

## THE PLANNING PROCESS (Communications Building)

In hindsight, an equation comes to mind. The amount of advice available was inversely proportional to the importance of the decisions to be made to meet deadlines, and to the latitude for altering the decisions, once made. In the beginning, when everyone was so busy, only a few Evergreeners were available to think about the DMA building. By 1973-74, there were a number of faculty colleagues and interested students who could – and did – offer advice and second guesses; but the building, now renamed the Communications Laboratory, had passed through the stages of schematics, preliminary working drawings, and final working drawings. Besides learning how to read blueprints, I came to dread the phrase “**change order**,” which inevitably would involve complicated revisions and large costs.

As I have said, the Evergreen team consisted of Jerry Schillinger, Director of Facilities; Bill Phipps, the staff architect assigned to the DMA project; Dave Carnahan, Associate Dean of the Library; and me as “academic client.” Dave, who assisted with both general and specific planning for the audiovisual-media components of the building – the spaces and the projected equipment – had the advantage of a staff already on board who could present well-formulated plans, while I was largely on my own. The architectural/engineering firm contracted to design the building had its own consultants, but I met with only two of them: the nationally recognized acoustics consultant hired to help design the auditorium, and the second acoustics consultant brought on when the auditorium project was shelved and the ET and RH needed his expertise. I met the project architect a few times, when he came over from Spokane with the executives of Walker, McGough, Foltz, and Lyerle. But he communicated mainly, as I have said, with Bill Phipps in developing whatever works well in the ComLab as it stands.

Helpful advice for my own thinking early on came from the three Oberlin consultants, with whom I could work as I commuted between Ohio and Washington in the late winter and spring of 1970. Each of them was compensated for only a few days of service, but their contributions were pointed and valuable. Oberlin College had built a new theater complex in the 1950's and a new Conservatory of Music and Art Department Annex in the 1960's. Though Evergreen would be a quite different institution, they could tell me what to avoid and what to aim for in the early planning of DMA. “If we had it to do over again, we would ....”

When the planning faculty came together in September of 1970, I could draw upon the experience of Sid White in the visual arts, Will Humphreys as a musician, and Bob Barnard in film and other media. Sid was especially helpful in our making the case to scuttle the separate Fine Arts building, which was ill-conceived for the Evergreen that was coming into being. As ever, my colleagues in the Deans' Office, Merv Cadwallader and Don Humphrey, were supportive. But they were working on their own buildings, and we could do little more than check in with each other about how things were going. Similarly, the President and Vice Presidents were interested in the process; but, having delegated the positions of “clients” to the Academic Deans, they stayed out of the way until it was time to scrutinize the justification statements about their respective buildings which the Deans submitted for incorporation into the budgetary proposal of the whole

College to the Governor and, we hoped, to the Legislature.

In the next years, Don Chan, Bob Gottlieb, and Bill Winden brought their expertise in music to the faculty; Gordon Beck and Ainara Wilder brought their expertise in theater, and Bud Johanson became the first instructor in dance. Other early faculty members involved in the visual arts, including printing and ceramics, advised Don Humphrey as he planned for work in these areas to take place in his laboratory complex. And each year's crop of new students passionately interested in the performing and visual arts wanted to contribute their ideas to the project. Our intense discussions took place in an atmosphere heated by zeal but tempered by good will. Yet it could become wearisome to explain each year, to a growing constituency, why the plans were as they were – and why it would be difficult and costly to make major changes. One of my colleagues summed things up well in those early years for the whole college. He said that if you announce that you're going to have a conventional four-year college, people know fairly well what to expect; but if you say you're going to have a different college, everyone will want it to be different according to his or her wishes. Thus I received more and more advice, but had less and less latitude to put it into effect.

Perhaps an anecdote, somewhat touching at this distance in time, will make the point. In the spring of 1973, a meeting with the executives of the architectural/engineering firm would be coming up in a day or two to lock in the final working drawings. In my office on the first floor of the Library, I had placed the massive bound pile of blueprints for DMA I on a large table so that I could study them in preparation for the important meeting. As I was ready to call it a day, there came a knock at the door. A young woman student was there. She had heard that I had something to do with planning the building for the performing arts, and she had some ideas. I do not believe that I sighed aloud, but you can imagine what I felt. I said, "O.K., where would you like to start," and opened up the first page of the blueprints. There were pages for each floor and for each major space – drawings and specifications for the structure, the dimensions, composition of the floors and walls and ceilings, lighting, electrical connections, venting for the air-moving and conditioning systems, provisions for water and drains, and so on, and so on. I led her to some high points: "Here's the Recital Hall, here's the Experimental Theater ...." After she had gazed a while at this mass of information, she said, "Oh, I guess it's pretty far along." I said, "Yes, it's pretty far along."

## **THE POLITICAL PROCESS**

In the summer of 1970, as I had taken up full-time work at Evergreen, one of my first tasks was the writing of the justification statement of DMA I for inclusion in the capital budget request to the Governor. The President's Council and Jerry Schillinger had decided to divide four main construction projects -- Lab, Seminar Building, Recreation Center, and the Drama-Music-Art Building -- into two phases each. On the basis of the schematic drawings provided by the architectural firm, and within a Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (including the initial equipment) of \$6.5 million, I described the kinds of facilities we were planning, why they were needed, and how they would serve future students. Shortly before Thanksgiving, the Governor and his staff approved DMA I for

inclusion in the total budgetary request he would send to the 1971 legislative session. The Legislature turned it down. Was it because of fiscal restraints, party politics, doubts about and even hostility toward Evergreen, prejudice about supporting work in the arts, or a combination of all of these? The answer is probably, "Yes."

We members of the Evergreen planning team and the Spokane architectural firm kept working on the project and submitted it again to the Governor in the fall of 1972. I could write a more precise justification statement, now based on preliminary working drawings. The experience of our first full year of operation, including our first students' interests and even demands for work in the arts, allowed me to add substance and even a sense of urgency to the renewed request. This time, however, the Governor and his staff turned the project down, and it did not go to the 1973 Legislature. There was a great deal of misunderstanding and even consternation among Evergreeners concerned with the arts. They had assumed, rightly, that Dan Evans, who had been so important in the founding of the College, was our friend and that he was strongly interested in the arts. Many of them did not realize that a Governor cannot waste what power he has in making futile gestures. Dan had recognized that conditions were even less favorable for the funding of DMA I than they had been in 1971.

An awkward moment occurred early in 1973. A musical afternoon, with awards to local artists, was being held on a Sunday at the State Capital Museum. Dan and Nancy Evans attended, as did I. An Evergreen faculty member and some of his students showed up to make a peaceful but still intrusive demonstration, carrying signs and chanting slogans. They did not understand the process, but Dan understood what they were doing and why. His dedication to Evergreen never wavered, and he was to become our second President.

During these years, I kept trying to do what I could to lobby for Evergreen in general and for DMA I in particular. Legislators were off limits, but I cultivated acquaintances among executive staff members and on several legislative staffs. Arts groups in Olympia, showing courtesy to our new College, invited me to join their boards. For several years in the earlier 70's, I served concurrently on the boards of Community Concerts, the Opera Guild, the Governor's Festival of the Arts, and the Thurston Regional Arts Council. Much of my time was spent listening to the members of one group griping about the goings-on of the other groups, but we did get some things accomplished.

Such activity may not seem to belong in a summary of the political process, but I heard the matter put succinctly by John Hightower. He had served Governor Nelson Rockefeller as founding executive director of the New York State Arts Commission. When I met him, he was serving as director of an association of business people supporting the arts, with headquarters on an upper floor of the Palace Theater Building on Seventh Avenue, NYC. As part of our Evergreen effort to develop internships in arts management, I visited him to explore the possibility of a Greener joining his staff. That didn't work out -- not enough compensation to keep an intern alive in New York -- but we otherwise had an interesting conversation. At one point, he recounted what Nelson Rockefeller had once said to him: "Johnny, all I know about politics I learned on the board of the Museum of Modern Art."

Despite the set-backs, those of us involved with the planning of DMA I resolved

to keep trying. We moved ahead to the final working drawings and retained the \$6.5 million MACC, not wishing to risk the whole project by raising the cost to account for inflation. Without changing anything in the spaces and equipment we had planned for, we changed the name of the building to "Communications Laboratory" because of bias against the arts and because, in a troubled economy, it would sound more practical in preparing students for "real jobs." I wrote a new justification statement about the final design, putting more emphasis than before on the work on audiovisual media which the facility would support. To the delight of the OPP&FM staff, used to thinking in terms of full-time-equivalent students (FTE) and full-time-equivalent faculty (FTEF), I calculated how many students would be using the building for all their program or group-contract activities and how many would be using how much of the building for part of their work; and I came up with the concept of the "full-time-equivalent user" (FTEU). My acquaintances on the Capitol campus accepted the statistical argument but said that the "user" part sounded appropriate to be coming from "hippie-haven Evergreen." I also found out that, because of the way I wrote justification statements, some of them were calling me a "poet."

After Evergreen's supplemental budget request had gone to the Governor in the fall of 1973, one of his fiscal analysts working on our capital budget section gave me a call about whether the College really needed the ComLab all that much. What had we been doing for the first two years? I told him that we had been using the Library lobby as our main concert hall and theater, and the fourth-floor cafeteria for smaller productions. Our students rehearsed for performances in seminar rooms, and our only practice rooms were temporarily vacant offices. He asked if we couldn't keep going on in this way. I replied: "O.K., I'll tell you what. You have your office in a cubicle in a nice granite building, with stone floors and large glass windows. Some day, when you're not going to be at your desk for several hours, give me a call. I'll come down with my trumpet and fluegelhorn to practice in your cubicle, and we'll see how much work gets done in your shop." I added, "If you don't give us the building as part of the capital budget, you'll have to add to our operating budget to provide psychiatric care for the other students and teachers trying to work while the practicing and rehearsing are going on out here." He seemed to get the point; whether or not the conversation had much effect, the Governor did send the request for the funding of the ComLab to the legislative session.

Early in the session, after the Governor's budget had been made public, the decision to change the name of the building backfired in a way that threatened to stall the whole project. From OPP&FM came the call: "Charlie, watch out. The media editor and critic of the Seattle P.I. is on the warpath. He has read the material about your building and thinks that it will duplicate special facilities which the taxpayers have already paid for at other colleges. He asked who was responsible for the justification statement, and I had to give him your name and number. He'll try to get you to carry on about how much the ComLab will be devoted to media work -- how much space, how much equipment. He's scheduled to write an editorial, and then he'll let Evergreen have it." Sure enough, a few minutes later came the call from the P.I., and the caller did indeed try to get me to emphasize "communications" and "laboratory." Forewarned, I talked about the Experimental Theater and the Recital Hall, and the emphasis on live performances. He wasn't at all persuaded, and I asked if it would be useful for me to bring him (in pre-fax days) more material about what would be going on in the building. That evening I wrote descriptions of the spaces dedicated to practice, rehearsal and performance. Early the next morning, my secretary typed up (in pre-word-processor days) what I had written, while I

xeroxed some of the architectural drawings. I drove to Seattle and got the packet of material to the desk of the editor/critic around 11 a.m. He took it, thanked me, and said that he had already written the editorial, which would appear early in the next week and would be recommending that the Legislature turn us down. I urged him to read what I had brought and consider changing his mind. He said he would read it, but that the editorial was finished, and that was that. The negative editorial appeared, arguing that we would be wasting the taxpayers' money and referring to specialized media facilities which had been funded in the last few years at Western and elsewhere. He called our proposed Communications Laboratory an "electronic sandbox."

Worse news was to follow. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives had Democratic majorities, which carried with them the chairmanships of the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee. After the hearings in which President McCann made the case for both our operating and our capital budget requests, both committees turned down the funding for the ComLab. After the vote in the Senate Ways and Means Committee, I heard a not unlikely story: The chairman, Senator Martin Durkan, had called first for a straw vote on the project, and there had been a majority of "Ayes." Then he looked hard at the committee members and said, "Now let's have the real vote." The "Noes" had it. Though the chairman of House Appropriation, John Bagnariol, had spoken favorably about Evergreen in the hearings, citing the good impression which our interns had made, that committee also turned us down on the ComLab. Governor Evans and all of us involved with the building at Evergreen had tried our best, but it looked as if the project was done for -- as if, after all the work, it would never be funded.

Then, in a late afternoon in the last week of the session, I got a call from the President's Office to be ready to go to the Capitol Campus. President Charles McCann, Administrative Vice President Dean Clabaugh, and Public Relations Officer Dick Nichols took me along with them to witness an unusual event. In the car they told me that Representative Del Bausch, Democrat from Olympia, was going to re-introduce the ComLab as an amendment to the budget to be sent to the whole Legislature. The hearings were over, so we would not be there to testify. But the committee meeting was open, and Charlie McCann wanted those representatives to see an Evergreen contingent sitting in the front row of the audience as they made their decision.

I also learned that the Ways and Means Committee, led by its chairman, had reconsidered its position and had voted again, this time in favor of funding the ComLab. Apparently -- and I offer this as hearsay, the way I heard it -- a close older friend of the Durkan family, whose son or sons had played with Martin Durkan, was working in the Facilities Services of Evergreen. After Ways and Means had turned down the building, he had invited Durkan to dinner and urged him to change his mind -- something like, "Martin, I know those people at Evergreen, and they're good people. They need that building, and you ought to give it to them." Whatever truth may be in this story, Senator Durkan did change his mind and the minds of his committee. And the members of the House Appropriations Committee knew it.

The open meeting of the Appropriations Committee was supposed to start around 5:30, and that's when our Evergreen delegation arrived. We had to wait in the hearing

room, which resembled a little theater -- the stage for the representatives and rows of seats on a lower level for the auditors. We weren't allowed to smoke there, but we also didn't want to leave the room. Charles McCann chewed his way through at least two cigars. Stomachs growled, and nerves were on edge as we waited. Finally, at about 7:30, the committee members gathered, and the meeting started.

Del Bausch led off: "Mr. Chairman, I shall propose that the Committee adopt a six-and-a-half-million-dollar amendment to the budget. I have a fifteen-minute speech prepared, but I'll cut it to five if the Chair guarantees passage of the amendment." John Bagnariol said, "You'll cut it to five minutes and take your chances." Representative Bausch began by going back to the mid-60's initiative to found a new four-year state college, to the successful lobbying of the Olympia group and the choice of Olympia for the site, and to the chartering of The Evergreen State College in 1967. In recounting the earliest history of the College, he had already used up more than half of his allotted time, and I was wondering what on earth he was doing. Then he swiftly cut to the main point. When the Legislature founded Evergreen, the members knew that sooner or later the College would be coming to it to request such a facility as the Communications Laboratory. Well, now it was later -- action on the building had been postponed for three years, inflation was driving up the cost, and the students needed the building. It was time to fund the project. The amendment was moved and seconded.

Chairman Bagnariol asked for discussion. "Bud" Pardini, Republican of Spokane, was the only one to speak: "Mr. Chairman, moved by the eloquence of my Olympia colleague, John Hendricks, in our Republican caucus on Sunday, I join in support of this amendment." I nudged Clabaugh and asked what was going on. Dean whispered, "He's giving the party line. He's signaling any of the committee members who weren't at the caucus that unless they have strong feelings of their own they should vote for the amendment." The vote was called for, the amendment was passed by a large majority, and we at last had the ComLab. It had been the only major item of business for this last meeting of the Appropriations Committee. After a brief flurry of housekeeping issues were taken up, the meeting was adjourned. In the corridor outside the room, some of the Representatives came to greet our Evergreen delegation. Handshakes and back-slapping all around. On the way home, I said to Dean Clabaugh, "Well, of course I'm happy about the outcome, but the attitude after the meeting seemed to be more as if we had won a basketball game, or something -- not really appropriate for a building which is going to serve thousands of students." Dean answered, "Sometimes the fact that we won is more important than what it was we won."

A week later, I had the chance to talk with Jim Sainsbury, who had served for Evergreen as Legislative Liaison during the session. He had come into the hearing room when the Appropriations Committee members had entered. In the course of the conversation, I told him that I had been confused and then worried about why Del Bausch had spent so much time on the history of Evergreen but then was so impressed by how he had wrapped things up. Jim smiled and said, "I wrote his speech." And I said, "O.K., but I wrote John Hendricks' speech to the caucus." I had gotten a call on the day before the Republican caucus was to meet. Representative Hendricks was willing to speak in favor of funding the ComLab, but he needed to know what to say. I have some experience in playwriting, but the most difficult task I have ever had to perform in that

area, especially with all I knew about the building and all that was at stake, was the composing of a four-to-five minute speech which would feel right coming from a friendly West Olympia drugstore owner. Apparently John Hendricks acted his part well, and so he became one of the many people, from Governor Evans on down, whose efforts resulted in funding and thus the construction of the ComLab.

### **A MEMORABLE MOMENT IN THE PROCESS**

One of the most hostile and vocal opponents of Evergreen in the early years was James Kuehnle, Democratic Representative from Eastern Washington. He was conservative, business-oriented, and devoted to economic austerity. His first well-publicized attack on Evergreen came during the 1973 session. Leo Daugherty, Richard Jones, and Pete Sinclair had devised a program for 1973-74 on "The Aesthetics of Dreams and Medieval Poetry," the working title for which was "Dreams and Poetry." It was to be one of the most imaginative and effective coordinated studies programs ever offered here. Kuehnle heard about it and took the floor of the House to make a vehement speech about how Evergreen was wasting the taxpayers' dollars on something so frivolous as the study of poetry. Teachers were going to be paid and students were going to receive credit for such an impractical expenditure of resources. Several other legislators took the floor after him to point out that the University of Washington, the Washington State University, Eastern, Central, and Western all offered courses devoted to the study of poetry. This was apparently news to him, but he still didn't like it and didn't like Evergreen for doing it.

On the next day, Representative Barney Goltz, a proponent of higher education, took the floor to read a limerick he had composed. The three main rhymes dealt with "Kuehnle ... obscenely ... Evergreenly," and the newspapers picked it up. Kuehnle persisted in attacking us whenever he had the opportunity. From a certain point of view, one could say that he was a useful enemy to have. Other legislators who had better reasons for disapproval of Evergreen and its programs were not so hard on us as they might have been because they did not want to be compared to him. On one occasion, in the fall of 1973 when he had visited the campus for a heated panel discussion on KAOS-FM, as I escorted him out to the parking lot he said, "Well, maybe what you're trying to do isn't all that bad. But you learn in business that if you're too far out in front of where the public is, you fail." And he kept after us.

In 1974, he was a member of the House Appropriations Committee and might have been expected to speak full force against us at the crucial meeting, but he did not show up until after the vote had been taken and the amendment giving us the ComLab had passed. Chairman Bagnariol, pretending that he had been opposed to it, cracked, "Jim, where were you when I needed you?" Kuehnle did not respond, but someone on the Committee answered quite audibly, "Out giving a poetry-reading."

### **A SET OF PROTOCOLS GOES INTO LIMBO**

So, at the close of the 1974 Legislative session, the building had been funded. It would be ready for full use in the academic year 1977-78. In 1974-75, my last full year in the Deans' Office before I followed Don Humphrey and Merv Cadwaller into the

teaching faculty, Provost Ed Kormondy asked me to form and chair a task force to develop, in effect, a manual of instructions for the building. It was meant for the future users of the facility and especially for the future Building Managers, who would be allocating the spaces in which a variety of activities would be taking place and organizing the technical support for those activities. For the task force, I brought together those faculty members who would be most likely to be running activities in the building and asked them to recommend some advanced students concerned with the arts. We met at least five times a quarter into the late spring of 1975 to hammer out agreements. The theater people wanted most of the building for drama; the music people wanted first call on everything for music; the dance people and the media people pressed their claims. One colleague believed that the #1 priority for the Recital Hall should be the showing of 35 mm. films. And so on.

I served as referee, mediator, and scribe to put together a document to present to the Provost and the President's Council for approval. There was also the issue of which interest-groups would have what influence in the technical staffing of the building and would receive how much of the equipment they wanted. I was not in control of the capital equipment budget, which was slashed to one third of the projected total after the construction bids came in and then brought part of the way back by Don Humphrey's contribution of funds saved during the construction and equipping of Lab I and Lab II. But part of the job of the task force involved proposing priorities for the purchasing of equipment. We finally finished our work and sent the document to Ed Kormondy. He accepted all of our recommendations, save for the scheme of having a staffed branch library on the third floor for scores, playbooks, and other materials directly related to hands-on work in the performing arts. Our report, as amended, was meant to govern the use of the building.

Several years later, when the ComLab was fully in service, the Academic Deans set about the task of locating and recruiting a Building Manager. Toward the end of the process the most likely candidate, Richard Nesbitt, was coming to campus for his interviews. Barbara Smith, the dean in charge of recruiting, asked if I, as former client for the building, would like to join the group who would be meeting him at the end of the day. I agreed and asked her if the candidate had been given in advance a copy of our task-force report -- the set of protocols governing the use of the building. Barbara said, "The WHAT?" In the rotation of deans, Barbara as a newcomer to the campus had never been aware that such a document existed, and the other deans currently in office had either never known about it or had forgotten it.

Somewhere in the Archives, a copy still exists. It might be nostalgic fun to look at it again. But when I think of all the hours that the group of us well-meaning folks of the task-force put into it, reading it again might bring on the condition, "It only hurts when I laugh." O.K., it's not the first time that a lot of effort put in by a lot of people has fallen through the cracks of the collective administrative memory of Evergreen. And new task-forces actually may relish re-inventing wheels, even though there are still a bunch of usable ones somewhere around the place. But the College should and can do better. Heed the words of Byron Youtz: "Let us make precedents of our successes, not of our failures."

## THE OBERLIN CONNECTION

Had I announced that, after twelve years at Oberlin, I would be leaving my position in the English Department and the associate deanship of the College of Arts and Sciences to work at a competing private coeducational college -- for example, Swarthmore, Carleton, Pomona, or Reed -- the response would have been chilly indeed. But Oberlin had been founded in 1833 primarily to train and to inspire students to go out as teaching missionaries, and Oberlinians had been instrumental in the founding of new colleges. My friends considered my move to Evergreen to be logical and gave me considerable encouragement. It did take some soul-searching to leave an old-established but artistically and intellectually exciting college to go to a cluster of office-trailers and pre-fabs adjoining a very large hole in the ground where the Library was to be built. The opportunity to make my contributions and my mistakes on a fairly large scale at a new college was irresistible, but my affection for my first home as a teacher persisted. Thus during the late winter and early spring of 1970 I was glad to be able to hire several Oberlin colleagues as consultants for DMA.

During the early years of Evergreen, I helped to recruit for the faculty several former Oberlin colleagues: Ed Kormondy (later, Provost), Mark Papworth, Jeanne Hahn, and Russ Lidman (later, Provost), as well as two former Oberlin students, Meg Hunt and Greg Steinke. We drew upon the expertise of other former colleagues and teachers to come out to us as visiting lecturers and academic consultants supported by grants. In addition, there were some exchanges of students, though the much lower tuition of Evergreen made things easier for someone wishing to come from Ohio to Washington to make the transfer. From the experience of the first six years of Evergreen's service to students, it appeared that one of my main hopes had been fulfilled: to learn if it was possible for a state-supported college to provide much of the concern for individual students and the close student-faculty collaboration for which private colleges prided themselves. Oberlin had a faculty member for every twelve students, Evergreen for every twenty. At Oberlin, a course amounted to one-fifth of a student working with one-third of a teacher. At Evergreen, whole people worked with whole people. Through the organization of our curriculum into coordinated studies programs and learning contracts, we had figured out a way to provide a commensurate student-faculty contact-ratio with only three-fifths of the faculty resources. And through all of this, I kept in touch as much as possible with former colleagues at the old school.

In the late winter of 1977, President McCann asked me, though I no longer was in the administration, to organize some sort of festival of the arts in May to which we could invite members of the Greater Olympia community. The dedication of the ComLab was to be the centerpiece. As the program developed, we would be presenting, for two-and-a-half days, performances of music, dramatic scenes, and dance, as well as exhibits of art work and films by our student film-makers. (The weather was unseasonably chilly, and we did not draw so many people to the campus as we would have liked. But the idea seemed worth pursuing. In the next years, under the leadership of Larry Stenberg -- limited to one very full day, and moved to June -- the town-gown festival became Super Saturday.) For the dedication of the ComLab, we planned to have a symposium in the afternoon on the importance of the arts in higher education, and in the evening to have an inaugural concert in the Recital Hall, featuring early Evergreen graduates as singers and

instrumentalists. Thinking back to the Oberlin connection, I called Emil Danenberg and invited him to come.

During my time in Ohio, Emil was one of the most esteemed teachers of piano in the Oberlin Conservatory and kept up his skills as pianist both on campus and around the country. He was one of the few Conservatory faculty members who encouraged his students, if they were so inclined, to come over to the Jazz Club, of which I was faculty sponsor. Just after I left, he was appointed Dean of the Conservatory. When, in the early 70's, the new president of Oberlin did not work out, and after another colleague had served for a while as Acting President, Emil -- with the enthusiastic approval of the faculty -- was appointed President of Oberlin. He became the only president of a liberal arts college who also played recitals around the country. When I called him about the symposium and the concert we had in mind, he was eager to come out. I asked if, in addition to being a panelist in the symposium, he would be willing to perform several pieces in the second half of the concert. He agreed, he came to Evergreen gratis as an expression of solidarity, and he played a solo recital for the whole second part of the concert. The audience and my colleagues greatly appreciated his contribution. For me, it was the closing of a circle.

## **CODA**

There have been administrators and trustees and contributing alumni at other institutions who have been more interested in constructing buildings than in supporting the people and programs which are the flesh and blood of a college. In the trade, they are known as having an Edifice Complex. I was never one of them. I worked on DMA I > ComLab because it was one of my assignments and because the students would need it. Yet I do take some satisfaction once in a while by patting a wall of the ComLab and thinking to myself, "I knew you when you were a pencil-mark."