Lucile Speer: They dealt in some matters, but they were [unintelligible]. Oh, don’t take it out.

Diann Wiesner: Well, okay.

LS: It makes it sound as though the union felt that they had to step in, and they were the intruders, so to speak. I think that, rather, that the, well, responsibility—the occasions and the scope of the things done by the grievance committee was much more far reaching. Yes, the AAUP was not unmindful of those. But they didn't enter into any cases that were just a matter of discrimination because of failure of the institution to promote and increase salaries.

DW: Let me ask this. The teachers' union didn't organize for the purpose of interfering or, say filling the gaps of the AAUP was creating or something like that?

LS: Yes.

DW: That was sort of my impression from my session last time. Who felt that there was interference? Was it members of the AAUP? Was it the president of the University [University of Montana], or was it really just an undercurrent that really didn't amount to anything?

LS: I didn't mean to emphasize that so much. I don't know that there was so much feeling that we were interfering. It was rarely the...and it had to be a case that had widespread implications before anyone would go to the AAUP National. This was from the national that the AAUP always had to have.

DW: All right. It still doesn't make any...I'm confused. Can we talk about specific examples of where some people on campus felt that there was an overlapping of responsibilities?

LS: No. That's just what I'm...I didn't mean to imply that they thought there was an overlap. One supplemented the other. They were both involved in...The AAUP had other activities too. They had other committees, but a grievance committee—grievances—is a traditional area and role of the labor union.

You take the Keeney case, and it was also true in another [unintelligible] that the union was involved but also the AAUP investigated it. All the AAUP did was to [unintelligible]. That was their remedy. They didn't go to the Board of Education to try to remedy.
DW: Yes. Well, I’ll tell you what we’ll do is we’ll listen to that tape. I didn’t mean to infer that you emphasized it, but just that it came up and it was at the end of the tape and you didn’t get a chance to develop it. So it essentially appears not to be of major importance, so if you want to just talk about, maybe talk about the grievance committee under George Heliker?

LS: The grievance committee was, of course, one of the important committees, perhaps the most important, the most active one. I did say that it didn’t amount to much.

DW: Were members appointed to that?

LS: Yeah, the president appointed them and usually had about three members. The thing was that George was our labor economist, and his professional work had involved him in that kind of activity with labor unions.

DW: What did you say his degree was in? He had—

LS: Economics, but as I say, labor economics. He has carried on this sort of work in the state, working for the state agencies where he represents sometimes labor, and sometimes management. He’s made quite a lot of money.

DW: When did he come to the University [unintelligible]?

LS: I suppose that was in the early...let’s see, maybe the late ’40s, very late ’40s. Oh no, he would have been in the early ’50s.

DW: Oh, is that right? So the union had been formed for quite a while?

LS: That’s a point that we didn’t have anyone who really had any experience or knowledge to go about this and were not sure what course of procedures to follow. So I can’t remember...of course, the whole Keeney case was a grievance that that was, of course, taken up by the state Federation of Labor. They were the ones who defended, or brought the suit.

But George, when he became chairman—and I was a member of the committee there for several years and became very active—and George was retired the last few years. He was—I don’t know how old—but he was in the second place he’d been in.

DW: You mean the second university?

LS: Yeah. He was at Wayne State at Michigan—at Detroit, Michigan.

There were quite a few...This was after all the difficulties of the Simmons administration were over, and Melby had been here and so on. I’m not sure who was president, but the chief activity of grievance committee, I would say, was these invasions or infringements of the rights of the faculty members as relating to tenure, promotions. Not so much salaries, because that, we
never went into that negotiation. We never did have salary schedules that they kept. But if someone felt that he was not receiving promotions, well, he had to cite evidence that he stayed three years or longer as an instructor without promotion, and no reason was given for it [the lack of promotion]. Of course, that could then assisted promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and so on. The AAUP, the national, had set certain standards that a person—that a faculty member—should be promoted after three years as instructor, or he could consider himself fired. You didn’t get permanent contract, or tenure I mean—more than a year’s tenure—until you became associate professor. Those standards were set by the national AAUP, and I can't tell you just when it was generally adopted here but at least it operated that way.

The cases that I recall taking up were more frequently involving the chairman of the department, who was the one from whom the recommendations came. Usually, the person who had a grievance made charges against the chairman of the department, and the individual who had the grievance would explain his case to the chairman of the committee usually. I don’t know if we all met, but I can recall their decisions—all of us meeting then with several chairmen—where we felt that the faculty member had been discriminated against. George was the one who did the work really. He knew the [unintelligible] and the technique, and he did the [unintelligible]. He was just a very, very—

DW: Would he have the department chairman come in for a meeting between himself and the chairman? What were the procedures?

LS: Yes, and we usually...then I’m sure George had an interview first, but the members of the committee met too. I can recall distinctly two meetings with committee—with the whole committee—and the chairman of the Zoology [Department] coming in. The man who had the grievance was Bert Pfieffer. He hadn’t received promotions, and he contended it was his pro-Russian, pro-Soviet leanings and other activities. He had the degree, and there wasn’t any objection to his teaching—good teacher. I remember the man who was the chairman of Music [Department]. He was not the Dean, but the chairman. He was a squirmy person. [laughs] Definitely. I can remember was what utter contempt that George Heliker after the man left—with what contempt—George summed up that chairman. That man was really disturbed and embarrassed, and I think he mended his ways.

Now, these were all just cases of the failure to receive promotions, and no good reason given. And others in the department were receiving the increases. It wasn’t a lot of across the board sort of a thing. I don’t recall ever sitting in on any of those where they had been discrimination or a grievance because they had been, well, suppose gone out and given a talk on some subject of inflammatory and might damage the prestige of the institution and imperil the appropriation and so on.

I don't recall that the committee ever went beyond the chairman of the department to the president, except with Bob Pantzer [Robert Pantzer]. I don't recall what the case was. It was a rather friendly meeting. Bob was not an anti-union person. He got along well with all factions in
Montana. It was an occasion where we straightened out some misunderstandings, but as I say, that's the only one I recall. The results that we secured, I don't think we had...We didn't have any really sensational ones like the Keeney or those five who were dropped—the sort of thing that we had under Simmons. But it did...It was the first time that the faculty and the div [division] head had a place to express its feeling of displeasure, its disappointment and supplying information into why they were not receiving individual treatment.

DW: After the meeting with the department chairman in those instances, then were things rectified without any further action? On the part of the grievance committee?

LS: Yes. I think George really carried...If there was anything further, George carried that on. I'm sure that we never met again. I think George did with them. I would say that instead of...I don't know of any place where the department chairman radically altered his decision. It made an impression, and I'm sure it created better feeling. It brought some...It did bring some changes, but nothing as dramatic as that.

DW: I was interested in the procedures and what was done [unintelligible]?

LS: Oh yes. It was indicating...so much of it was done by George Heliker, but I attended all the meetings of the committee that were called. But he was inclined to...he often—

DW: Apparently, we can assume that whatever the question, was resolved in some sense.

LS: Yes. Well, yes, I think more often that the final result was a feeling of understanding that things would be better the next year or something like that. There would be some, but it was not...nothing was altered in the sense that it had to go to the state board, you see, like a different kind of a contract.

DW: Was George Heliker still the chairman of the grievance committee when you retired?

LS: When I retired? Oh, when I retired. Yes, so far as I...Of course, I can't tell you whether anyone else had been in or not. So long as I knew, George was the...George had been on leave for quite a number of years, and then he'd come back for a little while, because he was doing so much of this labor work. I have to confess that I can only remember going to one of the union meetings after the Constitutional Convention. I remember going to give a legislative report.

By the way, we haven't mentioned at all the decline and growth of the union. At the time, that the grievance committee was most active was when our membership had declined, greatly. We had, when we organized, a large membership and it continued for a few years, but many of those who joined at the beginning were never active members. They were chairmen of departments, department people who really were not in sympathy. They were just against Simmons. Very soon a lot of those people dropped—

DW: Was the union an outgrowth of the Simmon's presidency?
LS: Well, it was sometimes seen, yes, as that. It was really that the two...that was there was a
great barrier throughout the [unintelligible] administration and the faculty. Oh, he had his little
circle. Then I would say that even when I retired, the union was down to very low membership.

DW: Would you give me an idea what you mean by low?

LS: Six!

DW: Six members?

LS: We had to keep those six because we had to pay...We paid national dues, and we had to pay
state dues down at the [unintelligible] accounts in order to keep our charter. We were
determined that we would not...We paid—the union paid—for one of those. Maybe we had to
pay it on seven members. We had only six members, and we would meet at noon.

DW: In the Lodge?

LS: In the Lodge. The Lodge. There was Edmund and. W.P. Clark and Jefferson, Ed Briggs. Is that
four?

DW: That’s four, and yourself would be five.

LS: Right, and then Lucia Mirrielees, as long as she stayed. She left, and then there was...I can’t
remember his name, he was [unintelligible many years and he taught library science at the
University of Michigan. We stayed at that and met regularly. I went to the Trades and Labor
Council. We did go to the...sent delegates to the state convention. Then we began to build
again as the University recovered [unintelligible] and faculty. People like Burt Pfiesser. Burt was
a good membership chairman. He helped bring people in. Mike Chessin and I, oh, there was a
time in there, and I think it’s still true that there were a good share of the Math Department
that were members. There were always quite a few in the English Department. Strange that
political science and history we didn’t get hardly...we never had hardly anybody. And languages,
you wouldn’t expect it.

DW: What were other high and low periods then?

LS: Well, that, but it was just a growth until, I understand now, they’re well up towards 125 to
150. And they did carry the election. The union is the bargaining agency for the university
system. The first election that was held at the time I was over in Helena for the [Constitutional]
Convention, and they lost that, but not too badly I guess. Tom Margrave, head of astronomy
and he’s in physics too now, [unintelligible], and I can recall him stopping to tell me about the
membership and election. I don’t think we have many in the biological sciences now, I just don’t
know that.
DW: Around the time that the union started, about five or six years after it started, the Keeney case came about. So you were probably a pretty good membership at that time?

LS: Oh, yes. Well, that was...The Keeney case was a year after, wasn't it? Or a year or two afterwards?

DW: I'm not sure when the union organized. I know that—

LS: '37.

DW: Was it? Oh, I see, so that was all going on about the same time.

LS: Yes.

DW: It was interesting to note that it says right in one of the investigations—I don't know if it's the AAUP or the Labor Federation investigation—said that he was, Keeney was, a founding member of the union, and you said that that was not the case—that he was a member, but he was not a—

LS: Oh. He was, yes. Did I say that?

DW: I think so. I can play that tape back and we can check it, but anyway do you recall reading the reports that said he was indeed a member...a founder of the union?

LS: Well, he was one of the—

DW: In other words, they're playing with the idea that this was one of the things against him. That he had been active in organizing the union on campus. Now, was this your interpretation also?

LS: Well, I don't think that the momentum came originally from him. The fact that there had been a union on this campus—

[Break in audio]

LS: —but that it was organized. I'm confident that it was not organized to protect him. Whether he would have participated more actively or less actively, he had been under that pressure. I don't know. I think it's a speculation at best. I can remember that he asked me, but I had already knew I was going to be joining. Edmund Freeman was always my counselor on the campus things, Lucia Mirrieles, and H.G. Merriam—those in the department that I'd been in—and other friends too. I don't think that...whether he had influence over it, but I don't think he...In fact—

DW: I believe one of the reports was trying to insinuate that possibly—
LS: Yes, that was used against him! Yes, and I know that, but I don't think there's much validity to it. It's just the two occurred at the same—

DW: Same time. Now, after the Keeney case and everything, then there was the union in the role of the University then, for say the next ten years—from the end of the '30s to the end of the '40s?

LS: Well, actually, what I've been talking about—the development of the Labor Institute—are—

DW: That was the next big phase, I guess.

LS: Yes, and also our development of relationship with the state Federation. Our participation and conventions, resolutions, and supporting labor people to the legislature and other state and local offices and that sort of thing. We didn't drop down to nothing right away. It was—

DW: No. In fact, if I'm understanding you correctly, it sounds like it was organized, and it continued to grow until the '50s...until, let's see...What about when George Heliker became chairman of the grievance committee? That's when it was rather small, you were saying that earlier.

LS: Yeah, well, it never continued...It never grew after the beginning.

DW: Oh, is that right?

LS: The membership just sort of stayed right there.

DW: It stabilized it?

LS: Yes, right there. As I said today, there were many who dropped out. I can recall our speculating why some of them came in who soon dropped. [laughs] I can remember Edmund Freeman say, “That one was a spy.” [laughs] He was a friend of Simmons and that, and Simmons had planted him in the union.

DW: This must have been—

LS: No. This was a story that came from the outside, and it was used against it. And it didn’t help—

DW: Now wait, wait, wait. You're referring now to the effect that Keeney was in the union.

LS: Yes.

DW: They tried to build up his role in the union—
LS: Yes.

DW: —to more than it actually was? Okay, okay. That was the story. I thought maybe you were referring to the spy again. [laughs]

LS: Oh, no.

DW: Yeah. Well, that sort of gives me a picture of the ebb and tide and sort of...because I’m curious to see if there was a relationship between these sensitive issues and the growth or the wane of the size of the union. That brings me to those—the five that were dismissed.

LS: That was early.

DW: Okay, when was that in...where were we in terms of the union?

LS: I really don’t have much recollection of that. Isn’t that in...

DW: H.G.’s book [H.G. Merriam]?

LS: Yes, or in H.G.’s testimony—

DW: His papers or something?

LS: Didn’t he make a tape for you? I thought Dale [Johnson, University of Montana archivist] said you had one.

DW: I’m supposed to find out about that. I’ll find out about that. What do you mean that was much earlier? Was that before you were—

LS: No.

DW: I was confused. I thought it was after the Keeney case.

LS: Well, Keeney was the one who did it. Who fired—

DW: Who fired?

LS: Who fired all those [unintelligible].


LS: No, that’s after the Keeney case.
DW: Okay, all right. Okay. Where were you? Were you on the grievance committee in those days?

LS: I don't think we'd organized to the degree, because that's long before George.

DW: What role did the union play with that case?

LS: Kept their heads down and more [unintelligible] I guess you'd say. There were lots of people who...there were people [unintelligible] dropped out then because they were plain scared.

DW: Was that sort of a—

LS: Their jobs!

DW: Yeah, I see what you mean.

LS: And there was no salary schedule. You could be discriminated against, salary-wise.

DW: What do you feel instigated these firings?

LS: The firings?

DW: Yes.

LS: Well, I think that they had been against...These are speculations, because I wasn't very close to it and I don't pay much memory. But I would say that they were—

DW: If you could speak from sentiment on the campus if it's easier.

LS: Yes, they had led opposition to the appointment of Simmons. The way they've appointed presidents here, they had a faculty committee, and frequently they have and people who didn't want conveyed, passed on their objections. There was this strong feeling against letting the downtown interests promote Simmons, and that's what they were doing. Simmons had the backing of the downtown, and I don't mean the labor people but the bankers, and the [Missoula] Mercantile principally.

DW: Me need to define the downtown group. Was it an officially organized group? Or was it a group of [unintelligible]?

LS: No. C.H. McLeod, well, with Hammond...He wasn't the one who founded the Merc, the Missoula Mercantile, but he carried it on for all those years, and a very fine man. There were some others. There were some others. There was a banker or two. Les (?) and...Who were some of the others then downtown? Oh, Jack...I can't remember. Well, it was the moneyed interests. [laughs] [unintelligible]. How many millionaires does he have in his cabinet? [laughs] Well, they
were the ones who were backing Simmons. No, the labor movement wasn’t too much in Missoula at that time.

DW: Not downtown and not on campus?

LS: No. That’s right.

DW: They made a lot of financial contributions to the university? What was their interest?

LS: Yes. That had been true from almost the beginning, and true from...the first president was Craig. He was a man who was independent. He didn’t...But when Craig needed anything, he was buddy-buddy with those downtown interests. The social life of University people—those who were up on the top, the president and a few—it was always those downtown people. Now, they had no social [unintelligible].

DW: Within the University?

LS: Within the University system. I didn’t realize that we were getting into this whole area of the selection of the president.

DW: Well, if you want to come back to it another time.

LS: No, that’s all right. It comes up, but I don’t think we need to feel we have to do it thoroughly. But there had existed for a good many years—and I think probably at no time was there a stronger relation...I don’t know whether you’d call it a bond. They were using each other, between the University presidency and the downtown interests. Actually, those people, like C.H. McLeod and others, felt that it was their duty to...I’m not sure, but the Missoula Mercantile gave a lot of money to the University [unintelligible]. It was just their extension of their domain, and no one thought much about it until they put their support behind a man who was incompetent for such a job.

DW: Okay, why were they so interested in seeing Simmons become the president?

LS: That a question. He had been a sort of colorful figure. That’s one reason. The only job he had—he was a graduate of Western [unintelligible] Reserve, and he had been in charge of... [unintelligible] a year or two, exploring Blossom (?) Wasn’t that the name of it? You could find under Blossom something...You better put that down.

DW: Yes, I will.

LS: A cruise.

DW: Was this in some other part of the world?
LS: No, no. It was, I think in the West Indies. He didn’t have anything else to talk about, but he was a colorful figure. He had a lovely wife, and yes, you could make something really good, colorful bit of that career of his as the commander of the Blossom.

DW: The explorer.

LS: Explorer, yes, because I can recall that when he gave his inaugural address, we [unintelligible] inaugurate them and the governor was over, and he talked on that trip [laughs]—cruise of the Blossom. That’s all he had to talk about. He never failed to tell you a word or two about that. There was a relationship that I’ll go straight...Another relationship was the governor at that time was Frank Cooney. I knew the Cooney family very well. Governor Cooney’s daughter Merilee (?) was a very close friend of mine at that time. Well, she always has been. She’s still living in Butte. He had appointed in Missoula, [unintelligible] an old Missoula family, Wally Brennen, whose father had run a...what do you call it where they shoe horses?

DW: A livery stable?

LS: It wasn’t a livery stable. He was still doing iron works and that sort of thing.

DW: A blacksmith?

LS: Blacksmith! Yeah, back of the Merc. He was a good friend of Mr. Cooney’s son, and if you please, he appointed Laurie Brennen (?) to the state Board of Education. [laughs] Well, we all just shook our heads. Of course, I was hardly mature at the time, but I knew the background of the University through my brother, you see. Somehow, Wally Brennen was...well, it was because of his father, an old-timer. Old-timers had great prestige, and they hung together even if they didn’t—as old-timers—even if they didn’t all have money. C.H. McLeod, he let Wally Brennen represent his views of the downtown.

DW: Yes. A direct line.

LS: That’s the one where they...An interesting pictorial bit that I’ll never forget. Here was the Mercantile, right here, and you go down a block down that street. I was going down that street one night right after dark down to an apartment house down here where Miss Pfieffer lived.

DW: Walking toward the University?

LS: No. I was going east toward the canyon. I was going down to see her. Here was the Mercantile. And I went past—crossed the street and went past Wally Brennen’s...

DW: Blacksmith shop.
LS: Blacksmith shop. He was in there in a dim, dim light, and the curtains were up and beside him huddling over this box were old Simmons and Wally. [laughs] My brother and his wife were out in Seattle and—

DW: Now, wait. Who was there? Simmons and Wally and—

LS: Simmons and Wally.

DW: The two or them?

LS: Yes. Talk about plotters. [laughs] Yeah, because they only had whispers. [laughs] Well, I went home and wrote to J.B. and Maryann (?), and oh, they, of course, kept that letter because I made it so vivid. Well, it was such a sinister thing to look in there. I saw the secret of the whole thing [laughs], you know, right then. I think that was a lovely bit, or I'd always wished that it could be put on as a play. [laughs]

Well that's how Simmons got in with the support for the downtown interest.

DW: All right. I would assume that the people on the campus were aware of this connection.

LS: I don't say it with complete confidence, Diann, because I realize that I had more information because of my brother, who'd been here so long.

DW: I should be saying then is do you think that was the reason, or what was the reason that the faculty was opposed to Simmons other than the fact they felt he was incompetent?

LS: Lack of...incompetence.

DW: Okay, they'd just taken his background and see that he just didn't have—

LS: He didn't have any of the qualifications. He had no experience. He had been an instructor for a year or two, and that cruise on the Blossom. That's all he had. That was the complete charge. No, I don't think that you ever found people on the campus advertising their distaste for the pressure from the downtown. It was not good business to do it. There were many who were sympathetic with them. Someone could do a thesis on that really. A good, a fine article—the influence of the downtown and how reluctantly it has been eased away from them.

DW: I remember in the first part of Merriam's book, it talks about the downtown group. I remember something that's not directly related, but I bet in a way it is. When the University had its dedication out here, the townspeople came out in their buggies and everything, and whoever was speaking—I can't remember which one of the speakers it was—said that, “This is your school.” Apparently, the business leaders of Missoula too that very seriously, right from the beginning. [laughs]
The light gets...

LS: Yeah, there was...

DW: Yes. The sun's shifting, and it's probably coming in brighter.

LS: It's just this time of day [unintelligible]. I was at the doctor's yesterday, and he's real pleased with the progress.

DW: That's good to hear.

LS: He said, "Use your eyes. Don't..." He emphasized that. It's kind of uncomfortable at times, but he said, "Don't worry about it, and the eye looks really good."

DW: Well, that's good. It doesn't hurt it, but still you need a little rest probably from this.

LS: But I have all that reading from...I can read this large type print.

Yes, it's interesting. It's an interesting aspect of the University—that relationship with downtown. I suppose that is natural when the town is small.

DW: Fairly small, right. I was just going to say that.

LS: Of course, we don't have the concentration of wealth in one business and your banks or corporations for the most part. Not a family-owned thing. I don't know whether we just completed...I think all we need to—

DW: Yeah, I think we've set the stage for—

LS: But you can see then that where...This still existed at the time Keeney was here. The downtown interest and people in the town, they did not welcome Phil Keeney. Edmund Freeman was a very elegant gentleman. They liked to have him talk or review books or something. Edmund kept his free-thinking values to himself—rather concealed. He was very moderate. His wife saw to that.

DW: What's the connection here? Was Edmund a candidate for the—

LS: No, no. I don't remember that there was anyone on the campus who was recommended at that time. I don't recall. In fact, as a rule, the faculty had been...the general sentiment of the faculty when they select a new president is to go outside. I'm very much interested...Well, first of all, I'm delighted that Marge Brown is named chairman of that selection committee. Do you know her?

DW: No, I don't. You mean Maxine?
LS: No, no. Marge Brown, who’s assistant dean of the Law School.

DW: No, no.

LS: She’s really quite an unusual—

DW: I’m getting her mixed up with Maxine Johnson.

LS: Marge has a far more diversified personality, a great deal of charm and a great understanding of people. She’s done a remarkable job of that.

DW: I think we set the stage there very well, Lucile, for the conflict which we all are familiar with.

LS: I wanted to tell them...Oh well, you said—

DW: No, you go right ahead because—

LS: One more thing, I think, that I wanted to say about the grievance committee—how it led to the establishment of the Faculty Senate.

DW: That’s right, you do that.

LS: I’m not going to go into detail on the Senate because that’s another whole story.

DW: Right, right, but I was very interested when you said that the grievance committee had been responsible for that, and I wanted to get back to it.

LS: At the beginning. I don’t know to what extent, I think this is perhaps the office of transition to the Faculty Senate. I don’t know how active the grievance committee is now, because since the establishment of the Faculty Senate with its various committees, it may well have taken over through its committees, some of the functions of the grievance committee. Now, this is a speculation that I’ve just been making because while I did see...I saw the Senate in operation for several years and were quite close to they, but I don’t know what has been done in recent years in the union. I don’t think I can exaggerate the importance and the contribution of the grievance committee. I suspect that the existence of that committee, and the fact that it was there as something they can go to, was the principal thing that increased...it held the union together and gave it some prestige, although its prestige was pretty low.

Oh well, the other thing was that we did keep some good people like Edmund and, well, Ed Briggs, but Ruan Jefferson (?) has been a, just a recognized leader of the faculty for, I don’t know, 30 years. He stood between the faculty and harsh administrations—unsympathetic administrations. He always was for the faculty. He was chairman of the budget and policy
committee, which is something that I don't know when was established. Probably H.G. tells in his...but it went back before I was here, and it continued too.

DW: Exactly how did the faculty Senate [unintelligible] the committees?

LS: I would say that the whole area of faculty administration relationships has been a very important one, both in the AAUP locally and nationally. In fact, the AAUP had a committee on faculty-administration relationships and the reports on abuses in that field are regularly noted in the AAUP Journal. What corrections the national tries to take to alleviate such conditions. So we had talked, as I say, in both the AAUP of which I was a member and an officer—

[Break in audio]

LS: I was in the [unintelligible] on some of this tape.

DW: Yes, you and Dale were mentioning that when we first met you.

LS: My brother J.B. was marvelous, but he wasn't so involved in the later years.

DW: We were talking about the Faculty Senate relations.

LS: Oh, yes. Of course, that was one of the objectives of the union—to develop cooperation between the administration and the [faculty]. We talked about it quite a bit at AFT I know. So out of that, in the union, we decided to promote the organization of a faculty senate. The faculty senate is a common form of organization at larger universities. By that time, see, this would have been in the late '50s. Now, it might even...it took around five years for it to get...late '50s and early '60s. I took over their minutes to the archives [K. Ross Toole Archives and Special Collections] of the Faculty Senate. When the faculty becomes so large that the individual is lost in the large group and no one speaks, but a few leaders at faculty meetings, the decision are not...the faculty does not take any part in making decisions. They have the right to vote, yes, but their voices aren’t. Then is when you found a need of a faculty senate, which is elected. There’s a procedure set up for electing, whether you have two from each department or two or three from the schools, two or three at large, and that sort of thing. You decide first how large you want the Senate. I think we have about 50.

DW: Did the Grievance Committee not only come up with the idea, but—

LS: No, I'm going to tell you how we operated, how we got...what’s next. I was going to say that this why our argument for the Faculty Senate is to give the individual, a faculty member, opportunity to be heard and to present his views through a democratic process. You see, our union didn’t fill that place because the president didn’t have any obligation to listen to the union or the AAUP as far as that was concerned. We finally decided—these were in the days when we had the six members who met for lunch—that we would invite some of the members, long-time members, of the AAUP, whom we knew were interested somewhat in the this too, to
have lunch at the old student union. I can remember very well, I suppose there were 25 or so at

that luncheon. I can't tell you who was the one who proposed that...he had good representative

from the AAUP and I guess of all of our members. It seemed that there was general support for

the idea, and it was recommended that a committee be appointed to study the organization of

faculty senates. Did they tell us...well, I’ll say to study the organization of faculty senates. There

would be a committee of four, two from the union and two from the AAUP. Lud Browman, who

was supporting this very strongly, and Al Stone, from the Law School, were appointed from the

AAUP, and Ed Marvin and I from the union. Both Ed and I were actually members of the AAUP

too.

We met for a whole year. I was the one who found out what institutions had, through the

catalogs at the library, and wrote to those institutions and got copies of their charters—what

they had for faculty senates. We kept meeting, and we tossed those around—different ones. I
don't think we started through...We talked them over, but we didn’t start to write anything

until the next year. Then we did draw up the plan. I think we took what appealed to us that we

thought fitted our needs from various. We didn't take one institution. Wisconsin, Chicago and

many other...none of them, I guess, were small institutions. Then after that had been

researched, sent copies to the AAUP and took it up with our members. It was studied from

some time, and there were changes made—lots of recommendations. I never worked harder on

a committee. Al Stone was very good, a legal person, was very helpful.

Finally, I guess we thought we were satisfied, and we sent it then...it had to be adopted by the

two institutions that they were approving this. Then it had to go to the president. We sent a

copy to the president. At that time Dr. Newburn, Harry Newburn, was the president, and he

was not interested in a faculty-administration cooperation. So he sat on it for a year, didn’t do

anything. We were pretty disappointed. I don’t know that any moves were made to prod him,

whether Jeff asked about it once, I don’t know. But anyway, he didn’t say [unintelligible] either,

but finally he did pass it on—it was the Board of Regents, that was before it became the Board

of Regents. It was the Board of Education. It had to be presented, and they had to approve it.

Some of the questionable things as to whether they would approve. First, the general idea of
giving this authority to the...It’s still left to the...The executive still was responsible and had the
main authority, but it was like in the legislature. We could propose things. We could express
disapproval jointly. The controversial thing was putting a faculty member on the Board of
Education and also putting a student. But it didn’t take them...I’m not sure whether it took
more than a year for the Board to approve it, but it was not too long. It was not as long as Dr.
Newburn had had it [unintelligible]. Then the election took place. I can’t tell now...I can’t recall

how many copies were circulated to the faculty. Then we had the elections, and then there was
the first meeting. A temporary president for the first meeting and election of officers. We had a
president and vice-president. Or did we call them chairmen? We didn’t have dues. I don’t know
whether that was all...Oh, we had a few committees. We had a committee that met quarterly
with representatives from the other institutions. There may have been others, I don’t recall.
I was a member of the first one, I was elected to the three-year term. They were elected three-year term and two, so we had—

DW: Staggered.

LS: —staggered. [pauses] They were good lively meetings, and people did talk. It was well attended.

DW: Were there a representative there from the president's office, or did you—

LS: No!

DW: —just report to him?

LS: Reported. He could come. These meetings were open. Any member of the faculty could come in and listen. I don't recall that a president ever came. I think there was a complete openness about it, and I'm sure if any president had expressed any desire to present his viewpoint that he would have been accorded the privilege. We were fortunate the first president elected was Dave Mason.

DW: What was the arrangement between the Faculty Senate and the president, as you said, to make recommendations? Was that—

LS: The president is the executive officer of the university. Of course, we had proposals come from him. I'm sure we had to find in the...what are any restrictions that needed to be placed. We did set up committees that were to deal with salaries and grievances, but pretty much under a review committee. If you were not satisfied with the promotion or increase that you received, you could ask—it was a matter of course—ask this committee to review your case, and there were members in this elected committee. I know that committee was used. I think the machinery was put right in there—the part it was to do. Now, the president was not compelled to follow that, but I don't think...I think such was the standing of the Faculty Senate that the president would have risked his presidency to have gone against them, because there was great respect for the Senate.

Now, I don't know anything about it [unintelligible]—

[End of Interview]