an initial decision not to subject a matter to the White Resolution; that passed.

On October 11, 1959, the Athletic Directors brought to the Joint Group a complaint. The minutes for that meeting note that

the point of concern reported by the Directors was that developments in Conference procedures, particularly with respect to matters coming under the White Resolution, were tending to militate against the exercise of responsibility by Directors as a group.

They emphasized that they were not questioning the principle of faculty control, but did wish to see some revisions:

1. That the White Resolution only apply to "academic standards for eligibility."
2. That the Directors be given full vote in the Joint Group, and that it have power over everything except academic eligibility and "Directors' Agreements."
3. Joint Group could review "Directors' Agreements."

The Faculty Representatives and the Athletic Directors agreed to meet in three weeks to review possible revisions to the procedures.

On November 1, 1959, the Faculty Representatives met again, with the Athletic Directors present but not voting, to discuss changes. They voted to make several alterations, two of which are of interest here.

1. Instead of requiring that a matter be referred to the "faculty," under the White Resolution, it can be referred to the committee or board to which control of athletics has been delegated.
2. The Faculty Representatives or Joint Group, whichever enacts a measure, shall determine by majority vote whether that measure is subject to the White Resolution.

The second changed the procedure agreed upon following Minnesota's objection the year before. The November 1 meeting minutes do not suggest that these changes are subject to the White Resolution.

Mr. Wenberg wrote to President Morrill after he discussed the November 1 meeting with Kinyon and Ike Armstrong. Both seemed undisturbed; Kinyon said the changes were technical and not important and Armstrong said they were good. Wenberg concluded that "these are sound steps."

Morrill hastened to disagree. To Wenberg he sent a note saying:

My own reading of the Faculty Conference minutes and their implications does not square with your comments. I think the athletic directors have won their point in seriously weakening whatever we mean (and hitherto have meant) by "faculty control"-- and I have a hunch that if our University Senate really knew the score they would sharply instruct Kinyon not to support the revised legislation.

Wenberg jotted a note back wondering, however, "whether there is a value to athletics in making the directors more responsible in certain conference matters and whether everything loosely defined as 'substantive' needs to go back to the full 'faculty' when there is a disagreement at the conference level." He added that he believed Kinyon "needs your counsel."

Two days before the meetings of the Conference, President Morrill received a letter from John Fullen, Secretary of the Ohio State alumni association, reporting on the meeting of the Faculty Council there:

They sent back with strong protest the actions of the Faculty Representatives, so-called, and the Athletic Directors who, in unilateral action, rewrote the rules of the Western Conference and declared them to be outside the requirements of the White Resolution. . . . In the minutes of the November 1st meeting, . . . they wrote the word "Faculties" out wherever they could and their principal piece of legislation was to assert that Faculty control would be considered as in effect by the action of any board . . . where the Faculty are in a majority.

At the meetings of the Conference December 10-12, the Faculty Representatives voted not to make the changes subject to the White Resolution. They did, however, revise some of their previous action. The Faculty Representatives decided to retain all authority to determine what was subject to the White Resolution and reverted to the previous arrangement on protests: if a school objected that a piece of legislation should have been under the White Resolution, the Faculty Representatives will vote to reconsider the decision that it was not. They left intact the change permitting the committees or boards to act on behalf of the faculties, rather than requiring legislation to go to the full faculty.

In a way, this last decision makes some sense, especially if, as at Minnesota, the actions of SCIA or ACIA

are subject to review by the Senate/Assembly. There is a mechanism for check by the Senate. When the White Resolution procedure was adopted in 1900, "the faculties" were small enough groups so that they could all be brought together to discuss legislation. Even at Minnesota, of course, the White Resolution issues had been going to the Senate for decades, not the "faculty." Morrill, however, was not persuaded.

On December 15, after the Conference meetings, Morrill received another letter from Fullen, who had rather caustic comments on the results.

The basic upheaval is the assignment of responsibility to a board, committee or council which will decide whether they wish to refer anything to faculties, and if the boys did not care to refer the re-writing of the constitution back to the faculties, it is quite likely that nothing may ever again be referred back. . . . Unless some faculties are willing to carry the battle, the Western Conference even as a symbol of sane regulations is gone.

Mr. Wenberg told Morrill that Kinyon again thought there were only a few changes, that the newspapers were making a big deal out of nothing, and that there was no reason to be alarmed. Morrill wrote to Wenberg: "I'm afraid Jack Fullen is right: that there's evasive skullduggery afoot in all this--and I surmise that Kinyon is a passive party to it."

The controversy about the extent of faculty control over athletics on each campus, and in the Conference, followed President Morrill to the end of his term of office. Jack Fullen wrote two more times. On December 30, 1959, he wrote to attack stacked faculty committees and said that "the faculty" were really not in control. The Faculty Representatives, he argued, have not represented the faculty, "in fact or in spirit," and now the Conference is trying to make it legal for them not to do so. A month later, January 25, 1960, he wrote again and enclosed a news article. The headline from the Columbus paper was about the Ohio State faculty declaring the new rules for voting to be illegal and calling on the Council of Ten to call a constitutional convention to draft a formal constitution for the Big Ten Conference and submit it to the faculties for a vote. There was, according to Fullen, also discussion of the possible withdrawal of Ohio State from the Big Ten if the Council of Ten ignored the request. Fullen closed by saying that he did not trust the President of Ohio State, who had said that Morrill, at the last Council of Ten meeting, "had made an emotional speech" about the issue of faculty control.

Morrill did not change his mind, either. He wrote back to Fullen on January 27 and described the Ohio State faculty request to the Council of Ten as "epochal--a smashing gesture." Morrill concurred that the questions should be considered by the Council of Ten. He went on to say that

the infiltration by the athletic directors and coaches of our Faculty Conference Representatives

is very great. I'm actually beginning to have trouble here with the attitudes of our Conference Representative and our Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics--but I think we can count on Minnesota to vote right.

Later in January SCIA Chairman Schultze sent to Morrill a copy of the SCIA proposal on the changes in the White Resolution procedures. SCIA recommended that the Senate accept the changes and authorize SCIA to vote on behalf of the faculty on White Resolution matters. The recommendation to the Senate also promised that SCIA would report all such votes and that it would bring for action matters of important institutional policy. Schultze said he did not feel there would be less faculty control of athletics, with the procedures in place at Minnesota, and that Senate control would still be in place. Morrill wrote back to Schultze saying he did not concur with the Committee's judgement and that faculty control would be jeopardized at some Conference schools. He also inquired how SCIA would decide what was important enough to bring to the Senate for action. He stressed that it was not a matter of semantics; he did not want the faculty voting on minutiae and applauded the scrupulousness of SCIA adherence to the requirement the White Resolution matters be brought to the Senate. Morrill expressed grave doubts that such diligent practices obtained at other schools, and he did not want to see legislation adopted which would weaken faculty control where it was already not well observed. He concluded by saying that the Conference schools are too parochial in their voting and that they need to be concerned at the weakening of the total structure of faculty control represented by the action taken at the Conference on November 1 and at the December meetings.

President Morrill's views went unheeded. At the Senate meeting on February 4, 1960, the faculty voted to approve the changes in the White Resolution matters, as recommended by SCIA.

Later in February the Ohio State President wrote to his Council of Ten colleagues expressing regret that he had been out of town when his faculty had passed the resolution calling for a constitutional convention. He suggested he could have gotten the resolution postponed until the Council of Ten could consider other proposals at its meeting in March. He went on to comment on an article in the Ohio State alumni magazine by Jack Fullen, saying that Fullen was incorrect in his assessment of the situation and that he, the President, was embarrassed by the article.

At the March 4, 1960 meeting of the Joint Group, the faculty representatives did not reaffirm a vote to sign a new Rose Bowl pact with the West Coast universities. The Faculty Representatives also voted to delete a clause permitting an individual Conference institution to accept an invitation to participate in the Rose Bowl. Gathering from the news accounts of the time, this vote by the Faculty Representatives so incensed the Athletic Directors that they voted to ban all post-season competition except Olympic tryouts; this would have prohibited any competition in NCAA

championships. The Faculty Representatives then voted that this ban was a White Resolution matter to be referred to the campuses.

This outburst on the part of the Conference prompted President Hannah at Michigan State to write to his presidential colleagues and suggest that there was something to be gained by having a frank discussion at the April Council of Ten meeting. He acknowledged that they had discussed athletics at virtually all of their recent meetings, but that the discussions had been shallow.

I would urge that we face this issue now rather than run the risk of possibly finding ourselves in a situation where at a later date we may not be able to determine or control the future course and pattern of our athletic programs.

Hannah, at least, is of the view that the presidents may certainly intervene and overrule actions by the Conference.

President Morrill wrote back to President Hannah expressing his concurrence. He added that he was ashamed of what had gone on at the Conference meetings, "and had said so, in no uncertain terms, to the two from here. . . . Unless the presidents do take some leadership, we are all going to regret it."

In mid-March President Morrill told the Board of Regents he hoped that the action on post-season competition would be rescinded. On April 1 SCIA voted against the ban on post-season competition, but also voted against any renewal of the Rose Bowl contract. The Senate subsequently confirmed these votes by SCIA. At the May meetings of the Conference the Faculty Representatives voted unanimously against a ban on post-season competition.

As the closing action in this sequence of events, at the end of President Morrill's term of office, the Faculty Representatives also voted, at the May 20, 1960, meetings of the Conference, to defeat a proposal to add language to the membership requirements insisting that any committee or Board voting on White Resolution matters must "be responsible to a general faculty body." Minnesota voted against the proposal to add the language; Ohio State voted in favor of it. In the last analysis, therefore, it must be said that the views of the faculty, as expressed by the Senate and SCIA, prevailed over those of President Morrill.

CHAPTER 9

MINNESOTA, MORRILL, AND THE ROSE BOWL

The Rose Bowl, in the 1950s, provoked a series of critical questions about the structure and control of athletics, both at the Conference level as well as at the individual campuses. It may be slipping beyond the memory of many, now, but the current agreement the Big Ten has to play in the Rose Bowl is the product of decades of heated debate about the role of athletics in higher education and the role of the faculty in governing athletics.

Shortly after the birth of the Conference, there was no strong sentiment opposing post-season competition. The November 28, 1902, minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Representatives record "the proposed participation by a conference college in a foot-ball game in California, under the auspices of a floral association," and the representatives determined that such participation would be "not out of accord with" the rules. The University of Michigan played in the game in 1902.

When the Angell Conferences were held in 1906, however, one of the recommendations that was adopted as a regulation was "that the football season end the Saturday before Thanksgiving." (Another recommendation, which failed of adoption, was that football be suspended for two years.) There was no explicit ban on post-season games, but no team participated in one for the next fourteen years.

In June of 1920, the Conference reaffirmed "its judgement that post-season games, in all branches of sport, are undesirable," although this was an expression of sentiment, not of a regulation. In fact, the Conference voted to permit Ohio State to accept an invitation to play in the 1921 Rose Bowl; concomitantly, however, the faculty representatives in December, 1920, discussed and adopted a motion "that the recent action of the Conference in sanctioning the Ohio State trip to California shall not be construed as a precedent." At their following meeting, in June of 1921, they voted that "the disapproval of post-season games hitherto classified as an expression of opinion on the part of the Conference . . . was declared to have the force of a rule of the Conference." The adoption of this statement as a rule was not submitted to the White Resolution procedure and there is no hint in the Conference minutes that any of the institutions dissented. (J. L. Morrill attended the 1921 Rose Bowl with the Ohio State team.)

There is no record of discussion of this subject in any of the minutes of the Board of Control for 1920 or 1921. Nor is there any mention of the post-season competition rule in the Senate minutes; we cannot even guess whether or not SCIA addressed the question inasmuch as there are, as mentioned previously, no minutes for SCIA until 1922. We do not know

if Professor Paige was voting his own view or that of the University.

At the specific request of the Iowa faculty representative that the question be addressed, in December of 1921 the Conference voted that Iowa would be in violation of the ban on post-season competition if it accepted an invitation from the Tournament of Roses. In February of 1930 the Conference again, unanimously, denied Iowa permission to play in a post-season game, and the following May voted to reject an invitation from the Southern Conference to participate in a post-season game, informing them "that it would be inadvisable to consider any proposal of this kind."

On February 3, 1931, in a letter to Professor Paige responding to a proposal from the faculty representatives that they would welcome a meeting with the presidents, President Coffman told him that the presidents did not wish to do so, because they had no program to submit. Coffman, however, relayed two items to which the presidents wished the faculty representatives would give more attention; the second was "a more definite policy prohibiting, or discouraging at any rate, post-season games." This is the first statement in Minnesota records of the University's view. Three days later, in a letter to Commissioner Griffith, Coffman again alluded to post-season games as one of the items against which the Conference should stand.

The Big Ten Alumni Clubs of Southern California, on November 18, 1931, adopted a resolution urging the Conference to permit a team to play in the Rose Bowl and sent it to all the members of the Conference. Minnesota apparently did not respond.

The issue would not go away. The athletic directors requested discussion of the Rose Bowl at the December 3, 1932, Conference meetings; the faculty representatives deferred the matter until May of 1933. Later in December, 1932, Professor Paige forwarded copies of letters from two of his faculty representative colleagues about a possible Conference vote to permit Michigan to play in the Rose Bowl. The Ohio State representative had polled seven of the faculty representatives and wrote to Paige that the vote would have been 6-1 opposing a waiver on the ban on post-season competition. The Purdue faculty representative, William Marshall, also wrote to Paige, saying that his institution would be in favor of an arrangement whereby the Conference could participate in the Rose Bowl once every four or five years and proposed that the subject be discussed at Conference meetings the following May. He also opined that the matter would not have to be voted out under the White Resolution.

In transmitting the letters to Coffman, Paige commented that "some of the universities are weakening in their position" and asked for advice about "what Minnesota should do, if anything, to influence the votes of Conference members." Coffman expressed dismay:

I must say that I think Mr. Marshall's letter is

discouraging, for the reason that, if he represents Purdue's opinion, then Purdue is evidently willing to make an arrangement this next May which will permit the playing of a championship game after the season is closed. I, myself, can see no good reason why this should be done.

Coffman added that he could think of no way to stop the Conference from changing the rule, but "if an opportunity presents itself, I shall discuss this problem with the Presidents at a meeting we propose to hold in January."

Coffman followed up on this expression of view in a December 29, 1932, letter to Commissioner Griffith. His focus was principally the role of athletics and recreation in the face of the economic crisis, but he gave vent to his irritation about the Rose Bowl.

Too many football coaches are still interested in the game for the personal glory that they can get out of it. They respond too easily to these elements that are interested primarily in commercializing the game. . . .

One does not need to go outside the Big Ten to find abundant illustration of what I am talking about. We have just had a striking illustration recently. A move was made to induce the Big Ten to modify its post-season rule to permit Michigan to play the Rose Bowl game. The very school that has for years been opposed to post-season games apparently was in favor of modifying the rule this time because its team would be invited to play the game. It is my understanding that every coach and every director, was in favor of playing the game. Now I was at a meeting recently where seven of the presidents of the Big Ten Schools, including the President of the University of Michigan, expressed themselves as being opposed to playing this game and opposed to modifying the rule, and yet, I understand, that it is to come up at the May meeting of the Conference.

At the May, 1933, Conference meeting, the directors explicitly recommended that "the Conference so amend the post-season game rule that it would be possible for a Conference university team to accept an invitation to take part with reasonable frequency in the Rose Bowl game." Voltmer reports that the directors favored participation either on an individual basis or "on a basis whereby the Conference rather than the individual member should receive the profits." The recommendation was rejected, according to Voltmer, on the grounds that it prolonged the season and that it was not a college event.

In answer to a plea to support the Rose Bowl from a 1913 law alumnus residing in Los Angeles, the President wrote in December, 1933, repeating his opposition. In his remarks, Coffman made statements that would be echoed by one of his successors twenty years later; he declared that "we are still thinking of football not as something designed primarily for

the students and the University but for the general public." He cited the recently deceased Ohio State president with approval in saying "that football has ceased to become a game and has developed into an enterprise." He told his correspondent, too, that the Conference members agreed that "post-season games represent an exploitation of the game and an exploitation of the students."

In what was becoming an annual letter on the subject, President Coffman wrote at some length to an alumnus on November 24, 1934, to explain the Conference opposition to the Rose Bowl. He recalled that "the faculties of the various institutions composing this conference, were compelled some twenty or twenty-five years ago to take over the administration of athletics because they were being exploited to the damage of the respective institutions." One way such exploitation occurred, he explained, was through highly commercial post-season games. Coffman got his history slightly mixed up, claiming that the ban on post-season competition antedated the Rose Bowl, which was not true. In addition to the commercial aspects Coffman cited the lengthened football season as likely to have a deleterious impact on the academic efforts of the team members. Although not so declaring directly, Coffman's sentiments remained clearly aligned with those who opposed participation in the game. (It should be noted that there are numerous additional letters in Coffman's files which are not cited here; they are almost invariably dated during or after the football season each year.)

In a letter to Griffith two days later, Coffman thanked the Commissioner for information about the attempts by the Governors of Ohio and Minnesota (Floyd B. Olson) to arrange a post-season bowl game for charity. Coffman dismissed their efforts as political pandering.

It is perfectly clear to me that these gentlemen were trying to increase their political popularity by using our two universities to accomplish their purposes. Of course their effort was only a part of the general drive throughout the country by civic and commerce associations, occasional newspapers, politicians, and the sporting public to prostitute football in the name of charity. Every post-season game, in my opinion, means an exploitation of the educational institutions that play the game.

Coffman, in the same letter, told Griffith of a recent conversation he had about the Rose Bowl with sportswriters at a New York luncheon (featuring Gertrude Stein as speaker); they, he said:

were of the opinion that the game ought not to be played, on the ground that it contributes nothing to maintaining college sport on a rational basis. It was their opinion that the game was fostered by certain commercial interests that desire to advertise California. . . . I, of course, believe they are right. . . . I suppose that a drive will

now be staged to induce the Conference to change its rule with regard to post season games. I hope that the Conference will have the good judgement to hold fast to the rule.

Late 1934 was a banner year for Coffman correspondence on the Rose Bowl, due mostly, no doubt, to the fact that Minnesota was undefeated and consensus national champion. In addition to the two letters cited above, he wrote three more in the next week. By and large he repeated his previous objections. Excerpts of some variations in his comments:

1. To one of his former students:

One of the arguments advanced is that a trip like this would be beneficial for the boys. If I were a member of the team I should like to go. Of course, a trip like this would be good for all our students. We know perfectly well, however, that the reason for sending the team out there is not for the purpose of giving the boys a trip.

2. To the Middle Western Colleges Alumni Association:

You can scarcely believe the number of requests that are made of us to permit our team to play after the season is closed . . . yet the real reason for suggesting that the Rose Bowl game be played is not that the team may make a trip to California; it is a feeling, peculiar to Americans, that the championships should really be decided and the Rose Bowl game in a way helps to do that.

3. To the Clerk of the Minneapolis City Council, after the Council adopted a resolution urging that the University seek to change the Conference rule banning post-season competition so a Rose Bowl invitation could be accepted: "Before this resolution was received, an invitation had been extended . . . to the University of Alabama to play the Rose Bowl game."

One of the Big Ten University Clubs again sent a letter to Coffman, in the midst of the 1935 season, urging consideration of the Rose Bowl. Coffman wrote back a polite but firm "No," citing strong Conference opposition.

The annual end-of-year letter of interest here for Coffman in 1936 went to a new quarter. The President of Stanford University wrote to him seeking support for the Rose Bowl; President Wilbur assured Coffman it would be a "dignified" event "brought under control." He also asked Coffman "to sound out" his Big Ten presidential colleagues. Coffman solicited the views of Professor Rottschaefer (who had succeeded Paige in 1934) and Commissioner Griffith, both of whom responded negatively. Coffman then wrote back to Wilbur to tell him the Conference would not change its position.

President Coffman died in September of 1938. An article

from the Chicago Tribune was brought to President Guy Stanton Ford's attention in November of 1938; the clipping reported on a forthcoming proposal from the Pacific Coast Conference (a predecessor to the present Pacific-Ten). Ford sent it to Rottschaefer, with a cover note declaring that the "University of Minnesota has always been thumbs down on these post-season affairs, and I do not need to say that so long as I am in this Office that opposition will be maintained by the University administration." Rottschaefer informed Ford that he concurred and that the proposal stood no chance of passage when it was considered at the Conference meeting three weeks hence.

The faculty representatives, as Rottschaefer predicted, remained adamant: At their December, 1938, meeting they unanimously reaffirmed the 1906/1931 rule terminating the football season the Saturday before Thanksgiving "in view of the wide publicity given to the matter of prolonging the football season in order to permit the playing of the post-season games."

In 1940 SCIA and the Senate finally got into the act. At the September 7, 1940, Conference meeting, the faculty representatives had lunch with the athletic directors and emissaries from the Pacific Coast Conference (PCC). The faculty representatives then discussed the Rose Bowl and agreed that they would go home and canvass the views of their colleagues prior to the December, 1940, meeting.

Rottschaefer reported the discussion to President Ford, wrote a long letter to the Iowa faculty representative, Karl Leib, explaining his opposition to changing the post-season competition ban, and predicted--to Ford--a 5-4 vote against a change. (Chicago, which had dropped football, declined to vote on the matter.) The letter to Leib could have been written by Coffman. Ford commended Rottschaefer on his letter to Leib and said that "the whole business is a smelly affair."

SCIA, on October 16, 1940, voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate rejection of any change in the post-season competition rule, "and particularly that it should not be amended in the manner being currently proposed so as to permit Conference football teams to participate in the Rose Bowl." The Committee cited as reasons the detriment to "the educational interests of the player," not helping to eliminate the widespread evils "now associated with intercollegiate athletics" and instead increasing those evils in the Big Ten, and opposition to lending Conference prestige to a non-education-based event. On October 17, 1940, the next day, SCIA reported its recommendation to the Senate, which approved the SCIA action.

When the faculty representatives reconvened in December, 1940, they had before them a recommendation from the directors that the Big Ten teams be permitted to compete in the Rose Bowl. Professor Rottschaefer's prognostication was not borne out; that recommendation was, again, rejected "with no dissenting vote."

Minnesota, in 1940, was Big Ten champion and Associated Press poll national champion. The Daily issued a congratulatory editorial and inveighed against the Rose Bowl.

Two Minnesota fans in Los Angeles, meantime, wrote to President Ford urging support for the Rose Bowl, asking him to put himself in the place of the fans. The letter provoked a sharp retort. "The real point, however, is not for me," Ford wrote, "to put myself in your place but for you to put yourself in the place of the team and the responsible administrative officers at the University, irrespective of any Conference policy or anything else." Ford also mentioned two other factors not brought out previously.

The University of Minnesota team at any time would be at a disadvantage in post-season games on the Pacific Coast. As I look out the window now, the air is filled with driving snow and the ground is still covered with the Armistice Day blizzard. The team itself had only two or three hours in the open the last two weeks of the season and the result showed somewhat in the first half at Wisconsin. Nothing that you can do in a fieldhouse will keep a team on edge from the end of our season to the first of January. However, that isn't the basis on which the matter has been decided at Minnesota and in the Conference. With those decisions you are familiar. Our own was made absolutely and there isn't the slightest chance that there will be a change in the general Big Ten policy at the December meeting nor in the policy of the University of Minnesota itself.

Incidentally, we have not been allowed to forget that Minnesota has an Atlantic seaboard clientele of thousands who, like yourself, are equally anxious to see Minnesota play some one of the outstanding teams in that area. Before Cornell went into eclipse, there had already begun to be talk about how fine it would be for Minnesota to play Cornell. So that, as is frequently the case, in the Democracy you allude to, We The People Speak with many and diverse voices and those responsible for the conduct and preservation of intercollegiate athletics have to carry on as best they may in their interpretation of their task.

Four years later, at the request of Ohio State, the faculty representatives held a special meeting, on November 26, 1944. Ohio State sought a waiver of the post-season prohibition in order to accept a Rose Bowl invitation. After deliberating two-and-one-half hours, they voted 7-3 to deny the request. That it was Ohio State that made the request is somewhat ironic in light of events that transpired seventeen years and two days later (when the Ohio State faculty voted to not permit its football team to attend the Rose Bowl--thus permitting Minnesota to go for a second consecutive game).

This 7-3 vote was the last time a majority of the

Conference members would vote against permitting a Big Ten team to appear in the Rose Bowl. Within two years there would be a five-year contract with the Pacific Coast Conference calling for an annual Big Ten-PCC game. Minnesota's opposition, however, remained unwavering for another sixteen years.

On May 31, 1946, the faculty representatives and athletic directors had a joint meeting at which they discussed, but did not act on, a permanent arrangement with the PCC for the Rose Bowl. The next morning, meeting in executive session, the faculty representatives voted to direct the Commissioner to "examine the possibilities of an agreement that might be reached" on the Rose Bowl (the vote was not recorded). On September 1, 1946, Commissioner Wilson reported on the meeting he had had with the PCC. After a reportedly lengthy discussion, the faculty representatives voted 6-3 to express the willingness of the Conference to enter an agreement with the PCC, provided that certain stipulations were part of the contract (no school is compelled to send its team, no team may appear more than once in three years, and others). The actual motion was in the form of amending General Regulations III(1), to create an exception, in the ban on post-season competition, for the Rose Bowl. Minnesota, Illinois, and Purdue voted against the exception, which was then referred to the Conference schools under the White Resolution procedure.

Upon returning to Minneapolis, Professor Rottschaefer sent President Morrill a copy of the minutes of the Conference meeting along with a summary of the pros and cons of the Rose Bowl proposal as prepared by its "leading proponent." The same day Rottschaefer wrote to Morrill, he also reported to SCIA on the proposal, which then voted unanimously against the Rose Bowl pact; Chairman Pierce, the following day, transmitted that vote to Morrill with a request that it be placed before the Administrative Committee of the Senate. The Administrative Committee sustained the action of SCIA and so reported to the Senate on October 31, 1946. The Senate docket had three pages of explanation of the proposal and the arguments for and against it so, as Rottschaefer explained to the President, the members of the Senate could be fully informed. Professor Rottschaefer told the Senate he would vote against the pact unless it decided to override SCIA and the Administrative Committee; the Senate did not do so.

Prior to the Senate vote, there appears in the files the first expression of President Morrill's views on the Rose Bowl. The correspondence between them suggest that Morrill and Big Ten Commissioner Kenneth L. (Tug) Wilson were good friends; on October 10, 1946, Wilson wrote a two-page letter to Morrill explaining the reasons for his support of the Rose Bowl contract. In it he commented that he, along with his predecessor, had "tried to put the proposition through [the Conference] . . . on a number of occasions" (Wilson had been athletic director at Northwestern before he became Commissioner.) Morrill wrote back a week later setting to print his views, which would not change for as long as he was President. In the letter to Wilson he reported the SCIA

unanimous vote against the Rose Bowl and said that he had not "intervened in the matter at all, except to discuss it informally with Frank McCormick" (Minnesota Athletic Director). He went on to lay out his view:

I appreciate fully the arguments for the arrangements with the Pacific Coast Conference. . . . And yet back in my days at Ohio State, I never could bring myself to want the Western Conference [the Big Ten] in the Rose Bowl, and in view of the dither these days over commercialism in intercollegiate athletics, I feel very deeply that the Western Conference will weaken its position by approving the Rose Bowl arrangement--by making a concession to still further high pressure and overemphasis on football in the minds of many, many people, including real amateurs and faculty members.

I realize that the plan is so drawn that no Conference institution is required to send its team to the Coast, even if it should be so lucky as to be designated. But any of us so designated would find it hard to live among the newspapermen and alumni if we declined to send a Conference championship team to the Bowl. I suppose the arrangement will carry by a 5-4 or 6-3 vote--but I will be frankly sorry to see the gesture made. A very bad attitude and psychology about college football seems to be sweeping the country now, both inside and outside the institutions. The recent Notre Dame article in TIME is typical. All this is probably a passing phase due to war reaction, inflation, which make for queer ideas and overburdened gate receipts, distorted eligibility rules, etc., etc. It will pass in good time, and I wish that kind of hysteria and crazy thinking would crystallize around pro-football, thus giving it a more proper outlet. I'd like to see college football take the saner course along the lines that you and Saint have been working toward the N.C.A.A. I just can't reconcile that philosophy with the Rose Bowl concession.

The themes in this letter are echoed again and again in the following fourteen years of Morrill's presidency.

Minnesota's opposition notwithstanding, the faculty representatives voted, by telegraph, on November 6, 1946, in favor of signing the contract. They reaffirmed that vote at the December Conference meetings (the vote was not recorded).

To clarify a technical point which became very important later, it is necessary to note precisely the action permitting the contract with the PCC. General Regulation III(1) read as follows:

Post-season competition in all sports is prohibited. Seasons in all sports, unless otherwise limited in these Regulations, shall close with the NCAA championship meet in each sport or with the National AAU meet in each sport.

In December, 1947, the faculty representatives voted formally (pursuant to their earlier decision to sign a contract) to change this regulation by adding a sentence:

Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl games of January 1, 1947-1951, inclusive."

In The Big Ten, written in the mid-1960s by then-retired Commissioner Wilson and Jerry Brondfield, Wilson reviewed the events that led to the 1946 pact. The 1902 event which Michigan attended was a low-key affair. When the Tournament of Roses began, in 1916, annually scheduling a football game, however, it began to attract a great deal more attention. It took "considerable urging" to get Conference approval for Ohio State to attend in 1921, and that was followed by the proscription which remained in place until 1946. Wilson relates that informal invitations were frequently extended by the PCC, and that the PCC representatives "came back almost annually with splendid arguments why a Big Ten team should appear each year." Added to that was recurring pressure from alumni of Big Ten schools who lived on the West Coast. When he became Commissioner in 1945, Wilson reported that he was determined to see the issue settled and worked with the athletic directors to persuade the faculty representatives to approve a contract. (One argument he recalled using arose from a meeting he had been in with Southeastern Conference presidents, at which time they told the Big Ten they were going to start awarding aid based on athletic ability without any academic requirement beyond admission. Asked where they would get the money to pay for the program, they replied that they expected it from lucrative post-season bowl games.) Wilson's efforts bore fruit; he also pointed out that the Rose Bowl agreement was the first in the country where a Conference agreed to divide up equally the income from an event.

Illinois played in the first Rose Bowl under contract,

in January, 1947, and at the March Conference meetings their business manager provided a report on the trip. There had been a number of problems; the Wisconsin faculty representative, Professor Rottschaefer subsequently told President Morrill in a letter in April, 1947, had changed his mind and asked if there was any way to cancel the contract. Morrill wrote back to Rottschaefer: "Your comment that Wisconsin is skeptical about the Rose Bowl arrangement is encouraging. Just one more experience like the initial Illinois one last New Year's Day ought to make the whole conference a bit sick of its bargain, I should think."

On October 2, 1947, Morrill wrote that "the Illinois victory in the Rose Bowl last winter, while cheering to all friends of the Western Conference, does not change my view of the disadvantage to college football in the arrangement. . . . I hope that Minnesota will vote against a renewal of the contract when it expires. . . . The bowl "ballyhoo" is entirely legitimate for professionals. It is out-of-bounds, I feel, for a group of universities professedly or honestly committed to the amateur idea." A year later, on October 1, 1948, he wrote to John Fullen, Alumni Secretary at Ohio State, "what with the Rose Bowl setup and the Conference surrender on scholarships, I am really sick at heart." He wrote again to Fullen in December of 1948, commenting on a recent meeting of the presidents, and recalled that

most of their discussion turned upon the folly of the Rose Bowl arrangement, and a show of hands was asked for which indicated that the presidents, at least were disposed to oppose any renewal of the . . . pact. . . . As I have said to you from the beginning . . . , the whole Rose Bowl arrangement seems to me so silly and so significant in the wrong direction, that the more misery there is about it, the happier I feel. This is tough on our alumni, I'll admit, but the more respects in which it is tough upon any and all elements of the Western Conference universities, the more satisfactory from my point.

The five-year contract was not cancelled. The games were played, and all through 1950 the Conference meetings included discussion of various items related to renewal of the agreement. In October of 1949, SCIA discussed the possibility that Minnesota might be invited to play in the Rose Bowl, and agreed that the ticket subcommittee would prepare plans on ticket distribution if the probability of participation arose.

On September 24, 1949, the former Athletic Director at Iowa (who had since become Dean of the Arts college at the University of Washington) wrote to Morrill, and sent along a clipping from the Seattle Times. He cited his own opposition to the Rose Bowl, and pointed to factors in the PCC which were not generally known to the Big Ten, one of which was that there was no faculty control in the PCC. He commented sadly that he had never imagined that the Big Ten would have agreed to the pact and that if he had known he would have acted earlier. It would have been, he said, a "bold procedure,

since there was little opposition to the Rose Bowl here except in faculty circles." He told Morrill that many of his colleagues "had been planning to get our own schools out of the Rose Bowl participation and were making some progress when the agreement with the Western Conference cut off from us the very best argument we had and that is that the Western Conference was not in favor of such participation." Morrill showed the letter to Rottschaefer and McCormick, who acknowledged that the information was new; Rottschaefer said that it "confirms our position" of opposition.

The Times article from Seattle described the upcoming vote on contract renewal as "one of the bitterest fights in the 53-year history of the Big Ten Conference" and described Morrill as "the leader in the fight against renewal." It also quoted Morrill as saying "I will use every possible means to influence other schools to ballot against renewal." In his letter back, however, Morrill was pessimistic: "I am not sanguine, I must confess, that the Western Conference will fail to renew the agreement. . . . We at Minnesota are a bit discouraged."

Also in October, 1949, Morrill wrote to Rottschaefer and McCormick inquiring when the renewal question would come to the Conference. "I have assumed that our Minnesota attitude toward the Rose Bowl agreement would remain unchanged, even if our team should be so fortunate as to be selected this year as the Western Conference competitor. . . . I have likewise assumed that if our team should be named to play this year, the [Athletic Department] and SCIA would both recommend acceptance of the invitation." Morrill also asked them if he should write to the other Conference presidents on the subject. "I am certainly not disposed at all to mount the barricades and put on any public crusade in the matter. . . . Anything I might do most certainly should be consistent with anything that either of you may be doing within your respective groups. I think we are fighting a losing battle in this matter, but I should like to see us continue to fight even though the odds are against us." Morrill did, of course, "mount the barricades" and he did write to the Presidents, as both Rottschaefer and McCormick urged, the following February (1950).

On October 17, 1949, Morrill responded to a letter from the President of Carleton College and related that the President of the University of Michigan agreed with his views on the Rose Bowl but had also told him that "the management of athletic affairs at Michigan had really passed out of the hands of the administration and even the faculty into those of what he calls 'the alumni and the professionals.'"

On October 19, 1949, Jack Fullen at Ohio State dropped a note to Morrill, in which he reported that the Illinois president had decided to vote in favor of the Rose Bowl and that the Chicago News was predicting an 8-2 or 9-1 vote for renewal. Morrill wrote back, saying he, too, had seen the Illinois switch and that "it made me sick."

The full extent of Morrill's feelings is perhaps well-expressed in a letter he wrote to Fullen two months

later, after the close of the 1949 football season. "I haven't dared to say so out loud, for home consumption here, but the fact that linesman went off side at Ann Arbor was an act of God's mercy to Minnesota, I deeply believe"--which caused a game to be lost and with it Minnesota's opportunity to compete in the Rose Bowl.

The vote on the Rose Bowl renewal was scheduled for the May, 1950, Conference meetings. On February 16, 1950, Morrill wrote to his presidential colleagues, setting forth in great detail his opposition to the game, and asking they meet to discuss it.

But beyond all this, I have felt that the abandonment by the Western Conference of its proscription against post-season games has not only given enormous nation-wide sanction to the whole plethora of "bowl games" from one end of the country to the other, but has also deprived our Western Conference of its previously acknowledged leadership in the sound and sensible conduct of intercollegiate athletics.

For many years the Western Conference stood like a beacon for reasonable restrictions, and I have a very genuine conviction that our subscription to the Rose Bowl arrangement gave strong sanction to attitudes and tendencies in the wrong direction. . .

. . .

I suppose I need not mention such things as the fact that during the last football season, public interest in our own Conference championship seemed to become competely secondary to the choice of the team that would represent the Conference in the Rose Bowl; with the unhappy and surely undesirable result that the "pressure to win" on teams and coaches was enormously increased. This "pressure to win," as we all know, is at the root of our difficulties in recruiting, subsidization, evasion of rules and regulations, and the demoralization of the integrity of athletic administration. . . .

The fact that the Rose Bowl game is really a feature of a great Southern California commmercial enterprise, not played on the campus of either of the competing universities, in a great glare of publicity and Hollywood glamour, with very little opportunity for our own Western Conference students and faculties and alumni even to see the game--all these considerations seem to me to make unrealistic and undesirable our partnership in the Rose Bowl arrangement.

I recognize that we, as Presidents, are not officials who must consider the Rose Bowl agreement and its possible renewal--but that this authority is lodged essentially in our Western Conference faculty representatives, with the counsel and collaboration of our athletic directors. But the

reputations, prestige, and policies of our universities are involved--and the ultimate responsibility for all three seem to fall largely upon the Presidents whose influence with faculty representatives and athletic directors presumable is great, if indeed not controlling. It is for this reason that I have ventured--not gratuitously I hope--to urge your reconsideration of the matter in the hope that our Western Conference institutions might move to regain their leadership in the sound and sensible conduct of intercollegiate athletics in the nation.

A week later Morrill spoke against the Rose Bowl to an alumni group in Pittsburgh; his comments elicited newspaper comment across the country. The opening line of the U. P. article was "Big Ten officials ho-hummed another blast by Dr. J. L. Morrill, president of Minnesota, against renewal of the league's Rose Bowl agreement." It had become a public crusade at that point, if it already was not so previously.

The presidents met on April 30, 1950, with the faculty representatives present, and Morrill's handwritten notes of his own comments have survived. He noted the responsibility of the faculty representatives as "authoritative Univ. spokesmen." The "original pact opposed by Minn. Senate Committee and Faculty [with] no prompting from me [and I would] suppose [that would be the] faculty view in most instits. if full faculty consulted." He reiterated the points in his February 16, 1950, letter, and then wrote that the "Presidents have responsibility for leadership." They took it in organizing N.C.A.A., the reputations prestige and policies of our institutions concern/final resp[onsibility] of Presidents/Faculties. Public and newspapers don't care/can't understand (finding that out!) "Morrill's conclusion: "Deeply believe W[estern] C[onference] can turn tide . . . if follow up on Rose Bowl

- can regain "lost leadership"
- can bring athletics back into context of Univ. purposes/ideals
- will discover among public/alumni unexpected support/strength

(Underlining in his notes.)

Following up the meeting with the letter to Wisconsin President E. B. Fred, Morrill observed that:

Apparently no real progress was made toward acceptance of the convictions I happen to hold in the matter--but that is not unusual, in my experience. . . . Frankly, I was deeply disappointed that some of the presidents could not seem to see beyond some small details for the improvements of the Rose Bowl arrangement, that others rationalized the matter by stating that the problem was so much greater than merely the Rose

Bowl that it hardly seemed worth bothering about the event, etc., etc.

I came away with the rather dismal impression that the Western Conference will continue to lose leadership and prestige in a total situation which is worsening by the minute--and that one of these days, in sheer self-defense of academic respectability, we presidents will have to grab the whole situation barehanded and try to shake our colleagues back into some context of common sense.

On May 25, 1950, on a motion during Conference meetings to take the steps necessary to provide for a renewal of the Rose Bowl contract, Professor Rottschaefer voted "No" for Minnesota. The meeting of the faculty representatives with the presidents seems not to have changed many minds, because he was joined only by the faculty representatives from Northwestern and Wisconsin. This vote occasioned a note from Morrill to Rottschaefer, after Morrill read the meeting minutes, expressing disappointment that Michigan State voted affirmatively. Neither SCIA nor the Senate directed Rottschaefer's vote.

In an October 27, 1950, letter to the President of the University of Washington, Morrill reviewed his own position and that of Minnesota. Speaking of the Rose Bowl as well as general athletic problems, he noted his deep concern, all his previous activities with the NCAA and the Big Ten presidents, and said that despite it all "[I] still find myself a kind of lonesome 'prophet in the wilderness'!" "I agree . . . especially with your feeling that individual institutions--and especially state universities--cannot 'go it alone' or make headway against the prevailing attitudes and trends. I agree with you also that leadership must come from the presidents." Morrill also pointed out that "I have been quoted pretty widely and sneered at a good deal by sports writers in connection with my opposition to the Rose Bowl. Actually, the Rose Bowl is not the issue at all. I see it as a symptom of all the things that are making difficulties for us." Then, finally, he expressed frustration and doubt about chief executive action: "All of this I have argued in two special meetings of the Western Conference presidents--they give some lip service to my ideas but the truth is, they are afraid of their own trustees and regents. . . . And so when the chips are down . . . , only Northwestern and Wisconsin voted with Minnesota."

In March of 1951, the faculty representatives took the definitive step for renewal by voting to amend the last sentence of the revised General Regulation III(1) to read "Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl game for the period January 1, 1952, through January 1, 1956." Business Administration Vice President William Middlebrook attended this meeting in place of Rottschaefer and cast Minnesota's vote "No." Purdue joined the previous three who had voted against continuation, so it passed 6-4; as new legislation, it fell under the White Resolution.

Vice President Middlebrook duly reported the vote to

SCIA. At its May 17, 1951, meeting, SCIA did not bother to take a formal vote against the contract, and simply recorded in its minutes the sentiment "that the long-range best interests of intercollegiate athletics are not involved in whether the arrangements provide for sending any one representative one in two, or one in three years." Confirming their longstanding position, on May 18, 1951, the Big Ten Club of Southern California sent telegrams and a history of their view urging renewal of the Rose Bowl pact to every president, faculty representative, athletic director, and head football coach. On May 25, 1951, the faculty representatives confirmed the renewal of the agreement, by the same 6-4 vote, Minnesota, Purdue, Northwestern and Wisconsin in the negative.

The Minneapolis Tribune carried an article on the decision and hinted that Minnesota had switched its vote. Morrill wrote quickly to Rottschaefer and Armstrong asking if it were true; Rottschaefer replied that he had voted against renewal, but that when, afterwards, the Conference was discussing the frequency with which a team could appear, he had voted on that question (inasmuch as the decision to renew had already passed by the 6-4 margin) in accord with sentiment expressed at the SCIA meeting. Morrill expressed relief.

The presidents met the following March (1952) and, according to a letter Morrill wrote on April 21, 1952, to President Wells of Indiana, he--Morrill--had been asked to formulate proposals which had grown out of their discussion of a report on athletics by the American Council on Education. Morrill sent his suggestions to Wells and included an amendment to General Regulation (now II) (1) banning Rose Bowl participation. The Council of Ten met again April 26, 1952, to discuss Morrill's proposals. Although the minutes of that meeting are not available, President Wells--as chairman--appeared before the Conference Joint Group to bring the presidents' recommendations to it. There is no record of any Council suggestion for changes in General Regulation II(1).

The Council met again in San Francisco on January 4, 1953, with the PCC presidents. The meeting minutes record that the PCC "would invite the Intercollegiate Conference to renew their present Rose Bowl Game contract for another three years following January 1, 1954. It was generally agreed that the Rose Bowl Game is the best and the least subject to criticism of such contests." Vice President Middlebrook attended the 1953 Rose Bowl, and the meeting, in place of President Morrill, and brought back a positive report. He wrote that he had made it a point to find out as much as he could about the event, and "came away with the feeling that if there were to be post-season games this particular game could be defended as being in accord with good educational standards." President Morrill's reaction, if any, is not recorded.

Incorporated in the January 18-19, 1953, minutes is a letter from the PCC Commissioner to Tug Wilson inviting the expected three-year renewal. The Conference voted 8-2 to go

on record favoring an extension of the contract, "subject to the machinery of referral to the constituent institutions as under the White Resolution." Rottschaefer voted "Yes," but both he and the Wisconsin faculty representative instructed the secretary to include a note in the minutes that they voted affirmatively only to ensure the matter came under the White Resolution. Rottschaefer also noted that Minnesota would vote negatively on final reaffirmation under the White Resolution procedure.

At SCIA the following week, the Committee voted to obtain faculty and administrative views on renewal.

In the meantime two representatives in the Minnesota House introduced a resolution declaring "that the University of Minnesota, its President, and concerned faculty be informed that the Legislature of the State of Minnesota deems the extension of the present arrangement for participation in this classic football contest [the Rose Bowl] to be advisable."

At the February 17, 1953, meeting SCIA Chairman Thomas Barnhart reported the results of a meeting between an SCIA "Rose Bowl Committee" and President Morrill; the Committee then voted 10-3 to maintain Minnesota's opposition to the Rose Bowl contract. Two days later, on February 19, the Senate approved this position. Writing about a month later to an alumnus who had told Morrill of his support for the Rose Bowl, the President responded by saying that "the entire matter of participation in the Rose Bowl was carefully reviewed by our University Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and our faculty. The decision against the Rose Bowl, therefore, was that of those charged with the formulation of the athletic and educational policies of the University in this particular regard." Once again, Minnesota's views did not prevail; on the 6-4 vote, on May 28, 1953, Michigan State, Northwestern, and Wisconsin joined in voting against the three-year renewal. General Regulation II (1) was amended to read, "Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl game for the period January 1, 1947 to January 2, 1957, inclusive."

The correspondence with John Fullen at Ohio State continued throughout the 1950s. In March, 1954, Morrill apparently sees himself in a hopeless role vis-a-vis the Rose Bowl and athletic problems generally. In a letter to Fullen, Morrill wrote:

More and more I am coming to the conclusion that the villain in the piece is not nearly so much the know-nothing fan or the coaches and athletic directors (who must live and die by the sword, poor chaps) but our faculty conference representatives and their presidents. More and more I have become within our Western Conference "Council of Ten" a nuisance, "more to be pitied than censured," and the guy who thinks everybody else in the Army is out of step.

His feeling hadn't changes by January 1955. In another

letter to Fullen, Morrill recalled both the trip he made to Pasadena when Ohio State played in the 1921 Rose Bowl and more recent games. "The whole deal was a wonderful spectator appeal with a tremendous thrill in participation . . . it just doesn't make sense in any rational collegiate cosmos. . . . The other presidents, most of them--except perhaps E. B. Fred of Wisconsin and Rocky Miller of Northwestern--have begun to look on me, I think, as a kind of nuisance and impractical idealist who is not very well up on the facts of life."

The pattern repeated itself when the 1953 contract came up for renewal three years later. In January, 1956, the PCC Commissioner invited renewal of the contract, and proposed that it now be for an indefinite term subject to cancellation on two years' notice. At the March 2-3 Conference meetings, the faculty representatives voted 7-3 to approve continuation subject to the White Resolution procedures (Minnesota, Northwestern, and Wisconsin voting "No"). On March 8, 1956, Rottschaefer reported the vote to SCIA, which decided to instruct Athletic Director Armstrong to discuss the question with President Morrill. A week after that President Morrill wrote to SCIA Chairman Warren Stehman and Rottschaefer noting that the issue would need to come to the Senate, and adding that "my own opinion and feeling about the Rose Bowl compact is so well known that I would hope the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and the Senate itself might sustain the vote against renewal which was cast" by Rottschaefer. Both did so.

The Senate action was described by Professor Rottschaefer, quoted in an article in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on April 13, 1956, as a quick vote to "overwhelmingly" reject the renewal. Stan Wenberg, writing to Fullen in President Morrill's absence, described the Senate action this way:

The Senate vote at Minnesota in support of our faculty representative's negative vote was one marked with spontaneity and enthusiasm. Indeed, it was almost explosive. The agenda item was presented by Professor Jack Stehman, the chairman of our Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, and Jack gave a brief explanation of why the Senate Committee was supporting the faculty representative's vote. He gave the usual reasons for opposing post-season games. The moment he moved the motion there was an instantaneous "second"; the President called for votes in favor of the motion, and this was when the spontaneous vote occurred. When the President asked for negative votes, a single voice sounded.

There was no other discussion.

The outcome was the same; in May of 1956, the Conference voted 7-3 again to renew the contract, with a three-year term. The last sentence of General Regulation II(1) was amended to read "Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl game." This final revision of language would trip up the Conference when the renewal question arose three years later.

Despite Morrill's resolute view on the Rose Bowl, he did tell sports columnist Sid Hartman that Minnesota would attend the 1957 Rose Bowl if it were chosen. Hartman quoted Morrill as "pulling for the Gophers to win the trip." "I've always been in favor of regulations that are for the betterment of the Western Conference," said the President; "we can't go it alone. If our team can go, I hope they do and win!"

It is safe to say that the 1959 cycle of deliberations over the Rose Bowl contract was not a repeat performance. The existing contract expired with the playing of the 1960 game. The PCC had dissolved and was replaced by the Athletic Association of Western Universities (AAWU), predecessor to the present Pacific-Ten Conference. At the March 5-6, 1959, Conference meetings, a Special Joint Group Committee on Rose Bowl Participation, created and charged the preceding January, made its report. (The Committee included Ike Armstrong, Minnesota's athletic director.) The report reviewed the history and present situation, including a comment that "participation is identified in certain quarters as a symbol of over-emphasis upon football and commercialization in the sport." (One cannot help wonder if this language was not directed at President Morrill.) In reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of the game,

however, the Committee concluded the arrangement was beneficial and submitted a resolution calling for a new contract beginning with the 1961 game. The resolution was adopted on a 6-2-2 vote; Illinois and Wisconsin voted "No" and Ohio State and Northwestern abstained. It came under the White Resolution.

On March 12, 1959, there is a notation in the SCIA minutes that Professor Kinyon (who replaced Professor Rottschaefer as faculty representative in 1957) "briefly reported on the recruiting rule changes as well as the action taken on the Rose Bowl." There is no indication if he explained why he voted in favor of the contract, in a direct departure from the oft-iterated position of SCIA, the Senate, and President Morrill. (It may have been, like Rottschaefer before him, that Kinyon voted "Yes" only to ensure that the question was brought under the White Resolution. There is no record of institutional dissent from his vote.)

On April 2, 1959, SCIA voted 7-4 to object, under the White Resolution, to continuing the Rose Bowl agreement and, once again, forwarded the matter to the Senate. In the Senate docket for April 30, 1959, there was reprinted the full report that had been submitted by the Special Joint Group Committee on Rose Bowl Participation. The Senate, with President Morrill presiding, voted unanimously to support SCIA in objecting to the pact renewal.

Now comes a different twist to the story.

The Athletic Directors met on the morning of May 22, 1959, prior to the Joint Group meeting (as was customary), and passed 9-1 a motion requesting that the Rose Bowl vote at "the Joint Group be a joint vote by closed ballot, the ballot to be tallied by the Chairman and the Commissioner, who will announce only the prevailing side." If accepted, this would have been a departure from prevailing practice for White Resolution matters. It would also have had a dispositive impact on the vote, because the athletic directors were strongly in favor of the Rose Bowl. The directors then adjourned to meet with the faculty representatives in the Joint Group.

At the May 22, 1959, afternoon meeting of the Joint Group, on the motion to reaffirm, under the White Resolution, the March 6-2-2 vote to renew the Rose Bowl pact, the faculty representatives voted 5-5 for renewal, so the motion to renew failed. The proposal of the directors on the voting change was apparently not accepted. Immediately thereafter, Professor Kinyon moved to rescind the permissive clause, the last sentence of General Regulation II(1) ("Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl game"); that motion also failed, on the same 5-5 vote. (Voting with Minnesota against renewal were Illinois, Wisconsin, Northwestern and Ohio State.) The Conference was now deadlocked: There were not sufficient votes to renew the contract, nor were there sufficient votes to delete the language making an exception for the Rose Bowl in the ban on post-season competition. As a consequence, attendance at the Rose Bowl had become optional with each institution: it could accept or decline an invitation as it

deemed appropriate.

Three days later, on May 25, 1959, President Morrill responded to a letter from the president of the Big University Club of San Francisco, who had written to Morrill urging that Minnesota support the pact. Morrill wrote back a bland letter, but commented that "the vote of our University of Minnesota faculty was adverse, as you know--and although I have not believed that the Rose Bowl commitment was in the best interest of Western Conference athletics, the Minnesota Faculty Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and the Senate itself took their action without any influence on my part (emphasis added)."

Others also wrote to Morrill. In his responses, the President repeated his earlier views. In one, he noted the publicity the issue had received, and also that there was "a great deal of pressure upon the institutions which voted against the renewal of the Rose Bowl contract." He went on to say that "our faculty committee on athletics and our University Senate feel very strongly that the Rose Bowl, while a very enjoyable and stimulating event, is pretty largely unrelated to the educational enterprize. . . . Personally, from the beginning, I have believed that the Rose Bowl only contributes to the very intense public pressure on the coaches and players to win at almost any cost."

The May vote on the Rose Bowl led to a furious debate on the mechanism and use of the White Resolution itself. In the meantime, at the December, 1959, meetings of the Joint Group, the faculty representatives voted to postpone indefinitely any action on the last sentence of Regulation II(1) (the permissive clause). At the January 7, 1960, Joint Group meeting, there was discussion of the Rose Bowl, with specific note that the AAWU had signed a contract with the Tournament of Roses for football games. A week later the AAWU extended a formal invitation to the Big Ten to renew the contract that had existed with the PCC. At the January 24, 1960, meeting of the Joint Group, it was voted 8-2 to refer the question of renewal under the White Resolution and to resolve the question at the March meetings. Minnesota and Ohio State voted "No."

Professor Kinyon carried this information and invitation back to SCIA, which held a "lengthy discussion" on January 29, 1960. The Committee decided to send a recommendation against renewal and against participation in the Rose Bowl to the Senate and asked the Chairman, Professor Max Schultze, to fully explain the pros and cons to the Senate. The SCIA vote was 8-6 on a roll call vote (one of the few ever recorded), and the split was along clear lines. Of the eight votes recommending against renewal of the Rose Bowl pact, seven were faculty and the eighth was the Business Administration vice president, W. T. Middlebrook. The six votes opposing the recommendation were cast by one faculty member, the two students, the two alumni, and the athletic director, Ike Armstrong.

The matter was duly brought before the Senate on February 4, 1960. The Senate, in turn, with President

Morrill presiding, changed the SCIA resolution so that not only was Professor Kinyon directed to vote against renewal of the contract, he was also specifically told to vote in favor of rescinding the permissive clause. By written ballot, the Senate voted 88-14 in favor of the amended resolution. Kinyon followed up by writing to the Secretary of the faculty representatives on February 8, 1960, registering Minnesota's objection.

At the March 4, 1960, morning meeting of the Joint Group, the Conference was again deadlocked 5-5 on renewal of the pact when the motion to reaffirm under the White Resolution was brought. Fritz Crisler then reported for a special committee, which recommended that Rose Bowl participation be left optional with the institutions. Shortly thereafter, Professor Kinyon once again moved to delete the permissive clause of Regulation II(1) ("Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl game"). The faculty representatives determined that the issue was subject to the White Resolution, and then voted 6-4 in favor of Kinyon's motion. There is no contract, and the ban on post-season competition now applies to the Rose Bowl, subject to the reaffirming vote required by the White Resolution. Following disposition of a few more agenda items, the Joint Group adjourned for lunch.

The athletic directors were apparently in a vindictive mood at that point, according to Professor Frank Remington, Wisconsin faculty representative. They met separately after lunch and voted to recommend to the Joint Group that Regulation II(1) be further revised to read that all sport seasons, except Olympic tryouts, "shall close with the Conference championship meet in all sports." This, of course, had the effect of prohibiting participation in NCAA championships, too. The directors' point, according to Remington, was that the faculty representatives should be consistent about post-season competition; it should apply to all sports, not just football. What they did not perceive --or chose to ignore--was that the concern about commercialization and over-emphasis applied primarily to football.

The directors then went back into a reconvened Joint Group meeting and presented their proposal. The Joint Group refused to table the issue, on an 18-2 vote, recessed to permit the directors to reconsider their proposal (which they voted 5-4 not to do), reconvened and voted 11-6 not to reconsider to motion to table. The faculty representatives then voted on the director's proposal to ban all post-season competition and adopted it on a 6-4 vote (subject to the White Resolution). Minnesota voted "Yes."

Schultze concurred with Remington's evaluation. "In a fit of frustration and pique over the [Rose Bowl] stalemate the Directors got the majority of Faculty Representatives" to support the ban on all post-season competition. Despite the affirmative vote cast by Minnesota, said Schultze, "Kinyon and I opposed it and Ike Armstrong felt as we did, I believe."

This action prompted Michigan State President John Hannah to write to his Council of Ten colleagues two days later, on March 7, 1960. He enclosed an editorial from the student newspaper, which decried the action by calling the Conference the "Little 10," noting that "until conference academic representatives kill the 'strategy' proposal of athletic directors that all post-season sports competition by members be barred, our conference will no longer have its aura of bigness. . . . Suggesting wholesale de-emphasis of sports is not likely to force academic representatives to back down on their anti-Rose Bowl stand, as some athletic directors reportedly hoped would happen." The article confirms by implication the comments of Professor Remington.

Hannah also suggested that "something might be gained from a frank and forthright discussion of our athletic operations and our central office at the April meeting of the Council of Ten." Hannah evinced a view that the Presidents could intervene, as had his colleagues before him: he continued, "I would urge that we face this issue now rather than run the risk of possibly finding ourselves in a situation where at a later date we may not be able to determine or control the future course and pattern of our athletic programs."

President Morrill was quick to respond. In a letter back to him dated three days after Hannah's, Morrill wrote that he was "candidly ashamed of the kind of thing that went on at the recent Ohio State meeting of Faculty Representatives and Athletic Directors and have said so, in no uncertain terms, to the two from here." He also accepted Hannah's judgment about presidential recourse: "I have had the feeling all along that things were drifting from bad to worse and that unless the Presidents do take some leadership, we are all going to regret it." Morrill had also made his views known locally: a Minneapolis Star article dated March 8, 1960, quoted him (correctly, given the identical handwritten note in his files) saying "I feel confident that the action forbidding participation in the NCAA championships will be rescinded--and I hope sincerely that it will."

Three other miscellaneous pieces in President Morrill's files help to understand the reactions of the larger community to recent series of actions taken by the Conference.

1. A March 12, 1960, clipping from an Ohio newspaper, wherein an editorial writer took to task an Iowa Regent who was urging that public pressure be brought on the faculty in order that they would vote "right" (i.e., in favor) on the renewal of the Rose Bowl contract.
2. A March 14, 1960, letter from a California alumnus of the University who berated Morrill for his inconsistency in opposing the Rose Bowl but favoring post-season competition in other sports and who accused Morrill of responsibility for "the demise of athletics at Minnesota started in your time and furthered ever since by the policies of

your regime."

3. A March 25, 1960 letter from another California alumnus of the University who had also served as a student member of SCIA in 1957-58 and 1958-59. This letter is interesting for the perspective of the events (whether "correct" or not is impossible to say) that took place when SCIA and the Senate dealt with the Rose Bowl renewal in spring of 1959. The author wrote to Morrill declaring:

I direct this letter to you because you and I know that the position of the University is your position; not the students, not the faculties, and not the alumni and the taxpayers of Minnesota.

Your actions alone were responsible for Minnesota's [sic] vote on this issue. Faculty control of athletics was entirely absent except for the rubber stamp [emphasis in original]. You may rationalize your position by pointing to the recent Senate vote, but recall these two facts:

1. When our faculty representative to the Western Conference voted for continuance of the Rose Bowl approximately one year ago, there was no protest of any significance by any of the above-named groups. Could it be that they approved of the move? [Presumably this refers to the vote cast by Professor Kinyon at the March 5-6, 1959, Conference meetings and reported in the March 12, 1959, SCIA minutes.]
2. The vote in the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics of approximately one year ago [April 2, 1959; when the roll call vote was 8-6] was a close one, and two of the eminent members who argued the merits of the Rose Bowl during discussion voted against continuance when they were reminded of your position by Mr. Middlebrook. Could it be that these people voted under duress? [emphasis in original; Vice President Middlebrook was at that SCIA meeting].

This alumnus clearly believed that the President was controlling events.

On March 31, 1960, SCIA voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate:

- a) That the University vote in favor of the continued Big Ten participation in NCAA championships (thereby objecting to the 6-4 vote at the January Conference meeting), and
- b. That the University reaffirm its opposition to the Rose Bowl.

Chairman Schultze transmitted these actions to President Morrill the following day, who thanked him and described the actions as "eminently sensible." The Senate, with Morrill presiding, on April 28, 1960, approved the SCIA recommendations.

At the May 20, 1960, meeting of the Joint Group, both issues received the second vote required by the White Resolution. On the vote to reaffirm the deletion of the permissive clause (which had passed 6-4 at the March meeting), the faculty representatives deadlocked 5-5 again, so the permissive clause was not deleted. The vote on prohibiting the NCAA championship competition also failed of reaffirmation--unanimously. So if there was a ploy on the part of the athletic directors, it was "effective" to the extent that the faculty representatives did not eliminate any possibility that a team could participate in the Rose Bowl, even though there was no contract, either. The Joint Group also decided that a directors' agreement, to continue to share Rose Bowl income if a Conference team participated, was an administrative matter in the discretion of the directors.

President Morrill might have felt a little disquieted at his last Senate meeting on June 20, 1960. While there was no contract for the Rose Bowl, the temporary "victory" at the March meetings (eliminating the permissive clause) had not been sustained. In what must have been, for Morrill, an ominous statement, Professor Kinyon alerted the Senate that in June it would need to vote on permitting the football team to attend the Rose Bowl if it were successful the upcoming season.

Minnesota was co-champion in Big Ten football in 1960 and ranked by AP and UPI as national champion. On November 21, 1960, (and recorded in the December 1, 1960, SCIA minutes), Chairman Schultze reported that he had, at the suggestion of President O. Meredith Wilson, polled the Committee members to determine their views on accepting a Rose Bowl bid if it were tendered. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of accepting. It also forwarded to the Senate a report and recommendation for acceptance. The SCIA cited four factors influencing its recommendation:

1. Minnesota had, for 14 years, accepted Rose Bowl income through Conference participation; to decline an invitation would deprive other Conference members of income which Minnesota had previously accepted from them.
2. Declining would jeopardize the possibility of other Big Ten teams receiving an invitation in future years.

3. Athletics and especially football can generate public attention and good will for the University.
4. The football team and staff were in favor of going.

The Committee also reviewed the history of Minnesota's position on the Rose Bowl and the current impasse in the Conference. The Senate, on November 22, 1960, voted to accept the SCIA recommendation (after debating but not adopting an amendment prohibiting acceptance of any future invitations or income from the Rose Bowl). It also instructed SCIA "to continue to strive, as in the past, for removal of the permissive clause from the Conference regulations." The Regents took the unusual step of commending SCIA for its decision.

At the December 1, 1960, SCIA meeting, Professor Kinyon reported that there appeared to be "no chance for a majority vote in the Conference for removal of the permissive clause," so the directive of the Senate could have no result. The Committee then voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate that it permit Professor Kinyon to abstain if a move were made, at the December 8-10, 1960, Conference meetings, to negotiate a new contract. This vote was taken with the understanding that any contract proposal would, under the White Resolution, be referred back to SCIA and the Senate for final vote. Also in those December 1 minutes is the note that "there was strong sentiment in the Committee that it would be in the best interests of the Conference and each member school to have a Rose Bowl contract, if the permissive clause cannot be rescinded."

Although there was a Senate meeting on December 8, 1960, SCIA did not report its recommendation on abstention. Nor did the Rose Bowl question come up at the Conference meetings.

SCIA met again January 12, 1961, and Professor Kinyon reported that the 5-5 impasse on the permissive clause still existed. "He indicated that perhaps our objective now should be to strive for renewal of a Rose Bowl contract that would be tied directly with the permissive clause." The Committee voted to appoint a three-man subcommittee to formulate a recommendation on a new contract for the Senate. That group came back to SCIA on February 2, 1961 (but not recorded in the minutes until the March 9 meeting), and submitted a report which was adopted and placed on the docket of the Senate for its March 9, 1961 meeting. The report, consuming five pages of the docket, reviewed again the history that led to the 5-5 deadlock on the permissive clause, pointed out that no change in that 5-5 vote was likely in the near future, and weighed the implications of continuing to operate without a contract. The report concluded that the Senate should authorize a contract with the proviso that the permissive clause should be amended so that the Rose Bowl exception would only be operative if there were a contract in place. The Senate, according to its minutes, discussed the proposal at length, and then decided to have more discussion April 27, later postponed to June 1. Chairman Schultze

reported to SCIA on May 4 that he had met with various faculty groups to explain the proposal.

Stan Wenberg reviewed an article by Marcus Plant, Michigan faculty representative, which led him to write to Schultze to comment on the Senate discussion. "It seems to want to act like a faculty and an administration all at once. The 'post-season game is educationally unsound--but our public role commands we accept' kind of thing." Wenberg wondered if Plant's article didn't provide a solution to the dilemma and asked Schultze if it ought to be circulated. Schultze said no; it might look as though there was an attempt "to divest the Senate of some of its authority. With the Rose Bowl issue still in the balance we must not antagonize our colleagues, even if the proposition were sound . . . If we get licked on that one it might be difficult to make much headway with respect to changing the procedures of faculty control."

The final debate occurred at the June 1, 1961, meeting; following, again, "extensive discussion," the Senate voted, by secret ballot, 70-42 to adopt the SCIA recommendation.

At the first meeting in the fall of 1961, Chairman Schultze reported the results of an AAUP poll of the faculty on the Rose Bowl. With 800 faculty participating, the results were:

27 percent favored a contract with the AAWU

25 percent favored unrestricted participation in the Rose Bowl

45 percent "were opposed"

Professor Kinyon reported that a special Conference meeting would be held October 1, 1961, to vote on a contract, with the wording of the motion along the line Minnesota had requested.

At that October 1 meeting, Kinyon moved that a contract similar to the previous one be signed with the AAWU on the condition that the last sentence of Regulation II be amended to read "Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl so long as a contract with the AAWU remains in force." The vote was 6-4, Minnesota casting the decisive vote, and the matter was referred back under the White Resolution.

When the issue came back to Minnesota, Chairman Schultze reported, for information only, to the Senate on November 2, 1961, on the Conference action. Although a question was raised about the need for another vote, President Wilson ruled that the action of the previous June was adequate.

On December 8, 1961, at the Joint Group meeting, the faculty representatives voted by the same 6-4 margin to reaffirm the October action. Negotiations with the AAWU took place over the next several months, and a contract was signed August 1, 1962. It remains in place to this day.

The final chapter in the story remains. Chairman Schultze reported (to the Senate on December 1, 1961) that he had again been requested by President Wilson to poll SCIA on accepting a Rose Bowl invitation if it were offered (the new contract had not been signed and the permissive clause still controlled). He had done so on November 21; it had voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate that Minnesota accept.

The invitation came--to Ohio State, on Saturday, November 25, 1961. On Wednesday, the Ohio State Faculty Council voted 28-25 to deny permission to the team to play in the Rose Bowl. (The history of faculty control of athletics at Ohio State in the late 1950's is an interesting story in itself.) After Ohio State declined, the invitation went to Minnesota. SCIA voted again on November 30--again unanimously--to recommend acceptance to the Senate, which voted 108-33 to accept the invitation at a special meeting on December 1, 1961.

When the Rose Bowl issue came before the Senate, Schultze recalls, President Wilson "was asked from the floor to make his views known." Wilson "asked if he should speak before or after the decisive vote was taken. He was told by majority vote 'you speak after we vote.'"

Following the vote, President Wilson made some remarks to the Senate which, as recorded in its minutes, present a stark contrast with the views of his predecessor.

The President indicated his gratitude for the careful consideration that had been given to this matter. He indicated that he shared, in part, some of the opposing points of view. He expressed his conviction that our success or failure in football is not at all significant in terms of our relations with the state and the legislature. He recognized that some people would be disappointed that we did not do as Ohio State did. . . . He expressed the hope that the academic faculty would take a positive view as it considers our athletic program and the image of the University. He thought academic control of athletics was more logically applied when dealing with criteria for eligibility for extra-curricular activities than in handling invitations to post season games. The effective athletic policy has already been determined and probably in favor of big time athletics at the time an invitation is received.

Whether or not Morrill ever communicated with Wilson on this view is not in the records of the University of Minnesota. It seems likely that Morrill might have agreed with Wilson's closing comments--while protesting all the same.

CHAPTER TEN

PRESIDENT MORRILL, THE FOOTBALL COACH, AND THE ALUMNI

The following parable, from Bertrand Russell, was found, very neatly typed out, in President Morrill's files for 1958-59 on "the football controversy."

Mass hysteria is a phenomenon not confined to human beings; it may be seen in any gregarious species. I once saw a photograph of a large herd of wild elephants in Central Africa seeing an aeroplane for the first time, and all in a state of wild collective terror. The elephant, at most times, is a calm and sagacious beast, but this unprecedented phenomenon of a noisy, unknown animal in the sky had thrown the whole herd completely off balance. Each separate animal was terrified, and its terror communicated itself to the others, causing a vast multiplication of panic. As, however, there were no journalists among them, the terror died down when the aeroplane was out of sight.

Doubtless President Coffman would have appreciated the story as well, had he had it at hand in 1925 and the early 1930s. Morrill, in 1958, was going to find himself in circumstances almost identical to those in which Coffman found himself in 1924-25: under strong public pressure to fire his football coach.

It is perhaps only a coincidence of what remains in the files, but the first correspondent to raise the question of Murray Warmath's continuation as coach was, as in 1924, Richard L. Griggs of Duluth. Griggs, now a regent, wrote to Vice President William Middlebrook on September 3, 1958--before the football season had begun--to ask for tickets for a legislator for one of the games and to comment on the athletic staff vis-a-vis the possibility of building a new stadium. Griggs told Middlebrook that it would "be very hard to sell me on any large outlay for a Stadium with our present set-up of Murray Warmath and Ike Armstrong." He recalled for Middlebrook his opposition to a contract extension that had been granted to Warmath (a five-year renewal, through 1961, that had been approved one year before the lapse of his first four-year contract granted in 1954). Griggs told Middlebrook that

I have lost confidence in Warmath, as a coach, and I have some reservations, as related to football, about Ike Armstrong's management. I like him and respect him, but there are some things in his public relations that have not been adequate, to my thinking.

Griggs concluded by asking for specific data on the outstate public appearances of Warmath and Armstrong for the previous two years.

Middlebrook wrote back a week later to suggest that Grigg's concerns could be aired in an executive session of the Board of Regents. He also commented that "the sports pages cannot and do not represent all public attitudes and do not necessarily present sound interpretations."

Apparently Griggs and Middlebrook talked about athletics, because Griggs wrote again to him on October 8, a long letter amplifying on the points he had made a month before. He told Middlebrook he would make no public statements, and would not embarrass Morrill and Middlebrook by seeking discussion before the Board until the President had a chance to consider and respond to his criticisms. Griggs also urged Middlebrook to give Armstrong a copy of the letter, saying he wasn't going to hide behind the President.

Griggs went on to outline several major points.

- Because athletics involved public relations and "big money," the conduct of the department was a matter of joint administrative-regental jurisdiction.
- In northeastern Minnesota there had been a shocking loss of prestige for football.
- Ike and Murray should be two of the University's "greatest ambassadors of goodwill"; neither of them seemed to ever show up in the northern part of the state.

Griggs said he was not talking about winning and losing; "I am talking about the lack of good public relations." He concluded by declaring that "the Regents should join with the Administration in considering a change of football coach at the end of this season" and that Armstrong should reconsider his public relations strategies if he was to keep his job. He reiterated his request for exact chronological information on where and when both the director and coach had apepear outside the Twin Cities.

The exchange of letters continued. Middlebrook wrote back to say he had given Griggs' letter to Morrill. Griggs wrote again on October 17 and warned Middlebrook that he would not remain silent on the matter once the football season was over, and urged again that his October 8 letter be given to Armstrong. He repeated, in stronger language, his opinions in earlier letters.

As far as I am concerned, I'd feel happier if both were to depart. I like them but I care more for the University welfare and in public opinion and public relations, the Athletic Dept. is "sliding down the cellar door" and fast. I have not one word of criticism of their character or conduct, fine men personally--doing a bad job. Ike can save

himself by reformation--getting off his swivel chair and taking to the "sticks." I don't see any hope for Murray.

Middlebrook must have talked with Armstrong, because on October 22 the director sent a letter and considerable data to Griggs about recruiting and public relations. Armstrong commented that they were making a sincere effort, but "it seems as if when our teams are winning there is nothing wrong with our public relations; when we lose everything is wrong."

Griggs responded to Armstrong with another lengthy letter on November 5, in which he reiterated his views of the problems that existed. He also sent a copy of his letter of October 8, since Middlebrook and Morrill had not done so. The gist of the letter was that football was far too important to the University to permit continued poor performance and that "the future under Murray is without promise"; he "must go." Griggs assured Armstrong that he had no personal animosity toward either of them, and that "if we have fallen on evil days in football and face no brighter future, you must share the blame with the rest of us."

Although not reviewed here, the public press had been critical of Warmath and Armstrong for some time. On November 3, Alumni Director Ed Haislet called for a "rallying of support" for the athletic department. As reported in the Daily on November 4, the

statement came in the face of mounting public and student sentiment for a football-coaching change.
... Saturday's 6-0 loss to Indiana caused the most violent reaction yet, including more effigy hangings.

Haislet was said to have acknowledged that the trouble "stemmed back to the failure to get" Bierman as director and Wilkinson as coach. He echoed, of course, the comments of LeVoir, et al, about the selections in 1950.

Stan Wenberg dropped a note to Morrill a week later, apropos Wilkinson. One of the regents had spoken with a member of the St. Paul press corps, who did not believe Minnesota could not have gotten Wilkinson. Upon calling Wilkinson directly, the reporter was told that Wilkinson "would not come to Minnesota under any circumstances." Wenberg concluded that this statement should put the issue to rest.

By mid-November the situation began to heat up. The football season was not going well (it was, at this point, 0-6 with two games remaining). On November 13 a group of "M" Club members "unofficially" sent out a questionnaire to over 2,000 "M" Club members. Included was a statement which read:

In the face of circumstances since 1950, our group feels that the "M" Club has functioned in too passive a manner and has not forcefully voiced opposition to the University executive

administrative decisions which has resulted in the removal of Minnesota as a power in intercollegiate athletics.

Recipients were asked to respond yes or no to five points, four of them having to do with a stronger role for the club and the fifth asserting "An injustice of long standing exists in the cause of Bernie Bierman and that every sincere effort possible should be made to him as athletic director at the University of Minnesota." There was no call for a change in the football coach.

Upon learning of this item, Bierman announced that "I am not interested in the job and would not accept it if it were offered." According to the Daily, on November 14, Bierman also said he was opposed to the move to put him back in the picture.

The Board of Regents met on November 15. Middlebrook wrote a memo to the files recording

At the meeting of the Board of Regents on November 15, 1958, the President reported briefly on certain aspects of the current athletic situation indicating that he is not in a position at this time to make any recommendation but desires further discussion with the Board.

There were, on November 24-25, a variety of newspaper articles about football. Some dealt with Coach Warmath's views on the season just completed (a 1-8 record) and his optimism about the prospects for 1959. Others addressed the results of the "M" Club survey (now named "Operation Hike") and a statement formally issued by the "M" Club board of directors.

One-third of those who received the survey had responded (749) and, by 90+ percent margins, supported a more active and vocal role for the group. Eighty-eight percent concurred with the sentiment about appointing Bierman as athletic director. The organizer of the effort, Bud Smith, said the results would be presented to the "M" Club and that, according to the Daily, "there is no intention of creating dissention or embarrassment to any individual or group." The Tribune reported, in addition, that Smith said "From this point on, any change in Minnesota athletic policy is up to public opinion." The "M" Club, meanwhile, said it had not had a chance to study the results but might have to act once it had time to do so.

Simultaneous with the release of the survey results came a formal statement from the "M" Club.

The board of directors of the graduate "M" club, representing 2,200 members, is very disappointed and disturbed with certain aspects of the presently existing athletic situation at the University of Minnesota.

This board has been working with the University of

Minnesota administration and with alumni groups toward a mutually agreeable solution. We shall continue to offer our assistance to the University administration and other interested groups.

The Tribune report on November 25, the day after the statement was issued, also quoted "M" Club president Lee Johnson as saying they had not, in meetings with Morrill, asked for any staff changes and that "they appreciated Morrill's cooperation in discussing the situation." The "M" Club had presented its statement to Morrill before making it public. Neither Morrill nor Armstrong had any comments on either the survey or the statement.

In the course of questioning by members of the press, Johnson "refused to be pinpointed on just what aspects the directors regard as 'disturbing and disappointing,' but said it was not entirely" the won-lost record, according to the St. Paul Pioneer Press. The Daily quoted him as saying "there was not elaboration on 'certain aspects' or a 'mutually agreeable solution,' but Johnson said the implications were obvious." A Daily editorial the same day, November 25, labelled this statement a "confusing double-talk that does more harm than good." The editorial condemned both the club and the survey for "pussy-footin' . . . , officially standing in the middle of nowhere . . . , vaguely condemning wrongs while not saying what they are and at the same time offering no solution." Joe Hennessy, writing a column in the Pioneer Press, concluded that "nothin' happened."

Charles Johnson, in the Star, said that there was a need for unity, for everyone to work for one cause, but he noted that "there is doubt whether this can be accomplished under the present regime." Johnson reported that Morrill recognized the problems and that he might recommend changes, although, Johnson wrote, the contract with Warmath would "not be broken unless the regents demand such action at their December meeting or Warmath himself asks to be released."

Over the next four days, November 26-29, 1958, Johnson ran a "People's Column," publishing several dozen letters from individuals around the state commenting on Minnesota football. It was remarkable similar to the Daily "Pig-Skin Post-Mortem" run November 27-30, 1921.

Dick Gordon of the Star wrote an article on November 26 analyzing the "M" Club statement and responding to the Daily editorial criticizing it. Gordon noted that the "M" Club had "a problem of its own." That is, "the last time the "M" men took a firm stand in directing administration athletic decisions they remember what happened. They backed Bernie Bierman to the hilt for athletic director and Dr. Morrill passed up Bierman in favor of Ike Armstrong." So, they were trying to be diplomatic and avoid any ill-will that might be created by an ultimatum. That was the reason, he explained, why the Daily broadside was unjustified. Gordon said that Lee Johnson and his associates recognized that Morrill "will never--and probably should not--accede to pressure." Morrill will "never be pushed, not by the "M" Club nor any other group," but, Gordon wrote, he was not indifferent.

President Morrill's own views were expressed in a letter he wrote in early December to an "M" Club member who had resigned from the group upon receiving the survey and who had sent a copy of his response to the President. Morrill thanked him for the copy and added that "no one enjoys winning a football game more than I do but I wish so much the good common sense you have expressed in your letter would be contagious." He also revealed that in the previous month he had "at least three meetings" with "M" Club Leaders and that they were "most helpful and interested in the welfare of the University and for this I am most grateful."

Regent Griggs was not letting up; he wrote to Wenberg twice in late November enclosing critical editorials from the Duluth newspaper and passing along his alarm that the football situation would have a negative impact on the 1959 legislative appropriation. He warned that legislators will "judge the management of administration and Regents somewhat on how we manage our athletics. Too bad but true" (emphasis in original).

Whatever the amiable relationship that might have existed between Morrill and the "M" Club was not shared by everyone. About the first of December began "Operation Shift," led by several alumni who were not "M" men. "Shift" consisted of statewide circulation of about 150 petitions--worded the same--addressed to the Board of Regents demanding the removal of Armstrong and Warmath. It also called for the appointment of Bierman as athletic director and for him to be given a free hand in selecting a Minnesota alumnus as football coach. One of the organizers, John Gould, told the Star that they hoped to have 5,000 to 10,000 signatures on the petitions, which would be presented to Regents in time for their discussion of the athletic situation, scheduled for December 12.

The "M" Club got back into action in early December, too; on the fourth they mailed a questionnaire to 465 high school coaches soliciting their opinions about the football coaching staff, the treatment of their players, and whether or not they encouraged their athletes to go to Minnesota. The results were to "be tabulated and then presented to Dr. J. L. Morrill . . . before he meets with the regents next Friday" according to an article in the Star on December 5.

President Morrill finally heard directly from Regent Griggs, who wrote to him on December 4. Griggs again warned about the legislative reaction and urged that Warmath be removed. He penned a postscript a day later, reporting that Warmath had visited him at home. "I heard him play the same old record--all of which I knew by heart. He doesn't seem to sense a thing wrong--even to public relations." Griggs concluded that Warmath was "a fine fellow but 'thick' 'upstairs'!" and that he had not changed his mind as a result of the coach's visit.

The idea of appointing a study committee must have been circulating through the President's office, because Ed Haislet wrote a letter to Wenberg on December 5 following up

a conversation the two of them had had just previously. Haislet said the idea of a committee was a "great mistake" because it would not satisfy the fans, would weaken support for the president, and would be seen as ducking the controversy. Haislet counseled that the President should instead take a firm stand to either support the athletic people or to change the program. Haislet urged the latter.

On December 8, the Monday before the Friday the Regents would meet, the St. Paul Dispatch carried an article citing "one of the most influential alumni" as being certain that Armstrong would be moved to a new position and that another athletic director would be appointed. Also reported were efforts by a group of "key" alumni to contact the regents to obtain the removal of both Armstrong and Warmath. Because there were contractual obligations to Warmath, money was to be raised to buy out the remainder of the University's commitment. "They would need to raise \$54,000," the reporter wrote, "and they estimate it would only take a matter of days. 'Already we've had offers for contributions totalling \$25,000 and these were all voluntary,' the spokesman said." Following the contemporary trend, the group of "approximately 25 businessmen and ardent followers of the Gophers" announced that they had launched "Operation Telephone" (urging individuals to contact their legislators) and were preparing to start "Operation Buck" (to raise money to buy out the contract).

The Pioneer Press also looked over the whole picture on December 8, and cited the backers of "Operation Shift":

Although it has been indicated that Bud Wilkinson, a former Gopher star and Minnesota alumnus, now coaching so successfully at Oklahoma, is no longer interested in returning to his alma mater, some members of the unofficial group do not believe this to be so. They even would like to see the regents go on record Friday as saying the athletic directorship is open to him if he will accept it.

The President, during this period, was responding daily to dozens of letters he was receiving. To cite one which seems to summarize his views succinctly: Morrill wrote to a Minneapolis banker who had expressed his support for the beleaguered administration and regents.

Long since I have learned that in the world of intercollegiate athletics there is precious little reason or good common sense. There is in higher education some tremendous inconsistency whereby, when the scoreboard flashes green everything is right with the world and when the football scoreboard flashes red everything is wrong.

Somewhere in the midst of all this there are good friends of education who also enjoy their intercollegiate athletics.

Morrill wrote to the Regents on December 9 and asked that their discussion of athletics on Friday be held in

"executive session." He suggested that a press conference could be arranged to follow the meeting, and that he hoped they would agree on some statement that could be issued. He promised to prepare a draft for them to consider.

"Operation Telephone" may have had some impact, because on December 10 ten Hennepin County--Minneapolis--legislators signed and sent a joint public letter to the Board of Regents. They wrote, on the basis of "repeated calls from constituents," that they wished to see an alumnus as football coach and listed the reasons for their view. This letter was, of course, widely reported, and it prompted a condemning editorial from the Star entitled "Crude Pressure on the 'U.'" The editorial writer rebuked the legislators for trying to tell the University how to conduct its business when its representatives would be appearing shortly with the budget request. One of the legislators then wrote back to the Star, President Morrill, and ten radio and television stations calling the editorial "naive" and replying that to be fair, the Star should editorialize about the pressure placed on the legislators by University administrators during the session.

As is normal during periods of such heightened interest in athletics, the newspapers had many articles on the situation during the days preceding the Regents' meeting. Herewith, again, a sampling and summaries:

-- December 9, Minneapolis Tribune (Sid Hartman):

"Rumors continued to fly in the Twin Cities that Ike Armstrong will be replace as athletic director. This fact couldn't be verified by authorities at the University."

-- December 10, Minneapolis Star:

Clarence "Biggie" Munn, athletic director at Michigan State, is rumored to be in line to replace Armstrong.

-- December 10, Daily:

Several regents supposedly favor a change in coach and director. "Morrill has not made public his sentiments, though he is known to be opposed to any direct pressure that would insist on a change now."

If Warmath "really wants to stay it is doubtful anything short of a demand by the president could force him to leave. And there is little chance of such a move by Morrill."

-- December 10, Duluth Herald:

Morrill "held to a position of cool and rigid propriety today in the midst of a breathless guessing game among the state's football fans. . . . Morrill has shunned any public announcement during all the maneuvering and speculation of the

past three weeks . . . Morrill would like to have Minnesota play winning football and resents any suggestion that he wouldn't.

-- December 11, Minneapolis Star (Charles Johnson):

The regents are the court of last appeal. Johnson reviewed all the uncoordinated activities that had been taking place and said that if nothing were done it would wreck recruiting and it "could be most serious and set back university sports for many years."

-- December 11, Minneapolis Star:

Lee Johnson met with President Morrill the day before and presented the result of the survey of high school coaches; neither would reveal what they were or how the meeting went. Johnson had also called a meeting of the "M" Club board for the day after the Regents meeting. On another phase, those who had been circulating the ouster petitions around the state were disappointed; they had only obtained about 1500 signatures.

-- December 12, Minneapolis Star:

The petitions were presented to President Morrill; they had 2,451 signatures. (All of the original and signed petitions are in Morrill's files.)

-- December 12, Minneapolis Tribune (Sid Hartman):

"The best guess is that neither Armstrong nor Warmath will be removed. Campus rumors were that Morrill would appoint a committee of regents, faculty, alumni, and "M" men to study the problem. . . . Several Regents . . . would like to see some changes made. In the past, however, the Regents have gone along 100 percent with Morrill's policy.

-- December 12, St. Paul Pioneer Press:

There "has been a move afoot to get the legislature --which convenes next month--to step into the picture, but leaders of both houses say they will not become involved."

-- December 12, St. Paul Pioneer Press (Joe Hennessy):

"Make any guess you wish."

As expected, the Regents did meet on Friday, December 12, and closed their meeting when they began to talk about athletics. The President's very orderly handwritten notes of his opening comments to the Board have survived; what follows is a reconstruction of his speech, from those notes. (The only words added are those which make his notes into complete and readable sentences).

We are all aware we have an athletic problem. It is a Regents' Problem, as fundamental issues always are. Both of us are harrassed. It is a distraction from the real business of the University and it is a pitiful distortion and degradation of what the University is all about. This is:

1. A problem of personnel.
2. A problem of "public relations."
3. A problem of University fairness and contractual integrity.
4. A problem of Regents' authority and responsibility to manage the policies and programs of the University versus outside demands and pressures.

You know some of the developments:

1. The Hennepin County legislative petition.
2. The various "operations"--"Hike," "Shift," "Buck"; the titles themselves a tip-off of their sloganizing and juvenility.
3. The letters in the newspapers and sports editors' slants (notably Johnson, Hartman, Reidar Lund versus the St. Paul paper attitudes).
4. The interest and activity of the "M" Club.

This is nothing new; it is as old as the hills. It is rather specially acute in Minnesota because we are bemused by the Bernie Bierman tradition of championship "Golden Gophers" and by the futile idea that Bud Wilkinson could solve all our problems and that he could be, or could have been had.

This has been the worst football season ever, although there were close scores and there was team play we can all be proud of. We are undermanned and crippled with critical injuries.

[Morrill then described the "M" Club as the "spearhead of agitation" and told the Regents of his various meetings with Lee Johnson and others. At the most recent conference with Johnson, they presented the coaches' questionnaire and talked of future "M" Club activities, and apparently said something to the effect that they wanted to "run Warmath and Armstrong out of town."]

We are at the stage of witch-burning, of throwing the Christians to the lions, of the lynch-mob.

I have had conferences with Warmath and Armstrong. They have had no run for their money or a chance to tell their story. There has been no chance of decent appraisal. There has been no publicity of anything in their favor.

The issue now:

1. A howling mob to run us out of the ball-park.
2. The dignity and unsurrendable authority and autonomy of the University.
3. Where will we go if we give in under pressure: the implications in other areas and the implication in the legislature.
4. The "Minnesota man"--what about the Presidency? We have had four the athletic directors [Luehring, Crisler, McCormick, and Armstrong] and two coaches [Crisler and Warmath] not from Minnesota.

The reaction [to keeping Armstrong and Warmath] is the beginning of what it will be: public letters and telephone calls, legislative, and alumni and the "M" Club.

The Regents or I should issue a statement. It should not be written to be defiant or inflammatory; it should be sensible, clearly definitive, and constructively intended.

Morrill then read a draft statement and proposed to appoint the study committee that Wenberg had mentioned earlier to Haislet. Before they finally agreed, however, Griggs moved that Morrill "be instructed to negotiate" the resignation of Warmath and the retirement of Armstrong from the directorship. According to Middlebrook's file memo after the meeting, Grigg's motion was not seconded, the Board adopted a statement, and Griggs "asked to be recorded as not favoring" it.

The statement issued after the meeting basically said the coach and director would not be fired and that there would be an "objective and fact-finding appraisal" of the athletic department, with representation from faculty, students, the alumni association, and the "M" Club. The release acknowledged the public desire for a change in staff, noted the ups and downs of Big Ten football, pointed out that athletics were not the primary purpose of the University and that contractual obligations were honored, that neither men had breached their contracts, and finally agreed that there was room for improvement. So the committee would be appointed and would be free from interference, but it would not be "an 'investigating committee' appointed to consider the retention or dismissal of staff members, which is the inescapable responsibility of the University."

Predictably, the events made the front pages of all the local newspapers. The articles reported on some of the exchanges that took place during the question-and-answer session that followed.

- The action was a vote of confidence in Warmath and Armstrong, according to Morrill; one regent said it was not.
- The President would oppose accepting money to buy out Warmath's contract (but said that if some group raised the money and offered it to Warmath in return for his resignation, the decision would be up to the coach).
- The executive session had lasted four hours.
- Seven of the twelve regents had approved the release; three had been absent, one had left for a dental appointment, and Griggs admitted that he had voted against it.
- At least one regent worried about the perception that the Board would buckle under pressure if they had fired the two men.
- General Regent support for the statement was not especially strong.

Also announced at the press conference, or very shortly thereafter, was the membership on the committee. It was to be chaired by Max Schultze, SCIA chairman; other members were Lee Johnson, the president of the Alumni Association (J.D. Holtzermann), the chairman of the Greater University Fund, a student, and Dean Walter Cook of the College of Education. All but Johnson accepted immediately; Johnson said he had to talk to the "M" Club board first.

As a writer of a Star article on December 13 observed, the "M" Club now had to decide "whether to endorse Johnson's

"appointment" to the committee or "to take a positive stand criticizing" the decision of the President and Regents. The Tribune polled several prominent "M" Club members for its issue the day the group was to meet; the reactions ranged from extreme disappointment to support.

The "M" Club met on Saturday and afterwards issued a statement of its own. They said "the action taken . . . was arbitrary and ill-advised." "We do not feel that it reflects the will and wish of the people of Minnesota." "We would be derelict in our duties if we were to accept without protest" the proposal for a committee. "It is imperative that the University remove [Armstrong and Warmath] at the earliest possible moment." The members of the group had presented enough facts to warrant a change and had acted with patience and good faith while Morrill made up his mind, according to an article by Sid Hartman. "We decided to go along with the wishes of Dr. Morrill and let him study the situation. Now that he hasn't done anything we had no choice but to act." The "M" Club did vote to let Johnson serve on the committee, if he wished, and a few days later Johnson wrote to Morrill to accept.

In the same Sunday newspapers reporting the "M" Club stand, there appeared a brief statement from Morrill expressing sorrow and disappointment at its decision.

Charles Johnson, in his "Lowdown on Sports" in the Sunday Tribune after the "M" Club acted, said this meant "a long drawn out fight" about athletics. He offered comments:

There is no doubt that University authorities refuse to be stampeded by any pressure groups into making changes at this time.

The committee idea of handling the controversy is as old as the school itself.

Even those who are most insistent on changes in the athletic director and head football coach can't say that the fact-finding committee is "loaded" for the purpose of "whitewashing" Armstrong and Warmath.

Take it from one who has been in the thick of every row over coaches and athletics at Minnesota for more than 35 years, pressure groups never have won a single argument from the University.

The campaign against Warmath and Armstrong in recent months has been tame compared to some of those in the past.

The available evidence suggests that the "M" Club was determined to see Armstrong and Warmath removed, and it only waited to speak out until after the Regents meeting because its members hoped Morrill would accede to their wishes. Morrill's recollection of the "run them out of town" comment in his speech lends credence to the perception.

It also seems that Armstrong did not know of the "M"

Club sentiment, and that the University had tried to stave off any extreme statements from it. An undated letter from Ed Haislet to Morrill, but written some time after the events, recounts a conversation that Haislet had had with Armstrong "about a week or ten days before the date that the "M" Club first set to release their statement." Haislet told Morrill that Armstrong talked to him about putting together a special committee on athletics, and "from what Ike said it was evident to me that Ike did not know what was going on--what the "M" Club was about to do." Haislet related that he and Holtzermann of the Alumni Association had "sat in on a number of meetings with "M" Club leaders . . . our whole purpose being to keep the "M" Club from taking any overt action." So Haislet had then told Armstrong what was going on.

Armstrong was "visibly disturbed," according to Haislet. He then went on to recount for the President Armstrong's exact words, as he remembered them.

I have been in the athletic business over thirty-five years--and that's the way the cookie crumbles.

I'm not the best athletic director in the country --but I'm not the worst. However, if President Morrill asks me to resign I'll be glad to do so--or if for the best interests of athletics at the University I should resign--I'll do so. However, I don't want to be fired--and I do want a job.

I'll tell you something else--and I have never told this to another person--this whole situation is not all my fault. I get the blame for hiring Warmath --actually, I recommended several other coaches first--and they were all turned down by President Morrill. My first choice was Paul Brown. I haven't cried about this--and I won't--but my hands have been tied in other ways, too.

For the next two weeks around Christmas, 1958, and New Year's, 1959, the situation settled down. On January 2, 1959, the study committee held its first meeting, with the President in attendance. As with the Regents' meeting, his handwritten notes have survived. He told the committee that the athletic department needed help, both in strengthening the program and in its relationships with various constituent groups. Their report, he said, should not be a white-wash, but it should provide both commendations and criticism. The issue of staff replacements had been resolved by the Regents. He concluded by pointing out, as he had to the Regents, that the issue for the committee was "one of University integrity, autonomy, excellence and success in athletics" and that he and the University needed also to know how its final recommendations could be implemented. The committee was thus charged with a task and went about doing it.

The "M" Club, the next day, sent to its members, and made public, a seven-page letter from Lee Johnson renewing its call for the removal of Armstrong and Warmath,

enumerating the reasons in each case, and reviewing the events that had led them to their current position. It is worth quoting at length, both because it provides the "M" Club perspective and how long the dispute had existed. It also illustrates how deeply involved the President was. The letter bears a remarkable similarity to the lengthy letter sent to President Coffman and the Board of Regents in 1925 by L. A. Page demanding the removal of coach William Spaulding.

Before quoting from the letter, however, the comments from individuals cited or quoted in it, as reported in the press afterwards, should be presented in order to let one judge its accuracy. Morrill declared, in a statement, that it was "a completely false misrepresentation of my attitudes and of statements made by me." Leif Strand (Holtzermann's predecessor as president of the Alumni Association) and Ed Haislet were quoted in the Tribune as saying the letter was "substantially correct." Holtzermann said there was "misrepresentation of fact."

After reciting twelve reasons for replacing Warmath and six for Armstrong Johnson presented a thirteen-month history.

1. December, 1957 -- Four members of the "M" Club Board after studying the situation and consideration of problems presented to the entire Board a resolution of disappointment with the athletic situation at the University. At this meeting the Board deferred voting on the resolution and appointed committee of Board members to prepare a questionnaire to be sent to all "M" Club members to determine, in an objective and fact-finding manner, the attitude of the individual "M" Club members at that time. This committee met frequently and worked out such a questionnaire, but the Board subsequently decided to further delay this project since the Alumni Association was planning action on this same problem. The questionnaires which you received from "Operation Hike" were not sent out by your "M" Club Board of Directors but were circulated by a group of loyal and interested "M" men. The results of these questionnaires have been helpful to the Board.
2. April, 1958 -- Dr. Leif Strand, then President of the University Alumni Association, appeared at the regular "M" Club Board meeting and reported that he and Ed Haislet, Permanent Alumni Secretary, had met with President Morrill on March 7, 1959 and had presented to the President, at that time, some twenty-three points of criticism followed by a recommendation from the Alumni Board of Directors that the President review the entire athletic situation and clearly set forth the athletic policy of the University. Dr. Strand told us that President Morrill was very receptive to his comments at this meeting, that the President indicated at this time his own disappointment in Athletic Director, Ike Armstrong, and that he intended to take active steps to correct the

problems which, he recognized, existed in the Athletic Department. Dr. Strand requested that the "M" Club act in cooperation with the Alumni Association and that the "M" Club Board take no further action at that time which might destroy further cooperative efforts with President Morrill. The "M" Club Board with some reluctance voted to accept Dr. Strand's recommendation and, except for continuing to study the problem, decided to, at least temporarily, table the resolution of disappointment and questionnaire.

3. November 3, 1958 -- At the regular November meeting the "M" Club Board unanimously passed a resolution to be presented to President Morrill and thereafter to be made public, stating our disappointment with the athletic situation and recommending the replacement of Ike Armstrong and Murray Warmath. The "M" Club Board unanimously decided that this resolution should not be made public until November 24, 1958, after the football season was over.
4. November 7, 1958 -- Meeting with President Morrill, "M" Club President, Lee Johnson, and Mr. J. D. Holtzermann, President of the Alumni Association. At this meeting Lee Johnson and J. D. Holtzermann stated to the President the complete dissatisfaction and disappointment of their respective groups in the intercollegiate athletic situation, and President Morrill, at that time, indicated to both of these men that he was disappointed in Ike Armstrong and informed them that he (Ike) could be moved from Athletic Director to some other position in the Athletic Department and definitely implied that he favored such a move. Dr. Morrill said that he could not recommend that the University break Murray Warmath's contract, but he indicated that he would be more than happy to accept Mr. Warmath's resignation if it were offered. President Lee Johnson then left town for a week business trip and Norb Koch, First Vice President of the "M" Club, took over as the official representative of the "M" Club in meetings with Dr. Morrill and J. D. Holtzermann during Lee Johnson's absence.
5. November 10, 1958 -- Meeting with President Morrill, Norb Koch and J. D. Holtzermann, at which time the athletic problem was further discussed. President Morrill was informed at that time that Mr. Clayton Tonnemaker, Second Vice-President of the "M" Club, representing the "M" club, and the Alumni Association jointly, was going to contact two possible replacements for Ike Armstrong as Athletic Director at the University. President Morrill indicated an interest in such interviews and certainly voiced no objections to this procedure.
6. On November 10 and 11, 1958, Clayton Tonnemaker

interviewed these men. In spite of the semi-official nature of this initial approach, both indicated a definite interest in the job of Athletic Director if it became available.

7. November 19, 1958 -- Meeting with President Morrill, Norb Koch, Clayton Tonnemaker and J. D. Holtzermann. Tonnemaker reported at this meeting that the men contacted had indicated a definite interest in this report and indicated that he was pleased that this action had been taken. After further discussion President Morrill presented three definite points of decision which he had reached and which all those present at the meetings were to maintain in the strictest confidence because he had not as yet had an opportunity to meet with either Ike Armstrong or Murray Warmath to discuss this matter with them in spite of the fact that he indicated to Dr. Strand on March 7, 1958, he intended to do something about this situation and to discuss it with both men. The following points were then made by the President at the November 19 meeting:

(1) That he certainly would do nothing until after the football season, November 22nd.

(2) He would not recommend breaking Murray Warmath's contract but would be glad to accept Murray's resignation, if offered. He would not oppose interests outside the University raising money to "buy up" the Warmath contract.

(3) He realized that a problem existed in connection with the Athletic Director, Ike Armstrong, and that he was certainly going to have a conference with Ike and thereafter indicated to the three men present that he was going to act to correct the existing problems. At this time, the President by his statements indicated to those present that some changes would be made and that specifically a change in the Athletic directorship would be forthcoming.

8. Friday, November 21, 1958 -- special meeting of the "M" Club Board of Directors at which time the Executive Committee including Koch, Tonnemaker and Johnson, in reliance upon the statements of President Morrill, recommended that the "M" Club Board continue to cooperate with the University and that we should not take a strong stand in opposition to the Athletic Department administration and personnel. In reliance on this recommendation, the Board unanimously approved a "soft" treatment, and presented it to Dr. Morrill for approval.

9. November 24, 1958 -- This "soft" statement was

released by the "M" Club Board.

10. December 7, 1958 -- J. D. Holtzermann and Lee Johnson met to draft a statement which was to be presented to the Board of Regents after being reviewed by Dr. Morrill. This statement expressed a definite concern over the "deplorable athletic situation at the 'U' of Minn." and specifically asked for the removal of Ike Armstrong and Murray Warmath. Subsequently this statement was reviewed by Dr. Morrill, and thereafter altered. [Holtzermann specifically told the Tribune that this recounting of his involvement was inaccurate.]
11. December 9, 1958 -- Lee Johnson, President of the "M" Club, had a 3 1/2 hour meeting with Dr. Morrill. In response to a request by Dr. Morrill at an earlier meeting, Lee presented documented facts which have led the "M" Club to arrive at its position against Ike and Murray. These facts were in the form of excerpts from letters received from the Minnesota high school football coaches, statements from former athletes, staff members, etc. After all these facts had been presented to Dr. Morrill, he was asked what his recommendation was going to be at the December 12th Board of Regents' meeting. Dr. Morrill at that time told Lee that he was going to recommend that Ike and Murray be retained in their present positions and that a committee be set up to look into the entire athletic situation. At the same time, Dr. Morrill asked Lee not to divulge this information to anyone until after the Board of Regents' meeting. This confidence was kept.
12. December 12, 1958, Board of Regents' meeting. The statement of the Alumni Association was read by J. D. Holtzermann and while it expressed dissatisfaction with the athletic situation, it did not ask for the removal of Ike Armstrong and Murray Warmath. At this meeting the Board of Regents approved a "vote of confidence" to Mr. Ike Armstrong and Mr. Warmath and appointed a fact finding committee to study athletic conditions at the University.
13. December 13, 1958 -- "M" Club Board's meeting and issuance of protest statement, recommending the removal of Ike and Murray. In response to statement Dr. Morrill was quoted in the paper as saying he thought the more "loyal and thoughtful" members of the "M" Club would be sorry about this action of the "M" Club Board. We feel that the "loyal and thoughtful" members will approve our action.

The gist of this January, 1959, recapitulation was, of course, that Morrill had misled the "M" Club about his intentions.

Holtzermann took the "M" Club to task immediately. He told Dick Gordon of the Tribune that he regretted the letter had been published. He charged that it constituted a "serious breach of confidence" and that the use of his name without his consent and "without consulting me . . . as to accuracy, is uncalled for and a violation of common courtesy and decency." The same day the article appeared, January 4, Holtzermann also talked with Lee Johnson, because he sent a note to Johnson on January 5 recounting their conversation. Holtzermann told Johnson that "I hope you will have seen Dr. Morrill by this time, and made your amends to him, and the corrections of fact to set the record straight." It was, Holtzermann said, necessary if he were to "restore the good name of the 'M' Club, because of your grave errors, the unfairness and the wrongness of the misrepresentations in your statement." Holtzermann closed his note by saying "Thank you for your apology to me yesterday, and [I] trust you offer the same to Dr. Morrill, which is more important to me."

It began to appear that the "M" Club had blundered, because expressions of support for the President began to come from many quarters. Perhaps least unexpectedly, SCIA adopted a resolution approving the December 12 Regent's meeting decision and deplored "the recent public attacks made upon the integrity of the President," which elicited a note from Morrill to SCIA Chairman Max Schultze conveying his "grateful appreciation" and his increased conviction that the University had done the right thing. The student All-University Congress did likewise. The Daily said the decision was "infinitely preferable to the ill-considered actions" of the critics. Stan Wenberg told the newspapers that Morrill had received 72 letters, 61 of which supported the stance by the University. Joe Hennessy, writing in the Pioneer Press, in a column entitled "Tone of This Thing Seems to be Discharge Everyone," observed that "there may be some other ways of interpreting this latest prepared statement . . . but to put it briefly it seems to add up to this--President James L. Morrill also must go. . . . This seems carrying things a bit far." He concluded:

The target now apparently has been shifted to the president himself. Think what you will about teams winning or losing, and certainly no sports writers in the Twin Cities are happy about losing teams, but not quite to the extent of shooting the top man out of the saddle.

The Star described the attack on Morrill "unfortunate, to say the least."

As evidenced by a report in the Star later in January, 1959, however, the "M" Club was not relenting. According to the article, about 25 speeches had been given, since the January 3 letter, to various groups around the state by members of the Club. The purpose was, among others, "to get across the point the 'M' Club is not trying to dictate administration policies."

The same day the Star article was written, several "M"

Club officials, including Lee Johnson, appeared on "Open Mike," a telephone call-in talk show conducted by radio station WCCO. The "M" Club representatives continued to level criticisms of Morrill, the football coaching and recruiting, and said they wanted a voice in the selection of a new athletic director. Johnson reportedly "denied that his group wants to dictate policy."

The radio show remarks elicited several reactions. Dick Cullum, writing two days later, added to the impression that the "M" Club was making a mistake. "If you happen to be one who wants a change in the athletic staff at the state university, you had better call off the "M" Club. This group of mumbling crusaders is doing your side of the case no good." Cullum criticized the use of anonymous quotations from letters the "M" Club had received from its survey of high school coaches, and anonymous callers to the show, as unfairly accusing without knowing who was doing it.

The following day, January 29, the Star reported the "M" Club had released all 113 letters it had received from the high school coaches, although it did not reveal the authors because they had been promised confidentiality. Cullum promptly took the Club to task again.

The public, here, is asked to condemn certain members of the athletic department on the testimony of men who will not identify themselves. No doubt the American sense of fair play will react with scorn against people who shoot from ambush, then jump into the saddle and take to the hills.

J. D. Holtzermann wrote to Morrill on January 29 to tell the President he was leaving the country for awhile and expressing regret that the committee was not done with its work. He also told Morrill that

I deeply regret the 'mess' which has resulted from this whole situation. I think the most recent radio participation by the 'M' Club President is deplorable, as have been his other recent efforts and I hope he will see fit to make his amends to you.

Holtzermann signed off by extending his "apologies to you for some of the misdeeds of certain Alumni who have so badly aggravated this situation by their unfairness and bad judgement." Morrill replied, thanking him for the support and commenting that "the whole thing continues to pain and perplex me and at a time when every element of energy and intelligence I can muster is so badly required for our legislative problems and negotiations." The President told Holtzermann he hoped the trip relieved him "from the miseries which have added so much to the burdens of your alumni presidency."

The repercussions of the radio appearance reached Schultze's study committee, too; it prompted a spat about Johnson's continued service as a member of the committee. Three full pages of its meeting minutes for January 30 were devoted to committee members discussion with Johnson. Schultze sent the minutes to Morrill under a cover letter reporting that the committee could not "carry out their assignment of an objective and fact-finding appraisal" if Johnson remained a member. He also told Morrill that Johnson refused to resign. Although admitting "discouragement and perplexity" at the difficulties, Morrill wrote back to Schultze that Johnson must remain on the committee; "I have made our bed and now must lie in it, so to say. . . . If I have made a mistake in asking him to serve, if I have misjudged his desire and ability to be helpful to the University . . . , then all this is a mistake that we must live with." Schultze and the committee accepted Morrill's decision.

Early in February Dick Cullum took note of a letter in the Daily from a faculty member who "wondered if this would not be a good time for the University to consider abolishing intercollegiate football." Cullum said the "M" Club had been "warned in conversation that they were creating an atmosphere on the campus which could carry over beyond the current situation." Cullum spoke then to the faculty, and took a swipe at the "M" Club, by pointing our that

the persons on the "M" Club Board of directors were, in the main, rather obscure in their athletic careers at Minnesota. Only a small minority had any distinction as athletes. . . . We may say that they did not make a great total contribution while in school.

Cullum also reminded the faculty that "many 'M' Club members, more mature, more stable, more prominent while in school and still more prominent after graduation, wish their board of directors had used better judgement." That was written on February 9; on February 13 Cullum followed up by commenting on how

it is sad to stand by and watch the future of intercollegiate athletics at Minnesota suffer perhaps irreparable damage. . . . From now on, in this sickening controversy, it is not a question of who is right and who is wrong. Nobody is right. When two puppies fight over a rag doll one may get the doll in the end, but by that time what is left of the doll?

One of the principal phases of the program being harmed was the football recruiting, as the Star reported on February 12. In a series of three articles written for the Associated Press by Jim Klobuchar and printed in the Star, however, Warmath said the recruiting was going extremely well.

Klobuchar also reported, in his series, on the continuing activities in the "feud." He quoted Norb Koch (whose name appeared in the "M" Club history) as admitting that "it seems now as though there might have been a misunderstanding in our talks with Dr. Morrill." He also reported that "a lot of 'M' Club members feel now that moving against Morrill was a tactical mistake." Warmath and Armstrong were also putting more efforts into their own public relations, and they "have refused to get involved in a public slugging match with the 'M' Club." In the last of his three articles, Klobuchar related that the "M" Club had "no plans to apply pressure in the selection of the next University of Minnesota president"--although it was only mid-February of 1959, the Club was hoping "for future action" by Morrill's successor. Morrill was scheduled to retire in the summer of 1960. Koch said they wanted a "clear statement of athletic policy" from the next president, and "have an interest in the selection and would welcome a chance to be heard."

The day after the articles were completed, Stan Wenberg relayed to Morrill Klobuchar's irritation with Charles

Johnson of the Star. Klobuchar had called Armstrong to tell him that the articles had been written to be balanced but that Johnson edited out favorable material. Wenberg also provided a copy of one article as it had appeared in the Rochester, Minnesota paper; large chunks had been cut from the Star edition. Morrill jotted a note: "This is really 'policy-editing'. . . . I may want to show it to . . . Cowles" [owner of the Minneapolis newspaper].

Charles Johnson also got involved in an exchange with Morrill at this point. He wrote one of his "Lowdown on Sports" columns on February 12. Several of his observations bear repeating; the last one provoked Morrill to contact him.

The current dispute between University of Minnesota administration and the "M" club is not doing the school's intercollegiate athletic program any good.

President J. L. Morrill, as the University's president, certainly had authority to give director Ike Armstrong and football coach Murray Warmath a vote of confidence. Whether it was the popular or wise thing to do is something else again.

The board of directors of the "M" club was entitled to say publicly it was dissatisfied with the school's athletic setup.

The "M" club didn't handle its case too diplomatically. The board did do quite a little negotiating behind the scenes to get some action. Failing in this approach, the former athletes came out slugging.

They demanded the immediate ouster of Warmath and Armstrong. They had that right. But they should have stopped there. Instead they launched an attack on President Morrill because they felt there had been a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of agreements or promises reached in earlier negotiations.

That attack brought many to Morrill's defense.

As one who has been close to every athletic controversy affecting the University of Minnesota for 40 years, we feel most of them could have been avoided if the "M" club men had been allowed just a small role as consultants or advisers on many occasions.

The former athletes never have wanted the final say on appointments. They merely have asked a little consideration in expressing their opinions--publicly or off the record.

In a few cases, they were given limited opportunities. Not so in the last two decades. One rebuff after another has made the "M" men so bitter that they have put on their fighting

clothes.

Morrill protested to Johnson that it was unfair to say that the "M" Club had not been given an opportunity to express its opinions. He recalled that there had been a Club representative on the advisory committee to choose a successor to Frank McCormick, that he had then spent "many, many hours with 'M' Club leaders," that he had done so again in the current controversy, and that he had put Johnson on the study committee and "insisted that he must remain on the committee" despite the wishes of the other members that he "could no longer serve with any usefulness." The President chided Johnson: "I do think, Charles, I was entitled to a better break than you gave me."

Johnson wrote back to Morrill and made a number of comments which shed interesting light both on the situation and on the role of the press. Johnson agreed that he should have "differentiated more clearly than I did between the Athletic Department and the University Administration" when alluding to the "rebuff" of the "M" Club. He also acknowledged the extent to which Morrill had involved the Club members both in 1950 and recently. Johnson confirmed, too, an already widely reported fact that in the current situation: "In conversation with (Lee Johnson and Norm Koch), I get the impression that they misinterpreted conversations that they had with you on some phases of the problem." Johnson went on to give Morrill a different perspective.

I think down through the years we in the Sports Department have gone far beyond the call of duty in trying to cover the many controversies that have developed in the neighborhood. I have the feeling now and have had it for a long time, that it has been pretty much a one way street. It has been pretty much give on our part and too much "take" as far as the Athletic Department is concerned in relationship with the newspapers.

However, I don't want you to get the idea that it is anything personal in any comment I have written. It may interest you to know that I did everything in my power to head off the drastic action by the M Club but I failed. Of late I have tried to delay other moves by the M Club which I think did no one any good.

He closed by suggesting that he and Morrill have an off-the-record chat. Morrill responded that he would "like nothing better," and told Johnson "maybe you'll even be able to give me some comfort and encouragement in just about the roughest experience this year in all my Minnesota years!"

The President reported to the Board of Regents in February on the status of the study committee.

In the first of his tripartite series of articles in mid-February, Klobuchar reported also that "to repair the

"... damage" done by their attack on Morrill, the "M" Club leaders had hired a local public relations man, Paul Sevareid, to work with them. On April 1, in a public declaration, Sevareid quit. He wrote to Koch, and made known the contents of the letter.

It was my hope that your cause could be advanced effectively and with purpose for the common good. It has become apparent that such is not possible under existing circumstances, for pronouncements from members of your board of directors, as quoted in the press and in other media, give evidence that your people and those dedicated to your purpose are unwilling to accept any position other than your own.

Sevareid sent the letter to Morrill as well.

Shortly after Sevareid's act of disassociation, the "M" Club cause got a boost from Representative Stanley Fudro of Minneapolis. Fudro had, immediately following the December Regents meeting retaining Warmath and Armstrong, let go a "blast" at Morrill, so-described and reported in the Tribune by Sid Hartman. Fudro had said then that the "failure to dismiss Warmath and Armstrong was 'pressured through by Morrill'" and Fudro "charged that Morrill 'callously intends to flagrantly ignore the overwhelming wishes of the citizens of Minnesota.'" Now, four months later, Fudro got back into the act; on April 7 he introduced a resolution in the Minnesota House of Representatives expressing "disappointment in the current conduct, policies, and practices of the athletic department" and urging the Regents to restore "athletics to acceptable standards of proficiency," particularly football. The Tribune reported the next day that the resolution was "understood to have originated with the University 'M' Club."

At the end of April Morrill finally responded in writing to Sevareid (they had talked earlier). Morrill told Sevareid of his own retrospective view of what had occurred.

As I look back over our athletic difficulties, vis-a-vis the "M" Club, in recent months I feel a disheartening depression over the developments. . . . I suppose it is a matter of leadership on both sides and I am aware of deficiencies on my own part and feel deeply that the "M" Club Board and officers were not really representative of either the intelligence or loyalty of the great body of "M" Club and especially so many leading figures in the Club whom I know so well and respect so sincerely.

How stimulating and creditable, for example, it would have been for the "M" Club to pledge its support of the University's legislative program and the Regents' request for appropriations! Instead, the Club seems to have stimulated the introduction of a resolution in the Legislature which, while never really considered or adopted, yet provoked a

wave of controversy and criticism deeply disadvantageous to the University's cause which is in great extremity.

The same day Morrill sent his letter to Sevareid the study committee presented its final report to the President; the original copy carries the personal signatures of each member of the committee. The 58-page report examined every nook and cranny of the department. The committee interviewed dozens of people (the Star said "hundreds") and reviewed the organization and accomplishments of the athletic program, intramurals, physical education, student participation, public relations, financial aid to athletes, recruiting, and the place of athletics at the University. The report was similar to the one that Coffman had sought in 1930 (but received only part of) and the departmental review in 1982. Some excerpts from the report will illustrate how the committee dealt with the issues pertinent to this chapter.

In the statement released by the President of the University on 12 December 1958, which announced the formation of this committee, specific reference was made to the Director and the Head Football Coach. The committee has taken full account of this in its work and in its report, without neglecting other aspects of its assignment.

Allegations of "de-emphasis" of intercollegiate athletics have been made in public against the Administration of the University and against those who are responsible for the formation and implementation of policy pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. The committee took full cognizance of these allegations in its first meeting and it has been alert to them throughout its work. It finds that they have no substance in fact. [In Cliff Sommer's view, however, de-emphasis was what resulted, although not intended.]

The public, including many people who are intensely interested in sports, are not generally familiar with the rules which govern intercollegiate athletics and with their effect on local operations. This has led to misunderstandings among those who have special concern for individual student-athlete or for athletics in general. When the team is not winning, misunderstandings can easily grow into accusations of incompetence and malpractice. Then the pressures increase.

Much of the criticism directed publicly and to this committee against the Department, particularly against the Director and the Head Football Coach, was expressed in such phrases as "their public relations are bad" or "they have failed in public relations." Although none of the members of the committee are experts in public relations and therefore perhaps not well-qualified to address themselves to this issue, the committee could not

ignore the frequency with which public relations have been mentioned. The committee has sought to evaluate the validity of such criticism and to find the reasons for it.

"When you are winning public relations take care of themselves" is one attitude expressed. Diametrically opposed views have also been presented to the committee. The committee believes that alleged "poor public relations" have been tolerated when the team was winning, or at least criticism was subdued in view of a winning scoreboard; such tolerance wanes when losses occur. In times of stress the desire for perfection becomes intensified; reasons for imperfection are rightfully sought. This has been the case recently. The committee also believes that, if the University desires to continue competition with other Conference universities on an equitable basis, good public relations of the Department as defined above are essential.

The committee cannot escape the conclusion that the Department has in general not been successful in its public relations as defined above.

The appointments of the present Director and the Head Football Coach did not meet with the approval of many people who publicly expressed their preference for other men. Both of these men were aware of this handicap when they assumed their work here; they have not succeeded in overcoming it.

A critical attitude has been taken by some segments of the press toward the Director and the Head Football Coach. The committee has no objection to criticism per se; it believes, however, that criticism should be fair, unbiased and constructive. The committee is fully aware of the fact that there always will be a constant search for news by aggressive reporters.

Until recently the Director and the Head Football Coach did not appreciate sufficiently the importance of their personal participation in public relations for the long-range success of the program in intercollegiate athletics and of the University as a whole.

The committee had an opportunity to become acquainted, in a manner which did not disclose the identity of the respondents, with most of the replies to the questionnaire which was sent by the Board of Directors of the Graduate "M" Club to football coaches in Minnesota last December.

The committee cannot overlook the frequency with which high school coaches mentioned that they had not been contacted by personnel of the Department for several or many years, that correspondence

concerning potential players had not been answered, and that apparently no successfully organized and effective system had in the past been developed by the Department to establish a close liaison with all high school coaches, many of whom consider this to be a serious shortcoming.

The Department has provided extensive assistance to the "M" Club in many ways; this is continuing at the present time. The Graduate "M" Club, in turn, has helped and continues to help the Department in very tangible and effective manner through contacts with prospective athletes, with high school coaches and in many other ways. . . . The committee considers it most unfortunate that the recent public statements and actions by the Board of Directors of the Graduate "M" Club have jeopardized effective cooperation with the Department at a time when it needs support.

The committee is fully aware of the fact that it was asked to do its work mainly because of circumstances relating to football and because of criticisms directed against the Director of the Department and the Head Football Coach pertaining to the results and conduct of football. Without neglecting other aspects of the policies and operations of the Department the committee has given major attention to matters pertaining to football.

Much criticism has been voiced publicly concerning the initial selection of the present Head Football Coach. . . . Much comment has also been made publicly that the Head Football Coach should be a Minnesota graduate, and "M" man. While the committee recognizes that a locally well-known reputation in sports and acquaintance with local conditions and people are very valuable assets to a coach, it rejects the view that a man who does not have this background should not merit consideration and appointment. Minnesota has no monopoly in producing able men.

This committee is not competent to judge the technical aspects of football play and it takes therefore no issue with this matter. It is only proper to report, however, that no criticism against the technical competence of the Head Football Coach was expressed by people whom the committee believes to be highly qualified.

The committee believes that the Head Football Coach found it difficult to adjust to personnel and conditions at Minnesota which are apparently somewhat different from those he encountered elsewhere. It required some time, evidently, before he became aware of this.

Last December the highest competent authority

rejected open requests for changes in personnel in the Department. Under these circumstances there is only one course open. That is to work for immediate improvement of conditions, in every respect.

In the light of this report, let those who we criticized take stock of their situation; let those who have criticized likewise appraise their stand.

Let us all forget past disagreements.

The committee found that while there have been definite weaknesses in the conduct of some of the operations of the Department, many of the past public criticisms were exaggerated and not based on factual, unbiased information.

The committee reported that the Director and the Head Football Coach are sensitive to the criticisms which have been expressed; sincere and effective measures are in progress to improve conditions.

After some internal maneuvering to try to ensure that the Regents could read the report before reading about it in the paper, President Morrill presented it to them at their May 8 meeting and then released it to the press. The news reports took quick note of a specific recommendation to hire a director of public relations and began to speculate who might get the job. Charles Johnson concluded that Armstrong and Warmath "didn't escape censure" but said that the committee and its reports "may not have healed all the wounds, but may have set the stage for a temporary truce among the various factions involved." Armstrong publicly commended the report as "helpful," while Warmath had no comment. Morrill, in his press release, said the committee had "done a good and useful job" and that the recommendations were "sound and worthy of favorable consideration."

The "M" Club board of directors met the Monday after the Regents' meeting to review the report and adopted a statement. They decided they were "in agreement with a substantial number of the points which are made and we feel they confirm our stand that all is not as it should be in the athletic department." But, "the few brief recommendations . . . seem to us inadequate and incomplete." They also concluded that "the University administration within its own group desires to determine the complete corrective course of action in as much detail as is deemed necessary. We respectfully urge that this be done with all possible speed." The Club did not renew its call for the removal of Armstrong and Warmath and did pledge its continuing cooperation.

The Regents met on June 13, 1959, and one of the subjects of discussion was the financial situation of Ike Armstrong if he were to retire early or assume a professional appointment at a reduced salary. They also agreed that the President should proceed with implementing committee recommendations having to do with physical education and intramurals and asking SCIA to frame a statement on athletic policy. The Board was scheduled to meet again on June 26; according to Sid Hartment of the Tribune, one of the agenda items was Armstrong's future as a director. "One group of regents is determined to have Armstrong resign as athletic director effective June 1960" when he would be 65. That group of regents, said Hartman, felt "it will be much easier to hire a new president to replace the retiring J. L. Morrill if the incoming proxy believes he can correct problems in the athletic department by hiring a new director." Morrill was reportedly opposed to forcing Armstrong to retire at age 65 rather than the normal 68. Because several regents were absent, however, the subject of athletics came up only briefly at the June 26 meeting.

The rather terse memo to the files that routinely followed Regents' meetings only noted, after the July 24 meeting, that Morrill was authorized to proceed on his recommendations as he saw fit. What actually transpired, however, was revealed in a subsequent exchange of correspondence Morrill had with two Regents, Griggs and Daniel Gainey.

Griggs, whose strongly held views were well known, missed part of the discussion and wrote to ask the President to tell him what had happened. In his note, Griggs advocated a transfer of Armstrong to some other position. Morrill wrote back, and related that Regent Gainey had made a motion, which was seconded, directing the administration to do what Griggs had asked: transfer Armstrong to a professorial spot at age 65. "There was then considerable discussion of the motion. I pleaded that the Regents would not adopt it and I won't repeat my arguments here for that although I believe they were cogent and persuasive." Six of the Regents spoke against the motion; then "Dr. Mayo clearly indicated his opposition and called for a vote. The discussion had made it

pretty apparent, I think, that Mr. Gainey's motion would not prevail and indeed would receive only three affirmative votes." At that point the seconder withdrew the second, so there was no motion on which to vote.

Morrill concluded his letter with two comments of note. "Athletic issues are never really settled, I suppose, and I would judge that if our football season is not a very successful one, the whole issue would be likely to recur." Morrill predicted accurately. He also revealed his own fatigue: "I am really tired out and have never looked forward more eagerly to a vacation than this one." (In another letter, written earlier, Morrill said it was "a vacation for which I sorely long after the most miserable and discouraging year of my Minnesota experience, what with athletics and our legislative struggles.")

Griggs wrote back again to assure the President that "the outcome was about what I expected and I shall, of course, abide by it. I will make no further statements or be drawn into any." Bespeaking his own great respect for Morrill, Griggs went on to say that "if I had felt that my position would be acceptable to the Board over your own judgement and your position as President, I would not have wanted it to ever have come to a vote. At no time have I wanted the Board to repudiate your judgement." He told Morrill he hoped that in the President's last year he could go out in 'a blaze of glory' and that the two great Presidents--'and I have known every single one'--were Coffman and Morrill.

Regent Gainey also wrote to Morrill to compliment him on the effectiveness of his speech in opposing his--Gainey's-- motion. The two men wrote back and forth on removal of people from positions at the University and the elements of leadership. Gainey closed the exchange in mid-August with the observation that he had never been and "am not now particularly opposed to Armstrong. I have felt that we . . . should not have allowed ourselves to get mousetrapped into the current situation, and it seemed advisable to face up to it as strongly as possible."

Running concurrently with the regental deliberations was a series of written exchanges between Morrill and the four men whose names have appeared earlier: LeVoir, Lund, Sommer, and Wright. Sommer opened the correspondence, on April 29, by transmitting a seven-page statement that the four of them had privately written. "Some of us have been rather silent during the last few months but, nevertheless, we have been thinking" was the first paragraph of Sommer's letter. He told Morrill that the appended statement could be used in any way the President wished. They wrote to him only because they did not wish to take up any of his time.

The four men clearly put much thought into their statement, because it was a reflective piece on what the University was about, the quality of its programs, and the extent to which there could and should be legitimate alumni involvement with the school.

Naturally, they also reviewed the athletic problem, in the context of their broader expressions. They described it as "widespread, intense and critical interest that has culminated in misunderstandings, harsh words, unfortunate rumors and accusations. . . . Statements have been made and challenged. Integrity has been questioned. Harm has been done. All this is regrettable. . . . We wish this matter to be properly resolved." Some of their other observations:

We suggest that the citizenry of the state of Minnesota should expect and there should be at all times the very best University leadership that can be obtained, that the staff be competent, that each staff member be responsible individually for able performance, that all departments be strong, that policies be pointed solely for the good of the state of Minnesota and its citizens, that major policies be clearly defined publicly and understood and that a strong liaison be maintained with the interested people of the state.

If the citizens and interested groups in Minnesota are entitled to this high effort and performance then they also have responsibilities. They must evidence a positive interest in the welfare of the University and the students. They must support its programs. They must be sober in their judgements. They must not be so ready to criticize that they look not at the far reaching effects of a University policy and at the traditions and deliberations that are a part of all major decisions.

For the University ever to shut itself off from the people is disastrous. For the people to unduly interfere with normal operation of the University is equally unsound. Both of these positions have been strained.

To the University of Minnesota Administration we suggest the following. We believe they merit the utmost consideration immediately.

- (1) Decide, as a University, the philosophy of an athletic program of intercollegiate athletics, intramural athletics a department of physical education.
- (2) Make public to the people of Minnesota the explicit attitude of the University Administration as to intercollegiate athletics.
- (3) Athletics has some faults. Which of us hasn't? Athletics is being derided by some. It is not being defended effectively or with zeal.
- (4) The University of Minnesota should set optimum standards for all staff members of the

athletic department as for any department of the University. Nothing less than the very best available at any time will do.

- (5) A liaison program with the people of the state and interested groups should be started, strongly expanded, continued and constantly upgraded. We do not feel this has been done effectively or in sufficient measure.

To all of us outside the University of Minnesota we suggest:

- (1) Maintain strong support of Minnesota athletics in a down cycle as well as an up cycle. This has not always been done.
- (2) Do not challenge the integrity of University administration. This has been unwisely done.
- (3) Speak positively for the University Athletic program. If you feel criticism is justified make it thoughtful and constructive.
- (4) Be vigilant of your interest and responsibility in University affairs. Differentiate, however, between policy and normal operations. Normal operations is the responsibility of the University.
- (5) Policy is also the responsibility of the University. Here, we believe the University has an obligation to all of us to make clear their policies. Here is the area in which we feel citizens and groups have a right to pass considered judgement.

This is our definition and feeling of the rights and responsibilities of the University of Minnesota and the people of Minnesota.

The report was dated the same day as that of the study committee, April 27.

Morrill wrote back to Sommers on May 12. He described their memo, and the committee report, as "grist for the mill," and said the best use he could make of it would be private. The President said he wished they had spoken out earlier.

I can't help wishing that you, Pug, Wells, and Babe had come to the front with this kind of good will and common sense much earlier in the face of the outrageous campaign by the present officers and directors of the "M" Club. I have felt myself a rather lonely target and have not been able to understand the silence and the acquiescence in that campaign by "M" Club men like yourself whom I have so much admired and respected.

Morrill related his uncertainty about whether the situation would improve and whether people would "close ranks and move ahead."

The four men were not pleased with Morrill's response; they wrote jointly to him again at the end of May, in a letter again authored by Sommers.

As we read and re-read your letter of May 12, together we conclude that:

- (1) We have not penetrated to you that we continue to think Minnesota's Athletic situation is serious.
- (2) You have not given our proposal serious consideration.
- (3) Further we are in no way encouraged to believe that you have recognized that anything needs to be done to correct this situation, nor that any particular action will be forthcoming.

It was not our intention to write further but you raised questions as to our lack of support and loyalty so we are obligated to speak our thoughts and be more specific.

You mention our acquiescence and silence. Our silence cannot be construed as acquiescence. We have not acquiesced in many of the tactics of the "M" Club and we promptly and vigorously voiced our opinions. It is unfortunate that some actions were ill-advised. We do, however, feel that a number of the purposes of "M" Club officials in approaching the University Administration last fall had merit.

It is true we were publicly silent. We had good reasons. We discussed making public statements at various times but always concluded they might not be beneficial.

Personally, I [that is, Sommer] have no further reasons for my silence. As I read the recommendations of the committee I find that I have been for all of them for years and some of them I have actively commented upon frequently.

I have always been courteously received by you and time has been made available whenever suggested. Yet, in a period of years, I have not seen any effect of these particular suggestions. Hence, my silence.

You asked us to interview the seven candidates for athletic director in 1950. This, we four did. To this date no person connected with the University of Minnesota has yet asked for our opinion on any one of the candidates.

One way or another, all of us have expressed our opinions. We have not enjoyed the definite feeling we have that our athletic department administration has been weak and that the department has been retrogressing rather than progressing for some years. We have maintained our enthusiasm, interest, and support of the Athletic Department and the zeal with which we have recruited student-athletes to Minnesota. Recently, it has not been easy.

We do not favor breaking specific term contracts. We do however feel that you could have avoided many problems and criticism if the athletic situation had been studied and appropriate action taken at an earlier date. . . . Please do not be misled into thinking that because many good thinking people disapprove of the "M" Club methods that they do not want much more vigorous action in Minnesota athletics and want changes, because they do.

As said earlier, we did not expect to get into specifics as we have but felt it necessary, after your reply, to inform you that these many months have not been easy for us. We suggest that the contents of this letter reflect the opinion of a much greater percentage of the good people in the state than you may think.

They closed by reaffirming their loyalty to the University and their willingness to help. Both Wright and Lund wrote separate letters to the President confirming their disappointment that he did not seem to understand the problems.

Morrill was perturbed by their comments and told them so in a letter a month later. He said he had reread their letters "at least three times" and "it seems to me there is a failure of understanding between us that appalls and discourages me terribly." He gently chided them for "a great many thoughtful generalizations about Minnesota athletics and two or three constructive recommendations, but no clearcut major suggestion of what you believe the University should do." "Unless," Morrill added, "you subscribe to the demand . . . that Armstrong and Warmath should be fired?" He recalled the hundreds of hours in conference and correspondence marked by "anxiety and anguish." He suggested that the five of them get together for dinner in the autumn. They all agreed to do so, but never did. In March of 1960, Morrill again wrote to Sommers regretting their failure to meet, pointing to his upcoming retirement as rendering any action now as futile, and urging them to work with the incoming President.

The 1959 season brought a mild repetition of the atmosphere that had existed the preceding fall. On November 12 WCCO Television broadcast an editorial rebuking "external sophomores," the "Grand and Exalted Order of Curbstone Quarterbacks," for reportedly gathering funds to pay off the remaining two years of Warmath's contract. The speaker

pointed out that Warmath was "not theirs to hire or fire," but called on the University to issue, "once and for all," a statement that it and it alone was responsible for the athletic department.

Three days later a Dakota County legislator wrote to Morrill to support the University "in the present uproar of criticism." If Warmath were to simply resign, or the Regents were to ask him to do so, it would be unfortunate but there would be no cause for "serious quarrel." For businessmen to attempt to buy him out, however, or for the Regents to do so, would be to recognize that "the fundamental, coldblooded purpose of any school's athletic program is to go out and beat the other fellow at whatever cost." He finished by saying that "the public positions of the Regents have been such as to command respect. I trust they shall continue to do so." Morrill said the University would not be a party to any such deal.

It was widely reported in the Twin Cities newspapers on November 21 that Warmath would not accept the rumored deal, either. He spoke to the "M" Club and told them he had not been contacted about being paid off and that "my contract has two years to run and I intend to fulfill it," according to Sid Hartman. The majority of the "M" Club members, said the sports writers, applauded the statement. The St. Paul Dispatch writer expected trouble. "Turmoil such as the University . . . never has experienced in its athletic affairs is expected to follow the close of the football season." Interviews with "M" Club members indicated that there will be no letup in the pressure" and also "indicated that the clamor will be far greater than a year ago."

Other press commentary followed over the next few days, including a column in the Star by Cedric Adams describing the treatment being accorded to Warmath and his family. Drunks throwing beer cans on their home steps at 2:00 a.m., chants, abusive letters, anonymous and obscene telephone calls, blackboard notes at his children's school, and so on. Joe Hennessy, in the Pioneer Press after the last and losing game, simply concluded that "Murray you gotta resign." It would not be right, or reasonable, and it must be despite the fact that "few people are held in more personal esteem than you are." Warmath declined to resign.

Towards the end of November, 1959, Charles Johnson did a piece which echoed the views Regent Griggs had made known to Middlebrook fourteen months earlier. Johnson averred that the difficulties stemmed from the fact that in 1956, "late in the season--specifically on the morning of the Michigan State game--Ike Armstrong walked into President J. L. Morrill's office and recommended that Warmath's contract, which was to run through the 1957 season, be torn up and a new one for five years be signed." Johnson now described it as "unusual," especially since there was neither "pressure or criticism." Morrill and the Regents approved the recommendation (although not without Griggs' dissent, as he pointed out). Johnson said the renewal "took everyone by surprise. . . . It was a cleverly engineered deal that looked harmless at the time."

In the same article Johnson asserted that "Armstrong personally picked Warmath as his gridiron boss in 1954. There was opposition from the few individuals Ike talked with before making the decision. . . . There was considerable unfavorable comment after . . . Ike stood his ground." If Haislet's iteration of Armstrong's comments were correct, of course, this was not true, and to a certain extent Armstrong was not as blameworthy as some held him. At no time, however did Armstrong make any public statement--as he had told Haislet he would not.

On December 8, 1959, the President met with the new "M" Club president, Norb Koch, as well as Clifford Sommer and Clayton Tonnemaker. It followed the inclusion of "M" Club leaders at a general alumni meeting, and was characterized by cordiality and understanding. Koch wrote to Morrill afterward to thank him "for the time and courtesy" of the meeting. "In a reign different from that which had prevailed earlier," Koch said, "we know that any decision you may have to make will be your own. . . . We only hope that . . . anything we may have said will help determine its ultimate course." The "decision" was, apparently, retention of the football coach.

That gathering was followed shortly by the Regents' meeting. No enlightening correspondence serves to expand on the brief file memo recording that Morrill reported the discussion with "M" Club representatives, reviewed fall developments in athletics, and that the Regents "voted to support the administration's handling of the athletic situation. Regent Griggs, abstaining."

The finale to "M" Club activity seems to have come with a January 2, 1960, letter to its members from Koch. The Club had, at Morrill's request, deferred any action until SCIA could adopt a statement of policy. The Club had done so, and was now writing to endorse the new statement. Although it also contained a line correcting any impression that Club silence implied a change of heart or view from the 1958 protest--which Koch said it did not--the point was not belabored and there was no call for anyone's removal. Koch sent the letter to Morrill, in fact, who wrote back to compliment him on the statement.

In his March, 1960, letter to Clifford Sommers, Morrill provided a revealing summary, all the more remarkable because of its brevity. "The train of events set in motion by the officers and directors of the 'M' Club a year ago last autumn drove the administration and the Regents of the University into a position which otherwise might have been different--and that for me at least, a surrender and retreat from that position would be unwise, stultifying and not now supportable by the Regents."

As is often the case with such episodes, history provided an ironical twist which no doubt amused Morrill, in his retirement, and probably many others as well. Warmath's team, 1-8 in 1958 and 2-7 in 1959, went to the Rose Bowl in 1961 (on an 8-1 record for 1960) and 1962 (on a 7-2 record for 1961) and was A. P. and U.P.I. national champion in 1960.

CHAPTER 11

CHOOSING A FOOTBALL COACH: 1983

Author's note: There arises the natural question about whether one can write a chapter, for a book intended to be a "history," when the events being recounted are recent. This chapter was written in the late summer of 1984, ten months after Coach Joe Salem resigned and the search for his successor began. Doubts about the validity of such an enterprise are increased when the author was himself intimately involved with the events. I was the staff to the search committee, and as such privy to many of the details of the search.

Despite these drawbacks, I decided to do this chapter anyway, primarily to get on the record at least an outline of what occurred. As anyone reading this book knows there was little documentation available for previous searches; this chapter is an attempt to remedy that gap in the information available. Writing it now also permits me to draw comparisons and note parallels with prior searches, to the extent they seem valid and noteworthy.

Finally, however, this chapter may include entries and observations that border on personal narrative--which is precisely what they are. While this chapter was circulated, in draft form, to the members of the search committee for their comments, opinions and additions, it nonetheless must perforce remain my own recounting.

Even with the foregoing comments intended to warn the reader, I want to note that I have attempted to write this chapter in as dispassionate and disinterested a tone as possible. I have not used the first person; when the term "staff to the committee," "assistant" or "staff to Vice President Wilderson," or some similar phrase is used, you may assume it was me.

- Gary Engstrand

CHOOSING A FOOTBALL COACH: 1983

By the middle of the 1983 football season people began to wonder if there would be a new football coach. In 1982 Minnesota won its first three games and then lost the next eight. Seven games into the 1983 season, Minnesota had won the first game and had lost the next six. That year one magazine had ranked Rice University as the worst NCAA Division I-A football team; Minnesota was second from the bottom in the 120-odd long list of schools. The one victory Minnesota had in 1983 was over Rice.

Given what was a disastrous won-lost record over two seasons, there was remarkably little public outcry demanding that Coach Joe Salem be fired. Sid Hartman's view was that Salem was personally popular: "You never hear anybody say a word against him."

That there had been some thought given to the future of football, however, is evidenced by internal administrative memoranda. Early in October, 1983, University Vice President Frank Wilderson, who had line responsibility for intercollegiate athletics, wrote to President C. Peter Magrath following a discussion he, Wilderson, had had with athletic director Paul Giel. While he had made no decision about changing football coaches, Giel wanted to be certain that the administration would stand behind him if he did so. More important, probably, was Giel's request that the University begin to consider a great deal more support for the football program, in ways both small and large. Revenues in men's athletics had recently begun to outstrip expenses (Giel had finally wiped out a deficit of nearly one-half million dollars accrued during the late 1960s and early to mid-70s); the director wanted to use some of the resources to improve the practice and office facilities for football. Vice President Wilderson recommended to the President that he approve these requests.

Also suggestive of the possibility of a coaching change were discussions held by Wilderson and his staff, and others, about the possible membership on a search committee, should the need to appoint one arise. The Vice President asked his assistant, when the question arose, to anonymously contact the National Collegiate Athletic Association about rules governing who might be on such search committees. Specifically, was there any legislation which barred someone currently active in the management of a professional football team from serving on a college search committee? (The answer was that there was no rule prohibiting it but that to choose such an individual would certainly violate the spirit of NCAA rules which attempt to keep college and professional football apart. Wilderson concluded it would not be worth provoking even the frowns of the NCAA, so consideration of such an individual was dropped.)

On Monday morning October 24 Giel met with Salem. The

team was 1-6 thus far in the season and the losses had occasionally been by wide margins; Giel asked Salem to resign. According to Sid Hartman, Salem knew the request was coming; he had told Hartman on Sunday, October 23, that "I'm not going to be here next year." Salem agreed to Giel's request, and the announcement was made the following Tuesday morning. Salem was quoted as saying that "we were going downhill, not uphill;" "I felt it was in the best interests of myself and the whole staff."

PART I: The Search

The search for a new coach was announced by Wilderson, who said a search committee would be appointed immediately. Press speculation on possible successors also begin immediately; for the first time since 1950, Bud Wilkinson was not among those who were seen as likely or potential candidates.

By the 1980s the University's regulations governing hiring procedures had become more formalized, so there was no question that a committee would be appointed. The normal practice at the time was this: The appointing authority (in this case, Giel) would appoint a committee, meet with it to give it instructions about qualifications for the position, timing, and so forth, and then let the committee go about the business of accepting applications, soliciting nominations, screening individuals and conducting interviews. Following this, the committee would then present the administrator with a slate of candidates from whom Giel, in this instance, could make his choice. The director would then recommend to the Vice President, the President, and eventually the Board of Regents, one of the candidates whose name had appeared on the slate submitted by the search committee. It was understood by all involved in every hire that the committee was to search; it was not a selection committee. The slate should only include the names of individuals who met the publicly-announced criteria for the position and all of whom were acceptable to at least a majority of the search committee members.

As had been the case since Henry Williams was replaced after the 1921 season, there was presidential involvement in the selection process. In a variation on the usual search procedure, approved by the University's Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action office (which was charged with responsibility for insuring that all searches were conducted fairly, correctly, and in conformity with applicable state and federal laws), President Magrath appointed Vice President Wilderson as chairman of the search committee and asked Wilderson to appoint the other members. Magrath asked that a slate of candidates be submitted to Giel, from which he could make a choice and recommendation to the University. Wilderson agreed to do so.

The President, in his October 27 letter to Wilderson asking him to chair the search committee, made several other comments.

- The "objective must be to field a football team . . . that wins more games than it loses. . . . Sooner or later . . . our new coach should build a team strong enough to be invited to bowl games, and . . . the Rose Bowl."
- There must be a demonstrated commitment, on the part of the new coach, to the welfare of the athletes as students.
- It must be a "clean" program, run within the rules.

He also declared, noting "the enormous amount of speculation in the media about likely successors," that "you and I know that no decision of any kind has been made." Finally, Magrath admonished the committee to actively seek candidates and "not be limited to the names of those who may apply for the position." By the language of his letter, the President confirmed a statement in Sid Hartman's column a few days before: "Magrath is in favor of a winning football team at Minnesota."

Because he had already given some thought to the membership of a committee, and because he had immediately begun to contact individuals about serving, Wilderson was able to send a letter the following day to the ten people selected conveying his appreciation for "your willingness to serve as members of the search committee." This polite and gracious language does not, of course, reveal that there was a great deal of interest expressed, by a large number of people, in being chosen as members of the committee. More than one individual contacted friends at the University in an attempt to exercise influence and obtain a seat. With only one exception, to be mentioned shortly, Wilderson did not respond to these efforts and made his own selections (in consultation with Magrath, with Giel, and with his staff).

A ten-member search committee was large compared to the norm for the University. Wilderson, however, believed that as many of the interested and constituent groups as possible should be represented. He also felt that there should be as many people as possible on the committee who were experts on football and who could, because of their experience, bring candidates, advice, and contacts to work on behalf of the University. (This latter consideration would serve to forestall the criticisms levelled against the Pierce committee when it selected Fritz Crisler in 1930, which were that the committee didn't know anything about football. The inclusion of expertise on football, in the 1983 choice of committee members, it must be said, was not made with the 1930 experience in mind. This was not wisdom based on the knowledge of history; no one involved in 1983 knew of that episode. Rather, such expertise was sought simply because it seemed the logical thing to do.)

Wilderson's choices were these: Jim Anderson (student body president), Merrily Baker (director of women's athletics), Billy Bye and Mike Wright (both former Minnesota football stars; Wright had also played professional football and had served on the 1978 search committee; both were active

in supporting athletics and the University), Alan Page (former Notre Dame and Minnesota Viking football great), Bob Stein (Dean of the Law School and faculty representative for men to the Big Ten, who had previously been a vice president with responsibility for athletics and who had also served on the search committee in 1978), and the late Lillian Williams (director of the Affirmative Action office; she died in July of 1984). The committee, in short, included representation for students, faculty, the administration, and alumni and simultaneously, men and women and Blacks and Whites.

In another unusual but not illegal or even unacceptable step, Wilderson appointed Giel as an ex-officio non-voting member of the committee. Magrath's October 27 letter to Wilderson had asked that he work closely with the director. Giel had, in the past, commented somewhat ruefully that someone in his position usually got "three strikes" and then he was out; that is, the next football coach would be his third such appointment, and if this coach did not succeed, Giel felt his own position would be at risk. A Daily editorial writer quoted Giel on this very point. "If Giel misses for a third consecutive time at bringing in a savior, Giel and his new coach will probably walk off the plank together. . . . 'I know the next time they'll be asking for someone to replace me.'"

While no one in the University administration had ever made such a statement to him, and Giel's felt pressure was self-imposed, Wilderson nonetheless believed that the coach would have to work so closely with the director, and would be so important to the future of the department, that it was necessary and appropriate that Giel serve on the committee. It was Wilderson's plan that only when deliberation about the final slate took place, after all screening and interviewing was complete, would Giel be excluded. He advised the committee of this plan in his initial letter to it.

The interest of the "M" Club in the selection of the football coach has been noted frequently in preceding chapters. In formulating his initial list of search committee members, Wilderson had not included a representative from that group. In response to a request from a member of the legislature, however, he agreed to appoint Bob Stein, incoming "M" Club president. Although inclusion of an "M" Club representative was no guarantee that its members would support the final selection, as Morrill's experience in 1951 demonstrated, to exclude it altogether would, if history were any guide, increase the chances of opposition and intrigue. Although the fact that Stein, a practicing attorney, acted as an agent for a number of professional athletes was a concern (in light of the exchange with the NCAA), his experience as a former Minnesota and professional football player and his widespread network of friends and acquaintances in football ranks was seen as a decided advantage.

The search committee held its first meeting on November 1; its guest was President Magrath. A brief synopsis of the meeting:

- The President repeated the institutional commitment to a winning program within the rules, and his request that it go beyond applicants.
- Committee members discussed salary, improvements in facilities, and the need for a school focus on football.
- The job would be a better one now than when either Stoll or Salem took it: "It has been a sputtering program; now it's in the pits. . . . Perhaps we can make a virtue out of necessity."
- There would be a need to negotiate with a prospective coach about what commitments he would want and what the University could guarantee.
- The new coach must be a good administrator.
- There was a need for absolute confidentiality.
- It was unclear how to approach "big name" coaches, but anyone on the committee was free to contact anyone they wished about possible candidates.
- The notice of the position would be circulated to all NCAA Division I and professional football teams, and experience at that level would be a minimum requirement.
- For the purpose of the search, anyone nominated by a committee member would be considered an "applicant," whether or not the nominee were aware of the "candidacy."
- The committee would, at its next meeting, formulate a "wish list" of candidates, putting aside all questions of salary or availability--if only to use the list as one means to identify the characteristics of the individual being sought.
- The deadline for applications and nominations would be three weeks hence: November 21.

When asked by one committee member what sort of candidate he would like, ideally, Giel said it would be someone like Lou Holtz.

By the close of the second meeting, on November 7, the committee had compiled an initial list of 60 names of "candidates," some of whom had applied--but most of whom had not. The list ranged from relatively unknown coaches and assistant coaches, who had been recommended by credible sources, to some very famous football names (Dick Vermeil, Joe Paterno, Johnny Majors, Hank Stram, Bill Walsh, and John Madden) and head coaches at successful Division I programs (Texas, Miami, Maryland, UCLA, Berkeley, Washington, North Carolina, etc.). The committee had concluded it would consider everyone it wanted to, whether or not the individuals knew it or cared.

In addition to compiling a list, the committee developed four criteria it agreed would be used in judging prospective candidates. They were coaching skills, administrative skills, recruiting skills, and personal characteristics (a commitment to academic values and a sensitivity to minorities and women).

The committee also decided, after talking about the idea during its two meetings thus far, that it would invite both former coaches Salem and Stoll in to explain what went wrong and what improvements would be needed. Four days later they met with the two men, for over an hour each, to get an appraisal. In response to a question from Stoll, one committee member explained that the group would not only act as a search committee, it would also tender advice to the University on how the football team and program could be improved. Both coaches had a long list of suggestions.

On Saturday, November 12, the committee held its fourth meeting. Wilderson summarized the results of informal conversations he had been having with members of the Board of Regents; all had expressed support for significant programmatic improvements in the football program. Dean Stein wryly observed that the Regents were more enthusiastic about improving the football team than had been the University administration (including, he admitted, himself, during his vice presidential tenure from 1978 to 1980).

The Dean then reviewed the major items mentioned by Salem and Stoll during the meeting the day before. Along with academic aid and housing, the biggest single problem appeared to be practice, training, and meeting facilities. One committee member said the University should build a separate football building; the proposal was met with considerable reluctance, primarily for financial reasons, although it was agreed the possibility should be explored.

In the five days since the previous meeting to discuss candidates, the committee members had begun to seek out information on the 60 people who had been on the initial list. In the intervening period, other names had been suggested after University staff members had made calls to personal friends and committee members had made their own inquiries. By the end of the three and one-half hour meeting the list had 54 names; some from the first list had been deleted and others had been added as a result of inquiry by committee members and University staff members. Of the 54, 14 had formally applied. Each applicant or prospective candidate was reviewed. At this same meeting the committee examined a list of every active Division I football coach.

The committee also dealt at length with two other issues. One was whether or not the University would ("was ready to") hire a black head coach, and the concomitant concern about whether or not minority group candidates might be "used." There was no "decision," but the cautions were noted and the sentiment seemed to be that a black coach would receive the institutional and community support needed.

The other matter was leaks to the press. One committee member brought up the subject by expressing dismay that the names of potential candidates kept appearing in Sid Hartman's column. Another said he was very irritated at the publication of the names, and warned sternly that their premature release would kill off the chances of hiring a good coach and doom the University to mediocrity. He added that his frustration was such that he was prepared to vote against anyone whose name appeared; Hartman, he complained, was chasing candidates away and doing a serious disservice to the University. Vice President Wilderson told the committee that the President had told Mr. Hartman he was damaging the search.

By the end of the meeting the committee identified 19 of the people on the list (none of whom had applied) who were to be contacted and which committee member was to make the contact.

The fifth meeting of the committee was held November 15 at Eastcliff, the University president's residence, and lasted from 7:00 p.m. to after midnight. The 19 assignments were discussed, and a variety of information about others was made available. Several of the committee nominees were removed because they had said, either directly to a search committee member or through friends, that they would not consider moving. By the end of the meeting the list of candidates stood at 48, of whom 17 had applied.

Another discussion that was to recur was about the media. The continued publication of the names of possible candidates remained a concern; the committee members wondered who was responsible and quizzed Giel. The director said he was not a source. Two committee members also reported of a radio show they had heard the Sunday two days earlier; Sid Hartman had first commended the committee, but had then said the Minnesota job was terrible, he would advise anyone not to take it, berated the committee for considering individuals it could not obtain, and called the committee "jerks," which provoked considerable ire among committee members.

At its November 22 meeting, a week later, the committee had available a significant pool of information on its candidates:

- Conference publications;
- Coaching records;
- Committee interviews with people knowledgeable about the candidates; and
- A large set of ratings on each from telephone conversations held by two University staff members with ten colleagues around the country; each candidate, where known, was ranked on the criteria the committee had earlier established.

Coming into the meeting, the committee had two groups of people: Those who had themselves applied (37 names) and

those whose names had been put in by the committee (31 names). Vice President Wilderson had made it known at the outset that all the applicants would have to be considered. (As noted, 17 of the applicants were also on the committee list, from the previous meeting, so the total committee list was 48: 31 nominees and 17 applicants.)

The first task undertaken by the committee was to review all additional information that had been obtained. As a result of these discussions, 9 of the 31 committee nominations were removed from the list, reducing it to 22; most, again, had taken themselves out.

The second task was a review of the 37 applicants. At the request of the committee, two University staff members had been asked to review the applicant files after the November 21 closing date; they had done so and informed the committee that 13 of the 37 were not qualified (did not meet the minimum criteria of experience or education set by the committee) or gave no indication of qualifications. That left 24 applicants warranting consideration.

The third and most time-consuming task was to review all 46 files--24 applicants and 22 committee nominees. Each committee member ranked each of the 46, on a scale of 1-5, on each of the four criteria that had been established earlier; a perfect candidate score would have been 20. If all nine members of the committee awarded a score of 20 to the same candidate, he would receive a perfect 180.

During the approximately three hours it took the committee members to individually review each file, one member stepped out to make a call to Lou Holtz at a time that had been prearranged. Following the conversation, it was reported that Holtz was interested in at least thinking about the possibility and asked to have the upcoming Thanksgiving weekend to mull it over.

Before the candidate review began, the committee members continued a discussion begun at the previous meeting: How were they to deal with the potential candidacy of one individual, respected in the ranks of football, but whom the committee was uncertain could do the job needed at Minnesota. He had provided the materials to Giel about his career but he had not formally applied. The opinions that committee members had received seemed to be either strongly in favor of him or strongly opposed. Giel had talked to him, also. Weighing heavily on the committee was the fact that he had a record as a winner; militating against him was the question about whether an older individual would have the energy to rebuild a football program that was in a shambles. Perhaps most troubling to the committee was the likely public impact if a well-known individual were not to be included on the list of people to be interviewed. Already under sharp scrutiny, and with almost constant leaks to the press, some committee members felt the group would look foolish if it didn't even give him a chance. Others suggested interviewing him, but it was pointed out that to cut him out before forwarding the slate to Giel would create equally intense pressure, if not more, and might be considered an insult to

the individual. And to interview and put him on the slate would put Giel under pressure, even though he might find another candidate better able to tackle the problems at Minnesota. The result, in all instances, was that the committee, or Giel, would be perceived as avoiding a coach of some stature. Such intimations had already appeared in the local press. The committee came to no resolution on him, and decided to rate the candidates to see where the situation was after that.

After the rankings were done, the list of 46 sorted itself out reasonably neatly. One candidate received a rating of 176 out of the possible maximum of 180; eight others ranged from 162 to 132. Three were at 126-127 and seven ranged from 116-122. The committee decided it would interview the top nine candidates as soon as possible, hold the second ten in abeyance pending the outcome of those interviews, and inform the remainder (of those who had actually applied) that they were not being considered.

Of the top nine candidates, three had applied, six had not. Of those six, four had indicated a willingness to talk; two had not yet been contacted.

It was agreed that interviews would be scheduled; where a candidate (who was not an applicant) was willing to talk but not publicly, the committee agreed to go to him at a location and time agreeable; whoever from the committee was available at those times would go.

The committee moved quickly. Three days later, Friday, November 25, the first interview was scheduled (the day after Thanksgiving) and three more followed, one on each of the succeeding three days. By the Monday night, following the fourth interview, the committee had learned three additional facts:

- That one of their top nine candidates had taken himself out; upon being contacted, he thanked the committee but said he would not move.
- That another of the top nine, Lou Holtz, declined after thinking about the position, primarily, he told the committee, because of the weather. The committee was disappointed, decided to ask President Magrath to call to give it one final try, but agreed to proceed on its interviewing schedule.
- That Paul Giel would soon have to undergo heart bypass surgery. The director's health became of great concern to the committee; it also appeared that if the surgery needed to be scheduled in the very near future, it would complicate the selection timing. The committee members deliberated at some length with the director on what might occur; he felt he needed to see and interview whoever would be on the final list before making a choice; the committee agreed, but was also concerned that if Giel were hospitalized for a period of several weeks, the University could not afford to wait and

might have to act.

In addition to interviewing candidates, the committee agreed to receive a contingent from the Minnesota High School Football Coaches Association. Five high school coaches met with the committee, with the understanding that they would not lobby for any particular candidate; they explained at length the difficulties and problems they had observed in the Minnesota football program.

The last four interviews were completed Wednesday, November 30, and December 1; the first three were out of the state and the last was on Thursday night in Bloomington, Minensota. Following the final interview, Giel left and committee members met until 1:30 a.m. discussing the eight interviews; not all committee members had been at all interviews. (The original top nine had been reduced to seven by the withdrawal of Holtz and the one other; the committee had decided, along the way, to interview one additional individual, so there were eight.) Despite the wish of several, two of the University members of the committee warned that it would be unacceptable to submit a ranked slate to the director; he must be given an unranked list of acceptable candidates and then be permitted the discretion to choose whoever he wanted from that list. To rank them would be to dictate the selection, because Giel would almost be forced to choose the top-ranked candidate whether or not he could work with the individual or whether or not he brought what attributes were needed. A slate would be public; to choose someone not ranked first would also invite lawsuits. The committee concurred.

On the basis of the discussion and interviews, each committee member was asked to write down his or her top five choices; it was agreed beforehand that any candidate who received less than five votes (i.e., majority support from the committee) would not be on the slate. After the tallying was complete, four of the eight candidates had received majority support: two had received nine votes, one received seven, and one received five. The slate was complete, exactly one month after the first committee meeting.

After this meeting, the only accurate description of events, from the committee perspective, was that all hell broke loose.

The committee was startled to read, in Sid Hartman's column the next morning, December 2, that it had interviewed Dan Devine the night before. Its members were even more astonished to see the names of all of the eight top candidates who had been interviewed over the preceding week. While Hartman's only gap in knowledge was that the interviews had already been completed--he wrote that they "have been or will be interviewed"--the list was accurate. Perhaps most galling to the committee members--apart from the leak itself--was the violation of the guarantee of confidentiality that had been extended to three or four of the coaches, men who had not applied, who currently had jobs, and who had extended the courtesy of meeting with delegations of the search committee at its request.

With the appearance of Hartman's next column, on December 3, it was clear that the serious breach in the confidentiality of the committee proceedings had turned into a complete collapse. Hartman outlined the itinerary that had been followed in conducting the out-of-state interviews and named the search committee members who had conducted them. Hartman also identified the names of the four candidates who had been submitted to Giel, decided upon at the late night meeting two days earlier: Rick Carter, at Holy Cross; LaVell Edwards, at Brigham Young; Les Steckel, on the Minnesota Vikings staff; and Bobby Ross, at Maryland. Hartman's only error was the statement that Edwards had applied for the Minnesota job; he had not done so. Hartman also commented that "a surprise absentee from the list is Pittsburgh Steeler offensive coordinator Tom Moore, who was considered a certain finalist." Moore had been touted in the Twin Cities press, but the committee had never been of the view that anyone would be a "certain finalist."

The publication of such detailed information about the actions and decisions of the committee provoked an uproar among its members. They were furious. While some of the earlier leaks, less serious in scope and impact, had caused flickering doubts among committee members about each others' ability to remain close-mouthed, there had been no real question of the integrity and commitment of each individual to the search process.

With the appearance of the two Hartman columns, however, those doubts, previously muted, flared into open recriminations. One committee member conveyed to the staff to the committee his own feelings; although a paraphrase, most of the words are his:

I'm so goddam mad at everyone associated with this search that I can hardly see straight. I can no longer trust anyone in that room. I want to clear my own name, which has been hurt by being involved; I want lie detector tests administered to everyone on the committee. This is the worst possible outcome. Our ability to recruit an outstanding coach has been badly damaged. We are now being hurt by not talking about the process we used. President Magrath should hold a press conference. This is really a fiasco.

Committee members speculated on who had given out the information.

The "damage" anticipated was that the three candidates, on the final slate of four, who had not applied for the job would now refuse to consider it. All three were subjected to public questioning at home about their intentions. Vice President Wilderson sent to all four of the individuals on the slate a letter of apology for the release of their names. He wrote:

It is apparent that someone on the Search Committee is determined to destroy the confidentiality of our proceedings. . . . Those of us . . . who made promises in good faith that our efforts would remain confidential until formal steps were taken are saddened and angry about what has happened.

He expressed the hope that they would remain open-minded, and told them "we profoundly regret any embarrassment that this may have caused you."

With the University's endorsement, the committee had also been evolving into an advisory group to propose steps to improve the football team apart from producing a slate of candidates for coach. It needed one more meeting to approve the final wording of its recommendations. A draft had been circulated, some telephone discussions had taken place, and the committee agreed to meet December 8 to recast the language for the committee letter to the President.

There were press comments over the next few days following the reevaluations about the finalists and the slate.

-- Minneapolis Star and Tribune, December 4 (Joe Soucheray):

There is infinite wisdom only in the appointment of Edwards.

"We are moving in the right direction," Wilderson said Friday.

The reason for calling Wilderson in the first place was the pleasantly surprising news that Edwards had suddenly appeared on the list of candidates. Why Edwards would appear as a candidate at this late date, almost offhandedly, was a mystery worth running down, especially if the committee of 10 was genuinely interested in a hot coach, or if the names of all the other candidates simply were intended to camouflage Tom Moore, the Pittsburgh Steeler's offensive coordinator, until he signed a contract. But as surprising as the candidacy of Edwards was the slipping back of Moore, who, despite all his favorable prarace publicity, was not a finalist after all.

But I'm not looking for work," Edwards said Friday from Provo, Utah. "Yes, Minnesota did approach me, but I haven't decided at this point just what my interests are concerning Minnesota. I'm happy here and I have no intention of leaving."

It not only seemed logical to inquire further of Edwards, but to insist that if he were a candidate in good standing, then why has the committee of 10 even bothered to interview anyone else.

"That's great news about Edwards," Wilderson was told Friday. "Is he a candidate you are regarding seriously?"

"Our ground rules," Wilderson said, "don't permit us to reveal who is or isn't a serious candidate. We've talked with a lot of people, but we can't afford to have any candidate's name surface in the paper."

But the name of LaVell Edwards already surfaced Friday in the newspaper, before Wilderson was called, which placed other newspapermen in the somewhat confusing position of getting search committee news out of the newspaper, or just where it wasn't supposed to be. Wilderson wouldn't budge.

"I can't tell you one way or another," said Alan Page, also a member of the committee. "I do find it aggravating to spend until 2 a.m. on a committee meeting and then read in the paper the next day about that meeting."

-- Minneapolis Star and Tribune, December 4, (Sid Hartman):

At LSU, where they fired football Coach Jerry Stovall and hired Miami Dolphines defensive coordinator Bill Arnsparger, Athletic Director Bob Brodhead made the decision.

Brodhead had been a member of the Dolphins' executive staff and had watched Arnsperger operate. So when he needed a coach, he hired who he thought was the best man available.

At Minnesota, they named a search committee. This isn't any criticism of any member of the search committee. It had a number of outstanding people on it.

But how can one expect a committee to judge the ability of a football coach on the basis of the presentation he makes before a group.

Tom Moore, the offensive coordinator at Pittsburgh, and Dan Devine, the former Notre Dame coach, are two people I know well. I wouldn't expect either one of them to see a committee made up of some academic people who aren't in a position to judge a football coach.

On the other hand, Vikings assistant Les Steckel is a handsome, personable, sharp and smart young man who could sell anybody. I'm not saying Steckel is not a good football man. He is. And if he is named to the Gophers position, as expected, he will do an outstanding job.

But Moore has such great credentials it is almost impossible to understand why he was not ranked with the top four coaches interviewed.

I'm willing to take all bets that once Edwards, Carter and Ross check out the problems at Minnesota they will say no thanks.

Edwards, 52, told friends he wants to make one move before he retires from coaching. He doesn't get paid big money at BYU and doesn't have a lucrative television contract. He gets an annual 6 percent raise as do all of the other professors at BYU. Stanford is interested in Edwards. And if he decides to move, rest assured he will pick Stanford over Minnesota.

What the committee ordered Giel to do was to hire Steckel, who is the best candidate of the four for the job. But Steckel is too smart to take the job unless a lot of changes are made.

-- Minnesota Daily, December 5:

Minnesota athletic director Paul Giel Sunday confirmed earlier reports that Pittsburgh Steelers assistant coach Tom Moore was not among those recommended by a search committee for the next Gopher football coach.

Moore's absence from the list was a surprise

because, along with Steckel, he was considered a leading candidate for the job. Apparently, Moore did not present himself well in the committee's interview, and he was asking for too much money.

"I'm disappointed," Giel said of Moore's absence. "That's all I'll say."

Steckel is probably Giel's first choice anyway.

But Moore also had several strong points, not the least of which is his association with the Steelers, one of the most successful franchises in the National Football League.

Giel wanted the option of making a choice between the two. Even if Steckel were given the nod over Moore, there is still the chance, however remote, that Steckel would decline the offer. Giel would have had Moore to fall back on.

As it is, Giel knows very little about Edwards, Ross, or Carter. He's spoken with each on the phone but has never met any of them face-to-face.

-- Minneapolis Star and Tribune, December 6:

Frank Wilderson, chairman of the University of Minnesota football coach search committee, said Monday night that the committee's work has been completed and that four names have been submitted to Paul Giel for consideration.

Giel said yesterday that he has met only Steckel in person and hopes to be able to meet personally with Carter and Ross as soon as possible.

"Right now it doesn't look good for Edwards," Giel said. "I have gotten permission from their athletic directors to talk to Carter and Ross, but I haven't been able to get in touch with them to set up anything."

It was reported yesterday that over the weekend Edwards withdrew his name from consideration and Giel's comments would seem to confirm that.

When asked if there actually was only one available candidate--Steckel--for the job at Minnesota, Wilderson said, "Each of the people, whose names have been submitted to Mr. Giel, has met with at least some of the members of the committee and they are convinced that he is a candidate for the job."

-- Minneapolis Star and Tribune, December 6 (Sid Hartman):

Rick Carter of Holy Cross and Bobby Ross of Maryland, two of the four coaches recommended to Paul Giel by the University of Minnesota Search

Committee, are under contract.

BYU Coach LaVell Edwards, one of the four recommended, withdrew as a candidate Sunday. So now Vikings assistant Les Steckel is the only one of the four the committee recommended who likely will be available for Giel to hire.

-- Minneapolis Star and Tribune, December 7:

The search for the next University of Minnesota football coach is "slowly zeroing in on Les Steckel," men's athletic director Paul Giel said Tuesday.

"Right now he's on the back burner," Giel said of Carter. "I had the real strong feeling that he'd like a shot at the job, but he wanted me to say that the job was his. That's really something I can't promise him. I've only talked to him on the telephone and I'd like to meet him face-to-face. He said he understood that I couldn't make that kind of a promise."

Giel said that he has tried for the last two days to reach Bobby Ross, head coach at Maryland, but has been unsuccessful.

Giel said he also would like to talk again with LaVell Edwards, head coach at Brigham Young, the fourth candidate. Edwards told university official last weekend that he was withdrawing his name from consideration, however.

"All of his family is in Utah," Giel said of Edwards, "and I think that blood is thicker than water. He would just as soon stay where he is right now. But I am supposed to talk to him again."

Steckel, an assistant coach with the Vikings, is the only one of the four candidates who has officially applied for the job. He is also the only candidate who has been interviewed by the entire screening committee.

Steckel told Viking public relations officials yesterday that he doesn't want to talk to reporters about the Gopher position, other than to say that he has applied and is interested.

"It's your deduction," Giel said. "But the last viable candidate is Steckel." [Giel denies having said anything like this.]

In the atmosphere of mistrust that had come to prevail with the release of the names, two lines of thought had developed to explain the unwelcome publicity. One was focused on Giel, who, it was suspected by some, had wanted Tom Moore all along and who was now trying to drive off all four of the finalists in the hope that the search would be

started over and Moore's name would appear on a new slate. The second was directed toward one of the committee members, who had strongly supported Steckel, and who, it was presumed, hoped to eliminate the three non-applicants (Carter, Edwards, and Ross), leaving Giel with only Steckel.

When the committee met, on December 8, the draft recommendations were set aside for a time in order to discuss the situation. The one committee member about whom there had been some suspicions angrily denied their validity. He acknowledged that he had supported Steckel, but it had been in the context of committee discussions about candidates, that he had no apologies to make for his views, and that he had not and would not undermine the search process. He said "I unequivocally assert that I am not the source of the names" and insisted that if committee members were going to challenge one another, they should confront the issue and have it out then and there. He also said he disliked the phrase in Vice President Wilderson's letter about someone on the committee being determined to destroy the confidentiality of its activities.

Another of the committee members accused the director of releasing the names and excoriated him for not publicly supporting the committee and its work. The committee, he said, was left "twisting in the wind" and the University was being discredited. Giel also angrily denied he had given out the names and said he believed there were four viable candidates.

As the discussion calmed down, several members of the committee made comments. One said this was not "Gophergate" but that there should be concern that rebuilding the football team was getting off to a very bad start. That committee member also endorsed the language of Wilderson's letter. Another said that irrespective of the press comments the committee had conducted a fair and honest search and, in response to public questions asked by a member of the Board of Regents, said the Board should be told that the committee had done a good job. Vice President Wilderson suggested he could make a statement about the work of the committee; one member expressed doubt that it would do much good because he was one of the "vilified academics" on the committee. He did, however, commend Wilderson for having done "a hell of a job" even though he was being vilified.

Another member of the committee related the substance of recent conversations that had been held with some other Big Ten athletic people. They were of the view, after discussing the names, that the committee had considered every potential head coach it should have and the individuals selected were excellent.

All of the members of the committee seemed to agree that in their view the reporters had crossed the line between reporting and making news, and that it would be known beforehand that the release of the three names would very likely lead to their withdrawal. And even Steckel, it was pointed out, was beginning to come under criticism; there was a need to act quickly.

The committee also was of a mind to disagree with the charge that it did not know football. As one of the members commented, "I know more than they do [the sportswriters] about football and so do others here." Another concurred, and added that one didn't need to know football--the candidates all clearly did--and observed that the committee was also looking for an administrator and an individual who possessed certain characteristics and personal attributes not related to technical knowledge of the game.

After spending time venting their emotions, the committee members turned to their appointed task of putting together a set of recommendations. The letter that was approved, and President Magrath's response, are appended to this chapter. The committee drew its points from the interviews with Salem and Stoll, from the high school coaches and from the interviews it had conducted with its candidates.

Evidence of the fear that the press would start taking shots at Steckel were quickly confirmed. The day of the last meeting also featured two columnists' review of the result of the search committee and the apparent lone candidacy of the Vikings assistant. Doug Grow recalled Giel had gotten in a dispute with President Moos twelve years earlier about the use of a search committee, and at another time would have told this one "it could take its list of football coaching candidates and punt it." Now, though, Giel was "too harried, too concerned about his health [the prospective heart surgery] to fight the committee." So, Grow wrote, "Giel, with only a grimace, will accept the insult that was handed him by a screening committee that, for practical purposes, left Giel with one choice to be the next Gopher coach. That choice is Les Steckel." Grow then reviewed with critical scrutiny what he perceived to be Steckel's lack of credentials.

In the St. Paul Dispatch, columnist Pat Reusse also analyzed the circumstances in caustic language.

This [search committee was brought to us by C. Peter Magrath, the University president and a man who serves as a reminder of that small-town caution about never trusting a fellow using a first initial in front of a middle name. As with all university committees, there was a requirement for a clear majority of cross-bearing, ax-grinding pseudo-liberals--and this group easily made the quota.

There were those of us on the outside who believed the task of the committee was to search for a football coach with the background to turn around a major program that has descended to a point of lameness now surpassed only by Rice University. In the last several days, this impression has been proven incorrect. We have learned it was not the committee's goal to find a highly qualified head coach, but to make a public display of its independence. [This echoes similar charges

against President Coffman that were made almost every time he had an athletic personnel controversy.]

The problem is that, in the process of making sure Giel did not get his man, Tom Moore, the search committee has left as the only active candidate an articulate, attractive, God-fearing gentleman with extremely feeble credentials for the position of Division I-A football coach.

Steckel's name appeared among the committee's final choices, along with three current head coaches. Their presence on the list of finalists proved to be a considerable mystery to [them] since they had not bothered to make applications for the job nor to make a journey to the Twin Cities to express an interest.

What Edwards, Ross and Carter had done was extend the courtesy of talking with members of the committee when they came to visit. Since the committee was in such a travelling and sociable mood, it is curious they didn't journey to Ann Arbor to visit Bo Schembechler, to the Poconos to visit Joe Paterno and to Eden Prairie to visit H. Peter Grant, not Les Steckel. Schembechler, Paterno and Grant would not have been interested in the job, but--as demonstrated by Edwards, Ross and Carter--that little roadblock was not enough to keep a coach off the lists of choices the committee left for Giel.

All of this could be marked down as a bit of comic stubbornness, but in the process of rendering Giel powerless, the committee has rejected, in Moore, the best of the legitimate candidates.

[Quoting a high school coach who was surprised at the outcome:] "I can't understand how a committee that includes several people who know nothing about football can spend 30 minutes with a coach of Tom Moore's credentials and decide he is less viable of a candidate than three guys who apparently did not want the job. How can they expect people to watch this fiasco and take the selection process seriously? . . . I can't believe a committee can spend that much time researching candidates and then wind up giving the athletic director one choice. It was either a hell of a railroad job or someone was out to get Giel."

The committee balked because it figured Moore was wired in from the start. If Giel was given a choice that included Moore, he would have been hired and the committee could not have boasted of its independence. For the sake of not being referred to as rubber stamps for Giel, the committee sold out Moore.

PART II: The Selection

Once the Search Committee had given Giel the four names, the University (in some part) and its athletic department supporters (in larger part) began to act.

After thinking about the candidates, and following a number of conversations, Giel focused his efforts on hiring Les Steckel. Steckel met with Giel, Wilderson and Magrath at Eastcliff on the evening of Wednesday, December 7, to discuss Steckel's interest in the job. According to a note Wilderson sent to Magrath the next morning, an understanding with Steckel had been reached and contract language would be prepared.

Nothing would be done immediately, however, because Bobby Ross (at Maryland) had called Giel late in the evening after the meeting at Eastcliff to confirm his continued interest in the position. Ross wanted to meet with Giel, and they agreed to try to set up a time to do so.

Jaye Dyer, a friend of Giel's and long-time supporter of the athletic program, recalled that he had been drawn into the selection process right around the time the meeting at Eastcliff took place. Dyer was a friend of Steckel's and a lot of people were calling him and urging him to not let the University let Steckel get away.

On Friday, December 9--two days after the apparent understanding with Steckel, Dyer received a call from Giel telling him that Steckel had withdrawn. Dyer knew that Steckel had been an eager candidate for the job, up to the meeting at Eastcliff; Giel, according to Dyer, was disappointed. He had talked with Steckel about the University's commitment to building a new football program, changes in the schedule, new facilities and solving academic problems.

Dyer, by his own recollection, must have spent almost the entire day that Friday on the telephone. He spoke with one of Steckel's friends--and a colleague on the Vikings' staff--who had, in turn, previously spoken with Steckel. Steckel's coaching friend told Dyer that Steckel didn't feel that there was a positive commitment to turn the program around. Magrath, Dyer was told, didn't have the right perspective on the circumstances and that the head coaching job was suicidal.

Dyer talked also with University Vice President David Lilly, and told him that the central officers did not realize how serious the situation was. The University, Dyer told Lilly, "would be lucky to get Joe Salem back." Among the other people Dyer spoke with were two search committee members and several "M" men and other department supporters.

The next morning, a Saturday, Wilderson called Dyer at

home to tell him Giel would be going into the hospital. He also told Dyer that the President thought he had persuaded Steckel to take the job, and asked Dyer, as a friend of Steckel's, to find out if the decision to withdraw as a candidate was irreversible. Wilderson assured Dyer that the University was committed to giving football the highest priority and that funds for new facilities were available.

In a conversation the same day with Giel, Dyer told him that several people had asked him to intercede with Steckel, to get him to change his mind. Dyer wanted to know if Giel still wanted Steckel as his coach; Giel told Dyer he would need a long conversation with Steckel, because he was concerned about someone who could be an enthusiastic candidate one minute and withdrawing from consideration the next.

Dyer talked to Steckel, and was told the same thing he had heard earlier second-hand. Steckel felt he had gotten "wishy-washy" answers to his questions, and he was concerned about the top administrators. He needed to be convinced that the President wanted a winning football team.

The following Monday morning, December 12, Dyer spoke again with Wilderson. Dyer, according to Wilderson, said "I became concerned that Les did not have the complete backing of Paul at that point." Wilderson assured Dyer that Giel wanted Steckel and was "in favor of our working on Les, and if we were successful, he [Paul] would sign him as soon as he was physically able to see him again." (That is, after the heart surgery.)

Magrath, the same day, sent Dyer a letter. He told Dyer he was "distressed at the outcome, at least at the moment, with regard to the football coach search. . . . I was convinced that the meeting . . . last Wednesday night with Coach Steckel was absolutely successful, that Les wanted the job, and that we could clarify in discussions between Les and Paul any outstanding issues that needed to be resolved." The President concluded by telling Dyer that "I very much hope that special efforts can be made . . . to keep Coach Steckel interested in the position" and by thanking him for his help.

In that same letter, Magrath tried to reassure Dyer (as had Wilderson) that "we are able and prepared to make the kind of commitments that are necessary to get the program turned around and moving dramatically in new and good directions."

Again, Dyer spent a good part of the day on the telephone. He was told by another friend of Steckel's that Steckel was reluctant now, in part, because he did not want to be perceived as taking advantage of the University (by holding out for commitments it would not otherwise make), although he still wanted "an unequivocal statement" from Magrath. It was also bad timing, coming in the midst of the Vikings' season.

At a breakfast meeting in his office the next morning, Dyer, along with search committee members Mike Wright, Billy

Bye, and Bob Stein, agreed to try to obtain a statement from Magrath endorsing the search committee program recommendations, and to appeal to the legislature and regents for support. In a conversation the following day, Dyer, Magrath, and Wilderson agreed that the University would draft a statement of the commitments to football (which Magrath would support) and which Giel could then use to talk once again with Steckel.

Dyer then sent a letter to Steckel following up his conversations. He told Steckel this:

As you know, Frank Wilderson, chairman of the Search Committee, called me to attempt to reinstate your candidacy. He confirmed that you became everyone's first choice for the position and that he saw no barriers to your getting everything you need to make the University of Minnesota a winner.

Our small unofficial group met with Bob Stein, Billy Bye, and Mike Wright. They convinced us that the Committee did its work thoroughly and diligently and that your presentation was "music to their ears." They stressed that the members' enthusiasm for you was equally shared by the academic and former athlete members.

Following that, we have had an extended conference telephone conversation among President Magrath, Dr. Wilderson, Dean Stein, Mike Wright, and myself. From this, we are absolutely convinced they can and will deliver on every item on the Committee's recommended list and on any reasonable supplement you may wish to add.

Members of the group have spoken with the Chairman of the Board of Regents, Mr. Lauris Krenik, who "applauds and supports" our last-ditch efforts to obtain Les Steckel. Wendy Anderson has encouraged us that Governor Perpich and key members of the State Legislature will look favorably on assuming some of the financial pressures that would otherwise distract from football.

Les, our undertaking has been an effort to determine how much or how little support a new coach can count on, for sure. Our group will assure you that the commitment, enthusiasm, and sense of urgency is overwhelming. You will be struck by the responses our members have obtained from University officials, the Regents, and governmental leaders.

To evidence his unwavering commitment to an excellent program, President Magrath is preparing a letter setting out the specifics of his commitment which we will have in hand to review with you.

Betty [Dyer] and I would like you and Chris to join

the Burnses and a few friends in our Metrodome suite after your game Saturday. At that time, we can arrange a time for you to meet with our group in a sincere effort to remove any impediment to your becoming the man to head up Minnesota football for many, many years.

All of these efforts, however, did not work, because Dyer talked again with Steckel on Friday, December 16 (two days after the call between Dyer, Wilderson and Magrath); Steckel said the answer was "no." Steckel told Dyer he had thought about it a lot, but the process had gone on too long, he had given his word to the Vikings' staff that he would stay and that his mind was made up. Dyer asked if Steckel would wait until after the last Viking game, and continue to think it over. Steckel declined, and asked that he not be considered further.

On one point, Dyer was adamant: Steckel did not turn down the Minnesota job because he knew he would be offered the head coaching position with the Vikings. Magrath, reflecting on these events later, wrote that "it's now clear that Mr. Steckel withdrew because he knew that he was going to be made an offer to take the Vikings position--at least he was made that offer, I'm quite sure, after Giel, Wilderson, and I met with him." Search committee member Mike Wright inclines also to the view that even if there was yet no offer, Steckel had reason to believe it would come.

In addition to the efforts being made to convince Steckel to change his mind, the University was taking steps to keep its options open. The same day that Dyer sent his letter to Steckel, Wilderson wrote to Ross to tell him that "we are extremely interested in the fact that you are willing to talk with us further about becoming Head Coach here at the University." Wilderson went on to lay out a compensation package that the University could offer. He urged Ross to call with any questions, and told him that "Paul Giel is eager to hear from you and to continue whatever negotiations he has begun with you."

Magrath also confirmed that there were a number of conversations he, Wilderson, and others had had with Ross, and that Ross "was a very alive prospect until the end."

The day after the last search committee meeting, Friday, December 9, Hartman reported that Steckel had withdrawn as a candidate. It was, according to the article, after a meeting with Magrath and Giel the previous evening; the reason, according to the article, was that "it would be a big gamble for him [Steckel] to leave his secure job with the Vikings to tackle the Goher position." Hartman again reviewed the status of the other three candidates and said that "there is every indication now that the search committee will have to start over." [Author's note: Sports Illustrated, in August, 1984, reported that Steckel, subsequently appointed head coach of the Minnesota Vikings, turned the University job down because he had received hints that precisely such an opportunity would be available upon the retirement of then-head coach Bud Grant. As noted previously, Dyer did not

believe this, but Wright and Magrath did.]

During the period of the private negotiations with Steckel and Ross, no news leaked to the press, and this silence continued into the following week. Several articles and columns did appear, however, in the St. Paul papers which added to the color of the enterprise.

-- St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 15 (Charley Walters):

[Former Coach Cal] Stoll strongly favors Pittsburgh Steelers offensive coordinator Tom Moore, whom Stoll hired as an assistant at Wake Forest and Minnesota. "Quite frankly, I'm going to do everything I can to help Tom Moore get that job because I feel he's the best qualified person available," Stoll said.

Influential people close to the Gopher football program are extremely upset concerning what they believe to be a sabotaging of the process in selecting a new coach. The feeling is that certain people close to the university still are determined to get Moore hired despite the fact Moore wasn't among the four finalists selected by the screening committee. The committee believes it did a very thorough job and has no doubts the finalists--LaVell Edwards, Rick Carter, Bobby Ross and Les Steckel--are quality candidates who had genuine interest in pursuing the job. Those candidates publicly dropped out of contention, however, when a source very friendly with the Gopher athletic department brass tipped off the media. The feeling is that by doing so, the source, who has told people in Minneapolis he will get Moore named as Minnesota's next coach, got the finalists to back off. It is believed Edwards, Carter and Ross desired to negotiate privately. Making their names public, some insiders feel, will open the door again for Moore.

-- St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 19 (Charley Walters):

Vikings offensive coordinator Jerry Burns and Lou Holtz, who resigned Sunday as Arkansas head coach, are extremely close friends. Holtz was an assistant to Burns when Burns was head coach at Iowa. Does Burns think Holtz, who was paid \$250,000 a season at Arkansas, would be interested in coaching at Minnesota? "I can't say anything about that . . .," Burns said.

-- St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 20 (Charley Walters):

Although it seems improbable that former Arkansas football coach Lou Holtz could become a candidate for the University of Minnesota job, the possibility is greeted by silence when mentioned to Gopher insiders. It is a fact that influential Minnesota football supporters have telephoned Holtz

several times seeking his interest in replacing Joe Salem, and you can be sure another call will be made today.

It also is not unreasonable to think that Holtz, who had an option in his five-year Arkansas contract to become assistant athletic director, could become athletic director at Minnesota and coach football if the opportunities were right.

It is interesting to note that Holtz's resignation was sudden, and because the Razorbacks are so concerned about the current critical recruiting period, Arkansas intends to name his replacement--probably Air Force's Ken Hatfield--within a week. Consider that LSU named Bill Arnsparger as coach the day it was announced it was firing Jerry Stovall. Salem's Minnesota resignation was public nearly two months ago and today the Gophers still do not even have a coaching candidate.

There is talk that Vikings assistant Les Steckel withdrew as a candidate for the Gophers job because he received indications he might be the heir apparent to Bud Grant, who is expected to remain as coach for another five years.

-- St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 21 (Don Riley):

I came back from vacation aghast that the University of Minnesota had not made move toward finding a head football coach. The U has become the laughingstock of major college athletics.

You can say the U selection committee is the only one in the world that could name four candidates, none of whom wanted the job. But, baby, this whole mess falls right in the lap of weak-kneed, vacillating president C. Peter Magrath.

My Lord! Can you imagine the Rev. Hesburgh of Notre Dame twiddling his thumbs for two months without a new football coach? Can you imagine Alabama going six weeks without a leading candidate? Can you envision Michigan without a herd of candidates battering down the doors? Magrath shows less courage, initiative and leadership on this issue than he did on the Metrodome controversy when he could have landed the super stadium of all time for his own Memorial Stadium site.

In plain truth, Magrath is running scared. His vacillation is that of a man not big enough for the job. If he were a coach, his superiors long ago would have given him the ax. How in the hell the taxpayers let him last, ducking and tip-toeing through the tulips, is beyond my comprehension.

-- St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 22 (Charley Walters):

Paul Giel said Wednesday he expected to be released today from Abbott-Northwestern Hospital in Minneapolis. . . . He said he'll remain at his Minnetonka home for two to three weeks and continue trying to find a new football coach. "It's just in a state of flux," Giel said of the coaching situation. Giel said he has no timetable to name a new coach. He said he has not talked to Lou Holtz, who resigned as coach at Arkansas this week.

-- St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 22 (Don Riley):

It's no fun to come down on an educator like U of M president C. Peter Magrath. But out of 64 calls, letters and wires, 87 percent favored my criticism of him over his feeble handling of the open coaching berth.

Meanwhile, I'd still like to know how they shuffled the deck against Roger French, the red-hot BYU aide who's sought by major schools all over the country. He wanted the job, his credentials are in order, he played here, he knows the recruiting systems and he's a class act. But then, who has ever accused the Gophers of making the logical move?

While these sundry opinions were being expressed, people began to act. As Charley Walters noted, Lou Holtz had resigned at Arkansas; that happened Saturday morning, December 17. He had been one of the committee's top nine original candidates (indeed, one of the top three), and it had been Holtz whom Giel had named when asked at the first search committee meeting what kind of coach he ideally wanted.

When Vice President Wilderson learned, Sunday evening December 18, that Holtz has resigned, he called Holtz. According to Wilderson, he told Holtz that as chairman of the search committee, with Giel in the hospital, he would put the search on hold. He urged Holtz to come to Minnesota, secretly if need be, to look at the situation. Holtz replied that he did not want to do anything--but that if he did, he would want his family involved. Wilderson agreed; Holtz said he would call back the next day.

Wilderson also placed a call that same evening to Harvey Mackay, a prominent local businessman long involved with Minnesota athletics and a friend of Giel's. He asked Mackay to set up whatever business contacts might be appropriate.

On Monday morning, without any prompting by the University, another local businessman and friend of Giel's put in a call to Holtz. Bill Maddux recalled that Holtz was not at home, so he left his name and number. When Holtz later returned the call, Maddux related, it was a mistake; Holtz thought the call was a coaching friend named Gary Maddux at Mississippi State.

Maddux says he had never talked to Holtz before, but did

so when Holtz returned his call. Maddux knew two of Holtz's friends, and had talked to them. He asked Holtz for three minutes, and if he was still willing to listen, for another three minutes, and so on. Holtz listened. Maddux ended by asking Holtz to come up to Minnesota that day (Monday). Holtz said he couldn't but would try to do so the next day. He mentioned that he might bring his wife. Maddux told Holtz that he would come under no obligation, but also told him that he wouldn't leave Minnesota without taking the job.

Later that afternoon, Holtz called Maddux back and told him he got the last four seats on a flight out of Tulsa, and was bringing not only his wife but also his son and daughter. He told Maddux he would arrive at 2:00 on Tuesday afternoon.

On Monday, after talking to Holtz, Maddux called Giel at the hospital that morning. He also called Magrath. Both men approved the contact. Maddux also called Harvey Mackay, and asked him to meet Holtz at the hotel. Maddux had registered Holtz at the Amfac under the name Robert Wood.

When Holtz arrived, despite the snowstorm and the bitter cold Minnesota weather, he was cheerful. At the hotel, Mackay put a hat and coat on Holtz so that no one would recognize him. They told no one Holtz was here.

After this point, there are conflicting recollections about the precise sequence of events. There is agreement, by the participants, about what occurred.

- Both Maddux and Mackay spent considerable time with the Holtzes.
- Mackay made arrangements for Holtz to talk with and meet local businessmen. Holtz also talked with Governor Rudy Perpich.
- One evening--Tuesday or Wednesday--included cocktails at Eastcliff and dinner with the Magraths, Wildersons, Dean Robert and Sandy Stein, and Nancy Giel and a later conversation among Magrath, Wilderson, and Holtz.
- Holtz was shown the Metrodome; his family was shown the area.

On Wednesday evening, back at the hotel, after much discussion, the Holtz family retired to their rooms to deliberate. About 9:30 Holtz came out and told those present (Maddux, Nancy Giel, Wilderson) that he would accept the job.

The search committee had been notified of Holtz's presence and were convened Wednesday evening December 21 to meet him. Although the meeting never took place, and Holtz accepted the position without the benefit of a full formal interview, he had met or spoken with at least three members of the committee. This was as many as had been present at meetings with Carter, Ross, and one other candidate who was not on the final list. Ironically, one of the search committee members was vacationing with his family out of

state and had arranged a meeting with LaVell Edwards, who had agreed to continue the discussions. That rendezvous was cancelled.

A press conference was held Thursday morning December 22 to announce the appointment and to introduce Holtz. It was a success.

Joe Soucheray, writing in the Star and Tribune the following day, wondered if the search process had really worked as well as several members of the committee had been quoted as saying it had. He had been told anonymously by one committee member that "Holtz was not present at the committee's meeting Wednesday evening, that there was no opportunity for most of the committee members to question Holtz and that the committee was left in the position of endorsing the appointment of a candidate whom most of the committee had regarded as an inactive prospect throughout the autumn." Soucheray also took note of Holtz's mention of the name of Harvey Mackay, an "M" man and alumnus who had long been active in University activities, including athletics.

Among those meeting with Holtz Wednesday night in his hotel was Mackay; absent, because he was still in the hospital, was Giel. The explanation proffered to Soucheray by committee member Mike Wright was that Mackay and Giel were longtime personal friends and "with Paul recovering from surgery, I'm sure that Harvey was acting to greet Holtz and welcome him here." Holtz acknowledged in his remarks to the press that he was "impressed" with Mackay. According to Soucheray, "most of the committee members said 'no comment' when they were asked their reaction to Holtz's mention of Mackay." Soucheray concluded that the Wednesday night hotel discussions, ended when Holtz and his family retired to talk alone and to pray, "wasn't exactly the process the search committee had in mind."

Footnotes to the Hiring of Holtz

The search committee never did ascertain who had provided the names and information to the press in early December. The members of the press corps did not indicate the source. (Author's note: Nor have I bothered to ask any of them, positive that sports writers will jealously guard their sources in the time-honored fashion of reporters. Inasmuch as I am in philosophical agreement that such sources should be permitted to remain secret in order to serve the larger public good of a free press, I have no intention of asking. I do not know whether or not the members of the search committee have queried the reporters; I haven't asked them, either.)

Holtz's appointment met with almost unanimous praise from every imaginable quarter. One exception was one member of the search committee (and others may have shared the reservation). Holtz, earlier in the year, had made filmed political endorsements for North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms. Helms, a conservative Republican, had lobbied hard against making Martin Luther King's birthday a national

holiday. There was some fear that the endorsements would hurt Holtz's recruiting when he was dealing with black athletes. (Holtz explained that he had made the endorsements based on friendship with Helms, before the campaign against the King holiday; he had later asked that they not be used and they were not aired.) The association was noted in the press, it did not cause great uproar, and appeared to have quickly passed from public attention.

Pat Reusse of the St. Paul Pioneer Press wrote a commentary on the search that appeared the same day as the news accounts of Holtz's hiring. He was still skeptical, even though search committee member Mike Wright apparently talked to him at some length.

The people involved in the announcement--University president C. Peter Magrath, athletic director Paul Giel, search chairman Frank Wilderson and committee members such as former Gophers Mike Wright and Billy Bye--would not be adverse to receiving apologies for the criticism they had taken from the media.

They would like you to believe, in fact, that the committee was never in the chaos the media described, and that Holtz's hiring is the result of a selection process that worked as planned.

Until Holtz's availability became known Sunday, there remains no indication the search committee was close to having its coach. Steckel backed off on the job on the eve of the day Giel was ready to announce his appointment; Edwards, Ross and Carter told reporters they were not interested in coming to Minnesota.

Mike Wright and other members of the search committee continue to deny they turned over a list to Giel that had only one interested candidate--Steckel.

"We gave Paul Giel a list of four strong candidates," Wright said. "The problem was nobody gave it a chance. The committee decided early we were going to seek a coach of this caliber. We have LaVell Edwards, one of the established winning coaches in the country. We had Ross and Carter, considered to be two of the best young head coaches anywhere. And, we had Steckel, who is going to be a great head coach some day."

"Unfortunately, the names became public before the process had a chance to work. It made things more complicated. But, I can say this: Discussions were going on with people on the list long after the public was told we didn't have candidates that still were interested."

Wright suggested that Steckel's public disavowal of the Gophers' job did not necessarily put an end to

his interest in it. "If Lou Holtz had come here and decided not to take the job, we weren't prepared to start the search all over," Wright said. "We felt we still had viable candidates from the original list."

Reusse said the reason Holtz had come was not because of the committee but because Mackay had played a persuasive, even perhaps dispositive, role. That charge could only have been confirmed or denied by Holtz; Wright's comments, however, reflected the circumstances that were understood by the committee to exist as late as mid-December.

It should be noted, too, that President Magrath, Vice President Wilderson, and others had had continuing conversations with Ross and Edwards right up to the time Holtz selected. Carter had made public his interest. It is inaccurate to say there was only one candidate.

It is interesting to speculate whether the role of alumni/outsiders was different in 1983 than in previous searches. For example, Coffman reported to Regent Snyder that he had sent a contingent of alumni to Chicago to persuade Crisler to come to Minnesota. Morrill used alumni --although they would say he did not listen to them--in 1950. Alumni also played a significant, if not critical, role in the creation of the position of athletic director. It seems unlikely 1983 differed very much from previous personnel changes; what is different is only that the alumni role is better documented.

Finally, there is no question that Holtz could not have been hired had not the search committee already given its endorsement, in the voting much earlier, to Holtz. Any contact with Holtz about the Minnesota job, under University rules, would have required eventual search committee approval before actual negotiations could be entered into. On this point, Vice President Wilderson was adamant.

APPENDIX 1

(Taken from the Minneapolis Journal, 12/4/21)

Looking for the Football Goat at University of Minnesota

Neither Students Nor Alumni Can Agree Whether Leadership or System Is Responsible for Gopher Gridiron Slump—Will Adoption of Athletic Director Plan in Use at Some Big Ten Schools Restore Maroon Pigskin Prestige?

One Faction Blames Williams, Second Blames Paige, Third Blames Both, Fourth Blames Administrative Scheme and Fifth Blames Alumni—Regents Tackle Question Dec. 13—Head Coach Decision Must Be Made by Jan. 1

What is the matter with football at the University of Minnesota?

University regents are planning to discuss this much-debated question at their next meeting, Dec. 13.

Five alumni, acting as a committee from the General Alumni association, have been studying the subject and are about ready to make a report. Informal conferences of alumni have been called, and at one attended by two score former football stars, last Tuesday, resolutions were adopted asking for the appointment of a director of athletics to take over full control.

Indications favor working out of such a plan within the next year, possibly this winter. Whether Dr. H. L. Williams will be retained as football coach next year must be decided this month, as notice for termination of his contract must be given before Jan. 1. Otherwise it is renewed automatically, and the "new deal" could not take effect until 1923.

Everybody Looking for a Goat

Two disastrous, heart-breaking seasons of defeat for Minnesota football teams have produced the natural reaction. Everybody is looking for a goat. Opinions differ, and the debate has been waged warmly ever since the season closed Nov. 19. It has been rather heated, dealing largely with personalities, and many alumni feel that it has given their university unfavorable publicity. But defeat piled on defeat has made the critics bitter.

Minnesota has played twelve games with Western Conference teams in the last two seasons. Ten of them were defeats for the Maroon and Gold. Minnesota lost every game in 1920. Though 1921 opened more auspiciously, and wins were scored over Northwestern and Indiana, the rest of the season was a nightmare for Gopher followers. Crushing defeats by large scores were suffered at the hands of Ohio State, Wisconsin, Iowa and Michigan.

Iowa, which used to be a regular bunching bag for Minnesota, has scored three successive wins, the last one by the record breaking score of 41 to 7.

Michigan has beaten Minnesota in the last two games, rolling up 38 points in the big 1921 masterpiece.

Wisconsin, traditional rival, has won two straight games and piled up a humiliating score this year, 35 to 0.

Two Seasons of Disaster Bring Storm of Criticism

So the storm of criticism, gathering all through the season, broke after the final game, and it has been howling fiercely about two devoted heads. The debate has brought out diverging opinions.

One faction holds Dr. Williams responsible for the sad chain of reverses.

Another element says that faculty control of athletics as exercised by Professor James Paige is at the root of the matter.

Still others, including numerous and influential alumni, say that both Williams and Paige are at fault. They think there can be no improvement until both the old timers are eliminated.

Some blame the alumni for failure to co-operate and give Dr. Williams the proper backing, saying he has not been given the material for winning teams.

One Constructive Idea Comes Out of Chaos

All this debate has been inconclusive. It could decide nothing. It might rage for years without a verdict being reached. But out of the chaos of destructive criticism has emerged one constructive idea. It is not a new idea, but circumstances have made the Minnesota men receptive to it, and everything points to its adoption. It may not be effected this year, but it probably is only a question of months.

The suggestion is that the old system be wiped out and a new one created, a department of athletics with a director in full charge, responsible to the president and the board of regents, and ranking as a member of the faculty. He would be a "full time" man, having full charge of all branches of sport.

Director Plan Wins in Other Conference Schools

Several schools in the western conference have this system and like it well. The idea was broached years ago at Minnesota, but rejected. Since that time Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Chicago have adopted the plan, and Wisconsin is getting ready for it.

University authorities are favorable. The change has been the subject of several conferences in the last few days, with regents, faculty members and alumni consulting. All are ready to back it when the details have been worked out, it was decided yesterday.

Dr. Williams favors a director of athletics, he said last week before leaving for the Chicago conference meeting.

"A director of athletics giving his full time to the work would be a fine thing, if the right man could be obtained," he said. "But the director does not need to be the football coach."

Williams Wants to Show He Can Win Next Year

Dr. Williams declined to discuss the issues in the controversy, but it is well known that he wants at least to fill out his contract term and show next year that he can "come back" with a winning team. He objects strenuously to being "kicked out" before the end of the contract period, after 22 years of service.

The regents have paid little attention to the athletic situation for years, but have decided now to grapple with it. They will take up the football problem at their meeting Dec. 13 for discussion, ~~at least~~, ~~and never~~ ~~for action.~~

Alumni Committee To Report Soon

Five alumni, appointed as a special committee on athletics, have been studying the football situation for the alumni association, and are about ready to make a report. They are considering the plan for an athletic director. Members of this committee are John F. Hayden, Henry F. Nachtrieb, Arthur E. Larkin, Orren Saferd and John Schuknecht.

Twenty-five alumni, most of them "36" men and including several assistant football coaches, battled with the problem for two hours last Tuesday at the Andrews hotel, and at the end of the debate no one opposed a resolution declaring for a "new deal" with a director of athletics in charge. The alumni committee was asked to give favorable consideration to this plan, and Dr. Engleman replied that this study had been done. The committee is working this plan out in detail for presentation to the General Alumni Association, the Athletic Board of Control and the board of regents.

Decisive Defeats May Be Real Blessing

"Sweet are the uses of adversity," and experience sometimes is the only teacher. It may be, leading alumni said yesterday, that Minnesota had to have the lesson of these two humiliating seasons to bring about the needed reorganization. Had the decisive defeat less decisive, the university might have struggled along with an antiquated system.

Still the debate goes on. The University Daily has opened its columns to letters on the subject. Other publications are giving space to it.

It is a peculiar debate. Everybody talks freely, and everybody discusses personalities. But the men most concerned, and the men in the most responsible places, refuse absolutely to talk for publication. The debate has been heated and so many unkind things have been said that men with the university's welfare at heart have been appiving the "lid". The authorities refuse to be quoted because they fear that anything they say will be misconstrued.

Facts are to be had by the barrel, by the ton, or if not facts, assertions. But to pin definite statements on any one is almost impossible.

They're All "Good Friends of Doc, but..."

"I'm as good a friend as Doc Williams has in the world," one alumnus will say, and then begin to give his reasons why the veteran coach should be retired, "not to be quoted."

"Jimmy Paige is the soul of honor, one of the most faithful and conscientious men that ever lived, but..." will be the preamble of another old-timer, who then proceeds to demonstrate his belief that the Paige regime has been a blight on university athletics. But he "mustn't be quoted."

Those who want both men retired from university athletics admit that such a course will do injustice. But if it necessary, they contend, to wipe the slate clean in order to get winning teams and to get the support of alumni through the northwest.

They have hailed the plan for a "full time" director of athletics as a "noisy out, assuming that it would mean the ousting of Dr. Williams and Mr. Paige. That does not follow, however. As Dr. Williams points out, the director of athletics does not have to be the football coach. As for Mr. Paige, he is Minnesota's representative in the conference, and his status in that respect would not be changed by appointing a director of athletics.

Stadium Plan Gives Alumni Big Voice

The alumni are a bigger factor in the situation just now than ever before. That is because of the impending drive for funds to build an adequate stadium. Some time next year the appeal will be made. Ground for the enlarged field had been acquired or optioned. Part of it has been paid for out of football earnings, and the rest will be taken care of. But the state can not be asked to build a stadium and the only way to do it is by popular subscription. Many alumni have served notice already that they are not going to contribute unless there is assurance of a new management and a new policy in university athletics.

Dr. Williams has coached Minnesota football teams for 22 consecutive seasons. Professor Paige has been Minnesota representative in the western conference for 16 years. Mr. Paige recently was reappointed for another year. Dr. Williams has a year more as coach, unless his contract is terminated before Jan. 1. To replace or

supercede either of these men is an act not to be lightly undertaken. The present athletic system at Minnesota has grown up about these two men.

Authorities Argue System Is Obsolete

The system, most of the university authorities agree, is "antiquated." It is an outgrowth of the old athletic association which was entirely controlled by students, independent of faculty control. Other universities had the same system, and the zeal for victory led students into courses that finally aroused faculties to action. Faculty control of athletics was asserted; strict amateur rules were made, eligibility was closely defined, training tables were abolished, freshmen were barred from intercollegiate contests.

The Intercollegiate Conference, now the "Big Ten," came out of a meeting of representatives of seven western universities in Chicago in January, 1893. Minnesota has been a member from the start. One of the rules of the conference requires faculty control of athletics. Minnesota's system was revised to comply with it, but its compliance is only nominal. Students have a greater voice in the management of athletics at Minnesota, it is claimed, than at any other institution.

Two interlocking boards have charge of athletics. One is the faculty committee on intercollegiate athletics. This consists of five faculty members named by the president of the university, two alumni named by the athletic committee of the alumni association and two students named by the athletic board of control. The faculty has a majority of one on this committee, which complies with the conference rule. But its functions are limited to eligibility matters, conference matters, and a veto power over the other body, which is the Athletic Board of Control.

The Athletic Board of Control consists of eight students, elected by the different colleges, two alumni and two members of the faculty. This board hires coaches, fixes their salaries, and exercises detailed control over athletics at the university. Its chairman is a student, Henry Norton. One of the two faculty members, however, is chairman of the ticket committee, and the other acts as auditor. Professor Paige is the chairman of the ticket committee. He is a member of both bodies, and so is the auditor, now Professor W. L. Burd, who replaced Professor E. P. Harding in that capacity.

Present Plan Fails to Correlate "U" Sports

There is no correlation among the different sports at the university under this plan. A director of athletics, such as other western universities have, assumes responsibility for all branches of sport. He is a "full time" man, a member of the faculty. He has in every case some sort of a council to assist and advise him, but it is really one-man control.

Iowa has an athletic director, Howard Jones, in supreme command. He is named by a board consisting of five faculty members, one student and one alumnus.

Illinois has an athletic director,

George Huff, chosen by an athletic board. The board numbers four faculty members, two alumni and six student managers of various sports. Deans of the university form a council of administration which approves schedules, choice of coaches and has veto power over other acts of the board.

Indiana has a director of athletics appointed by the regents, on recommendation of the president and the athletic committee, which consists of eight faculty members, five alumni and two students who sit on the committee but have no vote.

Students Have No Voice In Chicago Sport Control

Chicago university has an athletic director elected by a board of 19, all faculty members except one alumnus. The board members are nominated by the president of the university and approved by the trustees. The faculty has appellate jurisdiction over the acts of the board. No students are members.

Wisconsin has a director of athletics who is chosen by the president on advice of the athletic council. The council consists of five faculty members, one alumnus and one student.

Michigan has a director of athletics assisted by a council, whose plan has been changed recently, and the details are not available, but there is entire faculty control.

Directors at 45 Schools Are Good Coaches, Too

It happens that the director of athletics is also football coach at Iowa, Chicago, Indiana and Michigan. That is not essential, but is thought best if the right man can be found to fill the double berth.

This sort of system has been agitated at Minnesota before. E. B. Pierce, now secretary of the General Alumni Association, urged it several years ago, but was overruled. It was thought then that the change would do away with "student initiative" and impair the student morale and spirit. Since that time the other universities have adopted the plan, and it is claimed they have suffered no loss of morale.

Dr. Williams began his Minnesota career as director of athletics, but had no taste for supervising other sports, and as he was only a part time man, it did not prove successful. Dr. L. J. Choate is nominally athletic director now, but he has very little authority outside of his own realm as basketball coach.

Pierce Favors Single Council and Director

Mr. Pierce, who is strongly advocating the change now, says there should be a single council, an advisory body to assist the director of athletics. It also would handle intercollegiate relations.

In fact, selection of an athletic director would not disturb Professor Paige in his place as Minnesota representative in the conference. The rule of the conference forbids and faculty member drawing any income from athletic work sitting in conference sessions with a vote. Coaches and athletic directors attend but have no vote.

Friends Begin to Turn Against Dr. Williams

Dr. Williams has made some enemies in his 22 years of coaching at Minnesota, and they are being heard from. There is a new development in his case, however. Many long-time friends and supporters of the veteran coach have come to the point where they will say that he has "outlived his usefulness" and should retire.

Every one of these men will preface his remarks by telling how much he thinks of Dr. Williams, and what a great coach he has been, with emphasis on the "has."

They concede that Dr. Williams is one of the great strategists of the game, and that he has turned out many wonderful teams.

But they charge him with much of the blame for the poor showing of the last two years, and indict his rule as head football coach on the following counts:

That he has failed to develop the possibilities of the modern open game, and has allowed his fondness for "big men" to influence his selection of players.

That Minnesota under Williams has failed to develop a thorough coaching system such as other big universities have, with assistant coaches drilling several teams, re-training new material, and giving individual attention to the men.

That Dr. Williams picks eleven men and drills them in a complicated series of plays, changed before every game, while the "hay team" of substitutes looks on, getting no drill such as will fit them to step into the first team places when needed.

That Dr. Williams has been occupied in the last two years as district medical officer for the U. S. Veterans Bureau, and has been unable to give us much time to coaching as he should, sometimes being late for practice.

That Dr. Williams goes to extremes in "deception" and in complicated plays, while the players are weak in fundamentals of football.

That volunteer alumni coaches whose help is asked are given scant consideration when they do show up, and are sometimes driven away by brusque treatment.

There is another side to the Williams story, of course. While Dr. Williams declines flatly to take the stand in his own defense, he still has some friends who are not at all backward.

They think he is being treated with gross injustice.

Friends Say Coach Has Been Too Successful

"The trouble with Dr. Williams," one of them said, "is that he has been too successful. Minnesota under his regime has acquired the habit of winning. Since he came to Minnesota, our teams have won the western championship more than any other university. Until the last two years they have been a factor in the championship race right up to the finish of the season.

"Our Minnesota people are poor losers. Every school has its bad seasons. They are part of the game. Dr. Williams has had some mighty hard luck in the last two years. Now everybody is jumping on him. They don't want to give him time or a chance to come back with a winning team next year, but want him fired before his contract runs out.

"Men who learned all the football they know from Dr. Williams have been undertaking to tell him how teams should be coached. They have been criticizing his every move."

Says Williams Has Been Vigorously Criticized

"Does he have to report to every alumnus who visits the campus, and give an account of his time? One day last season Dr. Williams happened to be late to practice when one of his former players visited the field. That was the text for an article panning Dr. Williams. The critic did not happen to know that Dr. Williams had been detained by a conference with President Coffman and Jimmy Paige, because some letter writers had challenged the eligibility of Arnold Oar, and it had to be straightened out.

"Our athletic board would be a bunch of poor sports to kick Dr. Williams out because of one or two bad seasons. We are not the only ones. All the universities have been through the same thing. Yost has had his troubles with Michigan alumnus, and Stagg has been under fire. So has Zuppke at Illinois, and if his team had not scored on Ohio State by a fluke this fall just at the close of the season, he would be getting panned as hard as Dr. Williams."

Another supporter of the veteran coach called attention to the fact that Minnesota took on the heaviest schedule of any conference team this year, playing six hard games, and as a result has made a net profit of \$110,000 this year on football, \$43,000 more than ever cleared before. This schedule works out for next year to give games at Minnesota with Ohio State, Wisconsin and Michigan.

Williams Put Minnesota On the Map 21 Years Ago

The Williams regime began in 1900, after a series of poor years for Minnesota football. Minnesota has no standing in intercollegiate athletics and the athletic association was in debt. In that first season Minnesota won the western championship, made \$4,000 profit and got on the map. This was followed by years of steady progress in athletics, acquisition of Northrop Field, and lately with plans

for its extension. Only last spring \$50,000 of accumulated profits from football were put into land for the enlarged stadium.

The case for Dr. Williams is further stated by his friends in substance as follows:

"Dr. Williams is nationally recognized as one of the great coaches. His famous shift formation, originated here, has been gradually adopted in principle by most of the leading colleges of the country. Minnesota has won a majority of games with all her leading rivals except Michigan. After a series of close battles with Michigan, Minnesota won in 1919 by 34 to 7.

"Minnesota beat Chicago so often and so badly that Chicago finally cut Minnesota off its schedule. Scores of 43 to 0 and 33 to 0 are recorded.

"Yet during the years Dr. Williams has been under fire more than once, at times of temporary reverses. The first time was in 1902, when Nebraska beat Minnesota by one touchdown. The Alumni Weekly attacked Williams and demanded his removal. But other big games on the schedule were won and the agitation died out.

Futile Attacks Made On Coach in the Past

"Again in 1908, Minnesota was beaten by Wisconsin, and Chicago beat us 29 to 0. There was a terrific attack on Williams. It finally was agreed to suspend judgment until after the Carlisle game. Few expected Minnesota to beat the great Indian team, but they turned the trick and surprised the experts by showing a brilliant forward pass game. Minnesota was a conference championship contender three straight years after that, and Dr. Williams was acclaimed a great coach.

"There was another furor in 1913, after Nebraska beat us again. The famous Duluth alumni letter came out, demanding Williams' dismissal. It came just two days before the Wisconsin game. Wisconsin had the heavier team and was picked to win. Minnesota defeated her, 21 to 3, and the Duluth resolutions were made a joke.

"The last two years have been bad ones, due to a peculiar combination of circumstances. In 1920 the prospects were good, but before the season opened the team's captain was disqualifed. Eddie Ruben, was hurt in the first scrimmage and hampered all the season. Arnold Oss, all-western half back, was hurt in the first conference game and put out for nearly all season. In spite of these heavy losses the team played hard and well. Though losing every game, they lost by close margins and fought every minute.

Williams Lost All His Stars in Disaster Year

"There were great hopes for this year, for the material was in school, and a heavy schedule was arranged to help Francis and bring better games to Minneapolis. But after the 1920 season Ruven, Ekberg, Fraser and O'Brien left school. Nolan and Butler counted on as line stars, became negligible. Oss started in great form, weighing 185 pounds, but again was knocked out in the first conference game, and lost for the season.

"Minnesota went into the season with a green center, green ends, a quarterback who never had played the position before, and only one experienced tackle. Still they beat Northwestern and Indiana. Ohio State was encountered on her grounds, wrought up over the Oberlin defeat. The champions of 1920 outplayed the Green Minnesota team.

"Our team met Wisconsin and Iowa the best teams these institutions ever had. They outclassed Minnesota and won by big scores. But it isn't so long ago that Minnesota outclassed them, defeating Wisconsin 34 to 6 and Iowa 68 to 0. Michigan had early reverses due to injuries, but came back with a great team, tied Wisconsin and beat Minnesota.

Clamor Against Yost Stopped by Victory

"That saved Yost from panning. But it was only two years ago that he was on the carpet. Their athletic association decided to give him another year's trial. He satisfied the critics a while, but this year in mid-season was attacked by the Grand Rapids alumni, just as the Duluth alumni went after Williams. The consequences were the same. Michigan won some games and the clamor stopped.

"Stagg has been through the same thing at Chicago. He was ill for a while, had to leave and go to Florida, had to coach from an automobile. His team lost, but the alumni got together, raised \$12,000 to pay some assistant coaches, got out and rustled for material, and this year they won from Princeton and Wisconsin.

"Zuppke put Illinois on the map, but he had a bad season this year, and was only saved by victory over Ohio State.

"Dr. Williams has been hired as coach for three-year periods. He has worked two years under the present contract. There is a clause by which it may be cancelled, and some of the alumni propose to do it, so Minnesota can get a new coach and turn out winning teams.

Friends Insist on New Chance for Williams

"Why shouldn't Williams have a chance to fill out his time and show that the last two seasons were nothing but bad luck? He can see as well as any one what is the matter, and how to apply the remedies.

"Prospects for a winning team under Williams next year are good. Brown, Gilstad and Martineau have another year to play. Ray Edlund and Conrad Doyle, two fine ends, will be eligible next year, and of five men who made their letters at end this year, four will be back. Aas is due for a great year at center next year. Nolan is expected back. Hartig, Clement, Larson, Larkin and Ralph Olson, all big line men, will be back. So will Copeland. In the back field we will have Grose, Cy Olson and McCreery. Three other splendid back field men are in sight, Oster, Petersen and Dewey Johnson. Then there is the freshman squad with a goodly number of strong players to draw upon.

Poor Equipment Is Minnesota Handicap

"There have been some bad handicaps on Dr. Williams. While other schools have increased equipment, Minnesota has gone for 18 years with the old field. It is used for playing and practice. It is always in poor condition. Michigan has ten playing fields. Illinois has two fields for the varsity. Wisconsin, Iowa, Northwestern, Chicago and Indiana, all have two fields apiece. Most of them have indoor fields with dirt floors for practice, something Minnesota needs worse than any other school. The old 'gym' is a disgrace.

"Alumni demand winning teams, but what do they do to get them? There is stiff competition now for good players from high schools, but alumni of Minnesota pay little attention to them. Carleton, Macalester and Hamline offer inducements to high school stars. Some of the schools send out scouts. Eastern schools are after them, and many who might have come to Minnesota have been attracted elsewhere. I happen to know of one Minneapolis high school star Dr. Williams has urged to register at Minnesota, who has not been spoken to by a single alumnus.

"Students of Minnesota are accustomed to win, but they do not give their team proper support, and penalize them when they lose. The first two trips the team took this year, not a soul was at the station to see them off. Football men do not get sympathy or help in their studies, and under present standards any student at Princeton and Wisconsin.

"Students of Minnesota are accustomed to win, but they do not give their team proper support, and penalize them when they lose. The first two trips the team took this year, not a soul was at the station to see them off. Football men do not get sympathy or help in their studies, and under present standards any student at Princeton and Wisconsin.

"The team is behind Dr. Williams and wants him for another year.

"There were 27 men given football 'M's' this season, compared with a maximum of 18 before, which shows how many men were used trying to build a winning combination.

"Dr. Williams missed one week of the season this year, when he was called to Washington for a conference on the U. S. Veterans Bureau work. Prior to that he never had missed but one day of football practise in 22 years. In spite of some of the critics, he was out nearly every day last season and ready for work when the team reported."

Critics Say Two Jobs Are Too Much for Coach

Critics of Dr. Williams claim that his U. S. Veterans Bureau work has engrossed his time to the neglect of football. They assert that a football coach should be a full time man, so he could give more personal attention to the team. They point to the coincidence that Dr. Williams has carried the government work for the last two seasons, and that those have been the worst years for his football teams.

In reply to this, it is said that by special permission from the U. S. Veterans Bureau, Dr. Williams was allowed to take the time necessary for his coaching, and has spent as much time as usual with his teams. He got up early and worked on football plays before breakfast every day during the season, and generally was on the field for practise by 3 p.m.

Another point made for Dr. Williams is that Minnesota pays less for coaching talent than any of the conference schools. Dr. Williams receives \$1,500 a year from the athletic association. "Sig" Harris, assistant coach, gets \$1,800. Eight other alumni assistants have been paid only \$300 to \$350 each for the time they have given.

There are assistant coaches at other schools, it is claimed, getting more than Dr. Williams.

The critics say that Dr. Williams' assistants have not been utilized, however, most of them standing around with the "hay team" watching Dr. Williams and his eleven men, while Sig Harris worked alone with 65 freshmen.

Williams Adherents Pick Paige as Goat

Though relations are cordial between Dr. Williams and Professor Paige their "quarrel" for football defeats. They say Mr. Paige is so strict in enforcing conference rules that he "bends backward" that he is parsimonious in doling out athletic funds, and has failed to show proper sympathy with student athletes. More moderate critics say Mr. Paige has done much valuable work, but is unfit temperamentally to handle student athletics. The present system loads much detail on him. He does this work in addition to full work in the college of law, receiving \$5,500 salary as a law professor, and nothing for his athletic activities. Three men on the law faculty are more highly paid.

Student criticism of Mr. Paige has been severe. Those who have worked with him on the athletic bodies are warm in his defense, as a rule and on the campus the Paige issue provokes more bitterness than the Williams controversy. The Athletic Board of Control, of which Mr. Paige is one of the two faculty members, adopted resolutions only last week declaring that individual members of the board have been persistently blamed for acts "for which the entire board is responsible."

"We urge" the resolution said in part, "upon all those who are disposed to criticize this board, or any member of it, the necessity of obtaining accurate and definite information before forming or expressing opinions relative to the acts of this board or the acts of individuals performed in pursuance thereof."

Some of the Things Paige Is Blamed For

Mr. Paige has been a member of the conference 16 years, and has helped to draw most of its rules. He is called a "bug" in purity in athletics, but his friends claim that the conference rules are as fair for one institution as another, and that the Minnesota authorities have no choice save to comply with those rules. The rule

says not more than 33 men shall be taken to another university for a game. This sometimes has worked hardships. Before that rule was made freshmen teams and the band were sometimes taken, and a good part of the season's receipts were spent on railroad fares. It cost \$3,000 this year to take the 33 men to Michigan.

Regardless of the merits of this controversy, Mr. Paige has never received credit from the student body for the labor he has put in on student athletics, and probably he never will, because he does not know how to "jolly" students, and wouldn't do it if he could.

One grievance against Professor Paige is based on the dropping of baseball as an intercollegiate sport. This was in 1914. It was one of the two occasions in 17 years when the university senate has exercised its veto power over the athletic board of control.

Enemies of Professor Paige, by the way, claim that this veto power held as a threat over student members has compelled them to follow the Paige lead on other occasions, but this is denied by men who have served with him.

Want Baseball Back As a Major Sport

There is agitation now for a return to baseball as a major sport. The baseball fans claim that Minnesota can make as good a showing as any school in baseball, properly supported. It is in attraction to athletes, they claim as many boys like to play both football and baseball. They claim that the sport was dropped because it did not pay, and that, on the same reasoning, track athletics would have to go.

This claim is denied. Baseball was dropped, faculty apologists say, because it was turning university men into professional athletes. After winning laurels on the university team, they would go out and play professional ball in the summer, get caught, and be barred from football. It is also alleged that students take little interest in baseball and do not support it at other schools, also that intramural baseball, now quite popular every spring, would be killed by concentrating talent into a varsity team.

Needed Stadium and "Gym" Now Certain

Out of the bickering that has followed the two disastrous football seasons, friends of the university hope some good may come. They have been working to heal differences and frame constructive reforms.

An adequate stadium for athletics, and an adequate gymnasium, will be provided within the next few years under present plans. That will give needed equipment. Under a full time director of athletics, if the right man is obtained, there are hopes of putting Minnesota on the map in all student sports.

MINNESOTA FOOTBALL RECORD UNDER DR. H. L. WILLIAMS

Dr. H. L. Williams has coached University of Minnesota football teams for 22 consecutive seasons. Though his teams have lost ten out of twelve "conference" games in the last two years, the record for the entire Williams regime shows superiority for Minnesota over all but one rival. From 1900 to 1921 inclusive, the Minnesota football record stands as follows, counting only games with regular college teams:

Games won, 113; lost, 36; tied, 7.
Conference games won, 47; lost, 23; tied, 3.
Games with leading rivals:
Minnesota, 11; Wisconsin, 7; tied, 2.
Minnesota, 8; Illinois, 4; tied, 1.
Minnesota, 9; Chicago, 4; tied, 1.
Minnesota, 19; Iowa, 3.
Minnesota, 1; Michigan, tied, 1.
Minnesota, 3; Northwestern, 1.
Minnesota, 4; Indiana, 1.

APPENDIX 2

Personnel History

Presidents

William Watts Folwell	1869-1884
Cyrus Northrop	1884-1911
George Vincent	1911-1917
Marion L. Burton	1917-1920
Lotus D. Coffman	1920-1938
Guy Stanton Ford	1938-1941
Walter C. Coffey	1941-1945
James Lewis Morrill	1945-1960
O. Meredith Wilson	1960-1967 ¹
Malcom Moos	1967-1974
C. Peter Magrath	1974-

Athletic Directors (Men)

Henry L. Williams	1900-1922 ⁵
Fred Luehring	1922-1930
H. O. Crisler	1930-1932
Frank McCormick	1932-1941
Lou Keller	1941-1946
Frank McCormick	1946-1950
Ike Armstrong	1950-1963
Marshall W. Ryman	1963-1971
Paul R. Giel	1971-

Faculty Representatives (Men)

Conway MacMillan	1896 ²
Frederick Denton	1896 ³
F. J. E. Woodbridge	1897 ⁴
Frederick S. Jones	1897-1906
James Paige	1906-1934
Henry Rottschaefer	1934-1957
Stanley V. Kinyon	1957-1962
Max O. Schultze	1962-1974
Merle K. Loken	1974-1981
Robert A. Stein	1981-

Athletic Directors (Women)

Belmar Gunderson ⁶	1975-1976
Vivian M. Barfield ⁷	1976-1981
M. Catherine Mathison	1981-1982
Merrily Dean Baker	1982-

Faculty Representatives (Women)

Andrea Hinding	1975-1977
Julie Carson ⁶	1977-1979
Marion Freeman	1979-1981
Jo-Ida C. Hansen	1981-

¹ E. W. Ziebarth served as interim president during the summer of 1974.

² Attended first Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives meeting only.

³ Attended second Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives meeting only.

⁴ Attended third Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives meeting only.

⁵ Appointed as Athletic Director, but never really served in the position.

⁶ Acting.

⁷ Interim Director.