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ABSTRACT

Frank Anthony Rose served as the 20th president of The University of Alabama during a time of significant turmoil. His work is known in two contexts, the hiring of football coach Paul W. Bryant and the desegregation of The University of Alabama. Little is known about Rose and his life experiences that helped develop him as successful administrator. There is a greater context to his administrative career and accomplishments outside of these two events. Rose was a native southerner and trained minister with strong communication skills and an inherent feel for politics. He was very successful as an administrator and was guided by a deep sense of moral leadership. This study explored Rose’s life to develop a better understanding of the leadership traits he developed and the contributions he provided to education. Using historical and archival research, this study explored the life and contributions of Frank Anthony Rose from his birth in 1920 until his death in 1991. The purpose of the study was to provide a vision of the leadership abilities that he possessed, the issues he encountered, and the accomplishments he achieved as an educational leader.
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Frank Anthony Rose served as the 20th president of The University of Alabama. He was hired in the late fall of 1957 and served the university until his retirement in 1969. In this study, I examined his life with specific regard to the formative periods regarding education, professional development, and organizational affiliations. I sought to define the leadership skills he possessed. This is important because there was very little information documented on his life and most of his presidency at The University of Alabama. While he is known as the president who hired football coach Paul W. “Bear” Bryant and successfully desegregated the university in 1963, the totality of his life has never been fully examined. In short, there is much more to his life story than these two events. It is my contention that his leadership strengths were the result of many experiences that ran through his life. While there were several items I examined, there were two central phases of his life that show great significance. These included his time spent as a member of the Disciples of Christ Church (Christian Church), a liberal denomination and his fraternity membership with Kappa Alpha Order (K.A.), a social fraternity known for such things as conducting Confederate themed parades in its activities. Both of these organizations had a profound lifelong impact on him and there is a perceived tension or disconnect that exists between his affiliation with them that warrants further study. Rose was also politically astute and an excellent communicator, as I will show, these skills served him well as a leader.

Rose grew up in Meridian, Mississippi, where his family attended First Christian Church, a congregation of the Disciples of Christ. Rose was very active as a youth and young adult with First Christian Church. The influence the church had on him was significant for he felt his
calling was the ministry. While an excellent student and athlete at Meridian High School, he came from a poor upbringing. Based on this he had no resources for attending college. However, the congregation at First Christian Church was able to provide Rose with a scholarship to Transylvania College in Lexington, Kentucky. Transylvania College and its seminary, the College of the Bible were affiliated with the Disciples of Christ Church. The Disciples of Christ is a denomination that was founded in the early 1800s and had as its central theme “openness to other Christian traditions having come into existence as a 19th century protest movement against denominational exclusiveness” (http://disciples.org/our-identity/history-of-the-disciples/, n.d.).

The movement had arisen in Eastern Kentucky as a shedding of denominational names to be replaced with more inclusive terminology such as Christians and Disciples.

Unique to the founding of the Disciples of Christ was the inclusiveness of African-American members. As the denomination’s website pointed out,

The earliest congregations…in Kentucky and Pennsylvania included both European American and African American members. The Colored Christian Church was organized in Midway, Ky. in 1834. Thus, African Americans have been part of this movement from the very beginning. In 1917, the National Christian Missionary Convention was formed as the result of the determination of Preston Taylor, a former slave, who was minister of the Gay Street Christian Church in Nashville, Tenn. The purpose was to empower the witness of Black Disciples as members of the whole church through a partnership with white Disciples that recognized Black leadership in an era of blatant white supremacy and paternalism. For over a half-century, this convention conducted annual gatherings in which participants received in-service training in Christian education and leadership, program information, and inspiration for fulfilling their mission as Disciples of Christ. (http://disciples.org/our-identity/history-of-the-disciples/, para. 16)

This frames one side of the tension that was explored in the study of Rose’s leadership as a minister and administrator. During Rose’s studies and later administrative career at Transylvania, he participated as a minister with local Disciple of Christ congregations. He was also very active in his social fraternity, K.A. This is an organization with a Southern historical heritage that was known for its use of Confederate uniforms and flags at chapter events. K.A. heritage also
provides a romanticized view of the Old South that is typically more conservative in nature. Juxtaposed against his ministry work and the denominational mission, his affiliation with K.A. embodies the other half of the tension underlying Rose’s leadership.

K.A., was founded in December 1865 at Washington College in Lexington, Virginia. In its design, one of the founders, Zenus Ammen, stated K.A.Order was “an order of Christian knights pledged to the highest ideals of character and achievement where his contemporaries sought to preserve the masculine virtues of chivalry, respect for others, honor and reverence for God and woman” (http://www.kappaalphaorder.org/ka/history/heritage). As president of Washington College, Confederate General Robert E. Lee had become the “spiritual leader” of K.A. To Ammen and members of K.A., Lee “personified the heroic knights of the past, representing their noblest ideals and traditions of chivalrous behavior and even before his death in 1870, Lee was referred to as the Knight of America” (The Varlot, 2008, p. 66). The fraternity is deeply rooted in the heritage of a bygone era. It is a fraternity that is noted for its “Old South” tradition that has frequently produced controversy. “Boo” Haughton, a former president of K.A. at The University of Alabama stated that “Greek life goes back to the time after the Civil War when the plantation owners sought a place closer than Europe for their boys to learn how to conduct themselves” (Weiss, 1992, p. 56). Haughton noted that he came from “old money” and this is important because it gives insight to customs, traditions, and how members of the fraternity view themselves. Members of K.A. abide by the heritage of Old South chivalry. Most members at a chapter like the one at The University of Alabama come from “well-to-do families”, as evidenced by “Boo” Haughton. The typical K.A. profile at Alabama is counter to the background of Rose, who grew up fatherless and poor in Mississippi. On the surface the heritage of K.A. appears to be at odds with the mission of the Disciples of Christ Church, which
is one of inclusiveness. How these two organizations influenced Rose and his leadership are a major focus of this dissertation.

Rose was initiated into the Alpha Theta Chapter of K.A. Order at Transylvania College in 1939. Founded in 1891, Transylvania’s K.A. chapter is the oldest in the Candler Province, which encompasses Kentucky. This chapter is highly respected within the national fraternity and has won many awards for its academic and community service. It was against this backdrop, that Rose participated in many events as a student at Transylvania. He was very active in his fraternity and made it a lifelong passion. He served in many leadership capacities with K.A., including the chairmanship of its national education foundation. Rose was also instrumental in helping to develop and build a new national headquarters for the fraternity in Lexington, Virginia. He was a much sought after speaker and delivered many addresses to the K.A. national conferences. In 1957, one such speech was heard by Ernest Williams, an Alabama K.A. alumnus who was serving on the UA presidential search committee. After hearing this speech, Rose was immediately approached about the vacant presidency at The University of Alabama (Clark, 1993, p. 137). Thus, his participation in the fraternity was fortuitous for both the university and his professional growth.

Rose was viewed as a highly successful administrator and minister but there is a lack of understanding of his leadership as a minister and administrator as they relate to his national participation in what is considered a historically exclusive fraternity. This fraternity background seems at odds with the issues he had to address as a minister in the Disciples of Christ. The Disciples of Christ took great pride in their inclusiveness long before the term was so prominently used in society. Rose’s participation in the desegregation of The University of Alabama indicates he did a masterful job of completing this with no hostility or adverse effect on
the campus, student body, and faculty. This ability might be tied to his Christian roots and understanding of inclusiveness. Counter to this is his participation in K.A. and its history based on the legacy of Old South chivalry, segregation, and an era gone by. K.A.’s mission “seeks to create a lifetime experience which centers on reverence to God, duty, honor, character and gentlemanly conduct as inspired by Robert E. Lee, our spiritual founder” (https://www.washcoll.edu/campuslife/greek-life/kappa-alpha/, para. 1), so there is, at least a stated Christian connection between the two organizations.

Rose was also paternalistic based on his training as a Christian Church minister. This nature helped define Rose as more of a controlling administrator. His views on educating students with an emphasis on the liberal arts prior to specialization suited him well in the days of in loco parentis. Rose’s leadership temperament would be tested post-desegregation as the rise of student and faculty activism was counter to his core beliefs. Rose was an advocate for the student and faculty, but the rapidity of cultural changes in the 1960s likely alienated him from the purpose he envisioned for higher education. It appears Rose became weary of the struggles related to these changes and opted to resign as president. As an administrator, Rose lacked advanced degrees, faculty tenure, and scholarly research, These factors likely placed Rose at a disadvantage in negotiating with the faculty over issues related to student freedom. Rose’s ability to be progressive and pragmatic in dealing with university concerns was beneficial to him early in his career. He maintained a strong sense of political astuteness and negotiation skills that served him well during desegregation. However, Rose’s inability to adapt to the changing campus environment was due in part to the controlling aspect of his leadership skillset.

In this study, I filled a gap in what was known about Frank Rose’s leadership abilities by discussing the accomplishments other than desegregation and athletic success, for which Rose is
justifiably known. We do not have a complete understanding of his experiences that formed his moral and ethical compass as an educational leader. His impact on The University of Alabama cannot be discounted, as he was able to bring the university into the modern era on many fronts and positively reestablish its educational reputation. Upon his resignation, the Board of Trustees felt it only appropriate to name the new administration offices in his honor – the Rose Administration Building. This is a strong statement on his overall ability as a leader, but one that does not fully explain all the factors involved in Rose’s successes or account for the apparent contradiction between his religion and his devotion to his social fraternity.
CHAPTER I:
THE LITERATURE

This chapter considers the scholarly literature relevant to the study of Frank Rose and his university leadership. It is divided into four separate sections, one on historical studies of presidents comparable to Rose, one on leadership studies, one on historical research, and a final one on theoretical framework.

Section I – Historical Studies Relevant to Dr. Frank Rose

One way to consider the leadership of Dr. Frank Rose is to compare and contrast it with the leadership of leaders of similar institutions of higher education across the South, and elsewhere, and of leaders similar to Rose in other ways. Before doing that, a brief look at how studies of the University of Alabama during Rose’s presidency is in order. Perspectives on the conflicts encountered by Rose during his presidency are highlighted in Turning the Tide by Earl Tilford (2014) and The Schoolhouse Door by Culpepper Clark (1993). Tilford stated that “Frank Rose’s vision, wrapped as it was in the ‘pursuit of excellence’ (see 1958 inauguration speech – ‘fix your eyes on the greatness’) became reality because student leaders, most of them as progressive as Rose, joined with the administration to resist the old order represented by George Wallace and his ardent supporters” (p. 207). Tilford saw Rose as being a “progressive” in his academic vision and leadership. I will argue that Rose was also a pragmatist who was politically astute and understood intuitively the landscape and environment he worked in. He adapted to the nuances of the time in order to gain the greatest leverage for achieving his goals and vision of the university.
Culpepper Clark (1993), the former Dean of The University of Alabama’s College of Communication, pointed out that Rose’s ability to balance issues that divided people in a way that helped solve the problem of desegregation. For Clark also, Rose can be viewed as progressive due to his ability to maneuver through the political landscape of civil rights, desegregation, and student unrest in the late 1960s. I will argue that Rose is best viewed as both a progressive and pragmatist in his work with academic affairs, infrastructure, finance, and faculty development. A well-known student dissident, Jack Drake, who attended The University of Alabama during the Rose years said, “President Frank A. Rose and I had a contentious relationship. I viewed him as too slick, too eager to compromise, too concerned about the political reaction to events on campus…I now (50 years later) realize that Frank Rose was unquestionably the greatest president in the history of The University of Alabama” (Tilford, 2014, p. xi).

Rose’s wide ranging accomplishments are not well known. His tenure at the University of Alabama is known mostly for the peaceful desegregation of the university. However, his leadership and vision in other arenas are not as well documented. His life and leadership are explained in detail through analysis of his role as a minister in the Disciples of Christ, a very tolerant denomination, while also being a prominent national member of a perceived exclusionary and conservative, if not reactionary, fraternity – K.A. Order. There are extremes in his background that warrant a deeper study of his leadership.

The University of Mississippi provides the first case for an excellent comparison of Rose’s university leadership with that of a presidential colleague at a similar institution. In the book *Making Haste Slowly*, author David Sansing (1990) takes us through the troubling times of desegregation for higher education in Mississippi. He described how political influence rather
than the university leadership of Chancellor John Williams impacted desegregation at the University of Mississippi. In the early 1950s, the Mississippi Board of Trustees that oversaw the entire higher education system “armed the presidents of Mississippi’s white colleges with the power to avoid the tragic consequences of integration…and gave them the authority to accept or reject any applicants according to the best interest of everyone” (Sansing, 1990, p. 141). For Sansing, the university system in Mississippi proceeded with a program of delay and duplicity. Following Brown v. Board of Education, African-American applicants were continually denied admission due to a series of changing requirements. The Mississippi legislature counteracted the Brown decision by passing a resolution that bound all public education officials to “prohibit, by any lawful, peaceful, and constitutional means, the implementation or the compliance with the Integration Decisions of the United States Supreme Court” (Sansing, 1990, p. 140).

The Sovereignty Commission, a select group of segregationist politicians within the State of Mississippi, had as its sole function to keep public institutions of higher learning segregated. Governor Ross Barnett used the Sovereignty Commission to control any person who he deemed to be pro-desegregation. Much like Governor George Wallace in Alabama, Governor Barnett stated, “we must either submit to the unlawful dictates of the federal government, or stand like men and tell them never” (Sansing, 1990, p. 156). This was Barnett’s position on the James Meredith episode at the University of Mississippi. Meredith was granted admission to Ole Miss in October of 1962 after the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court ordered his entrance. Meredith had specifically picked the University of Mississippi as his target since it represented the last bastion of the Old South and any inroads made there would reverberate across the South. Barnett did all he could to prevent the admission of Meredith, going so far as to have the Board of Trustees rewrite the admission requirements. It was not until Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, a
University of Alabama Law School graduate, vacated all legal obstructions by the university that Meredith was admitted. However, Barnett and members of the Board of Trustees crafted a carefully worded denial of admission that would be delivered in person upon Meredith’s initial admission. This action by the Governor and Board had placed Chancellor Williams and key administrators in contempt of Judge Black’s order. Therefore, Chancellor Williams and Dean A.B. Lewis’s appearance in federal court ultimately led to the Board of Trustees being held in contempt for non-compliance with the legal ruling. The court directive subjected them to possible fines and prison time if they did not admit Meredith. They acquiesced, and he was enrolled. However, Barnett continued to be hostile toward the situation and in historical terms the blame for the ensuing violence associated with Meredith’s admission can be placed more on Barnett than on Williams.

Very little information is provided by Sansing (1990) on the leadership of Chancellor Williams during his tenure. Sansing did outline that the confrontation and politics of the situation related to desegregation were beyond Williams’s control since the Board of Trustees, who had been appointed through the governor’s office, took control. Williams served as chancellor at the University of Mississippi from 1946 to 1968, taking a cautious approach to his position. Williams is not portrayed by Sansing as a powerful administrator or leader, but is shown to be adept at understanding the political climate within which he functioned. In the book Making Haste Slowly (1990), he is not portrayed in a manner that allows me to compare him to Frank Rose. There is no definitive leadership style defined. There is one instance in 1963 when the board was pressuring Williams to expel James Meredith because of potential inflammatory remarks. He did not acquiesce to their position and Meredith eventually graduated. In contrast to
the lack of attention of Williams’ leadership by Sansing (1990), the Mississippi political powers that Williams encountered are discussed in great detail.

It can be said that the period of 1958 – 1968 at the University of Mississippi was one of highly-charged politics and relatively little administrative leadership. While no similarities can be found in leadership style between the actions at Alabama and Mississippi with the exception of both being flagship schools caught up in the politics of the day, a dramatic contrast in presidential leadership can be shown. Williams, at the University of Mississippi, has been portrayed by Sansing (1990) as an administrator who is simply carrying out political directives. In contrast, Frank Rose at Alabama, due to his personal political maneuvering and strong bonds with the Board of Trustees, was able to help shape the desegregation of the university in a peaceful manner. He did this by balancing the politics of the era and working behind the scenes to ensure a tranquil environment for the changing times. Rose was noted for his ability to balance problems and have everyone involved feel he was on their side. Williams encountered great strife and violence at Mississippi, while Rose was able to deal with the contentious issues of the day and create a peaceful and respectable climate within which the admission of Alabama’s first African-American students was accomplished.

In 1999, David Sansing followed up his book on the history of higher education in Mississippi with *The University of Mississippi: A Sesquicentennial History*. The book documents the story of the Oxford campus and goes into greater detail on the tenure and leadership of Chancellor Williams, a contemporary of Rose’s. The book covers the desegregation of Ole Miss in the same detail as his early book, *Making Haste Slowly*. From this perspective there is no new light shed on the leadership of Williams.
Sansing noted that Chancellor Williams knew the university had suffered irreparable harm from the desegregation controversy. The nation viewed Ole Miss in such a negative light that Williams reluctantly concluded that “America’s image of the university is that of riot and lawlessness….I will not try to brighten that picture, but it is not the whole picture” (Sansing, 1999, p. 314). There were students, faculty, and administrators who tried to make a positive difference, but they failed to accomplish this task due to the politics of the day. This explains in part why Williams had little success as a leader during the Meredith crisis, but had staying power as an administrator. He could only control the things within the Chancellor’s power and desegregation was a political issue that overrode university policy. However, he was politically astute and did enjoy the longest tenure of any Chancellor in the history of Ole Miss, serving for twenty-two years.

Sansing also noted that in conjunction with desegregation at Mississippi, an ongoing battle occurred over accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Williams was able to convince SACS that the issues of desegregation were more in the political realm than within the purview of university administrators. SACS allowed Ole Miss to continue as an accredited university, but placed them on “extraordinary status” which was subject to review in 1963. At the next annual meeting, Williams was able to report “a second African-American student had enrolled at Ole Miss without incident. The SACS College Delegate Assembly accepted William’s report and returned the University of Mississippi to full and unqualified membership” (Sansing, 1999, p. 306). By showing leadership over the tasks he could control, Williams was able to keep the University of Mississippi moving in a positive direction, though politicians made this extremely difficult. In the end, his tenure was one of ebb and flow, dictated by the politicians of the day. He never challenged the politicians but felt it best to
address matters from a long-term perspective. In this light, he can be viewed as partially successful during his tenure, the only shortcoming being his inability to control the violence of desegregation. In contrast, Rose was able to overcome the political pressures brought to bear with desegregation while maintaining the peace.

In 1985, Thomas Dyer produced *The University of Georgia – A Bicentennial History*. With respect to the era of Rose’s tenure, the book examines in great detail the desegregation of the university. Omar C. Aderhold served as the president from 1950 to 1967, thus making him Rose’s contemporary. Aderhold’s service as president was much like that of Williams at Ole Miss. The governor of Georgia and several elected officials were instrumental in delaying desegregation. Decisions related to this do not appear to have occurred at the presidential level. Rather, decisions were made via politicians and University System of Georgia Chancellor Harmon Caldwell, who had served as the University of Georgia president from 1935 to 1948. In 1950, Horace Ward, an African American, attempted to enroll in the University of Georgia Law School. Ward was offered funding to attend an out-of-state law school but insisted on attending UGA. After several delays, he appealed to Chancellor Caldwell who “claimed he …had no jurisdiction over the matter” (Dyer, 1985, p. 305). Aderhold had put off Ward by forming subcommittees to review his application. Tiring of the lengthy charade, Ward appealed his admission to Caldwell a second time who “replied that the young black would have to adduce evidence that he had been denied admission solely because of his race” (Dyer, 1985, p. 305).

Aderhold was a university president who found himself hampered by the desires of politicians and Chancellor Caldwell. It appears he abdicated any responsibility for the desegregation to these individuals by simply agreeing with their decisions and supporting their implementation. Caldwell had indicated he was “opposed to integration of any sort” (Dyer, 1985,
Ward was persistent, however, and even with delays and being drafted into the U.S. Army for two years, he still pressed for admission. Ultimately, he was accepted at the Northwestern University School of Law. His admission to Northwestern was a matter that would come back to the University of Georgia in 1960. In conjunction with a lawsuit related to desegregation of undergraduate admissions at UGA, Aderhold was questioned about the refusal to admit Ward. In his response he stated, “he felt that Ward had been evasive and inconsistent and did not possess the necessary qualifications to enter the university law school” (Dyer, 1985, p. 328). When Aderhold testified and was asked to compare the academic standards of Northwestern, where Ward had earned a law degree, with Georgia, he “claimed unfamiliarity with the standards of the various colleges within Northwestern” (Dyer, 1985, p. 328).

On January 9, 1961, the University of Georgia finally was forced to desegregate the university with the admission of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes. In contrast to Rose’s intense preparation for desegregation at Alabama, little was done by the Georgia administration to maintain calm and riots quickly broke out that created the need to remove Hunter and Hamilton for their own safety. Four days later, a federal judge ordered their admission and Aderhold acquiesced. Both students eventually graduated and became distinguished in their careers. Aderhold eventually had a change of heart on his views related to desegregation, likely due to changes in political leaders and the retirement of Chancellor Caldwell in 1964. In 1967, near his retirement, Aderhold advised the Georgia Athletic Association “to give up the idea that intercollegiate sports at Georgia should not be integrated” (Dyer, 1985, p. 334). It appears he realized that desegregation was to be applied across the board from academics to athletics. But overall, he appears to have been more like Williams at Ole Miss than Rose at Alabama. Mississippi and Georgia institutions encountered violence related to the admission of black
students, in part because of the presidential inactions of leaders who followed political directives rather than shaping policy.

William Link examined the life of William Friday of the University of North Carolina in his book *William Friday: Power, Purpose, and American Higher Education*. Friday was born in the early 1920s and came to prominence as a university administrator. In March 1956, he was appointed the acting president of the University of North Carolina at the age of 35. While relatively young, he was highly respected and held a “reputation for conciliation and mediation, he successfully communicated with a wide range of people and demonstrated an exceptional intuition about human relations” (Link, 1995, p. 85). He too encountered issues related to desegregation and the modernization of a university. The parallels with Rose are striking. Friday encountered faculty morale issues, athletic booster concerns, and concerns about the campus political environment and anti-communism. According to Link, Friday addressed the following problems:

> How independent was a public university from prevailing cultural and political norms? To what extent should the political culture, as manifested either by the legislature or the public at large, govern UNC’s operation? With what degree of independence should a public university pursue the truth and, in the case of athletics, set its house in order? (Link, 1995, p. 96-97)

Rose addressed similar issues of external intrusions into university affairs at Alabama. Rose and Friday led their respective institutions in an era of changing times with regard to race relations in the South. While Friday would serve a most successful tenure of thirty years, turning the University of North Carolina into one of the great universities in both academics and athletics, he did so based on a strong vision and understanding of politics and communication. Friday was a president who had a strong sense of the political landscape within his state. Jonathan Yardley of the *Washington Post* attested to Friday’s political astuteness by noting he had “worked quietly,
patiently, devotedly and, when the occasion called for it, forcefully to give the people of North Carolina the best public university their resources could support” (Yardley, 1986, p. 22). Friday, like Rose, had to overcome many external obstacles to his leadership.

To gain a better appreciation for the impact this had on his decision-making, consider Michael O’Brien’s (1998) biography of Father Theodore Hesburgh of the University of Notre Dame. In Hesburgh, A Biography, O’Brien introduced the reader to the multiplicity of issues a university president addresses at a large religious institution. He also gave insights on the role of religion in an academic environment. Hesburgh is a very good comparison to Rose. Both were trained theologians and presidents of prominent universities that placed a great deal of emphasis on athletics – specifically football. However, Hesburgh oversaw a university with a rich academic tradition where he would serve as president for 35 years. He became president at age 35 in 1952 and served until 1987, when he retired to be the president-emeritus. During his tenure enrollment, faculty, and degrees awarded doubled. He also increased endowment from $9 million to $350 million, thus allowing for continued growth in infrastructure and staff.

Hesburgh was a religious progressive not only in academic thought, but socially. As O’Brien pointed out,

He preferred reform to revolution…in the 1960s he argued, the great civil rights laws reformed U.S. apartheid…even if one has reservations at times about the profundity and accuracy of his analysis, and the sincerity and level of his achievement are impressive. Here is a man who illustrates the continuing value of commitment, openness, civility, readiness to serve, and profound humane integrity. (O’Brien, 1998, p. 147)

Open-minded in his approach to academic administration, Hesburgh oversaw the transfer of institutional control at Notre Dame to lay governance. Working under the auspices of the Congregation of Holy Cross, he was able to convince them “that the principal commitment of the order was the sanctification of people in the Church and not in the administration of educational
institutions” (O’Brien, 1998, p. 97). Hesburgh, even though administrative control would fall to lay governance, fought hard to keep a priest from the Holy Cross community as president of Notre Dame. This was due in part to the fear that “Notre Dame might otherwise slide toward secularization” (O’Brien, 1998, p. 97). Ever mindful of the religious duties of the university, Hesburgh maintained a model based on Harvard University where a smaller board of fellows and the board of trustees were an evenly divided group of laymen and academics. In Notre Dame’s case these academics would be priests.

Hesburgh was able to procure large donations through the Ford Foundation to the university in the early 1960s. This created a turning point for the administration and mission of Notre Dame. His tenure on the National Science Board had changed his view on Catholic parochialism. Hesburgh was concerned about the ossification of Catholicism in education. He stated that “the task for the Catholic higher learning will not be done if our philosophers and theologians continue to live among, work with, and speak to people and problems long since dead and buried” (O’Brien, 1998, p. 92). He wanted a balance between the humanities and sciences and stated, “Personally I have no ambition to be a medieval man. It is futile for a Catholic university in the second half of the twentieth century in the United States of America to point with pride to the lively intellectuality and critical vitality of the Catholic University of Paris in medieval France. Let the dead bury their dead” (O’Brien, 1998, p. 93). This was a controversial statement for the time, but reflected his leadership and vision for the future of the institution and how it must change to be relevant for the future. One of his most oft quoted sayings related to this was “The task of the prophet is to make comfortable people uncomfortable” (O’Brien, 1998, p. 92). Hesburgh was ever mindful of change and the need to be prepared to address it.
For all of the progressiveness displayed by Hesburgh, the one area that he could not seem to make headway with was an increase in minority student attendance. In May 1966, the university had only 65 African-American students, not many more than The University of Alabama. Hesburgh used this situation as an opportunity to help bridge the gap between the need to increase minority enrollment and to cement the legend of Notre Dame football. Notre Dame had a tradition of not playing in a college bowl game at the end of its season. The last bowl game it had participated in was on January 1, 1925, when Notre Dame defeated Stanford in the Rose Bowl. The 40 year hiatus was about to end as Hesburgh saw an opportunity to fund minority scholarships through bowl game revenue. Beginning “in 1970 the university broke its tradition of not participating in post-season bowl games and permitted the football team to face Texas in the Cotton Bowl. The university invested the proceeds of $300,000 from the game in minority scholarships” (O’Brien, 1998, p. 117). This was met with resistance by many and his critics argued that admitting academically unqualified blacks would lead to militant student groups and protests on campus. But this never occurred and he continued to champion the cause of minority enrollment. In addition, the advent of the Notre Dame Bowl era would allow the university to lay claim to more national championships. This in turn would strengthen the bottom line for the university. The contributions of Hesburgh continue to this day and shed a great deal of light on his ability to be use athletics for racially progressive purposes while remaining true to the university’s religious convictions. On both accounts he was highly successful.

Like Hesburgh, Rose’s service as a minister influenced his thinking as a university president. A book on a Methodist religious leader who was a private southern university president, F. Stuart Gulley’s (2001) biography of Emory University president James T. Laney, allows for comparison. In Gulley’s book, The Academic President as Moral Leader – James T. 
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Laney at Emory University, we are introduced to an academician, theologian, and administrator who led by a moral compass basing his decisions on a servant-leader model of placing the needs of the student first and framing it from an ethical perspective. Laney was southern by birth and grew up in Arkansas and Memphis during the Great Depression. An excellent student, he attended Yale University where he majored in economics. His development as an administrator, theologian, and academician came by happenstance when he entered the military intelligence branch of the U.S. Army in the late 1940s. He would later say that his tour in Korea impacted his worldview and upon his return to Yale in 1950, he chose to pursue a career in the ministry. As Gulley noted,

Laney would go on to become a four-time graduate of Yale University. His experience there, especially as an undergraduate and divinity student, impressed upon him the value of a liberal arts education. Based on his Yale experience, Laney believed that through the reading of history, English, religion, and sociology, students are introduced to those ideas that shake us, and reformulate us, and help us to become properly free, so that we may re-appropriate our own pasts with a sense of power and passion. (Gulley, 2001, p. 53)

Laney, at age 42, became the Dean of Emory’s Candler School of Theology where he served from 1969 to 1977. He then became the 17th president of Emory University until his retirement in 1993.

Laney’s belief in a liberal arts education proved important for Emory as it helped frame his role of a university leader. Gulley (2001) stated,

Laney more than any other research university president of his era believed that an academic president was fundamentally a moral leader. The moral authority of the president, for Laney, derived from the fact that a liberal arts education in and of itself was a moral endeavor. Thus, for Laney, the president was to demonstrate those qualities of moral leadership that would have a leavening effect throughout the institution. (Gulley, 2001, p. 2)

Another important aspect of Laney was his fundraising ability as an administrator. In this role, he was able to transform Emory into a top tier research university where “endowment grew by 1000
percent from $178 million to $1.76 billion; college student enrollment increased to 7,700 from 3,760; faculty appointments increased 67 percent; and new buildings were erected…adding 2.6 million square feet” (Gulley, 2001, p. 3).

In comparing and contrasting Laney with Rose, there are many similarities to be noted. Both were highly spiritual men; both possessed political savvy, excellent communication skills and were accomplished fundraisers; most importantly they both exhibited the ability to develop followership. With Laney, this was accomplished through his vision, a tolerance for ambiguity, and the development of teamwork. The provost at Emory once said of Laney that “perhaps his greatest contribution was to help us see in Emory the possibilities of greatness, to raise our expectations of ourselves, and to set a higher standard of hope and achievement” (Gulley, 2001, p. 202). There are parallels between Laney and Rose that help explain leadership styles and how successful people create successful situations. Laney and Rose understood the power of politics from an individual and legislative level. Both of these men realized that gaining the buy-in of university stakeholders was important to accomplishing their goals and how the power of alumni inclusion helps create pride in a university campus. Finally, both men were grounded in their moral philosophy as developed from their time in seminary. As Laney once said, “a president ought to know enough of what they are doing, in terms of their leadership, to educate” (Gulley, 2001, p. 203). Laney is one of the best examples of a successful university president who relied on his moral and ethical authority to accomplish the goals set forth for the academic institution. Laney possessed a keen awareness of how to interact positively with all he encountered while remaining resolute and firm in his convictions and vision. Rose and Laney shared many attributes of leadership that allowed them to both be very successful at their respective institutions.
Comparing Rose with all these administrators, only Friday at North Carolina seems superior in his leadership. His tenure and outcomes at UNC are testament to his abilities as an outstanding administrator. Rose seemed to be a good bit like Hesburgh and Laney. These leaders possessed many like traits – ministerial, politician, diplomat, negotiator, energetic, pragmatic, progressive, transformative, and moral leadership. Rose was less academically oriented than Laney, though on a par academically with Hesburgh. The similarity in both cases lies in the religious background and the leadership ability exhibited.

Rose, Hesburgh, and Laney all had to deal with issues that allowed them to use their ability as moral leaders to better serve their institutions. Rose and Hesburgh had to deal with the power of athletics, specifically football. Both realized how football could improve their university financially and racially. Both men were trained theologians and this provided a foundation for their moral leadership. Rose and Laney were both southerners who understood the region. Laney was also a seminary graduate who shared many traits with Rose. Both men were champions of a liberal arts education. They were excellent communicators and negotiators who understood politics. They also were strong in their ethical values and this served them well as leaders. Hesburgh, Laney, and Rose understood the strength that spiritual or moral leadership brought to their campuses. They leveraged this type of leadership to make positive transformations for their institutions.

Rose had leadership skills that allowed him to effectively communicate his ideas with others. This ability to communicate and his adeptness at politics helped separate him from administrators like Williams and Aderhold. Williams and Aderhold were beholden to the politicians of their state when confronted with desegregation. Their inability to provide sound leadership with clear directives resulted in violence. Neither had the communication or
negotiation skills to deal with the politicians who intervened during desegregation. Rose by comparison had to deal with a much more aggressive governor, but did so using stealth to maintain peace while creating a positive image of The University of Alabama. This demonstrated Rose’s leadership in dealing with problematic issues.

Section II - Leadership Theory

The leadership of Frank A. Rose comprises an overarching focus of his presidency and how it shaped his activities. I will list it here as a thematic element due to the fact that the previous president, Oliver Carmichael, was seen as lacking in the attribute of administrative leadership, according to Clark (1993). Rose possessed keen understanding of leadership that helps explain why he was hired and his ensuing success (Stevenson, 1981). To better understand the leadership of Frank Rose it is necessary to review the study of leadership and how some of these elements applied. Jeffrey Barrow (1977) created a social systems model of leadership where personal characteristics of the leader are identified under three headings – personal characteristics, environmental factors, and leader behavior (Bess & Dee, 2008). Barrow placed personal characteristics under a concept known as “trait theory.” This theory “views leadership as characteristic of the person. It seeks to identify personal qualities of leaders. Are they for example, taller? Braver? More caring?” (p. 835). Rose was a tall, handsome man who dressed for the role of a leader. His ministerial background also supported a caring and sincere persona.

Trait theory has been explored by several academicians: Bird (1940), Stodgill (1974), Ghiselli (1971), and Kilpatrick and Locke (1991). One study of note is that of McClelland and Boyatzis (1982) who narrowed their focus on the leadership traits most important to influence and success in an organization. They defined these “as essential: 1) desire to be influential, power motivation; 2) social skills; 3) task orientation….initiative and emphasis for achieving
goals; and 4) self-confidence” (p. 738). He was young and ambitious. He had a strong desire to climb the social ladder. He possessed strong interpersonal skills that enabled him to manipulate situations to his advantage. Rose’s political savvy provided him with a sense of self-confidence that enabled him to move from various stakeholder groups with ease. However, effective leadership cannot solely be defined by trait theory. Interactional skills allow the leader to balance effectiveness in ideographic orientation. Another important element related to trait theory is the definition of transactional, transformational, and transcendental leadership, or the Three T’s, that take into account the traits or values of the leader and they wish to engage their vision with subordinates. These will help define how Rose accomplished the tasks he encountered. I will address the “Three T’s in Section IV of this chapter.

Barrow also espoused the importance of leadership defined through behavior, interaction, and effectiveness. Behaviors come into play when a leader “does something to influence a group or organization to which they belong” Interaction results from the leaders’ “interaction of person and environment” and how they react to the situation. Effectiveness is the leaders approach to the group and how they deal with the “situation to produce some desired change or to sustain the status quo” (Bess & Dee, p. 837). Rose possessed all three of these traits and applied them in his presidencies at Transylvania and Alabama.

Rost (1991) placed a great deal of success on leaders who have great initiative and imagination. He integrated five theories of leadership and summarized them as follows: “Leadership produces excellent organizations because leaders are great executive who have certain traits (high energy, trustworthy, sincere) that help them choose the correct behaviors (positioning, manipulation, empowerment) so that they do the right thing in key situations dissatisfaction, volatility, lower morale) by facilitating the work group democratically and
forcefully” (p. 18-19). Rose possessed these traits that enabled him to make positive change in volatile times as a university president. But these same traits have the ability to raise unrealistic expectations of the leader which can lead to distrust as outlined by Murphy (2000, p. 118). I will argue that this appeared to happen to Rose later in his presidency as Alabama as more faculty viewed him as imperial in nature.

The foundational elements of Rose’s leadership came from the two great passions in his life: his work as a Disciples of Christ minister and his affiliation with K.A. Order, which will be explored in later chapters. Rose’s strength as a leader was due to his political astuteness, charisma, and interpersonal skills that had been honed within these organizations. In his role as a minister, Rose had become an exceptional communicator who was able to deliver his vision of change in a manner that was understood by many stakeholders. He was able to listen to constituents, assess their needs, and develop a plan to best address these. House (1999) addressed the qualities of charisma by noting these leaders “are said to be endowed with a quality of personality and a set of behaviors that induce followers to endorse the leader’s wisdom, power, and influence” (p. 564). Rose was viewed as charismatic and followers of such leaders show a shared commitment to goals, values, and a willingness to work for the collective good of the organization. These foundational elements are important, but Rose’s success was also due to his political skills. It is important that these skills be examined to help better define the influence Rose possessed in higher education.

Mintzberg (1985) noted that organizations are inherently political arenas. While diligent work and intelligence are key factors in career success, factors such as political astuteness and positioning are important. In 1983, Mintzberg suggested that political astuteness was the ability of an individual to influence through persuasion, manipulation, and negotiation. In order to better
understand political skill in the organizational setting, academicians define this as “the ability to effectively understand others at work, and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal and/or organizational objectives” (Ahearn, Ferris, Hochwarter, Douglas, & Ammeter, 2004, p. 311). People who are politically astute maintain an aura of self-confidence and personal attractiveness that gives others a sense of comfort. As Ferris et al. (2005) pointed out,

This self-confidence never goes too far so as to be perceived as arrogance but is always properly measured to be a positive attribute. Therefore, although self-confident, those high in political skill are not self-absorbed (although they are self-aware) because their focus is outward toward others, not inward and self-centered. This allows politically skilled individuals to maintain proper balance and perspective, and also, along with their tendency to be conscientious, to ensure that they keep a healthy gauge on their accountability to both others and themselves. (p. 128)

Administrators who are adept politically can negotiate varied social situations “in a manner that disguises any ulterior, self-serving motives and appears to be sincere” (p. 128).

To understand the effectiveness of Rose’s political leadership, it is necessary to describe the attributes that constituted this political skill. There are four key dimensions that describe political skill in an organization as outlined by Ferris et al. (2005). These include social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability and apparent sincerity (p. 129). Pfeffer (1992) referred to social astuteness as a political skill where individuals easily comprehend social interactions and accurately interpret the behavior of all involved. He described this characteristic as “sensitivity to others,” and argued, “it is this capacity to identify with others that is actually critical in obtaining things for oneself” (p.173). The second attribute of interpersonal influence is a trait possessed by people “capable of appropriately adapting and calibrating their behavior to each situation in order to elicit particular responses from others” (Ferris, 2005, p. 129). Pfeffer (1992) referred to this as “flexibility,” where people adapt their behavior
Networking ability is the third attribute of political skill. Their style is subtle and not bombastic, which allows them to easily build strong relationships and alliances with stakeholders. Networking savvy allows these leaders to be well situated “in order to both create and take advantage of opportunities. They are masters of the quid pro quo, highly skilled negotiators, and adept at conflict management (Pfeffer, 1992, p. 175).

The first three attributes of political skill are important. But they are meaningless if they are not perceived with apparent sincerity. Politically astute leaders who display apparent sincerity are known for their integrity, authenticity, sincerity, and genuineness. “They are, or appear to be, honest, open, and forthright. This dimension of political skill strikes at the very heart of whether influence attempts will be successful because it focuses on the perceived intentions of the behavior exhibited” (Ferris, 2005, p. 129). As noted by Jones (1990), the art of influence is successful only when it is perceived as possessing no ulterior motives. These leaders inspire trust and confidence in those they work with and do not use manipulation or coercion to get their way (p. 18). Rose’s background included leadership positions in high school, debate, fraternity, ministry, secondary education, and higher education. Each of these experiences had an effect on the attributes of political astuteness and interpersonal skills that would serve him well as a university administrator. Not to be overlooked is the fact that Rose was a highly ambitious man who used these skills to better his situation in society.

As an overarching theme, leadership has many foundational elements that are inherent to success. Vision applies to the overall direction and mission of the university. Rose came to The University of Alabama on the heels of an unsuccessful attempt to desegregate the campus in 1956. Carmichael, the previous president of the university, “was uncertain of his authority and
seemed to drift. He failed to devise any plan” to address the problems facing UA (Clark, 1993, p. 128). The university was lacking any clear goals and the morale of faculty members was very low. Faculty members were disenchanted with the leadership and began to leave for positions at other institutions of higher learning in the East and North. As noted in an institutional self-study for Carmichael,

“The faculty…feel somewhat frustrated because they would like to be of help to you but do not know quite how. I think it is not only important to keep them informed of what is going on (with regard to desegregation) but more particularly to tell them what you would like them to do. I believe they would welcome such guidance” (Clark, 1993, p. 129).

The institutional deficiency in leadership, lack of a strong strategic mission, and low faculty morale were some of the reasons for the exodus of faculty members. It became Rose’s task to address these issues immediately to create positive momentum for the university and to show there was a vision for the future (Clark, 1993). The question to be answered here is how did Rose’s leadership abilities shape his overall vision for the university? Fairhurst and Starr (1996) and Neumann (1995) explained that college leaders are judged by what they say and do on campus. Campus constituents come to their own conclusions about what is going on based on how presidents communicate their vision and plans. Leaders, then, must have the ability to frame information on their campuses as well as the ability to frame how constituents make meaning of that information. Vision in the case of Rose was the strategic mission or route that was planned out for the university over a period of time. It is an incremental approach to addressing the needs of the university in order to accomplish and exceed the mission of the university. The concerns that faced The University of Alabama in the late 1950s required someone with high energy and communication skills to unite the campus stakeholders toward a common goal. Vision was an
exceedingly important element in the selection of the new president, but the person chosen needed strong leadership skills as well.

One example of leadership skills needed as a university administrator was evidenced by Frank McVey of the University of Kentucky. In 1939, he drafted a document titled *The Sort of Man Needed for a University President*. This listed the several essential and very desirable leadership qualities that the president must possess. He went further by explaining “what the President must be able to do if at all successful” included the following:

1. He must retain the confidence of the faculty; 2. He must be able to win and retain the regard of the students and work with them without undue friction; 3. He must gain and retain the confidence of the Trustees; 4. He must win some kind of respectable standing with the alumni which will hold even if the athletic teams are not so good; and 5. He should gradually gain the confidence of the people of the state. (McVey, 1939, p. 282)

In 1963, Clark Kerr at the University of California-Berkeley expressed his own qualities when discussing the university president by stating he “is a many-faced character, in the sense that he must face in many directions at once while contriving to turn his back on no important group” (Kerr, 1963, p. 22). In his book *The Uses of the University*, he pointed out what a university president should be:

The university president in the United States is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of the arts and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of a church. (Kerr, 1963, p. 22)

It is important to note the leadership qualities cited by McVey and Kerr. They explain the necessity of a college president to be adept at many things in order to address the myriad of issues faced by a university president. When Frank Rose arrived, there was a great amount of
uncertainty. Uncertain times are periods where leadership is tested and opportunities are presented to assist stakeholders in making sense of future directives and linking them to past experiences (Senge, 1990; Weick, 1995). Both Transylvania College, where Rose had served as president prior to coming to Alabama, and The University of Alabama had experienced a period of decline. It was incumbent upon Rose to make an immediate positive impression to help shape the future of the campuses. Simrich and Morgan (1982) argued that “the actions and utterances of leaders frame and shape the context of action in such a way that the members of that context are able to use the meaning thus created as a point of reference for their own action and understanding of the situation” (p. 261). Such was the case with Rose and his initial actions as president at Transylvania. He had worked in the shadow of McVey’s University of Kentucky and became friends with the legendary basketball coach Adolph Rupp, whom McVey had hired. This allowed Rose to understand the importance of athletic pride to a university. Athletic achievement to an institution is symbolic but important. Symbols and stories help to frame and communicate a message (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Frost & Morgan, 1983). These symbols can be communicated in a myriad of ways, but most notably through the alumni and what they care about most. Addressing their concerns helps to create followership and gain acceptance from various university stakeholders.

In April of 1958, Rose delivered his inaugural address to the university, using the opportunity to frame his vision for the future and inspire those who would benefit from it. He quoted Pericles’ *Funeral Oration* by pressing for a high devotion to the state:

"Fix your eyes on the greatness of your country as you have it before you from day to day, fall in love with her, and when you feel her great, remember that her greatness was won by men of courage, with knowledge of her duty, and with a sense of honor in action, who, if they failed in any ordeal, disdained to deprive the city of their services but sacrificed their lives as the best offerings on her behalf. (Rose, 1958, p. 5)"
Rose felt clearly articulated goals for the university would create successful leadership. In a university setting, a challenge to the students, faculty, alumni, and others to strive for greatness in all endeavors helps to shape expectations. In his inaugural address at Alabama, Rose outlined the primary responsibilities of a university president are to fulfill three main objectives. These include the following. First, there must be a definition of its academic purposes and the freedom to achieve the set goals in a timely and effective manner. Second, he made sure to stress the importance of quality teaching and retaining faculty by never allowing them to deteriorate through false economy and lack of funds. Third, he emphasized that the university must strive for excellence in everything it does with a special challenge toward the student (Rose, 1958). As a leader it is imperative that all university students “must be shown the full sweep of life and the possibilities which are his; he must be inspired by association with the best, he must be confronted, in the words of Whitehead, with a habitual vision of greatness” (Rose, 1958, p. 8).

The pursuit of greatness was not limited to academics. Rose had developed a strong identification with college athletics while in Lexington. When he was “accused of stressing sports over scholarship, he replied simply, character is not built by a losing team” (Flint, 1991, p. 12). Another comment on his vision came from his friend Bernie Shively, who served in the administration at the University of Kentucky. Upon hearing of Rose’s hiring at Alabama, Shively commented, “He will make things hum, academically, and also in athletics. Watch Alabama snap out of it now” (Ruby, 1957). Birnbaum (1988) argued that when leadership changes occur, there are opportunities for administrators to create new visions through change initiatives.

At the time of Rose’s hiring, The University of Alabama was still recovering from a failed attempt at desegregation and low faculty morale. Rose understood the need to create new visions and make quick decisions based on a solid analysis of the issues confronting him. Once
the athletic issue was addressed, he could move on toward the faculty and infrastructure issues. Common sense was the key as Weick (1995) made clear, “sensemaking begins with the sensemaker” (p. 18). Prior to his presidency at Alabama, Rose had encountered a like situation at Transylvania College. The college was in poor shape financially, suffered from low morale and poor retention from faculty and students, and had a moribund athletic tradition. Rose understood the need to build up morale within the faculty and increase salaries. He also understood the need to build better facilities and improve the research and teaching venues. To make immediate inroads, he had to clearly identify the vision for the university and its stakeholders. Clarity of mission is the “key to effectively framing and communicating information in the alignment of message to messenger; there is no ‘right” way to communicate or lead” (Eddy, 2010, p. 319). But the vision must be clear and Robert Maynard Hutchins (1936) pointed out that a “university needs a purpose, a vision of the end and the president must identify it. For without vision there is aimlessness” (Hutchins, 1956, p. 177).

To his benefit, Rose possessed many of these talents and was an exceptionally strong communicator. He used his talents as a speaker to align his vision and message to gain buy-in from the staff. He also understood that the political climate was changing and that desegregation of the university was on the horizon. Because of initial actions taken when he became president, the university community held him in high esteem. Rose was able to give “clear signals to trustees, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and supporters that desegregation was coming and that the university must prepare for it. The same man who could boast to Governor George Wallace about steps to delay desegregation enlisted the university community in plans to prepare” (Clark, 2007, p. 170). Rose’s style and communication skills were central to his vision for the university. But they were supported by action and creating followership.
Daniels and Daniels (2005) pointed out the relationship of leadership and followership by saying “If power resides in the follower, then effective leaders must first learn what matters to their followers” (p. 12). A strong leader knows not to impose views on the group as a whole; rather, a leader examines the landscape to determine what is of the most importance to all constituents. Followers cannot rally around an issue if they feel there is no threat or need for change. Leaders “connect the values, aspirations, or frustrations of the individuals to the leader’s own vision” (Daniels & Daniels, 2005, p. 12). As Culpepper Clark (1993) pointed out,

Rose was good for the university in many ways. His eventual length of tenure alone provided continuity. In the twenty years since Dr. George Denny, there had been four presidents and three interim appointments. No one had held office for more than five years. Rose’s ability to raise money and to ride a crest of post-Sputnik dollars improved facilities and salaries. He was popular and a much sought speaker. (p. 152)

Looking at the dynamics of leadership through social attribution where people cognitively connect actions, outcomes, and causes as determinants of leadership, the question can be asked if Rose was truly an effective leader. Or was he a great communicator and politician? As Birnbaum (1988) noted on social attribution:

The tendency of campus constituents is to assign to a president the responsibility for unusual institutional outcomes because the administrator fills the role identified as that of a leader...because presidents are very visible and prominent, because presidents spend a great deal of time doing leader like things (such as ceremonial and symbolic activities), and because we (stakeholders) all have the need to believe in the effectiveness of individual control. Leaders, then, are people believed by followers to have caused events. (p. 26-27)

While Rose may have inherited the issues he faced at the university, he had the sagacity and vision to link together goals with tradition. He was intuitive in understanding the right words to say and when to say them, thus rallying people to the university’s goals.

The popular assumption is that the desegregation of The University of Alabama in 1963 was Rose’s legacy. His administrative skill in maneuvering through the political landscape of the
civil rights era was the one element of his tenure that has been investigated in detail. However, Rose possessed many attributes that enabled him to be an effective leader in many areas. Rose came to the university after service as the youngest college president in the United States. He possessed no earned master’s or doctoral degree. The Board of Trustees hastily arranged for an honorary Litt.D. in order to accentuate his authority on campus and with the public. He was hired to begin January 1, 1958, but actually began his work in October of 1957. He was noted for his abilities as an administrator that would be crucial to the desegregation problem. As Wright (1975) noted at Transylvania,

Rose had strengthened the academic program, completed a new library and gymnasium-auditorium, paved the way for the construction of a new girl’s dormitory, established good working relationships with the Disciples churches and brought the College to a new recognition in the eyes of the public. By a well-publicized and reasonably successful development program, he had substantially reduced the College’s indebtedness and raised its credit rating. He had turned the tide of the College’s fortunes and placed it on a path of growing strength and confidence. (p. 406)

Rose would need all of his leadership strengths to address the desegregation issue. The politics of race ruled the day and with the emergence of Governor George C. Wallace, Rose had to move carefully in addressing the admission of black students. He had been a friend of Attorney General Robert Kennedy since 1954 when the U.S. Chamber of Commerce had named the two to the Top 10 Young Men of the Year. He intuitively knew the showdown on desegregation was between Governor Wallace and the federal government. He worked to keep the university peaceful during desegregation by working through back channels with Attorney General Robert Kennedy all while keeping a cool demeanor in the face of possible conflict. As Clark (1993) pointed out, “No one doubted Frank Rose’s leadership at that moment” (p. 207).

The Alabama Academy of Honor Archives (1969) stated that “Dr. Rose…addressed the major divisive issue of integration in 1963.” He did so in a diplomatic manner that brought no
violence to campus and allowed for the admission of the first black students. Ever mindful of the overall teaching mission for the university, Rose (1964b) addressed the Board of Trustees: “This year has been a year in which the University has been confronted with serious challenges and fruitful opportunities for progress. I am happy to say that the University has met its problems with calm and dignity, and that it has continued to take advantage of all available opportunities to press forward toward the goal of academic excellence” (p. 1). This is important to note because he is still mainly viewed through the lens of desegregation. Rose’s influence on The University of Alabama went much deeper than this and it is rarely discussed in assessing his overall successes as an administrator. His desire was to press forward with the issues that faced the university’s long-term viability. This included improving infrastructure, faculty salaries, student enrollment, academic reputation, and pride in the athletic programs. Rose was always cognizant of the politics of any situation and placed an emphasis on stakeholder buy-in to increase the image of The University of Alabama on the national stage. Rose’s genius was the ability to anticipate the future. He addressed the needs of athletics, integration, faculty development, and infrastructure improvements during a most difficult time. His speaking ability and vision rallied people to the university cause and his drive for the pursuit of research was paramount to the turnaround of the university financially. It should be noted, “The president is something of a strait through which all activities must be sluiced; is an essential ingredient in the bureaucracy, and when he is out-of-pocket or ineffective…the institution will suffer” (Ray, 1970, p. 125). In the case of Rose, his vision and demeanor helped create the success he encountered at Transylvania College and The University of Alabama as he rallied stakeholders to the needs of the institutions.
Section III – Historical Research Methods

The methodology for this dissertation is historical research. Berg and Lune (2012) have described this type of research as “attempts to systematically recapture the complex nuances, the people, meanings, event, and even ideas of the past that have influenced and shaped the present” (p. 305). Only through an understanding of Rose’s past can we develop a complete picture of what events helped define his leadership skills. In the Preface, I have provided a brief overview of his early life. In later chapters, I explore in detail his leadership at The University of Alabama. This was accomplished through a chronological review of events that helped his development as a successful college administrator and theologian. Data from which this information was gathered include primary and secondary sources of information. Primary sources included such information as archival material located in university and private libraries. Archival sources included but were not limited to personal written documents, public records, board meeting minutes, personal correspondence, journals, and recordings. These included eyewitness accounts and oral histories of those familiar with the work of Rose. I worked with the H.S. Poole Special Collections Library at The University of Alabama, Bryant Museum Archives, Archives of the University of Kentucky and Transylvania University, Omicron Delta Kappa Archives, K.A. Order Archives, Meridian, Mississippi Library, and other archives as discovered. I utilized these sources of information to develop an understanding of Rose’s leadership style and the issues he confronted that helped direct his decision-making.

Secondary sources analyze, review, or summarize information in primary resources or other secondary resources. Even sources presenting facts or descriptions about events are secondary unless they are based on direct participation or observation. Moreover, secondary sources often rely on other secondary sources and standard disciplinary methods to reach results,
and they provide the principle sources of analysis about primary sources (http://www.lib.vt.edu/help/research/primary-secondary-tertiary.html). Secondary sources related to this research included the views of scholars and contemporaries on Rose. Several of these were published academic works found mostly in educational journals, essays in edited collections, and research monographs. These were used to provide context to Rose’s leadership to assist in framing my research. Textbooks, newspapers, journals, biographies, and recordings were all used. Among the newspapers included were The Crimson White (UA Student Newspaper), The Rambler (Transylvania Student Newspaper), Louisville Courier-Journal, Lexington Herald, Birmingham News, Birmingham Post-Herald, Tuscaloosa News, Meridian Star, and the New York Times.

Sources were synthesized to build a complete picture of Rose’s life and leadership style. An analysis of historical data relative to his life through these sources was utilized to help tell his story in terms of leadership themes that emerge. I reviewed as many sources as possible in order to complete an all-encompassing view of his life and how these secondary sources support the findings of his leadership style, based on archival research, library research, secondary sources, and literary reviews in the field of leadership studies.

**Section IV - Theoretical Framework**

Theoretical frameworks provide a particular lens by which a topic can be reviewed. Understanding that this is a historical study, I realize that a theoretical framework is not absolutely necessary. However, leadership theory can assist in analyzing a study by focusing on the leadership aspects that are most applicable to Rose. The theoretical frameworks that I reviewed centered on the style concept of leadership. One of the most important of these is the “Three T’s Framework” that addresses the elements of transactional, transformational, and
transcendental leadership as researched by Jeffrey Zacko-Smith (2008). Each of these elements of leadership is based on a foundational aspect of one building on the attributes of the one before it. At the foundational level comes transactional leadership that can best be described as a rewards system for productivity. In other words, participants are rewarded in some form for the leadership contributions provided. Another component is transformational leadership, where the communication of leadership is done in a relational context. The leader develops strong bonds with stakeholders that are based on empowerment of those involved in the decision-making process. Last is the transcendent leadership form. This leadership style transcends the direct methodology of leaders influencing those with whom they interact (students, faculty members, alumni) and takes it into the realm of all they may encounter—directly or indirectly. Within this framework, the transformational leadership style best exemplifies the work and actions of Rose.

The theory of transformational leadership was originally initiated by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). The theoretical framework notes that a transformational leader has enhanced followership and performance from those who work with the leader. The transformational leader has a charismatic quality that inspires and motivates those they lead. Leaders are noted for their ability to communicate clearly resulting in increased motivation for their subordinates. They have a clear vision of their goals, powerful influence over stakeholders, use symbolic actions to push for their needs, and empower those they lead. All of these traits were displayed by Rose.

To further expand this notion of transformational leadership, Greenleaf (1977) is noted for developing the theory of servant leadership. “The focus of servant leadership is on others rather than upon self, and on an understanding of the role of the leader as a servant” (p. 15). Servant-leader is a relatively new term that in the past would have been applied to the moral or ethical leader. A Christian trained seminarian would ostensibly be thought to be trained for moral
leadership. For purposes of this study, moral and ethical leadership seem to apply to Rose. Moral leadership is very much like transformational leadership in that it is vision oriented and is based on trust from followers within the organization. Moral leaders share such traits as influence, vision, trust, and delegation. The difference in the two would be that transformational leaders look to gain support from followers for “organizational” objectives. The moral leader is as interested in service to and from their constituents as in organizational objectives. In short, moral leadership could be said to be a subset of transformational leadership. The term servant-leader did not find its way into the Christian community until the late 1970s after the research of Greenleaf (1991). From a Christian perspective,

Inherent in the phrase servant-leadership is an understanding that presents the words as connected, with equal weight. Put this way, servant-leadership is a culture-shaping belief that invites relationships, community, interdependence, caring, and risk-taking. It creates environments unfettered by rigid formal structures, distributing power, authority, and accountability. Servant-leadership is more than just an attitude… it is a pervasive mindset that guides one in terms of how they live all aspects of their lives, regardless of whether or not they are in a formal leadership role. (Geddert, James, & Toews, 2006, para. 7)

In researching Rose, the emphasis was on his leadership as an administrator. This emphasis took into context the issues he faced in each of his leadership positions and how he successfully navigated through the complex issues he faced. His successes as a leader at The University of Alabama were the successful desegregation of the university, improving the infrastructure of the campus, increasing faculty size and salaries, increasing research dollars and endowment, and addressing the ineffective athletic department, specifically football.

Conclusion

In providing some examples in higher education from the era of desegregation in the Deep South, I can see that institutions of higher learning approached this phenomenon from different perspectives. Most notable was the influence of political power, either through the state
government, the board of trustees, or a combination of both. In a few cases, the influence of moral and ethical leaders overcame the obstacles their institutions faced. I have examined leadership styles from southern flagship universities to private institutions. The influence of politics and the leadership of the president in reacting to politics helped to shape the decision-making process. It was also true with Rose and how he adapted to changes. However, the decision-making process of each leader was different and some were able to make informed, patient, and thoughtful decisions that brought growth and prosperity to their respective campuses. Others created hostilities negatively impacting their institution and its reputation. The review of leadership theory will be consulted as I explain the positive attributes that Rose brought to The University of Alabama. These in turn can be examined to help explain how he was able to create such dynamic growth in an eleven-year period, culminating with the birth of the modern University of Alabama. In the chapters to follow, I will review several significant periods of Rose’s life. They include an introduction to his early life, his time as a student and administrator at Transylvania College, his affiliation with the Disciples of Christ Church, his membership with K.A. Order, his tenure as president at The University of Alabama, and post-presidential positions.
CHAPTER II:
FRANK ANTHONY ROSE

During Rose’s tenure of twelve years as the chief administrator of The University of Alabama, he made strides in redressing many negative issues that impacted the institution’s success. Upon his arrival at The University of Alabama, Rose confronted deficiencies in institutional vision, finance, infrastructure, faculty, and athletics. These issues needed Rose’s attention due to the previous administration of Oliver Carmichael, particularly Carmichael’s inability to handle the issue of desegregation in 1956. Carmichael had either not foreseen or willfully neglected the problems that arose from desegregation. It was noted that he was not on campus at the time of desegregation and had not prepared a plan for dealing with violence that might arise from it. In addition, the rich athletic football tradition of The University of Alabama was at low ebb. All of these issues combined to create lower morale among faculty members, alumni, and administrators. Therefore, Rose immediately had to address these issues through decisive leadership in order to create an environment of positive change. The timing of his arrival in Tuscaloosa cannot be underestimated. While he was instrumental in the desegregation of The University of Alabama, his leadership in rebuilding the Capstone (another name for The University of Alabama) into a modern university is often overlooked. His personal and educational background prior to his tenure at The University of Alabama sheds light on his administrative and leadership abilities.

Frank Rose was born in Meridian, Mississippi, on October 16, 1920. He was the son of Frank A. Rose and Susan Clara Cooper. His parents met in Meridian and were married there in early 1920. In addition to Frank, they had a second son, Ramon, born in 1921. Rose’s father
worked as a shoe repairman and his mother Susie was a seamstress. In October of 1930 during the first year of the Great Depression, his father passed away at the age of 33 when Frank was just nine years old. He and his brother grew up with their mother working odd jobs to make a living for the family. Their father had left them with debt and a home that was in a bad state of repair. Frank’s mother was left with sole guardianship of Frank and Ramon and worked a number of jobs to make ends meet. Life was not easy for the family and “early on he picked cotton at 50 cents a day and later plowed fields and drove soft-drink trucks to earn money” (Flint, 1991, p. 12). He was a highly energetic young man who worked hard to assist his family as best he could. His energy would be one of his great attributes in his career and later life.

His mother was studious but only attained a high school education. She was involved in the local community, often writing scripts for local community musicals and historical galas. Rose was intellectually driven and excelled as a student. His enthusiasm for knowledge was noticed by all, including his church congregation and school teachers, who worked to assist him in his educational goals. On Sunday, April 2, 1939, Frank Rose, who was “president of the senior class of the Meridian High School, volunteered for the Christian ministry” and was consecrated by Reverend D.H. Griffin and assisted by the elders of the First Christian Church (Church will celebrate, 1939, p. 1). He was always quick to give credit to his Church leaders and teachers in Meridian for his success.

In 1966, he was asked during his tenure as president of The University of Alabama about the teacher that had the greatest influence on his life. In response he penned a short commentary called The Teacher I Will Never Forget. He wrote,

It is always difficult to choose one person who has contributed the most to a person’s life. I was fortunate in having many good teachers – competent, dedicated and genuinely committed. I wish I had the time to write about all of them. However, there is one who remains an influence in my life to this day. Miss Mollie Bedwell taught Latin in
Meridian Junior High School and taught it in such a way that I not only gained an appreciation for the language but for the history and contributions of the Romans. She was a kind but firm teacher using all of her patience and time to see that her students did each day’s work well. She loved her students, and her subject, and she kept up through the years with most of them to congratulate them on their achievements and accomplishments. I receive a birthday card from her every October 16. In times of crises she somehow knows and continues to find the time to write a letter of encouragement. The writer of Proverbs 31:28, speaking of motherhood wrote: “And her children arise up, and call her blessed.” These words most certainly apply to this good teacher. (F. Rose 1966, p. 1)

The depth of his studies and influence of his religious beliefs are seen in this response. These were foundational elements that would help make him a successful leader and administrator.

Rose excelled as an all-around athlete in high school earning 10 letters in various sports. He was an exceptional football player at Meridian High School. He had thoughts of playing football in college; however, during a practice scrimmage, he “fractured three vertebrae in his neck and was told never to hold a football again” (Ruby, 1957, p. 13). His injury did not hold him back since he was a serious student who had decided by the age of 15 that he wanted to go into the ministry. As an all-around academic student, he was able to graduate from Meridian High School in 1939 with the highest distinction. He was active in debate where he honed his communication skills. Rose was politically active in high school. He served as the Meridian High School as senior class president, and presided over his May 1939 graduation ceremony by presenting a gift on behalf of the class to the school (Ray stadium is, 1939, p. 1). Upon graduation, Rose wanted to attend college locally and “made his first visit to the University of Alabama…seeking a college scholarship and was told none were available” (Alabama alumni raising, 1989, p. B1). He was then provided a partial scholarship by his local church congregation, the Disciples of Christ, to attend Transylvania College. Transylvania was affiliated with the Disciples of Christ (Christian Church) denomination and had as its purpose “to offer a
liberal arts education in the framework of religious and moral values” (Wright, 1975, p. 401). His personal plans were to use the opportunity in order to attend seminary after graduation.

Shortly after his high school graduation, the American Legion Department of Mississippi incorporated Magnolia Boys State on the second of May in 1939. The American Legion hoped participants would “be taught citizenship and effective participation in their country’s government through a first-hand study of governmental functions” (Magnolia boys state, 1939, p. 7). In June, Frank was invited to participate as a representative from Meridian for the first Boys State to be held in Jackson, Mississippi. Rose obviously possessed strong interpersonal skills and political astuteness as he “was nominated for governor on the federalist party ticket” (Meridian boy is, 1939, p. 1). He defeated Bradley Perry, the nationalist candidate and was elected the first Mississippi Magnolia Boys State governor. Upon his election, Rose stated,

Experience has shown that good government depends upon enlightened citizenship. That kind of citizenship must have an understanding of the basic government of the United States. Therefore, it becomes our duty if we are sincere in our work for the building of good citizenship, to work for a keener interest in government. That is what Boys’ State is doing (Meridianite is state governor, 1939, p. 1)

During the week-long conference, Rose had the opportunity to experience some of the intricacies of political leadership as well as using the interpersonal skills necessary for building consensus among constituents and stakeholders. Eighteen years later, Rose would return to speak with the Meridian Chamber of Commerce at their 1957 annual dinner just as he was about to embark on his presidency at The University of Alabama. The lessons Rose learned in the arena of politics were still relevant. As Clark Pearce, President of the Chamber of Commerce said to Rose, “you cannot imagine the impact that your inspiring message (on leadership) made on the people who had the privilege of hearing you and how much these people appreciate the super-human effort you made in order to be with us” (Pearce, 1957, p. 2).
Rose’s post-secondary education began at Transylvania College in the fall of 1939. Transylvania is located in the shadow of the University of Kentucky and is the first college west of the Allegheny Mountains and the 16th oldest in the United States. Being in a border state, the college was noted for graduates and faculty who served on both sides of the Civil War forces. Among them were Confederate General Albert Sidney Johnston, Vice President John Breckenridge, Senator Henry Clay, abolitionist Cassius Clay, Supreme Court Justice and Union officer John Marshall Harlan, and Texas founder Stephen F. Austin (http://www.transy.edu/about/history.htm). The college possessed a great heritage prior to Rose’s arrival.

Initially Rose started out as a pre-ministerial student who was very active on campus. He was also an active member of K.A. Order. It would become one of his lifelong passions as he routinely spoke at national conferences and ultimately served as the organization’s National Chairman. In addition, he was active in Lampas Circle of Omicron Delta Kappa, Student Council, Honor Council, The Crimson student newspaper, and Pi Kappa Delta forensic fraternity (Wright, 1975, p. 400). He used his time with Pi Kappa Delta to continue honing his skills as a speaker and debater. Being well organized, he also had the time to serve as a student minister to Wilmore Christian Church in Lexington where he made an immediate positive impression upon the congregation (Wright, 1975, p. 400). His energy for extracurricular activities was on display at Transylvania. He was able to balance a full class load that included summer school along with various organizational responsibilities as well as his ministerial duties. The lessons on hard work learned as a youth in depression era Mississippi proved beneficial in his success as a student. Rose was very involved with his fellow students and faculty, graduating with high distinction and an A.B. from Transylvania in August of 1942, one year ahead of schedule. He was never
called to military service during the onset of World War II, likely due to his old high school football injury. This allowed him to concentrate on his studies and future academic training.

Rose’s seminary training is keenly important. In the fall of 1942, Rose was admitted to the College of the Bible, located on the campus of Transylvania College. He immediately began work on his advanced degree in seminary studies while spending time pastoring various churches in the central Kentucky area. Articulate, charismatic, and well-versed in the Bible, Rose was able to make strong impressions everywhere he went. After four years of divinity study, he graduated in 1946 with a Bachelor of Divinity degree, writing his thesis on *The Christian Interpretation of Man*. Even though he served as a minister while in seminary, he still found the time to work full-time as an admissions officer and to teach courses in the Department of Religion and Philosophy at Transylvania (Wright, 1975, p. 400).

From 1943-46, he served as the principal of Nicholasville High School in Nicholasville, Kentucky. In 1948, Rose, at age 28, addressed two important positions of long-lasting influence. First, he was named the head minister of the Danville, Kentucky, Disciples of Christ Church, a position he would hold until 1951. Second, he took the position of Dean of Admissions at Transylvania working in this capacity until 1950. By handling both jobs, he showed the propensity to be organized and multi-task, skills necessary for a successful administrator and leader. His abilities did not go unnoticed by Transylvania President Raymond McLain who would later positively remark about Rose’s leadership skills. In early 1951, the college awarded him a sabbatical to enter the University of London to concentrate on graduate studies in philosophy and economics. He did not complete a degree, but was called back in late 1951 by his alma mater as the new president of Transylvania College.
From 1939 to 1951, Raymond McLain had served as the president of Transylvania College. Though he was a dynamic leader for over 11 years, the college had been struggling financially and there was a need to immediately address the fiscal situation. It is not known if McLain left of his own volition, but in June of 1951, he submitted his resignation so he could take on the role of Executive Director for the Commission on Higher Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ, an educational cooperative for the Christian Church. Before his departure, he recommended that the new president “should be a churchman, a fund-raiser, and well informed as to the nature of an educational institution.” McLain had tired of the pursuit of funding for the college and he recommended a dynamic young leader to take his place, Frank A. Rose (Wright, 1975, p. 400).

Rose arrived as a student in 1939 around the same time McLain ascended to the presidency. McLain had come to Lexington from Eureka College in Illinois, another Disciple’s institution. McLain and Rose were familiar with one another during these early days and must have forged a strong bond, because in the mid-1960s, Rose would bring McLain to The University of Alabama to serve as the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Upon the announcement of Rose’s hire, McLain told Transylvania students that “Mr. Rose is a young man. He will be one of the youngest college presidents in the country. This is all in his favor in student relations and other aspects of the total program of the college and his ministry in the Danville church has been one of the most inspiring in the state” (Wright, 1975, p. 401). In actuality, Rose was 30 years old and one of the youngest college president in the United States at the time of his inauguration.

During Rose’s seven-year tenure at Transylvania, he was able to “raise over four million dollars to eliminate indebtedness of the college and build a new library, a new gymnasium
auditorium, and a new girl’s dormitory.” He was also able to double the number of faculty to increase salaries from an average of $3,600 to one of $6,000. In addition, he doubled the student enrollment (Biographical data, 1957, p. 1. Rose from his experience in Lexington understood that a winning tradition creates university pride. Rose had experienced the importance of winning firsthand during his time in Lexington, Kentucky, as he watched the powerhouse Kentucky Wildcat basketball program, led by Coach Adolph Rupp, win national championships. He understood the power of athletics through the changes he made at Transylvania during his tenure as president and the positive influence it had. At Transylvania, “Rose differed with McLain’s (the previous president) philosophy of volunteer amateurism in intercollegiate athletic competition, and re-instituted the system of athletic scholarships, particularly in basketball” (Wright, 1975, p. 405). He understood that the need to build campus spirit and success in college athletics provided these opportunities. This experience would serve him well upon his move to Alabama.

Kentucky is a state consumed by the pursuit of excellence in basketball and the Transylvania College student newspaper The Rambler, drove this point home by saying, “Transylvania is an institution surrounded by tradition – part of that tradition is the losing of most basketball games played during a season. You’ll probably agree with me in saying that the college ought to shed at least this part of the tradition” (The tradition of, 1952, p. 2). Immediately, Rose hired C.M. Newton, a player and coaching acolyte of the famous University of Kentucky basketball coach Adolph Rupp. Newton took over a team that was winning two to three games a season. Within three years, he had them winning 19 games in a season. Student enthusiasm rose and created excitement on campus for the first time in many years. In addition, the echo of Kentucky basketball was ever present. The Wildcats won national championships in
1948, 1949, 1951, and 1958, which did not go unnoticed by the young minister and president who attended University of Kentucky athletic events. On the other side of the Kentucky campus, the UK football program was in its zenith under Coach Paul W. Bryant. From 1946 to 1953, Kentucky participated in three of the four major New Year’s Day Bowl games and won its only Southeastern Conference Championship in 1950. In the stands watching both Rupp and Bryant was season ticket holder, Frank A. Rose. Rose might well have grasped how pride in athletics helped in the rallying of campus stakeholders to meet the larger goals of the university.

His star was on the rise; and, in 1954, he was selected as one of the Top Ten Most Outstanding Young Men in the United States by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. In his class were future friends, Robert F. Kennedy and General Chuck Yeager. Rose was also a gifted speaker and was invited to become a guest lecturer at the Chautauqua Institute in New York in the summer of 1955. Here he met several national academicians and political leaders, allowing him to add to his network of contacts and friends. It was also during this period of time that he received an honorary LL.D. from Lynchburg College, a Disciples of Christ affiliate, for his years of selfless service to the ministry.

While his devotion to God and serving his church was important, he also was heavily involved in his social fraternity, K.A. Order. He served this fraternity in many capacities as a national leader and was asked many times to deliver keynote addresses due to his oratorical skills.

He would serve as the president and chairman of the K.A. Order and its Educational Foundation. In 1988, he was the 13th recipient of K.A.’s Award for Distinguished Achievement, the highest alumni honor given by the Order. He worked with the foundation up till his death in 1991 in order to secure a permanent home building for the fraternity in Lexington, Virginia.
Upon his death, he requested that all memorial gifts be made to the K.A. Order Educational Foundation. William E. Garner (1991), the K.A. Order Educational Foundation secretary, had this to say about his legacy,

Dr. Rose was heroic in gesture and deed. It pleased me to know that he was a scholar (an avid reader) [sic] of Robert E. Lee and deeply admired him, because no two men were ever more alike. If R.E. Lee had ever known Frank Rose, it would have been a friendship of mutual respect and admiration. They rank as two real heroes of our Order. (p. 27)

Rose felt passionately about his fraternity. While he was a noted minister for the Disciples of Christ Church, his final wish was for memorial gifts to be given to the educational foundation of his fraternity, one that was noted for its “Old South” history.

There has been no in-depth study on the leadership of Rose other than work on his handling of desegregation at The University of Alabama. The experiences of his life as a poor child of the Great Depression and attending a religious based college had an impact on Rose. These experiences helped shape the leadership style he would develop and refine while at Transylvania College. Though he did not encounter desegregation or pursue it at Transylvania, there were lessons learned that would help him at Alabama and later. Over his eleven years as the president and after his UA tenure, he encountered many issues outside of desegregation that called for strong leadership and institutional vision. Through a study of his leadership, one can gain a better understanding of how he addressed the issues facing The University of Alabama and education in general and how his life experiences allowed him to become one of the most successful administrators in the history of the Capstone.

During his presidencies of Transylvania College and The University of Alabama, there were similar situations that created the need for strong leadership. In both cases, he inherited a university that was experiencing difficulties with finances, infrastructure needs, faculty salary upgrades, and low morale issues. In conducting an initial review of archival material that
included personal papers, board-meeting notes, mission statements, financial reports, and more, I concluded that a major source of his strength appeared to be his vision and political astuteness.

Rose came to The University of Alabama during a time when civil rights was at the forefront of issues plaguing the Deep South. Over time, he would have to manage political issues in a very delicate manner while overcoming the demagoguery of Governor George C. Wallace, an avowed segregationist and law graduate of the university. For any one person, this would seem to be a herculean task and it was with great patience and diligence that Rose was able to maneuver through the politics both on and off campus to bring the university into the modern era. His leadership style and vision shed a great deal of information on how The University of Alabama transcended the issues of race to move forward as an institution of higher learning with an enhanced reputation. The next task is to explore the formative influences on the development of his leadership.
CHAPTER III:
INFLUENCE OF THEOLOGY ON ROSE’S EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

As already noted, as a Transylvania student from 1939 to 1942, Rose worked diligently on his studies in order to graduate early and enter the College of the Bible, a seminary affiliate of the college. The seminary was located on the campus of Transylvania and in the fall of 1942, he was admitted for studies. During his time, he served as a local student minister in preparation for his entry into the ministry. His mentor during this time was the Reverend Dr. T. Hassell Bowen, who was also a graduate of Transylvania College and its College of the Bible. He was a part-time instructor and the full-time minister of the Christian Church in Harrodsburg, Kentucky. Bowen attended Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University in New York; he earned M.A. and B.S.T. degrees. Rose (1946) upon completion of his master’s thesis, The Christian Interpretation of Man, acknowledged Bowen for his “supervision and suggestions” and, in 1952, coaxed Bowen to return to the College of the Bible as a full-time instructor (Rightmyer & Armstrong, 2011, p. 33). In May of 1946, Rose was awarded his B.D. from the College of the Bible and began work as a full-time minister and high school principal.

The sources of Rose’s Christian foundation can be found in his thesis, an 80-page review of man and how he is to be viewed in the world. His study looked at the classical, social, and scientific view of man, the realistic view of man as depraved, and the Christian view of man. In his research, Rose hoped to show that the times following the industrial revolution had left man needing to better understand his nature and seeking to pursue Christian principles in a more practical way. In his introduction, he stated,
Toward the close of the nineteenth century, science and technology seemed to have brought to man his dominance over events of space and time. Man began to see himself as the veritable Lord of Creation and Swinburne was singing, “Glory to Man in the Highest for Man is the Master of things.” Today, after the disillusionment of two World Wars, man’s sense of his own value has gone down. He begins to suspect that in passing from the tool to the machine, he has overreached himself and lost the power he once possessed. (Rose, 1946, p. 2)

The thesis was an in-depth review of doctrines held by sociologists, scientists, philosophers, clergymen, and other enlightened people regarding the nature of man. Ultimately Rose’s hope was that it helped the reader “caught in the cross-currents to see a little more clearly what life has been and what it can be” (Rose, 1946, p. 3)

*The Christian Interpretation of Man* (1946) was a defining moment for Rose. It is important that his thoughts expressed across three levels be reviewed for they provide a foundational view of his theology and how he viewed man on several levels. These views were instrumental in shaping his leadership development as well as life views as he moved into the educational arena as an administrator. His first classification of the interpretation of man was “Classical View of Man.” Rose went back to the ancient Greek and Roman empires to tell the reader about the ancient view of the blossoming of the mind. During the eighteenth century there was a movement toward intellectual enlightenment with an emphasis placed on Greek philosophy. As Rose stated, “in a very clear sense the writings of Greece were human documents…and the interpretation of life they set forth was called humanism” (Rose, 1946, p. 4). The Greek philosophers such as Protagoras, Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato helped free humans from barbarianism and helped in the discovery of the mind as a tool to better mankind. As Rose concluded from Greek writings, man “turns from the world of things to master the world of thoughts. Man from the beginning had been so busy with what he saw that he did not attempt to formulate a philosophy of sight” (Rose, 1946, p. 6). For the Greek philosophers understanding
was at the center of what man pursued in life. He had now risen from the level of saying “I am a body to saying I am a mind” (Rose, 1946, p. 7). For Rose, Greek life had transitioned man from the persistence of creating things to thoughts.

In contrast, Rose looked at the ancient Roman view where man was more of a creator, such as an engineer or administrator. The Romans were able to conceive government and the delegation of responsibilities within mankind. But Rose noted that the “typical Greek had a keener mind than the typical Roman, but the average Roman had a more dependable character than the Greek. It is here that the Greek and Roman supplemented each other” (Rose, 1946, p. 8). Rose’s conclusion was that the Roman influence bequeathed the statutory form of governance and the human values to operate in an open and collective society. Rose postulated that the Greek philosophers felt that wise men would be virtuous, however they were certain that most men were fools and happiness belonged only to the wise. Rose felt Roman man was more concerned with creating an orderly nature to life through laws. In addition he concluded that the Greeks and Romans saw life as a series of reoccurring human cycles where history was likely to repeat itself.

Rose then went into detail on the “Scientific View of Man” as seen through the lens of the physical universe. Citing Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton, he stressed the limitations of a universe where the Earth was central to the scholars of medieval Christianity. In this view, the universe in essence revolved the Earth, which was “occupied by God and man. Everything beyond the earth and its atmosphere was thought to be…eternally regular in its operations” (Rose, 1946, p. 14). But through the scientific discoveries of the age, man and religion were forced to see that the “simple picture which for centuries provided the cosmology of faith, investing the theater of man’s life with cosmic centrality and placing it under the irregular
influence of a God just beyond the relatively near stars, has been destroyed by science” (Rose, 1946, p. 15).

In contrast to this view, Rose addressed the anthropology and evolution of man by saying he appeared when an animal spoke. He added that man through speech and thought developed culture, meaning that man “developed mental powers and transmission not by animal heredity but by tradition, such as burying his dead with attentions that can only be construed as an expression of belief of another life after the eclipse of this one” (Rose, 1946, p. 17-18). Through traditions and repetition Rose argued that man can “preserve and accumulate achievements” with greater acceleration over time which in turn allowed for man to advance progressively faster in his learning and knowledge than at any time in the past. Rose clearly pointed out that humans operate under the same mechanisms as other life forms, heredity, material impulses, and accessibility to germs and disease. But unlike other animals, they are cognizant of this and science allowed them the opportunity to understand and combat the negative outcomes they may inherit. As Rose stated, “we are aware of the lapse (animal behavior) and can condemn it. That the character as well as the existence of the mental life is not merely connected with but conditioned by the body is a commonplace of experience” (Rose, 1946, p. 21).

In discussing the “Social View of Man,” Rose spent much time and contended that man seeks out his own kind and that self-preservation was only attainable through group cooperation. “Man got on with his fellows simply because he could not get on without them. It is just as native to man to act socially as it is for him to be hungry, or curious, or afraid” (Rose, 1946, p. 24). Rose’s basic premise was that man is driven into cooperation with others out of fear and egotistical need. Rose described four phases that help describe man’s social nature.

First, there is a native tendency to be with other people, to feel an unlearned sense of comfort in their presence and an uneasiness if too much separated from them, physically,
or in action, feeling, or thought. Second, human beings tend, furthermore, to reproduce sympathetically the emotions of others, especially those of their own social and economic groups. Thirdly, man’s conduct is natively social in that he is by nature specifically sensitive to praise and blame, and that he will modify his conduct so as to secure one and avoid the other. Finally, beside the specific tendencies to respond to the presence, the feelings, the actions, and the thoughts of others, man displays a capacity for social behaviors. (Rose, 1946, p. 25)

The four phases Rose described were based on the instinctive nature of man. He pointed out that the changes in technology such as the telephone and automobile allowed people located in rural areas to “make possible the fulfillment of this normal human longing to be near and with other people in body and spirit” (Rose, 1946, p. 27). He discussed how the “herd mentality” of man exponentially increases in human nature as it moves from the family, friendships, communities, the nation, and so forth. But he pointed out that communication is more intense at the family level and less so as one moves to larger groups.

Rose was arguing that man has a natural propensity to be with others and that the side effect of this is the development of belief systems in man. As with the “herd mentality” and religious faith, men fall under the belief or opinions of other men. Men move in groups and gravitate toward a particular belief along with the prestige it brings the individual. Rose pointed out that man migrates to a belief to have a sense of belonging or “the tendency to find comfort in the presences of one’s fellows and uneasiness if too much separated from them, is as pronounced in the sphere of moral and intellectual relations as it is in the case of mere physical proximity” (Rose, 1946, p. 28). The point was that most people go along with an idea or a thought as a means for having social interaction and feeling accepted in the group, regardless if the points on which they agree are rationally convincing. Ideas gained prestige due to those who carry the power of personality in the groups. Rose concluded that “group-think” plays a role in how people respond to one another within a group setting or how their beliefs are impacted. People naturally
follow a certain course of action and even the slightest bit of punishment for not following the group norm is effective. Rose pointed out that even a “man who has no moral or religious scruples with reference to gambling on any day of the week will, to avoid social ostracism of his neighbors, refrain from playing cards on his front porch on Sunday” (Rose, 1946, p. 29).

Rose went into detail on sympathy and how this impacts the actions of others. He felt that men through emotion, suffering, and observation “tend to not only sympathetically reproduce the instinctive action of others, but they tend, despite themselves, to experience directly and immediately, often involuntarily, the emotion experienced and outwardly manifested by others” (Rose, 1946, p. 30). Rose discussed a range of descriptions of men, from those who are “full-hearted” to men who are stoic and show no outward emotion. Rose felt these descriptions suggested aspects of a view of the development of their true character. Rose contended that it is difficult for men to discount their personal feelings toward an individual based on the way he or she behaves or is perceived. He took into consideration that man has to have a motive for an action, whether it be viewed as sympathetic or heinous in its act. As he stated, “fellow-feeling with others may warp our judgments or soften them…it is difficult altogether to discount our personal interest and affection” (Rose, 1946, p. 31). Rose was likely concerned about the position of influence and how one can influence a group to produce a message for the whole. He felt that most men are sympathetic and that this impacts how they view any situation they encounter.

Rose next explained the nature of susceptibility to praise and blame and the psychology of how people respond individually as well as in a group setting. His analysis resembled the view of behavioral psychologist B.F. Skinner, though Rose wrote his thesis two years prior to Skinner’s published work on behaviorism. Skinner developed the Theory of Operant
Conditioning (1948) introducing a new term called reinforcement. Reinforcement was simply where “behavior which is reinforced tends to be reinforced (strengthened) and behavior which is not reinforced tends to die out or be extinguished (weakened)” (McLeod, 2007, para. 1). Rose pointed out that “the desire for praise, the avoidance of blame, and the expression of both are instinctive, the occasions on which they are called forth depend on the traditions and group habits to which the individual has been exposed” (Rose, 1946, p. 32). In short, activities are determined by the reinforcement they receive. Rose concluded that a person’s level of education, his subservience to public opinion, and the law will dictate how he behaves individually and within a group setting. Rose concluded that in the case where the susceptibility to group attitudes exists, there is a greater propensity for individuals to be indifferent to codes by which they are governed that challenge group attitudes. His assessment was that the criminal and the martyr fall into this category – the criminal due to the lack of a moral code of normal behavior and the martyr due to deep convictions of justice and honor. Rose referenced the deaths of Socrates and Christ and stated that “they have been content to suffer martyrdom at the hands of their own generation in a persistent devotion to what in their eyes constituted the highest good of mankind” (Rose, 1946, p. 34).

Rose’s chapter on the “Realistic View of Man as Depraved” gave details on why man in all his infinite wisdom is not the making positive progress over time. He explained that man has become his own problem and creates his own disasters in things he has worked hard to build just as a “child in laughter knocks down his blocks which have been carefully placed” (Rose, 1946, p. 36). Rose felt man is driven by the pursuit of tangible items and conquests, while being blessed with the intellectual capacity to create laws and understand religion. His view was that the power of the mind to intellectually conceptualize over time and experience what will happen
enables man to predict his future to some extent. It also gives him false reason to believe he is master of all he surveys, for he uses this knowledge for the most part in a negative way. The intelligence given to man makes him in many respects unrealistic and moves him toward the destructive forces of life. Rose felt that nature and reason were the “two gods of modern man” who is “so sure about his essential virtue because he is so mistaken about his stature” (Rose, 1946, p. 39). Rose contended that man is in constant pursuit of the reason for evil within the world, yet there is an inability to learn from history why evil existed in the past. Interestingly Rose noted “modern man repeats the same mistakes in the problems of government as in the fanaticism of historic religions. He attributes evil to specific historical causes without inquiring how such particular causes (such as Hitler or Stalin) should have arisen” (Rose, 1946, p. 41).

Rose pointed out in his study there was a battle between man’s feelings and desires as opposed to his consciousness and will. The inability to control his impulses leads to ruin.

Rose argued that the power culture of modern man sees Christianity as a roadblock to human development “insamuch (sic) as the Christian way has already been tried a long time and does not seem to have been a marked success” (Rose, 1946, p. 43-44). In Rose’s view, neo-paganism was the true power culture of man. In other words, man was placing a greater emphasis on desires rather than a need for God. Neo-paganism is enhanced by the increases in scientific and technological findings. Rose even cited the dilemma in the military-industrial complex where “skill in war, an essential element to the power concept, may be marked while moral sensitivity is weak” (Rose, 1946, p. 44). Rose passionately argued that the true weakness of man was his thought and that he lacks any foundational principles to support positive change in light of the power-culture. The power-culture was the methodology by which man gains personal and political power within business or political venues. Rose felt man lived in a world of symbol
worshippers who place unrestricted feeling and thought into the expressive forms they see in society rather than grounding them in historical thought. He warned of the national state and stated it is “really the old tribe concept applied to millions of persons, unrelated and different creatures gathered under the banner of a government” (Rose, 1946, p. 47). Rose showed concern with mass production and increases in communication that have the ability to eliminate the old ways of nationalism and move us on a course toward world government. With this comes a move away from Christianity and toward man as his own God. A way to express a meaningful nationalism as explained by Rose was a love of country and a move away from world government. Rose felt a move toward world government was a warning that man was turning away from Christianity and toward man as his own God.

Rose addressed the Christian View of Man in the final chapter of his thesis. Prior to this, he described man as being his own worst enemy in over estimating his ability to control his environment. He also cited the inability to look at the past and learn from the mistakes of history. In presenting the Christian man, Rose quoted R.L. Calhoun in his assessment of What is Man: “‘From its dim beginnings until now, religion has recognized two sorts of reality towards which man’s life must be oriented – power and right’” (as cited in Rose, 1946, p. 59). Rose encapsulated the ethical view of man only from the Christian perspective, since it was the predominant religion of the time and the nation. He described the personal covenant that exists between man and God and how this relationship is one of trust and faith. Man must understand that God is always true to his covenant with man, yet man is not true to his God. Thus man brings upon himself his own punishment from a just and mighty God. As Rose described the relationship, “inward repentance and wholehearted love are what he (God) requires of all. The hope of the faithful is in God, not men, and that hope brings inward peace that is proof against all
misfortune” (Rose, 1946, p. 55). For most people Christianity is viewed as an individual relationship between man and God. However, Rose pointed out that men reap the rewards of their actions collectively; therefore, “men are destroyed or saved together, not individually” (Rose, 1946, p. 56).

Rose used the final portion of his thesis to show man as created in the image of God. From the beginning of religion, man was not a thing like the other creatures of the earth. Instead he was made in the image of God so as to not simply be in a state of existence, but to be a thinker and a solver of problems. For Rose, man is to ask the question “why am I here?” and because of this he “seeks a ground and a meaning as an act of transcendence” (Rose, 1946, p. 58). Rose stated that “made in the image of God” is a peculiar expression but the real interpretation is that it means “the idea of responsibility” (Rose, 1946, p. 58). To Rose, responsibility in Christianity is the same as man’s relationship to God. They are interchangeable and help define the purpose of man toward himself and those he comes in contact with. Rose even pointed out that there is a paradoxical approach to the Christian faith that revolves around human freedom and the belief that man is not perfect, but a sinner. Rose defined this in simpler terms by saying that “sin means a threefold perversion of created existence; it perverts man’s relation to God, to his neighbor, and to himself” (Rose, 1946, p. 60). He pointed out that God created man and man turned from his creator by disobeying him. It was only through his disobedience that man could have the opportunity to claim salvation through forgiveness and faith. Rose explained that man’s affirmation of the Christian faith allows him to transcend the living death to a just heavenly reward for truth and love of your fellow man and God.

Rose discussed the finite spirit of man living but his larger goal was to help others, to be a force for good, and to discover his true meaning. He stated, “Man is immersed in a struggle to
find himself. He has found that struggle a long succession of defeats. He has set his heart on some particular goal, only to be disillusioned or dissatisfied when he has reached it. Many times he cannot focus his desires on any goals and therefore lives in inner turmoil and defeat” (Rose, 1946, p. 62). For Rose, Christian beliefs are centered on the fact that men are all troubled and are blinded by their own desires, shortcomings, and ignorance. Rose pointed out a very old theme of spoiled human nature that the disciple Paul had described in the seventh chapter of Romans.

The trouble with man is centered in his feelings and desires, far down beyond the range of conscious thought and will. A man is as he loves. He identifies himself with that which he loves most. Where a man’s treasure is, there is his heart also. If then he loves the wrong things most, or loves the right things the wrong way, or loves nothing very much, frustration is inevitable. (Rose, 1946, p. 64)

Rose noted that in moving away from a person’s selfish nature and directing his efforts toward loving his neighbors as himself, man can experience the full glory of what life has to offer. In his mind, the individual must have strong moral values that are centered on serving others in order to benefit everyone. As Rose pointed out, the answer is not in man himself, but only in a man who can love God and his neighbor as he ought and come to the full realization of himself as a human being dependent upon such love to widen and deepen his being to its fullest dimensions.

In the concluding remarks of his thesis, Rose outlined the importance of the resurrection of Christ to the Christian interpretation of man. Christ suffered the agony of death born of the evils in the world to demonstrate that the “life of love is triumphant over impersonal forces and death itself” (Rose, 1946, p. 67). The death and resurrection of Christ helped to explain life itself. Rose stated that “a life that is superior to the circumstances of the impersonal world and capable of moral perfection, is in consequence superior to death” (Rose, 1946, p. 67). As a minister in training, Rose saw the necessity in the initiative of man, or the pursuit of serving others, which in Christianity is the defining characteristic of faith. Man must actively pursue knowledge and
goodness while mastering control of his thoughts and actions so they are of good to all of mankind. Rose concluded by saying:

One thing is sure, and that is, the Christian understanding of man with its relentless pessimism and its exultant faith sees man not merely re-housed and re-educated, but remade. The Christian faith sees man in the depths of his sins, but always in a relationship with and in a responsibility to a God in whose unseen presence he lives, and moves, and has his being. If there is any hope for man, it is because this is true. (Rose, 1946, p. 70)

Rose argued that modern man must return to the fundamental teachings of Christianity in order to find peace in the world. This dogma hinges on the goodness of man in his pursuit of following the teachings of God while being a loyal and capable servant to all you meet.

Rose’s Christian belief system certainly had an effect on how he led institutions of higher education. His work as a minister and understanding of doctrine likely allowed him to have a greater understanding of moral leadership outside of the church. And to this end, Rose used many opportunities to share his thoughts on leadership as influenced through the lens of his personal faith. One theme he often used was a challenge to put new values into our degrees and methodologies of teaching in order to combat the move toward a secular educational system. His thoughts on this were shared when he was asked what a Christian college was. Rose’s response articulated the views of a changing world and the themes he shared in his thesis.

For Rose, a Christian college is an academic institution that has the proper appreciation of the Christian religion and the dynamic part it has played in giving us a good culture in Western civilization. It is a community of Christian scholars who are devoted and interested in teaching and counseling our youth to become well-rounded, sensitive, religious citizens, and to relate themselves effectively to all other men in the common life process. The college believes that the Christian liberal arts tradition includes all of the essentials of a sound educational program adequate for our modern democratic society in this age of science, that it is broad
enough to encompass all the elements of our cultural heritage, that it provides the fullest approach to the individual needs of the student, and it dignifies the human personality and is capable of orienting man in the spiritual world (Rose, 1956, p. 17).

Early in his tenure at Transylvania, Rose spoke to the Kentucky Christian Women’s Fellowship where he said, “The church must show desire for justice, compassion for humanity and love of those who are fallen and lost…social revolution has been ignored by the church and government and the United Nations have displayed more courage than many Christian groups” (Rose address Christian, 1952, p. 2). In several addresses during this early period of his time at Transylvania, Rose compared the United States with the Roman Empire and concluded that the threats to the safety of the U.S. came from discontented groups within, not invasion from outside. His call was to “cure the tumors of our society” (Rose addresses Christian, 1952, p. 2).

An important theme echoed through the words and addresses of Rose to his students was that of service. He believed in moral leadership and strongly encouraged students to balance their lives so that the meaning they gained from it benefitted others. At his first Transylvania commencement address in June 1952, Rose expanded on this by saying:

No problem is without a solution, and there is no foundation for men to claim that civilization is nearing its end...you must beware of temptation to make opiates of religion, or college, or a job, an opiate that might blind them to all services they might give mankind. The need of the world today is for a moral leadership, our dilemma is a spiritual dilemma. We must have a religious faith and concern for the problems of all peoples of the world. (Rose baccalaureate address, 1952, p. 4)

Rose took every advantage to address students on how they could shape the future. He accepted any speaking engagement to publicize Transylvania College and he echoed the vision of students being a living part of the institution. At the September, 1952 Freshman Address, he spoke of spirit by saying “Transylvania is a spirit, binding the past with the future. It is a spirit that makes you a part of all that Transylvania has been and is” (The tradition of, 1952, p. 1).
expectations were for the college to be an instrument of good by teaching the students self-
sufficiency and the need to help not only themselves but others.

Rose was noted for talking about “new life” when addressing students. This point came
from the religious doctrine he was raised and trained with. Man must be saved and have faith in
order to have a new life in this world and upon his passing. At Transylvania, he used this as an
opportunity to frame education for the students. In one such address, he tied this to the
temptation to seek security. Rose stated, “anyone who will seek security will destroy his
opportunity….In a world in which the trend is toward more and more security, education is
needed for a new individual who will give of himself to the pursuit of knowledge – not to buy
security, but to prepare himself to grasp the opportunities…and above all, give yourselves
unreservedly to seeking a new life for a new world” (Frank Rose address, October 1, 1952, p. 1).
Rose spoke of giving unreservedly from the perspective of Christian doctrine. This included
living a life where a person can change the lives of others through Christ’s teachings of moral
leadership. Rose understood the relationship of education to his Christian roots and sought to tie
them together using his ability to communicate well. In addition he believed in Transylvania
students becoming “Christian citizens of the world” and faulted mankind for inability to look out
for the well-being of others. Rose summed this up by saying, “Modern man is responsible for his
own predicament, through the fact that he has used his resources for selfish ends and personal
gain” (Baccalaureate address Transylvania, 1953, p. 2).

One of the great opportunities presented Rose as a result of his ministerial training was
the opportunity to lead from the academic lectern and the church pulpit. As the president of a
Christian college, he understood the unique struggles faced in a changing society. Large private
and regional universities were gaining more research funding and endowment due to advances in
science while small Christian colleges could no longer compete due to the lack of the funding available to larger private institutions and to the move toward secularism in higher education. In August of 1956, Rose was invited to speak at the Conference on the Ministry of the Church of the Future. This event was held at Christmont Christian Assembly in Black Mountain, North Carolina. The seven-day event was important both from an educational and theological perspective. Rose served as the catalyst for the development of the Kentucky Private College Coalition that was designed to pull together resources in order to better gain funding for these institutions. He was also a member of the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the American Association of Colleges. As he said during the North Carolina conference, we have used these organizations as

an attempt to adjust our programs of education to meet the demands of our day…the Christian college like the seminary, is indispensable to the education of the Christian ministry. Our young people make their decisions for the ministry at an early age and need all of the spiritual resources of the Christian college to nourish and develop this commitment. (Rose, 1957, p. 18)

Rose had been asked to speak at the conference about the Christian colleges and the issues facing them in the last half of the century. His address entitled *Education for Tomorrow's Ministry* offered a two-pronged view of educational leadership and how external forces were changing the dynamics of the Christian college. One of his overriding concerns was the perception of ministers. He said,

a few years ago, the minister was recognized as the best educated professional man in the community, but today he does not enjoy such a position. The increased educational requirements for men of science and technology, the professional degree for educators, and the specialized requirements for leaders in business and industry have played a large part in taking away this position of prominence. (Rose, 1957, p. 16)

Rose was concerned that the minister who lacked educational or intellectual success was doomed to never reclaim a position of prominence in society. His offering to the attendees was that this
issue needed addressing at the financial appropriation level through a college’s religious affiliation. Many highly successful and formerly full-fledged Christian colleges now derived their funding from wealthy alumni or local citizenry. Rose stated that “the relationship to the church constituency is no longer one of vital concern or active participation in the affairs of the church” (Rose, 1957, p. 16). The picture of Christian education he presented was dark and he described the mostly smaller institutions as being mediocre compared to other more well-funded colleges.

Rose’s view of the centrality of finance in education was not new. However, he saw that the Protestant Christian college movement had been infiltrated by those from outside of the religious mainstream, which changed the dynamics of many Protestant colleges to more of a secular view. This was in part due to the increased need for studies in science and technology. The typical Christian college was still rooted in a liberal arts background for the undergraduate curriculum. Rose pointed out there were still success stories to be heralded in the religious education arena.

If we are to have the proper appreciation of the church and the ministry, we must properly show ourselves approved of God. Neither Roman Catholicism nor Judaism would make the terrible compromise we have made with our Protestant ministry. Their educational requirements are long and difficult, and we have found most of them to be extremely effective. (Rose, 1957, p. 18)

An example of what Rose was speaking of was Notre Dame University, where control of the curriculum was split between the church and laymen. That was not the case in some Christian colleges, such as Duke University, that were more financially independent and in turn were no longer producing a Christian-based education. Rose was still an advocate for a strong liberal arts education in order to prepare young men for the seminary. The Christian colleges’ concern was
“to give a good foundation for the students’ special field, broadening their knowledge of the world, and preparing him for effective citizenship” (Rose, 1957, p. 19).

Rose continued to expand on the message of financial commitment and the design of Christian higher education. He stated he had no desire to change how colleges were delivering education to their students. “We have had control of most of our colleges and seminaries for almost a hundred years, but we have done relatively little to make them really great educational institutions. The crippling force has been poor financial support due to the lack of real conviction for higher education” (Rose, 1957, p. 20). By this time, Rose had been president of Transylvania College for five years and affiliated with the college in some way for at least 17 years. His frustration seemed obvious as he continued to push the charge for change.

The Disciples must re-think their past and make definite plans for the future of our ministry is evident in our need for more leadership in education, administration, and the ministry of the local church…lest I be misunderstood, that this need cannot be met at the expense of any of our present programs or endeavors, but must come with an immediate increase in stewardship from a Brotherhood that recognizes that only a few of our people can compete nationally or internationally with those minds and spirits that have been afforded the greatest opportunities. (Rose, 1957, p. 20)

Rose pointed out that local church congregations expected new ministers who possessed “the spiritual capacity of Augustine, the mind of Einstein, and the eloquence of Henry Clay” (Rose, 1957, p. 20), but the church had failed to adapt with the times in order to provide such ministers. Rose placed part of the blame on the layman for not understanding the necessity to show as much conviction for the delivery of education as was devoted to mission services and the building of new churches.

Rose also addressed the educational balance between scientific increases in knowledge and those related to character development. He was quick to point out that everyone on the planet was grateful for the increases in scientific and medical knowledge and how this had truly
changed the world. Rose added that colleges were sometimes overlooking the issue of ethics that provided a boundary for what is morally acceptable in these educational advances.

Unfortunately, we have not given proper attention to those elements which lie at the center of any outstanding culture, that of personal and collective character, that of a philosophy of our civilization which would serve as a directive as to where we are going and why, or that of appreciation and respect for the best sense of values. (Rose, 1957, p. 21)

His solution was to make a concerted effort by the church to better develop the curriculum on the undergraduate side to mirror a strong liberal arts background but to expand it into the new day with the changes of science and technology. This expansion would be tempered with a program that continued to stress ethics and moral leadership. On the seminary side, a greater financial role must be assumed by the church to offset the cost of attendance. Costs were a hindrance to retention within the program. Rose concluded by saying,

the church and the Christian colleges and seminaries have a mission to change our modern world. Our problem is not in essence a material one, it is a spiritual dilemma…the church and our church colleges are being profoundly challenged by the new world of our century. An institution that seeks only to conserve the past is irrelevant to this age (Rose, 1957, p. 22)

The passion for change came through in this address and may have been a harbinger of things to come in Rose’s professional growth as an educator.

In 1964, he served as the keynote speaker at the inauguration of Presbyterian College President Marc Weersing. His emphasis then was on pressing educational leaders to do more in developing the character and moral leadership of the student. Rose stressed a need to develop the student beyond the classroom, both spiritually and socially, if this were not accomplished, the student and society in general will suffer for it. Rose’s challenge to the administration and faculty was straightforward:

the urgency of our time is found in the acceleration with which crises come. Our universities and colleges must become centers of learning if they are going to have any
relevance to our age. We have taken all too lightly our responsibility of turning out academicians who possess the abilities and knowledge to help us forge ahead in these many areas in which we are now lagging...juvenile delinquency, the high divorce rate, political bungling, a responsible agency of our government calling our churches arsenals of communism – these reveal an intellectual and moral weakness that informs us we have not been as successful as we would like to think. (Rose, 1964c)

When he led The University of Alabama, Rose continued to be influenced by his training as a Disciples minister. In the fall of 1960, Rose told the UA Student Religious Association, a consortium of campus religious groups,

We are living in one of the most coercive power cultures that history has ever known. The more complicated our society becomes, the more imperative it is that we derive from the educational process value judgment. It is at this point that religion plays its vital role and helps us to see the whole of life that is involved. Contrary to popular belief, our problem is not a material one but it is a moral and spiritual dilemma. It is my hope that our students will recognize the importance of the church to their educational opportunities and will see in worship the leavening that is needed for these times. (F. Rose, personal communication, Fall 1960)

Rose was very open to religious beliefs other than his own and welcomed them as avenues for improving student life. His understanding of the tumultuous times on college campuses reinforced his strong feelings for the influence of church on education. In 1964, he stated in a letter to Margaret Swift, “after having served on one of the NATO committees and having visited many foreign countries, I have come to the conclusion that our churches are doing a better job of creating good will toward the United States than any of our other agencies” (F. Rose, personal communication, January 30, 1964).

One of the most important and recurring addresses Rose gave dealt with man’s resistance to following a moral code of ethics. The speech was entitled A World Without Authority and it specifically dealt with man’s pursuit of freedom and the lengths he would go to in order to achieve it. Rose was mindful that freedom must be balanced with morality. However, in most cases once freedom was acquired, man did not use it in a positive manner. The challenge Rose
put forth was that living without authority is only acceptable as long as people “are willing to assume some responsibility to keep it that way” (Rose, 1955, p. 3). He felt man had difficulty in handling freedom when not bounded by rules of responsibility. Rose laid out two basic premises for doing this. First, a “thinking people” do not believe what you hear or see without validation of the facts. Secondly, moral responsibility is necessary to accomplishing freedom. He stated citizens must pay “proper attention to those elements which lie at the center of any outstanding culture, that of personal and collective character” (Rose, 1955, p. 5). Rose concluded his remarks by saying that “History gives witness to the fact (people) do not want external authority. Then let us discipline ourselves with the highest Christian values we know, and become responsible citizens in a world without authority. As thinking and moral men, let us urge the battle against all that crowds and distorts human life on our planet” (p. 6-7). Rose would be challenged by this code of moral ethics as he would soon be dealing with issues at The University of Alabama that would test the validity of these principles.

Rose’s training in seminary gave him insight on how man could be a loyal servant to his fellow citizens. In his writings and speeches, he would have recurring themes related to moral leadership. Rose expressed to his constituents a strong desire for justice, compassion, and love for those who could least help themselves. He spent countless hours reaching out to churches and delivering speeches from the pulpit on moral leadership and the importance of staying balanced in helping others. Rose’s experience and beliefs related to these matters would prove beneficial during his presidency at The University of Alabama. As The University of Alabama struggled to deal with desegregation, Rose used his seminary training as a catalyst for developing skills needed to address this. His ability to communicate his vision for the future while negotiating the political landscape of the university were developed in part from his training as a minister. Rose
understood the power of moral leadership but in order to do what was right for African Americans attempting to enter the university, he had to effectively deal with the power culture of the state of Alabama. This is where Rose’s leadership abilities paid dividends for the university.

Rose had often cited in sermons and speeches that man was resistant to an established code of ethics. He had concerns about the secularization of colleges and often spoke of the desire of man to govern himself. Rose used these themes to help frame the vision of what needed to be accomplished at The University of Alabama with regard to desegregation. In order to do this he had to rely on his skills of political dexterity and effective communication. Rose had faced similar challenges at Transylvania and used his skills to go across the state of Kentucky speaking to stakeholders on the importance of change. At Alabama, he would have to do the same in order to address the inevitable desegregation of the university. Rose’s training as a moral leader allowed him to focus on the need for compassion and his political compromise.

As noted in Chapter I, Mintzberg (1983) pointed out that Rose’s political astuteness was a blend of influence, persuasion, manipulation, and negotiation. Rose, in many instances, maintained sensitivity to the feelings of others. This was part of his ability to communicate effectively: an understanding of how to listen then speak. Ferris et al. (2005), also highlighted in Chapter I, argued that strong political leaders are able to make positive change when they have influence, develop strong networks of support, are astute in understanding politics, and show a sincere interest in the concerns and needs of others. Rose used his skills to influence the growth and direction of The University of Alabama during his presidency. Many of these skills were developed during Rose’s training as a minister. Rose was also influenced by his time as a member and leader of K.A. Order. In the next chapter, I will detail some of these influences.
CHAPTER IV:
THE INFLUENCE OF KAPPA ALPHA ORDER

Kappa Alpha Order (K.A.) is a men’s social fraternity whose traditions are rooted in the Old South. While there were many fraternities founded in the southern United States, none have their heritage linked to the southern way of life more than K.A. In order to understand the fraternity of K.A. Order, one must understand that the founding fathers of the fraternity considered Confederate General Robert E. Lee as their role model. Lee had arrived in Lexington, Virginia, on September 18, 1865, to take over the presidency of Washington College. General Lee spent his first night in Lexington at Mulberry Hill, where Frank Rose would secure a permanent place for the K.A. headquarters and Educational Foundation (Shelton, 2004). Lee was designated the spiritual founder in 1923 by K.A. alumnus and famous orator John Temple Graves who presented the “immortal toast” given at each national conference (http://www.kappaalphaorder.org). Lee was a renowned and respected military leader who served as the president of Washington College until his death in 1870. During his leadership, K.A. Order was founded at Washington College in 1866. Its initial purpose was to bring together young men based on the chivalry of the Old South, principally “reverence, gentility, service, leadership, knowledge, perseverance, and excellence” (http://www.kappaalphaorder.org). The fraternity was uniquely Southern and quickly spread across the region. The lineage to Lee was intended for members to show pride in their southern heritage and the gallantry that he symbolized. The fraternity was rife with symbols of the Confederacy and chivalrous knights, which again were meant to instill a bond of heritage within the membership. The colors of the fraternity are Crimson and Old Gold to symbolize the blood sacrificed and the money spent in
defense of the country (or Confederacy). The flowers of the Order were the Crimson Rose and the Magnolia Blossom, both of which tied in perfectly to Rose, Transylvania school colors, and his home state of Mississippi (Kappa Alpha Order, 2014b). The motto of the fraternity, *Dieu et les Dames*, a chivalrous term meaning God and the Ladies, is inscribed on the ceiling of the Mississippi Capitol, where Rose had served as the Magnolia Boy’s State Governor in 1939 (http://www.kappaalphaorder.org).

K.A. Order historically used symbols of the Old South to promote the fraternity. These included the use of Confederate battle flags and military uniforms at organizational functions. The public perception of their use changed over time from southern pride to prejudice. The symbolism of the southern aspect of the fraternity is difficult for some externally to understand. The fraternity sought to align their mission with southern heritage and General Lee. Many southerners felt a strong connection to Lee and the symbolism he represented, the chivalry of the old South and a lost cause. K.A. embodied this symbolism and used it as the catalyst for their mission. Liberal newspaperman and Alabama alumnus H. Brandt Ayers (1972) pointed out

> The average white Southerner does not intend insult by his enjoyment of the symbols of the Confederacy. He feels no shame in showing the flag or singing *Dixie*. He sees both flag and *Dixie* as a part of him through the continuum of history and place, and as a tribute to the unvanquished spirit of his own people….To all but a few poisoned minds the flag and songs are simply symbols of things which happened to their people along the way. Because they were dramatic and terrible things, the symbols state forcefully that although we have been beaten we will never admit the final defeat, destruction of the human spirit. (p. 5)

The last point of Ayers assessment of never admitting defeat is a part of what drew Frank Rose to K.A. Being a native of Mississippi, he understood the heritage upon which the fraternity was based. He was often quoted as saying the fraternity gave him:

> three great ideas that have determined to a great degree the success that has been his: the idea that life is more important than most people realize and that it must always be lofty, gentle, and growing; the idea that what appears to be defeat may prove to be a great
victory, and that man does not have to lose his honor in the face of defeat; the idea that service is more important than great financial gain. These three ideas are the fundamental principles that are to be found in the life of Robert E. Lee, who was the inspiration behind the founding of Kappa Alpha. (In eleven years, 1953, p. 49)

For Rose, there was a compatibility between his religious education and his membership in K.A. He had noted his seminary thesis, *The Christian Interpretation of Man*, that man can overcome defeat and still retain his honor. Rose described these ideas of success through Christ overcoming death and defeat to resurrect himself and to provide the impetus to save all men as well as his teachings on moral leadership. Counter to this were aspects of K.A. that did not create a positive image within the community, especially with regard to minorities. Rose was a champion of the fraternity, but he had the propensity of compartmentalize those things that were negative or might not stand up to critical evaluation. In all fairness to Rose, the context and time during which he was a member reflected imperfect times. His support of K.A. appears to be based on the ability to build strong leaders and live by a code of honor and chivalry, regardless of how antiquated and out of touch it may seem in the present day.

Rose was an avid reader of biographies and historical publications on the Civil War, Lee, and Jefferson Davis. Rose was drawn to Robert E. Lee on a number of levels. Rose had lost his father at age nine and was raised by his mother. Robert E. Lee was born in 1807, the son of “Light-Horse Harry” Lee, a Revolutionary War hero. The elder Lee had lost all of his family resources due to a bad land speculation deal. The embarrassment this created caused him to abandon his family and move in exile to Barbados in 1813. Young Robert was only six years old when he became fatherless, and, like Rose, was raised by his mother. Rose also admired Lee because of his leadership skills and deportment, which had an important impact on Rose’s life. “As a history major in college, Rose was inspired by Lee’s philosophy on life…and added that Lee was one of the men by whom he modeled his own life” (Brown, 1987, p. 6). Lee, like Rose
was very involved in his church as a youth. Lee was ambitious to correct the negative perceptions of his father and worked hard as a youth on his own bearing and character. This proved beneficial to him later in life as an Army officer. Rose must have felt a kinship since he too was ambitious and sought to improve his lot in life.

Lee also remained focused on changing his future. After entering West Point as a cadet, he gradually improved his standing within the Corps, earning no demerits. During his senior year, Lee was selected as the Cadet Adjutant, the highest-ranking cadet. To many at West Point, this was not received well since

the appointment made him the most prestigious cadet at the academy and enabled him to experience both the praise of his associates and the grumblings of malcontents who felt the position had been awarded along sectional lines. Southerners did well at West Point because they had the “habit of command”, learned from ordering slaves around the plantation. (Anderson & Anderson, 1988, p. 33)

Lee had never owned slaves but had spent a great deal of time learning about leadership. As Lee said upon taking the Cadet Adjutant position,

the cadet officer must do his duty, honestly, and faithfully. Without favor and without partiality. Do not seek to report, but let it be seen that though it gives you pain, still you must do your duty. That this duty is equal. Never more or less rigid, but always the same and your duty. The same as regards to your dearest friend or worst enemy. You will, thus gain esteem and affection and not dislike or hatred. (Anderson & Anderson, 1988, p. 33)

In the summer of 1961, Frank Rose was invited to address the K.A. Conference held in Memphis, Tennessee. He presented his view of Robert E. Lee and what he meant spiritually to the fraternity. The speech was called *You Must Earn Your Own Heritage*. In it, Rose quoted Goethe, the German philosopher: “what you have inherited from your fathers you must earn in order to possess” (*You must earn*, 1961, p. 12). Rose addressed the need to understand how the inheritance given by past leaders of the fraternity focused the current membership on rededicating themselves in order to “fully possess that heritage.” The subject of his speech was
how Robert E. Lee had become the spiritual leader of the fraternity and what leadership traits set him apart from others of his era. Rose outlined Lee’s fatherless upbringing as well as the discipline and character he displayed through his church, schools, and military assignments.

More importantly Rose emphasized Lee’s ability to do more with less, as demonstrated during and after the war. Rose stated that Lee had accepted defeat in honor, and refused great financial fortune…to begin rebuilding the lives of those who would become the leaders of tomorrow. His sorrow, he would not allow to become rancor; his defeat, not bitterness; his losses, not helplessness. For Robert E. Lee and his native South there was no Marshall Plan (reconstruction of the South as similar to the reconstruction of Europe following World War II)...He returned home to teach his boys the manhood out of which reason prevails and intelligence conquers. With courage and wisdom and perseverance, he started rebuilding. The South was the frontier and he led the way. This is what our founders saw in Robert E. Lee and this is why they gave us our heritage. (Rose, 1961, p. 17)

Rose concluded by talking of Lee’s character in the face of adversities and how he overcame them. Rose also pointed out that Lee did not want the Union dissolved or the South vanquished; rather he stood with honor to defend his home state of Virginia. Honor in the old South meant your allegiance was to your state first. When Lee was offered command of the Union Army prior to the Civil War, he declined the offer since it would be fighting not against the South, but against his home state of Virginia. Rose interestingly ended the address pointing out the fact that Lee had freed his slaves prior to the Civil War, but that his Union rival General Ulysses S. Grant did not release his slaves until after the war ended. Rose said, “Our founders (K.A.) saw justice, goodness, and Godliness in Robert E. Lee, and this is our heritage” (Rose, 1961, p. 17). Rose obviously admired Lee’s strength of character and leadership.

Rose was proud of his southern heritage and placed reproduction paintings of fellow Transylvania students Jefferson Davis and Henry Clay in the UA President’s Mansion. These had been supplied to him by Transylvania president Irvin Lunger (F. Rose, personal
communication, October 27, 1965). They represented a connection to his alma mater as well as to the Old South. Rose’s southern origins were on display for all to see. During Rose’s term as president at The University of Alabama, he became friends with the resident creative writing professor, Hudson Strode. Strode had written a voluminous biography on Confederate President Jefferson Davis. Strode was also a noted historian of the Confederacy. Upon completion of Strode’s last volume on the subject, Rose (1964) was moved to write Strode about his work:

> It is impossible for me to convey to you fully the magnificent job you have done on your final volume on Jefferson Davis. The only problem was that I could not keep back the tears on several chapters. It is difficult for me to understand how one man could hold so much knowledge and information in detail in his mind as you so clearly demonstrated in your magnificent writing. (F. Rose, personal communication, September 11, 1964)

Strode’s book was a substantive, and positive, look at the Old South and the Lost Cause and Rose’s letter shares this sentiment.

LeRoy Fischer, in the Journal of American History, critiqued the book by saying, “…his (Jefferson Davis) enemies are devils, and his friends, like Davis himself, have been canonized. Strode not only attempts to sanctify Davis but also the Confederate point of view, and this study should be relished by those vigorously sympathetic to the Lost Cause” (Fischer, 1965, p. 396).

H. Brandt Ayers (1970) was more directly critical.

> the symbols of the white South have also, moreover, been a barrier to self-perception…the average Southerner has found it difficult to see beyond the Confederacy. If he could see past it he would similarly revere the symbols of Monticello or the Hermitage – houses built by Southerners who led the nation and thus find even better reasons for self-respect (Ayers, 1970, p. 5).

It is not clear that Rose understood, or agreed with, these criticisms. His devotion to K.A. was unswerving, and likely such that evaluations of the intellectual founder of the fraternity, and its members, would not have pleased him.
Rose often cited the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian eras of the South in later speeches [West Virginia Wesleyan College Commencement, 1969]; thus he looked at the period before the inception of the Confederacy and its effects to make his points. After the difficulties Rose experienced with desegregation at Alabama, he sought to re-engage his thoughts on overcoming adversity and this is what Lee, Davis, and the Lost Cause represented. He was obviously enamored with the southern heritage of the fraternity and the symbolism it represented. K.A. was rooted in glory from defeat and overcoming adversity. The Christian-based code of chivalry helped create the martyrs of the old South. Rose felt a kinship to the fraternity through both his southern heritage and Christian upbringing.

At Transylvania College, Rose entered K.A. Order through the Alpha Theta Chapter. This chapter came to Transylvania College in April of 1891 when the four founders were initiated by knights of the Omega Chapter (Centre College, KY) at the Phoenix Hotel in Lexington (K.A. Order, 2014a; Chick, 1891). In September of 1940, Rose was initiated into Alpha Theta Chapter at Transylvania. He was very active in his fraternity and held leadership office in 1941-42. As pointed out in the November K.A. Journal (1953), “from the time of his own initiation until 1948, Brother Rose attended every initiation and every rush party held by his chapter, and after his graduation from Transylvania in 1942 until his acceptance of the presidency of the college (1951), he gave the initial talk to the boys who were considering K.A. as their choice of a fraternity” (p. 49). After his installation as president of Transylvania, Rose refrained from participating directly with his chapter to allay concerns over conflicts of interest with other fraternities and student organizations. However, he did remain active on the national level with K.A. Rose felt the fraternity was important to the college man because it furnished him with “the ideals that are so necessary for those who are to excel in the finer art of living and
living successfully” (*In eleven years*, 1953, p. 49). This elitism is in alignment with the code of chivalry and mission of the fraternity. The fraternity also provided Rose an opportunity to improve his standing in society. He had been raised poor in Mississippi, and the opportunity to join K.A. provided an opportunity to create new networks of friends. Rose was an ambitious man and Christianity and a sense of chivalry appear less to be motivators for this ambition than the personal connections made through the fraternity.

Rose was familiar with the members of K.A. Order who had been great leaders in life. Among them were General George C. Marshall, Admiral Richard E. Byrd, and General George S. Patton. Rose used them all often in addresses. He was an advocate for K.A. Order and he never hesitated to assist friends who desired to have their sons enter as members. His role on the K.A. national committee and position as president at The University of Alabama allowed him to make recommendations for fraternity membership on behalf of friends and university stakeholders. He would even contact The University of Alabama’s rival, Auburn University, to send letters to the K.A. rush chairman on behalf of friends. Of one candidate, Rose noted that he “possesses all of those abilities of character and intellect that would make him a good Brother, and I can recommend him to you without reservation” (F. Rose, personal communication, September 22, 1964). K.A. continued to be an influence on the Rose family. Rose’s brother, Ramon, attended Transylvania College and was a member of the fraternity in the mid-1940s. When Rose’s son Tony attended Transylvania in 1966, it was the desire of the elder Rose that he seek out membership in K.A. In a letter to Tony, Rose stated “I must admit that I was a little shook up that you did not seem to be impressed with the K.A.s. But I am sure that when you get to know them better you will change your mind” (F. Rose, personal communication, September 27, 1966). There is no indication that Rose contacted the Alpha Theta Chapter on his son’s
behalf, but he had a desire for his son to carry on the family legacy of becoming a member of K.A. It is not known why there was a hesitancy on the young Rose’s part, but eventually his father and uncle were pleased when Tony became a member of Alpha Theta Chapter.

Rose viewed the role of social organizations on a college campus as a powerful influence on the development of leaders. Rose also had ideas on the benefits offered by fraternities in higher education. He said,

while universities are primarily educational in nature, they are also social establishments, and fraternities are a manifestation of the tendency in human nature to institutionalize and to develop socially as well as intellectually…the main benefit of fraternities is that they afford students opportunities to exercise and develop leadership skills. (Brown, 1987, p. 6)

Most fraternal organizations for men were based on religious, occupational, or philosophical grounds. Many of these organizations were centered on an institution of higher learning that had a higher population of men who shared common values. Several social fraternities were originally founded on principles of moral and ethical contributions to man (Anderson, 2009). Over time, the social aspect of the fraternity eclipsed the original intent and missions of these organizations. Rose may not have looked at the fraternity environment as a place to create moral character, though that was his preference. Rather, Rose saw these organizations as great training grounds for leadership in general and a place for the understanding of political awareness and networking. As a national leader in K.A., Rose used his position to espouse leadership theory through the lens of honor and dignity as displayed by Robert E. Lee.

Rose worked various jobs to pay for his tuition at Transylvania and this required him to manage his time wisely. During his time with Alpha Theta Chapter, he was able to serve in leadership positions that were later used to help him “develop a career” in education (Brown, 1987, p. 6). His love for the fraternity, historical understanding of Lee, and his ability to speak
were shown in his address at the 1957 K.A. Order Conference. As Rose said about the event, “If I had not gone to that K.A. Convention, I never would have been president of The University of Alabama” (Brown, 1987, p. 6).

During Rose’s administration at The University of Alabama, he participated in very few K.A. events. The most notable exception was his participation in the dedication of the Alpha Beta Chapter house. In March of 1963, the UA chapter officially dedicated their new house on University Boulevard. Rose participated in the dedication and spoke at the dinner. The house finance building director was Ernest Williams, the board member at UA who had discovered Rose and pressed for his hiring as the 20th president at The University of Alabama (Alpha Beta/Alabama, 1963). The dedication took place just 90 days before Rose would guide the university through desegregation.

Rose was sought out as a speaker to several K.A. Order chapters around the nation, and, for the most part, did his best to attend these functions. At The University of Alabama, he appeared to be inclusive in his acceptance of all races into social organizations, but he left decisions about acceptance to the national governing bodies of the fraternities and sororities. Rose also understood the political landscape of the time and likely felt it best to leave these decisions on an organizational level. One friend of his was Hermann Wells, the Chancellor of Indiana University. Wells, an alumnus of Sigma Nu fraternity, was well aware that his national fraternity banned the pledging of Asians and African-Americans. However, due to federal laws that forbade discrimination and adversely impacted federal student loans, most universities with Sigma Nu chapters had to pass a waiver of honor to allow schools to be in compliance with the law. The waiver of honor was a statement from the university to the fraternity advising them on the handling of membership and non-discrimination and chapters agreed they would not practice
any discrimination in selection of their members. Regardless of the waiver, the fraternity would
still operate based on their own norms, allowing chapters to interpret their own definition of
discrimination. Wells was fully aware that The University of Alabama was not in compliance
with federal law and questioned Rose on his views related to this. Rose stated that

most fraternities and sororities likely maintain race-based restrictions, and some like
Sigma Nu (of which Paul W. Bryant was a member), maintain race-based proscriptions. However, if any fraternity or sorority were to decide to pledge black students, then our
administration would fully support them. Our decision on this matter has been made by
me as the president. (F. Rose, personal communication, May 5, 1966)

Rose understood the political dynamics of the U.A. fraternity system and advised Wells that
three of The University of Alabama board members were Sigma Nu members and to keep their
correspondence in the strictest of confidence. Though the university had desegregated, for Rose
the political battles in the board room over inclusiveness in a fraternity were not likely to be won.
There appeared to be no pressure for desegregation within the confines of the Greek system on
campus.

K.A. at The University of Alabama has been under scrutiny during and since Rose’s
administration. The scrutiny is more pronounced at UA than elsewhere due to the institutional
history related to desegregation and the civil rights era incidents within the state itself. This
creates a tendency to look closely and critically to the actions of fraternities at UA, especially at
racial issues. For years, the K.A. chapter at The University of Alabama, like many across the US,
celebrated “Old South” parties. These recreated an era long since passed, with members dressing
as Confederate officers and their dates as hoop-skirt wearing Southern belles. K.A. houses were
even draped with large Confederate battle flags, a symbol to many across the country of
discrimination.
The stigmas and stereotypes attached to these rituals eventually caused the national headquarters of K.A. to change the policy on this symbolism. In 2010, K.A. “banned members around the country from wearing Confederate uniforms to Old South parties and parades after years of complaints that the tradition was racially insensitive” (Reeves, 2010, para. 1). The impetus for this move apparently came from an incident at The University of Alabama in 2010, where the local K.A. chapter held an Old South parade having members dressed as Confederate soldiers and their ladies dressed in period dresses stopping in front of the Alpha Kappa Alpha (AKA) sorority house. AKA is a historically black women’s sorority, and the local chapter filed a complaint with their national headquarters and sent a petition to then President Robert Witt. The outcry was such that K.A. executive director Larry Wiese issued a memorandum to all national chapters stating “such displays have to end…In today’s climate, the Order can ill afford to offend our host institutions and fend off significant negative national press and remain effective at our core mission, which is to aid young men in becoming better community leaders and citizens” (Reeves, 2010, para. 1).

There is little evidence to indicate that Rose advocated the wearing of Confederate uniforms at events, but he was highly impressed with the symbolism of the fraternity as it related to overcoming defeat and creating good Christian leaders. To better understand this Ted Ownby of the University of Mississippi Center for the Study of Southern Culture has pointed out that “many people look at the South’s history and see what historians call the cavalier myth, an old idea that there was something distinctive about the Southern upper class….that view of the South changed over the Civil War. The loss to the North and the following years spawned a vision of the Confederacy as a time of bravery and sacrifice” (Muskal, 2015, p. 5). The K.A. fraternity was founded on the cavalier myth of chivalry and honor and over time it took on the theme of the
lost cause – bravery, character, and sacrifice helping in overcoming defeat. The Confederate uniform symbolized this notion for K.A. While the fraternity held activities with Confederate based themes, there is no evidence to indicate Rose saw them as detrimental to the building of character. Rather, he likely focused on the core mission of the fraternity as the reason for his fondness of the organization and chose to ignore the flaunting of Confederate emblems as part of the celebration of the fraternity since in this era their use was commonplace outside the fraternity.

Rose (as cited in Brown, 1987) once wrote an essay called the *Marks of an Educated Man* that he periodically used in speeches to sum up his feelings about the Christian man, one who understood chivalry, leadership, and character. It was a summation of his personal beliefs in what K.A., Robert E. Lee, and his Christian upbringing meant. He said,

“\[\text{The Educated Man has gained his strength from knowing and maintains it by learning...} \text{He knows himself and the men about him, and he is capable of discerning that which is good and bad within himself and others around him...} \text{The Educated Man sees in the physical sciences the eventual understanding of the material world in which he lives. He sees in the social sciences the promise of a better order...he sees in the humanities the opportunities of man to enrich his spiritual capacities and improve his values...} \text{The Educated Man is sensitive to man's inhumanity to man. He believes in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all people of the world. He may think and live in a region, but his knowledge, understanding, and sympathies are world-wide}\].” (as cited in Brown, 1987, p. 6).

Rose’s thoughts reflected the aspirations that all men should try to attain. In studying the mission of the fraternity and the influence of his theological roots, both can be seen to advocate the common values of reverence, service, leadership, and perseverance. This commonality was consistent with the inclusivity of the Christian church but questionable when juxtaposed to the demonstrated segregationism of K.A.

Near the end of Rose’s life, he invested his time and energy into the K.A. Order Educational Foundation. As a final testament to his fraternity, he helped them find a permanent
home in Lexington, Virginia, its birthplace, in order to create a historical legacy through its educational foundation. The fraternity secured its permanent headquarters location at Mulberry Hill, a Virginia historical landmark and a place that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Rose had envisioned placing the national headquarters at this location since it represented the location where Lee first entered Lexington. The symbolism of the location would tie the fraternity permanently to its spiritual founder. Rose had desired that the new headquarters be located where Lee first arrived in Lexington and in turn it was hoped that a historical connection could be made for the fraternity with the site. His efforts bore fruit even after his passing in 1991.

In 1993, J. David Carico of the K.A. Order Educational Foundation, of which Rose had been president, notified Rose’s attorney that “we are extremely proud and pleased to be recognized by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. This is quite an honor to us…and given Dr. Rose’s leadership in this project, I thought you might like to see the type of recognition we are beginning to receive” (J. Carico, personal communication, 1993).

Frank Rose was honored as K.A.’s 13th recipient of the Distinguished Achievement Award (K.A. Order, 1988). Rose’s citation in receiving the award puts in perspective his leadership with that of his hero Robert E. Lee:

By his exemplary leadership and the exercise of superb executive acumen as a university president and consultant of the highest order to numerous institutions of higher learning, he has made significant contributions to Higher Education in the United States, and by his gracious manner and innate integrity combined with religious devotion and dedication to the ideals of excellence in human accomplishments and chivalrous conduct, he has displayed the characteristics of the immortal Robert E. Lee to the youth of the nation and reflects high honor on the American University System and his fraternity, Kappa Alpha Order. (p. 2)

K.A. also nominated Rose for the National Inter-fraternity Conference Gold Medal for his lifetime contributions to all fraternities in general. Rose’s nomination made mention of his 1969 testimony before the Senate Finance Committee on maintaining tax exempt status for college
fraternities. The K.A. recommendation cited, “We understand that many of Dr. Rose’s more liberal colleagues among college presidents, took serious issue with his strong public stand on the educational values of fraternities” (K.A. Order, 1988, p. 1). It went on to point out that he had been an advocate for fraternities nationwide and that his goal “consistently had been to encourage fraternity men and women to maintain their organizations as positive adjuncts to higher education” (K.A. Order, 1988, p.1). This advocacy likely meant that Rose turned a blind eye to the negative attributes of fraternal organizations and concentrated solely on their positive influence on the college campus.

In February of 1991, Frank Rose passed away and K.A. memorialized him at an event in Lexington, Virginia. The memorial highlighted his character, leadership, and civility to all he encountered. It also focused a great deal on his time as president at The University of Alabama. William Garner (1991), director of the K.A. Educational Foundation quoted Rose regarding the desegregation of UA, “We will upgrade The University of Alabama’s level of quality to the point that students, faculty, and the citizens of Alabama would care too much for their school, state and people to let its reputation become tainted by anything…He opened the schoolhouse door to all men!” (p. 27). Garner (1991) also made note of the contentious relationship Rose shared with the governor of Alabama by quoting Rose from the 1987 K.A. Conference. Garner pointed out that when it came Rose’s time to speak he

“followed then governor of Kentucky Martha Layne Collins’ welcome with this quote – ‘Seeing the attractive Governor Collins up here, I have just thought of my friend Otis Singletary (then President of the University of Kentucky) and I was thinking why is it that Otis got to look at all those pretty Kentucky co-eds for his years as president, and yes, we had our share of handsome young people at Alabama, but I had to spend most of my time looking at George Wallace.”” (p. 27)

This gives a humorous view of Wallace, but a sexist view of Collins, though it does give insight to the amount of time Rose had to spend dealing with Wallace.
Garner concluded that “no two men were more alike in their dedication to young people, education, and all of human kind [than Rose and Robert E. Lee]” (p. 27). He also pointed out that Rose was a very effective communicator and motivator in addition to his ability to recruit people to any cause. But to add levity to the moment Garner said, “I say this with great affection, (Rose) was one of the greatest con men who ever lived” (p. 27). This harkens back to recollections of Rose’s past, specifically those of former UA Dean Culpepper Clark who said Rose could convince anyone that he was on their side in an argument.

As a lasting acknowledgement of Rose, K.A. Order passed a Memorial Resolution at its August 1991 conference in San Francisco. The resolution noted the life accomplishment of Rose as a matter of inclusion in the permanent records and archives of the fraternity. The resolution concluded by saying “we as Trustees, do hereby pause at this time to give tribute to and demonstrate our love and appreciation for Brother Frank A. Rose, recognizing and knowing that we shall miss him, his presence, his guidance and his counsel, his unforgettable fraternal friendship to each of us and his unequaled devotion to Kappa Alpha Order” (Garner, 1991, p. 27). While all memorial resolutions are designed to highlight the best of one’s life, in the case of Rose, these accolades were well earned. During the last two years of his life Rose was in poor health with emphysema and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease from a lifetime of smoking. But he gave all his energy to the fraternity in order that the K.A. Educational Foundation located its permanent home in Lexington, Virginia. In addition, no other member of the fraternity spoke at more national conferences than Rose. While not viewed as a scholar within higher education circles, he was seen as an astute historian of K.A.’s spiritual founder Robert E. Lee. Possessing an understanding of Lee and leading a life based on the principles espoused by Lee and the fraternity, Rose appeared to some members to have become an extension of Lee to the fraternity.
Overall, whether Rose is viewed as a politician, a diplomat, a minister, or an administrator, there is ample evidence to indicate the love of his fraternity was aligned with the core values he maintained as an educated man of theology, even though the two organizations were divided on the subject of desegregation. Rose is also viewed as a progressive and pragmatic leader who was originally transformational in nature, building strong relationships with stakeholders by using reinforcement and empowerment. This drew heavily from his ministerial training. Later Rose incorporated a transcendental leadership model where he used direct influence with those he interacted with. This leadership style was based on his political astuteness and negotiation skills. The basis for Rose’s leadership can be attributed in part to his role as a Christian minister and service to K.A. Order. There are other influences on his leadership, and they will be shown in the next few chapters, but these two had the most formative impact and were the passion of his life. All these influences played an important role during his presidencies at Transylvania College and The University of Alabama.
CHAPTER V:
TRANSYLVANIA COLLEGE AND THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

The issues facing Rose upon accepting the presidency at Transylvania would test his leadership skills. Though he was young, his experience as a minister, high school principal, and instructor at the college had provided him insight on how to address the overriding needs of the college. Rose had used his time in the pulpit to hone his communication skills and to develop strong networks around the state of Kentucky. His interpersonal skills allowed him to expand his social astuteness as it related to the needs of Transylvania. More importantly, the network of contacts and friends developed viewed Rose in a favorable light. Because of his allegiance to Transylvania and his authority as a minister he was viewed as leader with sincere goals. Rose’s job was to encapsulate the present condition of the university and present it to the stakeholders in a manner that would create a sense of urgency for restoring prestige to Transylvania. It would not be an easy task as there were many problems facing the university.

Upon ascending to the presidency of Transylvania College in 1951, Rose was “confronted with a crisis of financial indebtedness and declining enrollment” (Wright, 1975, p. 401). Rose immediately sought to increase church support of the institution and made numerous visits to congregations around the state of Kentucky in order to secure it. The first order of business revolved around the creation of financial stability for the college and Rose used his influence as a minister to go forth and seek assistance. As Wright (1975) explained, “No church was too obscure, no congregation too small for him to discuss the problems of the world in general and those of Transylvania in particular” (p. 401). But his main message was that the college was to be an instrument for developing high religious and moral values among its
students. In a commencement address, Rose (1953) described his view of what a student and graduate should be by saying “Transylvania has given you an education that should make you a sensitive, Christian citizen of the world. It is our hope that you have discovered the habitual vision of greatness which is to serve man and not destroy him” (Baccalaureate address Transy, 1953, p. 2). In order to accomplish this purpose, Rose had to address the financial needs of the college immediately. But he could not do this without sharing his vision of the university with local churches and stakeholders. The vision Rose had for Transylvania was not unrelated to the financial needs. They were congruent in their pursuit of the future success of the college.

At the beginning of his Transylvania presidency, Rose encountered a debt of $417,000. A circuit of meetings with all the Disciples of Christ congregations across the state had created pledges that addressed roughly one-fourth of the needs. Understanding that the congregations could not sustain the economic viability of Transylvania alone, Rose “believed that Kentucky’s private industry should express its commitment to private enterprise by supporting the independent private colleges in Kentucky” (Wright, 1975, p. 402). Through negotiations with the seven other private colleges in Kentucky, he helped initiate the Kentucky Independent College Foundation, which was “dedicated to annually soliciting funds from Kentucky industries and businesses to be divided equally among the colleges” (Wright, 1975, p. 402).

Pursuing an endowment goal of $1.5 million in conjunction with the college’s 175th anniversary, he was able to lead to the college out of debt. By April of 1957, the college had collected the entirety of the $1.5 million resulting in a new sense of pride in the college. As Wright (1975) noted, “The impact of these events (endowment campaign) was substantial. There was a new sense of spirit of confidence among the faculty and administration concerning future
prospects of the college. The new buildings on campus, especially the library and gymnasium, stimulated increased enthusiasm in the academic and athletic fields” (p. 405).

During his 1951 inauguration as president, Rose presented his address entitled *Hail Transylvania – Education for a New World* in which he enumerated the issues and opportunities facing the Christian college. Financially, the college was struggling and student enrollment had dropped. Rose (1951) addressed the faculty and students by saying, “I do think we can analyze our present dilemma, and perhaps move toward a solution by shaping our institutions and molding men’s thoughts in accordance with the best changes that are taking place in our economic and social world. I think we are all agreed that the difficulty of our time is the difficulty of the human spirit” (p. 2). His challenge to the audience dealt in balancing the advancements in the new world of technological gains against the spirit of the Christian church by being good moral leaders. In talking about technology, Rose said these developments are “imposing a responsibility upon us for which we are not prepared and not competent to accept…fully aware of the urgent character of our day, the liberal arts colleges must re-evaluate educational philosophies and practices, scrutinize their own participation in those practices, and seek to meet the responsibilities of these days” (p. 3).

Rose looked at American education in his inaugural address. He offered three views of educational philosophy facing the current day American college. He stated the first view was that of the cultural heritage where “it is the function of our colleges to transmit the cultural heritage of our western civilization through a content centered program of instruction” (Rose, 1951, p. 5). The second view placed the needs of the student at the core of the curriculum. Rose described this as an “approach that requires an examination of the student’s individual needs in preparing himself to enter the society in which he must earn a living, rear a family, exercise citizenship,
and face the gamut of problems in a modern civilization” (Rose, 1951, p. 6). Lastly, Rose cited the third view of education, the training of Christian citizens. He explained that this view maintains that it (training of Christian citizens) included (sic) all the essentials of a sound educational program adequate for our modern democratic society in the age of science, that it provides the fullest approach to the individual needs of the student, and that it dignifies the human personality and orients man in the physical and spiritual universe. (p. 6)

The point of this address was to refocus the college on the second and third goals, and particularly on the development of students as good citizens in order to better prepare them for the future. Rose’s Christian beliefs were shared so that the student remembers the foundational principles of their education.

With his inaugural address Rose effectively set the course for how Transylvania would operate as a Christian liberal arts college. It was his view that the college was there to provide an educational foundation rooted in moral leadership upon which students could expand their specialized training. To explain this point, Rose stated “the good liberal arts college concentrates all its resources in staff, facilities, and finances to giving an education to those who want to learn to live…its main concern is to give a foundation for the student’s special field, broaden his knowledge of the world, and prepare him for good citizenship” (p. 7). Rose felt that the Christian model of education produced a better leader for the community.

This address tied together the main issues that affected the livelihood of the college – finances, infrastructure, and faculty. If these three areas were addressed positively then the college would flourish and student enrollment would increase. He felt that adjusting programs to the changing times and providing trained and dedicated teachers was the key to educational success in addition to having a financially stable institution. Rose concluded that these “factors, supported by books, classrooms and laboratories, nourished in an atmosphere that encourages
learning, and inspired and directed by religious purposes, promise a better human product for the new world” (Rose, 1951, p. 9). As noted at the beginning of this chapter, Rose had been seeking out local Christian Churches to help with the finances of Transylvania. In order to be successful at this, his focus had to be on the development of Christian education for the students. Churches and other stakeholders of the college better understood the vision of Rose and it matched with their desires for future graduates.

The first annual Report of the President, delivered on June 9, 1952, presented a picture of the college in transition. It is important to go over the document that Rose presented due to the issues it addressed and the foresight and challenges he presented. He pointed out early in the report that the “Alumni have responded in excellent beginning of what promises to be a real contribution to the life of the College and the Churches have supported us without reservation” (Rose, 1952, p. 1). Rose stressed that the needed faculty number for an enrollment of 250 students was around 32 instructors. Yet Transylvania stood at 22 which as Rose stated was “increasing the lines of tension among some members of the staff” (Rose, 1952, p. 3). One reason for the lack of instructors was the low salary scale. Even though the college had increased tuition, these funds went to purchase supplies due to the rise in market prices. Rose noted that the faculty had gone five years with no salary increase and said “there is an end to the sacrifices that can be made in these days of increased costs of living” (p. 4). Rose made it an imperative to increase salaries though the faculties’ “spirit has been wonderful and their work most effective” (p. 4).

The second part of the report dealt with student enrollment. Rose noted that Transylvania was at a disadvantage being just a few blocks from the large public state university (Kentucky) “whose tuition is less than one-half ours” (Rose, 1952, p. 4). However, Rose added that the
enrollment decrease was also due to cyclical issues related to low birthrates during the depression that would rebound around 1958 with the increase in birthrates from the World War II years. A complicating enrollment factor was that after the first quarter of the year, one in seven students did not return to school for numerous reasons. Rose pointed out that the enrollment figures may highlight of most importance to Transylvania “the financial factor, dissatisfaction with some aspects of college, and the presence of students who had only planned be here a year or so” (p. 5). Rose’s confidence was justified as the college was about to enroll around 200 new students and retain 150 of their last class, resulting in a 30% increase in enrollment in contrast to a national average of a 12% decrease. Rose gave credit for this increase to the engagement of the local churches. This came as a result of an increased emphasis on Christian education in conjunction with the standard liberal arts program. He specifically pointed out that “the program that Dr. (Raymond) McLain is now engaged in through the national Council of Churches…has contributed a great deal to the Christian emphasis we have witnessed this year” (Rose, 1952, p. 7).

The final portion of the report dealt with infrastructure needs including dormitories, academic buildings, chapel, and a new library. The need to address the dormitories was paramount as Rose noted that “prospective students are brought to the College to look our campus over, and we lose them after they survey the dormitory facilities” (Rose, 1952, p. 7). On a more positive note, the construction of a new library provided an early example of how the university improved the campus plant. The construction of the library was not without problems, however. The college had appropriated $185,000 for its construction. Transylvania, however, could only get a low bid of $285,000. Rose exercised good business sense and decided to proceed with the construction in order “to complete all of the building on the outside and
complete one floor level on the inside and lock off the other two levels until funds are sufficient for completion” (p. 8). Rose then challenged the Board to raise the funds necessary to complete the remaining levels of the library within one year. He stated “there is nothing that will mean more to our future than the construction of this new library. Once this building is under construction, I believe we can push on with victory the completing our gymnasium-auditorium” (p. 9). Rose expressed his desire to make the college’s new gymnasium-auditorium available to the Lexington community to gain buy-in from local businesses and government in supporting the institution. He also indicated that construction of these two facilities would “let them (local citizens) know that we mean to stay here and do business on this property” (p. 9). The local public knew the college was not on firm financial ground and Rose understood the power of showing everyone the institution was intending to grow and remain a fixture in Lexington.

The January 1952 President’s Report concluded with both a challenge and a vision of what the future held for Transylvania. Rose pointed out that the college had never had an adequate financial endowment. He indicated he had reviewed every report of former presidents going back to 1924 and found that “there is not another college in Kentucky with as low an endowment as we have, and yet with all of them having two million dollars or more than we have, they have had deficit spending…if we had only one million dollars more, we would never have had a year of deficit operations” (Rose, 1952, p. 12). Rose tried to convince the Board to look ahead to the 175th Anniversary of Transylvania in 1955 in order “to make it possible for us to have our library and our gymnasium-auditorium completed and our other properties in excellent condition” (p. 12). He shared with the Board that the next five years would be difficult but “with the churches behind us, with private industry investing in our future, and with enthusiastic alumni supporting us, we should find ourselves financially improved” (p. 13). Rose
relied on his Christian ministerial training and relationships with leaders within the church to help build stronger connections with the Disciples of Christ. Rose had made the point in his seminary thesis that the rewards of collective action are what save men, not individual actions. It was important that the Christian churches collectively work with Transylvania to restore the institutions image. All would come to fruition and Rose would be able create an environment for the celebration of the 175th Anniversary that was unmatched in the college’s history.

In June of 1953, Rose made his second annual report to the Board of Curators and it marked a new focus in the direction of the institution. Rose’s many appeals to local churches and the Board of Curators were starting to bear fruit with work nearly complete on the new library. Progress was being made in addressing the debt of the university and the five-year capital campaign for the library, gymnasium-auditorium, and endowment was to be launched on January 1, 1954. This came after a statewide survey of the needs for the university had been completed by the New York firm of Marts and Lundy. Rose (1953) summarized the positive findings of the survey to the institutional stakeholders by saying, “Transylvania has given Kentucky her finest cultural tradition and continues to furnish our commonwealth with the finest young men and women, greatly contributing to our political, social, and spiritual life. For this heritage and her continuing contributions, the people of Kentucky are grateful and will support this great college” (p. 1).

The new capital campaign would solicit funds from “Lexington citizens, from Transylvania alumni, and from individuals who are members of the Christian churches in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi” (Rose, 1953, p. 1). Rose’s contacts with the Christian churches of the state and region would soon pay dividends for the college.
When the capital program began, Rose worked to give it an added boost by incorporating the help of Transylvania alumnus Charles Allen Thomas, who had coordinated the Manhattan Project on plutonium development during World War II. Rose used Thomas’s stature in business and government to secure a visit from President Dwight D. Eisenhower for the 175th Anniversary of the college (Wright, 1975, p. 402-403). With Eisenhower’s acceptance of the invitation, dramatic improvements could begin on the campus along with an increased excitement for the future of the college. On April 23, 1954, Eisenhower officially visited Transylvania College to help kick off the three-day convocation to celebrate the 175th anniversary. Upon Eisenhower’s arrival at the Lexington airport, supportive local citizens observed as the President, along with Rose and Senator John Sherman Cooper, passed through Lexington in a convertible headed for his much anticipated visit to Transylvania. Photos of the event captured the excitement of the crowds that day which proved helpful in gaining traction for the new capital drive. President Eisenhower “sensed the spirit of Transylvania” stating, “It seems to me that everybody who in the past has graduated from this institution, or who today is privileged to serve it or to be here as a student, has a great heritage of tradition which cannot fail to enrich his life as long as he shall live” (Wright, 1975, p. 4). For Rose and Transylvania there were no better public relations to be had.

While the visit of President Eisenhower created a great deal of pride for Transylvania, it came at a difficult time for Rose. Two days prior to the visit, Mrs. B.R. Curtis, 56…mother of Frank A. Rose, president of Transylvania College died in Meridian, Mississippi following a series of strokes that began three weeks ago. Rose said he would leave for Meridian after the weekend ceremonies for the 175th anniversary and Eisenhower’s visit. His stepfather had died on April 16. (Frank Rose mother, 1954, p. 4)
Rose was an ambitious man who wanted to make sure things went smoothly for the visit of the President. He showed no disrespect for his mother at this juncture since there was little he could do to alter the arrangements for her burial. He understood the overriding issue of improving the college financially and academically. Being present for the President of the United States visit was a significant symbol of his leadership toward improving the college, even if it meant a delay in paying his final respects.

The success of Eisenhower’s visit to the college reinvigorated support for Transylvania from local churches and alumni. In Rose’s November 1954 annual report to the Board of Curators, he spent his time praising the work of the administrative staff and faculty in preparing for the event and ensuring it was a success. This translated well to the enrollment side of the college as Rose shared that the student body increased to the limit of our present facilities, our new library was completed and dedicated, our indebtedness was underwritten by our successful campaign in Central Kentucky (businesses and alumni), and our current budget was balanced. This is an accomplishment far beyond the hopes and expectations of any of us. (Rose, 1954c, p. 2)

With this news, many on the board believed that Rose had accomplished a great deal. Additionally, his abilities were noticed nationally as he was selected as one of the 10 outstanding young men of 1954 by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Rose was selected for this honor in part for his work in developing a “scholarship program that pays the educational expenses of 200 students a year. More than 200 corporations and 1,000 individuals now subscribe to the program. Enrollment had doubled, a new library built…and the college debt paid off” (Rose of Transylvania, 1955, p. 1). Additionally, a number of Rose’s extracurricular activities were listed including his work in 1951 as “a guest of the U.N. in Palestine where he observed the work being done there among Jews and Arabs” (Rose of Transylvania, 1955, p. 1).
As noted earlier, another of the ten young men selected for this honor was a young attorney by the name of Robert F. Kennedy, whom Rose would develop a close relationship with over the next thirteen years. Rose continued to build a network of friendships that would prove beneficial in later educational endeavors.

With his increased visibility and successful record over his first three years at Transylvania, Rose was beginning to make significant changes for the college. These changes were shared with the faculty and administration in the November 1954 Report of the President. The report was important because it spelled out the positive growth of the university. One item Rose pointed out was the significance of positively affecting the financial status of the college. He said, “I would not be honest if I did not tell you that one of the greatest experiences that comes to a college president is that of balancing the budget…It is at this point that a college president can discover the health of his institution when he has so large and varied a constituency contributing to it and such splendid team work in managing it” (F. Rose, 1954a, p. 1). Rose was quick to give credit to those around him, often through using the theme of teamwork in accomplishing goals. He cited many people in his report as being responsible for the good fortunes at Transylvania. In concluding his comments on the present state of the college, Rose said, “As I see it, there is no secret to our success. It has been due to careful planning and hard work on the part of many people” (F. Rose, 1954a, p. 2). The next direction for the college, according to Rose, was toward improvement in facilities (renovations) and equipment. The capital campaign had been successful in bringing a new library, initiating a new gymnasium/auditorium, and increasing faculty salaries. However, Rose used these accomplishments as a springboard to further correct the aging facilities on campus. He simply
stated, “we are still seriously crippled by poor educational equipment and while our faculty members have been patient, this does not remedy a bad situation” (F. Rose, 1954a, p. 3).

The Board of Curators soon addressed the needs of Transylvania by placing an emphasis on better instructional equipment and augmenting facilities with needed improvements. With this, Rose and the administration turned attention toward a reorganization of the academic program. In doing so, Rose reiterated an old theme by saying “our world desperately needs people in positions of leadership who are capable of seeing life as a whole” (F. Rose, 1957a, p. 2). In his 1957 Report to the Board of Curators, the depth and breadth of changes were reflected. No longer was the emphasis on buildings and salaries, but now on academics. Rose used the report to share changes forthcoming on academic restructuring, standards, and classifications. He continued to place an emphasis on the liberal arts in order to make a student a well-rounded and worldly leader. Rose advocated that the student must experience life in totality from an academic standpoint. His thought here was a true concentration on the liberal arts to make students well-rounded in their knowledge of the world. Once this was accomplished, the student could pursue a specialized education (engineering, science, religion, etc.). The administrative team at Transylvania felt this could only be accomplished through a true liberal arts education. Rose succinctly stated that “our modern dilemma points with intensity to our (administrators) weakness in modern education to accomplish this end (a true liberal arts curriculum)” (F. Rose, 1957a, p. 2).

In order to better develop the liberal arts program needed, Rose enlisted the leadership of professors Leland Brown and Irvin Lunger to transform the departmental organization of Transylvania. Through their efforts, the college was able to consolidate departments and place them under four major divisions – natural sciences, social studies, education, and humanities.
Natural sciences would encompass the sciences, mathematics, and psychology. Social Studies comprised history, political science, economics and sociology as the main department areas. Education was redesigned by including physical education and a new emphasis on teaching leadership. Humanities included English, foreign languages, philosophy, religion, and the fine arts. Rose assigned to Brown, a science professor, the responsibility of piloting the new divisional program in natural sciences. He noted that “under the chairmanship of Dr. Brown, this pilot division demonstrated the fiscal and academic gains which are the promise of the divisional structure. Morale arose in the division as wise planning enriched the work of each department” (F. Rose, 1957a, p. 3).

In changing the educational environment at Transylvania Rose sought to strengthen the academics for students currently enrolled. A new emphasis was placed on academic classification by requiring all juniors to complete a core of courses before being fully designated seniors. To better assist future students, admissions to Transylvania were also changed from reliance on high school standing to use of “the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Board for the out-of-state students and the Kentucky Classification battery Test for Kentucky students” (F. Rose, 1957a, p. 4). Rose and his team felt this to be a more equitable system of granting admission and awarding scholarships since high school standing was not considered to be equal due to differing standards from school district to school district or region to region.

Rose also fought for an increase in tuition and special registration fees. He felt this was warranted as a “fair means of spreading the costs of increased faculty salaries proportionately to the students” (F. Rose, 1957a, p. 5). Rose’s report showed a stable college from the standpoint of finances, faculty, enrollment, and infrastructure. The tone of the report was positive and as
before there was the inclusion of more individuals to be thanked for their leadership. Rose summarized his feelings on his six years of service at Transylvania by saying,

> These have been busy and difficult years, but the confidence and support of the students, faculty, and Curators have been most rewarding ones. Many college presidents speak of the loneliness of their position, but the gracious and understanding spirit of the above groups has always made me feel a part of them. For the loyalty and devotion of all…I will forever remain grateful. (F. Rose, 1957a, p. 1)

Rose’s presidency at Transylvania was a success. Not only had he improved the facilities, faculty salaries, athletics, and academic reputation, he had also maintained strong ties to the Disciples of Christ community served by the college. These ties relied on his knowledge as a Christian minister and understanding of the college as it related to the Disciples of Christ mission. Rose’s familiarity with the college, seminary, and affiliated ministers across the state of Kentucky allowed him to quickly address the negative issues facing Transylvania on his ascendency to president. In order to get Transylvania College in the public eye, Rose traversed Kentucky to speak with civic groups, church congregations, and at high school commencements. He used these occasions to tie together the message of the school and the underlying Christian ethos that directed the college, Rose would also connect the heritage of the United States to its Christian foundations. During one address to the Kentucky Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives, he pointed out how the two were connected. Rose said,

> The story of America is the story of a people dedicated to first things and willing to sacrifice and die that their priorities might survive for posterity. These priorities are intelligent life, moral life, and faith. We Americans have never been afraid of ideas and differing political parties that have been in America, the several hundred church denominations, the thousands of colleges and universities, and the millions of discoveries and inventions show us to be a thinking people. Freedom of thought and freedom of speech have been no idle words. (Priorities in a confused, 1954, p. 2)
Faith was an important part of Rose’s life, both as a minister and an administrator. His religious goals were to help educate students to be moral leaders while his educational goals sought open-mindedness alongside of commitment.

In November of 1954, Rose was asked to speak to the Kentucky District Convention of Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ). He focused on Christian education, specifically the supply of ministers to the general populace. Rose spoke of a changing cultural environment and “with the urgent demand in the world for moral and spiritual leadership at the local, national, and international level, it becomes the solemn obligation of churches and church men everywhere to support the type of education that will produce enlightened personnel for this task” (Rose, 1954b, p. 1). Rose related that Christian colleges and junior colleges provided the pipeline for ministers to the local congregations. He understood that not everyone attending a Christian college like Transylvania would make the ministry a career. He noted however, that the college supplies “not only ministers and other professional workers for full-time Christian service, but an educated laity, doctors, lawyers, teachers, businessmen, and others who will be lay leaders in the various churches” (Rose, 1954b, p. 1). The habitual pursuit of greatness continued to be his theme for the stakeholders and students of Transylvania and the Christian Church. Rose centered his thoughts on the caring and service attitude that all Christians should possess.

Rose crisscrossed Kentucky to sell his vision of what Transylvania could become. As a result, he was often asked to speak at events outside of church and civic groups. One notable address came in November of 1955 when Rose addressed the Kentucky Farm Bureau banquet at the University of Kentucky. The theme of his address was the Poverty of Spirit in which he stressed the importance of keeping the American faith. He felt families and educators needed to
work harder at prioritizing what is important in life. He provided three indications of how this could be accomplished.

[1] We need to put more into life…we have allowed ourselves to become slaves to our institutions, rather than allowing our institutions to serve us. The ends have determined too much the means by which we are to live and the result has been a poverty of the spirit. 2. We need to improve our values. This has certainly been a day of lowering the standards and we do not require enough quality in our leadership…3. We need a cause worthy of dedication. The minister in his sanctuary devoted to the truth, the teacher in the classroom molding the thinking of his student – these are those who will give destiny to our people. (Rose address to, 1955, p. 2)

Rose did his best to weave together the need for a faith-based education that was rooted in strong ethical and moral standards. This provides a good reflection on Rose’s conception of Christian leadership in the college setting.

In June of 1956, Rose shared a sermon with the Transylvania student body that he had used on occasions around the state. Relating back to his master’s thesis at the College of the Bible, he challenged students when he said,

A student succeeds in proportion to how much of himself he is willing to put into his educational experience; the experience cannot end with college but must continue through life. Can we learn to do constantly what we have been able to do frequently and can we do completely what we have been able to do partially? Do not let the objective world defeat you, it is still man’s subjective contributions, his courage and faith that determine the issues of life. Defeat comes from inner collapse. Do not compromise your life. Real education is self-development and not to be confused with training. (Rose delivers baccalaureate, June 4, 1956, p. 2)

Rose was a minister by training and much in his speeches or sermons came from his experiences while a student. He used Christian service to shape the vocabulary so he can address all sides of the issue he speaking upon. In the best spirit of a minister, he always challenged the listener to do more and go farther.

Rose also left a very positive impression on the Transylvania students who viewed him as a mentor. One such student was Larry McGehee who left his hometown of Paris, Tennessee, in
1954 to attend Transylvania College. He pointed out in later years that he knew three things about Transylvania before he arrived on campus. It was small, church affiliated, and was 175 years old being the oldest institution west of the Allegheny’s. But upon his arrival, two things left a lasting impression: “the first was the entire student body came down with food poisoning from banana pudding” and “the second thing was getting to meet the college’s president, Frank Rose who was tall, dark, and dignified and, at age twenty-nine, was just beginning a long and successful career in college administration” (McGehee, 2005, p. 173). Rose’s influence on McGehee was long lasting, as he became a member of the same fraternity and graduated from Transylvania to move into the Disciples of Christ ministry. He would later earn his doctorate from Yale and follow Rose to The University of Alabama as a young vice-president.

Transylvania’s basketball coach C.M. Newton, who would also follow Rose to UA, understood his leadership very well. Rose had developed strong communication skills through his service as a debate student and work as a student minister. Once he had completed seminary, Rose continued to hone his speaking skills and became adept at getting his points clearly understood by his audience. Newton pointed out that

“as a young president he could just almost convince you of anything. He was a super salesman and an outstanding educator. He was one of the few presidents at Transylvania that went before the student body and announced a tuition increase, and before he was through, they gave him a standing ovation. He had that ability” (as cited in Hewlett, 1991, p. 4).

With the success he had helped create at Transylvania, Rose was a desirable administrator. Upon his departure for the University of Alabama, the congregation of the Ninth Street Christian Church in Hopkinsville, Kentucky, wrote to Rose to explain,

We have enjoyed the many recognitions and distinctions which have come to our brotherhood through you, both as an educator and as a Christian layman. We are grateful for the inspiration and direction which you have given to our young people who have been placed in your charge. Our blessings... go with you in your new field of service and
we believe, although you may be somewhat removed, we shall still share in the overall enrichment of our brotherhood and nation, when effective men like yourself continue to direct the thinking and inquiry of the students of our country. (Ninth Street Christian Church, personal communication, January 8, 1958)

Rose’s departure from Transylvania had quite an effect on the college and the state of Kentucky.

Both the *Lexington Herald* and *Lexington Leader* published editorials on September 7, 1957, regarding Rose’s departure for The University of Alabama. The thoughts reflected two points of view; Rose was a highly-qualified administrator and Alabama while inferior to Kentucky in academics but not athletics, now had an administrator who could make improvements in both areas. The *Lexington Herald* pointed out that

> Most of us have become accustomed through the years to seeing Alabama surpass Kentucky in athletics, but we are not ready to acknowledge any degree of superiority in the academic field. Now it seems that state has decided to step up its academic standing through the selection of a Kentuckian to head its university….Few educators have won the confidence of an entire state as has Frank Rose, and we are glad that Alabamans will be given the opportunity of seeing one of Kentucky’s go-getter sons in action. We just hope he doesn’t decide to put the same enthusiasm back of Alabama’s athletic program as he did behind his efforts to build up Transylvania educationally and financially. This could be ruinous just at a time when Kentucky feels that it has a chance against this Southern foe. (*Alabama takes Kentucky*, 1957, p. 2)

The overall point was that Rose would succeed in improving the academics at Alabama, but it was under laid by fear of waking the sleeping giant of Alabama football. The *Lexington Leader* in its editorial made no reference to athletics, rather giving accolades to Rose and his accomplishments of rebuilding Transylvania from all perspectives. It pointed out that Rose has “embraced the cause of education as a whole, and especially the cause of the independent and church related colleges of the nation….The University of Alabama would have been hard put to find a more able, conscientious and highly regarded man as its new president” (*Alabama takes Kentucky*, 1957, p. 2). Both newspapers recognized the abilities Rose possessed in helping to improve Transylvania College and felt he could do the same for The University of Alabama.
However, they did not appreciate the complexity of issues that Rose would face in transforming the university.
CHAPTER VI:
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, 1957-63 REBUILDING AND DESEGREGATION

Frank Rose came to the attention of The University of Alabama Presidential Search Committee in 1957. He had not been their first choice, as the committee had approached Chancellor John Williams at the University of Mississippi. But Williams told UA trustee John Caddell that “we really didn’t need an older man like him, that what we needed was a vibrant, young man who could create a new image for the University…and a good football program” (Stevenson, 1981, p. 9C). Caddell believed that the dynamics of the university called for this type leadership. In May of 1957, Rose was chosen to be the keynote speaker at the Tuscaloosa event in order to “speak in the interest of a building fund program for Alpha Beta chapter (UA) of the Kappa Alpha fraternity” (Transylvania College head, 1957, p. 26). The chairman of the K.A. building program was Robert Leigh, who as an alumnus of the university, had sought out Rose for his oratory and K.A. influence to help spearhead the campaign. Unbeknownst to everyone attending, UA alumni were looking at their future president. Years later, UA Board of Trustee member John Caddell recalled how Henry Harris, an in-law of his from Louisville, Kentucky, had mentioned Rose for the open post. When told he was young and dynamic and an ordained Christian Church minister, Caddell responded by saying, “Henry, we don’t need a preacher down here…and Rose kind of passed out of my mind” (as cited in Stevenson, 1981, p. 9C). It was not until Ernest Williams reported back to Caddell after hearing Rose speak at the K.A. meeting that Rose was considered. Williams flatly stated, “it was one of the best speeches he had ever heard and that this Rose fellow really warranted looking into” (as cited in Stevenson, 1981, p. 9C).
Given Williams’ enthusiasm for Rose, Caddell immediately contacted Coach Paul W. Bryant, then head coach at Texas A&M University, who had previously held the head coaching position at the University of Kentucky, where he had become familiar with Rose. Bryant was a 1936 graduate of UA and was friends with Caddell and his wife. Knowing that Bryant had been at Kentucky while Rose was at Transylvania College, Caddell hoped Bryant could shed some light on the young administrator. Bryant contacted Caddell and said ‘that Rose would make an excellent president for the University’ (as cited in Stevenson, 1981, p. 9C). With this and the input of other board members who had researched Rose, the committee decided to approach him about the job. Caddell indicated that Rose said that UA “needed to get the football program back on its feet and that if he was going to be president he wanted the key role in getting a football coach” (as cited in Stevenson, 1981, p. 9C). As will be shown shortly, he quickly accomplished this. The Board of Trustees was wary that Rose possessed no earned doctorate; therefore, UA felt compelled to bestow an honorary doctoral degree. Caddell noted that Rose was ‘no great scholar, but the ideal man for us at the time and a man who did indeed turn out to be charismatic and an excellent salesman for the university’ (as cited in Stevenson, 1981, p. 9C).

Frank Rose became the 20th president of The University of Alabama in the fall of 1957. He was taking the helm of an institution that was just 18 months removed from a failed attempt to enroll Autherine Lucy and thereby desegregate the university. The federal court order that allowed her to enter the university, even though she left the university because of overwhelming controversy provoked by her enrollment, was still in force. Rose understood it was only a matter of time before an African-American student would again apply for admission to UA. His focus would be on desegregating in an orderly fashion and without negative incidents that affected the university’s mission. In 1957, Rose found the university in a
shaken state from the Lucy episode when he arrived. Some 60 faculty members had quit. There had been widespread faculty disillusionment a few months earlier when Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael left as president…the most distinguished scholar in the school’s history, had angered alumni by letting Alabama’s football fortunes sag. And he was widely suspected of being too soft on integration to suit trustees or legislators. (Harvey, 1963, p. 2)

The situation had been so poorly handled that when violence on campus broke out Carmichael and the Board of Trustees were caught totally by surprise. As the *Birmingham Post-Herald* reported, “Carmichael was not even in town when the first mob swarmed over the campus, the day after Lucy enrolled. The demonstrations kept growing larger and uglier, unimpeded by the handful of police on hand” (Harvey, 1963, p. 2). The lack of preparedness and leadership for the event was problematic and eventually Lucy had to be removed from campus for her own safety.

The desegregation attempt was a public relations disaster. While there were many negatives attached to it, they also afforded opportunities for Rose to create future solutions. Rose’s view of the incident allowed him to plan accordingly in order to prevent future riots that would further tarnish the reputation of The University of Alabama. Famed *Birmingham Post-Herald* Columnist, John Temple Graves II in his column “This Afternoon” described Rose as follows. “A politician of the Lord…and as a minister of God he is for the Lord, of course. He is also for the Lord’s University of Alabama. With eloquence, imagination, force, contrivance, maneuver, dream, will, and an easy and endearing personality, he is out to make our University shine in even more glory and use than it has ever known in its glorious and useful life” (Graves, 1958, para. 3). Rose noted of the issues encountered by Carmichael. He knew that any actions taken by the administration, especially in the area of desegregation, had the ability to create problems for the university. Rose was likely politically sensitive to the issue of desegregation and what was best for the university. Rose was quoted as saying, it is “impossible for any institutionally sponsored activity to express a political opinion without giving the erroneous
impression that it reflects the opinion of the institution or of its officers of administration” (as cited in Graves, 1958, para. 6). Rose had understood the dynamics of a university that prided itself on its southern heritage and athletic success. Having grown up in Mississippi, he was a man of the South. Having been educated in Kentucky, he had seen firsthand a university which took pride in its athletic success. Kentucky was a basketball power and the success of the university as perceived by the alumni and supporters was measured in terms of success on the court. The same was true at Alabama and the first issue at hand was to address the pride and athletic heritage of the university - Alabama football.

When originally approached about the position at The University of Alabama, Rose indicated he wanted a role in selecting the new football coach. As soon as Rose was offered the presidency in the fall of 1957, he began the work of rebuilding the pride of the university, football. Alabama football was about to finish the 1957 season with its fourth straight losing season. In November of 1957, Bryant’s Texas A&M Aggies were ranked number one in the country. As Randy Roberts (1957) of the Wall Street Journal pointed out, Rose along with other trustees “flew from Tuscaloosa to Houston for what would become the most important alumni call in the history of college sports.” At the Shamrock Hotel, negotiations took place with Bryant only willing to consider the move. He requested that the offer not be made public.

Alabama’s rival, Auburn, ended up winning the national championship at the end of the year, making the Alabama job that much tougher for the incoming president. Rose’s flirtations with Bryant prior to the end of the season initially had a negative effect. Word got out quickly and the Houston Post even had a headline stating Bear Goes to Bama. Bryant initially said he needed time to think about the offer to which Rose said, ‘I didn’t have the time to wait, that we needed to move ahead with our program, and that I guess I would go up to Arkansas and hire
Frank Broyles’ (as cited in Thornton, 1989, p. 9B). Bryant immediately told him he wanted the job. Broyles was considered one of the best young coaches in the country. He was a graduate of Alabama’s bitter rival Georgia Tech and had just completed a successful season at the University of Missouri before entertaining the University of Arkansas job during this same timeframe.

On November 23, 1957, two days before the game with the University of Texas, Bryant removed himself from consideration for the job at Alabama by recommending Jim Tatum of Maryland. Rose made the information known to the public and indicated it would be at least 10 days before we get things worked out. We are not going to be pushed into any hasty action. There are several people still to be talked to and many things will be considered. At the present time we are trying to get information on several coaches. It is not true that we have signed anyone, and I resent the fact that some people are trying to explode this thing. When we get ready to make the announcement, we will do so, attempting to be fair with everyone….We asked Mr. Bryant to give us some counsel and help on suggestions, to tell us what he’d think best in our situation. When I returned to Lexington yesterday, his letter was in waiting. He said that he’d been greatly disturbed by the pressure on him, that he wanted to remove himself from the picture and wanted to recommend Mr. Tatum. (Bryant declines post, 1957, p. 3-C)

This was all for show. Bryant had already accepted the position in principle back during Rose and Sington’s visit on November 9th. The most that can be said for the letter was it was designed to give Bryant cover for the upcoming rivalry game with Texas. Rose was a politician and knew he had already secured the services of Bryant.

As the pursuit of Bryant came to a climax, Rose wrote to Texas A&M President W.T. Harrington and advised him “that we seek to employ Mr. Paul Bryant as the new Football Coach and Athletic Director at the University of Alabama….It is our studied opinion that Mr. Bryant is the only coach who can remedy the poor situation at the University of Alabama” (F. Rose, personal communication, November 25, 1957). Harrington sent back a stinging letter to the president-elect of UA stating, “Today Mr. Paul W. Brant asked for release from his contract as Athletic Director and Head Football Coach at the A. and M….I think it was inconsiderate of you
and the other representatives of the University of Alabama to contact Mr. Bryant before the end of our football season. I hope that he will be successful in remedying the poor situation at the University of Alabama, as you have stated” (W. T. Harrington, personal communication, December 2, 1957). While the matter was handled poorly and not in a manner typical of Rose’s diplomatic style, he had solved a major problem facing him prior to his inauguration. Earl Tilford stated it best when he said, “Rose, like (Dr. George) Denny, understood the role football played in the university’s culture. As long as the Crimson Tide won championships, Alabama fans…along with members of the state legislature, remained supportive. Football provided cover while Rose turned the academic and cultural tide to move the university in a new and more progressive direction” (Tilford, 2014, p. 207).

Bryant was returning home “to a losing team and a university facing its greatest crisis since the Civil War” (Roberts, 2013). Alabama alumnus and noted newspaperman Howell Raines once said Bryant came to Alabama at the “midnight of its humiliation” (Berkow, 1983, p. 12). To Rose, Bryant’s hiring meant getting off on a positive note and Rose was quick to point out to the press and university stakeholders that “Mr. Bryant, I believe, is the greatest coach in football. Alabama will be back on top where it belongs and it will not take our new coach a long while to get the team up” (Bear Bryant is, 1957, p. 4). It would not be long before Rose’s words proved prophetic. In 1961, the Alabama football team cruised to a perfect 10-0 season winning the mythical national championship in Coach Bryant’s fourth year. In early December 1961, Rose, Bryant, several trustees, and Pat Trammell (the team quarterback) traveled to New York’s Waldorf Astoria for the Hall of Fame Dinner to be presented the National Championship Trophy by President John F. Kennedy and General Douglas MacArthur. Kennedy’s few words on the team’s accomplishment were broadcast via telephone to a pep rally held in Foster Auditorium on
the UA campus. He said, “I was at college in the thirties and I remember those days when the Crimson Tide was sweeping across the United States, when it went to the Rose Bowl on several occasions and won – and I am delighted and I’m sure all of us who are supporters of football are delighted to see the University of Alabama is on the top again….The University of Alabama is a great school and has had a great tradition in the South and the country” (Bama’s a great, 1961, p. 2). Greater publicity could not have been delivered to the university than that which came with Kennedy’s words. They provided a sense of pride in the institution and region as well as demonstrated that the university could rise from defeat and become a winner again.

Rose through his hiring of Bryant earned political capital to expend as he moved forward with changing the dynamics of the university. Also Rose called on Bryant to assist with the desegregation of the university. As Rose would later recall,

“the coach, of course was concerned about the problems of segregation and he felt the university should move forward as quickly as possible in getting the matter settled. He talked with a lot of state leaders and prominent alumni and went with me to talk to a number of legislators and other people to get their approval for the university to move ahead” (Harwell, 1983, p. C8).

Howell Raines would later recall that “Bryant shared (with Rose)…contempt of Governor Wallace…but Bryant decided against publicly confronting Wallace” on the race issue at Alabama (Berkow, 1983, p. 12). Instead, the team of Rose and Bryant went through back channels to make the plea for a safe desegregation of the university.

Unbeknownst to many, Rose and Bryant had an encounter with racist Birmingham Police Chief “Bull” Connor. Connor called Rose to a meeting in the fall of 1963 about an upcoming football game Alabama was to play at Legion Field. Rose invited Coach Bryant along for the meeting and upon their arrival, Connor advised

that no tickets were going to be sold to blacks. Bear and I told him we’d never play any more games in Birmingham to which Connor replied, “Well, I guess I didn’t really mean it.” Bryant said that if any black person is hurt or a rock thrown at him, we’ll never come
back. The game was played and blacks came and there were no incidents. (Berkow, 1983, p. 12)

Rose understood the need for the assistance of the popular football coach in addressing desegregation. He understood the times were changing in the South, and that in spite of the changes desegregation would be a difficult issue. He set out to prepare for desegregation so “the university will maintain its dignity, its scholastic integrity, and our students and faculty walk as honorable men and women” (Alabama quality, 1963, p. 82).

At his 1958 inauguration, without mentioning desegregation, Rose alerted the audience to the other issues facing The University of Alabama. His inaugural address was titled The University and the New South and focused on changing the morale within the university to begin the process of rebuilding pride in the university. He started by stating that “the president of any university has the responsibility of not only defining the great heritage of his institution to the students and faculty, but he has a duty to share with them the future” (F. Rose, 1958, p. 1). Heritage was a thematic element he had used in the Christian Church, at Transylvania, and also often stressed in his dealings with K.A. fraternity. Rose then laid out the issues facing the university. He claimed an unequal distribution of wealth had created the lag between Alabama and institutions outside the region. Rose believed the only way to overcome this was to be forward thinking. He stated to the audience:

All of us are aware that this institution (UA) is superior to the occasion and the occasion to the individual. But colleges and universities, even the oldest and most distinguished, seize upon certain occasions to renew their high commitment. They pause to evaluate and appraise their progress and to summon a new outlook, remembering with Ruskin, that, “every human action gains in honor, in grace, in all true magnificence, by its regard of things that are to come”....We seek to see ahead (F. Rose, 1958, p. 1-2)

Rose expanded on the theme of a New South by saying the time has come when people are not going to live happily in the valley of ignorance. From this point forward, he shared his view of
how the university must join the modern world and that the people of Alabama wanted a great university.

Rose’s inaugural address was important for it set the tone, direction, and leadership vision for the university. As already noted, Rose was not an academician. However, he understood intuitively the needs of the university and central to its success were teaching, research, and quality faculty. He outlined three major points in his address, which carried through his administration at Alabama. First, he challenged to the university to define its purposes and “be free to carry them out to their greatest effectiveness” (F. Rose, 1958, p. 7). His concerns were education of the student, advanced citizenship, quality research programs, and maintaining high standards. He stressed the continued development of quality teaching. He said “a good teacher must be a person of wide culture and deep sympathy, with a mastery of the subject being taught…they must arouse curiosity and stimulate thought and by their attitudes induce right attitudes in others” (F. Rose, 1958, p. 7). He added that UA must keep faculty from leaving for schools in the East and the North. Finally, he outlined the overarching mission of the university – excellence in all things. He challenged everyone to reach for goals never reached before, thus creating an environment for students where they are shown the “full sweep of life…when confronted with creating new ideas we must as Whitehead said have a habitual vision of greatness” (F. Rose, 1958, p. 8). Rose had quoted Whitehead and discussed the habitual vision of greatness as a minister and in his presidency at Transylvania. The phrase, “The Habitual Vision of Greatness,” comes from Whitehead’s The Aims of Education. The full quotation reads: “Moral education is impossible apart from the habitual vision of greatness. If we are not great, it does not matter what we do or what is the issue” (1929, p. 69). This was Rose’s guiding principle as he worked with the university community and stakeholders to improve the image of Alabama.
The burdens of the past affected how people external to UA viewed the institution. The inability to desegregate in 1956 and the continued racial controversy over the issue were cases in point. As previous President Oliver Carmichael had pointed out, “the growth of the university and the development of the state are irrevocably tied together. Each depends on the other for its own future – neither can succeed if the other fails” (Carmichael, 1957). Rose was aware of the past issues at UA and tried to change the way the university was perceived. He, like Carmichael, attempted to tie Alabama to other engines that would help drive the university in a more positive direction. Rose noted that Alabama was blessed with natural resources that one day would make the area an economic power – but only if the education of the state matched the needs of industry. Rose shared the “two to ten percent relationship” with groups he spoke to – Alabama had 2% of the population and geographic area of the nation, but 10% of the national power potential and mineral resources. Rose stated that, “It is my belief that in the next 15 to 20 years Alabama can become one of the 10 most prosperous states in the entire country. It is possible that in only five states – New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, and California will the standard of living exceed our own” (Rose, 1959b, p. 2). While this may have been hyperbole, it was designed to instill pride in the state and the university. During one of Rose’s first faculty meetings on February 10th, 1959, he outlined the definition of what The University of Alabama was as follows:

I have been asked if the University of Alabama desires to become the Harvard of the South. My answer is an emphatic NO. Harvard fills its unique need. We also serve a unique need, a need distinctly Southern, distinctly for Alabamians...our objective is not to be another Harvard, but the best possible University of Alabama, comparable to any university in the South. (Rose, 1959, p. 12)

Like at Transylvania, Rose went on the road to sell the university and to help change its perception in the minds of citizens and to build on its future with entities outside the state. One
way to achieve this was to build up the faculty and research dollars for the university. But always on the forefront of his thought was the changing educational and social landscape of the university campus. Rose had learned from his ministerial roles that public outreach was essential in making positive change and displaying moral leadership. He felt at ease speaking and engaged with many organizations that could help further the positive perceptions Rose wanted to develop at UA. In the summer of 1958, he was the guest speaker at the First Christian Church in Gadsden, Alabama. It was here that a new minister, Rev. T. M. Carroll, was being installed. Rose had known him from his days at Transylvania when Carroll was completing seminary. In his address, Rose called upon the church “to meet its challenges and fulfill its obligations to both the congregation and the pastor” (Franklin, 1958, p. 4). The meeting had no major bearing on the future of the university, rather it presented the congregation with the opportunity to see the spiritual conviction of Rose. As Franklin (1958) stated, with Rose, “Religion is not merely something which takes place along with other arts and sciences. It is a paramount force in his life. He is not ashamed to express the importance of God and the church in the scheme of things. The future of the University of Alabama is in the hands of a dedicated, capable president” (p. 4).

This was exactly the type of public relations Rose was seeking. Most parents in the state were God-fearing and wanted their children in an environment with solid moral leadership. Rose had learned this from his time at Transylvania and knew his attendance at churches throughout the state would generate the publicity to further the cause of UA.

In 1959, Rose was asked to speak to the local Daughters of the American Revolution meeting. He talked critically about the “power culture” that now existed in the United States. He stated plainly that “we as a people must recognize the malignant tumors of civilization which may seem harmless, but if allowed to grow will destroy human life” (Dr. Frank Rose, 1959, p.
This quote harkened back to his days as a minister when he preached that neo-paganism and man’s desires were becoming more prevalent than his need for God. It was a speech that was a harbinger of things to come in the late 1960s. Rose also pressed the citizenry to understand who they were voting for in their political decisions and how their vote had an impact on education and society. He feared the danger of political complacency brought about by an unfounded trust in the power culture. Leadership and the proper training and use of it were paramount for the future of the state and the nation. Again, he used the two-ten percent relationship, stating that “Alabama has ten and one-half percent of the nation’s resources, two percent of its people, and ten percent of its land. Yet Alabama has to import 75 percent of its leadership and we at Alabama are now educating people for leadership” (Dr. Frank Rose, 1959, p. 7).

In July of 1959, coming on the heels of consideration of state higher education appropriations, Rose appeared before the Alabama State Legislature not to ask for additional university appropriations but rather to promote the university through a very well made motion picture film called Eleven O’clock in Alabama. The film was narrated by Mel Allen, the voice of the New York Yankees and an Alabama alumnus. In describing the film to the legislature, Rose indicated there were three stars, the first of which was Mr. Allen. He stated, “the second star of the film is the University of Alabama, which needs no introduction to you and I will not dwell on the virtues of this star or you might get the impression I am prejudiced. The third star and probably most important of this picture is all of higher education in the State of Alabama” (F. Rose, 1959a, p. 1). The film was shot in full color with the assistance of Hollywood actor Johnny Mack Brown and highlighted The University of Alabama campus. The title of the film was to remind citizens and legislators that “it is later than you think” to address the needs to create quality higher education in Alabama. Rose indicated he was not in Montgomery to ask for
additional appropriations for the university but rather to share “the story itself of your labors and money to bring a new dimension of greatness to our state, and to prepare ourselves right now – today – so that we will have the tools with which to carry on the greatest effort of your lifetime – the preparation of our young people for a useful life in the second half of the 20th century” (F. Rose, 1959a, p. 1). The film was designed to frame the needs of the university while celebrating its potential for greatness in the future. Rose was beginning to reshape the vision of the university within the halls of the legislature in preparation for the future.

Another issue facing Rose was the number of satellite campuses the university maintained. In addition to the flagship campus in Tuscaloosa, there were six facilities in Dothan, Mobile, Montgomery, Birmingham, Gadsden, and Huntsville. An initial assessment indicated that the medical college of the university in Birmingham should remain affiliated with Tuscaloosa. Huntsville had become the center of the rocket revolution, and engineering was the main emphasis. As Tennant McWilliams (2007) stated, “The cold war of the 1950s and early 1960s led to a rapid expansion of Marshall Space Flight Center and adjacent engineering enterprises in Huntsville. Rose in turn began to envision significant growth for the UA Extension Center” (p. 143). This provided the university with an opportunity to increase federal research dollars. In August of 1959, Rose visited the UA Huntsville Research facility where he spoke about university pride as a means to address public perception. He said, “I think it would be safe to say that wherever I have talked, and certainly every place I have listened, I have been made aware of a central theme or attitude about our university. It is the reputation and standing that the University of Alabama has as being a mighty fine university scholastically, as well as athletically….I guess you would call it Pride in the University” (F. Rose, 1959b, p. 1).
There was urgency in the need to change directions in order to compete with other universities in the South. As Rose said, “the university has critical needs of substantial nature which must be met NOW if we are to even hold our own in the field of higher education, much less excel” (personal communication, 1959, p. 2).

The Huntsville speech was a change in emphasis for the university administration. Rose for the first time came out and eliminated the romantic notion that The University of Alabama could continue to sustain itself simply on name alone. He was well aware of the financial problems facing the university and his speech analyzed what ailed the institution. Prior to this it appeared shameful to ask for money, due to perceptions by legislators that funding was not being appropriately utilized. But the research facility at Huntsville represented the new age and provided Rose the opportunity to move forward and change the alumni and business community thinking process on fund raising. As Rose advised the crowd,

To think that anything so terrible could even happen to the University that it should need money. How could this happen…this great need of millions of dollars for buildings, equipment, and teaching aids. How could the University, the Capstone of higher education in Alabama, and the pride of the State fall into such a condition of neglect? How could it be possible that its faculty be so underpaid and over worked that its members would be tempted to accept teaching posts elsewhere. Perhaps the University has followed too much the New Testament teaching of keeping the light under the bushel (Rose, 1959b, p. 2)

Rose desired to light a fire underneath the alumni and stakeholders of the university.

While it was not natural to demean one’s own university, Rose obviously felt the state of the institution warranted direct talk. The address also caught the attention of Wernher von Braun, the director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville. Von Braun had been in Huntsville since 1950 working on rocket engineering for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). He saw the need to expand engineering education in the area and he later wrote to Rose about The University of Alabama Research Institute saying, “As we have
said many times, our enthusiasm for the development of an academic environment in Huntsville…is vital to our (NASA) survival” (W. von Braun, personal communication, May 17, 1962).

Thirteen months later, The University of Alabama opened a science research center in Huntsville on September 24, 1960. Rose announced the beginning of a cooperative effort between UA and the Marshall Space Flight Center (NASA). He stated this was a “major step in enlarging and improving the University’s research and graduate programs. The primary mission of the institute in Huntsville will be to provide basic research services in problem areas encountered at the Marshall Space Flight Center” (Science Institute planned, 1960, p. 1). The Research Institute, as it was known then, operated under the direct control of the administration in Tuscaloosa. The initial plan was to start up the facility on January 1, 1961, with a modest staff of around ten with some research also done at the main campus. Studies would center on physics, mathematics, chemistry, and engineering with a contract to have NASA engineers available to teach and direct the research of graduate students. In addition there would be the transfer of researchers between facilities (Huntsville and Tuscaloosa) for better engagement within the academic community. Rose said, “In taking this action, the university joins the ranks of foremost American universities in solving critical military and scientific research problems…and to further the urgent need for research in the space age” (Science Institute planned, 1960, p. 1). A press release noted that the University of Alabama in conjunction with NASA and the Marshall Space Flight Center established the institute to “1) improve the academic climate of Huntsville; and 2) to provide research in aerospace problems encountered at Redstone Arsenal” (UA Research Institute News Release, 1962). Not mentioned was the desire of the university and
Rose to increase federal grant dollars to UA. He had advocated it however, in his Huntsville address when speaking of the financial woes of the university.

The Huntsville address also provided a platform to publicize the state of the university from a financial perspective when compared to the United States as a whole. Rose pointed out that Alabama was last or 49th in most educational categories and that only “3.6 percent of the people in Alabama over 24 years of age had more than four years of college training” (Rose, 1959b, p. 4). Because of the increase in student enrollment forecast to come by 1970, Rose believed the time for the university to prepare was now and that it was crucial to think of future students, and not worry about the past. He quoted former Alabama Governor Bibb Graves’s response to a constituent that said, “We are poor. We cannot afford money for education.” Graves responded, “We are so poor we cannot afford not to give more money for education” (as cited in Rose, 1959, p. 5). Using this as a springboard, Rose highlighted a $5 million campaign to improve all aspects of the university by 1970. Putting a local spin on the request, Rose said “all the millionaires are not in Texas, all the profitable corporations are not in New York State, and all the Cadillacs are not in Hollywood” (Rose, 1959b, p. 5). He pointed out that Alabama was rich in resources and had plenty of business leaders with wealth. Rose was attempting to make the problem easy to understand and difficult for stakeholders to shy away from. Rose attempted to be the voice of reason on why educational funding was so important. His belief was that Alabama’s natural resources were abundant enough to attract people to the state. Once people arrived, the university should position itself wisely to be the choice for educating them. Rose knew this could not happen without adequate capital and infrastructure improvements.

For Rose, part of assessing the financial state of the university was to evaluate the various satellite campuses. Prior to his arrival, Oliver Carmichael had envisioned a multi-campus UA
system based on the State University of New York model. The campuses would include Tuscaloosa, Birmingham, Huntsville, Mobile, Montgomery, Gadsden, Dothan, and Selma. Rose decided to concentrate on “UA’s Tuscaloosa operation being a main campus with…specialized campuses in Birmingham (health sciences) and in Huntsville (space and engineering)” (McWilliams, 2007, p. 143). Rose decided to close the extension centers in Montgomery, Dothan, and Selma due to the local influence of Auburn University in all three settings and administrative costs. Gadsden and Mobile were left operational; additionally, there was strong talk of having a second medical school at the Mobile extension center and this concerned Rose. The extension center was unprofitable and in 1961 occupied a building that was “slated for demolition to allow construction of the new First National Bank of Mobile” (McWilliams, 2007, p. 144). Local Mobilians had flexed their political muscle in Montgomery and made overtures to secure funding to keep the facility open against the wishes of Rose. The Mobile faction wanted a stand-alone campus called The University of Alabama at Mobile. In April 1963, a registered letter was sent to Rose demanding the creation of the Mobile campus. Rose delivered his reply in person, “No….In addition to a community college appearing at nearby Bay Minette, the Baptists’ Mobile College was on the rise and the historic Jesuit institution, Spring Hill College, was doing well. There was no need for a city the size of Mobile to have more of a UA presence than an extension center” (McWilliams, 2007, p. 144). Rose had good reason to close the Mobile facility as local business leaders wanted the extension center to become a free-standing medical school. Likely, Rose felt pressure from the University of Alabama Medical College alumni in Birmingham to have the facility closer to Tuscaloosa. Regardless, it was a political power play by Rose to demonstrate the need for a financially sound university system. Ultimately, the business leaders in Mobile would break away and form the University of South Alabama.
Maintaining multiple campuses and extension centers was costly. Rose intended to refocus the academic mission of the university and rely only on the benefits of those extension centers that provided the greatest gain. Rose felt the extension centers that were most useful were those that had a core academic mission (space, engineering, and health sciences). These would provide the greatest opportunity to ease the financial strain through increased funding and grants. If there were any doubt about the economic woes facing the university, Rose highlighted two institutions – the University of North Carolina (UNC) and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) as benchmarks for UA. The University of North Carolina had the same enrollment as Alabama while MIT’s student body was smaller. Yet UNC received $5 million more in support from the legislature and alumni than UA. MIT, a private institution, had an annual income twice the amount of UA. As Rose said, “is it any wonder that I have a very personal problem every time a faculty member from the campus comes to my office and tells me of an offer for as much as twice his present salary if he would leave the State and go to another teaching post…it’s no surprise to any of you businessmen that any one of our faculty could double his income by going into private industry” (McWilliams, 2007, p. 6). Rose told an audience that the day of state appropriations being the sole source of college funding was over. He pointed out that taxes alone cannot support the university. It was important that the stakeholders assisted through raising their fair share of the funds necessary for a full educational program. Rose concluded by saying, “Is it asking too much at this critical juncture in the history of the University to ask the beneficiaries of the higher education to rally to its cause and support it in its hour of need” (McWilliams, 2007, p. 8).

Rose’s goals for education were statewide in scope and not limited only to educational institutions like The University of Alabama. Rose had explained the power of Alabama’s natural
resources and how they could create future business opportunities. Around this same time, he was the invited guest to the Alabama-Auburn Alumni Joint Meeting in Tuscaloosa. After praising both institutions, he used the meeting to highlight the need to show greater concern for the human resources of the State of Alabama. Rose shared that “there is no greater resource than the people of a state. For without their resource, no resources are important, no advancement and no progress would be made. Nothing would be achieved that was worthwhile; nothing would be enjoyed for the present and nothing would be passed on to the future” (F. Rose, 1959d, p. 1).

Rose also focused on leadership and how the State of Alabama could no longer import 75% of its managerial and executive leadership for “no state can educate only 25 percent of its leadership and expect to be progressive and forward” (F. Rose, 1959d, p. 2). Rose made the case for alumni to better support their universities in order to better position these institutions for their children, grandchildren, and beyond. His thoughts centered on the need for greater achievement for children not through finances, but through better education. When comparing the value of money and education Rose noted that, for his children “I would choose…education. They would be far richer than if they possessed all the money, all of the land, and all of the homes that I could leave them. This is Alabama’s chance to make our children wealthy” (F. Rose, 1959d, p. 2).

In the fall of 1959, Rose returned to a concern with his own institution and spoke with the UA faculty on a myriad of topics. One of great concern was the negative vision and perception not only of Alabama but the South as a whole. Rose was concerned that if the South were seen negatively Alabama would also be viewed as a problem. In his comments, he was placing the university in a position to best accept the coming desegregation and public relations issues that would go with it. He addressed the faculty senate by saying:

the standard of living and future welfare of every man, woman, and child in the South hinges upon the degree to which we achieve excellence in education…integration
problems have taken center of the stage everywhere. It is not my purpose to question the wisdom of this investment in time or energy. However, I do maintain that the ability of the Southern people to so unite and to act decisively to protect their honest convictions and to preserve a part of their heritage is further proof that she can unite and organize when she is aroused. I want the South to be equally united, equally aroused, equally alert to the vital need for us to strive for educational excellence on which our future depends. (Rose, 1959c, p. 1-2)

His words sought to ease the burden of desegregation and not let controversy over the issue outweigh the achievement of the mission of the university. Rose used this opportunity to talk about how leadership could assist Alabama in dealing with desegregation successfully and how every Alabamian would respond in unison to create a better future. Rose’s call was to devote as much time to superior education as was given to integration; only then could The University of Alabama be a great institution. Rose concluded by saying we cannot “be lulled into the false premise that all it takes to further the progress of Southern education is to keep our schools segregated” (Rose, 1959c, p. 2).

Just as importantly, Rose sought to alleviate the concerns of the faculty when it came to salary, teaching, and infrastructure needs. Rose’s appearance before the legislature in 1959 was able to procure an appropriations increase of $2.1 million, which represented the largest increase in UA history. Sixty percent of this was earmarked for salary increases; 20% for new faculty positions; and 20% for departmental and divisional needs (Rose, 1959c). The state legislature also granted an increase of $6.9 million for infrastructure which also represented the largest capital outlay in UA history. In delivering the news, Rose advised the faculty that “It is my conviction and my personal knowledge that a good teacher cannot and must not be limited by financial worries or inadequate facilities. The good scholar must be made free from physical concerns, and it is the duty of the university to provide the kind of community that would encourage learning and teaching free from the burdens that come from trying to pay the monthly
bills” (Rose, 1959c, p. 1). Rose reported that UA had started a $5 million development program and had raised $2.6 million before approaching the alumni for their support. Rose praised the alumni and reminded the faculty that the alumni at Alabama were engaged and active in order to “give us an opportunity to continue a program of faculty salary increases, improve our physical facilities, strengthen our weak departments, and expand some of our proposed programs” (Rose, 1959c, p. 4).

In late 1959, UA began to work on a new ten-year development plan. The Greater University of Alabama Development Program, as it was initially called, was to be launched in February of 1960 with a goal to raise $43 million. Eventually the theme was changed to “Project 70” with a “drive to reach all segments of the state, both business and individual” (UA News Release, March 15, 1960). The main thrust of this campaign was to bring the alumni back into the fold and have them become more engaged stakeholders in the university. The period prior to Rose’s arrival had created a sense of apathy within the university alumni community. The hiring of Coach Bryant to right the athletic department woes had brought a resurgence of pride and Rose used this opportunity to build momentum. In his challenge to the alumni, he said

> The ultimate continuing strength of a university rests with its alumni. The degree of awareness and sense of responsibility of these men and women can mean the difference in a good university and a great one…the simple truth is that serious activities of organized alumni far outweigh the frivolities. It (Campaign 70) unites the opinions of many of the highest authorities in our land on the importance of private, particularly alumni support for education. (UA News Release, March 15, 1960)

Rose addressed the issues that faced the university by building a coalition of the alumni, business, and legislative communities. After the desegregation of UA in 1963, Rose noted that the need to address faculty, salary, infrastructure, and alumni issues was critical. He added, “We wanted to establish the image of a university as a place of excellence, an institution that people
would not allow another crisis to destroy” (Harvey, 1963, p. 2). This was part of a plan to establish a positive image of The University of Alabama, or as Rose had stated, a winning team.

In the fall of 1961, the Alabama legislature cut appropriations to The University of Alabama by $1.2 million due to a shortfall in state revenues. The loss amounted to a reduction of 14.4% of the appropriated funds. However, Rose had been preparing the university for this by reaching out to alumni and businessmen to garner support through donations and endowments. Continued federal grant money was also helping, in addition to a $25 raise in fees per semester that was earmarked for an increase in faculty salaries. Rose stated that despite the budget cut “the morale and academic endeavor of the faculty remains exceptionally high” (*Bama suffers severe*, 1961, p. 3). Rose noted that the loss of funds “necessitated a severe and drastic curtailment of operational expenses, equipment, purchases, and the elimination of unfilled and vacant staff positions….In addition the Medical Center is experiencing severe problems and morale is low although we are still maintaining a program in health and medical education despite a lack of support from the state” (*Bama suffers severe*, 1961, p. 3). Rose noted that federal grants for housing totaling $1.4 million and $734,000 for research instruction had been received to help offset the appropriations cut. In addition, funding via the capital campaign through the alumni base was also helping. Through it all, Rose had to make sure the faculty stayed happy and stayed in Tuscaloosa. Increasing faculty salaries was accomplished largely through the increase in student fees.

As the university approached another crisis over desegregation, Rose continued to plan for the larger issue of what education should be in the South. In May of 1962, Rose was invited to give the commencement address at Georgia State College. He used the opportunity to speak about how institutions of higher learning were becoming “social centers” rather than hubs of
education. While his address was meant to apply to education across the United States, it had a particular Cold War flavor and an insight into how he viewed the future of The University of Alabama and the expanding role of rocket technology in Huntsville. His point was subtle as follows:

Schools in this country must become centers of learning instead of community centers. Our universities must become centers of learning if they are going to have any relevance to our age. The United States faces a serious threat by advances made by Soviet Russia and Communism. The emergence of Russia as a scientific and technical power has caused us to make some rather searching inquiries about our programs of education. The result of our evaluation is the discovery that we need to put new values in our old degrees. (Schools becoming social, 1962, p. 4)

The growth of The University of Alabama Huntsville Center came through federal research dollars tied to initiatives with the Alabama Research Institute and Marshall Space Flight Center. While Rose had no clear path for increasing research support at the Tuscaloosa campus, he recognized the opportunity presented by the space race in Huntsville. He had befriended Werhner von Braun and had worked with him to go before the state legislature to secure funding for the center. It was his hope that Huntsville could provide an opportunity to put new value in old degrees.

It was at this time that the multi-campus university system became more problematic for Rose. Having discarded branches of the university in Dothan, Montgomery, and Mobile, he had seemed to lack a vision for how research studies should be placed on the main campus in Tuscaloosa. Huntsville was taking on the role of space technology and engineering, while Birmingham continued to expand in the area of medicine and public health. Rose “had no vision for making Tuscaloosa the true center of a statewide university system…and by the end of his administration in 1969 had established autonomous administrative units that would compete with Tuscaloosa for resources” (Clark, 1993, p. 150). The end result of this would ultimately be three
separate campus presidents and a university system chancellor. But in the context of the times, Rose’s vision focused on the things he could control and having federal research grants was one way of tying the university to the greatest endeavor of the 1960s – placing man in space. Rose’s leadership can be questioned if his lack of vision ultimately splintered the university system, but in context of the times it did allow UA to gain a great deal of prestige on both the science and medical front. Rose considered this a positive step forward in creating a positive educational reputation for the university. Tuscaloosa would remain the center of the university, even if research and development were slower in coming. For Rose, there were more pressing issues about to affect the campus in Tuscaloosa that would require all of his leadership skills and tact to handle.

rose’s leadership is framed in how he handled the desegregation issue at the University of Alabama. He was aware of how poorly the first attempt to desegregate UA had gone in 1956 and then watched institutions such as Ole Miss and the University of Georgia go through violent episodes related to their own attempt to desegregation. Rose had no intention of allowing this to happen at UA. It was made more complicated by the fact that newly elected Governor George Wallace had vowed “segregation forever” and planned to use The University of Alabama as his stage to demonstrate his political views on state’s rights. However, Rose was determined to make sure when the time came that the university would be able to handle desegregation with honor and dignity. In October of 1962, Rose delivered his State of the University Address to the faculty. While great strides had been made in many areas, attention was focused on the coming showdown over the desegregation of the university. In order to alleviate the concerns, Rose stated,

I am fully aware that there are some serious questions on your mind about the immediate future. First let me say that I do not know when we will be faced with the problem of
enrolling a Negro student…but we have not had one complete his registration since 1956. With our new admissions program requiring higher standards for admission, we have turned away more than 3,000 students during the last four years. (Rose, 1962b, p. 4)

Rose assured the faculty that the Board of Trustees was aware of the desegregation issues and there was “no thought to close the University to meet any crisis facing it in such a manner as to compromise the intellectual integrity of this institution” (Rose, 1962b, p. 4). Unlike at Ole Miss and the University of Georgia, Rose assured the faculty that all avenues of concern had been addressed in order that “we do not have mob violence and bloodshed” (Rose, 1962b, p. 4). He recounted the events of 1956 at UA and addressed the issues of safety at the University of Mississippi. With the responsibility for 9,000 students and 1,000 faculty members, The University of Alabama could ill afford to go through another crisis that would set it back in the eyes of many Americans. Rose reiterated to the faculty that “this university must never become the scene of mob violence, battle troops, or national news media seeking sensational headlines” (Rose, 1962b, p. 4). However, in early 1963, the University rejected the graduate applications of two African-American scientists at the University Center at Huntsville. David McGlathery, a mathematician was rejected for the spring quarter based on a technicality. “The Center claimed he did not take the entrance examination on time…The other scientist, Marvin Carroll declined to comment any further than saying this is something between the University and me” (Center at Huntsville, 1963, p. 3). Though these applications never resulted in enrollment they did signal what was coming in the next several months. Rose and the Tuscaloosa campus were busy preparing for the eventual enrollment of African-American students at the university.

In January of 1963, he met with the Tuscaloosa Civitan Club where he spoke about the personal obligation each citizen has to protect the freedom of others. Rose stated,

Freedom is won at a great price. Man cannot live fully without freedom. We see everyday attempts being made to curtail freedom, attempts to fit us into a mold and
control our thought. If we can be so easily led, we will be easily led to our own destruction. The man who dissents today has become a dangerous man….What we need is to be willing, like our forefathers to pay the price for freedom. When the history of the last half of the twentieth century is written, will the historians be able to say that we had wisdom, vision, and foresight? I hope they will be able to say they established themselves among the wise and molded their lives in freedom.  
*(Individuals must protect, 1963, p. 6)*

The speech appeared to be aimed at Governor Wallace and those who approved of segregation in the state. Though Rose never directly stated that he supported the entrance of African-Americans at The University of Alabama, the meaning and symbolism behind the speech were clear. Rose was preparing for the coming showdown with Governor Wallace.

Just prior to the desegregation of the university in 1963, Rose was selected as the Tuscaloosa City Citizen of the Year. He was recognized for his leadership in moving The University of Alabama forward. He stated,

> The University of Alabama has just begun to grow. In the future, the university will become a great space university. We have a team at the university, we don’t have any bosses. We work as a team and we sit down together and settle our problems…My work here has demanded just about as much as any man can give. We have been travelling a difficult road, but it is worth the price when you consider what is being done for our young people. *(Dr. Frank Rose selected, 1963, p. 1)*

Rose again shared the difficulties facing the institution. Unlike in past speeches however, he talked about the effect the difficulties had on him. Most importantly, he talked about two important aspects that would soon shape the future of the university – the space race and how the Huntsville Research Center helped the University and the advantages of working as a team to settle differences. The Governor’s office was not in tune with Rose’s team, but Rose’s partnership with Jefferson Bennett and the White House prepared the university for overcoming Wallace’s obstruction.

There was a serendipity that existed during Rose’s time at The University of Alabama. He had the great fortune of having key advocates in places of importance when it mattered. Most
people did not know of Rose’s connection to Attorney General Robert Kennedy and UA Executive Assistant Jefferson Bennett’s connection to George Wallace and the Alabama State Legislature. Rose understood Wallace’s position and his intention to publicly be seen trying to stop the integration of the university. And as the day drew closer in June of 1963, Rose worked behind the scenes to keep the peace and ensure that the campus environment remained calm. As Wallace would have his moment crusading for segregation by standing in the schoolhouse door, Rose would have minority students’ entry to UA secured while remaining in close contact with his old friend Robert Kennedy and his brother President John F. Kennedy about the situation.

The relationship with Attorney General Robert Kennedy extended back to 1954 when both were honored as being top ten Young Americans by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. This allowed Rose and Kennedy to cooperate on how to address Governor Wallace and his eventual threat to stand in the schoolhouse door. In June of 1988, Rose returned to the UA campus to participate in a forum celebrating the 25th anniversary of desegregation at the institution. The forum called *Opening Doors: An Appraisal of Race Relations in America* reunited Rose with the key players in the event. Vivian Malone Jones, one of the two African American students to enroll successfully in 1963, and former assistant attorney general Nicholas Katzenbach participated and shared stories of how the event played out from their perspectives. Rose noted that during the event he had worked behind the scenes with President John Kennedy and his brother, Robert, the attorney general, to prepare the way for a successful integration of the University. Robert and I struck up a friendship at an awards ceremony (1954) in New York. I had no idea at that time that six years later, Senator Kennedy would be President of the United States (and Robert would be the attorney general). But for this university and for this state and for the good of the country, this marvelous thing happened and he was able to challenge us to better ourselves and to cause us to take the kind of leadership that we could. *(Frank Rose, ex-president, 1991, p. 8A)*
Rose also praised Vivian Malone saying that, “God had to send her to become the first black to enroll because she was determined that she was going to get an education, determined that this is where she was going to get it and determined to go through what she was going through” (Frank Rose, ex-president, 1991, p. 8A).

Another fortuitous acquaintance relatively unknown to most was that of UA Executive Assistant Jefferson Bennett. Bennett was able to assist Rose in dealing productively with Governor Wallace. Bennett had been a one-time roommate of George Wallace at the university. They knew each other well and Bennett passed along what insights he had to Rose and the Kennedys. This required close contact and involved clandestine meetings between the Kennedys, Rose, and Bennett. For months leading up to the desegregation of the university, Rose and Bennett took trips to Washington, DC, separately and under aliases in order to avoid calling attention to their meetings. Wallace publically claimed that there was a conspiracy against the white citizens of the state and therefore “Bennett believed these clandestine precautions to be wholly necessary...so that Vivian Malone and James Hood could enroll without the threat of violence” (Hollars, 2013, p. 100). Bennett also thought that the Alabama National Guard should be federalized since he knew Wallace would physically block the entrance to registration for Malone and Hood. Bennett believed that Wallace “would respond far better when faced with his own men…it would send a clear message that Alabamians were committed to enforcing the law” (Hollars, 2013, p. 101). As it turned out, Bennett was correct in his assessment and Wallace backed down in the face of the federalized Alabama National Guard. As Tilden (2013) described,

Frank Rose supported his vision for the University of Alabama with a hard-nosed, carefully crafted, yet dynamic strategy to achieve his goals. The environment in which the university existed, a veritable slough of prejudice, fed the efforts of people committed to making the Capstone an island of liberal inquiry in a sea of conservatism. Frank Rose stepped cautiously and, above all, intelligently. (p. 67)
Rose used his political savvy and the communicative skills he learned as a minister in bringing people together to help him calmly work through the problematic issues that affected all stakeholders of the university. It did not hurt that he had connections with the Kennedys and kept them abreast, albeit secretly, of what was transpiring on the campus at Alabama. *The Crimson White* student newspaper covered the event with a column on what had transpired during the confrontation with Wallace. Its headline stated, “Rose Planned, Wallace Got Hot, (General) Graham Got ‘Em Through – All Events Led to the Pay Booth” (*UA can be*, 1963, p. 2). Students on campus did not riot and obeyed all orders and curfews placed on them. When the *Crimson White* asked James Hood about his peaceful admission he simply said, “This University can be a model for the entire nation” (*UA can be*, 1963, p. 2). Hood and Malone enrolled and went to their dormitories undisturbed.

*Time* (1963) magazine heralded the success of Frank Rose just after the desegregation of the university. The magazine stated that “behind all this manifest preparation stands a determined and dynamic president…some Alabamans put it when they speak of Rose, He’s lit a shuck – he has set a fire under the university as one might set fire to a shock of corn or wheat” (Alabama quality, 1963, p. 82). The article noted that Rose worked behind the scenes with alumni groups, trustees, and other university stakeholders to create a coherent message of how UA would address desegregation once it arrived on campus. In November of 1962, Rose convinced the Board of Trustees that the lack of leadership within the board at Ole Miss had left students and faculty ill-prepared for the desegregation of their institution. To avoid the mistakes they encountered, he fought for a unified front while making certain that Governor Wallace and other politicians had their say. The board heeded Rose’s advice and made a rare public statement on the issue saying, “This board will not condone, and will take such measures as it may deem
necessary to prevent violence, riot, and disorder” (Alabama quality, 1963, p. 82). With the board of trustees firmly in place, other organizations such as the alumni association, faculty senate, and student government association soon provided support for non-violence and an embrace of change. Time (1963) magazine shared their thoughts on how Rose handled the desegregation problem at UA stating: “The Wise Foresee. More significantly, (Rose)….has crisscrossed the state carrying the missionary message of his idea of a university, as a source of reason, enlightenment and civilized behavior…he visualizes the university as the instrumentality of that brighter future, just as education has always been the classic U.S. instrumentality of progress” (Alabama quality, 1963, p. 82). A lesser leader could not have likely maneuvered through the political complexities of the time, but as Culpepper Clark noted earlier, Rose possessed the ability to make everyone in the room feel like he was on their side and this skillset was a necessity during his administration. Rose stated, “I will exercise all the leadership at my command to see that the great tradition and great honor of this university will be recognized in the future” (University braces for, 1963, p. 1).

Rose faced other issues along with desegregation, including poor faculty retention and salaries. In February of 1963, colleges in the state ranked last in the southern region for professor salaries. All of the negative publicity related to desegregation hampered the ability of the university to draw top-flight professors. Rose took this opportunity to send a clear message on how UA must change. He said, “If the salary lag trend continues, you are not going to get the number of PhDs necessary to meet the college requirements. Secondly, you are not going to get faculty members with teaching experience and outstanding research ability. And last, you are not going to have any quality to your educational program” (Looser, 1963, p. 1). Rose used the issues of desegregation and faculty retention to help him frame the future for the university.
Desegregation was going to happen due to adherence with the existing federal court order. It was important that the university handle the transition with professionalism.

As to faculty and their salaries, Rose stated, “we must realize that we have to go to the national market and pay national prices to get the most competent people” (Looser, 1963, p. 1). As early as February of 1963, there were grumblings among the faculty over the administration’s slow progress in addressing salary discrepancies. University professors went public with their demands for increases and complained of Rose’s lack of speed in addressing the matter. When a study was published by the Southern Regional Education Board that showed Alabama had the lowest paid professors in 16 southern states, there was a divide in the feelings of professors.

Math Professor C.N. Maxwell pointed out that “the article had no bearing on me, I knew from other offers of the University’s relative pay scale” (Low salaries, poor, 1963, p. 2). W.L. Wilson, also of the Math Department stated, “we were aware of the low salaries when we came here…we came here because we wanted to, but now the University has fallen behind even more in relation to other schools” (Low salaries, poor, 1963, p. 2). Of even greater concern to Rose was the fact that many PhDs were leaving, an issue that meant problems with future accreditation. Rose told the faculty that “unless we receive the appropriation requests for salary increases we will not only lose some new people but many others who have made tremendous sacrifices through the years to serve the people of Alabama…appropriations will insure our ability to retain our present staff and to recruit good replacements and additions for the future” (Low salaries, poor, 1963, p. 2). Rose continued to take opportunities to speak with local civic organizations regarding the troubles facing the university.

Appropriations had always been a concern for the administration. Rose had been preparing his 1963 appropriations request to the state legislature for some time. It came on the
heels of the successful and non-violent desegregation of the university. With this, Rose had the leverage of a peaceful event that gained the university a tremendous amount of prestige nationwide. Rose lobbied for a 15% increase in salaries and advised the board of the importance of maintaining a sequential increase in salary appropriations each year. In 1963-64, he was able to garner a $1.3 million increase, and, for 1964-65, a $1.7 million increase. In addressing the legislative appropriations committee, Rose said, “we cannot afford to do less. To do less is to face the certainty of losing many of our able faculty members to other institutions who can and will pay more. This leads straight into mediocrity” (as cited in Looser, 1963, p. 1).

The budget increases requested by Rose showed the university was serious in its desire to compete with other southern colleges and universities. Rose worked hard to bring in new faculty members who possessed doctoral degrees through promising them continued growth opportunities. His main concern was to show action on the measures that meant the most to all stakeholders. But concerns with state government appropriations were an issue Rose would have to battle year to year.

Rose wanted the university to become a model institution for the South. In order to accomplish this, he had to convince everyone to exercise foresight when making decisions. Rose felt UA could dramatically change its academic reputation, but he had to convince all stakeholders this would take commitment. He was fond of quoting John Stuart Mill who said:

Great economic and social forces flow like a tide over half-conscious people. The wise are those who foresee the coming event and seek to shape their institutions and mold the thinking of the people in accordance with the most constructive change. The unwise are those who add nothing constructive to the process, either because of ignorance on the one hand or ignorant opposition on the other. (Rose, 1962a, p. 6)

Rose’s ability to handle the desegregation problem was unique. Through it all there had been no riots, no demonstrations, or a single arrest. Alabama was much like Ole Miss in how
students thought and the culture in which they were raised. However as noted in the *Birmingham Post-Herald*, “the difference lay in leadership and planning and Frank Rose provided a great deal of both” (1963, p. 2). One UA faculty member at the time gave Rose a backhanded compliment by saying he “has done an extremely good job in preparing the way for this to happen peacefully and quietly, but I don’t particularly care for Rose because he is too ambitious” (Harvey, 1963, p. 2). The latter half of this comment highlights some faculty thoughts on Rose and his administrative style that would resurface toward the end of his presidency.

After the desegregation of the university, the mood of the students on campus was a concern. For the most part they had remained fairly quiet and been peaceful. In October of 1963, the Student House of Representatives unanimously passed a resolution commending Rose and the administration citing “the excellent handling of the integration of the University this past summer and fall” (*Senate kills resolution*, 1963, p. 4). However, the students in the Student Senate were of a different mind. This body was made up of students who represented the various colleges and organizations on campus. In a 10-6 vote, the House resolution was defeated. As Jim Henderson, the graduate college representative stated, “if the press should get hold of this it will be played up as an endorsement for integration” (*Senate kills resolution*, 1963, p. 4). It appeared that some students were not supportive of desegregation. The semantics of the resolution tend to bear this out where student Barry McCrary, of the Law School objected to the title of the resolution. He said, “if we just omit the ‘excellent handling’ I would find it more acceptable” (*Senate kills resolution*, 1963, p. 4). But Larry Oaks, of the College of Arts and Sciences, simply said “any time we as the student legislature support Dr. Rose, it’s bound to be good publicity” (*Senate kills resolution*, 1963, p. 4). The defeat of the resolution still showed that old thoughts were entrenched in some student minds.
Rose was able to garner positive national publicity for the university in his handling of desegregation. His astuteness in dealing with the political situation of the day showed how he was able to build strong bonds with many groups of people. At the same time, Rose was clever enough not to alienate any constituency group and in turn kept the peace at the University of Alabama unlike that of other southern universities. Rose’s leadership was recognized and this helped with the financial stability and infrastructure of the university. The positive accolades received by the university also enabled Rose to work toward improving faculty salaries and career opportunities. In the next chapter, I will address the second half of Rose’s presidency and the growth of the university.
During the Civil Rights era, northern universities made attempts to create inter-institutional relationships with southern Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Tuscaloosa was home to Stillman College. Rose encouraged continued support for Stillman from the outside and received a letter from Elvis Stahr, president of Indiana University, about the possibility of working with Stillman. Stahr was a friend of Rose’s and aware of the political dynamics in Alabama. He told Rose, “I hope Indiana may have your own blessing, tacit or otherwise as may seem to you most useful, in our efforts…we are not at all interested in stirring up political problems or in anything else except helping Stillman and Indiana become stronger institutions” (E. Stahr, personal communication, September 10, 1964). Rose responded in kind by saying that while a “number of wives of UA faculty members taught there…we have not yet reached the climate where we can do a great deal more that would serve the best interests of Stillman, but some progress is beginning to be made” (F. Rose, personal communication, September 21, 1964). Rose understood the need to prepare The University of Alabama in expanding its service to all races so that political situations such as that raised by Stahr could be minimized. However, the political climate of the day was still difficult to overcome. However, one area where positive results were achieved was through the athletic programs.

Nothing gave Alabamians greater pride in their state and university than to see their men and school defeat another team, especially if it was a team from outside the South. Rose understood that one way for a man to prove himself was on the field of competition, much like
Robert E. Lee viewed his men in battle. If a man could survive there and contribute to the whole of the university, then he would be more readily accepted by the citizenry. It was Rose’s hope that Coach Bryant would recruit African-American athletes to the football team. He knew Bryant had the political capital to do so with his winning three national championships in five years. When The University of Alabama was desegregated, Rose, Jefferson Bennett, and Bryant watched the actions of Governor Wallace from Coach Bryant’s office window in Moore Hall. With Malone and Jones entering the university, it would only be a matter of time before African-American athletes would become a reality. Rose later recalled that Bryant “was concerned about the problems of segregation and he felt that the university should move forward as quickly as possible in getting the matter settled…he talked with a lot of state leaders and prominent alumni to get their approval to move ahead” (Harwell, 1983, p. C8). However, things did not move as quickly as desired.

In March of 1967, Rose had asked Coach Bryant about recruiting African-American athletes. Bryant quickly replied: “We have not actively attempted to recruit any colored athletes in the State because we have had none that we felt qualified both athletically and academically” (P. Bryant, personal communication, March 20, 1967). Bryant shared with Rose the lengths the athletic department had gone to in order to recruit black athletes, including black coaches’ clinics and having black coaches attend practices. Bryant summed up his response by saying, “we do not plan to recruit colored athletes from out-of-state at this time, but certainly would be interested in any who qualify within the State” (P. Bryant, personal communication, March 20, 1967). Bryant had cause for concern and wanted to make sure that when the transition to recruiting African-American athletes came about, it would be beneficial to the student-athlete. And even though he had African-American walk-on players during the late 1960s, none was ever
able to make the roster. Bryant’s concern was for the players and when he took responsibility for them as the coach, he had wanted to ensure their safety. Bryant clarified his point on the players he coached by saying, “he was my guy, he was my player, but segregation was still in the saddle” (Harwell, 1983, p. C8). Alabama’s football fortunes waned from 1967 to 1970. It was becoming more obvious to Bryant that Alabama had to integrate the football program in order to recruit the players necessary to keep pace with the changing student-athlete environment. It was not until 1970, one year after Rose left The University of Alabama, that the first African-American football player was signed to a scholarship.

Rose was a transformational leader by nature, but his success with desegregation started him toward a transcendent model of leadership. As noted in Chapter I, the transformational leader has strong relationships with stakeholders using empowerment as a tool for the decision makers. The transcendent leader concentrates on directly influencing those with whom they interact such as students, faculty members, and alumni. On May 17, 1964, following the successful desegregation of the university, The Birmingham News printed an essay under their Sunday Quest section written by President Rose on the Training of Future Leaders. Rose discussed how education impacted the dynamics of the day, specifically how it applied to the changing times of the world. Rose’s concern was that “knowledge is increasing so rapidly, communication and transportation are becoming so accelerated, and all facets of thought and life made so scientific that the average citizen surrenders his role as arbiter and tries to escape to a golden age of the past that never existed” (Frank A. Rose essay, 1964, p. 4). His concern was that with the changing dynamics in society, the training of student leaders on college campuses needed to be reassessed. Rose stated the “nation that learns and knows will have the leadership of the world” (Frank A. Rose essay, 1964, p. 4). Rose complemented the Alabama faculty,
students, and alumni for their contributions in improving the professional and academic image of the university. Using the positive momentum gained from the previous year, Rose stated “we have some people less informed, both inside and outside the university community, who have sought to alter our leadership and bring confusion, but the University of Alabama has had too much of this activity to be misled” (Frank A. Rose essay, 1964, p. 4). The essay provided Rose an opportunity to address the successes of the university while explaining to the public at large that UA was moving forward. In his conclusion, he discussed how the academic standards had changed in addition to the advancement of academic programs at the Birmingham medical center and the Huntsville Research Institute. Building a solid future meant gaining the attention of all stakeholders within the university setting. This required a transformational leadership approach since there were two unique constituencies – the wide political spectrum of the public, state legislature and board along with somewhat more cohesive university community – students, faculty, and alumni. The essay allowed him the opportunity to build positive public relations with both groups.

With the university now desegregated, Rose had to move carefully in assuring the successful entry of new African-American students. The people of the state still harbored deep held beliefs about race relations that were not going to disappear overnight. Rose knew the additional entry of African-American students was important but also that it must be tempered in delivery until the policy gained more widespread public acceptance. In June of 1964, five more African-American students were admitted to The University of Alabama. Their enrollment was described in a statement given by the African-American Rev. T. Y. Rogers, who served as the executive secretary of the Tuscaloosa Citizens for Action Committee. While there was no official confirmation of the enrollment, Jefferson Bennett did release a prepared statement that said
“...the University does not make any public statements relating to the status of any student or any person applying for admission, particularly in answer to a statement from a third party. For that reason we are making no response to the statement attributed to the Rev. T. Y. Rogers” (Five negroes reportedly, 1964, p. 3). The response followed university policy but more importantly it addressed the need to not flaunt the desegregation of the university in public, while continuing the process internally. Rose and Bennett understood the political dynamics affecting the university and being in the middle of appropriation hearings on the state level and capital campaigns with university stakeholders, the less said about desegregation the better. But the university was moving forward with the continued enrollment of African-American students.

While The University of Alabama was making positive strides in the enrollment of African-American students, a racial incident arose in late 1964 that involved the singer Louis Armstrong. Armstrong was scheduled to appear at the Cotillion Club, a university affiliated student organization. However, the event was canceled by university administration with little explanation. Jefferson Bennett (1965) stated that the administration of The University of Alabama advised the student Cotillion Club not to contract with Louis Armstrong for an appearance in February. The Cotillion Club followed the advice. The issue was a public relations disaster as no clear or definitive reason was ever given for the cancellation. The lack of an explanation coming so closely on the heels of desegregation was perplexing. This was not the first time Armstrong had appeared on the campus. In 1954, prior to desegregation, he had played for the Cotillion Club in Foster Auditorium. So to not have him back created a public relations issue at the least. The incident gave the university a negative perception nationally that it had worked hard to avoid. Rose provided little outward leadership other than stating the cancellation was for the safety of the campus.
The issue became public on campus and students disagreed with the university decision on the matter. The Student Government Association passed a unanimous resolution that stated “It is the opinion of the Legislature that the administration repeal the ban on the appearance of Louis Armstrong and his All-Stars – or issue a full explanation for the maintenance of the ban to the students of the University” (Armstrong resolution passes, 1964, p. 2). Rose never took the lead on explaining the issues related to the cancellation. He did appear on national radio and stated there were “‘confidential reasons’ for the cancellation. The Crimson White called the treatment of Armstrong “sloppy under the counter handling…typical of the way the entire controversy has been plunged into hopeless confusion” (Editorials – Sloppy handling, 1964, p. 4). People like Bennett and John Blackburn, Dean of Men, were left to explain the rationale. Blackburn stated that this was “not a decision against Negro entertainment but taking into consideration all problems relative to this performance we thought it unwise at this time…the university is trying to keep the door open and we don’t want to be locked in any positions” (Not the right time, 1964, p. 1).

The Crimson White also indicated it had conducted a survey that found that Negro bands had played on the campus for quite a few years with no incidents. The outcry over Armstrong’s concert cancellation was very pronounced from the students, faculty, and external sources and it cast a negative light on the leadership of the administration, one that Rose sidestepped with little commentary. It seems clear that Rose should have taken more of a leadership role by explaining in greater detail the reason for the cancellation. By allowing other administrators to give vague reasons for the cancellation, Rose ensured the controversy would not readily end. The university did eventually acquiesce to the Cotillion Club’s apparent desire for African-American entertainment and allowed the scheduling of singer Johnny Mathis in March 1965. No rationale
was provided for the approval of Mathis’ appearance. But the whole episode demonstrated how
the lack of direct communication created a situation that could have been avoided. The real
reason for the cancellation of Armstrong’s performance is not known, but it provided clear
evidence that issues related to race still were important. This incident created an outcry from the
student body. Students were beginning to express themselves with greater freedom and speak out
against university decisions. Rose was accustomed to an environment of student acquiescence, a
situation that was now a thing of the past. Desegregation was the beginning of student change on
the UA campus. Students were now more outspoken and quick to take a position on matters
related to the campus. Their reaction to the Armstrong prohibition was a harbinger of things to
come later in the decade.

Rose had many experiences with the stakeholders of the university other than students. He understood the politics of getting things accomplished and had developed through his
presidential experience a nuanced view of businessmen and their influence on academia. In June
of 1965, Rose wrote to Irvin Lunger, then president of Transylvania College, with advice on
development plans he was spearheading. Rose said, “I would advise you to stay rather close to
some of their (businessmen and influential alumni) thoughts and plans. Businessmen do a lot of
talking about education, but my close experience with them over the years has revealed to me
that they know very little about it” (F. Rose, personal communication, June 17, 1965). Rose had
tried to address this problem in his first few years at Alabama. In March of 1961, he wrote an
article called “The Businessman’s Interest in Education” for The University of Alabama’s
Alabama Business newsletter. He directly approached the historic problem that existed between
academia and the business community by saying “the businessman viewed the academic
community with suspicion and the scholar looked upon the business world with skepticism”
(Rose, 1961, p. 1). Rose used the Alabama Business newsletter to deliver his vision of how he wanted business to interact with the university in order to create a mutually beneficial outcome. He stated, “Businessmen are perfectly willing to leave educational processes to colleges and universities, but they do want to see the quality of education that will give them a more dependable individual as an employee. This demand on the part of American business should furnish us with the challenge needed to raise our standards for admission and graduation” (Rose, 1961, p. 2). Rose understood that in order to change the perception of Alabama as an institution of higher learning the requirements for admission and graduation had to increase. With stronger academic standards came the need for having top-notch faculty as a key component in accomplishing this. Just as importantly, Rose needed to ensure that the legislators and business community understood how improving the academic image of the university would have positive attributes for the state of Alabama.

Rose concentrated on the image of the university using friends to help with positive public relations. The university was on track to begin its development as a research university. Rose was committed to the development of research and how it impacted business in the local community. Rose’s essay *The Businessman’s Interest in Education* noted that many businesses were lending research personnel to universities in order to augment their teaching and research base. Rose compared the success of businesses and corporations and quality employees with local higher education. The relationship between quality students and top-notch corporate researchers was linked to institutions of higher learning that focused on research. To highlight this point, Rose referenced a recent example stating, “A good example of this was the recent move of the Chemstrand Corporation from Decatur, Alabama, to the ‘Golden Triangle’ in North Carolina, where this company could call upon the excellent resources of Duke University, the
University of North Carolina, and Wake Forest College” (as cited in *Alabama Business*, 1961, p. 3). In connecting the research aspect of education to business needs, Rose was positioning the university to take on added responsibilities in the Huntsville area with the Space Race, to increase federal grant funding, and to tie the future success of Alabama businesses to UA. Rose closed his challenge to the Alabama business community by saying “I believe the businessman’s interest in education is genuine. I see in his interest a challenge to more than our normal efforts in providing for our society young men and women who are intellectually competent, morally responsible, and who possess a willingness to think and work. Whether the businessman is making a gift or an investment will be determined by the seriousness with which we accept our responsibility” (as cited in Alabama Business, 1961, p. 3).

Rose had insights on how to try and address productively the institutional interaction with businessmen through the lens of business ethics. He shared his thoughts on the proper balance between business outcomes and the value of leadership. He summarized the findings of Philip Jacob’s book, *Changing Values in College* (1957), to highlight the loss of values in college students. He said, “In all of our colleges and professional schools we must teach those courses that call for value judgments and moral insights. It is here that students will get their proper perspectives for responsible living. No student can succeed who cannot properly orient himself in an environment that calls for respected leadership” (Rose, 1964, p. 2). Rose wanted to strike a balance between the needs of the student, the university, and the business community all framed within the context of ethical leadership. To further this argument he stated “There is this necessity of making truly cultured, social, and civic minded persons out of young academicians, and of bringing them to a consciousness of the ultimately religious foundations of life in our society, because with this deep ethical sense of obligation all human work and the progress of
learning is in peril of self-annihilation” (Rose, 1964, p. 2). Rose felt the training of students grounded in moral leadership would prove highly beneficial to the students once they entered the business world. He felt this would give them an ethical compass that would benefit the university as they became productive alumni.

Rose wanted to accomplish the goals he had set forth for The University of Alabama and he realized to accomplish this he must develop relationships with many constituencies that would help him. Most important to this was his development of friendships within the media. One thing unnoticed about Rose was his connection to people within the national media. He had the great fortune to have a fellow Meridianite, Thomas Moore, as President of the American Broadcasting Company in the 1960s. Moore was born a couple years before Rose, but they knew each other through high school. Moore would go to Mississippi State and the University of Missouri before entering World War II as a naval pilot. With the conclusion of the war, he began his rapid ascent to the top of ABC (Hevesi, April 4, 2007). Rose was fortunate to have a friend in such a high position and he used Moore’s assistance to help frame the picture of The University of Alabama that he wanted to have presented. In 1965, Rose asked Moore to be the commencement speaker at UA and Moore used the opportunity to speak about the legacy of Alabama. Moore offered Rose a chance to read his speech and it was left intact so the point delivered would hit home. Moore told the graduating seniors that you

are the inheritors of a sad tradition and a heavy burden. It is no secret that the present image of your state, and for that matter the entire South, is in deep disrepute…Who should speak for the South? Not merely the loudest among us, the most belligerent, or the most extreme. But all the people who are between now and never, the great majority of the South. (as cited in Tilford, 2014, p. 69)

Rose and Moore worked together during Moore’s visit to have an ABC news crew work on campus. Moore used his visit as an opportunity for the news crew to venture out across the
university and film a documentary titled *Southern Campus: A Quiet Revolution* that was soon to appear on Scope, an ABC News program. The program aired nationally about two weeks after the commencement and was designed to show a progressive view of the campus in contrast to stereotypes about Alabama. Rose had written to the executive producer of the show, Tom Wolf, and thanked him for his efforts. In turn, Moore wrote back to Rose stating “the reaction we have had has been superb. We have had letters commending the program from all over. We are going to offer our stations a replay of the program and I hope it will get some more exposure” (T. Moore, personal communication, June 22, 1965). The reactions of many progressives across the state of Alabama to the program caused Rose to reply, “We have received a splendid response from the people of Alabama. I believe the tide is finally beginning to turn” (as cited in Tilford, 2014, p. 69). The relationship with Thomas Moore was nurtured by Rose and he took opportunities to share with Moore upcoming events that might better frame the view of UA or education in the South.

Around the same time, Rose developed another close relationship with Louisianan David Nevin, a writer with *Life* magazine. The two men shared information on the desegregation of UA to help with an article that Nevin was planning on the South. Rose wrote to Nevin about the positive trend he was witnessing by saying

> I have just returned from Washington and found that the University of Alabama is held in the highest regard by all of the government agencies and the White House. I found not only interest in what we are doing, but a great deal of excitement and assurances from everyone that they were willing to put millions of dollars into the expansion of our programs. (F. Rose, personal communication, February 4, 1965)

Rose detailed how “we have won in our stand against the Governor” since Wallace was now helping to gain appropriations for the university via the legislature. Rose told Nevin that ABC and CBS wanted to do a documentary on The University of Alabama entitled *The Anatomy of a
Modern University. Rose turned them down in deference to the need not to alienate state politicians when the university was seeking appropriations from Montgomery. The documentary came later in the summer courtesy of Thomas Moore and ABC. But Rose did advise Nevin that the Moore film “would help greatly nationally but could hurt us locally as we have been able to move ahead with more than 50 Negroes now, a Negro faculty member at the medical Center and all conferences completely integrated” (F. Rose, personal communication, February 4, 1965). Political good sense was the driving factor for Rose in seeking the appropriations prior to drawing national attention to positive changes on campus.

In July of 1965, after appropriation decisions were made, Rose told Nevin that the South was changing and “living here, [I] see so much being accomplished. We have had over 1500 people on our campus in the Head Start program…50 to 60% of them were Negro, without the first incident. Even George Wallace is approving integrated programs under the Poverty Act” (F. Rose, personal communication, July 16, 1965). Rose continued to press Nevin on his writing and encouraged him about a possible book he was writing on the Civil Rights struggle in the South. Yet work demands on Nevin placed him outside the South and he was unable to focus on that work. Rose continuously readdressed the book in each letter between the two men and it is obvious he wanted the story told. Nevin wrote back to Rose in late summer of 1965 as he was now covering the Los Angeles riots stating “my interest is beginning to shift to the larger question of the position of the Negro in America. That may pass, of course, but regardless, I will go back to the South one day and I will chronicle the change we both know is coming” (D. Nevin, personal communication, August 18, 1965). The letter was a precursor to the work the two would later complete with the L.Q.C. Lamar Society. The letters lead one to believe that Rose was looking politically at how positive headlines could benefit the university while Nevin
was struggling to hone in on the exact problem he wanted to study. Nevin and Rose would later cooperate in work on the issue of “white flight” and how it was hurting education in the South (Nevin, 1975).

In spite of his pursuit of business and media support, Rose felt that businessmen and much of the rest of the public seemed to be interested in education but very rarely did anything tangible to support it other than the normal donations to the university. Business interests applied a lot of pressure on the Alabama legislators, which made the business community a continued area of focus for Rose in his career at The University of Alabama. Businessmen tended to get involved in elements of the university that were not geared toward academic growth. Rather they concentrated on the issues in the headlines that affected the perception of the university, such as athletics or campus events. As student unrest over the Vietnam War and student rights increased, there was greater pressure applied by the external stakeholders of the university. Many were businessmen and state legislators who saw the continued demands of students on campus as bordering on anarchy. This placed Rose in a very precarious situation. He was a supporter of academic freedom but knew that external forces expected limitations to be placed on the students and faculty. The gap between academic freedom and political reality was wide and Rose came under greater pressure to navigate it.

Rose invited his old friend Robert F. Kennedy to visit the UA campus in March 1967. Kennedy was in the early stages of a run at the Democratic nomination for President. He was touring the South and made an earlier visit to the University of Mississippi before coming to Tuscaloosa. Rose requested the visit with the hope of creating some positive public relations for the university. Kennedy was mobbed by students as he made his way across campus. When he finally spoke he shared his vision of the future in the South by saying, “I meet today not as
Southerners or Northerners, but as Americans from different parts of a single nation – less as old antagonists than as partners in a common future” (RFK believes a new, 1967, p. 1). The message he delivered was simple politically, but it made for an effective appearance that may or may not have resonated off campus, but that energized the university.

Students across the campus were starting to use this energy to express their thoughts openly. With new found levels of academic freedom it would not be long before the new ways clashed with the old mores of campus behavior. The issue came to a head later in the spring of 1967, when the university published a program booklet for an upcoming event entitled *Emphasis 67, Revolutions*. The booklet was published through the Student Government Association and included a series of essays by controversial public figures. The event also included several speakers. Among the writers were Bettina Aptheker, a leader of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement; Stokely Carmichael, a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC); and Roy Wilkins, a leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). To legislators and business people alike, this publication and event were seen as pushing too far and Rose became ensnared in a political struggle over who actually was leading the university.

The concerns over *Emphasis 67* pitted former Governor George Wallace and his wife and current Governor Lurleen Wallace and President Rose against one another. George Wallace along with several legislators had been made aware of the *Emphasis 67* publication. The political concern was about the contributors to the booklet and their views. The booklet created no positive feelings for the politicians, given its title, Revolutions. Academic freedom was changing for students but some politicians were not ready for this. In the political setting, academic freedom represented a lack of control with the students and faculty. To counteract the views from
Montgomery, Rose said in a statement issued on April 5, 1967, that former Governor Wallace questioned the leadership and direction of the university by “holding a copy of the Emphasis book in his hand, cited it as an example of academic freedom” (Senate proposes speaker-ban, 1967, p. 1). The governor’s office denied the statement saying that Wallace “had never seen the publication until Rep. (Ralph) Slate showed it to him” (Senate proposes speaker-ban, 1967, p. 1). Rose initially addressed the issue a day before at a university fundraiser for the University Law School Foundation in Birmingham. Before he could begin his address, he quickly moved toward the concerns being raised statewide over Emphasis 67. Facing the attorneys in attendance, Rose voiced his frustration with the political meddling of Montgomery and uncharacteristically lost his diplomatic edge in addressing issues of importance to the university. He became quite transparent in his thoughts and said, “We in Alabama have an inferiority complex. We think everybody in the world is against us. We are cursing the land. We are cursing the parties to which we belong. This must stop and we have to get along” (Dr. Rose says, 1967, p. 1). Those in attendance agreed however, with those in the legislature who were critiquing the leadership at UA. Legislators like Sen. Leland Childs, Sen. Bob Harris, and Rep. Ralph Slate, who did not attend the meeting, led the charge in Montgomery for a ban of controversial speakers at the Emphasis 67 event along with former Governor George Wallace. With this in mind, Rose defended his stance on freedoms within academia:

I’m not for sale and the University of Alabama, as long as I’m president is not for sale, politically or otherwise. If this position demands that I abandon my beliefs then I guess I’ll have to find another job. I’m not going to sell out. I have no political ambitions. I don’t want to become governor, senator, congressman or president. I don’t care what committee I’m called upon or who forces me. I’m still convinced we have the finest young people anywhere. I’m going to stand with them as long as they are not vulgar, obscene or seditious (Dr. Rose says, 1967, p. 1)
The actual *Emphasis 67* booklet included a statement of support from the university. It stated that this was an “opportunity to increase familiarity with subjects of current interest and importance. Some topics or speakers may be controversial. The University’s position is that investigation of important subject matter should not be interpreted to mean either endorsement or refutation” (Student Government Association, 1967, p. 2).

University students overwhelmingly supported Rose’s position with many saying they were “fed up” with the legislators’ meddling in university affairs. As the popular student banner that was posted on campus stated, “Freedom is a Rose…This is not Wallace University” (*Troy censorship fuels*, 1967, p. 1). Stan Wilson, a political science student participating in the demonstrations over a proposed speaker ban stated that

> I feel threatened as hell. I’m fed up and I see this as possible potential attempt for legislative control of the university. I admit, I’m here partly for selfish reasons because my degree would be threatened if something this drastic were to happen. I think it’s a real crime when you have education pitted against indoctrination. (*Troy censorship fuels*, 1967, p. 1)

The focus of *Emphasis* was to have a balance of speakers who could present ideas from both sides of the educational spectrum. But to some in the legislature the articles and speakers chosen were too controversial and gave the impression that the university administration was not in charge of the situation. The *Emphasis* program embodied the changing climate on most college campuses where students demanded more individual freedoms to express themselves. As newspapers of the time pointed out, “neither the question of balance nor the question of how the publication is financed, both under fire, is the real point of the dispute. The issue hinges on the advisability of a curb on academic freedom of speech and publication” (*Dr. Rose defends*, 1967, p. 6). The issue in question was free speech, a concept that was dramatically changing in the late 1960s.
In the past campus control had been paternalistic. Now the students were demanding more say in what they were taught or lectured on. As Ralph Knowles, the UA Student Government president said, “To become educated, one must hear all sides of the issue, regardless of how controversial…Second, and this is the crux of the matter, suppression of opinion by law is far more dangerous than any given viewpoint can be when it is aired and debated…this is a method of totalitarianism” (Dr. Rose defends, 1967, p. 6). In addition to support from the student body and faculty, some outside groups approved of Rose’s stand on academic freedom. The Alabama Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi Journalism Society sent the president a telegram advising him to “keep up the good fight for academic freedom” (Rose praised by, 1967, p. 2). In addition, a student petition drive on campus secured over 2,200 signatures in support of Rose’s handling of the speaker’s bureau incident. Upon receiving the petition and signatures, Rose stated “the legislature has said that the purpose of education is to let people think for themselves and it is ironic that the legislature seemed to change its mind during the Emphasis trouble” (2,200 back Rose, 1967, p. 1).

In spite of his stated defense of student freedom, by the end of Rose’s nearly twelve years of tenure as president of The University of Alabama, he was growing tired of the upheaval of the times and the unrest it was causing on college campuses. His style had always been that of negotiation. However, the changing times of the late 1960s were making this more difficult as students began to demand more and more of their institutions and faculty. The days of in loco parentis were surely dead, and with it the paternalism of the old college administrative style. Rose altered his views on academic and student freedom, but even he had limitations on how far he felt he could go. His view of academic freedom for students clearly was becoming more
ambivalent. In May of 1967, Rose delivered the commencement address at Spring Hill College in Mobile where he stated that

Student demonstrations sometimes confuse the lay public. However I am impressed with (the) students’ integrity…although some of their activities disturb me. If the demonstrations represent the insistence on student rights without responsibility and reason, then I am against the movements. But if it is a responsible effort to humanize the academic processes and to increase dialogue between faculty and students, then I am their advocate (Rose supports responsible, 1967, p. 8)

Rose advocated responsible citizenship and was against those who burned their draft cards and resisted requests for orderly movement from an area of protest. He said the “orderly processes of law provide for dissent and debate, and voting allows us adequate opportunities for change” (Rose supports responsible, 1967, p. 8).

Rose was still viewed by the local community as an asset to the university. In October of 1967, after the public distractions and acrimony created by the Emphasis 67, Rose and his wife were honored by the Tuscaloosa Chamber of Commerce and several civic groups in appreciation for their leadership of the university. Rose was “presented a plaque and about $30,000 worth of Savings Bonds and his wife (Tommye) was given a diamond broach. Rose told a group of more than 350 people…that he had been called to head a major corporation in New York, but had turned the job down because he felt he was still needed at Alabama” (Dr. and Mrs. Rose, 1968, p. 31). The uneasiness he was experiencing with student activism were weighing on him. Rose had encountered success in his handling of the Emphasis 67 crisis. He had stood up for academic freedom and asserted himself against the legislature. But the successful outcome of that encounter would be short lived.

In early 1968, Rose gave the Student Government Association orders to “rescind an invitation accepted by William Sloan Coffin, controversial Presbyterian chaplain at Yale University” (Rose nixes emphasis, 1968, p. 1). Rose had deep religious philosophical differences
with Coffin brought on partly by the latter’s January 1968 federal grand jury indictment for conspiracy to counsel, aid and abet draft resistance. Coleman Lollar, the student editor of the Emphasis 68 magazine disputed the president’s action: “I question if Mr. Sloane-Coffin is so controversial, even by the administrations standards, that he should not have the right to express his view and students should not have the right to hear his views…there is very definitely a credibility gap existing between the SGA and the administration. I think it is time the administration started dealing with the students as adults” (Rose nixes emphasis, 1968, p. 1). This dispute revealed a change in how the faculty was beginning to view Rose. The faculty members who were part of the Emphasis group were starting to take the side of the students on the issue. Faculty members were becoming concerned over Rose’s need for control of the university and his “popularity in student circles waned considerably” (Wolfe, 1983, p. 207).

Rose’s ascent to the presidency at Transylvania came at the age of 30. Unlike most administrators, Rose had not served in a true faculty position and was not an academician. He did not possess an advanced degree, but was rather well versed in the Bible as a result of his seminary studies and ordination as a minister. Therefore, he had no true tie to the rigors of faculty life with regard to research. Rose likely also never took into consideration the fact that most faculty who aspire to administrative positions have to bide their time as a professor, department chair, dean, and other positions prior to being considered for higher administrative positions. With this comes a good deal of time in grade with most faculty members never attaining these positions until later in their career. Rose had become a president early and the lack of an advanced research degree probably did not serve him well. There is an apparent disconnect between Rose’s leadership that was political and paternalistically based and the faculty who were immersed in teaching and research. While Rose was an advocate for improving
conditions for the faculty (salaries, infrastructure), he likely could not relate to their routine. This is probably the reason the faculty saw him as imperial and controlling. This negatively impacted Rose’s popularity on campus and likely hastened his resignation from the university.

Other issues negatively impacted Rose’s leadership at this time. Faculty members were concerned over the closing of extension centers in Montgomery and Mobile. One of the main issues from the faculty was that Rose’s “presidency had become increasingly imperial” (Wolfe, 1983, p. 207). With the rise of student activism, *The Crimson White* even questioned why students could not be treated “as adults” in reference to Rose and his administrators (Crimson White, February 19, 1968). There were also many administrators on campus – many of whom were younger men (Mathews, Thomas, McGehee) Rose had personally selected. Having younger administrators in positions of power within the university hierarchy created this imperial image of Rose. One such example was David Mathews, a youthful 32 year administrator who would follow Rose as the next president of The University of Alabama. Mathews, a U.A. alumnus came back to the university in 1965 as interim dean of men. In less than a year he was named Rose’s executive assistant and served in that capacity until he was named executive vice-president in 1967. The appearance was that Rose was intentionally picking favorites to key leadership positions rather than placing experienced administrators and faculty in these positions. This likely shows the inability of Rose to understand faculty dynamics based on his quick rise to the role of president and a compartmentalization of thought. His self-confidence, paternalism, and controlling nature were probably factors in why Rose chose younger administrators for positions of leadership, even though it caused dissent within the faculty ranks. There appeared to be a disconnect between how Rose was viewed on campus at this time and external to the university how he was seen by external constituencies. Rose was still a highly sought after as a speaker for
commencements and local community organizations. In most of his addresses, he spoke on education and how the changing times affected the way the public responded to teaching. In May of 1969, as Rose was ending his presidency at Alabama, he was invited to speak at West Virginia Wesleyan College on the role of higher education and social conflict. The address was noteworthy for its review of educational history in the United States. Due to its historical context, West Virginia Wesleyan College had it published for students and alumni to read. The address centered on various power apparatuses (political, racial, faculty, student, administrative) and how these were entwined between the old educational delivery and the change in its methods.

Rose addressed education as defined by Thomas Jefferson wherein higher education was “limited to a few rather than the many…there is a natural aristocracy of among men. The grounds of this are virtue and talents” (Rose, 1969, p. 1). Rose explained how views changed in the Jacksonian era through the writings of people like Alexis de Tocqueville. There was a transition between English aristocratic thought and the developing democratic model of education. Rose added, “the experiment was education: the building of a common school system at the elementary level for all people, an academy system at the secondary level for more capable graduates of the elementary level, and the limiting of collegiate study to an intellectual elite, the natural democracy” (Rose, 1969, p. 2). The ascension of Andrew Jackson to the U.S. Presidency was a defining moment of change. With a common man now occupying the top position in government, a greater call came from the citizenry that every citizen could attain a greater level of higher education. The problem laid in the delivery of education based on the old classical models as defined in the Yale Report of 1828. As more and more common people sought an education, the classical form of education was not helpful to those who were not from the
aristocratic class. Rose pointed out that “What higher education discovered, and America has come to realize, is that men are not alike in their interests, in their abilities, and in their intelligence. Beyond their common likeness in birth and death, men may also be alike in their legal and human rights, in their political rights, in their right to equal opportunities. But they are not alike in performance or in achievement, in ambition or in intelligence, in capacity or in interest” (Rose, 1969, p. 5). This statement spoke to several issues facing the United States in the 1960s, specifically to racial equality and a shift in authority on college campuses.

The conclusion of the Wesleyan speech spoke to mediocrity in education. Rose was concerned that the “community of scholars” ceased to exist once the U.S. moved to a division of labor in the trades a person could pursue. The old classical school was gone and there now was a need to educate all. This meant there was not difference in man from the vertical perspective (all men are created equal and entitled to the same rights and privileges) but there was and always would be a difference in the horizontal perspective. This perspective was the result of “the division of labor and ability as a natural consequence of a technical society and the reflection of this division may be seen in the varying structures of education” (Rose, 1969, p. 7). An educational system was needed that considered the diversity and capabilities of the citizenry.

Rose summed up his views by pointing out the qualities that were commonly held by all:

First, the true scholar has a rich appreciation for and use of disciplines other than his own, if he is not to be narrow in his perspective….Secondly, the true scholar is aware of his own limitations in his own chosen discipline….Thirdly, all faculty and students hold in common some similar burdens which they must bear….Their hopes, their fears, their commitments, their need of one another as critics and as supporters – these are the things faculty and students hold in common, and it is in this realization of their common calling that they are able to rise from mediocrity and approach the invisible threshold of excellence. (Rose, 1969, p. 7-8)

Rose was concerned about the future of education. He was concerned on many levels, especially his own role as a college administrator, which at this point had become a burden.
In the early 1960s, Rose drafted a speech entitled The Challenges for American Higher Education in which he discussed coming problems for higher education institutions. At the time of his speech, colleges were about to face an expansion of college student numbers due to the post World War II “Baby Boom” and the influx of service members using their G.I. Bill. The expansion created the need for more housing, more educational buildings, more faculty, and ultimately more dollars. This in turn meant higher costs for the students and more appropriation requests through state and local governments. Rose (1964a) stated that “it is not a question of whether or not we can afford it. It is a question of the priorities by which we want to live, and whether we want to live in a world whose leadership belongs to the Soviets (Cold War concerns)” (p. 3). His major concern was that the “real danger” was that the continuation of increased costs for students was eventually going to have a negative effect on educational access for deserving students. Rose said, “no nation can afford to surrender this kind of potential leadership and hold its rightful place in the world” (Rose, 1964a, p. 4).

Given these realities, Rose understood that the role of the college president had changed dramatically from an educational advocate to a fundraiser, and though he was adept at fundraising, he grew weary of its constant demands. To prove this point, Rose stated that “when Dr. Harold Taylor was asked why he resigned at such a young age (44) from the presidency of Sarah Lawrence College, he replied, ‘Money was what I had to talk about while bankers, politicians, and industrialists had the privilege of talking about education’” (Rose, 1964a, p. 5). Both Rose and Taylor became college presidents at age 30, both retired from college administration in their 40s, and both went into educational consulting. Both tired of the constant fundraising they had to do and intervention from outsiders on what academia should be doing.
In late 1968, Rose had made the determination to leave the presidency at The University of Alabama. He made his feelings known on how he perceived where higher education was going. He said,

a university must be free of any particular political ideology. Ideologues have tyrannized a number of American campuses, demanding the right to impose their view on the institutions involved and rejecting consideration of any opposing view. When a university loses its freedom of inquiry or loses its impartiality, whether captive of politicians or as a captive of campus extremists or as a captive of special interests, then it ceases to be a university and becomes an indoctrination center for whatever group happens to be in command. (*Birmingham News*, 1969, 29, p. 2)

The statement reflected the issues he was facing, especially with the faculty and the student free speech movement. It was apparent that Rose had grown weary of the struggles faced each day on the college campus. Also, he likely recognized his core beliefs were not consistent with those of faculty and students on campus in 1969.

Frank Rose tendered his resignation as President of the University of Alabama on January 27, 1969, effective at the end of the year. It was brought on by several factors: increased student radicalism, a shift away from in loco parentis, continuing struggles with state legislators over appropriations and academic freedom, and disagreements with some faculty over the direction for the university. Some faculty members viewed Rose as too slick and imperial (*Wolfe, 1983*). Rose had always possessed the ability to sell ideas and his communication style was more businesslike. Changes in student freedom likely made Rose’s style seem heavy handed. He was a man who enjoyed wearing tailored suits and looking his best assisted him in dealing with non-university constituents. However, to some he came across as a slick businessman who was more concerned about his appearance. Rose also appointed people he was fond of, to positions of leadership. Some of these were younger administrators, like Rose in his early days at Transylvania, and this did not endear him to some faculty. Rose was simply tired
from all the struggles he had endured over his eleven and half years at UA. In his resignation letter to Governor Albert Brewer, Rose said, “Because knowledge changes and expands so rapidly today, the modern university presidency requires complete dedication, innovative and creative ideas, and tremendous physical stamina….I felt the time had come to look deeply at where my experience and interests could best be used, and the time has come for the University of Alabama to look closely at the type of leadership it would require to achieve the goals we have set in recent years” (F. Rose, personal communication, January 27, 1969).

Rose later noted “there is a growing awareness among college administrators and executives that the ‘old order’ of higher learning needs changing. New concepts, new programs and new methods are either being instituted or planned which will make substantial changes in the life, if not the face of college campuses in the future” (Rule of reason, 1969, p. 5). This statement sheds some light on Rose’s difficulties in adjusting to changes. The Tuscaloosa News editorialized that Rose “had a remarkable capacity for bringing out the best in his associates. He has done more good here than he or others realize. But he could have done more with greater support, a larger measure of cooperation from the general public and the lawmakers” (Dr. Rose’s value, 1969, p. 4).

Whatever issues existed with some faculty members, the University Council passed a resolution on February 4, 1969, acknowledging Rose and his contributions to the university. The commendation was typical of those given to administrators who were leaving their office, yet it did point out the strengths that allowed the university to make progress toward the future. The resolution stated that Rose “was quickly recognized as a man to whom quality education was worth all his energy and talent…and has come to be recognized as a leader, not just on the campuses of this institution, but as a spokesman for education in the State and the Nation and has
contributed long hours of diligent work to raising the educational vision of all Alabama citizens” (p. 1).

On Sunday, March 9, 1969, the Birmingham News dedicated an entire section of the newspaper to Frank Rose. The segment entitled “To people of Alabama: Dr. Rose leaves educational legacy” was directed at singling out the accomplishments of his administration. Only two other presidents at UA had served longer tenures and neither had encountered the difficulties experienced by Rose. He took the presidency of UA at the age of 36 and left at age 49. He would later lament that when he left UA, he felt as though he were 70 years old. His accomplishments as an administrator were highlighted. The elements that resulted in these successes were duly noted. The News stated that in Rose’s “first year at Tuscaloosa, he went before 138 civic groups to give them a concept of what a university is and should be and what it will mean to the future economy and leadership of the state. Since then he has averaged about 100 speaking engagements a year, or almost two per week. And even then he turned down 10 for every one he accepted” (Dr. Rose leaves, 1969, Section B). So hectic was his pace as a university president that the article noted that the Carnegie Foundation determined that Rose was one of two college presidents who were the most overworked. He and his wife were offered a three-month all-expense paid around the world vacation. Rose said however, “we wanted to go so bad we could taste it, but we just couldn’t find the time” (Dr. Rose leaves, 1969, Section B).

The article also reiterated the philosophy that Rose had held for some time as it related to students. “We must turn out students who are competent in their chosen fields but who…know philosophy, history of man, what’s going on in the world, and above all have values. We need statesmanship instead of merely political leaders” (Dr. Rose leaves, 1969, Section B). Rose was
an ambitious man and very astute politically. However, his ministerial training still provided the moral compass that he fell back on when it came to educating students.

Rose’s presidency exhibited characteristics of both transformational and transcendent leadership. Transformational leaders possess strong communication skills and provide leadership through strong relations with university stakeholders. Transcendental leadership influence comes from strong interpersonal relations with many groups of people. At times he seemed to go back and forth between the two approaches in order to positively impact the greatest number of constituents that had a role in the university community. The News noted that Rose gave credit for university successes during his administration to the faculty and staff.

Rose also pointed out that he was a failure in delivering many things to The University of Alabama. The most glaring example was the development of a great Graduate School, as Rose stated, “we’ve made tremendous progress in developing our graduate school, but we have not had the money to get the kind of graduate program we need for Alabama. You can’t have a great university until you have a great graduate school” (Dr. Rose leaves, 1969, Section B). This was one area that concerned members of the faculty and it was not unnoticed by Rose.

Rose knew what a new university president needed to be successful at Alabama.

The role of a university president has changed. Until five years ago we needed a popular speaker, and a good administrator committed to quality education. Now we need a man with superb academic training…a scholar in his own right. Public relations is still important, but we need a complete commitment and dedication to the academic aspects of education. We need a president who can give more attention to the faculty and student affairs. (Dr. Rose leaves, 1969, Section B)

This statement reflected some of the issues Rose faced late in his tenure as president. He was not an academician, but rather an administrator who was skilled at speaking and public relations. He was also a minister who had a definitive view of the student experience and the changes in the late 1960s were counter to what he believed. The era of his type of leadership was passing and
the new era required leaders who were more academically oriented. He also recognized the importance of Student Affairs on college campuses as a necessary vehicle through which students could be reached. It is noteworthy that the next two presidents at Alabama were Rose confidants who held Student Affairs positions, David Mathews and Joab Thomas.

One overriding concern among the faculty was that Rose was an imperial president. Culpepper Clark summed up Rose in this capacity in the book *The Schoolhouse Door*, and the imperial presidency was discussed in the *Birmingham News* article cited earlier in this chapter. The article mentioned that Rose and his family would be moving to a new three acre estate Georgian home that overlooked the Potomac River in Alexandria, Virginia, “that contained seven bedrooms, seven baths, two libraries, and a sweeping back terrace that looks down on the banks of the river below” (*Dr. Rose leaves*, 1969, Section B). This was to be the first home owned by Rose since he had lived in Presidential Mansions for the past 18 years. As Rose said, “all my career I’ve lived in beautiful mansions and I didn’t think this was the time to ask my family to become accustomed to anything else” (*Dr. Rose leaves*, 1969, Section B). Rose seemed to have the ability to compartmentalize his views on life, especially with regard to the size of his home and family when compared with the perceived Christian view of this. The article entitled “Dr. Rose leaves educational legacy” stated he made this observation with a smile and was quite confident in his reasons for doing it. The new home was to be a combination of the UA Presidential Mansion and his summer lake home on Lake Martin. Rose had worked hard to overcome many barriers at Alabama and the toll had prematurely aged him beyond his 49 years of age. But for a person so keen on perceptions and with a theology-centered background, he seemed to have a blind spot about munificence, or the appearance of munificence, in his personal circumstances, a blind spot noted by many faculty.
In June of 1969, Rose delivered his farewell address. His frustration was displayed when he stated that

Universities have become too large to be parental. It is a physical and moral impossibility to expect universities to act as parents in an age when real parents themselves do not know how to rear offspring. This, too, is a change in the role that colleges and universities have been expected to play in years past. Rules and regulations on college campuses are being challenged, but reason is the law of the university. Violence is the law of the jungle and creative teaching, learning and research cannot take place in an atmosphere of disruption. (*Rule of reason*, 1969, p. 5)

Rose concluded by concentrating on change and innovation. He felt these were essential to the success of a university campus and allowed institutions of higher learning to concentrate on what their role was, teaching, research, and service. “There are some basic fundamentals which cannot change and certainly the rule of reason on a university campus must be one of them” (*Rule of reason*, 1969, p. 5). Rose had been highly successful in light of all the things he had encountered at UA. However, his training as a minister and philosophy as a college administrator were tested, and found wanting in part, during the period of student unrest in the late 1960s.

Rose left The University of Alabama in better condition than he found it. The theme of his administration had been the “pursuit of excellence” and when he left there was a feeling of accomplishment. State newspaper editorials commended his work and courage during his twelve-year tenure. Most cited his role addressing desegregation at the university, but many placed an emphasis on his role in improving education. Under his leadership one important lesson was taught and it revolved around continuous improvement. As the *Tuscaloosa News* stated, “to advance beyond the standing of Mississippi isn’t much progress. Rose made it plain that we cannot achieve greatness by looking inward. We must project far beyond our state’s boundaries. We must be among the best anywhere” (*Frank Rose leaves*, 1969, p. 4). Rose gave the impression to all who met him that he was never satisfied with the status quo. Rather he was
always in motion, pursuing the next goal. He had the ability to multi-task and perform his duties in many venues, sometimes all at once. His “pursuit of excellence” was summed up in a newspaper article that said, “He has not completed the task he set out to accomplish. If he had remained here (UA) for another twenty years he would not then have finished the job. Because he is the kind of executive who is looking and planning ahead while he is doing what is needed in the present” (Great contributions by, 1969, p. 4).

Board of Trustee member Ernest Williams had a long history with the university and had served as the Executive Vice President of Gulf States Paper. During his time of affiliation with UA he had come to know every president since John W. Abercrombie in 1907. Thus he had a unique perspective on university leadership. His thoughts on Rose were that he was an exceptional speaker who had the ability to charm anyone he met. He was a charismatic personality who used diplomatic, political, and ministerial skills to convey his message. In speaking at the Selma, Alabama, UA Alumni dinner in 1966, Williams was asked how he felt about Rose. He responded that Rose was a combination of the best in many of his predecessors:

    Dr. Abercrombie, who was conscientious and sincere; of Dr. George Denny who was skillful and outstanding; of Dr. Richard C. Foster who was genial and diligent; of Dr. Raymon Paty who was enthusiastic and resourceful; of Dr. Ralph Adams who was capable and efficient; of Dr. John M. Gallalee who was competent and industrious; of Dr. Oliver Carmichael who was distinguished and imaginative; and of Dr. James Newman who was dedicated and reliable. (Williams, 1966, p. 2)

One must remember that Williams had a vested interest in Rose’s success since he was the one who pushed so eagerly for his hiring. Williams went on to say that at the “age of 42, I believe, he (Rose) can with the additional 28 years – compulsory retirement at 70 – render 36 years of outstanding service. I for one will do everything possible to keep him at the helm” (Williams, 1966, p. 2). Williams could not foresee the negative toll the job had on Rose and that he would be gone in less than three years after the speech.
In 1988, The University of Alabama honored Frank Rose at a Washington, DC, dinner. The dinner was held to express the gratitude felt by many alumni toward his leadership in improving UA. Specifically noted were “the Capstone opening its doors to students of all races, the Birmingham campus expanding the medical center, and breaking ground for the Huntsville campus” (Outposts: National capital, 1988, p. 33). In attendance were Alabama Senator Howell Heflin, Congressman Tom Bevill, Ambassador William Dyess, newspaper editor and friend H. Brandt Ayers, K.A. Order Knight Commander Idris Traylor, Jr., former Tuskegee Institute President Luther Foster, March of Dimes President Charles Massey, former UA President David Mathews, UA President Roger Sayers, UA football coach Bill Curry, and former Indiana University president and friend Elvis Stahr, Jr. As evidenced by the roster of attendees, Rose had touched many lives during his time as the president at Alabama. As emcee, Dyess pointed out that Rose had been a strong and positive influence at so many institutions and on so many lives. At the University of Alabama you led us with a clear head, calm hand, and warm heart through years as trying as any in the University’s 158 year history. Under your guidance we not only survived, we prospered. We are grateful. (Outposts: National capital, 1988, p. 33)

Rose for his part recognized that the greatest obstacle he faced while at Alabama was Governor George C. Wallace. He lightly touched on desegregation and how Wallace’s stand in the schoolhouse door was a futile effort to block integration of the university…(I) also battled Wallace over the efforts to enact legislation banning controversial speakers from the university campus. It was a very turbulent period, of course, with a lot of threats…I tried to convince the governor and my colleagues of that, and I am happy to say that the alumni, the trustees, the students, and the faculty supported me 100 percent” (Alabama alumni raising, 1989, p. B1)

As evidenced that evening, the contributions of Rose were symbolized in three main achievements (desegregation, UAB and UAH) during his term as president. But he contributed
much more than just these three elements of success in his tenure. His training as a minister and moral leader was tested at Alabama and the university was fortunate to have discovered him. It was a mutually beneficial relationship.
CHAPTER VIII:
POST-PRESIDENTIAL LIFE

In his time at Transylvania College and The University of Alabama, Rose was “a staunch advocate of the humanities, and liberal arts, placing a high value on the study of history, philosophy, religion, the fine arts, and English in order to achieve a well-rounded education” (Brown, 1987, p. 6). Rose was concerned about the move away from the liberal arts and more toward the physical sciences and technology. He understood the importance of science and technology from his work with the UA Birmingham and Huntsville campuses. He was not against this type of education, but rather envisioned a balance between a classic liberal arts education and science. Rose became an advocate for smaller private, liberal arts colleges that focused on the humanities. He said private colleges were “the guardians of academic freedom” because they were free from political control and they could give more individualized attention to students. He suggested that “students wishing to enter the technical or professional fields should first get a background in the humanities from a small liberal arts college and then transfer to a larger university to complete their professional studies” (Brown, 1987, p. 6).

Rose had encountered desegregation and the academic freedom issues that accompanied student activism in the 1960s while at The University of Alabama. His view of education was changing and desegregation and student radicalism both played a role in this. Rose saw the changing landscape of higher education and his next endeavor provided an opportunity to try and cope with change and steer institutions in a more positive direction. Upon leaving The University
of Alabama, Rose began a new career helping to create University Associates, a higher education consulting firm that specialized in assisting with better educational access for all students.

In 1972, the Lucius Quntus Cincinnatus (L.Q.C.) Lamar Society came into being; it was “named for a Mississippi statesman who had been a fire-brand secessionist but whom, in the 1870s, became a spokesman for reconciliation between the races and regions” (Ayers & Naylor, 1972, p. 368). Lamar was a renaissance man who had served as an officer in the Confederate Army and taught metaphysics, social science, and law at Ole Miss.

Lamar was best known for his post-war efforts to reconcile the North and South, black and white, past and future, which is what earned him a chapter in John F. Kennedy’s Profiles in Courage (2005). Kennedy praised Lamar for his conversion to having a more inclusive nation. Kennedy (1955) cited Lamar’s moving eulogy of radical Republican and abolitionist Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. Lamar stated, “shall we not over the honored remains of…this earnest pleader for the exercise of human tenderness and charity, lay aside the concealments which serve only to perpetuate misunderstandings and distrust. My countrymen! Know one another, and you will love one another” (as cited in Kennedy, 1955, p. 148). The speech was viewed as a turning point in North-South relations after the war by many. However, many Southerners were not enthralled with Lamar because of his attempts to bring the races together. Antipathy to Lamar led to efforts to discredit the new organization. Lamar Society member and Anniston Star editor H. Brandt Ayers once wrote in a letter to Rose about how he felt regarding many southerners’ opinion of the Society: “Those who want to argue about how many angels can dance on the end of a Southern pinhead will not be attracted by the Lamar Society anyway. We will be known by what we do and not by what we call ourselves” (H. B. Ayers, personal communication, February
16, 1974). Ayers was pointing out that the organization’s namesake was not as important as the deeds they accomplished.

The Lamar Society was formed to fill a void created by the time and attention used to fight desegregation in the South. As people of the region fought desegregation, there were many areas of society that were neglected. The Lamar Society sought to address problems of “low wages and per capita income, rural poverty, unemployment, sub-standard housing, inadequate educational systems, population growth within families that can least afford it, and inadequate planning on the part of the state and local governments” (Lamar Society, 1969, p. 1).

It was important that the Lamar Society choose a solid leader who could help navigate the negative reaction to desegregation while being a powerful spokesperson and lobbyist for education in the South. Without hesitation the Society sought Frank Rose to be the president of the new organization. As Ayers later stated, “we sought a permanent, paid president to be a charismatic spokesman and chief fundraiser…and a seemingly perfect candidate materialized” (Ayers, 2013, p. 175). One reason Rose was chosen was his understanding of the South and the issues he had faced in the fight for desegregation at The University of Alabama. The *Southern Journal* (1974), a publication of the Lamar Society, pointed out that Rose had emerged as a southern establishmentarian counterpoise to George Wallace and in the process built the University (of Alabama) into an important institution. When Wallace chose the University as the place to make his futile stand against integration only a few months after the fighting at Oxford, Mississippi, Rose carefully orchestrated the drama…while Wallace played out his sterile ritual of resistance, the University itself emerged as the hero of the piece. Alabamians took pride in the good sense it showed. Rose was the classic liberal-progressive establishmentarian who forced institutional imperatives to stand second to principle and who had the strength to hold it all together. Thus when the Lamar Society turned to him for leadership, by definition it was committing itself to an action course. (p. 2)

While it may be a stretch to see Rose as a liberal-progressive in the ordinary sense, he was a native southerner, and minister of an inclusive congregation (Christian Church), both which gave
him a good understanding of the issues faced by the Lamar Society and the reformist impulses that motivated the organization. Rose’s successful desegregation at Alabama cemented his legacy and likely changed his view on how to approach the problem of education for the new world. Rose noted that. “When I was a boy in Mississippi, we all knew it was education that could drag our tails out of the mud. Well it still is and that’s why I have been fighting for education ever since and that’s why the Lamar Society is working on education” (as cited in Southern Journal, 1974, p. 1).

Rose officially assumed the “position of president at the annual meeting…in Jackson, Miss., April 13, 1973. The Society’s office moved to Washington, D.C. where the staff shared offices” with Rose’s parent organization, University Associates (Rose to manage, 1973, p. 2). One hundred years after Justice Lamar had changed his view on the races, a fellow Mississippian would head an organization designed to change how southerners perceived themselves and were perceived by others. The society was an association born in late 1969 of people: “who believed the South could achieve practical solutions to its problems, regardless of whether these men and women were liberal or conservative, white or black, Democrat or Republican, establishment or student. The Society would be a network of Southern competence, linking educators, political leaders, the professions, communicators, businessmen and students of the states of the old Confederacy plus Kentucky” (Ayers & Naylor, 1972, p. 369). Ayers stated the Lamar Society’s focus was “supplanting romantic rhetoric, long the solace of our region with pragmatic dialogue. That dialogue will be about removing the obstacles which have kept the South from reaching its full potential” (Ayers, 1970, p. 8). Thomas Naylor, who co-edited You Can’t Eat Magnolias with Ayers, said bluntly “the underlying premise of the Lamar Society was that it was high time for the South to get off the race kick, come back into the Union, and start solving its own problems”
Most notable for the Lamar Society was its “leadership in the development of programs to aid developing colleges and universities, and particularly those institutions serving minorities and the economically deprived” (University Associates, 1975, p. 1).

The Lamar Society, in large part, was a non-profit group of individuals who worked constructively to carry out Federal court orders to desegregate public schools. The Lamar Society, in its own words, was “developed to help equip local people to deal with the disruption that often follows a court order to desegregate…the program calls for going into selected communities and working with a committee to be formed of various community leaders…and the Society is also interested in the development of school programs leading to quality education for all” (Lamar Society 1969, p. 2). This organization was one of the first to address the issue of court-ordered busing and private segregated academies, especially in the South. Its membership was diverse and included such people as Terry Sanford, former governor of North Carolina and president of Duke University; Chancellor Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt University; newspaper editor Hodding Carter III; Atlanta Vice Mayor Maynard Jackson; civil rights activist Julian Bond; businessman Sam Wyly; and then Georgia governor Jimmy Carter. The Lamar Society also responded to a challenge from Duke University President Sanders and the formation of the Southern Growth Policies Board (SGPB). Sanford’s speech at the spring 1971 Lamar Society symposium gave a direct admonition “that the South in its pursuit of economic development not forfeit its birthright – not sacrifice the qualities that made the region so distinctive and so attractive as a place to live” (Winter, 2004, p. 2). The SGPB was founded in 1971 as a southern consortium of state governments dedicated to public research that promoted economic development in the South.
Frank Rose, a native of Mississippi, a minister in the Christian Church, and a former president at The University of Alabama, was well suited for the Lamar Society leadership role. Understanding Mississippian and the struggle for desegregation allowed him an insight to the thoughts of groups he would encounter. In one instance, Rose had the opportunity to interact with the White Citizens’ Council Schools (WCCS) in Jackson, Mississippi. There he found the increasingly intemperate opposition to desegregation disturbing. He recalled one of his visits with WCCS President William J. Simmons in 1975. When Rose asked why the WCCS did not enroll African-American students, Simmons stated “that he did not think the blacks mentally or spiritually were equal to whites… that morally blacks were not equal to whites” (F. Rose, personal communication, September 25, 1975). Simmons was adamant about the segregation of races and went on to say “busing and integration of public schools are an avenue to mix the races in marriage and the production of children so as to make America a colored race and not a white one” (F. Rose, personal communication, September 25, 1975). This encounter showed the type of issues Rose and the Lamar Society faced, and the obstinacy that they did not always overcome. Rose took on the leadership role of the Lamar Society in order to continue the momentum of educational change in the South. He felt his experiences as a university president would lend insight on how to positively impact the inclusiveness of students in the region. Being a fellow southerner would provide insight and inroads to those who were involved in politics related to educational change.

In 1974, the Lamar Society began work on a study, which resulted in a book, *Schools that Fear Built*. The driving impetus for this book was white flight from the public school systems. This was intensified by court ordered busing to help integrate schools based on demographics city and county wide. In a February 7, 1975, letter to John Griffin, Executive Director of the
Southern Educational Foundation, Rose outlined the Lamar book and the cities which were in its focus. Of particular interest was Louisville, Kentucky, where school busing was creating major concerns with students, parents, and politicians. Rose stated, “it has become evident that our public schools in the major cities are in serious trouble with most of them in the city school systems becoming predominately black and fast losing support of officials responsible for funding the public schools and the quality of education” (F. Rose, personal communication, February 7, 1975). With grant funding from the Ford Foundation, the Lamar Society was able to work with the City of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky, to seek and find, a solution. On September 25, 1975, Rose met with Ralph Bohrson of the Ford Foundation to review the findings of the Louisville report. Bohrson stated he “would be happy to recommend…the importance of this kind of activity (study) in communities like Louisville…and that we had demonstrated in Louisville that we had the expertise and were the primary factor in helping Louisville from becoming another Boston” (F. Rose, personal communication, September 25, 1975). From 1974 to 1976, Boston public schools had been placed under court control to desegregate through a system of busing students. The busing injunction created a series of racial protests and riots that brought the northern city negative national publicity. Rose’s background made him an agent for change. His life lessons were predicated on the understanding of individuals such as Simmons of the White Citizens Council in Mississippi and he could identify with his thinking because of the issues he had been exposed to as a Southerner. He also understood the political dynamics involved in building coalitions such as the one with the Ford Foundation.

In a February 1975 letter to Paul Hardin of Drew University, Rose rather pessimistically discussed his thoughts on the troubles encountered in higher education in the South stating: “One
of these days Southerners and Yankees will learn that universities must be academic centers of learning. I have often thought it was the alumni hangover from the 1920’s and 30’s and that one of these days our young people who seem to take learning more seriously will turn it around. However, my observations in more recent years have not encouraged me in this belief” (F. Rose, personal communication, February 14, 1975). Rose and the Lamar Society concentrated their studies, however, not on higher education but on public educational change in the South. Through a $243,000 grant provided by the Ford Foundation, they were able to study the impact that new private segregated schools had on public education. Rose was instrumental in the development and conclusions of the study. As the 1976 Report to the Lamar Society Board of Directors pointed out “Dr. Rose dealt extensively with southern accrediting agencies, state department of education, southern political leaders concerned with this new school phenomenon as well as field trips to schools and organizations supporting segregation” (p. iii). His political connections and understanding helped the Lamar Society to quickly identify the problems in order to study them and make recommendations for their solution.

When the book The Schools That Fear Built – Segregationist Academies in the South was published in 1976, it identified a growing problem in the southern United States, the growth of academies and Christian schools in response to desegregation. The study looked at why parents double-taxed themselves in order to send their children to private institutions As David Nevin pointed out, “the new schools seem to be an attempt by parents to recreate the Southern community and neighborhood schools of the 1940s and 50s, when their schools were all white and the authority of teachers and principals seemed to be absolute” (Keller, 1977, p. 12). The study was both qualitative and quantitative with Rose leading the team in conducting research over an 18-month period. The study had two parts – an overview that examined the
qualitative factors that created the new schools and a quantitative analysis of eleven new private
schools. This study was designed to help find the reasons for white flight. A task force
coordinator with the Southern Regional Council summed up that private “Christian schools and
segregation academies are almost synonymous” (Crespino, 2009, p. 248). Discovering the reason
for this was important for the Lamar Society.

Rose and the Lamar team were genuinely concerned about the future of public education
in the South.

As the successful desegregation of public schools in the South has become a reality in the
early and mid-1970s, the number of people turning to private schools to avoid
desegregation has grown steadily. The movement to private schools began in the 1960s
when the idea of massive resistance to desegregation orders was still current in the
South…though desegregation seems generally accepted, the shift to private schools
continues unabated. It is too simple to blame this movement entirely on racism and fear
of integration. At a deeper level, it probably is further evidence of a profound and
dangerous division beneath the surface of American society. (Nevin, 1976, p. 1)

The Lamar Society’s goal was to determine what the mechanism for private school growth was. It
showed that earlier private academies were secular in nature and designed for those of greater
economic means. They were also more rural in nature. The newer trend was more toward Christian
based schools that taught from an evangelical slant. These were more commonly found in larger
cities and their constituents were no longer the wealthy. Rather, the students came from mostly low
to moderate middle class backgrounds. But the report noted the new affluence of many in the
South. The Society did conclude that “the schools are destructive from several viewpoints and
constructive from none” (Nevin, 1976, p. 3).

The destructive nature of the private academies was found in three core issues. They
included that of the 1) individual, 2) public schools, and 3) society. By studying in a static
environment, the individual student was being deprived of life lessons needed in a society where
blacks and whites were viewed under the law as being equal. This hampered moving forward in an
integrated society. The major trouble with the private academy was it “transcends education and racial issues, perhaps the schools greatest significance is an illustration of this fundamental division of life” (Nevin, 1976, p. 5). Rose and his team found that in the ten years following Brown v. Board of Education, only one percent of black students in the South enrolled in integrated public schools. It was not until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that a greater movement of students occurred. By 1973, over 46% of African-American students had moved into traditional white public schools. In response, “the growth of private schools in the South closely followed these events. They tended to open only when local whites felt threatened by an integration order” (Nevin, 1976, p. 9). Private academies were seen to negatively affect individuals, public schools, and society in general. White flight was spurred by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and this took away support from public schools and societal interaction between the races.

Rose was a Christian minister who had sent at least two of his children to private schools something that did not seem to follow the Lamar Society agenda. His two sons had attended the McCallie School in Chattanooga, Tennessee, a non-denominational Christian academy during the early to mid-1960s. The school was “dedicated to the academic, physical, spiritual, and emotional growth of boys as they prepare for college and life” (http://www.mccallie.org/podium/default.aspx?t=103717, para. 1). Schools like McCallie benefitted from the desegregation of the South. As Nevin (1976) pointed out, “At the same time various old-line private schools in the South that had struggled for years to remain solvent now found their enrollment expanding rapidly. With the new students came new resources and new respect for them from their communities. Many such schools announced they did not wish to be regarded as havens for those fleeing integration, but they grew nonetheless” (p. 10). This provided some insight into the difference between an elite academy and academies that arose in response to
the desegregation of the South. Rose had sent his sons, Tony and Julian, to McCallie to give them a liberal arts education. One of his daughters attended a public local high school in Tuscaloosa. There are reasons why Rose likely took this course of action for his children. His oldest daughter attended high school in Tuscaloosa, but this was prior to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, so the school was segregated. His younger sons attended McCallie after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, an obvious contradiction to what Rose was trying to accomplish through the Lamar Society. It is worthy to note that McCallie has a strong Christian and military foundation based on “honor, truth, and duty.” At the time Rose sent his sons to McCallie (early to mid-1960s), he could have been looking at their education in another context from that of the Lamar Society in the late 1960s and 1970s. He may have wanted a more structured environment for them in order to create better educational opportunities in the future. Rose’s oldest son, Tony, followed his path to Transylvania University. Rose did what he felt was best for his children, but acted at cross-purposes with his later feelings of white flight in the South. However, Rose was able to compartmentalize portions of his personal life in contrast to the things he hoped to change externally, especially with regard to “white-flight” from public schools in the South. The ability to do this defies analysis other than to say he was looking at his children’s education from another perspective.

In 1970, the Lamar Society estimated 500,000 students were in private schools while the department of education in the thirteen southern states reported a total of 777,561 children in private schools. State officials readily admitted that the figure represented serious under-reporting. The 1970 census, which reached into every household, certainly was more accurate…the census showed 947,229 children in private schools in the thirteen state area. This amounted to a 22 percent increase over what the states had reported. (Nevin, 1976, p. 11-12)

Over time the Lamar Society identified the issues related to education in the South, but could not sustain the initiative for change. Part of this was due to a number of its members becoming
involved in the Jimmy Carter presidential campaign. Ayers left the chairmanship of the Lamar Society in 1974, turning it over to Edward Elston. As Ayers (1970) later pointed out, “Eddie (Elston) and Frank (Rose) weren’t afire with determination to make the Lamar Society a permanent, prominent, influential, progressive voice in the region. Frank was at the end of his career, semi-retired and a little tired. The flame in the board flickered…our interest riveted by the rising success of one of our members in his campaign for president of the United States” (p. 176). Though Ayers describes its demise in the mid-1970s, the Lamar Society continued to work for a few years under the leadership of Rose and University Associates.

In January of 1982, Rose was called to testify before the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights. The testimony was on proposed legislation regarding tax-exempt status for racially discriminatory private schools. He started out by explaining his own experience with racial inequality and desegregation at The University of Alabama. He said “Time and Life magazine said this historic event would bring an end to racial segregation in the United States. This occasion was witnessed by 75 million people on three networks for eight hours…Aside from its spectacular aspect, this incident did lay bare that existence of racial segregation, a truly un-American activity that has been and still is a stain on our American history” (p. 2r). Rose discussed the tax-exempt status of private schools and how, by 1982, they had for the most part become more inclusionary in student demographics. However, he pointed out that the passage of the Civil Rights Act in the 1960s spurred the creation of the private segregated schools that were the subject of the hearing. Rose referenced the Lamar Society and noted “the one great deterrent toward achieving our goal has been white private segregated academies that not only encourage white flight but provided a haven for those seeking to remove
themselves from public integrated schools…the common thread that runs through them all, Christian, secular, or otherwise is that blacks or Hispanics are not admitted” (Rose, 1982, p. 4r). Rose also pointed out that the issue was not a southern one but national. Rose’s testimony sought to validate the concern that institutions that foster discrimination are not healthy to education in the long run. He concluded by saying, “I can say without exaggeration the public schools in America are in serious trouble. To continue to give tax-exempt status to private segregated academies is to feed the cancer that will destroy what has been a dynamic force in our society…the white flight and private segregated academies have proven to be liabilities more than these (public) healthy institutions can carry” (Rose, 1982, p. 6r).

The Lamar Society under Rose explored new issues when it made contact with Davis Haines, who served as president of the Public Welfare Foundation in Washington, DC. Rose teamed with an old Kentucky friend, Elvis Stahr, then president of the National Audubon Society and a past president of Indiana University, to meet with Haines about a $90,000 grant to help bring public awareness to the problems of education. A cutback in federal funding for such programs had led Rose and the Lamar Society to seek out new funding. Working in conjunction with the Southern Growth Policies Board, aid was sought for Alabama and Mississippi due to their poor rankings in these fields. The proposal was made in coordination with Governors Fob James of Alabama and William Winter of Mississippi. Rose stated,

> It is fitting that we begin our work in Alabama and Mississippi for other reason. First, these two states typify the extreme problems of education and health delineated…we can establish models for other Southern states to follow”. He went on to point out that “I am a native Mississippian, and I know the state and its needs intimately. I might add that Governor (William) Winter…also serves on the board of the Lamar Society. I of course know the state of Alabama extremely well and have continued to maintain close ties with many people throughout the state since I left the presidency of the University of Alabama. (F. Rose, personal communication, January 25, 1982)
There is no record of the funds requested ever being distributed to the Lamar Society from the Southern Growth Policies Board, but the proposal indicated the depth to which Rose and his team were still committed to the cause of inclusionary student policies in the southern states long after H. Brandt Ayers indicated they had ceased.

The book *You Can’t Eat Magnolias* (1972) was a collection of essays on the history of the South and how it must work to overcome its self-inflicted wounds. It discussed who a Southerner is, how the South developed, the culture it sustains, the power of politics and economics, the sense of region, education, its past, and its future. It is fitting that Rose contributed to this work by providing reflections on Southern society. Considering the accomplishments of his life and where he had come from in Mississippi, Rose brought a personal view of how the South’s past had negatively impacted its future. He discussed how America was the richest nation in the world, yet “in two locations, the problems of poverty, disease, changing laws, and social stratification – or the problems of education, economics, ethics, and ethos are geographically visible. These two areas are the urban centers across the nation, and the South – those states of the old Confederacy bound together by geography and history” (Ayers, 1972, p. 299).

Rose argued that the South had been secluded from the rest of the nation since just after the death of Thomas Jefferson. Furthermore, he opined that Southerners and writers on the region have always encapsulated the problems in the context of historical, racial, and economic hardships while offering no real answer on how to address these. Using Wilbur Cash’s (1941) book *The Mind of the South*, Rose pointed out two questions at the heart of the Southern dilemma. First, is “where should the South be heading,” and, secondly, “how does the South reach these goals” (Cash, 1941, p. 301). Cash demonstrated that the South had been a “generally closed society, in contrast to the democratic norm of an open society” and broke down the “Southern system to its component parts,
so that the region’s weaknesses are laid bare and the possibilities for change become apparent” (Cash, 1941, p. 301).

These values were central to Rose’s leadership as a university administrator and consultant. With University Associates and the Lamar Society, he worked to change the educational climate of the South. He used his knowledge and persuasive skills to address topics to help benefit the New South. But he understood that the problem was with southern identification. As Cash noted, “to the Southern mind is the argument of Southern tradition…poverty, defeat, and defensiveness go together. The political idea of the Solid South as a continuation of the Old South is primarily a defense mechanism used by the South against its feelings of despair” (Cash, 1941, p. 302).

For all the positives created by the Lamar Society under Rose’s leadership, it can be said that integration was never fully achieved. In 2004, former governor William Winter of Mississippi, spoke to the American South Symposium at the University of Mississippi regarding the impact of the Lamar Society and an “accounting of just where we are” thirty years later. He stated

I must tell you that the problem of race, despite all the progress that we have made, remains the thorniest, trickiest, and most difficult barrier that we confront to achieve a truly successful and united region. One of the reasons that it is so hard is that most white folks and most black folks do not share the same perspective. Most white folks think we have come a lot further in race relations than most black people do. There is still too much misunderstanding between the races, too much white flight, too little trust, too many subtle nuances that signal the continuing gap. Closing that gap remains our most important unfinished business, and it is, of course, not just a Southern problem. (Winter, 2004, p. 7)

Rose used his influence with a network of educators and politicians to try and achieve Winter’s closing of the gap. Rose was chosen to lead the organization due to his ability to influence the decision-making abilities of people in power, who fell on both ends of the political spectrum.

At the 1974 Lamar Society Symposium, entitled The Southern City: Conflict of Consensus, Rose began to identify forces outside of the southern problem. He said,
the many questions that will always be unanswered when you are dealing with education...we are living in a revolutionary time, and we need to recognize that education not only belongs to the public schools, but also is the responsibility of every facet of life, and so often public school educators, private school educators are condemned by the public primarily because the home has not met its responsibility as an educational institution. (Rose, 1974, p. 100)

The late 1960s and early 1970s were a time of radical change in the United States. Not only were there changes related to the southern climate of civil rights, but the social upheaval of society involved governmental and education authority. The Vietnam War also cast a long shadow over the era. Rose’s comments at the 1974 symposium identified educational issues other than white flight from public education in the southern United States. Education was a family matter, and there was a sense that the strain of the times was placing a burden on the respect for authority. This in turn had negative implications for teaching and institutions of higher learning.

In October of 1981, Frank Rose was invited to be a keynote speaker at the Tuskegee Consortium Presidents and Coordinators Conference. The consortium was a group of historically black colleges that had come together using University Associates and the Lamar Society as a means to help overcome the financial issues faced by these colleges. Rose’s address centered on planning and how a HBCU could better develop strategy, goals, missions, and long-term plans to address survivability. Rose shared that there were at least three institutional needs critical to long-run success. These included a “well-written case, one which contains the strategy that will be used to conduct the institution’s mission and to reach its goals...the second is for the management of a planning process and a long-range plan that is based on these goals....The third is for the relationship of operating problems to the institutions goals” (Rose, 1981, p. 2). The speech addressed the importance of long-term planning. In reality, these institutions had lived in a reactionary mode for many years prior to and after desegregation in the South. Rose called for the
colleges establish an identity, for where they wanted to go, and how they intended to get there. He concluded his speech by saying “These are not easy times for our colleges and universities….Those of us who are capable of making the hard decisions to cut back, exercise good administration, and give strong management to future planning will be those who will survive the present crisis. Timid souls and poorly managed institutions will not” (Rose, 1981, p. 6). Rose was arguing for more assertive leadership in the HBCU ranks as essential to effective leadership in the future.

Frank Rose was also a national leader in organizations, other than the Lamar Society, which concentrated on leadership in higher education. He was prominent in Omicron Delta Kappa, a leadership honorary fraternity. Founded at Washington and Lee University in 1914, the organization was created “to recognize individuals who consistently achieve high standards of excellence throughout the five celebrated phases of campus life; athletics, community service, arts, communication, and scholarship; and to bring people together who build and sustain strong leadership communities while perpetuating lifelong relationships and commitment to Omicron Delta Kappa” (http://odk.org/odk/mission/, para. 1).

ODK was a leadership fraternity with a highly selective membership policy. In the spring of 1968, Rose was serving as a member-at-large for the national ODK committee. Prior to the 25th national convention, held in Atlanta on April 4-6, 1968 Rose was approached about becoming the new national president. He accepted the position at the April convention and used the opportunity to speak about student power on university campuses. The United States was in a transitional mode with student unrest and increased enrollments due to the post World War II baby boom. Students and their behaviors were influenced by the Vietnam War, so the traditional student as understood by most administrators and faculty members was vanishing. Rose noted in his speech that
Universities are in transition. The masses of students who attend are not of the same spirit or age as the students of the old college. They are older – with an average age of 22 instead of 16. They are wiser – with higher admission standards and better pre-college preparation. They are more interested in their society – in political science, educational philosophy and sociology…they are inquisitive, anxious to debate issues, eager to test concepts – as seen in their preference for seminars instead of lectures. (as cited in Houf, 1968, p. 1)

Rose stressed the changes on the college campus and how “ex cathedra” directives from faculty and administration are no longer accepted as they once were. He also pointed out that college administrators no longer stood as the parents of students when they are away from home. He pointed that “More time must be spent explaining decisions to them, more time must be spent in establishing structures which allow the teacher and the learner, the governing bodies and the governed, to find mutual solutions to mutual problems” (as cited in Houf, 1968, p. 1). This was an area of great concern to Rose and the lack of control that the university had over the student was likely the core reason he left university administration to move into educational consulting.

The delivery of this address was timely due to the issues then facing the country. Student radicalism was on the rise and administrators had difficulty adjusting to the new student mindset. In addition, students were empowered and emboldened, thus pushing the agenda for things they wanted to see on campus. Rose warned ODK members that institutions of higher learning must adapt and take the lead on the new issues facing them. He said that “once students learn that anarchy is not an alternative to paternalism and authority, and that anti-institutionalism is not the way to solve the problems of being enrolled in an institution, it becomes possible for more positive and fruitful structures to emerge” (as cited in Houf, 1968, p. 1). Rose advised the leaders to seek the middle ground between what the institutions demand and what the students desire. As the United States was becoming more diverse in its student demographics, diversity of opinions and viewpoints were also on the rise. Students who came from different backgrounds experience
and observe their world differently. As Rose stated, “the diversity of opinions and actions which we are hearing today, the verbal and sometimes physical clashes which accompany the diversity, the conflicts among leaders of an ever-widening spectrum of interests and causes, are all symptoms – not, as some would have it, of the decline and fall of society, but of transition” (as cited in Houf, 1968, p. 3).

Rose’s speech was directed at education but also dealt with human diversity. He shared the idea that disagreement between people was a symbol of freedom. This was the freedom to express ideas and have differences of opinion. This he said was the true “principle of diversity…and diversity without dialogue is futile” (as cited in Houf, 1968, p. 3). He challenged the audience that thinking men welcome diversity and differences of opinion. Rose felt these diverse opinions were foundational in allowing students, institutions, and society in general to become more cohesive in their thoughts and goals for the future. His admonition was forward-thinking:

While recognizing that diversity of opinion and action has many advantages, and is more desired than the acquiescence which allowed our ancestors in the 1850s to burn books, splinter churches, exile dissenters, and in general, suppress freedom of expression and of divergent opinion…simply stated, the problem is this: At the present time, our diversity is lost in a cloud of emotions and passion, and it is not characterized by reason, negotiation, dialogue, and orderly process and progress. (as cited in Houf, 1968, p. 3)

Rose’s speech was prophetic. During the ODK convention, Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated in Memphis. This event triggered a series of violent reactions across the United States in 1968. It made the challenge of student activism on college campuses more intense and brought into focus the contrasts of Rose’s training as an administrator in the days of parental oversight of students to the changed emphasis on student freedom that characterized the late 1960s.
At the conclusion of the convention, Rose officially took the oath of office as national president. He used the opportunity to make one last address to the delegates by stating

In 1914 when this society was organized, there was no doubt in my mind that it was organized for a purpose and great need, and if this is true in 1914, certainly it is true in 1968 and the years ahead. No one can live in the society in which we are living today without being mindful that there are constructive avenues that all of us must walk and I think together as academicians, we can walk those avenues and bring to our institutions and to our society the leadership that is necessary. (Rose, 1968, p. 2)

Interestingly, Rose had to cut short his speech to attend an event at the University of Kentucky where he would be a guest speaker on race relations. He was scheduled to appear with Hubert Humphrey, Cassius Clay (Muhammed Ali) and Senator Robert Kennedy. However, due to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., all the others had to cancel their appearance leaving Rose alone with a Kentucky Senator and a prominent attorney to cover a two-day conference. As Rose stated, “it was a fine experience but a sad one following the resignation of Kentucky President Jack Oswald” (F. Rose, personal communication, April 10, 1968). Oswald had just retired from UK and was a friend of Rose’s. There is no record of Rose making mention of Dr. King’s death in Lexington. The reason for this cannot be readily explained unless it was recognized by all as an unspoken tragedy.

Rose’s work both with the Lamar Society and Omicron Delta Kappa reflected his belief in leadership. He possessed a moral leadership mentality and worked hard to share the ideas related to this. His ministerial background afforded him many opportunities to gain a better understanding of the needs of people from a faith based environment, but also attuned to socio economic factors. He saw education as the only hope for changing the dynamics for those who suffered from economic hardships and race discrimination problems. There was a sensitivity to the man that was rooted in his background as a poor young boy growing up in Mississippi. He had a sense of the South from this background that understood the negative heritage endured by
the region following the war. His affiliation with many different organizations, especially the Christian Church and K.A. Order fraternity, helped shape his understanding of heritage and leadership. These two elements were influential in all that he did – shaping the future of any endeavor through the lens of tradition or heritage to gain stakeholder buy-in and the power of leaders who have a dynamic vision with energy to see a project through to its fruition. Without these experiences, he would never have made positive strides in improving the educational landscape for all.
CONCLUSION

The life of Frank Rose is an excellent case for the study of leadership and how the external influences he encountered over time impacted his decision-making. He was many things to many people, but his leadership style was grounded in his Christian training as a minister and focused on moral leadership. Rose was a progressive and pragmatic leader who was able to concentrate on the issues he faced and use his political astuteness to best address. The political astuteness he possessed came from a strong sense of social awareness and confidence entrusted him to stakeholders. His Christian training accentuated this by his ability to share sincerity with the messages he delivered. Part of this is due in part to the traits he possessed and physical presence he had. As outlined earlier, Rose had the innate ability to make everyone feel like he was their advocate. This was complimented by his ability to effectively communicate and come across with total sincerity. Rose was very progressive in his ability to steer the university and education in general toward inclusiveness. The pragmatism he applied to compliment this involved knowing when was the best time to breech a problem, stakeholder, and group. The fluidity he displayed between the two goes back to his political savvy and ministerial training. Rose was an effective communicator who understood how to tailor his message toward the audience he was addressing while maintaining a standard course of action for the overall goals he sought to achieve. This is displayed in detail with his handling of the desegregation of The University of Alabama.

Thematically, at the outset of this study the thought was that Rose was more of a Transformational leader, a leadership style that is relational in context. It is a style that is
humanistic and takes into account what is best for all people, better described as a Christian moral leadership role. The transformational leader is skilled at communication and readily creates strong ties with stakeholders and provides a sense of empowerment to all involved in the university decision-making process. The initial view did not change. However, close review of Rose’s life indicates he possessed some attributes of a transcendent leader also. This style is used by leaders who wish to expand their influence beyond those they are directly responsible for. The ability to make these styles of leadership work effectively involve the personal attributes of the leader. Rose was deemed a charismatic personality and as Mintzburg (1983) pointed out, these leaders maintain a high degree of influence, persuasion, manipulation, and negotiation. They are sometimes viewed as being too “slick” or like a salesman. However, Transylvania College and The University of Alabama both needed a leader who transcended simple administrative duties. They needed a polished leader who could sell the university while restoring the pride of both institutions. Rose seemed adept at both tasks.

The purpose of this study was to account for the leadership styles Rose possessed, the influence they had, and how they shaped his decision-making. Rose was president of two institutions. These colleges were both different in their design, Transylvania was a private Christian college and The University of Alabama is a larger state flagship institution. Both had similar issues relating to finances, faculty, and infrastructure. Both institutions posed rebuilding challenges and Rose was successful in meeting them. Rose’s presidency at Transylvania started in 1951, clearly occurring in the era of in loco parentis. As a graduate of this Christian college, Transylvania, Rose was imbued with paternalism in his work with students. At The University of Alabama, Rose encountered changing times that signaled the death of in loco parentis. The change created concerns for Rose that he was never able to allay completely during his
administration. The changes brought by an intensified student push for academic freedom and the rise of student activism challenged Rose and he tired from the labors it created. An advocate for a strong liberal arts education and moral leadership for students, Rose struggled with the changes of the late 1960s.

Rose moved with rapidity toward the presidency of Transylvania College and The University of Alabama. With this movement, Rose served as the leader over many faculty members who understood he possessed no terminal degree and was not a scholar. Rather, he was an administrator hired to repair the shortcomings of the institutions he represented. Likely the faculty felt he did not fully understand their role and he was viewed by some as controlling, paternalistic, and imperial. Rose simply lacked a feel for the career path of a faculty member working toward administrative positions. This in the end did not serve Rose well as student activism and faculty freedom gained a stronger foothold on the campus. In the period of 18 years since first becoming a college president, Rose had seen profound change on college campuses. He himself had served as a conduit for positive change with his role in the peaceful desegregation of The University of Alabama. The change would help transform the South but its aftermath hastened the end of his career as a college administrator. Rose could never fully reconcile his paternalistic beliefs with student activism. One thing is for certain, Rose was a charismatic figure who led through some of the most trying times in United State history, yet he is not recognized for his accomplishments other than the desegregation of The University of Alabama.

Rose was grounded in the politics of leadership at an early age, serving as a high school class president and the governor of Mississippi Boy’s State. His leadership was also derived in part from the spirit of the Christian Church in which he was trained and rooted in sharing success
with others when accepting accolades. One of his most quoted maxims was “service is greater than financial gain” and this reflected his Christian seminary training as well as his admiration of Robert E. Lee. Additionally, however, Rose was an ambitious man with a materialistic bent. He liked living in beautiful mansions and having his “family to become accustomed to anything else” would not be right. This statement seems at odds with his Protestant ethic. It also reflects the point made by several that there was an imperial quality in the man and his presidency. He was also a strategic leader who like Lee had learned to “do more with less” while calling on the sensibilities of stakeholders to gain more from those with greater interest in any issue. He stressed excellence and pride in all aspects of university life – academic, athletic, and social.

Rose wanted to use these elements to gain allegiance from all who had a stake in their institution.

Rose understood symbolism and how “victory from defeat” could instill a better understanding of the role heritage and tradition play in developing allegiance. As Rose had stated at the Memphis K.A. convention, “what you have inherited from your fathers you must earn in order to possess” (You must earn, 1961, p. 12).

Rose’s old liberal friend, H. Brandt Ayers once said, “his presence was that of a Methodist bishop, authority softened by a smile that never failed to reach his eyes, a personality of enveloping warmth but whose negotiating style could wither a professional poker player” (Ayers, 1991, p. 3). Rose was successful in handling most issues he encountered. His passion as a minister led him to be revered by his peers. He succeeded as a university administrator at Transylvania and Alabama. In both cases, Rose was able to improve infrastructure, endowment, faculty retention, student enrollment, and appropriations from various sources. Tennant McWilliams (2007) assessed Rose’s abilities by stating he was a man “with no earned doctorate but with a fulsome ego…nevertheless a Southerner who would understand how to deal with the
racial problem. This preacher would surprise them all. He turned out to be a charming young star of an educational modernizer...he was so charming that on occasion he would lose sight of the truth (but) would exhibit no counter-productive lost-cause bonds to Alabama’s old order” (p. 126).

Rose served as a mentor to Larry McGehee who like Rose was a Transylvania graduate and young college administrator. McGehee served as a vice-president and Executive Assistant to Rose at The University of Alabama and was later vice-president and professor of religion at Wofford College. Like Rose, McGehee was also a member of K.A. Order, and an ordained minister of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). In his 2005 book titled Southern Seen: Meditations on Past and Present, McGehee discussed Frank Rose and his leadership influence

The University of Alabama was suffering when he arrived. Earlier attempts to integrate the campus had ended in chaos, state appropriations for education were among the lowest in the nation, and its football fortunes were at low ebb. Before Rose even moved into the President’s Mansion in late 1957, he persuaded Paul “Bear” Bryant to come home to begin writing new record books. By 1963, the campus was integrated. State and federal aid was boosted. No matter how controversial the university became at times, Alabama became education-conscious and education-supportive. (McGehee, 2005, p. 173)

While it is common to discuss Rose in the context of desegregation at The University of Alabama, this dissertation has shown that there is much more to his accomplishments as an administrator. While he lacked standard academic qualification his politic astuteness and pragmatic approach allowed the institutions he led to prosper. Rose intuitively understood the Southerner, and was able to use rhetoric and charisma to win southern support.

Earl Tilford (2014) in his book Turning the Tide pointed out that Rose upon his departure did not leave in haste. Rather, he built “a solid corps of leaders and administrators to carry on” (Mathews, Thomas, and McGehee). He recruited Paul Bryant and C.M. Newton, who turned around the Capstone’s major athletic teams and brought in Raymond McLain (also from
Transylvania) as vice president for academic affairs. He also mentored and positioned David Mathews as a possible successor” (p. 165). Jack Drake, a late 1960s student radical who wrote the foreword to Tilford’s book, later reassessed his view of Rose and placed it in the context of the times. As he noted,

It was George Denny who brought the University of Alabama into the twentieth century, but only the early part of the century. He did not desegregate the place; it probably never crossed his mind. Frank Rose did and he did it with style and grace, and most importantly, without getting anyone hurt. Furthermore, he changed the perception in Alabama of what a university president looked and talked like. He was not a scholar called from the library stacks. Rather, he was young, smart, good looking, and above all, tough. (Tilford, 2014, p. xi)

Rose was also a highly ambitious man who moved quickly into positions of success based on his interpersonal skills and desire to better himself. Culpepper Clark in his book The Schoolhouse Door described him as an imperial president. Rose did often behave peremptorily. Rose made no qualms about using the university airplane to go from meeting to meeting. Nonetheless, his accomplishments as an administrator and consultant far outweighed his personal flaws. He had developed strong communication skills through his time as a minister and was comfortable in front of any crowd. He possessed a knack for knowing what his audience wanted to hear. His accomplishments as an administrator and consultant were substantial.

This study pictures Rose as an effective administrator who was able to positively impact the desegregation of The University of Alabama during the Civil Rights era. Rose was able to do this peacefully through his political connections and astuteness. And when one considers the politics of this era, his accomplishments appear even more remarkable. He not only had to change the mindset of the stakeholders of the university but he had to convince the citizenry of the Alabama that the changes were for the positive. The positive changes for UA were accomplished in the shadow of Governor George Wallace and his attempt to use the issue of race
for political gain. The tension of this era is not fully appreciated today. To have kept UA
peaceful following the violent and unsuccessful attempts of desegregation at the University of
Georgia and Mississippi was a testament to Rose’s planning skills. More importantly, it reflected
on his ability to use through stealth the tools he had available to him (Robert Kennedy, Jefferson
Bennett) to maneuver through the political minefield of the day.

In discussing Rose after his presidencies, Larry McGehee (2005) said, “Rose moved to
Washington to carve out another niche by serving as counsel to congressmen and campuses
(University Associates & Lamar Society)…he continued on an expanded scale what he had done
well on the small campus in Kentucky and statewide in Alabama, being an outspoken gadfly for
raising both the level of economic existence and the vision of hopes for the South, primarily
through better education” (p. 173). His association with the Lamar Society allowed him to work
with greater flexibility to address the future of education in the South. His memories of being a
young man in Mississippi played a role in him being driven, successful, and ultimately making
him a good leader. Rose’s experiences paralleled those of many southerners. Being one of them,
he understood the poverty, educational woes, and exclusivity of the region. His friend Brandt
Ayers eulogized him by saying his time with the Lamar Society created

> events that changed a whole subcontinent, the American South, more than with one
> university. But under his leadership, the university prospered in research, faculty salaries,
> morale, football, and the medical school started on its way to world-class prominence.
> Yet his greater significance was the choice he had to make in his time. He made the right
> choice with courage and diplomacy. Thus, he became one of the bearings on which the
> heavy doors of history swing. (Ayers, 1991, p. 3)

As a moral leader, Rose was able to make the most of his talents and get the most from
those around him. He was a man of influence not only regionally but nationwide. According to
his successor at The University of Alabama, David Mathews,
He was a man with a clear moral vision. He had a keen sense of what was right and what was wrong, but he was not a person prone to engage in moralizing...He was a master at getting support for higher education, for all kinds of institutions...He was as great an educator as the South has ever had and indeed, he was one of the South’s leading statesmen. (Hewlett, 1991, p. 4)

One thing was for certain, Rose never shied away from a challenge. He came to Transylvania as a young, dynamic, and energetic minister and administrator. He would leave the educational world aged beyond his years due to the struggles he encountered in rebuilding two universities. He had to face the one of the greatest struggles of the century in the peaceful desegregation of the University of Alabama. His view of education never really changed, he valued liberal arts and an emphasis on building the character of the student. While the changing times of the late 1960s made his job more difficult, he moved forward through his service with the Lamar Society to expand educational opportunities for all in the South.

Larry McGehee shared one of the most enduring stories of Frank Rose, his acceptance of the presidency at The University of Alabama. Many in the university community hoped the Mississippian could turn around the fortunes of the university and eliminate the pain of being perceived as second class to other areas of the United States. Upon Rose’s arrival the daughter of one of the members of the Alabama Cadet Corps that defended the university when Northern troops burnt the campus to ground presented him with an unusual gift, “a pair of brass cufflinks made from two buttons on the cadet uniform her father had worn a century earlier. Rose, who wore tailored shirts with French cuffs, wore the cuff links the rest of his life” as a reminder of his service and obligation to The University of Alabama (McGehee, 1989, p. 178). In keeping with Rose’s development of young administrators, upon his death Rose’s widow Tommye presented the cufflinks to McGehee, who had served as a young administrator under Rose at Alabama. He too had been a Transylvania graduate and Disciples of Christ minister. McGehee would wear
them until his passing, at which time his widow Betsy, presented the cufflinks to David Mathews. Mathews succeeded Rose as the 21st President of The University of Alabama and he still wears them each day. The cufflinks are a physical tie to the heritage of the “Old South” that Rose admired so much. They represented the hope for the future that both the presenter and Rose wanted for The University of Alabama and higher education in general. The cufflinks represented the “baptism by fire” the Alabama Cadet Corps had experienced in 1865 and the similar situation Frank Rose would experience 100 years later. Rose’s own words sum up his view as a minister, administrator, and a leader on education - “We need a cause worthy of dedication. The minister in his sanctuary devoted to the truth, the teacher in the classroom molding the thinking of his student – these are those who will give destiny to our people” (Rose, 1954). Rose’s did his best to redefine the destiny of many students and a region of the country.
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