

At this point I find myself, to some extent, in the position occupied by Joseph K. in Kafka's THE TRIAL. The GREEN MONSTER, the book of charges against me, so full of invalid and/or trivial charges, and the subsequent charges following the publication of that book, do not, in my opinion, constitute the real charges against me. Like Joseph K., I do not know the real charges. The real charges seem to be unspecified. Even the Hearing Committee that heard my appeal, after investing a total of 216 person hours, was at a loss as to what really brought my colleagues to the desperate action they took.

Many questions have haunted me about what was behind the unusual hostility shown against me by some of my colleagues. In the process of searching for answers I have read and reread about the trials of Alfred Dreyfus, Sacco and Vanzetti, John Thomas Scopes, the Rosenbergs, John Henry Faulk, Bertrand Russell, Angela Davis, and others. I have also re-examined all the written materials connected with my stay at the Kent State University (1967-1975) and the 20 hours of hearing tapes (May 31-June 12, 1975). I have also listened carefully to the tape on the Board of Trustees meeting of July 17, 1975, when my attorney and I spoke to the Board and the Board voted 5-2 to dismiss me. But most of all, I have sought answers to my basic question by re-examining my knowledge of the behavioral sciences, particularly my knowledge of social and clinical psychology.

To get beyond the surface aspects of the whole situation I'd like, therefore, to present a number of hypotheses which you, as the reader, after having read the preceding chapters and relevant parts of the Appendix, might look at and then decide for yourself, the answer to the question: why me? (Note: After each hypothesis is a space in which to write your assessment of the relevance of that hypothesis in attempting to answer the basic question)

The following factors might have contributed something to the conspiracy against me:

Hypothesis I. Educentrism

Educentrism is the idea held by many teachers that only a person with an education degree and/or public school teaching experience (K-12) is fit to help educate future teachers and school counselors. Educentric people/<sup>feel</sup>that anyone without this background should not be on the faculty of a college of education. In the CPSE department all my colleagues had one or more education degrees and most had public school teaching experience. When I joined the faculty in 1967 I was the only one with a liberal arts background and a Ph.D. in the behavioral sciences. I thus joined the department as an outsider, a stranger. I was different.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

Hypothesis II. Technocentrism

Technocentrism is the idea that the only kind of person fit to teach technical skills is someone with a formal degree in a relevant technology. This idea is a specific aspect of the general technocentric idea that only technologists have the basic answers to the most significant questions facing mankind. Technocentric persons feel that technical skills cannot be learned except in some formal way. All my colleagues were trained specifically in counseling techniques and had formal field experiences in counseling. At the time I joined the KSU faculty I had had some theoretical courses in counseling but little formal field experience, although I had had considerable informal experience. In this sense also I was a stranger and outsider. Here too I was different.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

Hypothesis III. Relative Deprivation

The principle of relative deprivation states that people feel deprived only in relation to what they perceive as fair treatment in relation to how they are treated in comparison to their peers, co-workers, or persons in a similar status as themselves. If , for example, they perceive a peer

315

as getting more salary than themselves on the basis of unfair criteria, they feel deprived and might strike out at that person perceived as treated better than themselves. When I joined the KSU faculty in 1967 I came into the department with a salary greater than most people in the department, or allegedly higher than it was thought, by some, that I deserved. At least four members, during the early years I had spent in the department, mentioned the fact to me that they were upset by my high salary. (By 1975, however, I was one of the lowest paid members of the department)

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

#### Hypothesis IV. Nepotism

Nepotism is the idea that favoritism must be granted to members of one's own ingroup, whether based on consanguinal, affinal, professional, ideological, or some other criteria, without due regard for merit. Thus, in part, because of educentrism and technocentrism, because I was not considered a member of the ingroup, I was treated as an outgroup person, a pariah. As Dean Wilson suggested, I became the "department nigger," even though initially

3/6

I came into the department with a high salary. As the "department nigger" my talents were exploited, I was given courses nobody else wanted to teach, etc. All the people I had helped, got one or two promotions. I got nothing in spite of the fact that, in terms of merit, objectively speaking, my achievements as a professor and scholar were far above theirs.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

#### Hypothesis V. Anti-Intellectualism

Anti-intellectualism is the idea that both science and reason are not as trustworthy guides to the solution of man's problems as are intuition, common sense, superstition, adherence to sacred, supernatural dogma, or habitual ways of doing things. People do not trust the intellectual because he approaches life with a critical rather than a submissive attitude. Anti-intellectuals take a timid, childish attitude toward the status quo. There was only one scholar and relentless critic of the status quo in the department and I was that person. Anti-intellectuals have a great deal of antipathy toward intellectuals.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

Hypothesis VI. Nativism

Nativism is the idea that the good life is achieved through loyalty to the status quo, preserving sovereignty at all costs, being superpatriotic, the glorification of dominance over people (power), and obedience. Nativism conceives of people as instruments, as tools. Since I was often disloyal to the status quo, cosmopolitan rather than provincial in outlook, uninterested in dominating others, and not especially obedient, I did not fit into the department because of its strong nativist orientation. It should be stated that the nativist drive for power is often based on compensatory actions against anxiety, hatred, and feelings of inferiority.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

Hypothesis VII. Procrusteanism

Procrusteanism is the idea that the good life is achieved by people adjusting to the status quo no matter what the circumstances are. It is an ideology strongly supported by educentrism, technocentrism, nepotism, anti-intellectualism,

318

and nativism. It is an ideology which glorifies conformity and denegrates individuality. Since I was very different from anyone in my department, I often felt that there were Procrustean efforts to get me to fit in no matter what the price. However, I didn't like having my limbs stretched or cut off so I'd fit in the department's already fairly full Procrustean bed.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

Hypothesis VIII. The Status Rather Than the Achievement Orientation

People concerned about their position in life more than what they achieve are more likely to be prejudiced because their drive for status is based, in large part, on feelings of inferiority and anxiety. Such people see achievement oriented people as real threats to their status seeking and, therefore, often manifest great prejudice and discrimination toward them. While in the CPSE department I was the most productive scholar there. I think that fact might have threatened the self-esteem of the status-oriented people in the department. 1/

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

1/See F.B. Silberstein and M. Seeman, "Social Mobility and Prejudice," AMER. J. SOCIOLOGY, 65 (1959), 258-264.

Hypothesis IX. Scapegoating

When a person finds the realization of his needs blocked he often becomes frustrated, experiences anger, and a desire to strike out and hurt people. When it is not possible to direct his aggressive feelings against the person contributing to his frustration he is likely to displace these feelings on some other person, a "scapegoat." Persons selected as scapegoats are often judged as too weak and defenseless to strike back, that is, relatively timid and non-aggressive. But often persons are chosen as scapegoats because they have so-called "inkblot personalities," that is, their image is unstructured enough so that they might be almost anything one could imagine. In addition to displacement, projection is often found in people who do scapegoating. When there is a convenient scapegoat, one can comfortably project characteristics one doesn't want to recognize in oneself on to the scapegoat, thereby, relieving one's anxieties on such forbidden thoughts. I think that the rumors going on prior to and after my dismissal manifested a lot of scapegoating. I remember the reporter Charles Lally from the AKRON BEACON JOURNAL taking me aside at the Board of Trustees meeting on July 17, 1975 and asking me,



320

in confidence, "Dr. Frumkin, I've got to ask you some questions which are bothering me. I've heard a couple of stories circulating about the 'real reasons' for your dismissal. Are you now under psychiatric care? Are you gay?" There were several members of the department who had some agonizing questions on these matters concerning themselves and were projecting these on me. Likewise those guilty of misusing federal funds or public funds, as well as of other unethical and unprofessional behavior, found it easy to accuse me of such behavior. And there were some who were so angry about my fighting for my rights that they subconsciously would have liked to kill me and, consequently, accused me of threatening their lives and the lives of members of their families.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

#### Hypothesis X. Authoritarian Personality Characteristics

Authoritarian personalities are conventional persons who generally conform rigidly to middle-class values. They are uncritical of the status quo. They are always on the lookout for and eager to condemn and punish violators of their particular values. They are often

unimaginative and anti-aesthetic. They are generally superstitious and think in stereotyped ways. They are often preoccupied with power and toughness. They see the world as a destructive, evil, hostile place. They have negative attitudes toward sex and tenderness. My personality characteristics are, for the most part, the anti-thesis of the authoritarian personality. That is, I'm unconventional, critical of the status quo, tolerant, imaginative, aesthetic, scientific, intellectual, unconcerned with irresponsible power and toughness, tender, hopeful, and have positive attitudes toward sex. My personality, life style, and behavior are a constant challenge to authoritarian personalities. All the previous hypotheses, from I-IX, except III, support Hypothesis X.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

#### Hypothesis XI. Group Pressure

Numerous behavioral scientific studies have shown that when other members of one's reference group take a particular position on an issue, few individuals have the strength to reject that position. Out of the 11 department members in the department I felt that at least two

persons were friendly enough toward me and had the courage not to go along with the effort to dismiss me. However, they did buckle under to group pressure and became parties to the conspiracy. That was a great shock to me but it is understandable in social psychological terms.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

### Hypothesis XII. A Bandwagon Effect

Once my 11 departmental colleagues voted for my dismissal, it was predictable that, unless there was some strong countervailing force introduced, other persons asked to make a judgment on whether to dismiss me or not, found it right and proper to follow suit. The bandwagon effect is dependent on snowballing group pressure, that is, growing group pressure. It takes very strong, independent, non-authoritarian, somewhat courageous persons to go against the force of the bandwagon kind of pressure, especially when such pressure is supported by authoritarian ideologies mentioned in the previous hypotheses. By the time the GREEN MONSTER had reached President Olds' office, 20 allegedly responsible KSU staff members, including the Dean of the College of Education and the Provost and Assistant Provost, had supported dismissal. Dr. Olds responded as any authoritarian leader would be expected to when confronted with an

issue presented in that way: he found prima facie evidence for dismissal and he never changed his mind about dismissal even though the Faculty Hearing Committee and KSUFA recommended that I not be dismissed, and the AAUP and the Faculty Ombudsman and my attorney urged him, if he felt dismissal was his recommendation, to go back to the Hearing Committee to explain his reasons for disagreement with their recommendation that I not be dismissed.

Notes: (Reader Assessment)

#### Hypothesis XIII. Reaction Formation

Sometimes a person finds it necessary to disguise his motivation by believing that he has a motive exactly opposite of the real motive. Thus, for example, when one borrows money he needs very much from a friend he usually feels gratitude toward that person. However, in not paying the money back in a reasonable period of time because he doesn't want to admit that at one point he was dependent on that friend, he suddenly turns on the friend and says, perhaps, " I owe you nothing. The money I got from you I earned for some job I did for you. Did you forget that you thief ?Are you trying to cheat me?" The initial gratitude and dependence are covered up, defended against by a display of ingratitude and alleged independence.

329  
The reaction formation has helped the man save face, to deny he ever had a debt to pay. In my first few years at KSU I helped a number of colleagues get published, some for the first time. Those publications led to their getting promotions, tenure, Graduate Faculty status, raises in salaries, and other benefits. Sakata and Palmerton turning against me, saying I contributed nothing to the rehabilitation program or the department, even though my publishing efforts helped them both get ahead significantly, seems a clear case of reaction formation coupled with a large amount of denial. My being accused of unprofessional and unethical behavior by my colleagues is really a reaction formation against their own unethical and unprofessional behavior. There is, of course, some projection here also. This was alluded to in an earlier hypothesis.

Notes: ( Reaction Assessment)

#### Hypothesis XIV. Alleged Sexual Exploitation of Students

At KSU, as on many other campuses, many faculty, whether married or single, whether male or female, are frequently known to be sexually involved with their students. Some, at times, feel guilty about this because it is considered a breach of the FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS and could

325

lead to dismissal for cause, that is, moral turpitude in this case.<sup>1/</sup> At least four or five of my departmental colleagues who voted against me have been known to violate this CODE OF ETHICS, yet nothing has been done to them. However, they had an opportunity, because I was single and known to be sexually active, to suggest that I was sexually exploiting students. This was one of the rumors, among others, circulating during the time of my dismissal. This projection on the part of my colleagues I'm sure relieved them of some of the guilt and anxiety they experienced because of their behavior. This charge was never made a formal charge against me because they knew that it might open a Pandora's Box that nobody was willing to risk. Yet, the six or seven colleagues who were against this violation of the FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS, and allegedly innocent of not violating that particular part of the CODE, must have seen this allegation as a cohesive force in motivating the conspirators against me.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

Hypothesis XV. Alleged Homicidal Tendencies.

At the faculty hearings at least two of my colleagues stated that they seriously felt their lives were threatened

1/ See Appendix , pages .

326.

by me. Both of these men, Dr. Alan Coogan and Dr. Glenn Saltzman, I feel, had a strong urge to kill me because of the "trouble" I had caused them. In repressing that homicidal wish, they projected that wish upon me, turning it around on themselves. Both of these men own guns. I have never owned a gun in my entire life and I am older than both of them. During World War II I enlisted in the U.S. Navy Hospital Corps to avoid having to carry a gun. I don't like guns. I think they're dangerous. Life is too precious, I feel, to be involved with such instruments of death.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

#### Hypothesis XVI. Socialist Orientation

My colleagues, for the most part, are committed to the capitalistic kind of democratic society, while I'm more committed to a socialistic kind. When we had an American Federation of Teachers union on the KSU campus, I was the only one from the CPSE department who was a member of that union. I have favored socialized medicine in the U.S. for many years. In 1970 I published a chapter in a book which dealt sympathetically with marriage and the family in the U.S.S.R. Some of my colleagues were not too happy about that publication. I have been sympathetic to and supportive of socialistic organizations and efforts in the United States. Some of my nativistic

327.12

colleagues might have consequently seen me as a subversive person. Dr. Saltzman, Chairman of the Department in 1975, is a Commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve . He is so superpatriotic that when he chaired the Ohio School Counselors Association convention in 1972 he practically made it mandatory that all those attending the convention wear some combination of red, white, and blue clothing and no other colors! It interesting to know that the only other tenured professor ever to be dismissed from the Kent State University is a socialist. In its 69-year history KSU has dismissed only two tenured professors and both are socialistically oriented. I personally am what might be called an Ordinal Socialist, that is, when various economic systems are ranked I prefer socialism over capitalism and other economic systems. Because of the selfish nature of human beings , I feel that socialism has a better chance of meeting the needs of all human beings than does the present version of capitalism and other systems.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

Hypothesis XVII. Militant Orientation Relative to Civil Rights and Liberties

Ever since coming to the Kent State University I



have been involved in several aspects of the civil rights movement. First it was with the Black student rights movement at KSU. Then with the American Indians. After that ex-convicts, gay people, and persons with esoteric religious orientations. I supported anti-Vietnam War efforts and the right of movie theater owners to show X-rated movies. At the height of the Black Student Caucus protests at KSU I was made an honorary member of the Caucus, the only white person made a member. This upset <sup>some of</sup> my colleagues. It was, as if, I had joined the "enemy" and committed treason because the Caucus was fighting against unfair treatment of Black students in the College of Education. After the Kent State Massacre in May, 1970, I testified in federal court about the chilling effect the post-massacre witch-hunting had on the intellectual atmosphere at KSU. In April, 1971, I organized and chaired a symposium on "The Kent State Massacre" at a national convention held in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Some of my colleagues had strong objections to my using that title which I created and feel is appropriate. They felt it was "bad public relations." The symposium turned out to be one of the best attended and received programs at the convention.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

### Hypothesis XVIII. Gay Rights

Realizing that homophobia is a real fear among Americans, I can understand how some of my colleagues would feel uneasy by my supporting gay rights. At the Conference on Community Resources in Portage County (the county in which Kent is located) which I organized and chaired in 1974, I had a discussion group on "Problems of and Community Resources for Gay People." Dr. Saltzman attended that conference and the only group he dropped in on was that one. Why that group? I wonder if it was because I happened to have been co-chairperson of that group with a gay faculty member from another KSU department that Dr. Saltzman happened to drop into that group to the exclusion of the others. In my seminar on the Social Psychology of Disability and in my class on Community Resources I always would spend some time on problems and community resources for gay people and have gay people as guest speakers. To what extent my involvement with gays was a factor in the conspiracy against me is difficult to say. I feel, however, that homosexual fears among my colleagues could have led to some projection which supported their whisper campaign against me and unified my enemies.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

### Hypothesis XIX. Fear

Other than the fear of death by murder, which we have talked about previously, there is also the fear of being criticized or made fun of by what I say or write or draw. The charges of misuse of federal funds I made against Palmerton and Sakata probably made all faculty somewhat fearful that I might also make similar charges against them. Nobody likes to be exposed as a thief, liar, bigot, or as mentally ill, even if it is true. My cartoon characterizing my colleagues in the CPSE department as members of a kangaroo court was not very well-received by those depicted in it. For people who are status seekers and who fear focusing on or facing the truth about their own behavior, my life style, which emphasizes openness and objectivity and criticism, is difficult for them to accept or even tolerate. As Dean Wilson has suggested in his supportive letter, by speaking, writing, and drawing, I point up the inadequacies these people feel about themselves. For some that prospect is terrifying and cause for repressive, draconian measures to stop it.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

### Hypothesis XX. Humanistic Orientation

Most of the positive orientations and factors mentioned in the context of the previous hypotheses point up different

aspects of my behavior which can be said to be humanistic, namely: my liberal education, objectivity, intellectualism, cosmopolitanism, individualism, non-conformity, achievement orientation, democratic orientation, sexual equalitarianism, tolerance, anti-homicidal tendencies, socialistic orientation, reverence for human life, struggle for civil rights and liberties, etc. Since most of my colleagues have strong authoritarian personalities, they are unalterably opposed to my behaving in most of the ways I feel right about. I contend that a good part of the adverse discrimination and mistreatment I experienced as a professor at KSU was because of my acting as a Humanist, that is, supporting such Humanist values as freedom of expression, universal human rights ( as exemplified in the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights), scientific objectivity, situation ethics, etc. I have been a practicing Humanist for more than 25 years and have been a member of the American Humanist Association and the Fellowship of Religious Humanists.

What do Humanists believe? This is stated succinctly by G.A. Lundberg: "...humanists believe that the purpose of living is to develop nobler, finer personalities in all human beings. Man must, with the aid of science, create for himself a more ideal society and not depend on God to do it for him. The humanist discards all theological beliefs about God, heaven, hell, immortality, etc., or considers them early stages in religious evolution. To the humanist, God is simply the supreme values, the good in

332

human life which man must work to increase. Heaven is the ideal society here on earth. Hell is society in which war, disease, ignorance, injustice, exploitation, and other evils flourish. The soul is the personality. Immortality is one's influence on other personalities during life as well as thereafter.<sup>1/</sup>

Discrimination, I feel, is always more than categorical. That is, one is not simply discriminated against because one is a Catholic, a Black, or Humanist. One is usually discriminated against because one is acting out, expressing, living by the values of one's group. Thus, it is not generally the Black Oreo who is discriminated against but rather the militant Black who might be fighting for first-class citizenship for himself and his people. And it is not the Humanist who gives lip service to Humanist values but rather the active Humanist like Dr. Henry Morgenthauer who defends the Humanist recognition of the right to abortion. Therefore, in a nutshell, I do believe I have been discriminated against at KSU because I am a Humanist and practice Humanist values.

I began work at KSU in March, 1967, and was given tenure in 1969. An example of a serious conflict I had with the CPSE department was over the mistreatment of an ex-offender in our program. The man was a good person, a better than average student, but some of my colleagues -----  
<sup>1/</sup> See Lundberg's SOCIOLOGY (N.Y.: Harper, 1954), pp. 562-563.

333

treated him as a pariah and failed him in a critical course shortly before he was supposed to graduate and start a new life. After his unfair treatment by my colleagues that student almost commit suicide. He has had serious psychological and emotional problems ever since. This man, in my opinion, would have made an excellent rehabilitation counselor if given had a chance and treated with some dignity. Another conflict occurred over my favoring an Angela-Davis-type instructor candidate over a <sup>white</sup> male toady who was awarded the job in our department. Some of my non-Humanist colleagues were promoted, given tenure, given salary increases unfairly denied me, even though they have been guilty of plagiarism, embezzlement, and did not qualify for Graduate Faculty status. On October 16, 1974, I filed a formal complaint against KSU with the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, charging KSU with having discriminated against me because I am a Humanist who practices Humanist values. I think my practice of such values plays a role in the conspiracy against me.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

### Hypothesis XXI. Jealousy

Jealousy is often precipitated by a fear of the loss of status or love and is manifested by hostility toward both the rival and the loved one. Since I have never competed for the love of any persons my colleagues were

involved with, then the only loss that they might possibly experience through competing with me might be that of status. How so? Well, first of all I had a better record of scholarship and writing than anyone in the department. In fact, I had one of the best records of a faculty of over 1000 persons. I have been in CONTEMPORARY AUTHORS(1970-1977), AMERICAN MEN OF SCIENCE(1971,1977), etc. Second, I was a better all-around athlete than anyone in the department. I mention that only because athletic skill was thought of as a desirable skill by members of that department. Third, I was more physically fit than anyone in the department. Fourth, I was happier and better adjusted than anyone else in the department. If this was not the case the continued attempts by my colleagues to get me dismissed and their attempts at character assassination might have been successful in leading to a psychotic breakdown, serious psychosomatic illness, or other pathological signs of personality disorder. Fifth, I was the most aesthetically creative person in the department. I have had national recognition as a practicing free lance artist and my work has been exhibited in such art museums as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Corcoran Art Gallery, Akron Art Institute, New School Art Gallery (N.Y.), Butler Institute of Art, Canton Art Institute, etc. Sixth, I was an achievement rather than status oriented person. I was not nursing ulcers because of status anxieties. I didn't have to smoke or drink alcoholic beverages to feel relaxed. I didn't have to drive around in a Mercedes-Benz to prove what kind of

man I am. I was not driven by a need for material things. I liked most people and I was not intolerant of people who happened to be different from myself. I think jealousy is a real factor in the conspiracy. It is noteworthy that green, the color usually associated with jealousy, was selected by my colleagues as the color for the cover of the GREEN MONSTER, the book of dismissal allegations against me.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

Hypothesis XXII. Sense of Justice

Of all the things in the world which motivate me, that excite me, send me into action, lift me from any apathy and indifference, the one thing that does that most is injustice. I'm not sure how my sense of justice, my sense of fairness developed, but I know that it has been an integral part of my life for as long as I can remember. I remember as a teenager how furiously angry I would get at the Nazis for their atrocities against Jews and other victims, at the KKK for torturing, tormenting, and killing my Black brothers and sisters, for the segregation of Japanese Americans during World War II, etc. It was early in my life that I think that I reached Lawrence Kohlberg's sixth stage of moral development ---



336

the stage where when justice is in conflict with agreed-upon law, then I would feel comfortable breaking the law in support of a higher law, the humanistic situation ethic as spelled out by Joseph Fletcher.<sup>1/</sup>

I feel that most of my colleagues in the CPSE department are at Kohlberg's second stage of moral development, what he calls the opportunistic stage. At this stage the person has a great consciousness of reward and tries to get rewards to satisfy his or her own egocentric needs. What satisfies those egocentric needs is considered good and right regardless of the fairness or ethics involved. At this stage one can justify plagiarism, lying, bigotry, and even embezzlement because, as long as one doesn't get caught, if it leads to rewards such as promotions and salary increases, it is good and right.

As a Humanist at the Kohlberg's sixth stage of moral development I was often in severe conflict with my second stage colleagues. A good example of this was when I once chaired a Ph.D. oral examination in the Psychology Department. Three out of the five members of the examining committee, on their first vote, wanted to flunk a practicing clinical psychologist ( a person who had proven himself as a competent clinician in the real world) on the basis of the fact that he missed some esoteric questions on research methodology and research posed by one of the

-----  
<sup>1/</sup> On Kohlberg, see his STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORAL THOUGHT AND ACTION (N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1969). On Fletcher, see his SITUATION ETHICS (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965).

33

more sadistic members of the committee. I pointed out to the committee that they must look at the total man. They must ask themselves: Why was this man here? Where is this man going? What kind of man is he? What is the meaning of this examination in terms of the psychology profession's future? If his major interest and competency is in the area of clinical psychology, then what is gained by failing him on his Ph.D. orals based on his performance in the area of research methodology? What is gained by preventing him from obtaining his degree and getting a license to practice clinical psychology? The conflict was between an absolutistic view about Ph.D. exams and a relativistic, humanistic principle as to whether or not the candidate was worthy of practicing as a clinical psychologist. The committee took a second vote after our discussion and passed the candidate by a 3-2 vote. I was never asked to chair a psychology Ph.D. oral exam again because I had been so critical of those who I had felt were unjust to the Ph.D. candidate. <sup>1/</sup> Thus, you can readily see why my sense of justice often put me into conflict with those I've seen as unjust. I think this factor is a significant one in motivating my enemies to join in a conspiracy against me.

Notes: (Reaction Assessment)

-----  
<sup>1/</sup> See the letter from Dr. C. Hendrick in Appendix B, page 5/6. Dr. Hendrick was the student's Ph.D. adviser.

So much for the hypotheses about the conspiracy against me. Since not a single charge made against me has any validity in terms of the evidence presented, what are the real charges?

On July 24, 1975 my attorney and I filed an appeal in the Portage County Court of Common Pleas requesting that the KSU Board of Trustees reinstate me. That appeal was then transferred to the U.S. District Court in Cleveland.

There are times in each person's life when one cannot, one must not, run away from injustice, when one must stay and fight for one's rights no matter what the cost. That time had come in my life. This was just the beginning of my struggle for redress.<sup>1/</sup>

#####

Note: The next few pages contain blank sheets of paper for you to use to put down and correlate any thoughts you might have about this book.

-----  
1/ I would like to hear what you personally think are the most valid hypotheses behind my dismissal. Please write to me at 920 PLEASANT DRIVE, YPSILANTI, MI 48197, U.S.A. I'll try my best to answer every letter. E-MAIL ADDRESS IS FRUMKINRM@YAHOO.COM.

337

Worksheet for Reader Reactions

Worksheet for Reader Reactions

Worksheet for Reader Reactions

Worksheet for Reader Reactions