

6-2017

Chapter 08: A Legacy of the Holt Era (The Wagner Affair), 1949-1952

Jack C. Lane

Rollins College, jlane@rollins.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mnscpts>

Recommended Citation

Lane, Jack C., "Chapter 08: A Legacy of the Holt Era (The Wagner Affair), 1949-1952" (2017). *Rollins College: A Centennial History*. 4.
<http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mnscpts/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives and Special Collections at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Rollins College: A Centennial History by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.

CHAPTER EIGHT

A LEGACY OF THE HOLT ERA (THE WAGNER AFFAIR), 1949-1952

At the Trustees' request, Holt agreed to interview the candidates for his replacement and make recommendations before he left for his home in Connecticut. One morning, while Holt was meeting with a prospective candidate, a man walked into the President's outer office and declared, within earshot of the candidate, he would like to interview for the Rollins presidency. It was an awkward moment. The visitor was told to come back later. Holt did not see the man until well into the evening and even then he did so with great reluctance. It was late in the day and Holt was tired. He was prepared to dismiss this impulsive creature who had walked into his office seemingly off the street. As the man launched into a speech about how well qualified he was for the Rollins presidency, Holt thought him brash and egotistical, the kind of super-salesman personality that warred against Holt's New England understated sensibilities. As the evening wore on, Holt began to change his mind. He found the man more and more appealing and by the time the man left, Holt had decided to recommend him to the Search Committee. On May 31, 1949, the Board of Trustees unanimously elected Paul Wagner Rollins's ninth president.

The unorthodox way in which Wagner came to be appointed President of Rollins College was perfectly consistent with his past performances—and it was a performance because Paul Wagner was nothing if not consistently theatrical. Like a professional actor upon a stage of his own choosing, he overwhelmed Holt, the Search Committee, the faculty and students and finally the Board of Trustees with a series of stunning interview performances.

He captivated his audience with novel audio-visual presentations and predicted this new technology was the wave of the future in education. He told his audience that he had been attracted to Rollins because of the college's tradition of educational innovation and experiment. (1)

To those who knew him well, Wagner's unorthodoxy would have come as no surprise. A mere accounting of this thirty-three-year-old phenomenon's meteoric career left most people breathless. With eyesight severely weakened at an early age by a measles attack, he struggled through elementary and secondary schools by listening to his mother read to him and by taking all of his examinations orally. Despite this handicap, he graduated with high grades from high school at the age of sixteen. His sight weakness outgrown, he completed four years of work at the University of Chicago in three years, acquiring his B.A. degree at the age of 19. While teaching English in a Chicago secondary school during his senior year, Wagner drew wide attention with his innovative use of audio-visual material. Impressed by the young teacher's effort, the head of Chicago's Department of Education offered Wagner a teaching position at the University's Experimental High School, originally headed by John Dewey and based on his progressive educational theory. Wagner remained in Chicago for three years, left for a year to earn a master's degree at Yale and returned to the university as an instructor. Throughout these years, he had been experimenting with the use of film and other visual aids in teaching. At the outbreak of war 1941, Wagner offered his services to the Great Lakes Naval Training School where he perfected the use of graphics in training recruits. Impressed by his innovations, the Navy Department offered him an officer's commission to introduce audio-visuals at the Naval War College. Wagner created the Navy's first audio-visual laboratory where he developed training aids and made

hundreds of indoctrinatory motion pictures. After the war Wagner accepted a position at Bell & Howell, a leading photography company. He was eager, however, to return to education. In the summer of 1949, when he learned that Rollins was looking for a new president, on an impulse Wagner hurried to Rollins College.

The public announcement of Wagner's appointment caused a national sensation rivaling that of Holt's. The tall, handsome new President, with a winning smile and a Hollywood persona, was greeted as if he were an academic celebrity. At 31, he was the nation's youngest college president. Only Robert Hutchins, Wagner's mentor, had been younger (age 30) when he assumed the presidency of the University of Chicago. In fact, most news reports of Wagner's appointment drew implicit comparisons between the two men. *Newsweek* made Wagner's appointment its major educational story of the week. In a three-page article, *Collier's* magazine called him "Education's New Boy Wonder." It depicted him in very flattering terms as a dynamic even brilliant young man full of novel ideas of how to make Rollins a better college. Wagner's inauguration attracted over fifty college presidents including, appropriately, Robert Hutchins as the keynote speaker. Wagner seemed a worthy successor to the beloved Hamilton Holt and a perfect fit for a college known for its academic experimentation.(2)

During the first months of his administration, Wagner appeared to exceed these large expectations. In his inaugural address and in his formal and informal conversations with the faculty and students, he talked of continuing the principles of Hamilton Holt, particularly the concept of Rollins's progressive tradition. A January 1950 editorial in the *Sandspur* proclaimed that he was governing with these convictions: "Dr. Wagner has already achieved his goal of establishing a friendly sort of basis between himself, the faculty and the students."

Most faculty members, in retrospect, invariably commented on the favorable impression Wagner made in these early months.(3)

Only a couple of early incidents clouded the bright beginning for the young president. In the fall of 1949, in the midst of football season, Wagner decreed the demise of that program. The announcement sent a small tremor through the campus. Had not the new president traveled with the team, diagramming a few plays at half time and hadn't he told some students that Rollins would have a football team as long as he was president? He had, but he found it impossible to reconcile that commitment with the sport's \$50,000 annual deficit. The Trustees persuaded him to drop football after the 1949-1950 season. He told the community that they may have to discontinue other intercollegiate sports after January 1951 if they too reported deficits.

The students reacted much less vociferously than expected, partially at least because Wagner diffused the explosive issue at a two-hour meeting with the entire student body. He not only convinced them that the football was not worth the deficit, he also sold them on the idea of a substitute program of life-long useful sports such as golf, tennis, swimming, sailing, and perhaps even chess. Students who had entered the Annie Russell Theatre meeting initially hostile, burst into applause after Wagner's performance. It was model exhibition of salesmanship.(4)

A second ripple of concern came in the first year as Wagner began to shape his own administrative staff. Almost immediately friction developed between former President Holt's Dean of Men, Arthur Enyart and the new President. The 68-year old Dean had been at Rollins since 1911. In that time Enyart had become almost as beloved as Hamilton Holt. He rivaled Holt's title as "Mr. Rollins." From the beginning the aging Dean had trouble adjusting

to Wagner's youthful style. After a stormy meeting where Wagner shouted that he was tired of Enyart's constant "infantile" behavior (he was particularly speaking of Enyart's opposition to dropping football), the old Dean announced his resignation. However much Wagner may have had reasons for losing his patience with someone who perhaps should have retired earlier, his attitude toward Enyart alienated many of the Dean's friends, some of whom were influential alumni who held deep affection for him.

With the Enyart problem behind him, Wagner turn his attention to other issues. Typical of all new presidents, he wanted to know the overall condition of the college. To begin the process, he gave Dean of the College Wendell Stone the task of conducting what Stone referred to as a "lengthy and exceedingly complicated" survey of the college's economic and academic condition. He then appointed Horace (Tolly) Tollefson, the then Director of the Library, as his executive assistant and "coordinator" with the duty of promoting greater, businesslike efficiency. Rollins community was accustomed to involving the entire community *before* assigning individuals these kinds of institutional studies. Then all factions would have ownership of and responsibility for the outcome. His apparent unwillingness to investigate how other Rollins presidents approached institutional self-studies was the result perhaps of his inexperience in college administration or even more seriously of an imperious personality.(5)

The combination of inexperience and imperiousness proved to be pernicious. This quality came as a complete surprise to the college community because it flatly contradicted his statements about the way he would govern. He was attracted to Rollins he repeated often because of its progressive democratic traditions. In his inaugural address he spoke at length of the need to take seriously the idea of a democratic institution where everyone

would be encouraged to participate. Whatever changes made at Rollins, he told the inauguration audience, would be the result of the participation of the entire college community. Future plans for the college, he promised, would be “fashioned by the faculty, staff and student body. Only by experiencing life in a truly democratic community can we hope to develop a true and abiding faith in democracy.” (6)

Those early appointments of Stone and Tollefsen caused only a slight ripple of concern among the faculty, but that deepened when they saw Wagner seeming to abandon the existing college governance structure (faculty committees and faculty meetings) for developing and implementing policy and began instead to rely on his own staff for information and advice. He frequently presented the college with *fait accomplis*. The community never debated, for example, the wisdom of the continuing football program. Wagner simply informed faculty and students of the necessity for abolishing the sport with the result that, although few objected, many remained unconvinced that it could not have been saved.

A more serious uneasiness arose over Wagner's effort to undertake a curriculum revision. At the beginning of his first summer, Wagner announced that he intended to launch an “educational aim study” that first summer. By his own admission, this approach was unconventional. Rather than following the traditional method of appointing a special faculty/staff committee to organize such a study, he asked each individual faculty member to submit a report based on an outline of “what every educated adult should know about factual information, general knowledge, attitude, appreciation, techniques.” Many faculty members resented this extra burden heaped upon them during the summer vacation and became irritably impatient as they tried to grapple with what one called “a rigid, inelastic,

superficial approach that left out vast areas of learning." Stone himself thought it showed a lack of understanding of the liberal arts. More important, they sensed that in the areas of traditional prerogatives and responsibilities, the faculty's only contribution would be merely to provide information to the administration, with the significant educational policy decisions determined by the President. This was not their view of democratic governance.(7)

Subsequently, nothing came of the "educational aim study" because in the fall of 1950, rumblings of serious financial problems surfaced. Despite knowledge of the college's perennial deficit during the Holt era, the faculty was surprised by the news. The new administration had consistently issued cheery financial reports in the past few years. As late as the September 1950 meeting, Treasurer John Tiedtke had announced "that the position of the college was financially sound and that it had been for two years." But underneath the optimistic facade, the administration was deeply worried about the college's future. Two external pressures on enrollment caused concern. First, as with most institutions of higher learning, rampant post-war inflation threatened to deplete the college's already meager treasury. Between the end of World War II and 1950 the cost of operating a college had soared nearly seventy percent, causing even prestigious institutions to run deficits. Second, World War II veterans who had swelled the number of college enrollments suddenly decreased, leaving many colleges with dangerously over-expanded in programs, buildings, staff and faculty. The entire problem was exacerbated by the outbreak of the Korean War. A call for military manpower mobilization threatened to deprive the college of an additional portion of its male population.(8)

When the college opened the 1950-1951 academic year, all these forces began to weigh heavily on the mind of the youthful president. Congress had authorized only a partial

manpower mobilization with exemptions for qualified college-bound young men. But what this meant for college enrollment, no one knew. In December, Wagner attended a Washington conference for 400 college presidents and returned with a pessimistic report. The Defense Department warned after the election in November, Congress would authorize the drafting of all 18-year olds. Still, Wagner reported to the faculty, many politicians disagreed with the Defense Department's predictions. All this, he noted, made "crystal gazing very difficult." The report, he said, left Rollins's future very much in the air, and Wagner inserted yet another uncomfortable thought: "In the event that we should lose 200 of the 356 men to the draft, there are several possible but undesirable answers including a reduction of faculty and staff." At the end of his report to the faculty he added that the United States Commissioner of Education had told him that nothing in the past fifty years would affect higher education as greatly as a national mobilization.(9)

During the fall of 1950, Wagner tried to meet this impending crisis in two ways. He presented a suggestion to the United States Department of State that it bring 400 to 600 Latin American citizens to Rollins for a period of six months where they would be taught American traditions and values. In this Cold War era, the State Department predictably seemed interested, encouraging the college to submit a detailed proposal. The Meet America Program (MAP) involved almost all faculty members and cost the college hundreds of man-hours of labor. In the end, it came to naught. Somewhere in the labyrinth of the State Department bureaucracy, it simply disappeared.

At this point, Wagner's imperious style of governance led to ruinous consequences. A democratic governance system requires involvement of the faculty in investigating the extent of the problem—in this case whether future conditions were so dire as to require

drastic measure. Instead of initiating such a process, Wagner appointed Wendell Stone alone to collect and analyze information on the college's probable economic condition for the 1951-1952 academic year. Specifically, he wanted Stone to determine probable enrollment for the following year by investigating the validity of draft deferments and by estimating the dropout possibilities for winter. Working with the Dean of Admissions, John Rich, Stone was expected to "plot the probable number of men and women we can reasonably expect to be admitted next fall."

With these estimates Wagner wanted Stone to determine the probable income for 1951-1952. This was enough work to keep Stone busy for the rest of the year, but Wagner handed the Dean an even more startling charge. The college, he said, must "play it safe by assuming that the total amount of student fees will be the operating budget for the coming year." The college, he stated, would not depend on endowment that fails to cover even debt payments; nor would it rely on "gifts of free money" because such funds constituted an exceedingly doubtful factor. Wagner also instructed Stone not to count on State Department MAP contracts nor the possibility of obtaining a ROTC unit. Finally, he told Stone to estimate the next year's operating costs and to determine what cuts would be required in order to balance the budget. Wagner left no doubt on the basis of this proposal some faculty and staff would be dismissed. The actual number would depend on the size of the gap between the operating budget and income from student fees. The president then gave Stone the most painful charge: on the assumption that cuts were necessary, Stone was to construct "a system of related values for determining who would be dropped."

Wagner admitted to Stone that much guesswork would be involved in this survey but "if we err," he told the Dean, "I hope it would be on the side of being too pessimistic rather than

too optimistic." The college could always hire or rehire additional faculty and staff, but "the opposite surprise would leave us in an embarrassing position of having contractual obligations we would not be able to fulfill." Wagner asked Stone to finish the survey by February 1, so that he could "digest, discuss and articulate it to the Board of Trustees at the February 1951 meeting." Through a Herculean effort by working night and day, by February 1 Stone presented to Wagner what the new President expected--a very pessimistic report on the present and future conditions of the college. John Tiedtke's equally gloomy financial predictions gave Wagner the final information he needed to present the Trustees a comprehensive plan to meet what he perceived to be a coming budget crisis.(10)

At the February 27 meeting of the Board of Trustees, Wagner found himself again in the familiar role of the super-salesman. True to his reputation, he gave the board a truly virtuoso performance. Armed with a plethora of visual material (graphs, charts, scales) and spontaneously constructing his own charts and messages on large sheets of paper, ripping and casting them aside as he talked, Wagner completely awed and overwhelmed the Trustees with his apparent grasp of the present and future prospects of the institution. Not in war nor peace nor depression had the college ever faced such a crisis, Wagner informed the Trustees. With a message that businessmen would understand, he warned them "the college must face decisions in a "tough minded way." Businessmen, he said, lived not in a "romantic" but a "realistic" world and a college "is in effect a business." We are, he said, "in a corporation selling a highly competitive commodity, college education." Looked at from this perspective then, he argued, the college must balance its budget in the following academic year. It must reject the financial philosophy of "embrace deficits and pray for gifts" or "pay now and pray later," and make once and for all the tough-minded decision to spend

no more than its income. Regretfully, he said, eighty-eight percent of that income came from student fees, and the recent national draft policy had made student enrollment highly volatile. Thus, in determining the budget, he concluded, the college must start with admissions. With his graphs and charts he presented the board the dismal enrollment predictions he had perceived from his Washington trip and from the admissions office. All colleges, including Rollins, expected a thirty-percent drop in enrollment. The admissions office reported an already-serious decrease of twenty-five per week in applications from last year. Thus, Wagner told the Board of Trustees, he was planning for a total of 449 students, a decline of twenty-nine percent or 200 students. He thought these not "hysterical figures"; if anything, they were too optimistic. "If you ask me to swear that we will get more than this number, I just wouldn't; if you ask me to swear that we will not get more than this number I will swear it." Finally, Wagner told them that these were not short-term conditions. He predicted the situation would last seven years.

All these figures and data led Wagner to his major point. If the 1951-1952 budget depended entirely on income from student fees, then given the precipitous drop in student enrollment, the college faced a sizable decrease in income. In fact, Wagner estimated a decrease of over \$150,000. To balance the budget would require a \$150,000 cut in expenditures. John Tiedtke, he said, after decreasing costs by \$39,000 last year, had figured out a \$77,000 cut for 1951-1952. The only area of expenditures that had not felt the cutting knife was the educational program budget. Now, Wagner proclaimed, the time had come to make one of those tough-minded decisions. He recommended decreasing the educational budget by \$87,000, a move requiring the release of fifteen to twenty faculty members.(11)

The Trustees seemed stunned by Wagner's performance. The president's argument seemed logical, but most of them found it impossible to absorb out all those figures and statistics in one gulp. Several times Wagner had scribbled figures on large newsprint, ripped it from the board, crumbled, and threw it on the floor. He presented, however, no information in the form of a typed report, nor did he offer alternatives. He explored other plans, he explained, and except for the one he presented to them, all wanting were found wanting.

Tiedtke and Stone followed Wagner's performance, but neither had advance knowledge of the President's proposal. Wagner had turned their research to his own purposes. Tiedtke conceded that, because of the perennial deficit, the college had lost or would soon lose its borrowing power. "I understand," he explained, "the terror of trying to raise money when you have gone the limit to your ability to borrow." He believed that if "the college ran into that situation again," it would surely go under. But Tiedtke was also concerned with the effect retrenchment. Rollins, he said, offered premium education. "We have a Cadillac assembly line and we cannot turn out Cadillacs without fenders or radiators or wheels; nor can we turn out Fords for we are not built that way." Worried that by dismissing professors and reducing courses the college would lose its reputation for quality education, Tiedtke sought to leave the Trustees with some sense of their responsibilities. None of this, he pointed out, considers the human suffering that would ensue from a retrenchment policy. The treasurer had no solutions to offer, but he asked the Trustees to consider all of the ramifications of a deep faculty cut, again offering a stark analogy: "I look at this very much like a cancer. To save your life you may have to amputate your hand, but it's a serious matter to amputate your hand." He could not predict faculty reaction to a cut but he did warn of a possible "kickback from the students." In general, Tiedtke presented a

less-than-cheery report whose tone and even substance supported Wagner's basic premises.(12)

Stone, who also had known nothing of the details of Wagner's previous report to the Trustees, presented a picture of faculty hardship brought on by low salaries. Many, he said, moonlighted simply to make ends meet. Here again, as in Tiedtke's report, the dismal presentation reinforced Wagner's report, because the President had argued that his plan would allow the college to raise the salaries of those faculty who remained.(12)

After these discouraging reports and gloomy forecasts, the Trustees voted unanimously in favor of Wagner's proposal. They then prepared an ominous public statement: "Because of present conditions which seriously impair the financial security of Rollins as well as other colleges, it has become necessary to curtail expenses. The Board of Trustees reluctantly instructs the President to reduce the faculty in the various divisions to conform to the budget voted by the Board according to the following plan: Faculty members aside from the following exceptions shall be retained in accordance with seniority in their area of study. Exceptions to the seniority factor:1) Part-time instructors may be retained if it appears financially advisable to do so. 2) All regular faculty members who could retire with Social Security at the end of the academic year 1951-1952 where a man is the only one in a division qualified to teach a particular subject that is considered essential."(13)

Having dispensed with the matter of the budget and faculty cuts, the Board's executive committee members, who had prior knowledge of Wagner's proposal and unanimously supported it, moved abruptly to solidify Wagner's position at the college in preparation for predictable unfavorable reaction against this plan. The Board of Trustees

unanimously voted the President a \$2,000 raise beginning in March, 1951 and promised him a \$500 annual increase until his salary reached \$15,000. Additionally, they used a resolution: "The Board of Trustees recognizes and appreciates the intelligent and thorough manner in which Dr. Wagner has carried on the work of his office, has analyzed the problems of Rollins and has presented constructive plans for the future of the institution."

The following day (February 28), the executive committee handed the Board of Trustees additional motions. The first recommended Wagner be given a ten-year contract in order to protect the president from possible opposition to the retrenchment policy. Several Board members vigorously opposed this unprecedented step, but eventually agreed to a compromise of a five-year agreement. As a final bulwark, the Board cemented the authority of the president in a by-law amendment, stating that the President shall have the sole power to hire and discharge employees and to fix administrative and educational policies of the college subject to the veto of the Board of Trustees." Although several Trustees seemed dazed by the effort to cover the president with monetary awards and verbal accolades, and to increase his power and authority, they did not oppose the motions. Some few, however, salvaged their consciences by recording their abstentions. Many left that February meeting with an uneasy feeling about the propriety, perhaps even the ethics, of raising a president's salary and handing him a five year contract and simultaneously voting to deprive twenty-five faculty members of their sole means of support.(14)

Although they had discussed the methods of faculty dismissal, the Board chose to leave the selection of individual choices to the President. Wagner thought to involve the faculty in the decision process, but he reconsidered when it became obvious that the number would exceed earlier expectations. Asking the faculty to dismiss one-third of its membership, he

concluded, would "have created an impossible psychological situation." He now began to study the report provided by Wendell Stone. Stone's survey of the personal financial conditions of most faculty members, indicated that from fifteen to twenty were financially secure or able to survive a year's leave of absence. He also provided the President with an analysis of departmental conditions, pointing out those areas where dismissals would most harm the college academically. In addition, Wagner requested from Tiedtke a list of faculty he expected to be financially secure following dismissal. The Treasurer found himself in unfamiliar territory. He finally submitted a list but not without considerable prodding from the President. With this information and with the criteria stipulated by the Board of Trustees, Wagner began constructing a list of faculty whom he would ask to leave at the end of the academic year.(15)

In the midst of this effort, the President appeared before a regularly scheduled faculty meeting on March 5. In an abbreviated repetition of his Trustee presentation, Wagner informed the faculty of the new retrenchment policies. The Board, he told them, had voted to reduce the present budget and it would be necessary to cut student scholarships, to reduce faculty salaries and later to make additional operational reductions. Even so, the college would still carry a deficit and would allow for no contingencies. Some faculty would have to be let go. He presented the Board's "mathematical formula" for faculty dismissals. These objective criteria, he explained, were designed to obviate the need to make judgments on a personal basis. He added a chilling warning: for obvious reasons there would be "no appeal and no discussion" following the announcement dismissals. The faculty left the meeting stunned by the news they had just heard.(16)

The President's staged another dazzling performance. His massive array of figures and his logical explanations were overwhelming. Like the Trustees, the faculty were stunned into silence. How could they respond when they had seen nothing on paper, nothing concrete to ponder and nothing to analyze? Wagner permitted no questions, but even if he had, the faculty probably would have been unprepared for queries. They understood the desperate financial situation but so many questions remained unanswered. Who developed the "mathematical formula?" What did the criteria for dismissal mean? Who, in fact, could remember those criteria? In this condition of uncertainty and confusion, each faculty member undoubtedly searched for and found reasons to believe he or she did not fit the predetermined criteria. At the Monday meeting, Wagner had promised to issue letters of dismissal immediately. But the first letter was not forthcoming until late Wednesday afternoon, and the majority of them did not appear until Thursday. In the interim, faculty members hovered before their mailboxes in extreme personal anxiety. As Royal France later expressed it: "For two breathless days the axe hung suspended over faculty heads, no one knowing who was to be decapitated and soon anger rose alongside fear."(17)

The ax fell on Thursday, March 8, and the thudding of heads falling reverberated throughout the community. Initially, the sheer numbers startled the community. The dismissals totaled 19 full time and four part-time faculty members, one-third of the entire faculty. As names became known, the shock deepened. Thirteen of those dismissed had earned tenure, and most had served Rollins for fifteen to twenty years. The President had dismissed the only two men who could teach German and Calculus, both courses required for pre-medical majors. Dismissals included all faculty members in education and business, thereby abolishing those departments. Five of the seven full-time English professors

received dismissal notices, leaving the department with two full-time professors and two part-time instructors to teach required English composition to 400 students. Included in the English group was Professor Nathan Starr, perhaps Rollins's most distinguished scholar and one of its most popular teachers. In addition, those dismissed included Paul Vestal, a Harvard PhD in Biology and an outstanding teacher; Rudolf Fisher, a talented professor who taught German and also violin in the Music Conservatory, and both intercollegiate coaches, Joseph Justice and John McDowell. As an alumnus wrote one of the Trustees, Wagner may have gotten away with a few select dismissals of weak faculty members. But the sheer number and quality of the terminations showed a "lack of wisdom." Even those who received notices of reappointment did not feel secure because they were given only one-year contracts. Gloom and dread hovered heavily over the campus by the end of "Black Thursday."(18)

That afternoon, Thursday, March 8, the local AAUP called a meeting for 8:15 in the Art Studio where the faculty began discussing alternatives for avoiding the cuts in their numbers. Wagner appeared in the midst of the meeting, turned the gathering into an official faculty meeting and gave the faculty another lecture on the necessity of making tough-minded decisions. The President agreed to hold another faculty meeting on Sunday, May 11, to listen to any practical suggestions as to how to solve the financial problem. (17) Had Wagner had previous experience of how transformative decisions were made in a democratic small college, such a strategy several months earlier may have produced results. At this point a meeting with a bewildered, angry faculty was bound to be explosive. The imperiousness of Wagner's governance style had become all too obvious.(19)

The news of the massive dismissals spread like a brushfire throughout the college community. On Friday, March 9, students gathered for the first of a series of spontaneous reactions to the rumors of massive faculty cuts. A group met in the dean's and the treasurer's offices on Friday morning to discuss the ways they could help save money. Suggestions included student participation without pay in maintenance, dormitory and dining room work. The following morning, Saturday, a large unofficial group of students gathered in the student center to discuss the dismissal issue. At this meeting the student mood originally positive and optimistic, turned sour when a delegation returned from the President's home with the news that Wagner would not see the students because he was still interviewing dismissed faculty members. The gathering broke up after the student leaders pledged to persuade the President to attend yet another meeting on Sunday evening at 7:00 P.M. Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning, the campus boiled with activity. Small groups of students and faculty met informally and spontaneously here and there on the campus, seeking to find out what was happening and what could be done about it.(20)

By mid-Sunday afternoon, the time set for a pre-arranged faculty meeting, the mood of the college community had shifted from a mixture of shock, fear and uncertainty to one of anger and resentment. Those feelings quite predictably began to center on the President himself. Students felt he was consciously snubbing their efforts to open a dialogue on the dismissal problem. They saw his unwillingness to meet with them in the student center on the previous Saturday as typical of his tendency to ignore the college's most important constituency. A student's letter to the editor a year earlier on the football issue had revealed latent student concern and discontent: "Dr. Wagner, You probably need not be told that you are being talked about in terms varying from four letter adjectives to their intellectual

equivalents. This situation will continue until the student body has at least an idea of the aims and policies of the college. The unrest over dropping football lies in the fact that it manifests a more general concern about the future of Rollins. Could this be cleared up? How about a consumer's report?" No report was forthcoming. Nor did the President attempt to close the communication gap that was obviously creating uncertainty on the campus. Consistent with his earlier behavior, he had simply ignored the problem when he announced the faculty dismissal policy. The students learned of the cuts in bits and pieces, from second and third hand sources. By Sunday, they were in an ugly mood.(21)

Much the same emotions swept over the faculty. Initially stunned and shocked, given time to absorb and deliberate the methods and consequences of the dismissal decision, they grew angry and resentful they had been given no role in the decision that would radical reshape the college's future. They felt they had been handed a decree with no opportunity to discuss its worth or to determine its validity. Hadn't Wagner told them that there would be no debate, no revision of this proposal? What had happened to the democratic community that was so much a part of the college's tradition, so loudly intoned in the college literature and so reverently proclaimed by Wagner himself? At a gathering of the faculty after chapel on Sunday, March 11, a large group for the first time openly attacked the President and his proposal. As time neared for the 3:00 p.m. scheduled meeting, they were primed for action.

At the meeting, the faculty passed unanimously a motion demanding "the president right here and now rescind the dismissals and begin work with the faculty and students on alternative proposals." The president quietly remarked that he had no authority to revoke a decision made by the Board of Trustees. The faculty then elected a special faculty committee to confer with the Board "on the whole problem and to resolve the situation."

Then the faculty asked the President to leave the meeting. After the President left, Nathan Starr introduced a motion that precisely expressed the mood of many faculty members: "The faculty feels that the present situation within the college has been handled improperly and could have been avoided. Our confidence in the Presidential leadership has been irreparably damaged." A long discussion of this 'no confidence' resolution ended at 6:30 that evening when the meeting recessed with a vote to reconvene "without the President" on Tuesday, March 13.(22)

As the faculty filed out of Dyer Hall, a crowd of several hundred students had already gathered in the student center. In retrospect, this gathering proved critical for the Wagner administration. Undoubtedly sensing the significance of the meeting, the President brought along the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees (Frances Warren, Louis Orr, Eugene Smith, Raymond Greene and Webber Haines). For reasons not quite clear, he also invited the mayor of Winter Park, William McCauly. It was perhaps Wagner's last opportunity to keep the dismissal problem from boiling over into a full-fledged revolt. Student president Kenneth Horton opened the meeting with a plea for calm and restraint. "Nothing constructive," he cautioned, "could be achieved through emotional upheaval." Other student leaders echoed Horton's plea for a rational discussion, but one student, Hal Suit, a veteran of World War II who had lost a leg at the Battle of the Bulge, began asking obviously hostile questions. The dismissals, Suit stated bluntly, lowered the quality of education at Rollins College and in effect "broke student contracts." Trustee Eugene Smith, rather than the President, attempted to answer Suit. To the contrary, Smith told them, the President and the Board of Trustees were upholding college standards by forestalling financial bankruptcy. Smith insinuated that the students ought to be thankful for Wagner's wise leadership in

these difficult times. But Suit would not be put off. If the college was in such desperate financial straits, Suit asked Wagner, why was so much money spent on decorating the President's office and in furnishing the President's home with expensive furniture? Wagner, who to this point had remained silent, reluctantly replied that the Board of Trustees wanted constructive answers not insulting questions. A groan from the audience brought from Wagner the irritated response that he had made a \$75,000 cut in administrative services during the last two years. Before the President could resume his seat, another student asked why he had refused to accept faculty offers to teach without financial compensation. When the President replied that no one had made such an offer, the student brandished a list of five faculty names. "Let me see those names," Wagner demanded, but the student refused. At that point, Wagner suddenly turned on his heel, and, along with the Trustees, walked out of the meeting. The President had missed perhaps his last opportunity to defuse a deteriorating situation. The students wanted to discuss their own proposal for saving money, but the President never heard them because he walked out before they could present it. Wagner's behavior united faculty and students into a solid core of opposition and, in turn, drove a solid wedge between him and the college community. Both sides were now edging the college to the brink of a major crisis that would leave a residue of hate and resentment for several decades afterward.(23)

A combat analogy by no means exaggerates as a way of describing what became known as the Wagner Affair. After the student meeting on Sunday, March 11, the opposing lines formed: the President, his staff, the Executive Committee and later a coalition of Winter Park citizens were on one side and on the other the faculty, students, a majority of the Board of Trustees and the alumni. Retiring to their appropriate redoubts, they gathered ammunition

for their causes and began hurling accusations, resolutions and press releases at each other.(24)

The faculty initiated its first skirmish on Tuesday, March 13. They listened politely but without sympathy to impassioned speeches by the President's staff who professed loyalty to the President and faith in "his honesty, sincerity and integrity." After they had finished, the faculty passed a statement lauding the President's and the Trustees' "tireless efforts" but also taking exception to specific aspects of those efforts, to wit: the faculty should have been previously advised of the retrenchment policy, and the President should have asked for suggestions before taking such a drastic step. The statement argued that the dismissals represent a violation of the spirit and letter of Rollins's rules on academic tenure and would lower Rollins's educational standards. The statement ended with a pointed criticism of Presidential leadership: "We deplore the failure to take advantage of student sentiment. The shock to the student body was profound. With youthful idealism the students are asking for guidance and advice as to how and where they can help and will be bitterly disappointed if it be not forthcoming." (25)

On the same day, almost simultaneously, the Executive Committee prepared its own statement. Present economic conditions, they argued, had led to the "difficult task of organizing a small college." It was unfortunate, the Committee declared, that the "natural distress over the loss of valued members had led to insinuation and charges of personal vindictiveness" toward the President. He simply had followed Trustee instructions. "The existence of this college is at stake. Personal considerations and personal feelings, important as they may be, must under such circumstances be subordinated to the preservation of an institution in the value of which we so strongly believe."(23) Both the

faculty and the Trustee statements were circumspect in language, but each revealed some hardening positions. In the following days both sides met frequently, but there was no meeting of the minds. Neither side was willing to move from its original positions.(26)

During the following month, both elements tore the campus asunder attempting to force the surrender of the other. Through the public relations office, the President issued to local newspapers news releases supportive of his cause. A student committee began meeting with a faculty counterpart and called meetings almost daily in the student center. *The Sandspur* editor, expressing student attitudes through his weekly editorials, accused Wagner of breaking his word and of taking Rollins "down the rocky road of ruin."(35) Then, on March 16, the Alumni Executive Committee headed by Howard Showalter issued a damning public statement. The Committee announced it had lost confidence in the President's "judgment and leadership" and called upon the Board of Trustees to remove Wagner. On the same day, Winthrop Bancroft, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, took an action that would lead ultimately to the end of Wagner's presidency: he appointed Trustees George Carrison, Milton Warner, and Eldridge Haynes as a special committee to investigate the campus upheaval.(27)

The Rollins row began to dominate local news, and by mid-March it had been picked up by the national wire services. In its March 12 issue of *The Christian Science Monitor* carried a story of the faculty cuts and discontent. A few days later, *The New York Times* cited the Rollins incident in an article on the effect of the Korean War on higher education. One week later the two leading national newsmagazines, *Time* and *Life* carried the news of the Wagner affair, both placing it in the context of a national educational malaise. Some aspect of the affair appeared almost daily on the front page of the *Orlando Sentinel*.(28)

The Carrison Committee convened on Wednesday afternoon, March 21, seeking to hear all who had made previous appointments. The committee spent time with all the major groups, including several hours with a faculty committee, and a total of 107 hours with individuals. On Thursday morning the 22nd, the Committee received a group of 34 faculty members. One of members, art teacher Hugh McKean spoke for the faculty: "We are some of the members of the faculty who think that Mr. Wagner should resign as President. We do not wish to take up your time with conversation, we just wish to show ourselves and make this statement." Carrison asked that everyone who concurred raise his hand. All thirty-four responded. Several reported they held proxies of others who could not attend. The demonstration greatly affected the Committee members, especially Eldridge Haynes. Wagner had insisted that Haynes be a member of the Committee and Haynes to that point Haynes supported the President.

On Thursday afternoon the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees invited the Carrison Committee to a meeting in the President's office where they heard Wagner read several letters from students, faculty and alumni supporting him as president. In addition, Wagner made a lengthy speech accusing his opposition of using "communist and fascist tactics." The committee departed much disturbed by the President's behavior. After a long evening discussion, they met again with the President and the Executive Committee at one o'clock on Friday, where Eldridge Haynes presented them with the committee's findings and recommendations. The overwhelming evidence proved, Haynes told them, that Wagner could not continue under prevailing conditions as President of Rollins College. Haynes then spelled out the committee's recommendations to the President: "He should immediately call a meeting of all faculty members, students and alumni and tell them in his best manner that

he and the Board had misjudged the tremendous response that was made by the Rollins family and that he would use this response as a way of solving the college problems. He should say that in response to such a display he would accept the challenge and recommend that the Board reverse itself, and also accept the challenge. He would say that all faculty would be reinstated; that we would gamble on our ability to get students, to raise money and keep Rollins as we know it. He would say further that he would get out on the firing line to do what he could do which was raise money. "Wagner burst into a long, agitated speech charging "character assassination" and condemning the persecution he had to endure. Pressed for a reply, he promised to give an answer in a few days. The committee spent the next few days preparing its report to a special Board of Trustees meeting called by Chairman Bancroft and awaited the answer from Wagner. None ever came.(29)

Just prior to the April 14 meeting, Wagner's cause was dealt a severe blow. On April 10, Hamilton Holt wrote his young successor that, as far as he could tell from a distance of a thousand miles, his cause seemed hopeless. Holt said that he understood Wagner's sincerity, but the young president must look realistically at the fact that he had lost the support of the faculty and the students. No president, he declared, could succeed without these two constituencies. Holt advised Wagner to resign. When the President resisted this suggestion, Holt sent his letter to the *Orlando Sentinel*, which published it on April 12 as a front-page headline. It was one of Holt's last acts on the part of the college. He died a few days later. (31)

Tension and drama abounded when Winthrop Bancroft opened the special Trustee meeting on Friday, April 14. One member presented detailed evidence his committee had gathered from the college community and then solemnly recommended the President's

dismissal. After a brief silence, the room erupted into a cacophony of heated accusations and unstructured debate. As one trustee later remembered: "Everyone was furious. Everyone was shouting. Ray Maguire (college attorney) was pacing up and down, shouting things no one had asked him to say and no one was listening to." Some were calling for adjournment, others protesting they were leaving town that evening. Finally, after Bancroft restored order, the Board agreed to adjourn until the following morning, hoping to resume deliberations with calmer nerves and less violent emotions.(32)

That night both pro-and anti-Wagner forces prepared strategy for the Saturday morning meeting. When Bancroft called the meeting to order two members simultaneously asked to be recognized. By prearrangement, Bancroft recognized Miller Walton who moved to adjourn until the Board could reconvene on April 27 in New York City at 10:00 A.M. Throughout Walton's reading of the motion, Wagner was shouting "Point of order, Point of order." He wanted a debate, but the chairman ruled the motion not debatable. On the vote, Bancroft broke a seven-seven tie in favor of the motion to adjourn. Ignoring the college lawyer's argument the vote violated parliamentary rules, Bancroft declared the meeting adjourned and with the other trustees left the room.(34)

Although neither President Wagner nor the Executive Committee members appeared at the April 27 New York meeting, a bare quorum of eleven trustees did assemble. By the time of the meeting, several trustees had worked out a face-saving plan. If Wagner would resign the Presidency of Rollins College, the Trustees would place Wagner at the head of a "Commission To Study the Financial Problems of Liberal Arts Colleges" throughout the nation. They gave Wagner until May 3 to accept or reject the offer. In the event he failed to resign by that date, they authorized a group of Winter Park Trustees to issue an order of

dismissal. After an "exhaustive discussion" regarding "possible persons who might be able to save the college from ruin," the Trustees elected Hugh McKean, Rollins art professor acting president.(35)

Eldridge Haynes assumed the responsibility of reporting the Board's proposal to the beleaguered President Wagner who was in New York at the time. Wagner seemed genuinely interested in the prospects of heading such a commission yet he kept repeating to Haynes, once with tears in his eyes, he wanted more than anything else to be President of Rollins College. Haynes could not convince him of the impossibility of that alternative. When the exhausted Trustee left in the early morning hours, Wagner had agreed only to give the matter serious thought.

One week later, on the May 3 deadline, Wagner still had not given an answer. McKean automatically became acting president, but because Wagner still occupied the President's office in Warren Hall, McKean set up shop in Morse Art Gallery. Rollins now had two Presidents, one clearly intent upon resisting ouster and still occupying the physical seat of power, and the other with no real authority looking on from the outside. Moreover, Wagner's supporters undertook measures that looked suspiciously as if they intended to keep him in office for a long time. Louis Orr, a local Trustee, publicly announced his unwavering support for Wagner. The *Sentinel* reported that Mrs. Warren, a dedicated Wagner supporter, wanted the college community to reunite behind Wagner, and a local "Citizens Committee for Rollins College" placed a full-page advertisement in the newspaper asking everyone to rally to Wagner's side in these times of crisis.

Nonetheless Wagner's authority began to crumble. On May 10, a majority of the students walked out of classes and refused to return until Wagner resigned. Wagner called

a faculty meeting the following day to determine "what action the faculty wished to take toward the student strike." Never had a President faced a more hostile faculty. Following a motion to refer the problem to a special committee, the faculty adjourned. The meeting had lasted fifteen minutes. Two days later all the deans announced that "in order to restore harmony," they would begin working with McKean rather than Wagner. (36)

Finally, a group of trustees headed by George Carrison gathered in Winter Park on May 13 prepared to serve Wagner an ultimatum and end the intolerable divisive upheaval. Along with trustees Arthur Schultz and Jeannette McKean, he arranged a face-to-face meeting with Wagner at the home of trustee Eugene Smith, a member of the Executive Committee and a Winter Park resident. Carrison later recalled in great detail the pitiful demise of the Wagner presidency. He told the beleaguered President that if he would resign he would be financially compensated and could leave the college with "personal dignity." Wagner continued to resist arguing that he could still carry on effectively. "Paul," Carrison told him, "this is getting us nowhere. The time has come when we cannot negotiate any further." Carrison then handed Wagner a letter of dismissal, left the meeting and, as he later wrote, "went to the Morse Gallery of Art, where a press conference had been arranged and a rather sizable group of faculty, students, and alumni and the press was assembled." At the meeting he announced "that Hugh McKean had been appointed president of Rollins College."

The next day, Acting President McKean called an all college meeting where he, Treasurer John Tiedtke and Carrison gave victory speeches to an applauding audience. When they emerged from the Annie Russell Theatre, the students spontaneously lifted Hugh McKean

on their shoulders and walked with him through the campus shouting cheers of victory. This gesture was to make deep imprint on the McKean Presidency.(37)

On May 15, all students returned to classes eager to restore normal conditions. The Wagner affair should have receded mercifully into the past, but the Executive Committee, Wagner and his local friends would not concede defeat. On May 16, *The Orlando Sentinel* front-page headline proclaimed "Wagner Says Still President," explaining that the deposed President refused to recognize the action of the April 27 Trustee meeting and other later actions as legal. The Executive Committee held a special Board of Trustee meeting to discuss the matter but failed to secure a quorum. The pro-Wagner citizens committee, after holding a large meeting in the Winter Park Country Club on May 14, began publishing a series of advertisements in the Orlando papers questioning the legal authority to fire Wagner. The first, entitled "Who Owns Rollins College?" listed the names of those Trustees who attended the New York meeting and implied that they had acted illegally. A second, entitled "Fair Play The American Way," accused the Trustees of defaulting on their promise to back Wagner after the February 1951 decision. An anti-Wagner group responded with its own full-page advertisement, explaining "What Rollins Is Trying To Achieve." On May 21, Wagner filed a \$500,000 suit against the eleven Trustees who had voted his dismissal.(38)

This disruptive newspaper and legal war suddenly took a serious and dangerous turn. On Thursday afternoon, May 24, the campus received the startling news that the Florida Legislature had passed a bill ousting all out-of-state members from the Rollins Board of Trustees. Local representatives had introduced the measure at the request of the pro-Wagner Citizens Committee. They argued that the Trustees were hopelessly deadlocked and out-of-state Trustees would not take time to attend meetings. The only solution was to

create a Board of Trustees willing to devote time to the college. "It is the duty of the Legislature," the Committee declared, "to remove this valuable asset of the state from the grasp of a small group of selfish and irresponsible men from other states and their rabble-rousing followers on the campus and put it under the control of open minded capable people close to the situation and aware of the interests of Central Florida and the whole state."(39)

The news of the bill threw the recently subdued campus into turmoil once again. A hastily called general meeting of faculty, students and townspeople created a "Friends of the College Committee" that began organizing opposition to the bill. At 11:00 that evening over 200 people left by buses and motorcade for Tallahassee to persuade the Governor not to sign the legislation. In the meantime, important townspeople, trustees and college officials began exerting pressure on Central Florida representatives in the legislature. In addition, from throughout the state came indignant protests against the Legislature's unprecedented and potentially dangerous interference in the internal affairs of a private institution of higher learning. In the face of mounting pressure, representatives of the Florida Legislature asked the Governor to return the bill for a second consideration, and on May 28, both houses unanimously rescinded their original legislation.(40)

The following day, May 29, the trustees held their regularly scheduled, and now critical, commencement meeting. The vote here would either reconfirm or reverse the special New York meeting's decision. When the members arrived at their usual meeting place, the conference room of Knowles Memorial Chapel, they found Paul Wagner and his attorneys already seated. Chairman Bancroft gavelled the meeting to order, called the roll (fifteen members present) and then declared a recess. The Chairman then asked Wagner and his attorneys to leave the meeting, but they remained firmly seated in their chairs.

Bancroft then called the meeting to order again, declared an adjournment to Morse Art Gallery and barred Wagner and his attorneys from the building "unless they used force to enter," but the ex-President made no effort to follow the Trustees to Morse Gallery. Raymond Greene, Louis Orr, Eugene Smith and Raymond Maguire all resigned from the Board of Trustees. Reconstituted, the Trustees moved quickly to affirm the decisions and resolutions of the April 27 meeting and formally removed Wagner as President of the college, "effective instantly." They also reconfirmed Hugh McKean as President and, in addition, elected Alfred J. Hanna as first Vice-President and John Tiedtke as second Vice-President and Treasurer of the college.(41)

Still Wagner continued his suit against the New York Trustees and hovered around the campus for a few days following the May 29 meeting. He watched Rollins commencement exercises from a distance. The diplomas were signed by Acting President Hugh McKean. Under pressure from college attorneys, he finally relinquished the keys to the President's office on Friday, June 8. Five days later, Hugh McKean for the first time entered the office in the administration building as Acting President of Rollins College. (42)

The Wagner affair had mercifully come to close. The hostile memories, however, engendered by the episode forever poisoned friendships. Individuals in Winter Park who were on opposite sides never spoke to each other again. The college was so embarrassed by the virulence of the disagreements that it attempted to conceal most of the documents connected with the incident. When I began researching the chapter on the Wagner presidency, I was puzzled by the scarcity of archival evidence. After a long search I discovered a rusting file cabinet hidden in a dark corner of the basement in Mills Library. The cabinet was labelled simply "Wagner." Everything pertaining to the Wagner Affair had

been locked and sealed with an iron bar and stowed in a shadowy corner of the basement. The securely locked file cabinet's shadowy location was symbolic of the college's resolve to bury from sight one of the most ignominious episodes in the its history.

Paul Wagner's demise was tragic in the sense of good intentions, doomed by the man's own hubris, ironically resulting in the opposite goal he was attempting to achieve. He brought catastrophe on an institution he was trying to serve. His downfall left the college with a deep awareness of what might have been. He deprived Rollins of his exceptional insight into the future of higher education and the opportunity of placing itself in the forefront of the coming twenty-first-century technological innovations in education. Wagner and Wagner alone was responsible for squandering that opportunity. He fell into the same trap as had his predecessor. Instead of defusing a growing crisis, Wagner, like Holt, became its a cause. Rather than mediating the crises, both chose to command authority.

The Wagner Affair left the entire college in a state of exhaustion, with a deep desire to experience some peace and harmony. As a result, the college community tended to look backward to the perceived harmonious past of Hamilton Holt rather than forward to an exciting, unpredictable, innovative future beyond the Holt era. That unrealized future was the goal of Paul Wagner. His failure resulted in the appointment of Hugh McKean who, as a committed protégé of the deceased Hamilton Holt, tended to see Rollins's future from the perspective of the past. Thus, "Mister Rollins College" would continue to cast a long shadow and Hugh McKean would prove to be his last legacy.

NOTES

1. Trustee Minutes, May 31, 1950. For Wagner's background, I have used material from the biographical file in the Wagner Papers, Rollins Archives and from Hartzell Spence, "Education's Boy Wonder," *Colliers* (January 13, 1951).
2. Spence, "Boy Wonder"; *Newsweek* (August 8, 1949); *New York Times*, June 8, 1949.
3. Faculty Minutes, January 7, 1950; *Sandspur*, January 18, 1950.
4. *Sandspur*, October 10, 1950; Trustee Minutes, October, 1950.
5. Faculty Minutes, April 10, 1950; Enyart Statement Concerning the Wagner Affair <no date>. Rollins Archives. As evidence of the animosity created by the Wagner affair, I found the records for this incident stored not in the Archives but in the basement of old Mills library vault. The file cabinet that was securely locked. I believe I was the first person to see these records since they were placed there.
6. Inaugural Address, February 8, 1950.
7. Memorandum to the Faculty, July 15, 1950; Wendell Stone and Nathan Starr Statements. Wagner Affair Records.
8. Faculty Minutes, September 25, 1950; Trustee Minutes, October 1950. For the national problem see "Crisis in the Colleges," *Time* (June 29, 1950).
9. Faculty Minutes, October 30, 1950.
10. Wagner to Stone, December 15, 1950; Trustee Minutes, February, 1951.
11. I have reconstructed Wagner's performance from several trustee depositions located in the Wagner Affair Records.
12. Trustee Minutes, February 27-29, 1951.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Depositions Wagner Affair*
16. *Faculty Minutes, March 5, 1951.*
17. *Depositions*

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.* This and the following discussion of faculty activity is reconstructed from several faculty statements in the Wagner Affair Records.

20. *Sandspur*, March 10, 1951; Kay Lehman to George Carrison, March 15, 1951.

21. *Sandspur*, March, 1951.

22. Faculty Minutes, March 11, 1951. For faculty sentiment see Statement by Flora Magoon, Wagner Affair Records.

23. My account of this meeting is reconstructed from statements by students, faculty and trustees in the Wagner Affair Records, and a special issue of the *Sandspur*, March 12, 1951.

24. Trustee Minutes, March 14, 1951.

25. Faculty Minutes, March 13, 1951; Faculty statements in the Wagner Affair Records.

26. Trustee Minutes, March 16, 1951.

27. Public Relations News Release, March 17, 1951; Stone Survey, February 1, 1951.

28. See *Orlando Sentinel*, March 12-20, 1951 for almost daily coverage of crisis; *Sandspur*, March 17, 1951; Alumni statements in the Wagner Affair Records; Bancroft and Carrison in the Wagner Affair Records. *TIME*, March 19, 1951; *Life*, March 26, 1951.

29. Carrison Statement.

30.. Trustee Minutes, March 29, 1951.

31. Holt to Wagner, April 10, 1951; *Orlando Sentinel*, April 12, 1951.

32. Trustee Minutes, April 14, 1951; Statements by Trustees in Wagner Affair Records.

33. *Ibid.*

34. *Sandspur*, April 15, 1951; Trustee Minutes, April 16, 1951; Visiting Committee Report, May 9, 1951; *Orlando Sentinel*, April 26, 1951.

35. Trustee Minutes, April 27, 1951; Trustee Statements in Wagner Affair Records.

36. *Sandspur*, May 10, 1951.

37 Reconstructed from Statement by George Carrison in Wagner Affair Records.

38. *Ibid.*, and statements by faculty and trustees in Wagner Affair Records.
39. Trustee Minutes, May 15, 17, 22, 1951; *Orlando Sentinel*, May 17, 20, 1951.
40. Telegram to Florida House of Representatives, May 24, 1951; *Orlando Sentinel*, "Central Floridians to Run Rollins," May 25, 1951.
For statewide protest see for example TAMPA TRIBUNE, May 27, 1951.
41. Trustee, April 27, 1951.
42. Wagner to McKean, June 7, 1951.
Paul Wagner settled in New York after leaving Rollins and entered the public relations business. He rose to Senior Executive of Hill and Knowlton, a renowned global public relations firm. In the 1970s he founded his own public relations business which concentrated on serving not for profit organizations. In 1999, he and his wife Jeannette, Vice Chairman of Estee Lauder Companies, formed a pro bono group—Nulli Seconds Associates—devoted to aiding global not for profit companies with strategies to achieve success. Wagner died in December, 2015.