

Maureen and Mike

Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

Archives and Special Collections

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: library.archives@umontana.edu

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

This transcript represents the nearly verbatim record of an unrehearsed interview. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

Oral History Number: 389-003

Interviewee: Jean Pfeiffer

Interviewer: Dawn Walsh

Date of Interview: March 4, 2000

Project: Missoula Women for Peace Oral History Project

Dawn Walsh: Hello Jean, thanks for being interviewed today. I'd like to just start off by asking you some basic background information—that's just simply when and where you were born.

Jean Pfeiffer: I was born in Whitehorse, Yukon Territory in Canada in 1927. My father was the bank manager up there. I was there until I was about four, and then we moved down to southern British Columbia, where I was raised in Grand Forks, British Columbia, which was a great town to grow up in.

Dawn Walsh: Okay, and so while you were growing up did you go to high school in Grand Forks?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yes, and that's where I got my political background. My mother was very active as a Socialist. My father was a conservative bank manager. So, I had this discussion going across the table constantly. In high school, we had a very lazy principal that mostly ordered us to have debates, so that she wouldn't have to spend too much time teaching us. So, I got into debates at an early age, such as "Should India have its independence?" and things like that.

Dawn Walsh: And so, were there any questions around peace and war at that time when you were in high school?

Jean Pfeiffer: Oh, yes. Well, World War II was going. It wasn't over until I graduated from high school. So, there was a lot of concern about that and a lot of worry as the young men went off to war. There was quite a bit going on, politically.

Dawn Walsh: And how were you involved?

Jean Pfeiffer: Arguing with my conservative friends, or hearing it at home. My mother had been asked to run a campaign for the Socialist candidate in our district, and I think our district has continued to send that sort of person to our Provincial Parliament.

Dawn Walsh: So, what were the conversations that you would have with your conservative classmates, and what was your position, as it was?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well left. Pretty much caring about other parts of the world that had been demolished, caring about children that were having such a hard time when some of my friends just cared about their own—they wanted to put their own needs first and didn't seem to care

about what was happening in the other parts of the world. I went to Sunday school and learned that everybody is important, but I'm not religious now.

Dawn Walsh: And what were the types of conversations that were happening in your house at that time?

Jean Pfeiffer: A lot of it I didn't understand. It was party—my parents discussing certain individuals who were in provincial positions, so a lot of it I didn't understand. But, I sort of instinctively moved towards my mother's position.

Dawn Walsh: So, I hear both your Sunday school's teachings and your mother's beliefs influenced how you saw the world as you were growing up?

Jean Pfeiffer: And my best friends and their parents—and so, yeah, we learned from them.

Dawn Walsh: Was there ever any particular event that you read about in the paper, you know, something that was in the news or photograph that you saw that really influenced your concern for people in countries outside of where you lived?

Jean Pfeiffer: Oh, yeah. It was during the War. There were all kinds of newsreels, and also movies about the War—the Second World War, which of course we all supported at that time. Yeah, horrific stuff on those the newsreels. You know, you just—you were hoping that it was the war to end wars. Of course, it wasn't. Yeah, we were concerned. In high school all the young men went, started joining up—so, there was a problem with the conscientious objectors, the Italian families in my community, the German families. Canada didn't have the draft, and a lot of people—the Anglo types—joined up. Some of the other groups—Russian people in my area, and they were pacifists and did not join up. The Italians were torn and the German—and they didn't have to join up. We had immigrants from the Ukraine, Russia; most of those people were pacifists and did not want to join up. So, there were conflicts in the community about this. Our dances got to be pretty—very few males, a scarcity of males, except for these people who didn't go to war, and so, there was some hard feeling about this...[hesitation]...Canada is different from the United States, so you don't have to be shocked. Our best friend was a Communist—the father—and Gloria and I would talk to him about all these things. He was very interested in all this stuff. He worked for the telephone company, and he was a good friend of my mother. He ran for Parliament; he didn't make it, but he was very active in the community, organizing drama groups and all kinds of stuff. So, I had good dose of this. But I didn't think I should say it on here—Americans get too shocked. In Canada, you could be a Communist.

Dawn Walsh: Very different. And so, I wanted just to ask you again about when you said there was a lot of controversy as far as, because there was no draft, and some men were signing up and some weren't. What were your personal thoughts at that time?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well, at that time I supported the War, and I thought Hitler was terrible. But I didn't want to see anybody go to war—not my friends. So, I was concerned about them. Some of my girlfriends were engaged to somebody who went off and got killed in Italy, and you know it was pretty tragic. I didn't—I don't think I personally held it against them for not going. Of course, a large part of Canada was not involved—all the French speaking, eastern provinces, which were dominated by the French Canadians, they didn't go. They weren't involved. So, it was sort of split this way. But since most of the Anglo types at that time—it's different now—and that time, in my community, people from the British Isles, the immigrants—British, Scottish, Irish—were most of the business people in town, the fathers of this little town, whereas, we had about 22 nationalities—lots of immigration from all over, Eastern Europe. And then, of course, they sent the Japanese families in from the coast, as they did in the United States. They weren't put in camps in my town. They were just moved. They were fishermen who were moved into Grand Forks, and these Japanese children would go to our school. They were exemplary citizens. They would volunteer to fix the basketball court, and they would clean up after dances. They tried very hard to be accepted. So, I had lots of foreign-speaking students in my class. I had a class of 30, maybe 10 would be with an English—the new immigrants called everybody else English. My background was Scottish and Irish—and the rest were Ukrainians and Yugoslavs and Japanese, Italians, Germans, anything, everything. I went home to tell my mother in the first grade, “Oh, I met a geranium.” [laughs] They towed us around at their parties.

Dawn Walsh: And then did you go to the university in Canada?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yes, the University of British Columbia.

Dawn Walsh: And did you—were you continuing to be socially aware and politically aware at that time in your life?

Jean Pfeiffer: Right, I was. I met my husband there. He was an American. Yeah, I was active, and very anti-sorority, fraternity that sort of thing.

Dawn Walsh: Were there any social or political causes that you were involved in at that time?

Jean Pfeiffer: Our campus was quite grown up because all the—I started in 1945, and the War was just over. So, masses of veterans were attending the university, and mostly veterans, and they were so much more mature. They were taking an active part in the political life of British Columbia. For instance, one of the women—girls—I lived with, we had a basement apartment, and there was six of us—and she ran for Parliament. She didn't make it, but she did pretty well. So, we were seriously interested in this sort of thing, and what Canada was going to be like after the War. It was kind of an exciting time—good motives, people wanted peace, and they were very generous, thinking of all our allies and then, the economy started to grow quite rapidly at that time, too, so there were jobs. It was an exciting time to be in B.C., and I hated to leave, actually. But my husband was an American who was up there working on his Master's. I

married him, but we had to then move to Oregon where he had a T.A. fellowship and was starting on his Ph.D. in California. So, that's when I moved to the United States. I didn't come here as a refugee wanting a better life. I think I left a very good life, but since then, I've acclimated.

Dawn Walsh: So, I want to ask you about—you said after the War there was a lot of changes happening and a lot of hopes. What were your hopes at that time?

Jean Pfeiffer: That things would be better. There was a revolution that was still going on in China, and I just felt optimistic that the world had settled this problem, and now we would work together, and things were looking up, and I was young. Life was just opening up.

Dawn Walsh: And in what ways were you hoping that changes would be better?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well, economically better. I mean, the refugee thing and the number of people killed was just horrendous. So, just having peace and the idea of peace and prosperity—we thought now we would be able to get back to work. Yeah, people were optimistic. So, it was a good time.

Dawn Walsh: And what year did you say you came to America?

Jean Pfeiffer: 1949. I got married in 1949, graduated and then got married. And then we moved to Oregon for a couple of years, and then my husband transferred to the University of California at Berkeley, so that's where we spent several years.

Dawn Walsh: And then what year did you come to Missoula?

Jean Pfeiffer: 1959. In between, we were in Idaho—Colorado, Idaho where my husband had his first teaching job, and then the University of Utah and then Grand Forks where he was in the medical school. I got a nice, little job there in the Biology department as a T.A., because they didn't have a graduate program—and so, I got hired for that. Then we wanted to be back in the mountains after North Dakota, so we came—we were really delighted to be able to come to Missoula.

Dawn Walsh: So you were here then in 1963 when the first peace group was formed—the Missoula Peace Group? Were you involved in that in '63, that was with Reverend Sanders?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yes. He was one of the people. A lot of us were in as couples or families, and my husband was involved and lots of other families. It was not just a women's group.

Dawn Walsh: And so how did you come to be involved with that group in 1963?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well, I guess it was the atomic bomb. You know, after World War II this was the only thing hanging everybody's head—you know, what was going to happen with this atomic bomb. We were very worried; the testing was going on. This feeling of optimism—the Cold War had started, or before that, and so everybody was worried about what are we going to do about the bomb. Yeah, we were concerned about atomic war. So, that's the main thing, to try to counteract the militaristic buildup that was happening here.

Dawn Walsh: And so, I understand there was a Hiroshima exhibit also that year. Were you a part of that?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yes, I was. And we had a very nice exhibit downtown in a place that looked like an art gallery on Main Street. We tried to be very artistic—Japanese flower arrangements, Japanese food—and horrible pictures on the wall.

Dawn Walsh: So, what was your part in that show?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well, helping decorate and set it up and get people to come. The mayor cut the ribbon to open it. We had quite a general audience for that. Lots of townspeople that weren't necessarily involved in our peace activities, which is what we wanted. We wanted to show people what might happen.

Dawn Walsh: And so, what type of response did you get from the community?

Jean Pfeiffer: Very good. Lots of people came, and we really felt that it was quite successful.

Dawn Walsh: And then in 1970 the Missoula Women for Peace Group started?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yes, by then the—well, I guess before that—the Vietnam War was going and there was buildup and buildup for this, and we got really concerned. And with the atomic bomb around and the Vietnam War happening, I don't exactly remember why it started out as a women's group. Maybe someone else will have more insight on why we started to do this. We found, in retrospect, sometimes we occasionally did have male members, and they were good people, and were very welcome and contributed a lot. However, in general I felt—I'm not sure that everybody felt this way—when our husbands came or a lot of men, the women kept quiet. It was really interesting to watch. The men were much more forceful and much more aggressive, and we politely sat back and listened, and this was not good. So, in the future we didn't really encourage men to come—our husbands, because our husbands were very interested and very involved in lots of ways, but I think it was much better to leave it as a women's group. Also, we weren't so vulnerable, a lot of us weren't working in those days, and we could say and do things that our husbands could not.

Dawn Walsh: Like?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well, take political activity, public statements that might—the Cold War was getting tighter—might jeopardize their positions in the job force. So, it's easier for women to speak out.

Dawn Walsh: So, what types of statements were you making at that time?

Jean Pfeiffer: Anti-war activities. We were having fund-raising, phoning. I suppose, mostly letter writing and talking to our Representatives, having marches and rallies. We were very active at that time, and we had a large following. These were not people that necessarily continued with us, but we just had a large phone tree when we were having activities. There was just a lot of people in the community worried about that war. So we really had very broad support. And I'm sure there were many that didn't like us one bit.

Dawn Walsh: So what would you say were some of the outcomes of that early work of the Missoula Women for Peace?

Jean Pfeiffer: I don't know that we were that important, but when you put all together across the whole country almost every community had some organization like this—or perhaps not—but grassroots organizations opposed to what was happening in Vietnam—the build-up and the lack of negotiation and the lack of goals, and what was the point. Then, of course, there was the television showing all the terrible atrocities going on. So, we just felt that this was just something we should not be involved in. I don't know how much effect we would have, but we were a voice, one of several, probably, in the community. There were, I'm sure, people that were opposed—or supported the Vietnam War, especially those who had sons and relatives in it. I was involved early on, but a lot of people came into it when their sons were getting to be draft age. And for that reason, and probably a lot of people don't agree with me, but I think the draft is good, because if we are going to involve the nation, people should really feel it. It is easy to sit back if we have a volunteer army and let them fight some project and be untouched. So when we had the draft that's when the real opposition to the war got going, not beforehand really—I mean not so much. Because it was way other there, and we weren't really touched. So, with the draft it got really closer to home, which is the way most people respond to any crisis.

Dawn Walsh: And did it affect your family directly at all?

Jean Pfeiffer: No, my sons were too young. If it had gone on much further, it might have. But they were too young. No, I didn't have a personal stake, but I didn't like the direction it was going. It affected, of course, a lot of friends and people we knew. Some had to go, and they didn't want to. Some went, and wanted to. And then lot—several went to Canada, and this broke up a lot of families. Whole families were split down the middle and upset about their kids leaving, but that happened. I had quite a few really good friends that went up there. Yeah, it was a very disruptive time.

I still have some signs down in the basement, you know, a big red slash against bombs and atomic testing. Testing was another big thing. That was very scary, because my husband had done some research on how the winds blew from Nevada, probably over Montana, but a lot of the rain settled in North Dakota when we were living there. He did a very interesting research project, and they were quite worried about Strontium-90. He was active in another group that was testing baby teeth here and there. A lot of anti-war organizations were working. There was lots going on. I have had a very full life, considering all the things my husband was involved in. Missoula Women for Peace—that was mine.

Dawn Walsh: And so, you talked about a lot of letter writing campaigns and sending messages to Representatives. What type of response did you get back at that time?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well, they paid attention to us. We were very often able to invite our Representatives to meet us, and they did. And we would get letters back. I don't think our local Representatives were gun-ho about the war. I don't remember—I guess Max Baucus was in there forever. But I think a lot of them were opposed, and we got responses. We didn't stop it single-handed, but I guess we were one factor.

Dawn Walsh: Now, do you remember what happened in Missoula after the 1970 Kent State killings?

Jean Pfeiffer: Oh, I'm sure we had one of our big rallies. Oh, there was a big thing on campus. The students had a huge demonstration and shut down all classes. We had a very good president at that time. He diffused the anger by siding with the students, which I thought—he said that understood why they were upset. Some students and faculty occupied the—they were focusing on the ROTC, because there was nothing else to focus on here, and occupied their offices, and they negotiated themselves out of it. Nobody was fired; no students were reprimanded. I thought that the campus handled it very well, but there was a great outpouring—yeah, the lawns were filled up on campus. We had what they call talk-ins—speech ~~forums so that people could express their points of view on the war.~~ And I can't say to—that did they call those? Talk-ins? Do you remember?

Dawn Walsh: Forums?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yeah, they sort of amounted to that. And faculty were involved to.

Dawn Walsh: And did you do any public speaking?

Jean Pfeiffer: I personally, no. I prefer not to do public speaking. We assigned that to May MacDonald. No I didn't. I would talk to people individually or on the phone, but I didn't do any speaking.

Dawn Walsh: Could you speak about the demonstrations on tax day that Missoula Women for Peace initiated?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yeah, I guess maybe we got our inspiration from a—I'm not sure where the inspiration came from or the idea. But on April 15, or close to it, we had a demonstration down at the federal—not a demonstration—we sold cookies, because we could make money and people stopped. Then we had all this literature, and maybe a big poster, saying what your tax dollars are going for, and what they are really needed for, and how much you're spending. Because it's something that people don't think about, they don't debate about it, even in these Presidential debates, nobody is talking about it. I don't think that people realize the amount of money we spend on warfare. So, we were just trying to bring this up to let them know where their tax money was going.

[End of Side A]

[Side B]

Jean Pfeiffer: —lasting repercussions. This is an area—that militarism, the military buildup in this country is kind of off limits. You don't debate it. The Congress fights like crazy over a small welfare budget, but when it comes to the military there is really no debate, and they keep giving more and more thinking by throwing this money at them we'll be secure, which of course we won't.

Dawn Walsh: What do you think it will take to change that around?

Jean Pfeiffer: I have no idea. At this point, I feel very sort of depressed. Okay, the Cold War is over, but we still use military action in lots of cases. I think it's really hard to find a place in the world where military action has been used that we feel that we've accomplished something. Most of the times we've used it, things are just as bad or even worse, than before we started. You can take all kinds of examples. The intervention idea is very complicated, and I don't say that we shouldn't use military for certain situations, but I don't think it always helps. I'm not a real pacifist in that I say "defense is necessary." And I think it's sort of that United States, being such a horrendously great power—being raised in Canada, which isn't a power—that there's nobody to hold them in except us, the American people. There's no other power that could even touch them, so they really have a free hand. I really wish that they would do a lot more cooperating through the U.N., do things in conjunction with others. I know sometimes they try with NATO and things like that—I'm not sure that's the way, because that's just a military organization, but I'm really distressed that they don't support the U.N. openly and consult more with their allies and solve problems in nonmilitary ways. Use the amount of energy and money that they put into the military, can you imagine if they used that much energy and that much money on alternative peace thinking how much it would do?

Dawn Walsh: So what would a peacekeeping model look like for you?

Jean Pfeiffer: Well, I think there's got to be some kind of international government in time. I can't see it right now. I can't see it yet. But, I do think you have to have a—maybe a military force. There has to be some way to handle the bullies of the world, at the same time by being another bully doesn't do it. It's got to be other pressures. And, I don't have the answers yet, but some better way has got to be found with the technology that we are developing.

Dawn Walsh: I want to ask you about the Malmstrom Air Force Base protest that happened in 1978—were you and Missoula Women for Peace involved with that? That was with Reverend Lemnitzer?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yes, Lemnitzer, our Lutheran minister. It was his idea to go over. That's the military presence in Montana that we could focus on, so we went over at Easter. He probably went a few years before we did—maybe on his own or maybe with just a handful of friends, and then it got larger. And so, at some point there was a lot of people going over from

Missoula, driving over with buses, and people from Great Falls would join us, and from all over the state. And, of course, the Vietnam War was on then. It was a just sort of an anti-militaristic feeling. This was just a way to bring to attention what was happening and get some publicity.

Reverend Lemnitzer was very creative and courageous, I think, because he didn't have the support of his whole congregation. So, a lot of us went over. Some of our members, not me, stepped across the line, which meant if they did it twice they would be arrested, and—I don't know—keep them in jail for awhile. I had a young family at home, and I couldn't do that. But, some of our members did once. I tried to remember if anybody was jailed for that. I know that individuals were put in jail, including one of our own members, Will Curling (?). They climbed the fence of the missile installations in Great Falls, and they weren't going to do anything, it was just a signal. They climbed the fence and got arrested and got put in jail. It was another way of trying to show that we did not like these missiles here. I really applaud them—that's a hard position to take.

Dawn Walsh: What has been your involvement with the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom?

Jean Pfeiffer: Not too much. I think that they are a great outfit. They're working on lots of issues. And we have had them here, and they've spoken here. And we decided as a group to be affiliated with them, so that we could get their newsletter and □□ No, they're
very old organization. I think, did Jeannette Rankin belong to them? I think she did way back. One of the problems we have now is that there's so many issues and so many ways to go. And I feel that the Women's International League—I know they're all related, but we are too small a group to split like this, and it's really hard to know where to put your energies, because the domestic scene relates to the larger world scene, and they're a very broad organization. You know, justice has to do with corporate people problems and race problems, lots of human rights activities as well as international peace. A lot of the people in our group now are getting elderly, and they do not have the energy to devote to this, and most of the young people have jobs, and that's why we are largely an older people's organization, because you can't do this and work too. And so, our group has changed, and we don't have a focus. During the Vietnam War or the atomic testing—well that's happening again, I guess. It's hard to find a focus, somewhat, we should work on. I mean, like the Jeannette Rankin Center now working on compassion. Well, all these things, of course, are related to peace, but it's hard to know.

I personally think we should be working on—well, we have tried—at to get the United States to join the anti-personnel land mine ban and sign the atomic testing ban, and that sort of thing, because we are really in a dangerous situation now if we don't stop this proliferation that is going on to other countries. If people are worried about terrorism—my gosh, can you imagine terrorism with the atomic bomb out there? I think that the only way we can stop that is to, the United States has got to be an example. It's the power, it's the first one, it's the only country that dropped one—first country to develop it, and I think they need to show an example. You're not going to get third-world countries to give it up if we don't give up. I think the only

safe world has to be an atomic-free world, which sounds very high in the sky, but I think we have to work in that direction. It's going to take a lot of international cooperation, and we're going to have to work more with other countries, and listen to them. I know that we're powerful and feel that we can do anything we want, but I think we have to consider this. We all relaxed after the Cold War and thought we wouldn't have this worry, and now—Jonathan Shell has written another book on the problem, and it's just as bad now as it was earlier. I really think we have to work on that, plus the military response to problems.

There's a lot of domestic things that we talk about and want to get involved in. I know that they all lead to the same thing, but I just don't think that we can do them all. That is what my interest in this is. But I like the group so much, because we have a sympathetic audience. And we mostly meet now to compare notes and things that come up. One of our people is working on the Jubilee 2000, and I think that is wonderful, a great step. So, there's just lots of things going on, and different people in our group have different backgrounds and participate in different things in the community and can bring it all to the group and tell us what they're doing—It's very interesting. They keep up with things, and we discuss issues of the day, even though we are not necessarily going to act on them. I'd say that we are much less active now than we used to be. I think that everybody feels—most of members, they've been through years of this and just have to slow down. We can't do it all. We are hoping that younger people will, which is happening, will come along and take it up.

Dawn Walsh: So, what is a message or messages that you have for younger generations in terms of peace?

Jean Pfeiffer: You got a big job ahead of you. I guess one thing that distresses me is there's less and less news and less and less interest in world affairs. For one thing, people are too busy. All the young people are trying to earn a living and get by and have families, so they don't have the energy either, and they don't really know what's going on. They don't have time, and that's a concern. But, in general, the news items are doing less and less on international affairs. We're just very badly informed about what is going on. So, I guess I wish you could plug into what is happening in terms of militarization and directions we should go in.

Dawn Walsh: So, I know that you are a great-grandmother—Is that right?

Jean Pfeiffer: Yes.

Dawn Walsh: How, if I could ask, how have you brought peace and the belief of peace into your family, and into raising your children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren?

Jean Pfeiffer: I don't go for that, this idea of being a peaceful person. I know it's important, but I don't think that is what causes wars. I think that wars are caused by scheming, powerful people that can do these things. Yes, I don't beat my children, but I'm not going around...I don't like that "peace begins at home business," I'm sorry. That if you have an argument with

your neighbor and can't solve it—I don't think that wars start this way. They may have when communities are little, but I think it's other forces, economic forces and deals between the powerful people, that force wars on people. I don't think we go to war because we hate another nation, although they sure whip it up during wars—you know, your anti-racism, like the Japanese situation. They whip all this up, and yes, you can get to hate others when atrocities happen, but I don't think we go to war because we're just sitting here and just dying to go war because of so and so doing something. It's all manipulated from above. So, I don't want to say this "peace at home" business, sorry.

Dawn Walsh: That's all right.

Jean Pfeiffer: Argument is good.

Dawn Walsh: That's what I'm getting from your response, that there's a healthy sense of debate and argument that needs to happen amongst humans.

Jean Pfeiffer: Yeah.

Dawn Walsh: And that it doesn't have to lead to war.

Jean Pfeiffer: Right. No, I don't think that war is caused by that. I know that Bosnia, and that whole area is very complicated, but for a long time in Bosnia there was Serbs, Croats, and—what was third group? Muslim Bosnians, I guess, living together, intermarrying. A man in one town was so shocked when all this war broke out, he says, "My neighbors, we've been living together for decades—I don't know for how long—and getting along just fine." But when something is stirred up outside and gets things going, yes, you're going to develop hate. I don't think it's a good idea to fight in families, but I don't want to concentrate on that.

Dawn Walsh: I'd like to just ask a couple more questions, and one was I'm wondering what your involvement was during the early '80s and mid-80s when Missoula Women for Peace were working to bring the Jeannette Rankin to Washington, D.C.?

Jean Pfeiffer: I have to say, I think it was largely almost one person who did that. Connie Skousen was our chairperson for many years, and it was her idea, and she really worked hard, and pushed that and got this humanities organization in town interested. I was not directly involved, just supportive, and, gosh, I give her credit for spearheading that whole thing.

Dawn Walsh: And then later?

Jean Pfeiffer: Oh, the statue—wait a minute I got to say, I'm changing that. I'm talking about the statue in Washington that Connie spearheaded. As for the Jeannette Rankin Center, there was others involved, yes. And I think that a few people were more active in that. I wasn't too active in that, but it sounded like a good idea. We were all very supportive, but I think maybe

Flo Chessin and Jim Ranney and Connie and others—you might find others when you interview that were more involved in that. No, I think it's a great idea. I always thought that we should have some kind of central clearinghouse, some kind of meeting place where people could go and read and talk. But, this is—I think it's a very good thing for the community. So I support it, but didn't think of it, and I'm not involved in it particularly. So, is that the end?

Dawn Walsh: Do you have any closing statement you'd like to make?

Jean Pfeiffer: I think I've made them all.

Dawn Walsh: Well, thank you very much.

Jean Pfeiffer: Okay.

[End of Interview]