

mode of organizing a Center for International Studies on the UMSL campus." Fedder had previously worked at Ohio State and had developed his model after that program. Bugg, in turn, sent Fedder's memorandum to Weaver. Weaver "liked the model . . . and asked Bugg to lend [Fedder] to work on a university-wide program of International Studies." Fedder spent his first year as a St. Louis campus faculty member but actually worked with a system-wide committee developing a four-campus International Studies program. Weaver was aware that there were complaints from Rolla, St. Louis, and Kansas City that if the University was to be "one university with four campuses," the university-wide officials should not all be housed in Columbia. In response to that idea, Weaver designated the St. Louis campus as the place where the Director of the system-wide International Studies program would be housed. Fedder did not want to become the Director of the university-wide International Studies office, however. The university-wide committee which he was chairing, therefore, had to establish guidelines for the four-campus program and to seek a university-wide director.²³

Just as Fedder's arrival and reassignment reflected Weaver's policy of building "one university with four campuses," Joe McKenna's arrival and assessments reflected the new attitude of the faculty as to what the mission of the St. Louis campus had become. McKenna arrived in the fall of 1967 as a full professor with tenure, and he joined a Department of Economics, not a Social Science Division. He also joined a faculty which aspired to be a university, not an undergraduate college. The faculty were also willing to explore seriously the urban mission.

McKenna described the feeling of the faculty regarding its difficult task:

There was a sort of general feeling that although we had a model of the land-grant universities and we had a model . . . of . . . [a] great scholarly institution, no one had ever worked out very satisfactorily a suitable mod-

el of what an urban university was supposed to be. And there was a general feeling that somehow or another we were going to see if we could design that model. One of the great advantages we had was, that we had no history. . . . There was a feeling that there was some kind of relationship to be built with the city, although, we didn't quite know what it was. . . . It was our intention, at least, and everybody talked at the time as if, the way they were going to do this was . . . we were going to build a full-scale university, with doctoral programs in every field, but . . . we were going to concentrate those doctoral programs in areas that would be of the most importance to an urban community. . . . In other words [concentrations would develop within each field]. Economics would concentrate in urban economics, housing, things of that sort. . . . For example, St. Louis tends to be a financial center so that probably, financial markets would also be an important part of our focus. But the idea was that we were to aim at not the broad range of scholarship because we probably were never going to be big enough to really do everything correct, and we ought to concentrate.²⁴

McKenna was aware that Ellis' initial view of the St. Louis campus was different from what had developed. McKenna had "a strong feeling that Jim Bugg had built something that Elmer Ellis never approved." McKenna stated, "I think Elmer Ellis always thought that he was building a junior college here, [and] it's quite clear that Jim Bugg had no such plans." McKenna believed there were not only problems with Ellis over what the campus was to be, but there would be problems with any President of the university-wide system because "the mission of [the St. Louis campus] has always been defined by [the

St. Louis campus] very differently from the way it has been defined by the University of Missouri system. The University of Missouri system has always [considered] that it has a major campus at Columbia and three satellites." McKenna watched with interest as Weaver prepared to move his university-wide administration out of Jesse Hall, located in the middle of the Columbia campus. Such a move was initially viewed by McKenna as "brilliant," for, if Weaver was really intent on building "one university with four campuses," he had to remove himself from all four campuses. McKenna thought Weaver should "have moved [the central offices] to Jefferson City." Instead, Weaver had a new building constructed in Columbia, which, from McKenna's perspective, continued the old perception of viewing the major campus at Columbia with three surrounding satellites in the state.²⁵

The first faculty meeting of the year was held on September 16, 1967. Bugg welcomed the 180 faculty who had gathered and informed them that enrollments had increased to 7,127. He then conducted the election for the Tenure Committee and the Policy Committee. He announced the appointment of six new administrators, Richard Dunlap as Assistant to the Chancellor, Larry Bogue as Director of Personnel, Don Murry as Director of Research, B.F. Schumacher as Director of the Metropolitan Studies Center, Richard Burnett as Director of the Reading Clinic and Robert Elsea as Assistant Dean in the School of Education. He then announced his decision to fill the position he previously occupied, Dean of Faculty. A committee was elected to conduct a search. Bugg also announced that the North Central Association would be sending accrediting committees to the campus in December or January. Krasnoff reported that the By-Laws Committee was still working on their assigned task of rewriting the by-laws and of studying the present administrative structure.²⁶

Bugg then discussed the preliminary report

of the campus Ten Year Planning Committee which had been made on August 10th. That report provided a general outline of program development. Bugg announced that, during the fall semester, each department would analyze its own strengths and weaknesses relating to program development over the next ten years, and that each department would hire an outside consultant who would study the departmental reports and make recommendations. Those reports would be studied, once again, by the campus Planning Committee, who was responsible for making campus recommendations to a system-wide committee. Ultimately, the system-wide committee would make recommendations to the President who in turn would make recommendations to the Board of Curators.²⁷

Bugg forewarned the faculty that a great deal of time would be spent on the planning process during the forthcoming year. Bugg noted, "The decisions we make will, for better or worse, determine to a considerable degree our destiny for the next decade."²⁸

In closing, Bugg commented on the difficulty of making academic plans for the next ten years since no one knew what the "cybernetic age will really bring," yet the campus was going "to provide an education for students who will live their adult lives in such a society." Bugg was certain that the campus should not "slavishly follow the pattern . . . of other colleges and universities." He opposed any hope "to be, another Harvard or Berkeley or Michigan or Wisconsin," explaining, "For, if we seek to mold our development upon the pattern of any institution, no matter how outstanding it may be, we shall condemn this campus to the fate of a second rate campus." He believed the answer lay in devising and justifying "our purpose and our future development in terms of the leadership and service which *this* urban campus of *this* state university must provide for *this* community."²⁹

In his speech, Bugg demonstrated his progression from running an undergraduate campus, which would serve as a feeder school