

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: 270-008
Interviewee: Gordon Browder
Interviewer: Annie Pontrelli
Date of Interview: July 23, 1991
Project: University of Montana Centennial Oral History Project

Annie Pontrelli: This is Annie Pontrelli interviewing Dr. Gordon Browder. It's July 23, 1991. Gordon, why don't you just start off with the years that you were here, and in what capacity, and courses you taught just to kind of give us a foundation.

Gordon Browder: Well, I came to Missoula in January of 1948. My dad and I came from the University of Florida, and it shocked me. It was awful cold in Missoula. I came here to be the chairman of the new Department of Sociology. There had been a change in administration. I stayed here until 1945, I beg your pardon, 1975, when I retired from the Sociology Department and went to Main Hall as Director of Research—University Research. I stayed in Main Hall in the administration for two years, and finally retired in 1977. I've been around quite a few years.

AP: Sounds like it.

GB: I did teach on that basis [part time] five or six years.

AP: Now what were you teaching?

GB: Sociology. My particular specialties were populations and corrections—criminology.

AP: I'm sure that you noticed a lot of changes over the years in different positions on campus; why don't you tell me a little bit about some of the changes that you observed over the years, whether it was with faculty members, or the campus itself, or students.

GB: Well, I think you have to keep in mind that in 1948 the university was quite small. I don't recall what the exact enrollment was, but I doubt it was much exceeding 2,500 students and of course, the faculty was correspondingly small. It was a pretty intimate place in those days because it was small enough so that everybody knew everybody else. But, of course, those early post-war years marked a beginning of some really substantial changes on the campus. In the first place, student enrollment began to expand very rapidly, and this meant that new faculty had to be found. We had, as is usual at this institution, considerable turnover inside the administration. I think somebody about that time coined the phrase, "Montana: the graveyard of presidents." Actually, it wasn't so much a graveyard as it was a wasteland: presidents coming and going in those days. The late '40s, all through the 1950s was a time of very rapid change. A good bit of interest in reorganization on campus, reorganization of administrative labor, reorganization in the curriculum, a change in the participation of faculty in university governments.

I think the faculty senate which was planned in the 1950s, finally came into being about

1960-1961. That really marked a major shift in the relationships between faculty and administration. Up to that time, well take budget making as an example, it was a pretty much a one on one thing. The department chairman would go in and sit across the table from the president, and the business manager would be there, and the budget of that department would be hammered out. There was really no substantial faculty participation in that sort of top level policy decision making. With the development of the faculty senate that changed, the faculty got increasingly involved through the senate. Then, subsequently we had collective bargaining, which was another change in the pattern of relationships between the faculty and inside the administration.

But, I think the most important thing that happened during this period when I first came was the very rapid pace of change on campus in numbers of students, the composition of the student body, in number and variety of faculty, and in the increasing involvement of the faculty through the senate process in the administration. They were really significant changes. I don't know if that answers your question, but it was a very general way of looking at it.

In my own department for example, which started out with the title of Sociology and Social Administration, (because there were some undergraduate social work classes taught), we subsequently added anthropology as a separate major and the department became Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Administration. Then, subsequently, social administration split off and formed a separate Social Work Department, as it exists now [1991]. So, we were back to sociology and anthropology, and then, a couple of years later, anthropology split off as a separate department, and we went full-circle back to sociology now. So, as I said, it was a period of some pretty rapidly formed changes.

The organization of the curriculum was very different in those days. We had what is sometimes referred to it as the "lower college" system then, we never called it that, but, the first two years on the campus undergraduates had a pretty narrowly prescribed curriculum. There were four major areas they had to take: social sciences, biological sciences, humanities, and physical sciences. So, for the first two years freshmen and sophomores really had very little elective opportunity when they took these courses. They were prerequisite then for moving on into other division courses in one of the majors outside of your electives. That wasn't strange to me because at the University of Florida where I'd taught previously, we had a similar system. One actually, that was more rigidly organized than the one here because at Florida we had six areas students had to take the first two years. We had no dean of the college in those days. The College of Arts and Sciences was organized along these four comprehensive lines, so that there was a chairman of the division of social sciences and a chairman of biological sciences, and so on. No dean, no central administration in the college itself. We didn't have a dean of the college until I guess Coonrod, Dr. [Robert] Coonrod came sometime in the 1950s. At that time, the old divisional organization was broken up and we went into the college system, essentially the same system we have now, with the dean who reports back to the vice-president. There were some interesting sidelights as a consequence of this divisional set-up we had...I won't indulge into just any old personality...

AP: Do! Do!

GB: The chairman of the humanities division was Dr. Merriam. Of course, everyone knows who Dr. Merriam was, for many years he was an outstanding scholar. He was instrumental in starting a lot of activities, particularly on campus. He published a literary magazine. A very active, influential person. The chairman of the social sciences division was Dr. [J.E.] "Burly" Miller, who was also something of a fixture; he had been here many years. He had been the Dean of Men. He and Dr. Merriam had some differences of opinion when the Liberal Arts Building was built. Of course, space was limited, and both social sciences and humanities were going to be housed in that building. Dr. Miller and Dr. Merriam carried on something of a vendetta for a while to see who was going to get what space, and how much. So finally I think they hit some sort of a compromise, but for a while there things were—if not tense—some sparks flew over the allocation of space in the Liberal Arts Building. So there was a lot of that sort interpersonal interplay then, because what we thought about this was the old-timers on campus - people like [Burly] Miller, and Merriam, and Archie [A.E.] Merrill of mathematics who was the Academic Vice-President then, and Ernie [E.A.] Atkinson who had been a long time here in the Psychology department and was something of a power on campus - there were a few strong personalities that really stood out then, and who actually constituted a sort of leadership on the campus. My observation is that's changed considerably now and strong personalities don't count as much as they used to. Of course, as I said a while ago, the campus was small; everybody knew everybody else and so these strong, dominant personalities really stood out in those days.

I don't mean to slight some other very important people. Dr. Rulon Jeppeson in Physics certainly was one of those really influential people on campus in those days.

AP: What were some of the things that he did?

GB: Professor Jeppeson was the first president of the senate, and he had been very instrumental in trying to encourage and develop stronger and more significant faculty participation in the governments in the university. He also had some strong ideas on curriculum matters, and was a member of the old Budget and Policy Committee for years, which developed a bit of curriculum policy in those days. So, he was just a very influential person because he had been here a long time for one thing, because he was a person of absolutely impeccable character, complete integrity; you could really trust him and look to him for leadership.

There were several other people who were here in those days who were really carry-overs, I suppose, from pre-war times, and who had been through some of the battles which I'm sure you know about on the campus - the Levine Affair after World War One...

AP: I don't know that much about that one.

GB: I don't know anything about it firsthand, but it was very much on the minds of people, even when I came. This involved a young professor; I guess an assistant professor of economics who in effect took on the Montana Power Company, which in those days had the reputation anyway that they were putting over all the important political and economics trade in the state. Anyway, as I recall, Professor Levine raised some questions about a taxation of natural

resources [mines] in the state and the Montana Power Company and the Anaconda Company, which was dominant then in mining in Montana, decided that he needed to go. So, there was a big bit of litigation over it. I don't remember really whether Professor Levine was fired or whether he left of his own accord; I rather think he left of his own accord. But at any rate, he left.

People like Atkinson and Merriam and Miller and Jeppeson had been involved in the way back struggles on the campus, to not be dominated by political and economic interests in the state. So, they had sort of earned their stars on the "front lines" and that's another reason why they were very influential as long as they were around. I certainly don't want to make any individual comparisons, but my impression has been that when these older, dominant personalities had moved out of the scene, then there hasn't been an emergence of a similar sort of what I think of as a cadre—a small group that's exerted its right to leadership. I give reasons for that, of course the size of the university is one thing and the size and diversity of the faculty and the student body. Things are just more complicated now. But, it's interesting to those of us who have been around for a long time and do more reminiscing, (and justified maybe), but to be entranced with what seems to many of us a much simpler time right after World War Two and on down through the '50s, and what seems to be a very complex, complicated arrangement now with union representation and a much more complicated organizational structure than we used to have. It's a sort of thing, I suppose, that old codgers do, who look back at the way things used to be.

But at any rate, it was an exciting place to be in those days. The sheer magnitude of change, the direction of change of the fifties, particularly - a very exciting time to be around. A lot the problems that you read about, and hear about now, or read about then. It was always the inadequate budget. Never enough money, large classes, the constant cry for additional faculty to take on increasing student loads. It's the same thing. Maybe it makes some of us who have been here a good while a bit, well if not cynical, at least skeptical, when we see what goes on in the legislature because, in my recollection, every legislative session that we've ever had has been the same. It's run into the same sort of problems...

[Phone rings]

The question here is what it was like working in administration between 1940 and the time I retired in 1977. We had a number of administrations, so it isn't really accurate to talk about the administration.

When I came here, the president was James McCain. He was followed by president [Carl] McFarland, whose tenure was really sort of too long. Dr. McFarland was an alumnus of our law school. He had been a very successful lawyer back in the Washington area; had been an assistant attorney general during the Roosevelt years in the 1930s. He was very happy he got out of government service and went into practice in Washington with the former attorney general that he served under and so thought he was brought in to be president after McCain left. He was a very strong person, but a rather distant individual—quite a contrast to his predecessor who had been a warm, outgoing person. So there was a sort of an atmosphere of contention between the faculty and administration that developed out of Dr. McFarland. I'm

sure other people have mentioned that. Nonetheless, he was a strong and very able person. I think that he probably left the university over budget matters. He had some sharp differences with the legislature over budget matters.

Of course, in between we had a number of acting presidents. When he left [Harry K.] Newburn came as president. He was a different sort of individual entirely. Although I'm not sure of the order: President [Robert] Johns was here for a couple years, President [Robert T.] Pantzer was here during the '60s. He, incidentally, was the president who was confronted with what relatively little turmoil we had in the student unrest of the '60s, what, I'm sure you have been told, never really amounted to much on this campus. We had some student anti-Vietnam activities and a few moratoriums against going to class. The really most significant single incident I think during the sixties was the occupation and trashing of the ROTC building, when students opposed our involvement in the war. They destroyed records, maybe burned some paper and wrecked typewriters. President Pantzer handled that very well indeed. He got involved himself in talking to students, so a calmer head prevailed. Nothing really significant ever took place after that. So, Bob Pantzer gained a great deal of respect for the way that he handled that particular situation. One other instance that I think gave Dr. Pantzer a great deal of stature was the so-called "student as nigger" incident. Have you been told about the "student as nigger"? You probably know about it.

AP: I have, but go ahead and tell me through your viewpoint.

GB: Well, it simply involved the assignment of an essay by a young English instructor entitled "The Student as Nigger." I forget who wrote it now. It so happened that in the section of English in which this essay was assigned, the daughter, I believe, of the then-commanding officer of ROTC was a student. So, she complained and people got involved and thought that it was scandalous to suggest students could be compared to niggers and so on. There was quite a bit of "off with his head" sentiment to get rid of this guy, the English instructor. It actually had reverberations in Helena. Dr. Pantzer stood up right to the end in defense of this instructor to assign whatever material that he wanted to assign. So, the whole thing blew over, and that gave Dr. Pantzer a bit of heroic stature in the minds of a lot of people—that he would not knuckle under to a minority that was critical and that threatened the staff's academic freedom of speech in the school.

Anyway, after Pantzer left, then we had a succession of presidents. When I served in Main Hall inside the administration, Dr. Pantzer had just left, and we had a relatively new president then. I'm sorry, I can't recall his name. Since then we have had three or four. I would guess that over the years after at least eight different people had been through the president's office, plus several acting presidents in between.

The tenure philosophy—that's been unfortunate for the university, I think. It's meant that we've lacked a certain stability in Main Hall, a certain continuity in the administration, because the new president comes here and it takes at least a year just to learn the ropes locally and internally. It takes him at least one legislative session to get his feet wet in Helena, which is quite an experience in itself: it must be a traumatic experience for a new president. So, it takes two to three years before a new person coming in is really in a position to feel comfortable and

knowledgeable about what the job of president entails. Our experience has been somebody would come in, be here for two, three, four, maybe five years and then move on. Then we have to see the process start all over again. I think that's really been detrimental to the interest of the university. I contrast it sometimes with the experience over at MSU [Montana State University-Bozeman]. For a long time, their presidents served for years and years, and there was a tendency, when a president did leave, to fill job his eternally. It had sort of a built-in continuity in the administration. But, I guess that's the price you pay for being the sort of place we are. It's a big university, a good place to get administrative experience. People who have been here by and large, move on to bigger and better things. For example, when Jim McCain left, he went to Kansas State, and he filled a very big pair of shoes there, because [Milton] Eisenhower had been president of Kansas State then. He was very successful with that institution. McCain was able to go in and do just an outstanding job and stayed there until he retired. We've had a number of people who have left our administration to go on to bigger and better things. I suppose, in a sense, that's flattery, but, it doesn't help our own stability and continuity. I'm not saying this critically; it's just the way things have been.

My own experience with administrators we've had has been generally pleasant. They've been, all of them since I've been here, accomplished people, professionally well-trained, very good people. When I say that president McFarland was not a very warm person, that's just his personality. He was not approachable, he was not a naturally friendly, outgoing individual that you sit down and chat with on a one to one basis very easily.

I do remember one experience, I hadn't been here very long and Dr. McFarland had just come in as president. I had to go see him about some departmental matter. I knew that President McFarland had been to Harvard Law School after he'd left here, and I had just read a book that sort of indicted lawyers as more complicated and arcane and esoteric than they needed to be. This book was called *Woe Unto You, Lawyers*. It was written by the dean of Yale Law School. Thinking to make small talk with a president whom I didn't really know at all, I mentioned that I just finished this book by Dean Rodell and I asked the president if he'd by chance seen it. He took off his glasses, and he looked down his nose at me, and he said "Professor Browder, you realize, of course, that Rodell was from Yale." (laughs) So, that showed me where the president stood vis-a-vis the Yale (unintelligible). But, anyway...He was an interesting person. I would say that these change of events, that probably the most important thing that happened on campus after I came was the establishment of the Faculty...

[End of Side A]

[Side B]

GB: ...the relationship with the faculty and administration. It had been a long time in the making, some of us worked on it a good many years before it finally came together. There were some units of the campus that were skeptical about the notion of a [faculty] senate, and so it took a good bit of salesmanship in some quarters to sell the idea. I think that once the senate was established, and once it was clear that it did two really important things. One was to constitute a forum for all parts of the campus, because senate members were chosen to represent certain academic areas on the campus. It brought the faculty together in ways that I don't think it ever would otherwise. Another thing, of course, that it did was to constitute, define, and organize, and out of principle instrument for relating faculty matters to the administration. I think it also was good from the standpoint of the central administration because, if the president had a matter of policy or a problem he wanted to discuss, he would come over to the senate. He viewed them that he was dealing with the representative body that could report back to its constituents. I think it strengthened the hand of the faculty very, very significantly, once it was organized. I don't know now how it's operating, because of course, when collective bargaining came in '76 or '77, then the status of the senate vis-a-vis the status of the union, I think, rather complicated the picture. So, I don't know now whether the senate is still the rather powerful instrument that it was then or not. It's still functioning at any rate.

AP: What were some of the other organizations and activities on campus?

GB: Well, for the faculty, until the faculty went union, the AAUP, (the American Association of University Professors) was a very important organization. It represented the faculty and stood as an advocate for the faculty. Although I don't think the membership was ever very large, it was a very active, and rather strong organization for the faculty.

On the student side, certainly the sororities and fraternities were much more in evidence then than they were later. When I say that, I mean the '50s particularly. They were very active. As a matter of fact, as new faculty people one of the first duties my wife and I had was to chaperon a dance that was at a fraternity house. Sororities used to invite faculty for dinner sometimes on Saturdays or Sundays. There was a much more active creed [?] presence on the campus then I think was true later on.

We never did have a very overall active student body here. Even, as I say, even during the 1960s when there was a lot of ferment all over the country, our students just didn't seem to be that interested. I don't mean that a lot of them weren't concerned about Vietnam, didn't have strong feelings about it one way or the other, but there was never this tendency, really, to kick over the traces and embrace a cause in any widespread way. That led some people to criticize the student body for being apathetic and disinterested. I don't think that is necessarily so. After all our location, for one thing, really isn't conducive to a lot of activity. It's quite different from San Francisco, I'd say. One of my sons who was in Columbia in the 1960s was sent home along with his entire class about a month early because of student activism on the Columbia campus. There students simply halted the operation of the university. It just ceased to function, and the police took over. Well, we didn't have anything approaching that. I'm sure that there were

some organizations, the SDS maybe, others, but they were certainly small and not very much in evidence. I don't think that our student body was really apathetic or apolitical or non-political, I just think that it's because, in a sense, we're sort of, in terms of our location, sort of a backwater here. There is no incentive a strong activist would find in an urban residence. At any rate, it was very pleasant. It was very nice that we didn't have a lot of the things that went on in other places.

So, I don't know. It's sort of hard in way to conceive of that period in any systematic way. What tends to happen I think, is that certain things, certain incidences, certain experiences, stand out, such as the organization of the senate, or the trashing of the ROTC building (minor though it was, that was a nine-day wonder), budget crises, or endemic special events. Student demands changed over the years. The university changed a good bit in order to meet the changing demands, I think, towards the development of Black studies and Native American studies, and the development of a School of Religion, which was quite a controversial issue when it surfaced back in President Pantzer's administration.

AP: Why was it controversial?

GB: Well, because there was considerable difference of opinion in the faculty as to how far a public university ought to go in being involved in religious instruction. When I came here [and] for a long time thereafter, we had a little Department of Religious Studies. There wasn't a major, just courses that were taught by volunteer ministers from one or another of the local churches. Many people thought that what we really needed was an organized program in religious studies, so president Pantzer appointed a committee to study this and make recommendations. The committee had on it people who felt quite strongly one way or the other: some felt very strongly that we needed an organized school or at least a department of religious studies, others felt that we shouldn't have anything about religion at all. But finally the pro-religious studies people prevailed after much argument. I happened to have been a member of the committee, and we had some really long, (hardly acrimonious but certainly argumentative), sessions about this. Finally, the recommendation came back to the president, that the university establish a separate, organized program of religious studies. Whether it be called the school or department was not too germane. When this was presented to the president, he accepted the recommendation, and it went to the [faculty] senate. Again there was considerable discussion in the senate about it, but finally the idea of a separate department of religious studies prevailed.

The university brought in two people who were certainly the first rank of scholars of religion in the United States, Dr. [Ray] Hart and Dr. [Robert] Funk, who were brought here from [Vanderbilt] Tennessee. They came out of a very strong religious studies department, and so they established the Department of Religious Studies with a major. Faculty were added until it became very active and a very well-known program in the country. Dr. Funk subsequently left. Dr. Hart stayed here for many years. There was a journal of Religious Studies [Journal of American Academy of Religion] that was published here, Dr. Hart had that journal which he brought with him. So, the university really gained a lot of status for such a small department of religious studies. Again, I don't know where that stands now. I don't know after Dr. Hart and Dr. Funk left, my impression is that the emphasis on religious studies has diminished

somewhat, although I really don't know if I should speak about that because I don't know. But, at any rate, that was another high point. The discussion and difference of opinion over whether we ought to have this program.

There was, I think, less contention over the Black Studies program, although there was strong opinion about that one too, as you can expect. The Native American Studies program seemed to be a natural for us because of the state location, and the reservations, and the size of the Native American population in the state. That was established without the necessity of a long, drawn-out argument about whether we ought to have it or whether we shouldn't.

Let me think back over the years at these...Well, I guess "special situations" in a way, over these not-routine items that would pop up and need to be dealt with in one way or another, and then they would recede and something else comes along. After I had gone to Main Hall as Director of Research for the university, we had another problem about whether we should accept some grant money from the Department of Defense. The money looked very attractive and it was a substantial sum, several hundred thousand dollars, maybe more than that. It involved a certain amount of secrecy because a good bit of this research was classified since it was Defense-related. The question came up then at the Faculty Senate as to whether the university would be justified in accepting money if the results of the research couldn't be made public, or couldn't be published as the results of research should be. Again, there was strong pro and anti-feeling, but in the end the university did not accept the grant. I think a lot of people were unhappy to see all these hundreds of thousands of dollars flitting away someplace else, but it was probably a wise decision.

A similar situation came up about the same time which involved a cooperation with the university—at least parts of the university—with some Iranian government project. There again, it was an arrangement that was finally turned down because there were allegations of anti-Semitism on the part of the Muslim Iranians. Some people were discouraged because women wouldn't be permitted in public driving vehicles and that sort of thing. It wasn't a world-shaking matter at all, but it caused a lot of discussion of that in the [Faculty] Senate before it was finally rejected. I suppose if you talked to a dozen people, you would get a dozen different recollections of situations of this sort. On the whole, it was, as I said, a very interesting, challenging time, the late '40s. For a while at the university a lot of things happened, a lot of changes took place, a lot of improvements, a lot of the old problems hung on, of course, the budget problem especially. In some cases [the problems] were quite exacerbated by administrative decisions that really didn't help very much.

AP: What do you feel your greatest accomplishment was during those years?

GB: Mine? Well, I think I'd have to say that building the Sociology Department from a brand-new entity with two people in it to the successful, free department that it eventually became. That was very satisfying to me personally, to be involved in the growth and development and the bringing in of some very fine people on the faculty. Again, I think from the standpoint of personal satisfaction and enjoyment, I'd have to say seeing my department develop was the outstanding experience for me. I wouldn't want to do it again though. (laughs)

AP: What did you like best about your times here?

GB: I think I'd have to say that personally [I liked best] the association of the people in the university, getting to know and appreciate some of the really outstanding people that were here in the years that I was, not only in my own department, but throughout the institution. I think that this personal contact, the personal enrichment that you get associating with people that you really respect and have high regard for, not only professionally, but personally too. I guess to put it another way, unless that sort of satisfaction for your colleagues and your associates, your fellow faculty people isn't there then no matter what else happens, I think there is always some sort of a lack or emptiness. I really felt fulfilled because of these personal associations.

Of course, I should mention the students over the years. There is always a—I don't know—sort of a satisfaction even now when I run across former students whose names have long since escaped me, but they seem to remember my name. (laughs) That's satisfying.

AP: [If] you were to go back in time and relive any of those memories or do anything differently, what would you do?

GB: Well, I guess to be a little bit facetious about it, I wouldn't choose to come from the deep south to western Montana in the middle of winter. I don't recommend that. It's culture shock. (laughs)

Well, looking back I really can't think of anything that I'd change especially. I'm sure that administratively some decisions that I thought at the time were wise, probably shouldn't have been made. But, I can't think of anything that was really catastrophic, or threatened the program, or any individual, or so on. No, I can't really think of any major changes that I would have made.

AP: Would there be any memories that you would want to relive?

GB: Oh, there are lots of times that I enjoyed very much and would enjoy experiencing again. The associations with some of the people that I worked with, I'd request to go back and relive. Some of the classes that I taught, that I felt particularly good about, I'd really like to go back and do it again, I wouldn't dare try because I'm sure it wouldn't work out nearly as well the second time around. (laughs) There are some associations and memories in the department that I would really enjoy reliving...seeing some of the people who I enjoyed knowing then that aren't around anymore, talk with them and be able to sit down and have a session with some of them. But, all in all my memories are pleasant ones. I wouldn't change much.

AP: Any other insights, observations, memories, or anything else you'd like to share?

GB: Well, I just haven't been very closely associated with the campus. After I retired from the administration, like I said Alice and I taught for four or five years on just a part-time basis, as retired people can do. Since then, oh for seven or eight years now, my contact with campus has been very limited; so mostly what I know about it now is what I read or pick up on the street

third-hand or if I happen to run into somebody from campus. Everybody agrees, I'm sure, that the university is having some really serious problems in regard to the budget and in regards to recruitment and retention of faculty. Any way you look at it, we simply are not very competitive. The university has been most fortunate, considering the fact that its salary scale is quite embarrassing, to get and keep as strong of faculty as we have. I think that the president, President Dennison, is right in pointing out that this isn't something that going to last indefinitely. Something has got to be done before very long to strengthen our position in the market place, or else we are going to see the attrition of good people on the faculty who simply can't take outdoor activities—fishing, hunting, and skiing—in place of dollars in pay. What can be done about it, I don't know. Maybe the approach the university and the Regents seem to plan to take is a good one, to cut back. Maybe we try to be more than we can afford to be. Maybe we need to make the place smaller, more selective [with] higher entrance requirements. We have some students that just don't have a chance under the best of circumstances. This is tough to do, especially in a state like Montana, where everybody can go (unintelligible). Whatever happens though, it's going to be traumatic, as we saw when it was necessary to retrench, [like] the cuts in programs that we had here a few years ago. That was a very, very painful process, because no matter what you eliminate by the way of a program, there are going to be some awful strong advocates with good reasons for not eliminating it. Of course, this puts the administration in a particularly sensitive position to have to make that sort of decision. Well, you know that regardless which way the decision goes, someone is going to be unhappy or mad at you. It is going to be very interesting to observe how this administration and subsequent ones can handle this—what I think of as an overarching problem of adequate funding, or, the definition of a program that we can't afford with the resources we've got. It's an unenviable situation any way you look at it, but certainly that is, above all, the most pressing, the most serious problem the university faces, and is likely to face the next few years. I'm glad that I don't have to make the decisions.

As a retiree, I enjoyed what I did while I was doing it. I have absolutely no regrets about [not] being called in. I enjoy getting back to campus once in a while, although I see very few people that I recognize anymore. I wish the university well, but I don't shed any tears over not being a part of it anymore. It was wonderful while it lasted, and it lasted a long time.

I don't know whether this has been helpful at all...

AP: You've been very helpful. I know that you probably have an appointment that you have to leave for.

GB: I have to pick up my wife before 11:30, but that's ten minutes away. I thought she'd be able to drive by now, and she could, but she doesn't feel comfortable doing it yet.

AP: Okay, unless you have something else...

GB: No, no. I appreciate your giving me the chance to reminisce. Of course, you know the minute I walk out of here I'll think of something else.

AP: That's fine. Make a note of it and we can get back at another time too.

GB: I certainly will. Incidentally, have you seen this little collection of letters from former [faculty] senate chairmen that Jim Cox put together a year or so ago?

AP: No.

GB: Well, it occurred to me...I was glancing through it. I ran across it in my files a day or so ago. It occurred to me then that it might be useful. Jim Cox, a few years ago, asked all former senate chairmen, beginning with Rulon Jeppeson who was the first chairman, to submit a little note or recollection of what went on during his tenure [in the faculty senate]. It occurred to me that it might be useful. I think Jim is retired. I don't know whether he gets to the campus or not.

AP: I've seen him on campus before.

GB: You might ask him about it.

AP: He was in forestry?

GB: No, he was partly a chemist and partly education. He taught chemistry. I don't know what he was, whether he was in chemistry or education. Anyway, if you don't make contact with him, or find it somewhere else, I'll be glad to lend it.

AP: Oh, that would be great!

GB: As I say, it is interesting. Most of the former senate chairmen responded, there were several who did not for one reason or another. If you glance through it you can see how each of the chairmen of the faculty senate observed what was going on during his tenure. Again, different people have different perceptions of things, but take a look at it. It's not very long. If you can't find a copy, give me a call, and I'll send you this one.

AP: Okay, that would be great. Thank you very much.

[End of Interview]