

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: 408-021
Interviewee: Gordon Browder
Interviewer: David Brooks
Date of Interview: July 27, 2006
Project: University of Montana Oral History Project

David Brooks: It's May 23, 2006, and I'm David Brooks, the interviewer for the University of Montana's Oral History Project. Today I am interviewing Mr. Gordon Browder, who was a long-time professor and chair of the Sociology Department at the university. Mr. Browder, thanks for talking with us today and I'd like for you to start maybe by telling a little bit of your personal and academic background; what brought you to Missoula in the first place?

Gordon Browder: Okay, I graduated as an undergraduate from the University of Virginia in 1936 as an English major. I started graduate work in sociology at the University of North Carolina in the fall of 1936, even though I had not had any background in sociology, but this was in the middle of the Depression of course and you seized what came along. North Carolina also contained a pretty good stipend, which I got. I got my master's degree in sociology in 1941 and a Ph.D. in 1943.

My first academic job was at the University of Texas. I was a member of the faculty of the sociology, sociology faculty there until I went into the army in 1943. When I came out of the service I took a temporary job at the University of Florida as a favor to a friend of mine who was not able to get out of the service and pick up his duties at Florida. I stayed at the University of Florida for two years.

In 1947 I had a call from the president's office at The University of Montana asking me if I'd be interested in applying for a job at Missoula. I said I would be and the upshot of it was that I did accept the position here as professor of sociology and chairman of the department. I and my family came to Missoula in the winter of 1948; not a good time to come to Montana from Florida, I'd say, especially because it was a particularly hard winter. At any rate I came here in 1948 and I've been here ever since.

When I first came, the Sociology Department as a separate entity was new. Sociology, of course, had been taught as part of the economics curriculum in the Department of Economics. A new department was set up that included sociology, anthropology, and social welfare. For several years we operated as a three-major department. A bit later social welfare split off and formed a Department of Social Work, which I believe now is called the School of Social Work. A year or so after that anthropology split off and formed the present Anthropology Department. So, what began as three different academic areas eventually ended in three differently administered departments and as far as I know has remained like that ever since. With that sort of a beginning then I embarked on a career that kept me at the University of Montana for the next 30 years.

DB: You mentioned moving from being an English major to a sociology major and then shortly thereafter, we see the University of Montana develop a specific sociology, anthropology, and social welfare department out of the Economics Department. What was it about that time in the nation during the Depression that also was present in Missoula that was making those changes happen so that you personally would change fields and the university would move in that direction?

GB: Of course, all over the country universities were growing after the war; enrollments were growing pretty rapidly in those days. I think that the social sciences, which really had not had a great deal of emphasis during the war years, began to generate a good bit more interest and concern around the country. It was sort of a natural function, I suppose, of growth and development not only here but at other universities too. The growth in all three of these areas that I mentioned was quite substantial in the years after the war. Even though I've been retired now for almost 30 years, I gather that they still, all three areas, are still attractive to students, enrollments have stayed high.

As far as my change in academic areas was concerned I suppose that if in 1936, when I graduated from the University of Virginia, somebody had come along and offered me a nice fellowship to do graduate work in an English department somewhere I certainly would have taken it, but I wasn't so fortunate. Somebody did come along and offered me a substantial fellowship to do graduate in sociology and so I took it. I certainly wouldn't like to leave the impression on anybody that was cavalier, or what was cavalier in those days, which academic department I was in; I'd have preferred to stay in English if I'd a chance to do so. I think that anybody who grew up and remembers the Depression years would realize that it was a certain—oh, how should I put it—a certain opportunism. You sort of seek or seize the best thing that came along, especially if you didn't have any money and you'd just graduated from a university. I guess that is not a very satisfactory answer, but I think it is fairly honest as far as I'm concerned.

DB: It certainly makes sense. Could you talk a little bit about when you moved into sociology what your research interests, or pursuits were, and then how you brought those into the University of Montana to start this new department?

GB: Well I was trained mostly as a graduate student in quantitative sociology. That is a particular field, hard to imagine, it was population study, demography. I did my graduate research in population and wrote my master's thesis and dissertation, both were concerned with demographic data. I brought that same emphasis to Montana. However, when you are starting a brand new department and there are certain courses that have to be offered and you have a limited faculty to cover them, then everybody teaches not necessarily what he would prefer to teach, but what he can teach. There was a good bit of that here at Montana in the early days.

One of the areas that sort of picked up along the way was criminology. It so happened that there was a good bit of interest in criminological and correctional matters in the state at that time. So, I gravitated to that area and liked it, sort of took to it, and during my teaching career in the department, criminology and corrections, penology, criminal justice got to be one of my major areas. I did a good bit of work in those fields. I have worked at the prison for a while in the educational program over there. For 18 years or so I was chairman of the State Board of Crime Control. So criminology sort of became my main interest here at Montana.

DB: So did it also become a major emphasis of the department as a whole?

GB: Yes.

DB: Who was the original faculty? What was the curriculum that you started with and soon thereafter built on?

GB: Originally, we had two or three courses in criminal justice. The introductory course in criminology—cut that off for a minute, I need some water.

[Break in audio]

GB: Well, when I got here, I don't remember all of the courses specifically. There was an introductory course in criminology, there was an introductory course in juvenile delinquency, and I think that was about it. The courses were expanded as we became a separate department and got additional staff. We added courses then in the general area of criminology. They attracted a lot of students. Eventually we developed a strong emphasis on social injustice, criminal justice areas in the department. Although you'd want to check this out for yourself, I think that now the department has something that probably corresponds to a pretty strong major in the criminal justice area; I have not kept up on the development of courses over there for a long time so I don't know for sure but my impression is that's the case.

The good bit of interest is still maintained. Even before I retired a lot of the students took sociology with this criminology emphasis because they wanted to go into such careers as probation / parole officers, or correctional officers in penal institutions and things. We did turn out a lot of people that went into those particular types of jobs.

DB: Why do you suspect that was the interest of students and then obviously of the department, here in Montana you mention that it was popular in the state.

GB: I suppose it was pretty general. My—this might sound a little shallow, but anything with crime or sex in it is going to be attractive not only to university students, but to the population at large. I think one reason why students sort of flocked to the criminology courses was because crime is sort of a romantic concept. You know you like to read about murders and rapes and arsonists and that sort of thing. That might not be forever, but—

DB: It makes the news.

GB: Yeah. I could say the same thing about a course in courtship and marriage that we had for many years; I don't know if it is still being taught or not. That also attracted students. The courses were quite large; even in my day would run sometimes to 100 people in a course. I think that the subject matter was attractive. I never had the impression that the academic substance of the course was nearly as seductive as the idea that you got to look at pictures of the reproductive organs of men and women. You might not want to include that, but—

DB: So, you know you are talking about post-war years and early '50s and the student body; can you talk a little bit about the student body at that time and how much of it was the growth about the G.I. Bill, people coming back from the war? How much you know, if you have a course on courtship and marriage, how much of your student body was women at the time, or increasingly so?

GB: Well, I don't know. I couldn't give you anything near an exact breakdown, but certainly there were a lot of women students not only in that course but in sociology courses generally. Because we had the social work emphasis later, the separate sociology department, social work students took sociology courses as sort of a basis and background for their later professional training. We always had at least 50 percent, and my guess is more women enrolled in courses than men. I think that was probably true up and down the line with all of the courses.

As far as the general student body, I was very much impressed with university students coming back to school after the war. I think some of the best students I ever had at the University of Florida were returning veterans and then the same thing was true when I got here. I thought the returning veterans made almost ideal students because they were pretty serious about being able to get into college, or to be back in college. They were very conscientious, just very, very satisfying students to have from an instructor's point of view. I felt that as the body of veterans of ex-World War II people began to diminish, that somehow the quality, this might be an unfair evaluation, but somehow the quality of my students wasn't quite as substantial or as solid as it was early on.

DB: You link that to them being older students, or having the war experience?

GB: They were older, exactly, they were older. They had had the war experiences behind them. They, I don't know whether they attained more maturity during the war years than they would have if they hadn't gone to war, but they seemed more mature. They seemed more concerned with the substance of things. They really wanted to get as much as they could out of that university and college experiences. From that standpoint they were very satisfactory students.

DB: Do you recollect any specific examples to illustrate that of student projects, or individual students' relationships you had, or in the course you taught?

GB: Well no, not specifically so much. It was really more like sort of an atmosphere that surrounded students generally. The returning veterans seemed to have an influence even on those people who were not veterans. There were enough of them so that they formed sort of a core group of serious people who were sort of no-nonsense; they didn't come to the university to play, they came to the university to get what they could out of it. That seemed to sort of filter to a certain extent into other students. Again from my standpoint it was sort of a different sort of student culture that was characterized by a more serious concern with what they were doing; less interest in the byproduct of the university, the having fun aspects of the university. I don't suppose that we've ever had that particular sort of student culture in our schools before and I started to say I hope we don't have the circumstances that produce it again, but who knows about that? There will undoubtedly be a lot of Iraqi War veterans coming back, but we don't know about that.

DB: The students who weren't as interested in the, as you say, byproducts, or entertainment aspects of college or university life at the time, were there any unique organizations or activities that arose because of that different demographic?

GB: I can't think of any. The first instance that I can recall of a change and it was brought about by a different attitude and a different set of values was the influence of the, what we call sometimes the 'hippie' generation. That did cause very, very visible, palpable changes in the social structure of the campus population. In the behavior—it is true that here in Montana we never had the very serious trouble with the rebellion against authority and destruction of campus property, that sort of thing. I guess the most serious, at least the most spectacular example we had was when a group of students captured the ROTC headquarters; you probably know all about that. They burned some document, I don't think they did a great deal of damage, but it was pretty spectacular for Montana. The president addressed them from the steps of Main Hall and it really wasn't anything compared to the student uprisings at Columbia University, or some of the California schools, but it was pretty rich stuff for Missoula and the University of Montana. There was a definite change in the character of the place.

A little personal anecdote, I had a friend who had been to the university many years before and had been in the military and was a very patriotic individual. We were walking across the campus to lunch one day and a student with long dirty looking hair hanging down to his shoulders, dressed in an old army field jacket which still had stars and stripes on the shoulder, on the sleeves. This chap practically went through the roof when he saw it. This was absolutely against every value system he had; it was unpatriotic, demeaning to the military, it was as bad as burning the flag. Whenever this particular individual saw a person like that, and there were a good many of them on the campus back in the '70s, then he had same sort of attitude. So, there was enough of the hippie attitude that it became injected into the local situation, so that some people got pretty upset about it.

DB: How about in the faculty? You went off into the army and then returned to the academic world. How about other faculty on campus and what effect did that have both in faculty leaving and then as they came back from the war?

GB: I don't think that particularly important impact. There were some faculty members who were certainly much more sympathetic to the rebellious spirit of a lot of students. Some faculty members sort of identified themselves with students in more extreme circumstances. Some of the younger faculty members actually began to emulate the dress of the hippie, or so-called hippies too. But, my recollection is that by and large it didn't really affect the faculty very much.

One member of my own department came to the university here from one of the California schools because he got tired of the uprisings and the cutting of class and the general, what he thought of as, misbehavior of the student in the California school. He was impressed by how quiet things were around here; how docile and non-rebellious the student body seemed to be. But, I don't think the faculty was affected much. It certainly didn't have any impact on my department in terms of the faculty or the students. Things went on pretty much as usual during the hippie years. I had a son at Columbia University at the time the worst of the student uprisings there took place and then they simply closed down the whole university for a period of time; called in the riot police. And you know things were pretty quiet here.

DB: And why was the University of Montana isolated from that extreme reaction do you suspect?

GB: Well, I don't know. Maybe it is, as you said, isolated. Maybe it is physical, relative, physical isolation might have had something to do with it. Maybe the fact that we were comparatively small, maybe there simply was not the core of student leadership, insurgency type of leadership on the campus. I don't know. It is a little hard really looking back on it to judge why things didn't get more disrupted in the end. Other people might have a different impression of it, but from where I sat and my own recollections, I certainly don't recall any serious trouble. Students cut class or get drunk, but they got drunk anyway. A bunch of them descend on the ROTC corps, but that was pretty small potatoes compared to what was going on in other parts of the country.

DB: To rewind a little bit there is something I've heard about the '50s in terms of being sort of an intellectual revolution that largely came out of the study of sociology and how that intellectual revolution was sort of a critique of the suddenly booming middleclass in post-war affluence. It brings to mind works like William White's *The Organization Man* or John Kenneth Galbraith's *The Affluent Society*, *The Lonely Crowd*, books like that that really came out of the study of sociology. How much of that was an influence on the department here? How much of that did you absorb and became a part of the curriculum, or student interests?

GB: Undoubtedly individual faculty incorporated as much or as little of that particular sort of material as they chose too. I taught one course for a while called Formal Organizations. I found

some of that material very useful. *The Organization Man*, for example, was a fairly colorful example you could use in class as to how a particular sort of organizational structure tends to produce certain personality types that go down to even how people dress, whether they wear neckties to work and so on. Yeah, sociology certainly, well sociologists, wrote some of that material and certainly other sociologists used it. I don't think that it represented a major trend, or major emphasis in the field of sociology, but it certainly was useful and quite appropriate for certain courses. There was a good bit of that sort of material coming out in those days.

DB: How did that sort of material reverberate with students who were at a relatively geographically isolated university like the University of Montana, a somewhat small rural western community when these works are about suburbanization and the interstate highways and large corporations?

GB: Yeah I suspect that at the time and I can think it is probably correct that for a lot of students it really wasn't very realistic. They did not come out of a background, or had not had the sort of experiences that would bring them in contact with that type of social organization. I mean what in the world would talking about a bureaucratic structure like General Motors, for instance, mean to most Montana people? Don't get me wrong, I don't mean that they couldn't read about it and understand it and absorb it, but as far as any personal impact on them I think it was probably minor.

I used to use in my Complex Organizations course a number of examples of what we call bureaucratic structures and any major assumes that sort of structure in which leadership at the top filters down. As you come down the ladder there get to be more and more people involved and so on. Well I would take the military as an excellent example; the Catholic Church would be another good example of a bureaucratic structure in another area, and large industrial organization, dozens of them, of course, in our society. I think that by taking specific examples of that type of social organization that it made it more meaningful to students than if you just tried to talk about it in general terms because most people even from Montana have some notion of how military is put together. I could use the university itself as an example of a structure like that, so they didn't have a problem with it.

DB: How, later as the department grew, were you trying to shape it in a certain way, or move it toward something, say having a graduate department, certain number of students, what would the research emphasis be if that came about, and what successes did you have? Who were your allies in getting there, who opposed it?

GB: After the three areas in the original department each went its separate way, then sociology, which was my concern, began to develop a shape and a direction that led more and more toward an emphasis on graduate work. We were from the beginning essentially an undergraduate teaching department. As we got more people in then we got more research interests represented and we got people who were actually doing research. Dr. Ray Gold, for

example just last year or so published a book on some of the work that he did and he is working on another book now.

More and more graduate-level activities came about as more and more faculty people got out in the field and actually gathered data and wrote them up and so on. So our graduate program began to grow. At one point we were listed by the American Sociological Society as one of the five best, however they defined it, master's programs in the country; we had an excellent master's program. Then the administration got interested, I mean the university administration, got interested in building up a graduate level activities in general across the campus. It began to encourage different disciplines to move more in the graduate education direction.

As far as we were concerned in Sociology we were asked—well I guess we were required—to try to put together a Ph.D. program. History had the same mandate from the administration. While I wasn't privy to all of the thinking of Main Hall on this matter I know that one of the stimulating concerns was the fact that Bozeman was beginning to strengthen its graduate level work. At any rate, we were told in Sociology and the people in History were told, and there were other departments involved, to begin to think about a Ph.D.-level program, and we did.

Obviously, we didn't have the resources at the university to support a Ph.D. program; they are expensive. If you're going to get good students at that level you've got to have something to attract them and that means you have to have either fellowships, or attractive working jobs, teaching, or graduate assistants, or research assistants and that requires a lot more money than the university had to put into it. The only way we had to go was to see if we could wrangle some money somewhere.

We put together a training grant request and submitted it to Washington to the—I'm not sure what they call this specific arm of the Health, Education, and Welfare—but at any rate we put together this grant request and they liked it in Washington. They got together a visiting committee of some of the outstanding people in criminal justice; we were going to emphasize the criminal justice area and now our Ph.D. work. The committee came out and examined the place, interviewed people, and liked what they saw. The upshot was we got a very generous grant. I don't remember what the exact figure—several million dollars and we were able then to build up a library and hire additional staff, and develop some attractive jobs for people coming in; teaching assignments and research assistants and so on.

The upshot was that it was a pretty good program and we turned out probably about six Ph.D.s before our grant ran out. The trouble with these grants is that they don't have permanent lives. The university, if it wanted the program to continue, would have to pick it up itself and there was no way the university was going to do that. The Ph.D. program lasted, I suppose, all together about five years. We got an extension and more funds for our grant, training grant so that people who were in the program could finish. I think that we turned out five, maybe six Ph.D.s.

Interesting little aside, I have an email from one of my former graduate students in that program who has been teaching at Simon Fraser University the other day. He is going to be in town next week, next month. He said he would look me up, but at any rate we turned out good people and all of our Ph.D. students got jobs in respectable institutions. The one I mentioned went to Simon Fraser, one of them went to one of the Texas, University of Texas schools, one went to a research lab in Washington, another one went to a teaching job at the University of South Dakota, so it was a good program.

DB: What was it about the program that you suspect garnered it one of five best sociology departments and then before that won you the grant in the first place? And what were those Ph.D.s focused on, what was the emphasis?

GB: As I said our emphasis was on, for the Ph.D. level training, was on criminal justice area. So, we developed internship opportunities for student to go to the prison, or to some department of justice area, something like that. We developed a good field work program to give them practical experience and it was attractive, I think, from that point of view. We had some very excellent people on the faculty, well very good, the best we could find. I think that just a combination of factors.

It was small, of course, and that's an attractive feature for a lot of people. If the graduate program is too big the individual student feels sort of lost. Here everybody worked closely with all the students and that helped, so it had some good features. Of course when the federal money ran out there was no way that we could continue it. Maybe it is just as well. The thing that has pleased me is that it was very successful while it was working and I'd much rather see it terminate when adequate support is gone than try to struggle on with inadequate resources.

DB: You were also involved in a number of other things on the campus besides just the sociology department. You spent time in Main Hall as well, away from being the chair of the sociology department. One thing I would like you to talk a bit about is your participation on the Bolle Committee; what exactly that was, when it happened.

GB: Yeah, well the Bolle Committee was set up—here is a lot of material I am going to turn over to you because there is a too much to try to cover. But, it was set up at a time when there was a great deal of unhappiness around the country about some of the practices of the Forest Service, some of the timber harvesting practices. There were two national forests that were particularly the focus of criticism. One was a national forest in West Virginia and the other one was the Bitterroot National Forest here.

The congressional delegation from Montana, Senator Metcalf particularly, was interested in having some research done on what the Forest Service was doing and whether there was something to be concerned about and whether there were better ways, and so on. So, Congress appointed this committee, which had a long name, a special committee for the blah, blah, blah.

It was known as the Bolle Committee because Arnold Bolle, who was a forestry professor at that time, was chairman.

Of the members of the committee there were seven of us all together: Bolle, chairman; Dick Behan of the forestry department, Les Pengelly, who was—you probably know about him from—he was in wildlife; Bob Wambach, who was associate dean of forestry then; Tom Payne in political science; Dick Shannon, who was jointly appointed in economics and forestry; and myself. We spent a lot of time in the Bitterroot looking at the land; flying over it and walking through it. A meeting with the people who were on the ground, on the cutting edge of the forestry business in that area, and we identified some particular problems.

One of them was clear cutting and to people of the Bitterroot this might seem kind of minor, but if you lived down in the valley and you look up at the mountainside you don't want to see a lot of bare stuff up there. This is a time when the Forest Service considered clear cutting one of its major tools. There are times when clear cutting is the best way to go, but anyway that was one of the things that made the locals unhappy.

Another point that we made was that local managers in the Forest Service, and district rangers didn't have enough control over their own activities. This stuff that I will give you largely is on that. There were several more areas of that sort that we identified and made some recommendations about. Naturally it caused a lot discussion. A lot of the old-time forestry people in particular were unhappy about it. They were particularly unhappy about bringing in people from social sciences to tell them how to run their business, which we weren't trying to do at all.

It was a lot of activity and lots of meeting and lots of travel to the Bitterroot. Finally we issued a report, a report on the Bitterroot National Forest and I thought I had a copy of the report as it was printed—appeared I guess in the Congressional Record, I am not sure. Anyway there is a copy in the archives. It was written up in a number of magazines; there is one example in here. It was considered to be a pretty important thing at the time because it did force people to take another look at resource management. Even professional foresters can make mistakes and they do have to recognize that change comes about and if they are going to survive and people are going to be happy with them they have to change themselves, and this sort of thing, sociological stuff you might call it.

It seemed to have been pretty effective. I don't know how you measure the actual impact of this sort of things, but I think that people in the Bitterroot are happier now with the way the Forest Service is operating and I think that as time has gone on that the Forest Service people have begun to realize that they might know more about managing forests than anybody else, but they have a people-management problem too and they are aware of that now. I think it had some salutary effects. It was very interesting, one of the most interesting things I ever got involved in.

DB: How did you get involved in—and I suppose Tom Payne as well from political science department—how from those departments were you grouped with these five other people that were involved in wildlife and forestry?

GB: I don't know who made the final decisions. Some of us had been working for several years with a school that used to be given on the campus in the months of January and February called School for Administrative Leadership that brought in some 30 or 40 middle-management-level people from resource management agencies: the Forrest Service, the BLM, the Soil Conservation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and so on. So, that I, Dick Shannon and Tom Payne who worked with this school, had some credibility, if I can put it that way, already with resource management people. They knew who we were and what we represented. My guess is that when the time came for whoever made the decisions back in Washington they, whoever made the decisions or talked to Lee Metcalf, or maybe people on the campus said, "Who do you have that you'd suggest?" and we got recommended.

I mean it could have been five other people but it ended up with us and the group worked well together. The Forest Service people who, even though we were tough on them sometimes, were very cooperative. It was a good experience. I think it did a lot of good so I am going to give you this and when you are through with it, if you want to give it to archives, do so.

DB: How did the university as a whole, or the administration, or Main Hall view this committee, which I assume was primarily in the study—

GB: Yeah, yeah, these were all academic people.

DB: —that clearly would be viewed by a lot as fairly activist.

GB: Yeah, I suppose so. Although I don't remember that there was ever any particular point made of that. I sensed, and I guess all of us did, that here was a group of experts, professionally trained people who were doing a day-by-day job of managing resources. Here was a bunch of college people over here who fooled around in outer space and really don't know much about practical aspects. You could sense sometimes that this professionally trained group was a little suspicious of us academicians. But, all of us had been working with resource management people for a good many years and we had a pretty honest give and take relationship with them and they with us. So it really wasn't as much of the suspicion as you seem to be suggesting. There was some of it, no question about it.

We had, I guess the Society of American Foresters, a local chapter, after the Bolle report came out at a meeting here to discuss it. It was a well-attended meeting. We all—all of us who had been on the committee—turned up and there was some pretty frank, some pretty frank criticism from both sides and that was one of the most entertaining meetings I've ever attended because some of these old (inaudible) type foresters were pretty blunt in saying, what the hell is an economist doing on this committee, or sociologist, what does he know about it?

So we could come back and say, okay you might know how to saw down a tree, but you don't know much about what sawing down that tree means to these people in the valley, that sort of thing. It was a lot of fun.

DB: So you've mentioned this committee as well as the success of the somewhat brief Ph.D. program as some of the highlights of your time. In still being a resident of Missoula, going on 30 years since you have retired following a roughly 30-year career there, what do you see as some of your legacies that continue on in that department, or in the university? As well as some of the marks you made that are no longer there, that have disappeared in the intervening time?

GB: Oh, I wouldn't have any idea David, I really wouldn't. When I left the university, well before I left, I was in Main Hall for a couple of years. I believe my former department just went on fine. After I left Main Hall I remember all I wanted to do was to go fishing. That's what I did. So, my contacts with the university have been minimal, minimal. They have been very friendly, but I rarely get to the campus anymore and to tell you the honest to god's truth I don't know what's going on over there, except what I read in the *Missoulian*.

The department has done well. I don't know how many people it has now, more than it had when I was there, but it has done well. It had some very active members, some of whom were there when I was. Most of them have come since I left. I don't feel that I made any particular impact on it. If I were to take credit for anything I think it would be, looking at it from an administrative more than an organizational point of view, that I was able to work with my own people so that they formed a cohesive group. They got along well together. And, that all developed an interest in making the operation successful whatever we decided to do. That, I've been pleased by, but as far as having sent the department in any particular direction, no, I can't take any credit for that.

It was a good group of people who took what they did seriously and really had the concern, the interest of the university and the department at heart and it worked. So, all three of the departments that eventuated from this cocoon at the beginning have done well, each one has done well. I think the social board people are now training at the graduate level. I read about things that the anthropologists are doing, sounds good. It has done well and I've always been very pleased to have been a part of it, to have been there in the beginning and see this thing get off to sort of a shaky start at first, but do well.

DB: How about any final poignant, funny, interesting stories that you think about from time to time and would like to have remembered from your time there?

GB: Well, I don't know. One of the things that I did to the department's credit I think, I mentioned that I was chairman of the State Board of Crime Control for quite a few years. I think that there I may well have had some influence in getting our students in contact with people and agencies that could be helpful to them when they decided to go the criminal justice direction. I think that was a helpful thing and the same thing was true with the prison. I spent a

good bit of time over there and that doesn't sound so good. Again I formed some good relationships with the prison that got some of our graduate students some good research opportunities over there; thesis writing and that type of thing.

Looking back everything was a cooperative effort, I can't take an awful lot of credit for a great deal, but I did manage to hold it together and get things started, if that makes sense. Once the ball got rolling and the three departments developed each in its own way, then good, we were in business. So, it was a good 30 years; I enjoyed all of it.

DB: Well I appreciate you talking with me today about it. If there are any other things you would like to add—

GB: No, I would like to say good luck to you on this.

DB: Thank you.

GB: I happen to be a strong advocate of oral history. I think we do too little of it. We should be doing a lot more than we...we lose so much—

[Break in audio]

—one of the best interviewers I've ever seen, he—

[Break in audio]

—the department such as it was at the time had no office machines, it didn't have an adding machine, didn't have a calculator, all it had was a typewriter. So the first year I was here I put a budget together for my department, I put in for a calculator and an adding machine. Burley Miller who was head of the social sciences division at that time, he said, "Gordon you are wasting your time." He said, "Main Hall is not going to give you any money for that sort of stuff you don't need."

I said, "The hell we don't need it, Burley. I teach a course in population and I teach demographics and demographic statistics and that's got an adding machine at least"

"Well," he said, "You are not going to get it."

That was in the days when McFarland was president and budget conferences were always held in the president's office. So I went over and there was President McFarland and the business manager and me. The president had my budget request that had already gone in. I had my comments going over it, we got down to the (unintelligible) and "Adding machine! What does a sociologist do with an adding machine?"

I said, "Well Mr. President there are certain things that we study sometimes that we need to add up and we do accumulate data that needs to be analyzed."

"Oh, hum," he says. "And calculating machine," he says, "I suppose you are going to say you need one of these."

I said, "Well of course we do. We teach a course in statistics and how can I teach a course in statistics and talk about measures of central tendency if you don't have something you can calculate a mean on?" Well, he could see the logic in that and by god, I ended up...I got both of them.

DB: Great.

GB: Yeah, he gave me an adding machine, he gave me a calculator, and Burley Miller just couldn't believe it that the President did that. But, that was just an indication of how little the administration and I guess people generally knew about what was going on in the social science area. They knew about history and they knew about economics, but when you came to political science and sociology, and social psychology they didn't have much of a notion. So that was a small victory that I was always proud of; I got a purchase order and I was able to go down to an office supply place downtown and buy my two machines.

DB: And that was the start of it. Now everybody in the department has their own computer.

GB: Everybody has a computer on his desk and I retired...

DB: That's your legacy.

GB: I guess. Before I left I remember taking a course in Cobol, I don't even know whether they use Cobol on anything before for anything anymore. Anyway, we learned to write program in Cobol.

DB: That's quite a change.

GB: Yeah and I think maybe there were a half dozen PCs on the campus at the time and there was no university computer system. When they did get the central computer in they had to renovate the basement area of the social science building; you never saw so much machinery in your life. Unbelievable, of course this was back in the days of vacuum tubes. But, anyway, a lot of changes.

[End of Interview]