

# Hoover Institution Chief to Resist Order to Retire

By Richard Bernstein, Special To the New York Times

July 1, 1988



See the article in its original context from July 1, 1988, Section A, Page 8 [Buy Reprints](#)

New York Times subscribers\* enjoy full access to TimesMachine—view over 150 years of New York Times journalism, as it originally appeared.

SUBSCRIBE

\*Does not include Crossword-only or Cooking-only subscribers.

## About the Archive

*This is a digitized version of an article from The Times's print archive, before the start of online publication in 1996. To preserve these articles as they originally appeared, The Times does not alter, edit or update them.*

*Occasionally the digitization process introduces transcription errors or other problems; we are continuing to work to improve these archived versions.*

---

W. Glenn Campbell, conservative Republican, friend of Ronald Reagan and builder of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, relishes a good fight, and a difficult few weeks have given him an occasion for one.

He has had the chance, for example, to assert his heritage of "an old Scottish warrior" and to thunder, "I don't run under fire." He has promised, with equal gusto, to "come over the hill again," and has threatened to hire powerful lawyers to help him do it.

The occasion for Mr. Campbell's enthusiastic defiance is a decision by the trustees of Stanford University to require that he retire in 1989 as director of the Hoover Institution, a well-endowed public policy research organization that jealously guards its independence from the university with which it uneasily shares a campus.

The trustees' stated reasoning is that Mr. Campbell will be 65 years old in 1989, the customary retirement age at Stanford. Support From Fellows

But Mr. Campbell, who notes that exceptions to the retirement policy have been made recently, does not want to step down, even suggesting that he may file an age discrimination suit against Stanford. His opposition to the trustees' decision, announced in mid-May, has become the latest of many issues that over the years have made for tension between Stanford and the institution, founded by Herbert Hoover in 1919.

Mr. Campbell is supported by a majority of the more than 100 Hoover fellows, who include four Nobel laureates and some of the most renowned names in American scholarship. Sixty-four fellows signed a letter to the trustees protesting not only the "process and substance of your recent actions regarding our director" but also contending that their decision to offer Mr. Campbell the position of senior fellow, along with a generous financial settlement, represented "direct interference in the Hoover appointment process."

"Campbell is in excellent health and he's doing a terrific job and we think he should stay," said Martin Anderson, a Hoover fellow who is a former domestic policy adviser to President Reagan.

Still, few here seem willing to state for the record what most seem to believe - that Mr. Campbell is being required to step down not because of his age but for other reasons. Among them are a thinly veiled personal antagonism between him and the university president, Donald Kennedy, Mr. Campbell's habit of making acerbic public comments in

favor of conservative causes and, perhaps most important, Hoover's own reputation as a bastion of conservative thinking on the generally liberal Stanford campus. Anti-Hoover Bias Seen

And so, while there is uncertainty about the motives of the trustees, their decision has brought to the surface at Hoover a sense that the university is unenthusiastic about defending it from its critics and perhaps even motivated by a desire to gain greater control of it.

"The action appears to confirm the belief that the university is anti-Hoover," wrote Seymour Martin Lipset, a Hoover senior fellow, in a letter to the Stanford trustees' president, protesting the move to push Mr. Cambell into retirement.

For his part, Mr. Campbell, who in 28 years as director has helped raise the institution's endowment from \$2 million to \$110 million, is notably circumspect when he discusses the reasons for his ouster.

In a recent interview, he said he "was always ready to discuss the subject" of his retirement with the trustees but declared, "I don't like pre-emptive strikes."

As for the reasons behind the trustees' decision, he would only say, "It has nothing to do with my age."

Warren M. Christopher, a former Deputy Secretary of State who is the chairman of the Stanford trustees, said the opposite. Interviewed by telephone at his Los Angeles law office, he said the decision was guided solely by a desire to abide by Stanford's retirement policies. "In my view, there's no political aspect to it," he said. Rudeness Is Ascribed

One of the complaints of the Hoover fellows is that the trustees were rude to Mr. Campbell in the way they handled their decision, announcing it to him in a letter signed by Mr. Christopher instead of giving him the chance to announce his own retirement.

"The reason we did things the way we did is that the director doesn't want to step down," Mr. Christopher said. "I sent the letter to Mr. Campbell because, starting in January, he started making public statements that he would be the one to decide when he would leave."

"There is not now and there never has been any threat to the independence of Hoover," he added. "Hoover has operated with great freedom and independence and that's the way it's going to continue."

Whatever the public statements in the case, the intensity of feeling aroused by the issue of Mr. Campbell's retirement would be inexplicable without the long history of animosity between Hoover and some at the university. Founder's Fear of Liberals

When Mr. Campbell, an economist with a doctorate from Harvard, was appointed Hoover's director in 1960, the move came amid efforts by Mr. Hoover himself, who died in 1964, to keep what he unabashedly called "the left-wingers" from gaining control of his creation, including his insistence that the institution be kept free of Stanford faculty control.

This behest of Mr. Hoover, the presence at the institution of many conservative scholars and Mr. Campbell's own politics have contributed to tensions on campus. In May, shortly after the trustees' decision on Mr. Campbell was announced, 57 members of the Stanford faculty demanded that the institution's status be debated by the Stanford faculty senate. The professors, who have yet to argue their case before the senate, want to gain what they call "normal university governance" over Hoover, meaning, in essence, a say in its appointments.

"The problem is not that they are conservative," said John F. Manley, a political science professor who is one of the leaders of the effort, acknowledging that there are members of the Hoover research staff who are liberals. "The problem is that they are an independent institution within the university and they have a political mission."

This accusation is dismissed by most at Hoover as inaccurate and unfair. Dennis L. Bark, a Hoover senior fellow, notes that fellows undertake political activities as individuals, in the same manner as Stanford professors. Hoover fellows also deny that the institution is "ideologically monolithic."

One Hoover fellow, George Marotta, retaliated against the faculty petition by doing research into the voter registration of the 57 faculty members who signed it. He found that all but three of them were registered as Democrats.

"Eighty to 90 percent of Stanford is Democratic," Mr. Anderson said. "Basically, it's become a monolithic university, and the irony is that Hoover is getting charged with bias."

Mr. Campbell dismisses the petition as the work of "a small left-wing undistinguished clique in the faculty that wants to get rid of me, take control of the Hoover Institution and divide up the spoils."

"I have a mission at Hoover," he said. "It's to make it the best policy research center in the world, and I think we're well on the way, despite all the harassment we have to put up with from undistinguished people."