

CONFIDENTIAL

Interview with Maud Bard Warren, 1511 Wood Avenue, Colorado Springs, November 29, 1972. By Juan Reid

Mrs. Warren served as President Slocum's private secretary from 1908 until her resignation in 1916. She was recommended for the job by a friend of Slocum's, who lived in Philadelphia where Mrs. Warren lived. She came to Colorado Springs for her health (TB). At the time of this interview she was 91 years old; so she was 27 at the time she became Slocum's secretary. Slocum interviewed her personally for the position.

The president's office was located in Palmer Hall, first floor, northwest corner of the building. Mrs. Warren first became aware of complaints that Slocum made advances to anyone of the opposite sex during the 1915-16 academic year. A woman student was employed part time by Mrs. Warren in the president's office, and Slocum started to give her assignments that required her to be in his office alone with him. The girl reported to Mrs. Warren that Slocum had made advances toward her and that he had placed his hands on her body. The girl was confused and didn't know how to handle the situation. Mrs. Warren advised her to quit her job and she did. President Slocum inquired about her after she had left and Mrs. Warren told him she had quit her job.

Later Slocum made a similar type of advance toward Mrs. Warren. She stated that it was not a playful act and ~~there was~~ there was no question as to the intent. She resigned her job during the 1915-16 year at the time the rift between Slocum and Parsons was intensifying. Mrs. Warren married E.R. Warren, who was curator of the museum in Palmer Hall in the fall of 1916. He was 57 at the time.

During the 1916-17 year (after she was married) P.B. Stewart, trustee of the college questioned Mrs. Warren about the alleged advances Slocum made toward her. She told him the truth and also about the accusations made by the student assistant. Stewart was very loyal to Slocum and was loath to believe anything bad about him, according to Mrs. Warren. Slocum apparently had denied that he had made immoral advances.

Mrs. Warren said that she felt sorry for Slocum and his plight; since he had been good to her. When asked why she thought the reasons were for Slocum's actions, she said she wasn't sure but that Mrs. Slocum's personality may have been partly responsible. She stated that Mrs. Slocum was "icy" and aloof. Also the Slocum's had had no children. Afterward when Slocum was in the East (1917?) she wrote him asking that he tell the truth. She didn't receive a reply. Her husband approved the letter.

Mrs. Warren stated that Colorado College had reached its finest hour prior to the year of the split between Slocum and members of the faculty headed by Dean Parsons. She stated that Parsons was a wonderful man and highly respected. She also had a high regard for Dean Loomis. Mrs. Warren was not aware that a trustee committee investigated the charges that Slocum misused endowment funds to meet deficit operations.

Mrs. Warren's husband position as curator of the museum was a voluntary one. Apparently he received no stipend or an honorarium. Her husband's father was Dr. Warren, perhaps the same Dr. Warren that gave his chess collection to the college. Her husband received an honorary degree from CC in 1939 and their two daughters attended CC.

Confidential

Notes on conversation with Eleanor Davis Ehrman, instructor of women's P.E. at Colorado College 1914-30. (summer 1972)

Mrs. Ehrman confirmed that the split between Slocum and the faculty at CC was due mainly to Slocum's autocratic rule. Although there were faculty committees, Slocum appointed them rather than permit a faculty committee on committees to make the appointments. She stated that Slocum made all major decisions without consulting the faculty. The opposition was led by Dean Parsons. Mrs. Ehrman stated that rumors circulated the campus that Slocum made advances to some women staff members. She stated that some younger staff members claimed that they didn't dare go into Slocum's office alone.

Mrs. Ehrman admits that any advance of that day, pat or squeeze, would have been interpreted ~~as~~ differently than today in light of the strict code of the era, which did not permit a man putting his hand on certain parts of a woman's anatomy regardless of the intent.