Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1995

The Portland Learning Community : a history

Martin White

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

White, Martin, "The Portland Learning Community : a history" (1995). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 3574.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5458>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Martin White for the Master of Arts in History were presented May 4, 1995, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

[REDACTED]
Gordon Dodds, Chair

[REDACTED]
Lois Becker

[REDACTED]
David Horowitz

[REDACTED]
Douglas Sherman
Representative of the Office of
Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL:

[REDACTED]
David A. Johnson, Chair
Department of History

* * * * *

ACCEPTED FOR PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BY THE LIBRARY

by [REDACTED]

on 30 June 1995

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Martin White for the Master of Arts in History presented May 4, 1995.

Title: The Portland Learning Community: A History.

This thesis recounts the history of the Portland Learning Community, an experimental institution of higher education founded in 1970 by a group consisting mostly of former faculty and students at Reed College. The Learning Community was funded by the Carnegie Corporation and affiliated with Antioch College.

The first chapter explores the background of the Learning Community at Reed College. Disputes there had roots in Reed's institutional structure and in pressures that the outside society placed on the college during the eras of McCarthyism, the struggle for civil rights, and the Vietnam War. In the late 1960s a crisis occurred that resulted in an exodus of younger faculty members.

Reformist Reed faculty and students formed the core of the group that organized the Learning Community during the period 1967-70, a process described in the second chapter. Apparent initial agreement about goals for the new community gave way to disputes about academic rigor and membership

standards; one group also favored attempting to integrate urban and "exurban" lifestyles, while the other was exclusively urban in orientation. During the summer of 1970 the Learning Community began formal operation in a dozen houses in Portland's Irvington neighborhood.

The third chapter discusses the community from 1970 to 1973. After the first year academic activity was subordinated to community-building and an exploration of individual relationships. A new division appeared between the "political" and "intensity" groups, the former more oriented toward participating in the larger society, the latter toward developing relationships within the Learning Community. In 1971, the community began a restaurant and an "Open Community School." The trend after 1970 was for members to become more identified with their houses and less with the Learning Community as a whole. During 1973 most of the houses were sold and the community disbanded.

An appendix considers the Learning Community's place in a tradition of educational experiments including the Bauhaus and Black Mountain College.

THE PORTLAND LEARNING COMMUNITY: A HISTORY

by

MARTIN WHITE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
HISTORY

Portland State University
1995

This was the order of human things; first the forests, after that the huts, thence the villages, next the cities, and finally the academies. . . .

--Giambattista Vico

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	.iv
PREFACE	.1
CHAPTER	
I "OUTMODED SCHOLASTIC PEDAGOGY"	.6
II "SOME PROPOSITIONS THAT DESERVE TO BE TESTED" .	.48
III "MAKING PEOPLE'S DREAMS COME TRUE"	.90
APPENDIX	
A THE BAUHAUS AND BLACK MOUNTAIN COLLEGE: AN ALTERNATIVE TRADITION	.139
BIBLIOGRAPHY	.147

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have gone out of their way to be helpful to me in my research. Thanks to Richard Burg, Mason Drukman, George Fasel, John Laursen, Bill McLaughlin, Grace McLaughlin, Maya Muir, Roger Porter, Victor Rosenblum, Deayne Roush, Jon Roush, Kathy Roush, Sam Schrager, Allyn Snider, David Sweet, Peter Thacker, Kirk Thompson, Jim Webb, and Dan Wolfe, for allowing themselves to be interviewed. Thanks also to Reed College archivist Marilyn Kierstead, Pat Cahill of the Columbia University Rare Book & Manuscript Library, the helpful people at the Oregon Historical Society library, Rick Harmon at the Oregon Historical Quarterly, and Michael Munk for access to his research on the Stanley Moore case.

Much credit should go to Gordon Dodds, David Horowitz, Lois Becker, and Douglas Sherman at Portland State University for their support and useful comments. I would like also to acknowledge Joe Uris's article on Reed College in One Dollar magazine (August 1974).

And thanks especially to Patti, who has put up with a lot.

The usual caveat is particularly important to note in this case: no one mentioned here is in any way responsible for the views I have expressed or the errors I have committed.

PREFACE

This thesis recounts the history of the Portland Learning Community, an experimental institution of higher education founded in 1970 by a group consisting mostly of former faculty and students at Reed College. The Learning Community was funded by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation and was affiliated with Antioch College, which provided academic credit for work done at the Learning Community. Due to the failure of members to agree on goals and to personality conflicts among them, the community persisted only a short time. But during that time it attracted widespread interest and the support of a number of talented people. As an instance of what came to be known as the "counterculture," it included many highly articulate participants.

The origins of the Learning Community lay in a reaction to the entrenched academic culture of Reed College. That culture was shaped by Reed's development as an institution, the best account of which is Burton Clark's, summarized in the first chapter of this thesis. The ethos at Reed also owed much to a damaging assault on the college during the McCarthy era, which left the faculty with a raw sensitivity concerning issues of academic freedom (or "faculty prerogative," as some

might term it). Then, during the 1960s, Reed faced a challenge from younger faculty members who felt the college could be more flexible in meeting the needs of students without undermining its academic standards, and from students who sought a voice in personnel and curriculum decisions. When these efforts at reform were blocked and many of the reform-minded faculty and some students left the college, the Learning Community was one outcome.

A word about Reed College: Some readers may find the view of it presented here surprising. This account is not intended to provide a "balanced" view of what happened there in the 1960s; its purpose is provide a context for the Learning Community. Reed College, therefore, is seen from the point of view of the Learning Community. Some readers might suspect that the Learning Community, in turn, is seen from the point of view of Reed College, as an instance of reciprocal or symmetrical bias. Perhaps. In any event, I would argue that a point of view does not render an account any less true. Of that, the reader will have to be the judge.

The subject of the second chapter is the aspirations and activities of the Learning Community's organizers from 1967 to 1970, as broad agreement on the desirability of making a new start outside Reed's confines gave way to disagreement on a variety of issues. Broadly speaking, these issues concerned standards: the criteria for the admission of new members, for example, and what kind of academic rigor, if any, was

desirable. Some members also advocated a bipolar community that would attempt to integrate urban and "exurban" lifestyles, while others felt the community's limited resources had to be focused within the city.

The third chapter describes the more radical course taken after the actual foundation of the community in the Irvington neighborhood of Portland, as efforts to build a community and to grapple with the fundamentals of human relationships increasingly took priority over academic activity.

Now that this account is concluded, I see that it is the story of a series of arguments going back to the turn of the century. In some instances I tend to find the position taken by one side more sympathetic; in other cases, I am not so sure. In any event, I would argue that the rights and wrongs are of secondary importance. The greater significance of these disputes is their probing of fundamental issues. What is the relationship, for example, between individuals and communities, and how do we balance their conflicting demands? To what extent should an institution's own interests prevail over those of its constituents, or some substantial fraction of those constituents? What is the nature of education? How do we decide what is important in our heritage to transmit, and what is the best way to transmit it? How qualified are students to direct their own educations? To what degree is it

possible to repudiate a culture and to create, starting from the beginning, a "counterculture"?

These are not issues amenable to any final resolution. My goal has been to present the best arguments I could find on either side. I have relied freely on the words of the participants in these events, both because they spoke for themselves perfectly well and because the tone of the discourse is important.

It seems only fair that I put on record my own involvement in the affairs recounted here. It is peripheral. I attended Reed College from 1965 to 1969, when I received a B.A. in history. I had no particular complaints at the time about the curriculum. I respected many (not all) of my teachers. I was not (excepting my junior year, when I had mononucleosis) especially unhappy there. During my senior year the college seemed increasingly chaotic, as students and younger faculty made bids for a voice in shaping the institution. I was perplexed by the issues raised by the demands for an independent Black Studies Center in the fall of 1968 and by the bitterness of the resistance to those demands. I was baffled by the wholesale dismissal of younger faculty members that began that winter.

When the Learning Community emerged soon after my graduation, I paid no attention. Later, I met a number of people who had participated in that experiment, and I came to feel it would be useful to put on record their reflections on

those experiences. The first duty of the historian is the preservation of memory.

One issue raised by some members of the Learning Community I would like to address directly. That is the view that their experience could not be understood or described meaningfully by outsiders, that its essence lay in subjective qualities that "objective" observers could not comprehend. I don't know whether this argument is susceptible of logical refutation, but I do not believe it. Giambattista Vico wrote that the social world, which is the creation of human beings, is uniquely capable (that is, even more so than the natural world) of being understood by human beings. If Vico was wrong, then we have no prospect of understanding even that small corner of the past we ourselves experienced--let us say, for example, Portland, Oregon, in the 1960s and 1970s--which with the passage of time grows increasingly exotic.

CHAPTER I

"OUTMODED SCHOLASTIC PEDAGOGY"

From its beginnings in 1911 Reed College saw itself as distinctive. Its youthful first president, William T. Foster, viewed his appointment as an opportunity to make an entirely fresh start in higher education. "Reed College," he wrote, "purposes to take full advantage of its splendid freedom from harassing traditions." Foster had already made a reputation as an educational reformer at Bowdoin and Columbia University. He was deeply concerned about the deleterious effect of a number of trends in higher education: the growing size of institutions, the increasing distance between teachers and students in large lecture courses, the tendency toward academic specialization, and what he perceived as the excessive flexibility of the elective system. Foster also deplored the prominence that football and fraternities had assumed in the established eastern colleges.¹

Many of the features that made Reed College unusual had their origins during the eight years of Foster's administration. Fraternities, sororities, and intercollegiate

¹Reed College First Annual Catalog, 1911-1912, January 1912, p. 19.

sports were banned from the outset in favor of a more "democratic," campus-wide approach to social life and widespread participation in physical activities such as gymnastics, handball, intramural football, tug-of-war, tennis, basketball and track. There was to be no place at Reed for the gentleman scholar or the socially prominent athlete. Foster also planned for Reed to serve the larger community. "He and his associates, while they were building Reed, would also help Portland rid itself of its vices and raise the citizenry to enlightenment," according to Burton Clark. This community uplift was to be accomplished through the service of faculty members on local boards and commissions, through the provision of extension courses, and "in a highly visible way, [the probing of] the sores of the city."²

Emblematic of Foster's ability to set people on edge was his uncompromising adherence to a program of "simplified spelling" ("alfabetical," "confirmd," etc.). Clark says that

the spelling had high visibility, being present in one public document after another, and was persistently carried forward by the president from year to year despite its obviously irksome quality.... An administrator sensitive to the community and eager for equilibrium would never have used it. Only an intellectually secure and stubborn man, committed fully to his own view of the long run, would have been so impractical.³

²Burton R. Clark, The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed & Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970, p. 103.

³Ibid., p. 104.

Although simplified spelling did not outlast Foster's tenure, others of his innovations were more persistent. Probably most significant for the future of the college was his promotion of active faculty participation in its governance.

The codification of the faculty role at Reed was partly precipitated by an event that took place far from Portland. This was the arbitrary firing in 1915 of four professors from the University of Utah, a case that prompted the first investigation by the newly formed American Association of University Professors (AAUP).⁴ One of Utah professors, A.A. Knowlton, then came to Reed to teach physics. Foster and the faculty were already conscious that Reed needed to formalize its organizational structure, but Knowlton's case made that need appear more urgent. That year they produced a constitution, which was adopted by the board of trustees in 1916.

The Reed College constitution was unusual in the status it accorded to the faculty. It defined the president as a member of the faculty and as the chief executive officer, not of the college, but of the faculty. It set up a "welfare committee" consisting of the president, two faculty members, and two members of the board of trustees, short-circuiting the role of the president as liaison between board and

⁴Walter P. Metzger, "The First Investigation," AAUP Bulletin, vol. 47, no. 3, September 1961, pp. 206-10.

faculty. And it established a faculty council, consisting of eight members of the faculty, elected by their fellows, on which the president would sit in an ex officio capacity. The council was to discuss matters of personnel and budget before the president made any recommendations to the board of trustees.⁵ Such an arrangement would make it difficult for even the strongest president to make important decisions on his own initiative.

Financial difficulties and strained relationships with faculty members and the outside community prompted Foster to resign in 1919. After an interregnum of two years, in which a faculty committee played a large role in administering the college, Richard F. Scholz became the second president. In the three years before he died, Scholz strengthened the faculty, reorganized the departments and divisions, ratified the discontinuation of the extension programs that had lapsed following Foster's departure, raised tuition, and instituted a program in the humanities consisting of "broad courses in history and world literature, to run on parallel time lines."⁶ This program, according to Clark,

⁵Clark, p. 122. Compare these arrangements with those at Whitman College, where President Stephen B.L. Penrose dominated the life of the college for 40 years, from 1894 until 1934. See G. Thomas Edwards, The Triumph of Tradition: The Emergence of Whitman College 1859-1924. Walla Walla, Washington: Whitman College, 1992, pp. 124-503 passim.

⁶Clark, pp, 114, 116.

became the heart of the freshman year and an important part of the life of the sophomore.... [Every student's] first year was dominated by the lectures of the humanities professors and especially by small discussion sessions around a table with an instructor, usually a senior figure, and a small group of students.... The basic required courses in the humanities thus became another component that would touch all who entered the college and from which there was no escape. A sizable component of the faculty also became closely identified with this program, and henceforth, for many within and outside the college, the program became the expression of Reed ideals.⁷

Following Scholz's death in 1924, the senior faculty assumed the leadership role at Reed and dominated the college throughout the 1920s and 1930s. A handful of men who had arrived at Reed in the Scholz era or earlier, these professors had participated in shaping the college as a distinctive institution, and were committed to its perpetuation. The status of these senior faculty members derived originally from Foster's constitution and was further enhanced by Scholz's organizational reforms. As Clark describes the situation, from 1916,

for thirty years the college had no associate professors, no one between the one or two full Professors in a discipline and the junior, non-tenured staff.

... Whatever its manifest purpose, this structure had the clear consequence of promoting faculty oligarchy.... The junior ranks of instructor and assistant professor suffered much turnover, a phenomenon that was to persist as part of the nature of Reed long after the associate professorship was added.... A dozen to eighteen men

⁷Ibid.

monopolized status in the faculty and the personal influence that flows from it all through the years when a distinctive character was first being generated and then fully institutionalized.

... By 1930 the organizational structure at Reed was an extreme illustration of faculty authority; the influence of faculty in policy-making very considerably exceeded that which obtained in other colleges of average and above-average rank.⁸

This structure was proof against the efforts of Reed's third and fourth presidents to point the college in new directions. Norman Coleman (president 1925-34) tried to make Reed more congenial to the conservative outlook of the larger community by introducing a dose of religious piety. He also attempted to start a program in Far Eastern studies, in which he had a personal interest. Neither of these proposed reforms was implemented. His successor, Dexter Merriam Keezer (1934-42), thought Reed was "over-intellectualized," and tried to introduce more "practical" courses, as well as to improve relations with Portland's citizenry. According to Clark's account,

His efforts were to come to nought. He ran contrary, not to the trustees--for they were in considerable agreement--but to the ideals and practices of the faculty. Desiring an intellectual campus, the faculty did not share the president's concern about balance in the life of the student.... The faculty council, in Keezer's view, gave "political expression to the extreme conservatism of the faculty, both in matters of educational policy and any others which might affect job tenure." ... Keezer discovered that the

⁸Ibid., pp. 121-22.

faculty influenced educational policy to a degree probably not exceeded anywhere in the country.⁹

One manifestation of the "intellectual" character of the college was the practice of not reporting grades. Grades were given and recorded in the normal fashion; they were simply withheld from the students, with the object of encouraging them to pursue learning for its own sake. This idealistic stance, as described by Clark, was not without its dangers.

Faculty and students became inordinately proud of this policy ... [which] came to stand for intellectual purity.

But the purity could be harsh since the nonreporting of grades fed directly into a general severity in grading that was at the very soul of the college. Reed ideals early and strongly discouraged the coddling of students.... In the freshman humanities course required of all, the instructors were ... giving less than 30 per cent of the students A's and B's.¹⁰

However, students who were receiving unsatisfactory grades were of necessity informed of their standing.

The result was that low grades were better communicated than high ones. On top of severe grading in a bright, competitive student body, the policy of not reporting grades made the college strongly punishment centered.¹¹

This atmosphere of academic rigor and severity contributed to a dropout rate that was extremely high. Generally only about 25 percent of incoming freshmen

⁹Ibid., p. 127-28.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 130.

¹¹Ibid., p. 131.

graduated in four years; delayed graduation raised the proportion to about one in three. In contrast Harvard graduated around 90 percent of its entering freshmen, and Swarthmore about 75 percent.¹²

During these early postwar years, the rigor of the humanities program was increased. According to the self-study report undertaken in 1953, "whereas prior to 1941 the relative frequency of D's was supposed to be 10%, the recommended norm for lower division courses at the present

¹²Ibid., p. 141. The causes of Reed's high dropout rate are no doubt many and complex. Whatever the causes, if it were viewed as a problem rather than a point of pride, it would have been fixed.

Reed's suicide rate has also been dismayingly high, especially among its few minority students. The most recent occurred May 19, 1994. According to a report in The Oregonian, "A 23-year-old Reed College student jumped to his death Thursday afternoon from a downtown Portland parking garage. Arun Ram had been depressed that academic troubles would keep him from graduating Sunday, college officials told police. Witnesses told police they saw a man standing on the 8th-floor railing of the garage at Southwest Sixth Avenue and Salmon Street. He yelled that he was going to jump, then leaped, landing on the sidewalk below. Ram is from India. His mother had traveled to Portland for the graduation." May 20, 1994, p. E3.

In 1972 Nora Lehnhoff, Reed '70, wrote an article in the alumni magazine suggesting that Reed would do well to offer its students more support, emotionally, socially, vocationally, and in other non-academic ways. Nora Lehnhoff, "I could have used some nannying," in Reed, February 1992, pp. 2-3. Lehnhoff's article attracted some support from alumni who felt the college could have made some difficult years easier than it did. But it also drew attacks from alumni who in one form or another advanced two basic arguments: (1) I and many people I have spoken to were happy at Reed, so why wasn't everyone? (2) Reform would end with Reed becoming "yet another liberal arts college, more than less like every other in the land." Letter from Don Watkins, Reed, August 1992, inside front cover.

time is 20%.¹³ And while teachers did not always follow the "recommended distribution" exactly, the report observed that "there has been a marked increase in the severity of grading in the larger freshman courses in comparison with pre-war practice."¹⁴ As a consequence, despite an increase in the quality of entering freshman, the mortality rate continued to increase.¹⁵

This mortality rate would become a bone of contention in the 1960s, by which time the new arrivals of the 1940s were tenured, senior faculty members. But before they had to face an internal challenge from a new generation of faculty and students, they first had to witness a major assault from the outside on faculty autonomy at Reed, an experience that had much to do with shaping their outlook.

In 1952 Duncan Smith Ballantine assumed the presidency, and by 1954 he had become controversial and unpopular for proposing to broaden the curriculum and for challenging what he called the "oligarchic dictatorship" of the faculty.¹⁶ Then, during that summer, with the president and the faculty

¹³The Reed College Self-Study Program, September 25, 1953, Section I, p. 37.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 42

¹⁶Clark, p. 160.

already at loggerheads, three professors at Reed became the target of investigations by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) in its hunt for subversives or disloyal members of the intelligentsia.

One of these, Stanley Moore, had joined the Reed philosophy department in 1948. During a pre-employment interview with a Reed professor, Moore had mentioned that he had been turned down for a position at an eastern college because he was a Marxist, and stated that if Reed had any similar policies, he would not be interested in teaching there. The professor said that at Reed the faculty enjoyed complete academic freedom. Before Moore was offered the job, this conversation was reported to the president of Reed (Ernest B. MacNaughton) but not to the faculty council. When Moore came to Reed, he was always, according to the 1958 AAUP report on the affair, "frank and open about his Marxist outlook."¹⁷

In 1950 or 1951 a member of Reed's board of trustees learned of Moore's Marxism, including a rumor that Moore had at one time belonged to the Young Communist League at the University of California. This trustee raised the issue of Moore's past affiliations first with President MacNaughton and later with Duncan Ballantine when he became president;

¹⁷J. Keith Mann, Robert J. Lampman, and Edward C. Moore, "Reed College," AAUP Bulletin, vol. 44, no. 1, March 1958, p. 103.

neither of them wished to investigate the charge. In 1953, Moore was appointed full professor, the rapidity of his promotion testifying to the high regard of his fellow faculty members and his popularity among students.

In March 1954, Moore was named before a HUAC subcommittee as having been an official of the Communist Party in Alameda County, California. In June Moore appeared before the subcommittee, where he refused, on the basis of the First and Fifth Amendments, to answer any questions concerning his academic or political activities or affiliations. Later in June, a HUAC subcommittee (the Velde Committee) held hearings in Portland at which Moore was identified by Robert Canon, a former dean of students at Reed, as a member of "the professional club of the Communist Party,"¹⁸ an organization that Canon represented as secret and conspiratorial.

In "An Open Letter to the President, Trustees, Faculty, Students, and Alumni of Reed College" on June 2, 1954, Moore argued that neither HUAC nor the trustees and administrators of Reed College had any authority to question his beliefs and associations; that invoking the Fifth Amendment should not be construed as an admission of guilt; that, in any event, membership in the Community Party was no indicator of professional competence; and that he had never concealed

¹⁸Ibid., p. 105.

either his past activities nor his Marxism. In a second open letter on June 21 Moore requested that, if the trustees intended to investigate his conduct, they do so in an open and public hearing.¹⁹ However, the board of trustees decided on a private and "informal" hearing, apparently because it wished to protect the privacy of two other faculty members (Lloyd Reynolds and Leonard Marsak) who had also been named before HUAC.²⁰

These maneuvers by Moore and the trustees occurred in a context of public hysteria, which the AAUP report describes:

The House Committee hearings in Portland received wide local coverage, and were televised if the witnesses did not object. There was much adverse reaction to the conduct of faculty members invoking the Fifth Amendment before the Committee. The prevailing mood is illustrated by the fact that there was a suggestion that the Reed College campus might be condemned for a Portland city college.²¹

It was in this supercharged atmosphere that, on June 20, Ballantine suspended Reynolds from teaching during the summer session. On June 23 the faculty, by a vote of 38 to 9, passed a resolution protesting this action to the board of trustees.²² As events unfolded, the faculty, with few

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 106-07.

²⁰Ibid., p. 109. See Ellen W. Schrecker, No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986, pp. 237-38.

²¹Mann, et al., p. 110.

²²Ibid.

exceptions, continued to support Moore on the basis of his outstanding academic performance; the position of the majority was that political affiliations were not relevant to evaluating the fitness of any professor to hold the position to which he had been appointed. Ballantine disagreed, holding that membership in a conspiratorial organization such as the Communist Party was "beyond the scope of permissible political beliefs and associations and academic freedom."²³

In preparation for the Moore hearing, the faculty council submitted a report on the issue of Moore's noncooperation with the various investigations. According to the AAUP report, the council conceded that

an act of noncooperation, if proved, was a very relevant factor in regard to tenure. It argued, however, that a decision concerning termination of tenure should not be based solely on such a specific failure, but should be made in the light of the general service and performance of the faculty member involved.²⁴

The faculty council also contended that the burden of proof in regard to any allegations should be placed on the board of trustees rather than upon the accused.

The three cases now came before the board of trustees. In the cases of Reynolds and Marsak, because they cooperated with the investigations undertaken by the faculty council and the board of trustees, at least to the extent of stating that

²³Ibid., p. 115.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 120-21.

they were not presently members of the Communist Party,²⁵ the board recommended that no action be taken, though Marsak, who was untenured, was dropped a year later when his contract expired.²⁶ He was not able to get another job in academia for nearly a decade.²⁷

Moore, on the other hand, continued to adhere uncompromisingly to his position of noncooperation. He argued that the private hearing before the board violated AAUP guidelines; contended that the college, by questioning political affiliations in which it had professed itself to have no interest when it hired and then promoted him, was creating an ex post facto law; and asserted that the board's exclusion of membership in the Community Party from the protection of academic freedom was a usurpation of the power of the faculty.²⁸

Because Stanley Moore refused at the hearing to discuss his political affiliations or to refute the accusations made by Robert Canon, on August 13 the board dismissed him from his position. Ballantine, whose already rocky relationship with the faculty had been made impossible by the vote of no

²⁵Michael Munk, "Oregon Tests Academic Freedom in (Cold)Wartime: Stanley Moore vs the Trustees of Reed College," unpublished manuscript, pp. 65-67.

²⁶Schrecker, p. 238.

²⁷Ibid., p. 269-70.

²⁸Mann, et al., p. 118.

confidence following his suspension of Reynolds, resigned later in the year (as did three trustees).

According to Ellen Schrecker,

Reed may well have had the only real academic freedom case of the McCarthy period. For Reed was the only school at which the faculty openly disagreed with the trustees and administration about the basic criteria for employment.... [A]t every other school the faculty was willing to impose some kind of political test on itself.²⁹

It has to be noted, however, that the Reed faculty's position was never as extreme as Moore's; it never held, as he did, that noncooperation with political investigations was irrelevant to employability, and the faculty council itself subjected Reynolds and Marsak to questioning³⁰. After Moore was fired, William Parker, secretary of the faculty council, expressed to the press his disappointment at Moore's firing, but at the same time thanked the board of trustees (which had entirely ignored the faculty's recommendations during its deliberations) for its "cooperation."³¹

In the aftermath of the Stanley Moore affair, Frank L. Griffin--a Republican, a Baptist, and a retired professor whose ties with the college extended back to the drafting of

²⁹Schrecker, p. 240.

³⁰Ibid., p. 238.

³¹Michael Munk, "Oregon Tests Academic Freedom in Cold War Time: Stanley Moore vs the Trustees of Reed College," p. 83.

the 1915 constitution--was brought in as president to take charge of damage control.³² The college adopted a policy of advising candidates that membership in the Communist Party was incompatible with holding a faculty position at Reed.³³ The AAUP report describes the next couple of years as a period of "rallying around the College by all those interested in its welfare. The stresses of the immediately preceding period receded and were replaced by a spirit of common purpose among the Faculty, President, and Board."³⁴

In 1956, Griffin was succeeded by Richard H. Sullivan, during whose tenure the problems of the McCarthy era would fade into the past. For many who had experienced the case personally, though, it remained an open wound. Alumni from the 1950s wrangled with the board of trustees for nearly 40 years, demanding that the board reverse its position and apologize to Moore.³⁵ For faculty members who had witnessed

³²Clark, pp. 162-63.

³³Mann, et al., p. 134.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵In 1981, the Reed board of trustees issued an expression of regret for Moore's termination, but Moore was not invited to visit the campus, as his supporters among the alumni had demanded. In his 1991 commencement speech, poet Gary Snyder, Reed '51, referred to Reed's "unfinished business with Dr. Moore." See Michael Munk, "Reversing the Verdicts: The Case of Reed College," Monthly Review, March 1992, p. 38. On January 28, 1993, Reed's new president, Stephen Koblik, wrote to Moore extending a formal invitation to visit, which Moore declined. See Reed, November 1993, p. 2.

the controversy, its ramifications were many and sometimes surprising. At the least, it left some senior faculty with a prickly sensitivity to any expressions of discontent or desire for change--from whatever direction--that might affect academic freedom or faculty prerogatives (between which no clear distinction was made). During the 1960s such expressions were to be neither rare nor timid.

Sullivan served as president from 1956 until 1966. The unusual length of his administration was facilitated by a congenial personality and an early commitment to the preservation of the status quo. By the middle '60s, however, he was looking toward the future. During the 1963-64 academic year Sullivan proposed the addition of a graduate school, a notion he persuaded the trustees to support. The faculty was another matter. Richard Jones saw the graduate school proposal as a watershed: "For the first time in Reed's history, the graduate school controversy had divided the faculty on the matter of the college's major objective and its principles."³⁶

Sullivan's proposal failed, but two years later, in response to a financial crisis, he proposed another drastic alteration in the status quo: that Reed reconfigure itself as three colleges--a traditional liberal arts college with 935

³⁶Richard Jones, "The Reed Community: Rise & Fall," in The Reed College Student Handbook 1991, Blake Nebel, ed., p. 14. Jones taught history at Reed from 1941 into the 1980s.

students, a public affairs college with 375, and an arts college with 300.³⁷ Sullivan's hope was to resolve Reed's financial problems through growth rather than thrift. He put the matter to a Committee on the Future of Reed College (Committee of 42), and soon after resigned.

Although this second Sullivan proposal was scuttled,³⁸ the college nevertheless found the appeal of growth attractive. In 1966 the board of trustees accepted the recommendation of the Committee of 42 that the student body be increased from 900 to 1200 by the end of the decade, with a commensurate increase in the size of the faculty and the physical facilities.³⁹

New teachers, whom Reed traditionally recruited directly from graduate schools rather than from the faculty of other colleges and universities, arrived in those years in substantial numbers. While Reed's practice had long been to call many but to choose few,⁴⁰ the newcomers were often

³⁷Jane Van Cleve, "Where Do We Grow From Here?" Reed College Sallyport, November-December, 1969, p. 12.

³⁸The three-college notion still had its proponents in 1969, among them Howard Waskow. See Reed College Sallyport, November-December, 1969, p. 32.

³⁹Report reproduced in The Quest, October 29, 1969, p. 6. The student body at Reed numbered 561 in 1941, 700 in 1946, 865 in 1964, and 1200 in 1969, according to Jane Van Cleve, *ibid.*, p. 9, and Marshall W. Cronyn, "FAC Minority Report," Sallyport, November-December, 1969, p. 18.

⁴⁰According to Clark, writing in the early 1960s, "Reed long has had heavy turnover in the junior ranks, especially in the humanities staff.... In a college so poorly financed and with

unaware of the traditionally high attrition rate among new recruits. Those who were aware hoped, or were led to believe, that the swelling student population had altered their prospects for the better.

Among this younger generation of professors were a number who later played a role in the formation of the Learning Community. In 1961 Roger Porter joined the faculty; in 1963 George Fasel; in 1964 Mason Drukman, Jon Roush, Kirk Thompson and Howard Waskow; in 1965 Jim Webb; in 1966 Bill McLoughlin; in 1968 Millie Howe, John Mephram, and Mary Pedersen.⁴¹

Newcomers were quickly struck by the accumulation of power among the senior faculty, though it took them awhile to appreciate the dangers associated with any questioning of the status quo. During his first year at Reed Bill McLoughlin participated in an attempt to reform the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), the body responsible for curriculum and tenure decisions. It had ten members, nearly always chosen from among a group of about a dozen senior faculty members. Together with Kirk Thompson and Ed Garlan, McLoughlin naively

such a long tradition of a small staff of full professors supported by a larger staff of instructors and assistant professors, a heavy turnover of young men became a latent financial subsidy.... This system allowed, almost guaranteed, careful selection, in which a man was fully assessed for how he fitted the institution." Clark, p. 156.

⁴¹Reed College Bulletin, 1968-1969, pp. 115-122.

wrote a proposal that the FAC reserve slots for assistant and associate professors, to provide junior faculty with a voice on the body. This reform was passed by the faculty during McLoughlin's first fall at Reed. After the meeting, Garlan shook McLoughlin's hand, commenting on what a courageous thing he had done, much to McLoughlin's surprise.⁴²

The relative ease with which this restructuring was accomplished may have been the result of the absence on sabbatical of two members of the senior faculty who usually played key roles on the FAC: philosopher Marvin Levich and historian Richard Jones. In fact, in January 1968, after Levich and Jones returned, the reform of the FAC was reversed.⁴³ This failed reform effort was, however, merely a prelude to a many-faceted attempt by younger faculty members to implement basic changes at the college.

All of the received verities about Reed values came under assault in the next few years. This assault was fueled by the increasingly violent distempers of the larger society, its consensus destabilized by the Vietnam War abroad and racial conflict at home. The war created a sense of urgency, and protests against it accustomed students to take direct

⁴²Bill McLoughlin interview, June 12, 1992, IA-130. Rosters for the FAC for seven years between 1960 and 1968 show that 13 professors occupied 73 percent of the available positions.

⁴³Blake Nebel, "Into the Modern World," Reed College Student Handbook 1991, p.10.

political action. Differences tended quickly to become polarized. The atmosphere of "passionate intensity" did not accord well with notions of patient negotiation and of working through channels.

By the late 1960s, the humanities had played a special role at Reed for nearly half a century. The parallel literature and history courses of the World War I era had been combined into a single program in 1943. Since then it had undergone tinkering but little change. To many of the younger faculty and a large number of students, the narrow focus on the heritage of classical Greece and Medieval Christendom was antiquated. From the late 1930s to the early 1950s, in fact, the number of entering students intending to major in the natural sciences increased from under 40 percent to nearly 60 percent of the total.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, for many senior faculty the humanities program continued to represent the essence of what made Reed a special and a valuable institution.

While the second year of the humanities program had some flexibility, the first year's curriculum was, as a former professor described it, "set in stone."⁴⁵ Taken by all

⁴⁴The Reed College Self-Study Program, September 25, 1953, Section I, p. 12.

⁴⁵James Webb interview, October 16, 1994. Webb taught literature and humanities at Reed from 1965 to 1972.

freshmen, it comprised three lectures and three conferences a week. The readings were strenuous. Each student was required to write ten papers, of increasing length as the year progressed, each due at noon on a Saturday, with every student writing on an identical topic. Promptly at noon the papers were collected from the faculty mailboxes by the Humanities 110 secretary, with late papers receiving no credit. While the program counted for credit equivalent to one and a half times a standard course, the workload was acknowledged to be double.⁴⁶

One result of this program was the promotion of a sense of camaraderie among the freshmen, many of whom stayed up writing all night on the designated Friday nights. The rigor of the course also contributed to the fact that only 65 percent of entering freshmen were still enrolled the following year.⁴⁷

This attrition rate was a problem many of the younger faculty members thought should be addressed. They felt there was room to relax the rigor and rigidity of the humanities program without dealing a mortal blow to academic standards

⁴⁶The Reed College Self-Study Program, Section III, p. 1.

⁴⁷This statistic is for the years 1940-59, not including the war years 1942-46, when only 34 percent of entering freshmen returned the following year. Clark, p. 141. The percentage of returning students actually increased slightly in the late 1960s, which might be partly attributable to the vulnerability of male students to the draft.

at Reed. When they attempted to introduce changes, however, they found that resistance was, as Roger Porter describes it, "massive, and it was swift, it was punishing, and it was extremely demoralizing to a lot of young faculty."⁴⁸

A proposal to introduce multiple paper topics was defeated 11-10. Some time after this vote, Sam McCracken, the Humanities 110 secretary, took the liberty while collecting the papers of examining those submitted by students in the conferences of new faculty members; he noticed five titles that suggested topics other than the one assigned. He reported this to Professor Jones, who called the teachers in question into his office and described their behavior as "unconscionable." At the end of the year all five were terminated.⁴⁹

During the 1967-68 academic year, however, many faculty members still hoped to avoid a complete break between the conservative and reformist factions. Following Richard Sullivan's departure, Byron Youtz was appointed interim president, and as a gesture to the younger faculty and to open a dialogue, George Fasel, a historian still in his twenties, was appointed as his assistant. According to Fasel, Youtz was offered the presidency, but he was unwilling to undertake that increasingly thankless job on a permanent

⁴⁸Roger Porter interview, 1A-177.

⁴⁹Ibid., 1A-190.

basis.⁵⁰ The following year Victor Rosenblum was hired as president.

By the fall of 1968 student dissatisfaction with (as one student described it) the "outmoded ... scholastic pedagogy"⁵¹ and coercive nature of the humanities program had been vocalized to an extent that warranted the setting aside of two full class days, December 5 and 6, to discuss the issue. At the resulting convocation, not surprisingly, students expressed a variety of opinions about the program, but in general they supported a position that "students be given freedom (i.e., a wider variety of choice insofar as his [sic] program was concerned) and that students have an effective voice in administrative matters (i.e. hiring and firing of faculty)," including representation on the FAC.⁵²

Immediately following the convocation, the issue of humanities reform was overtaken by a crisis on the different but related topic of black studies at Reed.

In 1964, Reed had accepted a Rockefeller grant to provide scholarships for black students,⁵³ a group virtually unrepresented at Reed before 1963. By the 1968-69 academic

⁵⁰George Fasel interview, December 5, 1994.

⁵¹David Weissman in The Quest, December 10, 1968, p. 9.

⁵²Unsigned article, *ibid.*, p. 2.

⁵³Blake Nebel, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

year, the black student population had grown to nearly forty, a number sufficient to support the organization of a Black Student Union (BSU) to represent their point of view. Blacks at Reed found little to appeal to them in the unapologetically Eurocentric humanities program. By now, too, the civil rights movement of the early 1960s, emphasizing integration and nonviolence, had lost its impetus, and a more separatist and confrontational stance had become fashionable among black intellectuals and students.

When the BSU first introduced a proposal that Reed create a Black Studies Center (BSC), the reaction was not unfavorable. According to Mark Stanley, writing in the Quest, the Educational Policy Committee (containing both faculty and students) "voted to recommend the establishment of such a program, and established a subcommittee to set up two or three tentative models" for consideration by the faculty.⁵⁴ To move beyond a statement of principle, however, proved to be difficult. Issues included the question of who would determine the curriculum and hire faculty, as well as how the courses offered by the BSC would be integrated into the overall Reed curriculum, with its already rigorous system of general and departmental requirements.

⁵⁴Mark Stanley, "A History of Black Studies at Reed," Quest Extra, Dec. 15, 1968, p. 5.

In dealing with the faculty in the fall of 1968, the BSU came to feel, rightly or wrongly, a spirit of condescension toward black history and culture, and the absence of a sense of urgency. As a consequence, the BSU lost faith in the prospect of realizing its objectives through negotiations and resolved to provoke a crisis. Early in November the BSU presented a list of five nonnegotiable demands:

I. The consultants [to be hired to design a black studies program] will provide a fresh view of Reed College. We want a commitment to a Black Studies program in some form.

II. We want funds to bring Black consultants here to confer with us, the BSU, to develop a workable satisfactory curriculum. We want funds enough to keep them here long enough to develop this curriculum.

III. We want ABSOLUTE control in the selection of the Black faculty for Black Studies. Their qualifications will be not only on academic credentials but also on knowledge in the field. All professors should receive at least the minimum Reed salary for beginning professors and should receive higher salaries as their experience, academic credentials, and knowledge of the field dictate. No Black professor will be removed without BSU permission.

IV. We want control of the curriculum until there are enough Black professors to take over the job.

V. No courses dealing with the peoples of African descent will be taught at Reed without BSU permission.⁵⁵

Then, on December 11, in the absence of an acceptable response, the BSU occupied the administrative offices on the second floor of Eliot Hall and called for a student boycott of all classes to force the college to agree to the demands.

⁵⁵Quest Extra, Dec. 12, 1968, p. 2.

By this time the merits of the BSU's case had become entangled in a discussion of the merits of its tactics.

The reply of the faculty was that it supported in principle the establishment of a black studies program but that it found demands 3, 4 and 5 unacceptable. According to the report of the faculty position that appeared in the Quest, "Acceptance of these demands would compromise essential principles of academic freedom."⁵⁶ The escalation of the dispute left many faculty members who supported the idea of a black studies center uneasy about the frontal assault on their prerogatives by the BSU. Passionate debate served mainly to obscure rather than clarify matters, as every participant had his or her own view of the "true" issue at stake: the Black Studies Center itself, the five demands of the BSU, the occupation of Eliot Hall, the boycott of classes, the honor principle governing acceptable conduct at Reed, or the bad faith of supposedly unscrupulous adversaries in claiming the primacy of the secondary issues.

⁵⁶Ibid. "Academic freedom" is usually taken to mean that professional incompetence, as judged by one's peers, or moral turpitude are the only criteria for removal from a tenured academic position. Stanley Moore at his hearing before the Reed board of trustees called academic freedom "a charter of liberties of a profession." See Michael Monk, "Oregon Tests Academic Freedom in (Cold)Wartime: Stanley Moore vs the Trustees of Reed College," p. 80. As will become clear, academic freedom was a more inclusive concept at Reed in the 1960s. Ellen Schrecker in her study of McCarthyism comments that "we should not be surprised that [academic freedom] was invoked more often to defend the well-being of an institution than the political rights of an individual." Op. cit., p. 23.

In this situation, many waited to hear what position Lloyd Reynolds would take. Reynolds' authority on campus was less political than spiritual. He had taught and left a lasting mark on students ever since the 1920s, many of whom were among Reed's most prominent alumni. A charismatic teacher, by the 1960s his radical vision derived more from William Blake, John Ruskin, and William Morris than from Karl Marx.⁵⁷ But the basis of the prestige he enjoyed among the students counted for less among a faculty that regarded academic rigor as the highest of virtues. Nevertheless, given Reynolds' personal history, no one could imagine that his commitment to academic freedom could be anything less than absolute. At a community meeting to discuss the crisis, Reynolds' position was refreshingly simple: Reed College, he said, had room for a Black Studies Center.⁵⁸

President Rosenblum refused to call in the police to resolve the impasse created by the occupation.⁵⁹ His strategy

⁵⁷For Reynolds' point of view, see his introduction to John Ruskin, The Nature of Gothic. Portland, Oregon: Charles Lehman, Publisher, 1975. Also, Lloyd J. Reynolds, The Decline of Materialism. Portland, Oregon: The Alcuin Press, 1978.

⁵⁸Personal recollection of the author.

⁵⁹In retrospect, Rosenblum's feelings about his actions at that time were mixed. He was pleased that no acts of violence were committed on campus during the BSU sit-in or at any of the other protests of that era, for which his measured response was no doubt partly responsible. He was sorry that he did not take a stronger leadership role by making clear to the faculty his support for a black studies program, which he felt was essential for the college to recruit a more diverse student body. Victor Rosenblum interview, July 28, 1992, 1A-

of temporizing was facilitated by the calendar: when the occupation began, only a few days remained until the end of the term and the beginning of the winter vacation. The end of the term was set forward until after the winter break to overcome the logistical difficulties presented by the disruption of classes and normal administration.

Following a week of debate and maneuvering, the faculty, by a vote of 53 to 50, approved

in principle the establishment of an autonomous Black Studies Center under the auspices of the Reed Institute. It is understood that the Center would ascribe to the standards of academic freedom as enunciated in the 1940 A.A.U.P. statement on academic freedom and tenure. It is understood that the Black Student Union and consultants will assist in the selection of the first director.⁶⁰

Since the proposed BSC would be "autonomous," the actual relationship of the center and its faculty and staff to Reed College remained undefined.

By the time campus life resumed in February, the divisions within the Reed body politic resulting from the disputes over the humanities program and the BSC had been deepened and hardened by another brutal development. During

300. Rosenblum was president of Reed College from 1968 to 1970.

⁶⁰Unsigned article, Reed College Quest, February 5, 1969, p. 1. The Reed Institute is the corporate entity under which Reed College is subsumed. The BSC in theory could have been responsible to the board of trustees of the Reed Institute (and been housed on the campus owned by the Reed Institute) yet have remained administratively independent of Reed College.

the vacation break, the Faculty Advisory Committee abruptly fired a substantial number of younger faculty members. According to Michael J. Lanning, editor of The Oquest, saw the FAC's personnel procedures as "patently unsatisfactory when compared to any intelligent standard of academic freedom through democratic means, or of academic professionalism."⁶¹

This purge prompted students to demand the formation of a Student Advisory Committee to serve as a counterpoise to the arbitrary actions of the FAC. And on February 17 Professor Svitavsky introduced a motion before the faculty to increase the number of members of the FAC to 15, "to allow for more representation of junior faculty and, implicitly, for the liberalization of the FAC's perspective. It was defeated 59 to 44."⁶²

During February and March the Black Studies Center continued to be a subject of intense politicking among both students and faculty. On Thursday, February 27, mimicking the BSU's December action, the Reed chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), with the support of other campus

⁶¹Ibid., p. 2. Between 1960 and 1974 the average number of departures from the Reed faculty was 14, with the exception of 1970 and 1971, for which two years the total was 59. See graph entitled "Retention of Faculty, 1960-1975," Reed College Student Handbook 1991, p. 44. The Reed College Bulletin, 1968-1969, lists 138 faculty members.

⁶²The Campus Gazette, February 19, 1969, p. 4A. Several competitors to the Oquest made ephemeral appearances in this period.

activists, mounted a copycat occupation of President Rosenblum's office. This attracted little support and a great deal of opposition, especially among white students whose priority was the effective lobbying of the faculty as it approached a critical vote. On Saturday, March 1, Rosenblum's office was vacated by the occupiers. On Monday evening a candlelight vigil was held outside the Faculty Office Building. Before the vote was taken, President Rosenblum "asked if he might express his personal support of the motion and he received a (standing) vote of confidence."⁶³

Sam Schrager, who witnessed some of the debate, recalls it as extraordinary acrimonious. Howard Waskow, probably the most outspoken of the liberal faction, attracted a great deal of hostility. One professor, who had been at Reed for nearly a quarter of a century and was known to have a drinking problem, was hooted down when he attempted to speak with cries of "drunk!"⁶⁴

On Tuesday, March 4, after extended debate over a variety of amendments, a Black Studies Center was approved by a vote of 60 to 54.⁶⁵ The BSC as constituted on that date was

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Sam Schrager interview, September 9, 1992. Schrager was a junior at Reed in 1968-69 and a member of the Committee of 8 discussed below. He now teaches at The Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington.

⁶⁵Unsigned article, The Wall Poster, March 5, 1969.

not to be a separate entity from the college, responsible only to the trustees (as earlier envisioned), but essentially a new department of the college; its faculty members would have the same standing as faculty members of other departments of the college. However, the normal control exercised by the FAC (and guaranteed by Article III, Sec. 5. of the Reed Constitution) over hiring and firing would be circumvented. Initial hiring of a director would be done jointly by the BSU, President Rosenblum, and the board of trustees of Reed College. The director and faculty of the BSC, once constituted, would then assume control over its own hiring and firing, the FAC to be involved only in cases of appeals. However, courses offered by the BSC for credit toward a Reed degree would need the approval of the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) of the Reed faculty, which would be advised by the director and faculty of the BSC.

One byproduct of the bitter conflict leading up to the establishment of the BSC was Lloyd Reynolds' surprise announcement during the spring that he would be leaving the college at the end of the academic year. According to a conversation Reynolds had with Sam Schrager at the time, his resignation was due to the pressure he had received from fellow faculty members not to speak out in support of a BSC. These faculty members, Reynolds told Schrager, called him to

say that they had supported him during his HUAC troubles in the '50s, and they were now calling in their IOUs.⁶⁶

Apparently his callers failed in their purpose, for Jim Webb recalls Reynolds at faculty meetings as the strongest and most passionate supporter of a BSC. Webb did not know about the phone calls Reynolds had received, but said that it was obvious that "he was very disillusioned with the state the college was in at that time."⁶⁷

The proposal for the formation of a Student Advisory Committee led to the creation of a Committee of 8, consisting of four faculty members and four students, "to advise the faculty on questions of student power."⁶⁸ Student proponents of the idea of an SAC ran a slate of four for the student seats, of whom only three were elected (Steve Engel, Sam Schrager, and Jon Mehlman); the fourth student position was captured by a "conservative," Steve Dresler.

In the spring the faculty revised the procedures for election to the FAC, with the object of reducing the opportunity for "slating," a technique the faculty

⁶⁶Sam Schrager interview.

⁶⁷James Webb interview.

⁶⁸The Wall Poster, March 13, 1969.

conservatives had devised.⁶⁹ And so the academic year 1968-69 came to a close.

The next academic year began with the majority of entering black freshmen refusing the register for the required Humanities 110 course.⁷⁰ The debate that ensued was similar to later academic disputes about multiculturalism and the place of "the canon" in higher education. (It should be noted that the positions taken by faculty members on this issue did not necessarily reflect the usual "senior/junior,"

⁶⁹The elaboration of the electoral machinery necessary to govern a republic with only slightly over a hundred citizens is instructive:

As in the old system, there will be two ballots: a nominating ballot on which appear the names of all eligible members, and a second ballot from which the final ten members are elected. Formerly each faculty member had fifteen votes on the nominating ballot. Under the new system, faculty members will vote for only eight on the nominating ballot: the second ballot will list 25 names instead of 15 at present. This provision was designed to render slating less effective: under the former system one strong slate could capture ten of the fifteen places on the final ballot. Voting on the final ballot under the new system will be preferentially weighted: the candidate listed as first choice will receive one full vote, the second choice eight tenths of a vote, and so on down to the fifth and all succeeding choices (up to ten) who will receive three tenths of a vote. This makes it impossible according to the scheme's architect that a small majority of the faculty could elect the entire FAC to the exclusion of a large minority.

Unsigned article, The Wall Poster, April 22, 1969.

⁷⁰Mark Gordon, "Blacks Refuse Registration," The Oquest, September 10, 1969, p. 1.

"conservative/liberal," or "tradition/reform" divisions--as they were various labeled.)

In October feelings were exacerbated by the leak of a memo by Sam McCracken, chairman of the Humanities 100 staff:

October 17, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Freshman Humanities Staff

FROM: Sam McCracken

Attached is an expansion of a current student-initiated proposal for reforming the Humanities at Reed College.

I spent about three hours last Monday talking with the initiators, who can be said to be earnest, and by comparison to last year's innovators, pleasantly non-hostile, and I can report that little was said to change my mind or theirs.

While I believe the proposal at hand to be impractical in the extreme and positively undesirable were it practical, I hope you will all take the time to read it, and that we can arrange for the staff or a delegation therefrom to meet with the proposers. My own tolerance for student-generated twaddle is as low as any man's but I believe that one of the burdens of authority is the obligation to give audience to the humble and oppressed, and that a corollary of our telling students who disrupt that they ought to have gone through channels, even when the process looks tedious and futile. [Sic.] Also, I suspect that as teachers we have some obligation to tell students who appear to be in the wrong just why they are in the wrong. There is finally the prudential argument that if we don't give the proposal some serious attention, we may well hear about our dereliction later on.

I will consult with you in a week or so to gather your opinion as to what is to be done.⁷¹

Also in October a report developed over the summer by the FAC was released; it recommended reversing the expansion

⁷¹Published in the Quest, October 22, 1969, p. 6.

policy introduced in 1966 by the Committee of 42 and decreasing the size of the student body to 900.⁷² This study was a response to acute financial pressures, but even the majority report admitted the cost-cutting advantages of such shrinkage were minimal. Instead, it based its recommendation on the hope of regaining a more "homogenous intellectual ethos," a better "shared understanding" among students about "the limits of acceptable behavior," and better communication among sub-groups of the larger community.⁷³ The majority report glossed over the consequences of a rapid contraction of the faculty, but dissidents pointed out that one consequence would be a faculty that was almost entirely tenured.⁷⁴

Later that fall, on November 17, the Committee of 8 elected the previous spring submitted majority and minority reports to the faculty. The four faculty members (Westling, Levich, Leadley, and Rhyne) and one student member (Dresler) recommended that no Student Advisory Committee be established, because

such a committee would arouse expectations among the students as to the role which they would play in the making of decisions which would either be

⁷²Mark Gordon, "Pennies from Heaven," The Oquest, November 19, 1969, p. 2.

⁷³"FAC Majority Report," Sallyport, November-December 1969, pp. 16-17.

⁷⁴Marshall W. Cronyn, op. cit., pp. 20-21

misleading, or, if fulfilled, gravely compromise the standards of professional competence on which basis the decisions in question must be warranted.⁷⁵

The minority report by Engel, Schrager, and Mehlman called for the freedom for students to design, with their advisors, their own programs; to choose pass-fail grading; to disregard divisional and general area requirements; to take up to a third of their courses "outside the scope of the courses offered in the curriculum," including independent study, student-run courses, field work, or jobs; and to dispense with the necessity to choose a departmental major, with its associated requirements.⁷⁶

In December 1969 there was a second massive purge of younger faculty by the Faculty Advisory Committee, but its actions were not quite unanimous. The previous year, while he was on leave in New York working for the Carnegie Corporation, Jon Roush was elected in absentia to the FAC. While he was clearly among the leaders of the reformist group in the faculty, the non-confrontational persona he projected evidently made him broadly acceptable.

The experience of serving on the committee was one he remembers as deeply unpleasant. During the fall he and his nine colleagues sat in judgment on those of the junior

⁷⁵Quoted by Kim Spencer, "You Can't Always Get What You Want," The Oquest, December 10, 1969, p. 8.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 12.

faculty whose contracts were coming up for renewal. One case in particular made a lasting impression on him. Marvin Levich produced an article published in an academic journal by the teacher in question and cited the niceties of the article's argument as evidence that the teacher was unfit to continue at Reed. Roush said that if the article were going to be an issue, he would need time to read it, and the case was put off until the next meeting.

Since the article was not in his field (nor, for that matter, in Levich's), it required some study to master its intricacies, but having done so to his satisfaction, Roush could find nothing offensive in it. Nevertheless, when the teacher's future was put to the question, he was terminated by a vote of 9 to 1. The vote was the same in a number of other cases, more perfunctorily decided.⁷⁷

The announcement of the terminations, coupled with the failure of student efforts to achieve any voice in the direction of the college, led to the proposal of a tuition boycott in January 1970. Around a hundred students participated initially; eventually, after negotiations with President Rosenblum, nearly 40 refused to abandon their position and never registered for spring term.⁷⁸ Jon Roush,

⁷⁷Jon Roush interview, August 3, 1992. Roush taught literature and humanities at Reed 1964-1967 and 1969-70; from 1967 to 1969 he was on leave to work at the Carnegie Corporation in New York.

⁷⁸Blake Nebel, *op. cit.*, p.11.

despite the sense of alienation he had acquired from his service on the FAC, saw the boycott as a serious enough threat to the financial integrity of the college that he felt compelled to speak out against it at a large meeting on campus.⁷⁹

Always in the background as these campus issues were disputed was the seemingly interminable war in Southeast Asia, still a ferocious meat grinder in the spring of 1970, two years after Lyndon Johnson conceded failure in his attempt to impose his will on Vietnam and 18 months after the collapse of the Democratic Party.

Earlier that academic year, the war had been an acute issue on campus, when the faculty voted 40-31 not to cancel classes to support a nationwide moratorium scheduled for October 15, although many classes were in fact cancelled on an individual basis.⁸⁰ The issue was, as usual, that of "academic freedom," opponents of a general closure arguing, according to the Quest reporter who covered the debate, that it "might violate the academic freedom of a hypothetical faculty member who supported the war (none of these spoke)."⁸¹

⁷⁹Jon Roush interview.

⁸⁰The list of professors cancelling classes did not betray any of the usual campus "conservative/liberal" divisions. See The Quest, October 8, 1969, p. 4.

⁸¹Unsigned article, *ibid.*, p. 1.

Activists argued that the notion of preserving the college as an entity with an apolitical status was a delusion, while conservatives thought it was paramount. Roger Porter recalls being stunned when John Westley stated in a faculty meeting that if he could stop the war in Vietnam by calling off his classes for even one day, he was not sure he would do it, because too many other values in western culture might go down the drain.⁸²

Then, the following April, Nixon invaded Cambodia, and on May 4 the Ohio National Guard shot down four students at Kent State. At Reed as elsewhere anger against the war exploded, and students demanded the college take a position. As earlier, the faculty was split.

Nixon's invasion of Cambodia eventually created some small collateral damage in bucolic Eastmoreland: it turned out to be the precipitating factor in Jon Roush's resignation from Reed. During the campus uproar in May, a senior faculty member suggested to Roush that if he had Roush's convictions he wouldn't be teaching but out manning the barricades. Roush found the suggestion persuasive. His reasons for his resignation appeared in an open letter to the community:

I am too tired, too bored with talking about Reed and its problems, too pessimistic about the chances for any changes that I would like to see, too alienated from this mad and suicidal faculty, too much involved in trying to start a new and better

⁸²Roger Porter interview, 1A-246.

place. I like what you are trying to do, and I hope something comes of it, but I expect that Reed will get what it deserves.⁸³

The new and better place to which Roush referred was the Portland Learning Community. The process leading up to its founding, which took place simultaneously with the events of the two academic years just discussed, will be the subject of the next chapter. Before proceeding, however, it is worth noting two things that emerge from the foregoing account:

(1) Reed College as an institution was more fluid in the 1960s than earlier or later. That decade saw a proposal by President Sullivan to transform the college into a mini-university consisting of three separate but related colleges, a proposal that might eventually have led to an institution similar to the Pomona cluster of colleges. In addition, the plan to establish a Black Studies Center hinted at the possibility of establishing entirely new institutions, separate from yet related to Reed in ways yet to be defined.

(2) The senior faculty at Reed in the '60s faced a challenge to its power from both junior faculty and from students, the outcome of which remained in doubt in the minds of many throughout the period. By 1970, however, that outcome was no longer in doubt, due to the decimation of the ranks of younger faculty members. The decision to reduce the size of

⁸³The Oquest, spring 1970, p. 2.

the student body meant that no positions for tenured faculty members would be open any time soon. Without support within the ranks of the faculty, student demands for participation in the governance of the college were unsustainable. The control the Educational Policies Committee maintained over authorizing credit toward a Reed degree for classes offered by the new Black Studies Center gave the faculty a mechanism for imposing its standards on the new department.

That Reed College would emerge from the maelstrom of the 1960s essentially unchanged was not inevitable: it was the result of the strenuous efforts and entrenched position of those who opposed innovation. Marvin Levich should be given the last word:

A major set of educational issues faced the College in the late '60s. In my view, it was a period of lots of gimmicks and fads. It was a time when lots of institutions gave up rigorous requirements and grading, when colleges became cafeterias where students could sample. For the most part, Reed remained adamant against those temptations. The College had a purpose and a mission. I think the behavior of the College and the behavior of the faculty were admirable.⁸⁴ ✓

⁸⁴Quoted in Barbara Peschiera, "Marvin Levich, Claude Vaucher retire," Reed, August 1994, pp. 14-15.

CHAPTER II

"PROPOSITIONS THAT DESERVE TO BE TESTED"

During the last years of the 1960s the dialogue at Reed between traditionalists and reformers degenerated into angry bickering. Traditionalists lost hope that the process of reform could be contained before it destroyed the qualities that made the college unique. Reformers lost hope that they could transform Reed into what they envisioned as a less rigid, more humane academic milieu, and began to direct their efforts elsewhere. Eventually some of the reformers began to work toward the creation of a new institution. First, though, they sought satisfaction in various extracurricular activities. Two of these influenced the development of the Learning Community: the Reed College Upward Bound program, and a series of meetings at Jon and Deayne Roush's ranch at Wise River, Montana.

Beginning in the summer of 1966, Howard Waskow co-directed with Rondal Snodgrass an Upward Bound program located on the Reed campus. The program was intended to give disadvantaged minority high school students the academic boost that would help prepare them for a college education. Many of the participants came from Seattle, and some of them later attended Reed. According to Dan Wolfe, who worked under

Waskow as a teacher in the program, "Reed College, the second summer, was mortified by the behavior of these unruly kids on their campus."¹ The program's unpopularity did nothing to improve relations between Waskow, the most outspoken among the reformist group in the faculty, and his conservative adversaries.

Eyebrows were also raised in Washington, DC. Edith Green, the tough-minded member of Congress from the east Portland district that included Reed College, wanted to transfer responsibility for the Upward Bound program from the Office of Equal Opportunity to the Department of Education, and due to her efforts readers of the Congressional Record were regaled with tales of unsupervised minors drinking, sniffing glue, getting pregnant, and being tutored in the techniques of building explosive devices.² Roger Porter recalled that some participants in the Reed Upward Bound program returning to Seattle for their senior year of high school expressed strong views concerning perceived racial and class inequities in American society and public education in particular. Their ability to articulate those views was evidently attributed to Upward Bound by people in positions of responsibility.³ As a result of mounting opposition, Waskow

¹Dan Wolfe interview, 5/31/92.

²Congressional Record--House, July 24, 1968, pp. H7409-11.

³Roger Porter interview, 6/3/92.

and Snodgrass lost the directorship of the program after 1968.

By that time, however, the program had attracted to Portland a couple who played an important role in the Learning Community: Dan and Judy Wolfe, friends of Waskow from his days as an undergraduate at Johns Hopkins in the 1950s. Dan played the violin professionally and later became a social worker in Baltimore; Judy taught history in a Baltimore high school. In 1966 Waskow invited them to Portland to work under him in the Upward Bound program. The Wolfes participated in the program again in the summer of 1967, and made plans to relocate permanently to Portland in 1968, which they did despite Howard Waskow's departure from the program after that year.⁴

Meanwhile, from 1967 to 1969 Jon Roush was on leave from Reed to work for the Carnegie Corporation, a philanthropic organization that funded innovative and experimental projects in the field of education. Roush and his wife Deayne summered on their ranch near Wise River, Montana. Before leaving for New York, during the summer of 1967, the Roushes hosted a meeting at the ranch of several Reed colleagues as well as activists from around the country to exchange ideas on how to improve academia.

⁴Dan Wolfe interview, 5/31/92.

Dick Burg was one of those who attended the 1967 meeting. Burg had come to Reed as a freshman in 1963, taken his second year off, then received an induction notice shortly after starting his sophomore year in 1965. For the next three years, until his draft status was resolved, he was unable to continue as a student. Through his freshman roommate, Michael Hudson, Burg met the Rouses. That summer he took a job at the ranch as a handyman, so he happened to be there when the meeting took place. He remembers seeing Terry Borden from the Harvard School of Education and Jim and Cynthia Nixon, activists from the Bay Area, as well as a number of Reed faculty members.⁵

Throughout the 1967-68 period the ranch at Wise River was the site of frequent visits by younger and reform-minded members of the Reed faculty. Grace McLaughlin, then wife of Reed philosophy professor Bill McLaughlin, remembers half a dozen visits there during the late 1960s.⁶ The most significant of these meetings, in August 1968, was a convocation to talk about educational alternatives. In the report on the Learning Community that Janet Abrams and Charlton Price later prepared for the Carnegie Corporation,

⁵Dick Burg interview, 4/16/94.

⁶Grace McLaughlin interview, 7/3/92.

they described the 1968 discussions as focusing on "a kind of college ... that would combine action and study."⁷

Those attending included Jon and Deayne Roush, Reed literature professors Jim Webb and Will Baker, Reed political scientist Mason Drukman and his wife Elaine, Dick Burg and his girlfriend Kathy McKeown, and a number of others from Reed and elsewhere. Just as the conference was breaking up, John Laursen paused at Wise River on a cross-country journey with a friend; he found the topic of the conference of compelling interest.

A friend of Dick Burg, Laursen attended Reed from 1963 to 1967, then went on to do postgraduate work in political science at the University of California at Los Angeles. His experience there gave him a new perspective on academia. UCLA's political science department exhibited what he found to be an unacceptable detachment from the actual political world it ostensibly studied. For example, the university barely acknowledged Robert Kennedy's assassination in June 1968, continuing without pause through final examinations though this pivotal event occurred not far from the campus.

Laursen was offered a teaching assistantship for his second year that allowed him to take the summer off. Returning to the Northwest to visit friends, he found that

⁷Abrams & Price, p. 6. See also interviews with John Laursen, 7/14/92; Jon Roush, 8/3/92; Deayne Roush, 8/5/92; Dick Burg, 4/16/94; Kathy Roush, 8/4/92; and Grace McLaughlin, 7/3/92.

many of the people he wanted to see were in Montana and made his way to the Wise River ranch. The alternative approach to education being discussed there immediately struck a sympathetic chord. Although he returned that fall to UCLA, he stayed only one more term, then left the program. Later, on a visit to New York, Laursen again saw the Roushes and arranged for a job at Wise River for the summer of 1969.⁸

As Abrams and Price relate, Howard Waskow met Morris Keeton of Antioch College during that summer at a conference on educational innovation in Colorado Springs. Keeton had recently helped start a new Antioch campus in Columbia, Maryland, funded in part by a grant from Carnegie that Jon Roush helped administer. At Waskow's request, Roush came down from Montana to join the discussion.⁹ This meeting established an important connection with Antioch, which at that time was exploring the idea of establishing yet another campus on the West Coast.

Other possibilities were opened up through the presence at this same conference of Joseph Katz of the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford. Katz was a writer on issues of educational reform with whose work Waskow was familiar. According to Abrams and Price, "It developed that Katz was looking for a lab in which to test his educational

⁸John Laursen interview, 7/14/92.

⁹Abrams & Price, p. 7.

ideas, to create an educational setting that would include people over a wider age range and have a broader curriculum. He spoke of a site for such a program in Marin County, California." One of the ideas discussed at Colorado Springs was that the coalescing Reed group, with Antioch's assistance, could move to California, where it would be conveniently located to work with Katz.¹⁰

While possible relationships with Antioch and with Katz were under discussion, the possibility of continuing ties with Reed College had not been foreclosed. The anomalous position of the Black Studies Center and the call for reducing the size of the student body population in the FAC report of October 1969 kept open the question of Reed's unitary structure. The published version of that FAC report included a suggestion by Howard Waskow that Richard Sullivan's cluster-college plan be reexamined.¹¹ In November 1969 Jon Roush wrote to Alden Dunham at Carnegie that

We have talked confidentially with Morris Keeton about the possibility of Antioch's sponsoring our group as a new unit in the Antioch network. (The sun never sets on Antioch.) We are also proposing to Reed that it turn itself into three cluster colleges and make us one of them. If those possibilities do not pan out, there are a couple of other ideas for ways to do it independently.¹²

¹⁰Ibid., p. 8.

¹¹Sallyport. Portland: Reed College, November-December 1969, p. 32.

¹²Jon [Roush] to E. Alden Dunham, November 7, 1969 (CC).

As late as March 1970 Reed's President Rosenblum was suggesting that "the Learning Community consider formally requesting accreditation at Reed. Rosenblum thought the Reed faculty reaction would probably be negative but felt the effort worth a try."¹³

Long before that time the Learning Community core group had become cohesive. By the fall of 1969 the group included Howard and Betty Waskow, Mason and Elaine Drukman, Jon and Deayne Roush, Bill and Grace McLaughlin, Kirk Thompson, Millie Howe, Mary Kay Pederson, George Fasel, Ben McKendall (dean of admissions at Reed) and his wife Jane. For each person, the emerging community assumed a sense of reality at a different time and in different circumstances.

George Fasel, for example, returning to Reed that fall after a year in France, was drawn into the discussions through his friendship with Drukman and Waskow. Fasel remembers going through several stages in his relationship with the community during that fall: interest because of the involvement of his friends and his dissatisfaction with various aspects of Reed life; discomfort with the early looseness of the plans; a more positive feeling as the plans took shape; and finally a waning of commitment as it became

¹³Record of telephone conversation between Morris Keeton of Antioch and "KP" [Carnegie staff], March 12, 1970 (CC).

clear that his family would not find congenial the communal living aspects of the community.

Kirk Thompson recalls the ongoing struggle at Reed over the humanities program, which reached an acute stage during the December 1969 convocation, as seminal in the formation of the new community. Thompson felt that speaking out in favor of reform on that occasion was regarded by Richard Jones and Marvin Levich as a betrayal.¹⁴ Meetings with sympathetic colleagues to discuss reforms in the humanities were noted and considered disloyal. By that point it was becoming clear to Thompson that Reed was impervious to reform and that a new beginning would need to be made outside its confines.¹⁵

Roger Porter believed the idea of the Learning Community received a strong impetus from the faculty layoffs announced that same month, particularly Thompson's. Porter saw Thompson as the most scholarly among the younger faculty, the one most attuned to Reed's traditional emphasis on academic rigor. Thus the FAC's denial of tenure in his case seemed particularly ominous.¹⁶ Thompson's dismissal meant, moreover, that the group of younger faculty members, by now friends, would soon be breaking up. Porter recalls a meeting at his house to discuss how to keep Thompson in town. The idea of a

¹⁴Kirk Thompson interview, 4/16/94.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Roger Porter interview, 6/3/92.

new school seemed to solve this and a number of other problems at a single stroke.¹⁷

The Reed faculty layoffs definitely stimulated a sense of urgency at the organizational meetings, which had been increasing in frequency during the fall. Jon Roush described their tenor:

There were 35 to 40 people, mostly faculty and students at Reed. There was an air of mystery. At the meetings we discussed, do we have a curriculum and if so what's a good one? Are there some things more important to teach and learn than others? Some said yes very strongly, others insisted no. We quickly started talking about whether we wanted to be a college or a community. Some were looking for a commune. Others were looking for a more perfectly structured learning experience. The former tended to be students, the latter tended to be faculty.¹⁸

In the early days, this lack of consensus tended to facilitate a sense of optimism and hopeful possibility. Grace McLaughlin described that period as "a real high." People were full of enthusiasm. The continual meetings and discussions promoted a feeling of intimacy. The proposed community was perceived as uncharted territory, and participants felt that they could make up their own rules as they went along. "People just thought differently [in the 1960s] about what was possible and what wasn't possible."¹⁹ In retrospect, John Laursen compared that stage in the Learning

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Abrams & Price p. 9.

¹⁹Grace McLaughlin interview, 7/3/92.

Community's development to the 1992 presidential candidacy of Ross Perot: a blank slate onto which everyone could project his or her own vision of the future.²⁰

The occasion of Laursen's own entry into the core group was an indication that the stage of initial euphoria was drawing to a close. Since his visit to the Roush ranch in August 1968, he had felt a sense of involvement in the emerging community. During the summer of 1969 he had worked at the Roush ranch, and followed the Roushes to Portland in November, when winter in the Rockies brought work to a halt.

During the interval between September and November interest and participation in the planning meetings had increased to such an extent that the core members thought it necessary to limit participation. The group then decided that voting rights would be limited to those who had attended at least two meetings at that point.²¹ This placed Laursen in an anomalous situation. Even though his intention to participate in the Learning Community had long been clear to himself and his friends, he had not been present at the required number of meetings before the membership limitation was implemented.

Nevertheless, Laursen's participation in meetings and activities was not questioned until an issue under discussion came up for a formal vote. At that point, Howard Waskow

²⁰John Laursen interview, 7/14/92.

²¹Abrams & Price, p. 9.

raised an objection, observing that for Laursen to vote would violate the two-meeting rule. A long and acrimonious discussion followed, much to Laursen's embarrassment, since it ranged beyond the procedural issue to the value of his contribution to the community.²² On this occasion Waskow's objections were overruled and Laursen was recognized as a full voting member.

Sometime in the fall or winter of 1969 the first "nonacademics" began participating in the community, with important consequences. The chronology is confused. In discussing Howard Waskow's reaction during the summer of 1969 to Joseph Katz's proposal that the Learning Community consider setting up shop in Marin County, Abrams and Price comment that

This [proposed move] ... would have excluded some members of the Upward Bound efforts who for Howard at least were part of the community of interest

²²John Laursen interview, 7/14/92. The people Laursen remembers being present at that meeting included, in addition to himself and Howard Waskow, Betty Waskow, the Drukman's, Roger Porter, Pam Seaworthy, Jim Webb, Dick Burg, Kathy McKeown, and George Fasel, among others. Jon Roush was present, and remembered the confrontation between Waskow and Laursen, for which he could think of no reason beyond personal animosity. George Fasel also remembered the incident, in which he took John Laursen's part because he opposed the development of an exclusive core group. The hostility between Laursen and Waskow was noted by many others. According to Deayne Roush, "Howard did not like John Laursen. There was no question about it, ever." Kathy McKeown felt Waskow was threatened by Laursen's clear and forceful arguments in support of positions Waskow found distasteful. See interviews with Laursen; Jon Roush, 8/3/94; George Fasel, 12/5/94; Deayne Roush, 8/5/92; and Kathy Roush, 8/4/92.

that had been developing: Judy and Danny Wolfe, old friends of the Waskows from the East; and Rondal and Beth Snodgrass, who with Howard had been key people in the Upward Bound and alternative schools effort.²³

According to Abrams and Price, during the fall of 1969, after several meetings had already occurred, "Judy Wolfe called Howard to ask if the meetings were open, and she began to come to the meetings, despite his misgivings about the Wolfes being able to continue if the Marin County plan were to come through."²⁴ On a list of "present members" with the handwritten notation "Dec" at the top, the names of the Wolfes do not appear; on a "membership list" dated February 1970, the Wolfes' names do appear.²⁵ If these dates are accurate, they indicate that the Wolfes' potential participation played a role in Howard Waskow's thinking considerably before they became recognized members.

From the time she joined, Judy Wolfe was a significant presence in the community. She was a strong partisan of what became known as the "community" point of view. Allyn Snider, a sophomore at Reed who dropped out at the end of that year to join the Learning Community, described Wolfe as "very, very powerful and very difficult, very volatile and very

²³Abrams & Price, p. 7.

²⁴Ibid., p. 9.

²⁵Burg docs.

dangerous."²⁶ Her relationships with other members of the community tended to be either very close or antagonistic.

Meanwhile, even as new members and points of view were being brought into the core group of organizers, events at Reed were increasing the pressure to agree upon a coherent vision of the emerging community. The concurrent crises about the humanities program and the Black Studies Center, were at their most acute stages in December 1969, also the month the first of the massive faculty layoffs were announced. During the Christmas holidays, Jon Roush proposed the following timetable:

late January, 1970. Final decisions about admissions procedures and criteria.

early February, 1970. Admission of five new faculty members.

Distribution of brochures to prospective student and teaching members.

March 1, 1970. Admission of 20 student members to help with planning and organization.

April 15, 1970. Admission of 75 student members for 1970-71, including those of the 20 admitted in March who are willing and able to stay with us. Of those 75, 20 will join the Community in June and 55 in September.

June 1, 1970. Open both the urban and the exurban sites on a full-time basis, with at least 20 students and 4 FTE faculty.

²⁶Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92. In retrospect, Kirk Thompson came to feel that the entry of nonacademics into the community, something that was never discussed or agree-upon by the community as a whole, was a pivotal event. See Kirk Thompson interview, 4/16/94.

First tuition payments received.

September 1, 1970, to August 31, 1971. 75 students and 5 FTE faculty, with additional teaching services volunteer.

September 1, 1971. Increase to at least 120 students and 8 FTE faculty.²⁷

This schedule was never formally adopted. It contained assumptions about the nature of the community that were not shared by all, but it reflected a consensus that the community needed to be operational by the fall of 1970.

The pressure to keep on schedule was increased by a decision to open up the meetings during January 1970. This was a period of Reed's academic year, known as Paideia, that fell between terms and was reserved for not-for-credit independent study and other activities. Students were free to pursue their own interests, taking workshops or teaching them. The core group felt this would be a good time to publicize their activities and to get the reactions of potential members while their plans for the next fall were still flexible. The new participants (not yet considered members) brought a lot of energy to bear on the organizational problems facing the community, but their presence did little to facilitate the realization of a cohesive vision.

²⁷[Jon Roush,] "The Learning Community: A Proposal," January, 1970. p. 6. (CC)

Throughout the winter and the spring of 1970, competing ideas of the community were debated within the group as a whole and within committees formed to address specific issues. One of the fundamental issues was location. Some, especially those with experience of the Roush ranch, saw participation in the community as a chance to escape not only from academia but from the city itself. Others, like Judy Wolfe, felt that "the city is reality," and saw the "exurban" (as they termed it) extension of the community as peripheral. The fact that these two sets of aspirations existed was recognized; the problem was how to integrate them.

For Jon Roush, it was not actually a problem at all, but an opportunity; the urban-exurban duality was essential. In January 1970 he expounded his point of view:

The Community will have two sites at the beginning: one in Portland and the other in the country but within 30 to 45 minutes of Portland.... The exurban site will comprise 100 to 150 acres. This site will include some single-family dwellings, dormitories, meeting rooms, and studio space. The Community may farm some of this land to provide some of our food. We expect a great deal of traffic back and forth between the urban and exurban sites, because interesting things will be happening at both places and because we are convinced of the need to experiment with forms of social organization that include both modes of life.²⁸

In April, in the grant request to Carnegie, Roush elaborated on his view of the importance of the exurban component of the

²⁸[Jon Roush,] "The Learning Community: Information and Intimations," January 1970, p. 1. (CC).

community. He saw the Learning Community as a laboratory for testing the proposition

that a social organization can consciously seek to assimilate urban and agrarian modes of life into an integrated whole. It is clear that urban and rural societies in America have become so disparate as to represent one of the major cultural divisions of our time. The possibilities for reunification may be more apparent in the Northwest, where major cities have grown up next door to wilderness, than in other parts of the country; at least it is possible here to conceive of single social systems that make ecological sense. We expect to be able to learn and teach how to work toward such a system. For example, one of our members is a chemist-ecologist, and we are currently exploring the possibility of membership with a physicist-ecologist. Both men are interested in the social and political aspects of ecology as well as its scientific problems, and both would play an active role in both the urban and exurban sites. We number among our members many other ecological activists, and the opportunity for working at both sites has attracted many of them.

... We expect the real payoff to be in the continuous interaction between members living the two different kinds of life.²⁹

Members of the exurban group explored several sites, including one near Gresham (at that time still considered an "exurban" location) and a goat farm.³⁰ But only one site, in Skamania County, Washington, was seriously considered. In a letter to Alden Dunham, Jon Roush described it as

the most beautiful valley I have seen outside of a national park, and the perfect topography for our needs. 180 acres of rolling timber, grassland and orchards, with a stream in the middle, 600 foot

²⁹Jon Roush, "Grant Request and Antioch Endorsement," April 19, 1970. (CC)

³⁰John Laursen interview, 7/14/92.

cliffs on either side, national forest behind, and all of it facing the Columbia River. Fertile soil and plenty of sunlight. The price and terms, moreover, are better than anything we have run across. Unless some problem arises, we will get it.³¹

A newsletter from February includes the statement that "we decided to go ahead on the Box Canyon."³²

A short article by Mason Drukman in the February 28 newsletter describes a trip to the property to show it to Charlie Springer, a visitor to Portland whose scientific credentials made him attractive as a prospective member:

Charlie Springer visitated the Community this past week. Charlie, chemist, incipient ecologist, and draft counselor, now at Earlham College, was greeted at the airport by Mason and Stuart Loeb and was immediately spirited to the Box Canyon via the sleek Drukman town and country station wagon with electric rear window. After delighting in the Canyon for a piece, the trio was seen at various times thereafter at points east of Washougal, the sleek town and country's bonnet ajar, radiator a-steamin', finally rescued by an indiginous [sic] Washougal matron with a long hose.

Having visited with ASP [the committee on Agenda, Steering and Planning] on Tuesday night, talked to Lydie and Elaine on Wednesday morning, lunched with Mason, Howard, Jon, Roger, Kirk, and Jon Mehlman, bein' squired about the [Centenary Wilbur] Church [where the Learning Community had rented an office] by Kirk on Wednesday afternoon and attended the affiliation session at the Roushes in the evening, Charlie left Thursday morning with a fair idea of and apparent enthusiasm for the Community. Because of financial considerations, as well as a new baby, Charlie's wife, Bonnie, could not make the trip. She is very interested in working in a community day-care center and has much

³¹Jon Roush to Alden Dunham, February 15, 1970. (CC)

³²Rag, undated but probably February 21, 1970. (Burg docs.)

experience in such activities. Charlie took two application forms and we should be hearing from him rather soon. In line with their various skills, the Springers have expressed interest in both the urban and exurban sites.³³

John Laursen, whose vision of the exurban site had been shaped by his experiences in the Montana Rockies, remembers the selection of the exurban location soon becoming a bone of contention. Separate committees were working on the selection of the urban and exurban locations, and while he felt the exurban group left the urban site to the urban committee, he did not feel that autonomy was reciprocated. The urban group, in his view, thought of the exurban site less as a place to live than as a weekend retreat, and while it wasn't participating actively in the search, it did want a veto over the selection.³⁴

Another emerging area of disagreement was the academic orientation of the new community. Ideas about this occupied a spectrum whose extremes were contained in the very name "Learning Community." The "learning" viewpoint was probably held most strongly and expressed most vigorously by Kirk Thompson, who advocated academic standards as rigorous as Reed's, but different. What Thompson hoped the Learning Community would provide was seriousness of inquiry rather than the academic ritualism he saw at Reed, which he felt

³³Rag, February 28, 1970, p. 1. (Burg docs.)

³⁴John Laursen interview, 8/18/92.

functioned more like a miniature graduate school than an undergraduate college.

For others, academic standards were themselves the problem; they needed to be disposed of, not reformed. The most prominent members identified with that viewpoint were Howard Waskow and Judy Wolfe. According to Abrams & Price, "Their view was that the communal aspects were the main justifications for the new effort, and that the others [the "Learning" adherents] were still tied to repressive, overly structured conceptions of what a learning situation could be."³⁵ According to Howard Waskow,

The problem was that the people who wanted traditional academics didn't want anything else. Kirk was not there [during the Paideia break at Reed in January 1970], but later on he, more than others, became the ideological leader. His view was, "This is our chance to kill once and for all the Upward Bound, Free School model of the Learning Community." That was one way of saying "get rid of me and Judy." So the lines were really drawn.³⁶

The Wolfe/Waskow renunciation of academics appealed to youthful potential recruits weary of what Maya Muir, a freshman that year, remembered as Reed's impersonality and a sense of being force-fed information. Allyn Snider, a sophomore, saw the concern with establishing academic standards as a misguided effort to bring along into the new institution those very aspects of Reed she was hoping to

³⁵Abrams & Price, p. 13.

³⁶Quoted in Abrams & Price, p. 13.

leave behind. At the time, the motives of the "Learning" group seemed incomprehensible; they must be simply "uptight bad people."³⁷

The Learning Community nevertheless faced the practical problem of establishing credibility with Carnegie and Antioch. And if it were to attract students (and the parents who would support them and pay their tuition), it would have to provide in return some currency recognized in the outside world, including academic credits and draft deferments. This issue remained unresolved. Meanwhile, the antagonism between Kirk Thompson and Judy Wolfe became one of the axes on which community discussions rotated, as that between Waskow and Laursen had become earlier.³⁸

Another issue under discussion was the way in which roles would be defined within the community, and the corollary one of how participants would make a living. In a letter to Alden Dunham at Carnegie Jon Roush described the dilemma:

As you know from your visit, there is some disagreement about the nature of teaching and learning roles within the Community, although we all agree that the distinction can be a real and important one. That uncertainty is exacerbated whenever the categories "tuition" and "salary" are introduced. If students pay and teachers get paid, and if we are serious when we say that the same person could be a teacher at one time and a learner

³⁷Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92.

³⁸Roger Porter interview, 6/3/92.

at another, then a tuition-salary system would need to be much more flexible than it normally is....³⁹

The effort to resolve these issues could require the presence of dedicated members at several meetings a week. The newsletter dated February 28, 1970, provides a random cross-section of a week's activities:

Saturday:	Open house, 8:00 P.M., at Porter's.
Sunday:	Core Group meeting, 7:00 P.M., at McLaughlin's.
Monday:	The usual [referred to in earlier newsletters as the "teaching and learning group,"] 8:00 P.M., at Laursen's.
Tuesday:	ASP [Agenda, Steering, and Planning] meeting, 8:00 P.M., at the Garage.
Wednesday:	Publications meeting, 3:00 P.M., FOB [Reed Faculty Office Building] 5.
	Exurban meeting, 8:00 P.M., at the Garage.
Friday:	Core Group meeting, 7:30 P.M. at Drukman's. ⁴⁰

Other activities, suggested in the February 17 newsletter as opportunities "for Community and non-Community people to get to know each other," included the People's Nursery (a parent-supervised child-care arrangement being developed by Lydie Mephram), an Ecology Book Store, a proposed organic garden at Reed, an organic cooking course at Allyn Snider's house, an opportunity to be trained as an air pollution index reader, "a group to talk about new ways of studying social sciences and humanistic psychology," "a group

³⁹Jon Roush to Alden Dunham, February 15, 1970, p. 2. (CC)

⁴⁰Rag, February 28, 1970. (Burg docs.)

to study the politics and economics of ecology," a printmaking course given by Deayne Roush and Amelia Hard, and a group to discuss ideas and experiences of education from other places than Reed.⁴¹ It should be borne in mind that most of the participants during this period were also full-time teachers or students at Reed.

Concurrently with the internal organizational activities, the Learning Community was solidifying its relationships with Antioch and Carnegie. The effort had begun, according to Abrams and Price, during the fall of 1969.

A number of position papers were prepared. Mason developed a statement on "teaching democracy" that did not, to say the least, receive an enthusiastic response. Kirk Thompson was one of those most critical. He in turn prepared a long paper on theory of community that still left open questions of development and implementation. A more explicit design was provided in a third paper by Howard; it outlined three possible sites and ideas in curriculum. This also was not a rallying point and in fact was little discussed. Reed faculty members Mary Kay Pederson and George Fasel, along with Jon [Roush], prepared a fourth paper.... This too was never discussed in detail.⁴²

A fifth document (whose authorship is not disclosed) was sent to Morris Keeton at Antioch. None of these documents was ratified by the core group of organizers; none survived in

⁴¹Rag, February 17, 1970. (Burg docs.)

⁴²Abrams & Price, p. 9.

Carnegie's files. Keeton's "advice was not to spend too much time in planning, but to start doing."⁴³

Meanwhile, Alden Dunham at Carnegie, who had been kept informed of activities in Portland by Jon Roush and by mutual acquaintances at Antioch and elsewhere, invited Roush to submit a proposal for funding.⁴⁴ As a result,

Over Christmas vacation Jon drafted a proposal which served as a statement of purpose, though it was never formally discussed or ratified by the other members of the Portland group. The proposal had to achieve two goals: it had to emphasize innovation and experiment (to be an attractive purpose to Carnegie as a basis for granting funds) and it had to bridge or mute the real differences in concepts and intentions that had emerged in the fall discussions and were still unresolved.⁴⁵

Roush's draft, entitled "The Learning Community: A Proposal," thus never had any official standing as a constitutional or foundation document for the community. However, as its most widely disseminated written description, it presumably represented the Learning Community concept as the people who joined in the winter and spring of 1970 would have understood it. For that reason it is worth examining in some detail.

Roush described the community as consisting at that time of about thirty members, with plans to grow to include 200 to 300, living on two sites, urban and exurban. He did not

⁴³Ibid., p. 10.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Ibid.

envision the urban site as providing any housing, but as providing space for meetings, classes, and studios, as well as an office. Similar facilities, as well as single-family dwellings and dormitories would be available at the exurban site.

Regarding the decision-making process, Roush wrote that "the Community will be governed in all important aspects by the Community as a whole. Every member of the Community will have a voice, for example, in decisions about admitting new members, about 'curriculum,' and about the budget." At this point, however, Roush still envisioned a clear distinction between teachers and students, reflected in the financial structure: "We will distinguish between teachers and students, but any member may be a teacher at one time and a student at another. Anyone who is a student in the Community will pay tuition, and anyone recognized by the Community as a teacher will get paid." No teacher would be distinguished by rank or given tenure. "We are considering the possibility of allotting different faculty salaries on the basis of differences in need."

Students would not be given grades, and would plan their own courses of study. "We will assume that there is no way to 'fail' while learning. If it becomes mutually apparent to a member of the Community and to the rest of the Community that the member can not learn or teach in the Community, then it will be time for him to leave." It would not be required for

a student to be working toward a degree, though Roush hoped credits would be available through association with an established institution.

Women would participate directly in the community, not as "faculty wives," children would have a role,⁴⁶ and community members would participate in the larger society. "We hope to make a difference in Portland."

He expected the community to be self-supporting through tuition payments and through "entrepreneurship," giving as examples a craft shop, a coffee house or restaurant, and a bookstore.

In the financial section of his proposal, Roush noted that members had pledged \$22,000 to acquire property. To pay for faculty, staff, benefits, travel, rent, and miscellaneous overhead, during the first 18 months of operation, he intended to ask Carnegie for a grant of \$62,000, which would allow tuition income to be applied to start-up costs at the urban and exurban sites.⁴⁷

⁴⁶In practice, John Laursen observed the emergence of a primitive social hierarchy, in terms of whose views were given the most respect. At the top were the "bull elk," married men with families (Jon Roush, Howard Waskow, Mason Drukman), then married men without children and single men, followed by women and children. See John Laursen interview, 7/14/92.

⁴⁷The six paragraphs above summarize [Jon Roush], "The Learning Community: Information and Intimations," January 1970, pp. 1-7. (CC)

On February 15 Roush sent Alden Dunham at Carnegie a "progress report" on the evolving relationship with Antioch, which had scheduled a "constitutional convention" for later in February that he and Howard Waskow planned to attend. The report also elaborated considerably on current thinking about the budget, membership, and other issues.

Regarding the budget, Roush reported that the Learning Community had decided to abandon the standard tuition-salary model and to adopt a "contribution model":

We expect that every active member of the Community, regardless of his role, will contribute equally to the Community financially.... Included in the total operating expense is a very healthy allocation for support of members (in conventional terms, scholarships, salaries, room and board). Having done that, we then ask every member to declare his financial need (including his contribution to the Community) for the year and his financial means. On the basis of those declarations, we then allocate our support budget among the members.⁴⁸

The circular aspect of this process was not addressed. It is hard to understand how the community's expenses could be calculated before its members' "needs" were stated. Yet those needs could not be known before the member's share of the community's expenses were known. While Roush admitted that he was initially dubious about the feasibility of this financial structure, he was evidently willing to defend it to Carnegie, and Carnegie was apparently willing to overlook its flaws.

⁴⁸Jon Roush to Alden Dunham, February 15, 1970, p. 2. (CC)

Roush also made clear "that we do not intend to make ability to pay a criterion for entrance for any member, and we are prepared to go to great lengths to raise additional money for members' support if we need it. Nor will we ask any member to do anything that he considers a 'sacrifice.'"

Concerning membership, Roush wrote that the community had developed a procedure, not described in his letter, to admit new members.

At this stage in the game especially we want to take only people we feel confident about, because there is a lot of work to be done.... Whatever procedures we decide to use for subsequent admissions will undoubtedly require that anybody interested in joining the Community spend some time with us before he and we make up our minds. We want the entrance procedure to be a process of mutual selection based on first-hand knowledge.

Roush also discussed the precedents and antecedents for the Learning Community as well as its unique qualities. "So far as we know, no other institution is trying or has tried what we are trying." Of the four points he felt it important to express, the first was that the Learning Community was

more interested in encouraging the processes of learning than in replicating the conventional structure of academic disciplines.... We feel quite at home in this era of student-initiated courses and student-designed programs, and we will probably be as willing as anybody to go in that direction."

Secondly,

we are explicitly concerned with interpersonal relations as they affect learning.... We have found that as we pursue our goal of building a community, we are achieving many of the outcomes of sensitivity training (group efficiency, self-awareness, mutual concern and understanding)

without the hot-house effects of precious self-consciousness that often accompany conventional sensitivity or encounter situations."

Roush's third point was the Learning Community's affinity with the "communitarian policies" of Black Mountain College,⁴⁹ although he did not enlarge on that point. Fourth, Roush made a claim for the originality of the Learning Community in looking at the problems of ecology and the city as an interrelated whole. "We want our people to have a first-hand acquaintance with actually living at both places--having neighbors, getting food, selling services, being political, buying equipment, disposing of waste, building, studying."

Finally, regarding the community's theoretical premises, "I personally think they are best described in John Dewey's Democracy and Education.... There is no modest way to say it: we are the first group to attempt seriously to put Dewey's ideas into practice at advanced levels of education."⁵⁰

At the very time Roush was expressing his vision of the future to Alden Dunham, that future was being pounded on the anvil of a fundamental question, which could no longer be ignored: who would be a member of the community? The activities during the Paideia period had drawn a number of

⁴⁹See appendix for a discussion of Black Mountain College.

⁵⁰Jon Roush to Alden Dunham, February 15, 1970, pp. 1-5. (CC)

new participants into the orbit of the emerging community; their status might be determined in two very different ways. Under the two-meeting rule the newcomers were not allowed to vote, but some of the "core" or "nuclear" members felt that opening up the meetings had implied a commitment of eventual membership. Others felt the community was in danger of being overrun before any consensus on its direction had been reached by people with little understanding of the issues under consideration.⁵¹ The debate was complicated, in practical terms, by the fact that the future status of the newcomers now needed to be discussed, in the name of openness, in their presence.

It was agreed that the membership question would be resolved one way or the other at a meeting on March 6.⁵² A memorandum prepared by some of the core group concerned about the effects of a sudden large increase in membership stated the issues:

(1) Can we really postpone financial decisions/ clarification of the contribution model until after March 6? It seems that we have talked about this in two distinct ways. Do we admit people and then work

⁵¹In retrospect, John Laursen found it puzzling how, no matter what the issue--academic rigor, urban/exurban, openness of membership--the split within the core group always fell in the same place. John Laursen interview, 8/18/92. Among the "student" members, the issues were often perceived merely as irritating impediments to moving forward, their merits far less important than personal loyalties. See interviews with Maya Muir, 10/24/94, and David Sweet, 7/8/92.

⁵²Rag, February 17, 1970, p. 4. (Burg docs.)

out as a community the problems of financial resource allocation? Or do we tell people when we admit them and before they have joined us that we can meet their needs to a certain extent--another way of putting this: is the Learning Community absolutely committed to meeting the needs of (a) the now extant community, (b) the community as it will be constituted on the seventh of March, and/or (c) the community as it will exist in June/September?

(2) In considering people for sponsorship on the sixth of March ought Community members to take as primary considerations (a) whether people have been working with us during the last two months, (b) whether they are planning to be with us in the immediate future (March-April-May), (c) whether they plan to be with us in the long-range future (June/September), or (d) all of the above? ...

(4) ... Finally, it seems to be very unclear, if only that some people think that a decision has been made and others are very unclear, whether we are going to make role distinctions, either formally or informally?⁵³

The "sponsorship" referred to in this memo came out of a proposal by Grace McLaughlin⁵⁴ intended to bridge the gap between the "open"- and "closed"-membership factions. McLaughlin's plan was that new members be sponsored by existing ones. John Laursen remembers the proposal as requiring sponsorship by three existing members.⁵⁵ Abrams and Price write that a new member would be sponsored by "an individual." According to their account,

⁵³Undated memorandum from "Laursen, Burg, Pedersen, McLaughlins, Drukman (Mason)" (presumably February 26 or 27, 1970). (Burg docs.)

⁵⁴Abrams and Price, p. 13. Grace McLaughlin interview, 7/3/92.

⁵⁵John Laursen interview, 8/18/92.

after heated discussion a proviso was added, but never fully accepted by the Howard-Judy group, that prospective members should not be sponsored by an individual unless there was reason to believe they would be accepted by the whole group. There was also much disagreement about how many should be taken in, and how rapidly. Many of the people initially proposed were almost unknown to members of the group that had met in the fall.⁵⁶

According to Laursen, the McLaughlin proposal came after a considerable period of wrangling. "It was very, very clear that we were setting up a situation where it was possible maybe to heal this kind of fractiousness if everybody treated everybody else's feelings about this issue with respect."

Abrams and Price describe the denouement on March 6, their account evidently based largely on information from Howard Waskow, since it is his feelings that are recorded.

Ultimately, about thirty or more [new members] were proposed, their sponsoring group including, in all but a few cases, Howard or Judy. Howard felt himself to be in the middle, torn between the more academically-oriented group now coalescing around Kirk and the advocates of a communal approach with open membership, the view for which Judy was the most active proponent.⁵⁷

Of the participants on the other side of the issue, John Laursen had a vivid memory of the occasion and its consequences. In his view, Howard and Betty Waskow and Judy Wolfe, rather than weighing the merits of each individual

⁵⁶Abrams & Price, p. 13.

⁵⁷Ibid.

applicant in terms of what he or she would have to offer to the community and would need in return, instead

sponsored every single person that applied. And, in effect, my memory of it actually is of Judy just putting her hand up and keeping it up. So, we were totally devastated by that. It was a shocking event to me. Essentially they had decided that this agreement we had made--I mean, they didn't honor it. It was of no value to them. And the Learning Community doubled in size at that point.... They [the new members] all owed their presence, their membership, to Howard and Judy and their cohorts, and we never won another vote on another issue from that moment forward. If there was any vote, Howard now had ... a voting bloc--you know, he was like a ward heeler in Chicago. If there was a vote, and Howard put his hand up, there were twenty little hands that would go up with him. And so he had gotten this majority in the group by just this one act of, in my view, complete perfidy.⁵⁸

According to Laursen, the defeated faction, casting about for alternatives to complete surrender, talked of invoking the authority of the board of directors that had been created to facilitate the process of incorporation then under way, and which the Waskow/Wolfe faction did not yet control. Jon Roush, however, was not willing to pursue that expedient, and his participation would have been necessary.⁵⁹

⁵⁸John Laursen interview, 8/18/92. According to Grace McLaughlin, Howard Waskow and Judy Wolfe sponsored people even they didn't know, on the premise that anyone who didn't have a place to go should be welcome. See Grace McLaughlin interview, 7/3/92.

⁵⁹John Laursen interview, 8/18/92. For incorporation, see Record of Interview, KP and Jon Roush, March 17, 1970. (CC) Laursen recalls appealing at this time to Mason Drukman for support, citing the history of revolutionary movements: If the Waskow/Wolfe group managed to purge the "left" (the closed membership faction), then the moderates (Drukman)

The implications of this shift in the power structure would take a few months to become clear. Not everyone felt that a breach had opened that could not be closed. Dick Burg, despite being a close friend of Laursen's, could see both Waskow's and Laursen's positions as reasonable; both structure and openness had their appeal. Before the final battle about membership, he had appealed for flexibility and reconciliation:

The approaching enlargement of the community coincides with the death of the community and the birth of the community. This version of the membership procedure suggests that merely "knowing" we are changing will not transfer community through to the other side. We really must flow with it! Reach for Unity, not reinforce "two" as in "old and new."⁶⁰

Jon Roush, too, felt ambivalent about the issues at stake. He tended to speak out on behalf of and to be identified with the "structural" faction, but that was partly because he felt the other position was so well represented. Had it been weaker, he felt he might have drifted in that direction.⁶¹

With the community now grappling with the task of absorbing its new members, the process of organization went forward rapidly during the spring. The urban group had reached a decision to locate the community in the Buckman

would be next. Everyone in the Learning Community was to the left of their adversaries.

⁶⁰Rag, February 28, 1970, p. 2. (Burg docs.)

⁶¹Jon Roush interview, 8/3/92.

neighborhood, in Southeast Portland immediately across the river from downtown.⁶² Since relations with Reed were becoming strained,⁶³ the office was rented from Centenary Wilbur Methodist Church, at 215 SE 9th. The church was large, the congregation diminished, and the minister, Harper Richardson, was a social activist who made space available inexpensively for "alternative" organizations.

The connection with the church opened another opportunity. The congregation owned a Multilith press, fallen into disrepair, that caught the eye of John Laursen, who had learned the printer's trade during summer jobs in college. He and Dick Burg offered the church \$200 cash for the press. In their offer, they wrote,

Although we are not representing the Learning Community in this matter, we are associated with it, and would give priority to the printed matter that that organization intends to generate. We would like to make very clear, however, that we plan to be in a position to offer cost-plus printing to the organizations now housed at Centenary Wilbur and to the Portland radical community. We do not intend to operate as a commercial shop, but as a communications service for such organizations.⁶⁴

⁶²According to John Laursen, the choice of Centenary Wilbur as a location for the office was a reflection of the LC's commitment to the Buckman neighborhood. See John Laursen interview, 8/18/94, and Dick Burg interview, 4/16/94.

⁶³Dick Burg interview, 4/16/94.

⁶⁴Dick Burg, John Laursen & Bob Phillips to Paul Libby, February 26, 1970. (Burg docs.) Years later John Laursen learned that his purchase of the press had given offense to Howard Waskow, who apparently felt it should have belonged to

To provide a home for the press and themselves and a place for meetings away from Reed, and in keeping with the current focus on the Buckman neighborhood, Laursen and Burg rented a house at SE 28th & Taylor. There they spent several weeks rehabilitating the press.

When the press became functional, the first job John printed on it was the Learning Community's "promotional literature." This was originally conceived of as a brochure, but since it proved impossible for everyone to agree on a text, it was done as a series of loose leaves--one on the community's goals, one by the urban group, one by the exurban, one on finances, several comprising brief statements by current members, and finally one on membership in the community that admitted candidly that "procedures for entering and leaving it have yet to be precisely resolved." These loose sheets were shuffled together in stationery boxes and became known as "the box." On the cover it stated "First Printing May 1970 by Press-22."

During that spring, the posture of the "Learning" group was one of accommodation to new realities. In April, recognizing that the urban group would not support the purchase of the land in Skamania County, and that the resources for developing urban and exurban sites

the community rather than have fallen into private hands. See John Laursen interview, 8/18/94.

simultaneously were probably not available, the exurban group suggested delaying for a year the purchase of land in the country. They also endorsed the urban group's change of focus from the Buckman to the Irvington neighborhood, which had occurred soon after Laursen and Burg's rental of the Taylor St. house.⁶⁵ During the next several months a number of houses were purchased in Irvington, some by individual members (the Drukman, the Waskows, the Wolfes, Kirk Thompson and Bill McLaughlin), others by the Learning Community itself.

From the outside, the divisions that preoccupied the participants were not so apparent. Carnegie looked upon the enterprise with great favor. In Alden Dunham's view, "The Portland Learning Community ... represents the most educationally radical experiment currently to be found in the United States." In that memo, laying out the reasons that Carnegie should support the Learning Community, he wrote,

In my view, the major justification for this grant is as follows. Across the country in large numbers of institutions there are educationally radical groups of young faculty members confronting their more conservative colleagues. Internal dissension is rife. Some good may come of this dissension, but on the whole it strikes me that the net result is a loss to institutional cohesion and purpose.

⁶⁵"Efforts to find an exurban site on which an option could be taken proved fruitless," as Abrams & Price blandly put it, p. 14. See memorandum TO: All of us. FROM: Some of us (Kirk, Bill, Mary, Laursen, Kathy, Maya, Grace, Jim, Dick), April 24, 1970. (Burg docs.). Also see John Laursen interview, 8/18/92.

Moreover, the Young Turks are cast in the role of attackers of the establishment without really having any constructive alternatives to implement. In this case, at Reed, there is a possibility of enabling a group of educational reformers to do something positive and constructive as an alternative to what they are rebelling against. This is an experiment, and observers seem to think that there is no better group in the country to try it.⁶⁶

Both Carnegie and Antioch were concerned that Reed might take offense at their support for the Learning Community. For that reason, in February Alden Dunham called Victor Rosenblum, who responded with a statement of his admiration for the founding group and his sorrow that Reed was not "a big enough place" for them to carry out their experiment. "VR makes it plain that he thinks CC should make its decision independent of Reed College. He says that no matter what the CC decision, there are bound to be sour expressions from one sector or another."⁶⁷ Dunham also called Richard Jones. According to his record of the interview, Jones

is a conservative academician on the Reed faculty and has been one of the key conservatives leading the fight against transformation of the College into the Learning Community model. He states quite openly that he thoroughly disagrees with the Learning Community notions of education simply because he doesn't think they will work and yet he can't be sure. He admires the faculty members connected with the Learning Community and feels they are men of tremendous ability. He thinks that CC should provide them some seed money to do their

⁶⁶Memorandum from Alden Dunham to AP, FA, March 12, 1970. (CC)

⁶⁷Record of interview between EAD [E. Alden Dunham] and Victor Rosenbloom [sic], February 26, 1970. (CC)

thing, primarily because what they want to do may be highly significant and because they simply will not be able to do it at Reed. Jones does not think that a CC grant to this group would be interpreted by conservative academics at Reed as a slap at Reed College.⁶⁸

Dunham also found that Morris Keeton at Antioch was still "extremely enthusiastic about the Portland group. He says that the faculty members involved are a definite cut above Antioch faculty and ... the students are at least as good as Antioch students." Keeton was unable to say exactly what the relationship would be between the Learning Community and Antioch, since the latter was in the throes of redefining its own structure, but felt an arrangement could be worked out for Learning Community members to get academic credits through Antioch if they later transferred to Antioch.⁶⁹ In March the requirement to transfer to Antioch was dropped.⁷⁰

On March 12, Alden Dunham recommended a grant of \$62,000 to the Learning Community to assist in start-up costs,

⁶⁸Record of Interview between EAD [E. Alden Dunham] and Richard Jones, February 26, 1970. (CC) At this diplomatic level, relations were correct, even cordial; down in the trenches, it was sometimes another story. "A Reed professor who saw one of his former students on campus called him a 'traitor.' Another simply grew pale and rigid on the occasion of a friendly greeting." Judson Jerome, "Draft: The Learning Community," July 1971, pp. 6-7. (CC)

⁶⁹Record of interview between EAD [E. Alden Dunham] and Morris Keeton, February 26, 1970. (CC)

⁷⁰Record of interview between KP and JR (Jon Roush), March 4, 1970. (CC)

primarily justified on the basis of Jon Roush's proposals.⁷¹ On the following day Morris Keeton wrote to Dunham stating that the academic credit arrangement would be for "students admitted directly to PLC who simultaneously have their admission ratified by Antioch Columbia." He reaffirmed Antioch's interest in the project, writing that "the Portland Learning Community is conceived with a philosophy and methodology which would make it a distinctive and significant addition to the network of centers among which Antioch students might choose." Keeton was "less sure about the managerial strength of the PLC."⁷²

In April Jon Roush wrote to Antioch a formal request for support based on four "propositions [that] deserve to be tested": (1) the greater significance of learning carried on in a communal context as opposed to traditional academic settings; (2) the integration of urban and agrarian lifestyles; (3) the importance of a "contribution" model of financing; and (4) the opportunity the community would have for "responsible advocacy roles in the larger society."⁷³ James Dixon, president of Antioch, endorsed the request, writing to Dunham that

⁷¹Memorandum from EAD [E. Alden Dunham] to AP, FA, March 12, 1970. (CC)

⁷²Morris T. Keeton to Dr. Alden Dunham, March 13, 1970. (CC)

⁷³Jon Roush to James Dixon and Morris Keeton, April 19, 1970. (CC)

Although the proposed venture is quite small, the propositions being tested are of enormous significance. Since they take the form, "It is possible to do educationally an urgently needed new form of service," the test can, if affirmative in outcome, be accomplished at a modest cost. It would be most rewarding to undertake this further collaboration with the Carnegie Corporation in the service of American higher education.⁷⁴

Keeton's misgivings about the "managerial strength" of the Learning Community were evidently shared at Carnegie; these were overcome by making Antioch the beneficiary of the grant; it would administer the funds on behalf of the Learning Community. "On top of the original budget of \$62,000 has been added \$15,000 for the services that Antioch would provide. These include general consulting, financial planning as well as financial aid planning, general accounting, and fund-raising advice." This memorandum also stated clearly that the grant was predicated on Roush's four propositions.⁷⁵

The precise terms of the relationship between Antioch and the Learning Community, however, remained unclear. Antioch's constitutional convention, at which that relationship was to be settled, "had begun one day prior to the shootings at Kent State so the meeting was promptly adjourned. M[orris] K[eeeton] stated that the PLC issue at

⁷⁴James P. Dixon to Dr. E. Alden Dunham, April 24, 1970. (CC)

⁷⁵Memorandum from EAD [E. Alden Dunham] to FA and AP, May 6, 1970. (CC)

Antioch probably won't be resolved until next year at this time."⁷⁶

On June 11, Carnegie formally notified Antioch that it had appropriated funds for the Learning Community. These were now, at the request of Carnegie's board of directors, increased to \$87,000 to provide \$10,000 for "as objective an evaluation as possible ... of this very interesting experiment so that the experience of the Community can be made available to other educators." The funds would become available for disbursement on July 1.⁷⁷

The Learning Community was in business.

⁷⁶Record of interview between KP [at Carnegie] and Morris Keeton, May 21, 1970. (CC)

⁷⁷FA [at Carnegie] to James P. Dixon, President, Antioch College, June 11, 1970. (CC)

CHAPTER III

"MAKING PEOPLE'S DREAMS COME TRUE"

The grant from Carnegie assured a future for the Learning Community, but it was not the future a hopeful Jon Roush had forecast. The dispute over membership in March 1970 had driven a permanent wedge between the "learning" and the "community" factions, though the implications of that division took several months to become clear. In the meantime, the strength of the commitment both groups had made to the new community during the previous fall and winter carried the organization forward.

The move into Irvington began, and by the fall of 1970 the community comprised approximately 65 people living in 11 houses in the area from Northeast 11th to 16th between Thompson and Klickitat.¹ There were also two houses outside Irvington; the Roushes, in the interest of the continuity of their children's schooling, stayed in their home near Reed, and Dick Burg and John Laursen remained at the house on SE Taylor St. At the end of the 1969-70 academic year a newly tenured Mason Drukman resigned from his position at Reed and

¹Bill Keller, "Refugees from Conventional Academia Stress 'Living' in New Learning Community," The Sunday Oregonian, November 22, 1970, p. 41.

took on the community's only official and salaried role, that of "administrator."

During the summer many people, particularly members of of the "learning" group, were out of town, and the logistics of the move into the Irvington houses was a major preoccupation of those who remained in town. The newsletter continued to be published, however, and that became a new focus of dispute.

Before the confrontation over membership in March, the communications committee had consisted of Dick Burg, John Laursen, Bill McLaughlin, and Kirk Thompson, all people associated with the "learning" group.² Thereafter, Howard Waskow assumed an increasingly prominent role in editing and producing the newsletter. By the end of spring, the procedure was for Waskow to produce masters of the newsletter, which John Laursen then reproduced on the newly refurbished Multilith. There are two entirely separate accounts of what was at issue in the disagreement that arose at this point, both of which will be included here.

According to members of the "community" faction and the account in the Abrams and Price evaluation, the issue was some pictures submitted to the Rag by Dan and Judy Wolfe's nine-year-old son Benjy.

²Rag, February 17, 1970, p. 1.

John Laursen, one of the "college" group and mimeographer of the Rag, refused Benjy's copy and other material--poems and stories from other members on the grounds that these contributions were not up to Rag standards. The Rag appeared as a two-page issue without the pictures, which were "killed in the composing room." ... Here was the "freedom vs. structure" issue again. Some felt the Rag should have some literary standards for its writing, for the type of material that could be included, and for format. Others held out for "free-form," with a requirement only that anything submitted should be published.³

Laursen remembered the subject of the dispute quite differently. According to his account, in May or June, after Waskow brought the masters for the newsletter to the Taylor St. house, Laursen discovered that it included a couple of pages that were entirely "an attack on Deayne Roush written by Judy Wolfe, just a diatribe ... a personal attack on somebody who was a close friend of mine, and didn't seem to have any relationship to being a Learning Community newsletter--but in any event [it] wasn't something I was willing to print."⁴ He printed the other pages, which Waskow

³Abrams & Price, p. 16. See also Dan Wolfe interview, 5/31/92.

⁴John Laursen interview, 8/18/92. Laursen's recollection of the attack on Deayne Roush is corroborated by Jon Roush and Kathy McKeown. Abrams & Price describe an attack on Deayne and Jon Roush ("never having understood what the LC was all about" and "not being part of our Community"), but they do not mention the newsletter as its vehicle and they place it much later in the year (p. 20). By that time Laursen had long since stopped participating in the community, so that chronology seems unlikely. There is no documentary evidence to reconcile these accounts. Howard Waskow declined to furnish the author with copies of the newsletters in his possession.

picked up while Laursen was out. Waskow called later, incensed, to find out why the missing pages had not been printed, and at the next general meeting brought charges of censorship. Laursen's reply was that the newsletter could include whatever Waskow wanted, he just wouldn't print items he found offensive. This incident brought Laursen's involvement in the Learning Community to a close.

For most members, however, the physical demands of the move placed ideological differences temporarily in the background. The activities of that period are described in a newsletter from August 14, which will be discussed in some detail. According to that newsletter, members were occupied with the purchase of houses and their refurbishment, including remodeling, painting, and sewing drapes. A task force had just begun to meet "to discuss restructuring the Community," but attracted little interest. Mason Drukman was wrestling with the problem, posed by Carnegie as a condition of the grant, of locating an evaluator. A large group of members was meeting to support the candidacy of Tom Walsh for city commissioner, and to discuss what position Walsh ought to take on the forthcoming People's Army Jamboree (see below). Seven new members had joined. Allyn Snider was organizing a "Food Conspiracy" to purchase provisions in bulk for the various households.

Grant [Raddon?] submitted a report on a meeting to discuss "degrees and requirements." He found the meeting

refreshing, as the perception distortions of each other's meaning and intent was largely avoided, and there was considerable discussion and general agreement on issues.... There was considerable enthusiasm for the Black Mountain Method (cf.: collected papers on Black Mountain, Kirk Thompson, ed.), wherein a person would decide when he felt he was qualified for a degree and would request the school to examine him. The school would then bring in professionals from outside the school to test the student in his chosen subject.⁵

Valerie reported that she, Jerry, Serena, Steve, and Gail had formed a group with Bill [McLaughlin], independent

⁵Zabriskie Point Rag (as this issue is entitled), August 14, 1970, p. 2. (Deutsch documents) Black Mountain College was frequently mentioned as a significant predecessor of the Learning Community (to call it a "model" would be overstating the case). For example: "Black Mountain College in North Carolina is perhaps the best known effort to alter the ownership-employee-client structure of American colleges. An interesting recent experiment is the offshoot of Reed College faculty and students now loosely affiliated with Antioch and functioning in Portland, Oregon as 'The Learning Community.' The Learning Community is experimenting with an environment that makes no distinction between living and learning." Joseph Fashing and Steven E. Deutsch, Academics in Retreat: The Politics of Educational Innovation. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971, p. 245. According to Dick Burg, Black Mountain served "in many people's minds as some hopeful model that the Learning Community might become." (See interview.) According to Maya Muir, Black Mountain "seemed like the only tentative model that anyone proposed at all" (interview, 10/24/94). George Fasel recalled an early meeting of Learning Community organizers at which a person or persons from Black Mountain spoke (interview, 12/5/94); no one has been able to identify who spoke. For other references to Black Mountain see Kathy Roush interview, 8/4/92; Deayne Roush interview, 8/5/92; Jon Roush interview 8/3/94; David Sweet interview 7/8/92; and Kirk Thompson interview, 4/16/94; also Jon Roush to E. Alden Dunham, 2/15/70, p. 5 (CC). For an account of the Black Mountain tradition in Oregon, see appendix.

of the psychology group but related to it, to study "the philosophic presuppositions and implications of Gestalt theory" in Merleau-Ponty's The Phenomenology of Perception. And Bill contributed a piece suggesting readings in David Hume, Wolfgang Kohler and Frederick Copleston as helpful prerequisites to an understanding of Merleau-Ponty.

Allyn Snider reported from "Judaism House" on efforts to learn Hebrew and to master yogurt-making, and Grace McLaughlin noted that her "pottery studio is in full operation with some very able students and a new kickwheel." David Sweet was trying to organize "a study group ... to watch televised football games and drink beer."⁶ The newsletter as a whole conveys an unmistakable sense of purposeful activity and optimism about the future of the community.

The People's Army Jamboree referred to was an aftershock of Richard Nixon's invasion of Cambodia at the end of April

⁶All quotations from the Zabriskie Point Rag, August 14, 1970, pp. 1-4. (Deutsch documents) The mention of football may have had resonances for the longer-term members of the community. During a weekend organizational retreat to Cannon Beach the previous November, George Fasel had brought a television to occupy his two daughters, ages three and five, during what he expected to be an intensive and tedious schedule of meetings. It was also the weekend of the Michigan vs. Ohio State game, a rivalry he had followed since childhood, and since the television would be there, he planned to see it. The idea of watching football on television, to Fasel's astonishment, provoked a storm of protest; football was symbolic of a cultural matrix that the Learning Community rejected in its entirety: crew cuts, John Wayne, the military. See George Fasel interview, 12/5/94, and Roger Porter interview, 6/3/92.

and the subsequent killings at Kent State on May 4. During May, the Portland police, with the blessing of Mayor Terry Schrunk and City Commissioner Frank Ivancie, attacked war protesters in the Park Blocks near Portland State University. Soon thereafter, the announcement that Nixon himself would speak in Portland at the national American Legion convention scheduled for September prompted antiwar groups to organize the Jamboree. Rumors sprang up that Portland would be inundated with visiting radicals, and the FBI and local law enforcement officials were panic-stricken at the prospect.⁷ Scanning the horizon for threats, they stumbled on the Learning Community, and attempted to recruit Dan Wolfe as an infiltrator.

After moving to Portland to participate in Upward Bound, Wolfe had gotten a job with Clackamas County, counseling juveniles who became involved with the justice system, a job that made him known within the Clackamas County Sheriff's Department. When one of the Learning Community houses down the block from Wolfe's came under police surveillance as a "black panther house" (strangely, since the Learning Community was notably and exclusively white in racial composition), a routine license plate check revealed Dan

⁷Brent Walth, Fire at Eden's Gate: Tom McCall and the Oregon Story. Portland: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1994, pp. 286-89. See also Dory J. Hylton, The Portland State University Strike of May 1970: Student Protest as Social Drama. University of Oregon Ph.D. dissertation, 1993.

Wolfe's serendipitous presence. Detective Vern White, not realizing Wolfe shared a group affiliation with the inhabitants of the suspect house, asked him to keep an eye on the house and report any suspicious activities.

When Wolfe refused, he was harassed and threatened by the Portland police for not cooperating with the Clackamas County Sheriff's Department. He reported the threats to Mason Drukman and the situation was discussed at community meetings. Eventually, after Tom McCall's strategem of promoting a rock concert near Estacada left the People's Army Jamboree becalmed, the threats and harassment of Wolfe diminished.⁸

Other members of the community participated in activist groups helping plan for the medical and legal problems that were expected to result from the impending confrontation. David Sweet remembered Serena-Lynn Brown serving as a medical volunteer.⁹ After that summer, however, the internal development of the community took increasing priority over political activism.

The problem of the evaluation referred to in the August 14 newsletter was beginning to occupy a significant amount of Mason Drukman's time in his capacity as administrator, and

⁸Dan Wolfe interview, 5/31/92.

⁹David Sweet interview, 7/8/92.

would eventually place great demands on his diplomatic skills. In a letter to Morris Keeton in July, Alden Dunham stated two questions the evaluator would need to answer: "whether this kind of departure makes a difference with students and whether the community structure is both viable and exportable." He also noted that "we want to avoid someone who is an obvious enthusiast for the new student culture or who is not likely to produce quantitative data. In short, we are looking for a really critical examination of what the place is all about."¹⁰ In response to a request for guidance, Dunham forwarded these same views to Drukman.¹¹

By September the leading contender for performing the evaluation was Steven Deutsch, a sociologist at the University of Oregon. In a proposal submitted in September, Deutsch and two doctoral candidates working with him argued for an approach that would illuminate "the experience as an emerging and exportable philosophical model, [as opposed to] the traditional notion of some kind of tangible measured achievement in learning output. [The analysis would be] focused on the collective experience."¹² Deutsch was willing

¹⁰Alden Dunham to Morris Keeton, July 9, 1970. (CC)

¹¹Mason Drukman to E. Alden Dunham, July 9, 1970, and EAD to Mason Drukman, July 17, 1970. (CC)

¹²S. Deutsch, M. Feuerberg, and R. Brown, "Some Proposed Ideas Concerning The Learning Community Evaluation Project, September 17, 1970, p. 1. (CC)

to perform the evaluation for the allotted \$10,000 (an impediment for other potential evaluators who were approached), and was ready to start in October, an important point for all concerned. His proposal was supported by Mason Drukman and by Morris Keeton at Antioch.¹³

At Carnegie, however, Dunham found Deutsch's proposal "weak," for reasons he did not make clear; it can be conjectured that he found Deutsch too sympathetic to reformist trends in higher education to be an objective observer.¹⁴ Dunham was realizing that the \$10,000 appropriated was not enough to get done the kind of evaluation he wanted. (In November he requested an additional \$5,000 from the Carnegie board, which was granted.¹⁵) Dunham also regretted the time lost in the search, expressing agreement with the comments Deutsch made to Drukman in October when he found out he was not going to get the job:

It has now been two months since you first approached me. That means that any other evaluators will be that much further behind, and we already felt the need to work to fill in the in-between period to get at Time One for a longitudinal analysis. The dynamics of The Learning Community just since August, when you were already three months under way, are obviously critical. The

¹³Morris T. Keeton to Dr. Alden Dunham, September 22, 1970. (CC)

¹⁴EAD to Mason Drukman, October 19, 1970. (CC)

¹⁵EAD memorandum to DZR and AP, November 25, 1970, and FA [Florence Anderson at Carnegie] to James P. Dixon [president of Antioch], December 9, 1970. (CC)

longer the evaluators wait, the more difficult it will be to acquire important initial data.¹⁶

The task of evaluating the Learning Community was ultimately undertaken by Janet Abrams and Charlton Price, under circumstances they describe in their report.

Janet Abrams, a recent political science graduate of Stanford University and former member of the Stanford Research Institute staff, had made a summer visit to her friends the McKendalls in Portland and through them had met a number of LC people. She decided to apply for membership in the LC and also began to think about studying the Community as a participant observer. She was involved in some of the negotiations about prospective researchers who ultimately turned out to be unacceptable either to the Community or to Antioch and Carnegie. As the pressure increased to arrive at a study plan and get research underway, it became clear that an outside researcher with additional experience would also be needed even if Janet were involved as an "inside" observer. She proposed Charlton Price, a former colleague at SRI for this role.¹⁷

Before that study could get under way, however, the "dynamics" that Deutsch mentioned culminated in what was later referred to as "the Blood Baths." The membership issue, for one thing, had never really gone away, despite the

¹⁶Steven E. Deutsch to Mason Drukman, October 10, 1970, p. 2. (CC)

¹⁷Abrams & Price, Appendix A, p. 2. The McKendalls were Benjamin McKendall, the dean of admissions and students at Reed who later lost his job because of his focus on recruiting minorities (see Roger Porter interview, 6/3/92), and his wife Jane, both of whom had been involved in the organizational phase of the Learning Community and were listed as members in the "box," May 1970 (Burg docs.).

triumph of the "open" faction in March. It came up again in August when a radical from Reed wanted to join, prompting a "bitter and heated" discussion.¹⁸ Although by the time he was ultimately accepted he had lost interest in joining, the dispute generated a lot of ill feeling. The ease with which newcomers were able to enter and leave the community also left many of the older members disoriented. Grace McLaughlin remembered that she never knew who she would find staying in her house when she returned home at night. There was "a legion of people in sleeping bags that we didn't know who were de facto in the community at that point."¹⁹

One of the newcomers, who went by the name of "Blue," impressed several members of the community as a particularly sinister character.²⁰ According to Dick Burg, Blue created a lot of tension by introducing a weapon into the house where he was staying.²¹

Meetings, which tended to be frequent, lengthy, and unproductive, were another demoralizing factor. Decisions were supposed to result from a consensual "organic process" that was intended to allow a "fluid and flexible" response to changing circumstances. All voices were equal, and any

¹⁸Abrams & Price, p. 16.

¹⁹Grace McLaughlin interview, 7/3/92.

²⁰Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92.

²¹Dick Burg interview, 4/16/94.

newcomer could reopen discussion of issues that others felt had been settled. "Part of the 'organic process' approach was a general disdain for planning ahead. Things get done by just starting and letting them grow."²²

David Sweet recalled attending a meeting to work out a budget required by Carnegie and Antioch in connection with the grant. Richard Garmise immediately began to argue against having a budget at all, and that became the subject of the meeting. Maya Muir remembered Garmise and Fred Price as "principled obstructionists" who frequently turned discussions away from the matter at hand and in the direction of fundamental ideological issues.²³

Fatigue and disillusion took their toll during the fall of 1970. The vicious attack on Deayne Roush had had a major impact on the Roush family's attitude toward the community. Jon Roush said he underwent an emotional withdrawal from participation at that point. He went to Waskow and asked him to intervene, but Waskow said that Roush, as a member of the community, should stand up for himself. This Roush was unwilling to do, feeling Waskow's attitude of "anything goes" had implicitly provided encouragement for the attack.

²²Abrams & Price, p. 38.

²³David Sweet interview, 7/8.92, and Maya Muir interview, 10/24/94.

Also, Jon Roush was embarrassed by a sense of responsibility toward Carnegie and Antioch, whose support for the community was largely due to his connections. He was uncomfortable about the community's haphazard accounting practices, and was reluctant to be seen in a parental relationship with the community. Moreover, he was fresh from a rancorous year serving on the Faculty Advisory Committee at Reed. Although he was aware that there were members of the Learning Community who were looking to him for leadership, he came to feel that if the Learning Community was going to be as factionalized and strife-ridden as Reed had been, the reason for his participation had evaporated.²⁴ Thus, when the Roushes returned to Portland from their summer in Montana, their involvement was more peripheral than it had been in the spring.

Seeing the direction the community was taking, most members of the "learning" group simply stopped participating. For some, like John Laursen, the break was a sharp one. For others, like Dick Burg, it happened more gradually, and involved personal as well as community issues. During the spring of 1970 he had felt he was definitely a part of the community. Later in the year, having broken up with his girlfriend, Kathy McKeown, who remained in the community, he

²⁴Jon Roush interview, 8/3/92. As David Sweet put it, "Jon's absence was a presence in the community." (See interview, 7/8/92)

began to feel a sense of distance, and eventually he became completely estranged.²⁵ Bill McLaughlin, Kirk Thompson, and Dave Sweet all found other activities increasingly rewarding and stopped attending meetings. According to Abrams & Price,

This left the Learning Community with a not much diminished membership, but swung the balance of power strongly toward those with the "communal" view of what the LC should be. It also reduced to four the Community members with college teaching experience, and changed the age distribution sharply. Now, there were less than 10 people over 25 years of age, and the vast majority were between 18 and 22.²⁶

Howard Waskow saw this as a generally positive development.

What is now happening is that another skin is being shed, getting rid of the old internal contradictions. More of those faculty types who saw this as just another experimental college now find it impossible. The question now is, is the vitality in the other thing enough to sustain us. We've got to give ourselves enough room financially to allow enough time for this to be fully born.²⁷

Toward the end of this process of "shedding another skin," Bill Keller of The Oregonian wrote a two-part feature on the Learning Community. As he described the community at that point, the "contribution model" that Jon Roush had proposed had been put into practice. "Members are given as much as they need to live, plus whatever expenses they incur

²⁵Dick Burg interview, 4/16/94.

²⁶Abrams & Price, p. 17.

²⁷Quoted in Abrams & Price, p. 18.

in their individual pursuits. There are no salaries. They contribute from savings, parents, or part-time work." According to Keller, there were no role distinctions, aside from Drukman's one-year appointment as administrator. In the sphere of academics, "Members have organized meetings-- 'classes' and 'teachers' are among the banished words--on such subjects as Hebrew, science fiction, radical economics, philosophy, pottery and dance.... People never think about [academic credit] unless they are reminded by parents or draft boards."

Keller quoted Jon Roush on the demographics of the community: "We tend to attract people like ourselves. There are no blacks in the community, and few poor people. I mean, there are people who don't have money, who are completely supported by the community, but not from a lower-class background." Roush still looked forward to the establishment of an exurban site, and saw the community as essentially outward-looking: "Some of the houses are acting like communes, true. But we're not interested in withdrawal, in an isolated alternative.... We don't rely on our own resources to the extent that most communes do." It was Keller's judgment that "so far, however, the 'curriculum' of the Learning Community has consisted mostly in giving birth to itself," and he quoted member Jerry Kellman's comment that "the central paradox of the Learning Community is that we

have no real common basis except a desire to encourage individual growth."²⁸

In the second part of the article, Keller explored the community's "personal hostilities and conflicting ideologies," apparently based on interviews with Grace McLaughlin, Howard Waskow, and Jon Roush. According to Keller, McLaughlin had resigned two months earlier, over the issues of membership and academic standards. "I expected some sort of criteria, even if it was only evidence of a desire to do something--anything--seriously and carefully." Despite her resignation, "Mrs. McLaughlin still lives with two Community members and teaches pottery to anyone who is willing to do it 'as a discipline.'" McLaughlin also expressed concern about the effects of open membership on the community's financial viability: "I don't think the Community will survive economically. Too many people will come in looking for a place to crash, and there won't be enough initiative to get them to contribute. I don't think the leaders of the community are financially realistic."

Howard Waskow, on the other hand, "says he feels 'an enormous sense of accomplishment that we have done so much in so little time.'" He described himself as--like his critics--a perfectionist, but argued that building emotional

²⁸Bill Keller, "Refugees from Conventional Academia Stress 'Living' in New Learning Community," The Sunday Oregonian, November 22, 1970, p. 41.

connections should take priority over insisting on high standards. He went on to observe that "there are some people in the Community who haven't had as much endurance of the unknown as the rest of us, so they fall back on the old forms. They might call it a sense of realism, or discipline, but it is actually a kind of fear. I don't mean to use that word harshly."

In Jon Roush's view, the community's greatest accomplishment was simply to present itself as an alternative to the conventions of traditional academia:

I hope that after people have found out they don't need college, they will see that they don't need the Learning Community, either. We have a centrifugal action, pulling members in, and then spinning them off.

Eventually, I think the Community will become a place for college students to go after they graduate. Once they've learned how worthless their degrees are to them personally, the Learning Community will give them a chance to continue their intellectual pursuits without serious constraints.²⁹

While the adherents of an "open" policy toward admission had achieved an unquestioned ascendancy by this time, it proved impossible to settle the issue to everyone's satisfaction; its treatment continued to evolve. According to Abrams and Price, after the September dispute about the Reed radical's membership, a procedure was adopted whereby

²⁹Bill Keller, "Conflict In Ideologies Triggers Difficulties In Organization Of Learning Community," The Oregonian, November 23, 1970, p. 16.

newcomers desiring admission would declare their intention in the Rag, and "a week later official affiliation would occur. There was no formal vote, but the interval of one week was provided so that objecting LC members could 'go to people and talk about it' if they wished the individual who was proposing himself not to join." New memberships were limited to eight per month.

By late November the Irvington houses were getting crowded, and even where space existed residents were becoming concerned about the "psychological space" that newcomers might occupy.

People in most houses felt that the groups established were at least congenial, and there was reluctance to "graft on" others. These considerations brought about the organic decision that membership would be closed.

Another reason for closing membership was that some people with whom no one wanted to live had come in under the self-declaration system. It was difficult to see how one could be a member if one was acceptable in no house.... [As administrator, it fell to Mason Drukman] to explain to certain new members that they weren't wanted in any house.³⁰

Early in 1971 a special membership meeting considered a policy of requiring prospective members to be accepted as residents in a house as a prerequisite to membership, but two members blocked consensus on the grounds that full houses would have no voice at all in admitting new members, who could be blackballed by the members of one house whatever the

³⁰Abrams & Price, p. 41.

degree of their popularity in the community at large. Instead, a membership task force was created, consisting of whoever wanted to serve on it, to meet with prospects and inform them of community concerns and issues (including objections to the prospective member by existing ones); the decision to join was nevertheless to remain with the new member.

This procedure was implemented for a time, but the informational meetings quickly evolved into mere social occasions. Abrams & Price described the status of the membership issue in the spring of 1971:

With no real criteria for membership ever determined, the only basis for objection to a prospective member were personal likes and dislikes. LC members could never quite face the responsibility of expressing such feelings to someone contemplating joining. Constant explanation and orientation of prospective new members did take a lot of time and energy, and, when the task force tired and allowed its responsibilities to languish, the welcoming function became a rote performance, and a lot of orientation was done haphazardly. People continued to come into the circle of the LC who didn't know anything about the Community and weren't being talked with. Thus the consensus on new member procedure might be said to have organically decayed.³¹

During this year, despite the withdrawal of the more academically oriented members, the community continued to provide a venue for intellectual activity. In the spring of

³¹Ibid., p. 42.

1971 a number of members submitted requests for credit to Antioch, supplying their own summaries of what they had learned and in some cases endorsements by those under whose tutelage they had worked. Antioch forwarded three of the most extensive requests, those by Richard Garmise, Stephen Ervin, and Tom Breidenthal, to Carnegie, as examples.

Garmise requested 45.5 academic credits for work in linguistics, psychoanalysis, reading and writing poetry, gestalt psychology, economics, violoncello, piano, and music pedagogy, some of which were individual and some group projects. He also included an extensive summary of his work in "community building," for which he requested no additional credit. His most intensive efforts were in psychoanalysis (in which he tallied 375 hours of work) and violoncello (417 hours). His summaries of his work in gestalt psychology (140 hours), economics (104 hours) and community building (no hours given) are of particular interest, however, for the light they cast on community activities.

Part of Garmise's report on the Gestalt group concerned a couple, trained by Fritz Perls, who arrived at the Learning Community in the fall of 1970.

On their initiative the community began a series of Gestalt therapy meetings.... The group leader (the male) showed character flaws which prevented a therapeutic process in the group, and which tended to focus the group's attention on breaking down some of the character armor and inhibitions shown prominently in the leader, not to mention frequent attempts to deal with a defensive but still highly obnoxious sarcasm in him. This combined with the

feeling on the part of many of the group that the group as a whole did not possess still the naivete which Gestalt therapy evidently calls for, nor the confidence in the apparent superficiality of Gestalt therapy and its promised "cure." It has indeed become my opinion from my experience with Gestalt therapy, and my readings of Fritz Perls and Barry Stevens, that those who turn to Gestalt today, those who profess to be "into" it and those who profess to be "cured" by it are of the same make-up as those who fifty years ago were cured by snake oil and faith healers.³²

Another of the study groups in which Garmise participated was known as "URPE," an acronym for Union for Radical Political Economics. According to Garmise the group included a core of seven members, with an equal number as occasional participants. Discussions focused on "problems of the interface between the Community and the outside world, decision making, and problems of roles and power within the Community." After the New Year, the group split into "Other URPE," which continued to focus on Learning Community issues, and "Structured URPE," which read Paul Samuelson's standard textbook on economics in conjunction with various radical critiques of his viewpoint.³³

"Structured URPE" was developed and led by Millie Howe. Although, as she wrote in her cover letter to Antioch endorsing requests for credits, Samuelson's text was "painful and embarrassing to us all," she used it in

³²Richard Garmise, request for academic credits, June 1971, p. 7. (CC)

³³Ibid., pp. 8-9. (CC)

response to a need on the part of some Community members to experience "a regular, elementary economics course." The need is created primarily by the intimidation felt by the uninitiated when they cannot use the jargon of economic theory (e.g., "marginal" this and that) or conceptualize problems.

According to Howe, the course evolved in the direction of an exploration of a "sociology of economic knowledge," and she expressed the hope that it would serve as a foundation for a subsequent course on "the political economy of Oregon."³⁴

Garmise found the course valuable both for the knowledge gained about "how fully our lives were and had been conditioned in conformity to the capitalist social guidelines," and for its exploration of "classroom dynamics" and the relationship between "good performances" (and the inhibiting impact of "good performances" on other members of the class) and grades. In his request for credit, Garmise submitted a formidable list of 20 books as "Works That I've Read And Feel Myself Responsible For."³⁵ Garmise's requests for credit for work done on the violoncello, piano, and "music pedagogy" were similarly detailed.

Garmise also submitted a lengthy reflection on the "community building" process as it had unfolded during the previous year:

³⁴Mildred R. Howe, "Structured URPE," accompanying requests for academic credits, [June 1971]. (CC)

³⁵Richard Garmise, request for academic credits, June 1971, p. 9. (CC)

Meetings have often been given over to personal hang-ups rather than final decisions. Even such necessary money-making activities as the forthcoming restaurant have not been pushed too hard against the resistances of others. We have by and large recognized that it is more important for us to feel comfortable with what we are doing than to succumb to the sort of deadline pressures most groups in our civilization put as something of the first importance. This year, economically, has been a year of grace for us; we could not have had the opportunities to be ourselves, our own products, without Carnegie's money, but I think we used the time we bought to a really remarkable advantage.³⁶

Stephen Ervin's requests for credit included "Computer Modelling of Finite Automata," a project he worked on at the University of Massachusetts in the fall of 1970 before taking up residence in Portland. The work he did beginning in January included "Stained Glass Technique & Design," "Batik Workshop," "Sketching and Water Painting," and "Applied Carpentry."³⁷

Tom Breidenthal worked on economics with Millie Howe, Old English with Jon Roush, and accounting (for the community), in which he was tutored by Maya Muir, his predecessor in that task. He also requested credits for "Communal Dynamics," "Working at Abel's," "Jewish Studies," "Teaching Beginning Russian," "Gestalt Psychology," "Untranslated Russian Literature," and "Studies in Mystical Literature."

³⁶Ibid., p. 13. (CC)

³⁷Stephen Ervin, Application for Credit from Antioch, 1970-71, June 1971. (CC).

In his discussion of communal dynamics he wrote:

Since the Community is, in one respect, a "federation of houses," much effort has been expended in the attempt to build and strengthen these smaller units; i.e., to create real homes, not crashpads or dormitories. I have been fortunate in belonging to a household which has maintained itself steadily enough to begin to be a "family." We have functioned together with no rules; our anarchical system has depended on constant communication and attention to each other's needs.

Breidenthal was also strongly affected by his "exceedingly tedious" work as a book distributor:

My experience at Abel's strengthened my conviction that, in order to survive as a viably functioning economic and social unit, the Community must create its own income-producing jobs, so that its members can bring in needed capital while working together on non-alienating projects. Therefore, after leaving Abel's, I focused my energies toward the planning of the Community's proposed free school and the restaurant."³⁸

The spring of 1971, as Breidenthal noted, marked a change in direction for the community. During the 1970-71 academic year, individuals, subsidized by Carnegie, had been able to pursue a broad range of activities, intellectual and otherwise, at their personal discretion. As the year wore on, members became increasingly conscious of the necessity to make the community financially viable once the subsidy was removed. Even before the move to Irvington, a number of

³⁸Tom Breidenthal, Request for Credit for Work Completed from September, 1970 to June, 1971 in the Learning Community, June 1971, p. 3. (CC)

possible money-making enterprises were under discussion; Abrams and Price mention a publishing venture, a foodstore, a bookshop, a gallery, and a furniture-making business.³⁹ But by the spring of 1970 the school and the restaurant had won out.

In addition to their potential as revenue sources, Waskow and others also saw these enterprises as opportunities to maintain the Learning Community as an integrated community, rather than the "federation of houses" Tom Breidenthal had described.⁴⁰ To an extent, planning and operating the restaurant and school were the occasions of a major group effort. However, they suffered--the restaurant especially--from the same absence of a cohesive vision that afflicted the community as a whole, and in fact introduced new divisions. According to the Abrams and Price account:

There were various versions of a restaurant proposed, and little agreement at first on what should be done. In July a cafe was purchased in the downtown fringe, and the hard work of operating it began. Again the principle of collective leadership prevailed. There was no restaurant manager. Instead the tasks such as ordering, cooking, washing, serving, menu planning, keeping accounts and food preparation were shared and shuffled about. Gross revenues dropped off sharply at first from what the previous owner had said were his average receipts, but then there was some improvement. But the books were not kept sufficiently, even as late as four months after the opening of the restaurant, to be able to determine if a profit were being made. And there was some difficulty after a month or two in covering all shifts in the restaurant, which

³⁹Abrams & Price, p. 75.

⁴⁰Maya Muir interview, 10/24/94.

operated from early morning until late evening seven days a week.⁴¹

Part of the difficulty was that there were two distinct visions of the restaurant, which became embodied in two new factions, the "political" group and the "intensity" group. According to Peter Thacker, who joined the community during the summer of 1971, "the split pretty much came down around how much intensity there needed to be in relationships to make something work." The "intensity" faction felt a lot of time needed to be spent "processing," which involved working on relationships with other people. The "political" group was more task-oriented; "you had things to do."⁴²

Attitudes toward the restaurant reflected these different visions (or perhaps personality types). According to Allyn Snider, Howard Waskow, Millie Howe, and Judy Wolfe were all very interested in food; to them the restaurant represented an opportunity for culinary exploration and creativity.⁴³ Four months after its opening, "discussion continues as to how the LC might change the nature of the restaurant so that members might feel better about it. For instance, said some, a stronger effort could be made to attract students and hip customers, or organic foods might be

⁴¹Abrams & Price, p. 21. The Fairfield Cafe was at 1121 SW Stark.

⁴²Peter Thacker interview, 1/6/94.

⁴³Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92.

served."⁴⁴ For the "politicals," on the other hand, the restaurant was not merely an opportunity for culinary self-expression but an existing entity with a clientele with needs to be met; they "felt like you can't just abandon all these people who basically are down here on pensions and have been going to this place for a long time; you have got to serve them good food."

The organization of the school had a similar haphazard quality. "Discussions about the free school--both prior to and subsequent to its inception--have avoided detailed considerations of what would occur on a day-to-day-basis. Those involved in the school have preferred, instead, to take the position that 'we will let the kids come, and then see what they want to do, and figure it out from there.'"⁴⁵

The two key people in the life of the school were Allyn Snider and Peter Thacker. Snider had joined the effort to organize the Learning Community as a 17-year-old freshman at Reed during the 1969-70 academic year. Thacker was a newcomer, and older. He had been a senior at Antioch when Howard Waskow visited there during the spring of 1970 and spoke about the plans for the Learning Community, which he presented as an "alternative university." Thacker's friend Caralee Cohen, a student at the University of Massachusetts

⁴⁴Abrams & Price, p. 55.

⁴⁵Ibid.

whom he had met while doing an internship at a high school in Philadelphia, also saw Waskow speak at Antioch, and came to Portland to join the community during the summer of 1970. Meanwhile, after applying unsuccessfully for a job at Adams, Portland's new, "experimental" high school, Thacker got a job at Timberhill, a private school in California. During that year he visited Caralee at the Learning Community on two occasions. Since he was, relatively speaking, an experienced teacher, community members encouraged him to come to Portland to participate when plans began to mature to start a school.⁴⁶

During the summer of 1971, therefore, work at the restaurant and organizational activities for the school were the primary focus of the Learning Community; everyone worked at the restaurant, and participation in the school planning effort was also high. The school had barely opened in the fall, however, when the Learning Community entered into a new period of turmoil, which Abrams and Price refer to as the "Great Housing Shuffle." This was precipitated by Howard Waskow separating from his wife Betty and their children and moving in with Millie Howe. Two residents of Howe's house began looking for a new place to live. Together with three other like-minded members of the "political" group, they "announced that they wanted to establish their own household

⁴⁶Peter Thacker interview, 1/6/94.

unit, one that would be more egalitarian and sharing."⁴⁷ However, this involved asking already established residents to vacate another house, creating resentment among those asked to move and prompting those unaffected to take sides for or against "the Five." In Thacker's view, Howard Waskow now came to occupy a neutral center position in the community, attempting to mediate between the "intensity" and "political" factions.⁴⁸

The viewpoint of the "political" faction was not really a resurgence of the earlier "structure" or "learning" position. The "political wing" did not have the interest of the earlier group in establishing roots in the countryside, nor did they particularly desire a revival of academic learning.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the alternative vision they represented, of greater engagement in society at large and less internal "processing," was deeply antithetical to Judy Wolfe's ideas, and she, along with Caralee Cohen and one or

⁴⁷Abrams & Price, p. 63.

⁴⁸Peter Thacker interview, 1/6/94. According to Thacker and Maya Muir, "the Five" included David Greenburg, Betsy Winter, and Dwight Morrill, in addition to themselves. Maya Muir interview, 10/24/94.

⁴⁹Even within the small "political" group, opinions varied about their differences with the "intensity" group. Maya Muir saw the "political wing" as wanting a slightly more structured learning environment than the "intensity group; Peter Thacker felt the "political" group wanted to worry less than their adversaries about academics. See Maya Muir interview, 10/24/94, and Peter Thacker interview, 1/6/94.

two others, now resigned from the community. "The LC had become a kind of place in which they could no longer grow and change, and was becoming too preoccupied with projects such as the school and the restaurant instead of devoting energy to the development of emotionally close relationships, the Community purpose that they regarded as central."⁵⁰

While the community was thus shifting its direction significantly for a second time, perceptions from the outside were having a hard time keeping pace. In February 1971, Alden Dunham at Carnegie was still thinking of the Learning Community, as he had a year earlier, as "a small band of very bright faculty members and students who left Reed College to set up their own innovative educational group,"⁵¹ and was attempting, at Jon Roush's behest, to raise private funds to tide them over when the Carnegie money ran out. By June, Dunham's information was more up to date, but still idealistic.

The present situation at PLC consists of a few people taking courses at Portland State University or the local Community College although most learning revolves around just living in the unstructured experience that is the community. C[harlton] P[rice] compared PLC to eighteenth century political theory in practice.⁵²

⁵⁰Abrams & Price, p. 22.

⁵¹EAD to Norton Simon, 2/16/71. (CC)

⁵²Record of Interview, Charlton Price, EAD, FM, KP, 6/8/71. (CC)

Antioch viewed the year 1970-71 as a period in which the Learning Community had successfully overcome a number of obstacles. Morris Keeton felt that "the Community will survive as a living-learning community such as the project proposal originally envisaged, but that the specific form taken by the community will differ substantially from that originally envisaged by some of the original leaders of the Community."⁵³

By October, the documents from Antioch begin to convey a sense of disillusion. An unknown commentator there, in response to an exposé of the Learning Community written by David French and published in September in New York Times Magazine, wrote that the community was "as much selfish as idealistic and was certainly pretty naive. Ultimately the world has to be faced as it is and much of the counterculture was and is pure escapism."⁵⁴

David French had in fact made the Learning Community (which he did not mention by name, but which was clearly recognizable to participants as the subject) a whipping boy for his disillusionment with hippie America. "The counterculture is dying," he began. As a prelude to his discussion of the Learning Community, French described how he

⁵³Morris Keeton to Alden Dunham, 8/3/71, pp. 1 and 5. (CC)

⁵⁴Unsigned note, 10/4/71. (CC)

and his wife Elena had returned to America from a foreign service tour of duty in Ethiopia convinced of "the empty pretentiousness of our own technology-bound economic system" and filled with admiration for the traditional cultures of Africa. Africans, he had observed,

could be so direct, in fact, that they would become almost nonverbal, communicating by a kind of telepathy. And the same sense of involvement extended outward, to their families, their extended families, their tribal environments. In other dimensions, it went even beyond that: an almost mystical sense of spiritual fullness seemed to entwine them with generations dead and yet unborn. It all seemed wondrously human, caring, spontaneous, clearly opposed to the world in which Elena and I spent most of our time.⁵⁵

This was the sense of community he hoped to find when he and Elena arrived to stay with a friend living in one of the Learning Community houses.

Not surprisingly, he was disappointed. And he saw the Learning Community as symbolic of an entire failed revolution. The young people of the 1960s, he discovered during his brief stay in Portland, had renounced their parents' values only on the surface. "If the counterculture has rejected grades, authority, the nuclear family, it has thus carried over from the straight world psychological transience, the fragmentation of lives, immersion in

⁵⁵David French, article (title page missing), New York Times Magazine, October 3, 1971, p. 21.

abstractions, self-indulgence, and an atomistic version of individual growth."⁵⁶

By the fall of 1971, critiques of the Learning Community were becoming commonplace. The month before French's piece appeared, Judson Jerome, a literature professor at Antioch, published an article in Change magazine about a number of experiments in communal living, of which the Portland Learning Community was one. Jerome's study was considerably more thoughtful than French's, but very much a product of the time. "Civilization has gotten out of hand and is becoming dangerous to the people and the planet," he began, invoking "writers like Roszak, Mead, Reich, Theobald and above all Mumford."⁵⁷

For Jerome, the two dominant trends in higher education at that time were "outreach" and "community." The first emphasized travel, working at jobs, apprenticeships, independent study, and a generally expanded idea of learning as opposed to a narrow definition of academics. "Logically this line of development leads to deschooling, as advocated by Ivan Illich, where education is left to the learner's initiative, and the open use of a variety of resources is facilitated."⁵⁸ The second trend acknowledged the need for "a

⁵⁶Ibid., n.p.

⁵⁷Judson Jerome, "The Living-Learning Community," Change, September 1971, p. 46.

⁵⁸Ibid.

support group, a home base, in which there is reinforcement, acceptance, affection--in which there is joy. [Students] need the sense of community stripped away by the Megamachine."⁵⁹ Jerome acknowledged that these two tendencies, one emphasizing individuality and the other community, might be difficult to reconcile.

Jerome explored four programs (in order, as he put it, from "right" to "left") grappling with these problems, the Residential College at the University of Michigan, the Environmental Community at the University of Washington (which existed for only one year), the Learning Community, and "ONE, a phenomenon in San Francisco" comprising 200 young professionals.⁶⁰

Jerome's attitude toward the Learning Community was ambivalent. Many of the facts he reported and judgments he made had a negative tone, but his overall conclusions were resolutely positive. The community, as he described it, had

dwindled from about 50 to about 35 (including mid-year additions), a kind of attrition which the remaining members regarded as healthful in the long run. Both because of personal tensions and frustration because of the community's inability to define itself, a number of highly valued members dropped out or moved on to other more conventional college options. But the exodus seems to have had a galvanizing effect on those who remained, releasing unexpected new sources of creativity and energy.

⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 46-47.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 53.

At the time of my visit I saw a close group of people moving ahead. If they were still unable to agree upon purposes in the abstract, they were purposive on the practical level, engaged in concrete planning to move part of their community to a rural site and to own and run a restaurant and an experimental school both to learn management and to earn income. Paradoxically, compared to the other living-learning communities I am describing here, this one by far had the highest degree of seriousness, intensity and intellectuality, the greatest commitment to academic achievement. One of the older members said, "I've never been in such an intense intellectual community in my life!"⁶¹

Within the community, however, Jerome noted "a thin-skinned individuality," a "highly verbal, analytical style of life," a sense of being "held accountable for every word," and an undertone of antagonism toward both one another and outsiders. One member told him, "When you think of all the anger that has come out in this community, it is just overwhelming."⁶² Jerome observed that relations with the neighborhood were distant, and also commented on the trend toward the "federation of houses" that Tom Breidenthal has noted.

Though integration with the neighborhood was an explicit intention, little integration has occurred. When I visited, the houses were distinguished from those of their neighbors chiefly by their high grass--partly the result of an ideological commitment to naturalness of environment and partly owing to the fact that the community owns only one hand mower. They had received nuisance notices from the city. Each house has a name and an identity and tends in many ways

⁶¹Ibid., p. 51.

⁶²Ibid., p. 52.

to be a small community of five or six people--not always a close or successful community."⁶³

Relationships with the outside world were often treated as unwelcome intrusions, even those with Antioch and Carnegie.

It seemed to me that the Community's connections with the Carnegie Foundation and Antioch were enormous burdens, albeit probably necessary ones: the economic support was critical, and most of the former students would not have been attracted to it, or their parents might have opposed their attraction, had there been no opportunity to pursue a degree. But these associations cause the Community to be subject to continual intrusion and monitoring.⁶⁴

Antioch, in fact, reported in the summer of 1971 that four professors and five students⁶⁵ had made visited the Learning Community during the previous year, and observers had also come from Carnegie. Under continual scrutiny, community members often felt misunderstood. As Millie Howe expressed it,

There was such deception; we were used ... When I start to explain, I feel proud, and not defensive, and then they realize that this thing is for real, and they become very aggressive, and then I realize I don't want to do this, and I feel like turning on them and saying so how are things going in your

⁶³Ibid., pp. 51-52. For unfriendly relations with the neighborhood, see Grace McLaughlin interview, 7/3/92. Dan Wolfe remembers rough neighbors, threatening dogs and break-ins as a part of the experience. Dan Wolfe interview, 5/31/92.

⁶⁴Judson Jerome, "The Living-Learning Community," Change, September 1971, p. 52.

⁶⁵Morris Keeton to Alden Dunham, 8/3/71, p. 3. (CC)

fucking nuclear family ...? It seems legitimate [to visitors] for them to ask the most intimate questions about what I do with my life 24 hours a day.⁶⁶

On the other hand, Dan Wolfe remembered visitors expressing a giddy enthusiasm that, to a participant, immersed in the unromantic day-to-day life of the community, seemed laughably inappropriate to the situation.⁶⁷

Jerome also noted a surprising absence of interest in working outside the community and in acquiring "practical skills." "Not even cooking had much prestige as an area for learning--at a time when the counterculture is almost compulsively concerned with diet. The valued activities pertained to study and talk; they [members of the community] related in a verbal way to one another."⁶⁸

Nevertheless, Jerome felt positive about the community's future. "By this past summer they were moving in much more concrete and enterprising ways--developing their restaurant and school," he concluded. "It is a community of high energy."⁶⁹

⁶⁶Judson Jerome, "The Living-Learning Community," Change, September 1971, p. 52.

⁶⁷Dan Wolfe interview, 5/31/92.

⁶⁸Judson Jerome, "The Living-Learning Community," Change, September 1971, p. 52.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 53.

In November 1971, not long after the publication of the Judson Jerome and David French articles, Janet Abrams and Charlton Price submitted their evaluation to Carnegie. As Steven Deutsch had warned, and as Abrams and Price were themselves aware, much had transpired before the study began. The interviews they conducted were largely with members who had survived the "Blood Baths," and thus the perspective of the "Learning" faction was severely foreshortened in the report. Most of the material was gathered in the period between the late fall of 1970 and the summer of 1971.

Nevertheless, the report is by far the most important documentation of the community to have survived. It includes seven chapters, the first a narrative of the community until mid-1971, followed by four others describing the community as a learning situation, a social system, a personal experience, and a financial alternative. A sixth chapter was devoted to relations with the outside environment. The final chapter contained the researchers' reflections on their experience, and members' reactions to previous drafts of the report.

Abrams and Price believed that many of the Learning Community's problems derived from "the special interpretation of individualism in American middle class experience.... These values as understood in the American middle class and therefore its representatives in the LC--made efforts to achieve a viable alternative community difficult, perhaps

impossible."⁷⁰ This was true despite the conscious efforts of the counterculture (as personified by the Learning Community) "to establish a way of living that avoids competition, win-lose rules and their inevitable accompaniment of status distinctions and social controls." This culture of individualism interacted with the community's other basic problem, which

has been the lack of agreement on basic goals and purposes. In the outside world, this difficulty need not be faced so continuously or directly.... The LC, particularly after it committed itself to seeking to become an alternative to the larger society, attempted to strip away structure and adopt new basic assumptions. Central among these was the primacy of the individual, and the promise that the LC would be conducted in ways that would encourage and assist individuals in meeting needs and achieving goals that they themselves would define.

That the Learning Community was looked upon more as a support structure for its members than as an end in itself put its survival in question.

Community members saw matters differently. The report, they argued, "has an air of detachment, of certainty and of objectivity. It slides over the broken promises and the difficulties of the research team." Members felt the report omitted or misrepresented "the amount of growth and change that has occurred in individuals and in relationships;... the extent to which problems and difficulties are a result of a

⁷⁰Abrams & Price, p. 92.

general condition in the larger society;... [and] the individual meanings of the Community to its members." The criticisms of the report frankly doubted that any "objective" description of such a subjective experience as life in the Learning Community could have any merit, and questioned the honesty of the authors in even making the attempt.

Both Judson Jerome's article and the Abrams and Price evaluation took their leave of the Learning Community as it was heading into its second year, and both looked forward optimistically to the bracing effects of the group efforts to launch the restaurant and the school. A third endeavor was the "rural site" that Judson Jerome mentioned in his article: a parcel of land near Molalla in Clackamas County that the Learning Community purchased in June 1971.⁷¹ This venture into the countryside was an echo of the ambitious plans formulated earlier by Jon Roush and the "exurban" group.

According to Allyn Snider, the property was purchased because Karen Burdick, a member who was formerly a Reed student, wanted to live in the country. "There was this sense that the community should be about making people's dreams come true, you know, and that was a definite Howard and Judy thing." Burdick and several others lived in a small house

⁷¹Clackamas County 71 14722. The contract on the property was sold by the Learning Community in November 1972, Clackamas County 74 7032.

there and raised pygmy goats. "Their life was about surviving out there on that land,... with the help of money from Carnegie."⁷² According to Abrams and Price, there was little integration between the Irvington and Molalla sites.

Several of the people in Irvington feel that the city group is the core of the Community, that the personal relationships between the urbanites is [sic] what holds the LC together, and that if the members in the country do not spend time getting close to those in the city they will not really be part of the Community. Those on the exurban land have resented being told they are a "peripheral" merely subsidiary part of the LC.⁷³

Meanwhile, in Portland during the fall of 1971 the school joined the restaurant as a functioning enterprise. While the organization of the school had received broad support during the preceding summer, the resignations of Judy Wolfe, Caralee Cohen and others left only about four community members to run it.⁷⁴ Allyn Snider, who was 19, became president of the school's board of directors, Jonathan Mandel was the secretary, and Peter Thacker was the treasurer. Snider took responsibility for the lower grades, while Thacker directed activities in the upper ones. About 35

⁷²Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92. See also Abrams & Price, p. 21.

⁷³Abrams & Price, p. 51.

⁷⁴Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92.

students were enrolled for the first year, ranging in age from kindergarten through high school.⁷⁵

The school's literature called for "an ungraded continuous progress curriculum. Freedom of project choice, of course, is part of the stimulus."⁷⁶ In practice, the students were more or less allowed to do as they chose, which it turned out in the lower grades was "to run around in the side yard and play war."⁷⁷ In the upper grades, a similar permissive attitude prevailed, especially during the first year. "The students were kids who were stoners, for the most part.... Their parents had put them in the school as a last resort, hoping that there would be at least some supervision."⁷⁸ Much of the time was occupied taking field trips in a van, to plays, to Portland State University, or to hear political speakers. In the spring of 1972, Thacker took seven students on an extended trip to California; they found themselves in the Bay Area at the time of the bombing of Haiphong harbor and participated in transforming the People's Park into Ho Chi Minh Park amid clouds of drifting tear gas. All returned home safely.

⁷⁵Peter Thacker interview, 1/6/94.

⁷⁶Open Community School brochure, provided by Allyn Snider.

⁷⁷Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92.

⁷⁸Peter Thacker interview, 1/6/94.

The second year there was a larger student body, another teacher was added, and the instruction became more structured and academic in orientation.⁷⁹ According to Snider, the school became well established and operated for a number of years, though its affiliation with the Learning Community was no longer a factor after 1973.⁸⁰

By the spring of 1972, as the two-year Carnegie grant period was drawing to a close, the Learning Community was clearly becoming less distinct on Carnegie's radar screen. Staff there and at Antioch were no longer sure what was happening in Portland:

In trying to locate the whereabouts of Jon Roush, KP [a Carnegie staffer] finally caught up with M[ason] D[rukman]. MD is working on the staff [of] The Oregon Times which is a muckraking publication along the lines of I.F. Stone. MD reports that JR is alive and well and living in Portland on weekends ... while commuting to Berkeley to work at the Wright Institute. MD was amazed that JR has not been in contact with CC.

MD feels that the evaluation of PLC is a decent report. He indicated that setting up a community like PLC again would not be insurmountable. The major weakness was in not taking into account personalities and insufficient agreement on goals. MD does not see much hope for the existence of the current PLC.⁸¹

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92. The Open Community School appears in the Portland City Directory until 1982.

⁸¹Record of Interview, KP and Mason Drukman, 3/28/72. (CC)

Drukman's pessimism was well founded. While members continued to occupy a few of the houses on a cooperative basis and to work at the Open Community School into 1973, the community after 1971 was drifting toward dissolution. On October 18, 1973, the Learning Community, Inc. became an inactive corporation. The houses were mostly sold off that year and the next.

Abrams and Price ascribed the failure of the Learning Community to an inability to agree on goals and to excessive individualism. Today those problems would probably be addressed by calling in consultants on goal setting, conflict mediation, and organizational development. Why weren't they then?

The Learning Community had other options besides hiring consultants that it did not pursue. It might have found its bearings by locating itself in a tradition. The experiment at Black Mountain College, by which a number of the Learning Community's participants were influenced, might have formed the basis of such a tradition. But lessons of the past were seldom invoked in those records of the Learning Community's disputes that have survived. One of the community's characteristics was an intense absorption in the present moment.

The Learning Community was part of a culture of protest. Some members had participated in Upward Bound; it is probably safe to venture that all opposed the Vietnam War. But years

of effort during the 1960s to cleanse society of racism and militarism had succeeded only in revealing the intractable nature of America's shortcomings. By the end of the 1960s, many people committed to change were coming to think that reform was a hopeless cause and that an entirely new beginning would have to be made. If that were the case, what could be the value of consultants, of tradition, of the lessons to be learned from past struggles? All those represented unwelcome visitations from a culture the Learning Community rejected root and branch. As Howard Waskow later wrote, "After all I'd fought for in the Sixties, compromise I was no longer able to abide."⁸² And such an uncompromising new beginning required the unremitting critical scrutiny of the world, of one's fellows, and of oneself advocated by the "intensity" group. The problem the community faced, as one community member posed it, was that "Society keeps coming back in through our own hangups."⁸³ In retrospect, it is easy to see that the community's prospects for success were in an inverse proportion to the radical nature of the task it undertook.

To regard the Learning Community as a failure, therefore, is perhaps too easy a judgment. In institutional

⁸²Howard Waskow & Arthur Waskow, Becoming Brothers. New York: The Free Press, 1993, p. 73.

⁸³Anonymous Learning Community member quoted in Abrams & Price, p. 89.

terms it clearly was: despite the resources lavished upon it, despite the wealth of talent committed to its success, it failed to persist. But if it is looked at in terms of its own goals and of its impact on individual lives, a different conclusion might be possible.

Many members look back on their participation as an important stage in their lives. For Maya Muir, as for many others, Reed had been an unhappy experience; the Learning Community offered a structure to her life at a time it needed one: an alternative family, a chance to get her feet on the ground. The adults there were sympathetic and helpful, and it was exciting to participate in their interesting lives.⁸⁴ Allyn Snider saw the Learning Community as giving her the gift of a nontraditional entry into the field of education, an opportunity to take experimental teaching to the outer limit.⁸⁵

When David Sweet joined the community, he felt that it was an experiment that "couldn't fail, because we were going to learn things no matter what." But if some members took away something important from the experience, others paid a disproportionate cost, as Sweet recognized in retrospect. While those in his age group had little to lose, older members, such as Howard Waskow, Mason Drukman and Jon Roush,

⁸⁴Maya Muir interview, 10/24/94.

⁸⁵Allyn Snider interview, 7/4/92.

who gave up tenured or tenure-track positions at Reed, had a lot more at stake.⁸⁶

Nevertheless, it is worth recalling Jon Roush's comment to the Oregonian in November 1970: "I hope that after people have found out they don't need college, they will see that they don't need the Learning Community, either. We have a centrifugal action, pulling members in, and then spinning them off." Seen from that perspective, the Learning Community accomplished what it set out to do.

That centrifugal action propelled all the participants in the Learning Community permanently out of academia, with the exceptions of Kirk Thompson, who went on to a long career teaching at Evergreen College in Olympia, Washington, and Grace McLaughlin, who continues to teach at Portland Community College. Jon Roush and his family settled in Montana, where he combined cattle ranching with environmental consulting; in 1993 he became president of the Wilderness Society. Deanye Roush continues to live at Wise River, where she is a rancher, a photographer, and a guide. Kathy Roush (née McKeown) is a cattle rancher and graphic designer near Florence, Montana. Mason Drukman, after editing Oregon Times, moved briefly with his family to New Zealand, then returned to Berkeley, California, where he works as a freelance

⁸⁶David Sweet interview, 7/8/92.

writer. Peter Thacker teaches in the Portland Public Schools and Allyn Snider at Catlin Gabel. Maya Muir, after other adventures, is a writer in Portland. John Laursen continues as a graphic designer and owner of Press-22. David Sweet works for the City of Portland. Dan Wolfe continued to work with juveniles in Clackamas County into the 1980s, when he turned to photography, in which he first became interested while at the Learning Community. Richard Burg is a management consultant in the Bay Area. Mary Kay Peterson became head of Portland's Office of Neighborhood Associations in the 1970s and then in the 1980s was a high-ranking member of the community at Rajneeshpuram.

One permanent contribution of the Learning Community to Portland has been culinary. Bill McLaughlin went on to a career as a restaurateur and for a long time has owned and operated L'Auberge. Howard Waskow and Millie Howe founded Indigene, of which Millie Howe is still the proprietor; Waskow later moved on to a career in counseling. Judy Wolfe, later known as Grey Wolfe, was a founder of Bread & Ink Cafe; in 1985 she and Howard Waskow were married.

APPENDIX

THE BAUHAUS AND BLACK MOUNTAIN COLLEGE: AN ALTERNATIVE TRADITION

In 1933, John Andrew Rice and several colleagues founded a new college in Black Mountain, North Carolina. Rice had taught at the University of Nebraska, Rutgers, and most recently at Rollins College in Florida, where his iconoclastic teaching methods and combative personality had resulted, after a divisive struggle, in his dismissal. Rice had had his fill of working within existing institutions. With three former colleagues and a number of dissident Rollins students he determined to make a fresh start. While Rice's strong prejudice against organization and bylaws meant that he could get no support from foundations, a private backer made it possible to begin operations.

Rice was an acquaintance and admirer of John Dewey, the pragmatist philosopher who explored educational philosophy in Democracy and Education. Dewey's view was that the increasing complexity of society has made necessary the provision of "a special social environment which shall especially look after

nurturing the capacities of the immature."¹ However, the unfortunate tendency of schools is to frame education too exclusively in academic terms, while human beings are constituted to learn most efficiently through activities they share with their teachers and their peers. Experience is more important to learning than books. (Dewey is concerned as well with the antidemocratic consequences of a narrowly academic approach to education.)

Activity is not only more efficient as a teaching method than academic learning, it has the further advantage of helping build a community. "The school itself must be a community life, in all which that implies," says Dewey.

The plea which has been made for education through continued constructive activities in this book rests upon the fact they afford an opportunity for a social atmosphere. In place of a school set apart from life as a place for learning lessons, we have a miniature social group in which study and growth are incidents of present shared experience.... The learning in school should be continuous with that out of school.... Isolation renders school knowledge inapplicable to life and so infertile in character.²

Dewey visited Black Mountain twice during its second year and served on its Advisory Board.³ Nevertheless, Rice

¹John Dewey, Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916, p. 27.

²Ibid., pp 416-17.

³Martin Duberman, Black Mountain: An Exploration in Community. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1972, pp. 40, 102.

never saw Black Mountain as merely an attempt to put into practice a predetermined educational ideology. In his view, developed after observing some more doctrinaire efforts at educational reform, "'progressive education' when it is stupid, is much more stupid than the other kind."

It was Rice's intention to put art at the center of his curriculum, and during Black Mountain's first year he was put in touch with two refugees from Nazi Germany who were to have an important influence on his school: Josef and Anni Albers. Josef Albers had taught at the Bauhaus, founded by Walter Gropius in Weimar in 1919 and suppressed by the Nazis in 1933. Rice immediately hired Albers despite the fact that he spoke no English at all (and had never heard of North Carolina). According to Martin Duberman, this "was one of [Rice's] shrewdest intuitions, perhaps the key decision in Black Mountain's early years."⁴ Albers learned English quickly, and was a key member of the faculty from 1949. (He served longer there than anyone else, as he had at the Bauhaus.)

Though the Bauhaus is remembered principally for its influence on 20th century architecture, graphic design, and other applied arts, it was also an educational experiment. Peter Gay describes it as

⁴Martin Duberman, Black Mountain: An Exploration in Community. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1972, p. 56.

a family, a school, a cooperative business, a missionary society. Neither Gropius nor the other masters believed in disciples; it was not an academy where the great teacher reproduces little editions of himself, but "a laboratory," where "students stimulated teachers" and teachers, students.⁵

According to Gropius,

the manner of teaching arises from the nature of the workshop: organic form developed from mechanical knowledge; elimination of all rigidity; emphasis on creativity; freedom of individuality, but strict scholarship.... Students participate in the projects of the masters.... [F]riendly relations are fostered between masters and students outside of the work by means of theater parties, lectures, poetry readings, concerts, and fancy-dress balls.⁶

Through the medium of the "cooperative business," which would produce and market the designs originated at the school, Gropius hoped that tuition would gradually be eliminated and that students would be admitted purely on the basis of merit.

Throughout its existence the Bauhaus remained small (120 students or less). Participants remembered the atmosphere as at the same time playful and monastic.⁷ According to Tut Schlemmer, "Boys had long hair, girls short skirts," and she recalls that the local citizenry, also known as

⁵Peter Gay, Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider. New York: Harper & Row, 1968, p. 99.

⁶Walter Gropius, in bauhaus and bauhaus people. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1970, pp. 9-10.

⁷T. Lux Feininger, "The Evolution of an Idea," *ibid.*, p. 173, and Pius E. Pahl, "Experiences of an architectural student," *ibid.*, p. 227.

"philistines," took a dim view of the irreverent spirit emanating from the school.⁸

At the Bauhaus, Josef Albers taught an introductory course called the Vorkurs. As a former student described the course,

the marvelous aspect ... is that it was not "taught" in any strict sense of the word at all.... [I]deas were broached in a general way, some kind of hidden talent of invention was appealed to, and the resulting response was astonishing. But one felt a tremendous conviction emanating from Albers, a great joy in what he was doing, also a certain humility with which even quite wretched works were discussed with the purpose of inducing deeper insight in the student.⁹

Albers imparted some of this Bauhaus spirit to Black Mountain, and more was brought by Walter Gropius, another exile from Germany after 1933, who later served on Black Mountain's board of fellows and designed a new building for its campus.

Black Mountain's initial student body numbered twenty-two, of whom fourteen had come from Rollins with Rice. At its peak, during the period of the G.I. Bill following World War II, it was never attended by more than a hundred students at any one time. But its influence was out of all proportion to its size. People associated with it, either as instructors or

⁸Tut Schlemmer, "... from the living Bauhaus and its stage," *ibid.*, p. 154-55.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 181. See also Hannes Beckmann on the Vorkurs, "Formative years," *ibid.* pp. 196-98.

students, included John Cage, Merce Cunningham, Buckminster Fuller, Willem de Kooning, Charles Olson, Paul Goodman, Robert Rauschenberg, Eric Bentley, Agnes de Mille, Robert Duncan, and Robert Creeley, among others.

Black Mountain had no required courses; students, with the assistance of their advisers, planned their own course of study. The only exams given were to pass from lower to upper division and to graduate, which occurred when a student felt ready. Few ever did.

During its lifetime (1933-56), Black Mountain passed through several phases and endured many of the factional disputes that seem typical of such communities. Those who want to follow its history in detail should read Martin Duberman's excellent account of the college's history. One dispute, however, is of special relevance to this study.

In 1945, John Wallen, a 27-year-old instructor in psychology at the University of Maryland, was hired by Black Mountain. Wallen had little use for the trappings of traditional academic institutions: degrees, credits, grades, textbooks, fraternities, etc., which he felt all stood in the way of gaining a true education. He advocated, among other things, complete control of colleges by their faculty and students; colleges as self-sufficient small communities oriented toward service to the larger society; students and

teachers working together at meaningful tasks and socializing together.¹⁰ Black Mountain seemed the ideal place.

Nevertheless, Wallen found that at Black Mountain there was a gap between its professed principles and its practices. One contradiction was between the ostensible policy of laissez-faire regarding student work and the sanctions that could in fact result if students performed poorly. Wallen felt a contract between student and teacher spelling out what was expected might produce better results by placing responsibility more clearly on the student. He tried to improve the efficiency of the school's work program and make it more integral to the life of the college community. He wanted to give a lower priority to the cultivation of individual talents and a higher one to making a contribution to the Black Mountain and the larger society beyond it. He felt his innovations were opposed by the "Europeans," such as Albers and his sympathizers, who were content with the status quo.¹¹

By 1947 Wallen's position at Black Mountain had provoked enough resistance for him to resign. He and a group of

¹⁰John L. Wallen, "Unwanted: Liberal, creative, sound educational living, by complacent, sedate, well-established college, motive, November 1946.

¹¹Martin Duberman, Black Mountain: An Exploration in Community. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1972, pp. 233-280 passim.

students sympathetic to his views researched sites in Maine, Utah, and Oregon, finally settling on Oregon.

He left in February 1948 to find a location, and the following summer several students joined him near Estacada, Oregon. For several years they lived together as a farm cooperative and had a woodworking shop. To create for the small logging community a sense of its history and traditions, they started a timber jamboree with dances, logging skills, and a crafts exhibition. When the group dissolved, many of the members moved to Portland (where several taught at the Catlin Gabel School and remained a close community of friends.¹²

Twenty years later, someone from Black Mountain College came to a meeting of Learning Community organizers to share that earlier experience. No one remembers who.

¹²Mary Emma Harris, The Arts at Black Mountain College. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1987, p. 113.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An important source of information for this thesis has been interviews conducted by the author. Many of these were recorded on tape, in which case a written summary of the contents was created noting all the topics touched upon and including occasional direct quotations. In the few cases of unrecorded interviews, the author made notes. Summaries and notes are presently in the possession of the author. Interviews are cited in the footnotes by subject and date.

A second important source was documents collected in the files of the Carnegie Corporation. These include correspondence, records of telephone interviews, position papers, magazine articles, etc. These files are archived under the name of Antioch College in the Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, 654 Butler Library, Columbia University, New York City. Documents referred to from these files are noted "(CC)."

Also obtained from these files was the evaluation report on the Learning Community commissioned by Carnegie and produced by Janet F. Abrams and Charlton R. Price, listed below. It is referred to in the footnotes as "Abrams & Price."

Other documents, including correspondence and newsletters, were acquired from Richard Burg, noted as ("Burg docs.") and from Steven E. Deutsch ("Deutsch docs.").

Other books and articles referred to include the following.

BOOKS

- Abrams, Janet F., and Charlton R. Price, The Learning Community (Portland, Oregon). A Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, December, 1971.
- Clark, Burton R., The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed & Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.
- Dewey, John, Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.
- Duberman, Martin, Black Mountain: An Exploration in Community. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972.
- Edwards, G. Thomas, The Triumph of Tradition: The Emergence of Whitman College 1859-1924. Walla Walla, Washington, Whitman College, 1992.
- Fashing, Joseph, and Steven E. Deutsch, Academics in Retreat: The Politics of Educational Innovation. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971.
- Gay, Peter, Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968.
- Harris, Mary Emma, The Arts at Black Mountain College. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1987.
- Hylton, Dory J., The Portland State University Strike of May 1970: Student Protest as Social Drama. University of Oregon Ph.D. dissertation, 1993.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Sheldon S. Wolin, eds., The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1965.
- Neumann, Eckhard, ed., baubaus and baubaus people: personal opinions and recollections of former Bauhaus members and their contemporaries. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1970.
- Reynolds, Lloyd J., The Decline of Materialism. Portland: The Alcuin Press, 1978.
- Rudolph, Frederick, The American College and University: A History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Ruskin, John, The Nature of Gothic, introduction by Lloyd J. Reynolds. Portland: Charles Lehman, Publisher, 1975.

- Schrecker, Ellen W., No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- von Hallberg, Robert, Charles Olson: The Scholar's Art. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Walth, Brent, Fire at Eden's Gate: Tom McCall and the Oregon Story. Portland: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1994.

ARTICLES

- "FAC Majority Report," Sallyport, November-December 1969.
- French, David, article (title page missing), New York Times Magazine, October 3, 1971.
- Gordon, Mark, "Blacks Refuse Registration," The Quest, September 10, 1969.
- Gordon, Mark, "Pennies from Heaven," The Quest, November 19, 1969.
- Jerome, Judson, "The Living-Learning Community," Change, September 1971.
- Jones, Richard, "The Reed Community: Rise & Fall," The Reed College Student Handbook 1991, Blake Nebel, ed.
- Keller, Bill, "Conflict in Ideologies Triggers Difficulties in Organization of Learning Community," The Oregonian, November 23, 1970.
- Keller, Bill, "Refugees from Conventional Academia Stress 'Living' in New Learning Community," The Sunday Oregonian, November 22, 1970.
- Lehnhoff, Nora, "I could have used some nannying," Reed, February 1992.
- Mann, J. Keith, Robert J. Lampman, and Edward C. Moore, "Reed College," AAUP Bulletin, vol. 44, no. 1, March 1958.
- Metzger, Walter P., "The First Investigation," AAUP Bulletin, vol. 47, no. 3, September 1961.
- Munk, Michael, "Oregon Tests Academic Freedom in (Cold)War-time: Stanley Moore vs the Trustees of Reed College," unpublished manuscript.
- Munk, Michael, "Reversing the Verdicts: The Case of Reed College," Monthly Review, March 1992.
- Nebel, Blake, "Into the Modern World," Reed College Student Handbook 1991.
- Peschiera, Barbara, "Marvin Levich, Claude Vaucher retire," Reed, August 1994.
- Spencer, Kim, "You Can't Always Get What You Want," The Quest, December 10, 1969.
- Stanley, Mark, "A History of Black Studies at Reed," Quest Extra, December 15, 1968.
- Van Cleve, Jane, "Where Do We Go From Here?" Reed College Sallyport, November-December, 1969.

Wallen, John L., "Unwanted: Liberal creative, sound educational living, by complacent, sedate, well-established college," motive, November 1946.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The Campus Gazette, Reed College, 1969.
The Quest, Reed College, various unsigned articles from the period 1969-71.
Reed, November 1993
Reed College Bulletin, 1968-1969.
Reed College First Annual Catalog, 1911-1912. January 1212.
The Reed College Self-Study Program, 1953.
The Wall Poster, Reed College, 1969.

ARCHIVES

Clackamas County property records
 Multnomah County property records

INTERVIEWS

Burg, Richard, 4/16/94
 Fasel, George, 12/5/94
 Laursen, John, 7/14/92, 8/18/92
 McLaughlin, Bill, 6/12/92
 McLaughlin, Grace, 7/3/92
 Muir, Maya, 10/24/94
 Porter, Roger, 6/3/92
 Rosenblum, Victor, 7/28/92
 Roush, Deayne, 8/5/92
 Roush, Jon, 8/3/94
 Roush, Kathy, 8/4/92
 Schauffler, Manvel, 4/10/94
 Schrager, Sam, 9/9/92
 Snider, Allyn, 7/4/92
 Sweet, David, 7/8/92
 Thacker, Peter, 1/6/94
 Thompson, Kirk, 4/16/94
 Wallen, John, 4/11/94
 Webb, Jim, 10/16/94
 Wolfe, Dan, 5/31/92