

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: 270-036, 037

Interviewee: Thomas Payne

Interviewer: Annie Pontrelli

Date of Interview: August 1, 1991

Project: University of Montana Centennial Oral History Project

Annie Pontrelli: This is Annie Pontrelli interviewing Dr. Thomas Payne on August 1, 1991...Hello, Tom, why don't you tell me the years you were at the University first of all and in what capacity and then we'll get some of those foundational bits of information out of the way and go on from there.

Thomas Payne: Well it's good to be talking with you Annie. I arrived at the University on September 17, 1951, as an instructor in political science. That was 40 years ago in September and I retired from full time teaching in 1985 to a part time status through 1990. I came as an instructor in political science and retired as a professor in political science. I spent most of my career as a professor.

AP: So you taught political science to all different ages and all different levels?

TP: Well, the first year I taught freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors and even a few graduate students. Generally in my later years I taught, my first class was a sophomore level class and I taught, usually, juniors, seniors and graduate students as well. My fields of interest were predominantly American politics, public administration, public policy, including specialties such as the budgetary process, and I had a sideline interest that I developed in Canadian politics, which was a course I developed in 1977.

AP: You developed that in 1977?

TP: Yes.

AP: Why don't you tell me more about that process you needed to go through?

TP: Well we decided that we needed to offer something on Canada, because Canada is the most significant trading nation with the United States, our neighbor to the north, very much like us. And in the department with what was and since I was in American politics and also had spent some in Britain and understood British politics, the theory was Canada was halfway in between so I should be the one to teach Canadian politics. So the process of developing, and I did a lot of reading, studied Canadian history, and took the summer of 1976 and toured Canada, checking in with state legislators and the national government in Ottawa for some time so that I got a fairly good feel for the situation and I traveled in Canada before, so it was not too difficult. Of course, it's a specialty where you have to learn some new language and new ideas but I enjoyed it very much.

AP: And how long did you teach that particular...?

TP: Well my last class and that was in 1986, in the spring of 1986. Unfortunately we had to give the class up temporarily because there was no one else on the staff who wanted to teach or could teach it at the time but happily one of my former students, Michael Lazlovich, has just joined the department and his degree is from the University of Carlton in Ottawa, Canada. So he is going to teach the class again so I am very happy with that.

AP: Because of the many years that you were there [University of Montana] you probably noticed a number of changes. Maybe you can comment on some of your observations when you first started teaching there and then some of the changes that perhaps you observed throughout the years you were there.

TP: Well, it's hard to visualize how the campus was when I first arrived for someone who wasn't around 40 years ago but it was a smaller campus so of course most of the buildings that are around now were not there in 1951. Student housing was then in something called the strip houses, adjacent to the then defunct golf course which was later revived as the University golf course. But nearby there were World War One or a World War Two-type, one story barracks that looked like mountaineer cabins as it were. This is where married students, graduate students and junior faculty who just arrived lived and this is where my late first wife, Katie and I lived the first year with our new son, David, who came with us from Chicago. We arrived in September, and we found one of those had been set aside for us. We had to do some improving on that in order to make it acceptable but it worked out fine.

The campus was markedly different in that there was a road around the oval that was closed much later. Van Buren bridge was open then, we didn't have a Madison-Arthur bridge and you could drive across the Van Buren bridge which is now a foot bridge and drive directly up to the campus and drive into the campus and go around the oval and actually I think there were a few students in the 1950s who parked their cars on one side of the oval and then drove around to the classes on the other side that seems impossible to think of now.

The general situation was quite different. There were about, there were about a little over 2,000 students then versus about 10,000 now. The faculty and the staff were about a third or a quarter of the size of the present faculty and staff. In those days I ended up feeling that everyone knew everyone, or got to know everyone. Of course, since I was new I made it my business to get acquainted with as many people as possible. My later years there were a lot of people on the faculty who I did not know but there were some vintage old timers around when I arrived who had been around at least 40 years themselves and now I have been here 40 years but people like Paul Phillips in History and...when I joined the department it was a combined history, political science department and Phillips had been around since 1911, so (unintelligible) and was kind of the grand old man of western history. He and I became pretty good friends during the few years he had left and he gave me an awareness and historical background of the state of its politics and so on. Which was very useful.

AP: Any other changes that you observed, maybe specifically with students; student attitudes, social attitudes, yeah I guess attitudes would be the best way to phrase it.

TP: Well when I arrived it was shortly after the end of World War Two around, there were still some veterans from World War Two around. Veterans typically, tended to be older, more conservative, more serious about what they were doing, and worked pretty hard. Students generally were students who enjoyed life, but fun was not as high a priority as it came to be later I think on the campus. There were more strict rules for women students in those days, as far as hours were concerned. This was before the "revolution," and women students during the week as I recall it would be in by 11 o'clock. There were always chaperones at dances. My wife and I were invited occasionally to chaperone student dances and events and were frequently invited to sororities and fraternities for dinner which gave us a chance to get to know students. That closeness, I think, no longer exists, there is now a feeling that students are mature and that we are no longer at the University en locus parentis, in other words we are no longer, responsible for the students in a personal way. That relationship has changed somewhat in that respect. It is still possible to be on close terms with students but the relationship is quite, somewhat different. It was more traditional in those days and by the mid 1960s it was evolving in to a much more unstructured relationship.

AP: Now In the '60s, of course there was the Vietnam War going on and in the early '70s. Were there some observations or certain incidents that you remember during those tumultuous years?

TP: Well actually our campus was relatively peaceable. Early on there was not a real opposition to the war. It began to develop after the war began to escalate in the mid-1960s. As late as 1967 I had introduced then a new class called voting behavior, which we did some early polling, before public opinion polling was as prevalent in Missoula. I had my students go out and introduce. One of the questions was: How people felt about the Vietnam War? I found as late as 1967 that there was within Missoula, among voters, some substantial support for the war and campus was relatively calm. Gradually, later on, in the later 60s there were some teach ins, expressions of opposition to the war, culminating in the protest of 1970 over having ROTC on campus. The president at that time was Robert Pantzer and he did, I thought, an excellent job of keeping the situation cool by trying to listen to the students and being a negotiating posture rather than a negative, authoritarian posture so that we avoided some more of the...no buildings were bombed or burned out. There were no really serious revolutionary disturbances other than the famous 1970 confrontation over ROTC which still is on campus but of course is now optional there's the more (unintelligible). It was required for freshman and sophomore males at that time, so that's changed quite a bit.

AP: You mentioned Bob Pantzer and certainly there were other presidents who were working for the administration, can you comment about some of those presidents and what you recall about them and what their style was like and what their administration was like?

TP: Well I arrived the same year that Carl McFarland became president. Carl McFarland was a distinguished administrative lawyer who was wealthy because of fees he had earned in Washington. Was someone I already heard of before I came here because of some significant research that he had done, which made national attention, which gained national attention, so he was a person of considerable stature on campus, a former student and very well respected early on. He tended to be authoritarian in style and then at times would be fairly arbitrary. But generally he was respected by the faculty and worked very hard for the University in his particular way. Unfortunately he was inclined to become rather difficult sometimes with the Board of Education. (Unintelligible) had the Board of Regents to deal with and in 1958 he said "If you don't do such and such I am going to resign," or something to that affect and they accepted his resignation. I would describe him as an authoritarian in style.

He was succeeded by Harry Newburn under whom we developed some of the faculty government institutions, including the Faculty Senate. As a member of the budget and policy committee, a forerunner of the executive committee of the senate, I worked very hard to help draft the constitution by which the Faculty Senate now operates, and was a member of the senate for the first four years of its existence. So we had an elective body of the faculty that could deal directly with the president and asserted the faculty's authority and Henry was very good with things of this sort. Subsequently of course we've had the staff senates and other devices that didn't exist before. I'm happy to say I was involved in the committee that finalized the draft of the first Faculty Senate proposal. As far as I know that constitution is still in effect with some modest changes. So I think that was an important change. I found Harry Newburn to be a, probably of the eight presidents I've known, probably the in some ways the ablest administrator, but in those days the faculty was rather badly split and those who liked McFarland didn't especially like Newburn. Many of them had problems, opponents found him very unacceptable. Fortunately I was able to deal with both men to the extent that it was necessary, but I had closer dealings with Newburn because I was more involved in campus leadership politics during the Newburn era than I had been doing in the McFarland era.

The president whom I found least acceptable was Robert Johns who succeeded President Newburn in 1963. Johns was around for three years. He did some fairly good things like getting the area where Dornblaser field is, changed for a University student center and also for a library. But in the process of doing so he alienated many alumni by deliberately burning down the bleachers in Dornblaser field, things of this sort. Those were rather explosive moments. He was probably the most arbitrary, autocratic and generally disliked of our eight presidents as far as I can recall.

He was succeeded by Bob Pantzer who was well liked. I never felt that Bob significantly addressed some of the problems of the campus, but he was generally respected and got along well with faculty and students and was probably the best liked and remembered of the presidents. So those are the first four presidents.

Pantzer was followed in 1974 by Dick Bowers, who was president until 1981 and then we had Neil Buck for about four or five years and Jim Koch came in 1986 and George Dennison came in 1990 so that's that. Incidentally, the last president, George Dennison was a student of mine in the early 1960s and incidentally was a very good student, one of the best students that I've had on campus. Back in those days he was in one class in which there were about, as I look back over the records, about 37 students in the room and three As in the class. He was one of the three As. I don't know if he would be embarrassed if I said this or not but I had no idea then that I was giving an A to a future president of the University of Montana, but I'm glad I selected one that was highly qualified as it turned out.

AP: What lead you to University of Montana and to Missoula?

TP: Well, after my undergraduate education in Missouri at a small college called Westminster I served four years in the military in World War Two in the Air Force as a non-flying, photo-intelligence officer, ending up with the Twentieth Air Force on Guam. During the war I met my late, first wife Katie and we had agreed during the war that as soon as the war was over I would go to graduate school, and I chose a school, which I wished to attend, which was the University of Chicago, which was, in the mid-west, generally regarded one of the best schools. Fortunately Chicago was willing to accept me and she was willing to work some while I was in graduate school which helped a great deal. I had a couple of years teaching at the University of Tennessee while I was working on my doctorate. In 1951, I was finishing my doctorate in Chicago and looking for a job and the late Earl Miller after whom Miller Hall is named who was then chairman of the history of the political science came to Chicago. He was on a recruiting mission through the Midwest and my chairman in Chicago said that there was a gentleman from Montana at the (unintelligible) who would like to talk with any Chicago political scientist. He specifically wanted to see me and two or three others that he was interested in. He felt maybe it might be worth my while to go down and see him so I went down and I met Earl. I was very taken with him. He seemed a very personable, grand old man in the older tradition and was very concerned about the virtues of my coming to Montana. He talked in terms of my interest rather than just a recruiter's interest. He said if you come to Montana—he made a very good promise—he said, "You'll never get rich, but you will never starve to death." I have had a number of opportunities to move elsewhere since 1951, but I've, after much soul searching decided to stay in Montana. I've been very happy about that choice.

I must say however that the salary situation for faculty relative to the national situation was much better when I came in 1951 than it became later on. In the late '60s and early '70s we began a gradual process of falling behind. Until then we were relatively competitive with peer institutions. But from about the late '60s for the next 20 years we gradually lost a little bit every year in terms of our standing so that after the early '70s about the best one could hope for was just to keep up with the cost of living and of course, that's a period when inflation developed. The '50s and early '60s were low inflation periods and high productivity periods for the American economy: periods of prosperity for Montana. But Montana entered in the '70s and

'80s, a much more austere period and the faculty and University, I think, felt that we're just trying again to catch up with the situation.

AP: Do you remember what your first observations were about Missoula and about the university? I mean there must have been a lot of mixed emotions when you first arrived, I would think.

TP: Well Missoula was a little different city to me. I had grown up in small town in Missouri, but I lived in Chicago for a number of years and had been away from Missouri for ten years in military service and so on and I really didn't know what to expect. On the way to Missoula we drove in our 1950 Pontiac, which was our first car. We had saved money through graduate school, we didn't need a car in Chicago so we had a relatively new car and on the way to Missoula we read A.B. Guthrie's Novel, *The Way West* so that was our introduction to Montana, traveling along the way. And I was reflecting that people in *The Way West* did not have motels in which to stop every night along the road.

So when I arrived in Missoula it, of course, was different than it is. The 93 strip was just barely beginning to develop. There was a Safeway store and a bank near, north of South Avenue. The Tremper's shopping center, and Holiday shopping center and the Southgate Mall obviously weren't around in that period. Downtown Missoula was still real significant. Every faculty member had a charge account at the Missoula Mercantile which was then locally owned. It's now called the Bon. It's part of a chain but it was a family business. Faculty carried large charge accounts traditionally with tolerance by the firm. Most faculty dealt with the old First National Bank which was then headed by Ted Jacobs. A good friend of the University, was Jacobs' family. It's subsequently, of course, become part of the First Interstate Bank chain, so it's not quite the small, folksy bank it was 40 years ago. I was able to get a loan for the first house we bought in 1952. After living one year in the strips and my wife was expecting her second child in October 1952, so we decided we should buy a house and we were venturing out to edge of town on Sentinel and Lester which is in the Lewis and Clark area. The Lewis and Clark School had not been built. Fairviews had very few houses on it. The South Hills had not developed. The enormous development of places like Miller Creek and the Rattlesnake, there were very few houses in the Rattlesnake. The first time I drove up the road it was still pretty much a rural area. Of course it now has several thousand people and is now a part of the city of Missoula, but it was unthinkable 40 years ago that this was anything but a rural, semi agricultural area.

The few places that were there are still at the same place like the Missoula First Federal Savings and Loan, the Bon was the Missoula Mercantile. First Interstate Bank had an older building there. There was a Fox theater which has been torn down. The Wilma was going strong in those days. The Florence Hotel was then—the Florence Building—was then a nice hotel, one of the best hotels and the place to eat in downtown Missoula. Believe it or not, the Dairy Queen on the corner of Beverly and Higgins was there 40 years ago. I can't think of a lot of other places that were quite the same. I think the Smith Drugstore was still, on the corner of Higgins and Broadway, as it is, but most other things that I can think of have changed considerably since

then. Those are some that I was trying to think of that I could remember. I'm sure I could think of a lot of others that were. Because there's obviously some other businesses that have been around. The 4-Bs had one restaurant in Missoula on west Broadway. They had one restaurant in Deer Lodge and [were] developing a restaurant in Helena. That was the size of the 4-Bs chain that's grown to be a significant restaurant chain in the Northwest part of the country. It has several restaurants in Missoula but had only one in 1951.

Most people in 1951 traveled by train. Flying did not become very prevalent out of Missoula County Airport until later, until the mid 1950s. If you were going some place, to meetings or something like this, you took either the Northern Pacific at the north end of town or the Milwaukee, there were two trains a day each way for each line. If you can imagine four passenger trains, east bound and west bound in 1951. So there are none at all, the only train crossing Montana now is Amtrak which goes through Whitefish as the nearest point of access. But air travel for the average person in the early '50s was almost unthinkable.

AP: What were some of the rules, the regulations, some of the social standards while you were here, things that maybe they wouldn't do now a days? And one thing you mentioned was how the females were expected to be back in by 11 o'clock at night. Were there some other rules or regulations such as those?

TP: Well I think until the mid- to late '50s women students were not allowed to wear trousers or slacks on campus. Jeans were still in the future as far as uniform of attire. I'm trying to think. There was a woman dean of students, Dean Maurine Clow, whom I got to know very well and that was a very significant part of activity. Women were referred to in those days as girls, more girls than boys kind of description or situation.

One thing that I remember from the early '50s was that, at least in my department, it was well established that if a professor, and all members of the department were then men, we had 11 faculty members of history-political science, we became a separate department in 1959 from history, but whenever you saw a woman student in your office you always had the door open. Earlier, one faculty member had been slandered; a male faculty member had been slandered by a woman student. Probably the first case in the history of Missoula of sexual harassment. He later successfully won reinstatement, he was suspended from the faculty for some time and so the tradition was well established that you were very careful and very cautious about relations with students. There was no such thing as a, there probably weren't, if there were any rapes or anything of this sort we never heard anything about it. There wasn't, I was not aware of any harassment then but there was really no discrimination against women but they were a smaller part of the student body, about two-thirds of the students were men and about one-third were women.

Political science was a department in which there were not a lot of women students. The thought that women might go to law school or something came a lot later. Political science was basically a pre-law subject. I remember my first woman student who, whom I was able to

support for a graduate assistance-ship and graduate scholarship at another school, Dorothy McBride of Butte. And I went to bat for her very strongly at the Vanderbilt University School with which I derived some fairly good contacts. And [she] was able to get a faculty, a graduate fellowship at Vanderbilt, over the protest of some members who were convinced that if she came to Vanderbilt she would probably never finish or get married or something else. As it turned out she did finish, she was the first woman, that I knew well, to get a doctorate, although Joan Hoff, with whom I had some contact in the '50s was probably our first woman student in the social sciences to get a doctorate that I can think of at the moment. Joan Hoff Wilson is now a fairly distinguished historian and Dorothy McBride has continued in political science at Florida Atlantic and is fairly well known too. So I am very happy to have been involved in fostering the advancement of women on campus. I was very supportive of the appointment of our first woman faculty member in 1955, Barbara Teters, but she proceeded, a few years later, to marry one of the deans and we had a rule on nepotism, a husband and wife could not both be on the faculty, so she had to step aside at that time. Things have changed a great deal now you can, a married couple can, both have jobs on campus but that was—

[End of Tape 1, Side A]

[Tape 1, Side B]

AP: —regulations and rules, or did things kind of start relaxing around that time?

TP: I think things gradually began to relax in the 1960s. It's hard to describe it, but I think that the Kennedy era ushered in some of the (unintelligible). I remember the dress of women began to change. Some of them even had hairdos reminiscent of Jackie Kennedy's hairstyle in those days. They became much more conscious of dress and much more flexible. I can't remember when I first saw socks, but it was probably in the late 1950s when girls began to loosen up (unintelligible). That's one thing that escapes, escapes my memory. Still, the dances, of course, tended to be formal and women students generally wore, formal or evening dresses at dances. Some of the dances the men wore tuxedos. (Unintelligible) student social events.

There were a few big bands around in the 1950s for dances. The Student Union then was now part of the (unintelligible) on campus, and the University Theater was part of the first Student Union building out here. Later in the late 1950s, the Lodge replaced that building as the Student Union, and the Lodge was (unintelligible) in 1969 by the present University Center. I remember being present at the dedication of the present Student Union in 1969, when Senator Mark Hatfield came to Missoula and made the speech. As a matter of fact, my wife helped his wife, who liked hats, do some shopping at the old Missoula Mercantile. We were on a sabbatical in 1977. We went to Washington and ran into the Hatfields again, and they remembered very well their Missoula experience.

You can see the evolution of buildings. When I came in 1951, the present Social Sciences Building was the library. The Law School was in what is now environmental studies. The library moved in the 19...the early 1970s. I think about 1973 to its present location, and the former library became the Social Sciences Building.

AP: The Law Building is now the Psychology Building?

TP: The old Law Building, which originally was the old library, became later the Law Building —it was the Law Building when I left—became the Psychology Building and then became environmental studies. Psychology moved to the other side of campus when new a new science building was built in the 1970s.

Just keeping track of all these changes is almost a juggling act when you realize that the impact (unintelligible) much fewer buildings in those days. Business and education jointly shared the, what was the (unintelligible).

[mic movement]

TP: Business and education separated [in] the late '50s when education moved into the new Liberal Arts Building. Now happily, business, which is expanded a great deal, is getting a new

building as a result of the decision of the legislature in 1991. Forty years ago the Business Building seemed very new, and it seemed very adequate. As a matter of fact, the first class I ever taught on campus was in one of the classrooms in the Business Building and another classroom in 1951-52 was in the Journalism Building. We did not have our own classroom building until the mid-50s when the Liberal Arts Building was first finished. We moved there in 1955. The History and Political Science Departments have been in the Liberal Arts Building ever since.

AP: What did you like best about the University, Tom? I mean I know that's kind of a general question but, in your interpretation.

TP: I was reflecting on that the other day, a few weeks ago, with President George Dennison, and I told him that the thing I really liked about the University of Montana, for my 40-year association with it, was the complete freedom that I felt as a faculty person. I said, "No one ever gave me an order, as I can recall, in 40 years'. Of course, he was very kind, and he said, "Well, you probably were always doing what you were supposed to do anyway." Of course, you were expected to show up for classes. You had to teach something that you knew something about. You had to have office hours and be available for students, and you were expected to be fair and you were evaluated. Your promotions depended upon your research, your teaching and your public service, as they always have. So that there were forces that—peer pressure, I suppose—kept everybody behaving themselves.

I never really felt under any pressure at any time. I felt totally free to say whatever I wanted in class. Of course, to say things that were relevant to the class and not to talk about other things, but I felt very free in terms of hours of work. No one ever said, "You've got to be at your office at eight o'clock in the morning." It was up to me to figure out my schedule and negotiate with the departmental chairman on class schedules, but within the context of available resources, the University afforded its faculty maximum freedom. In the early years, I always felt...I was probably a minority in that my political philosophy was a little more conservative than many of my colleagues, but they tolerated me. Later on, of course, we obviously came closer together in our points of view. All kinds of diverse behavior...Not behavior, but thought, were welcome on campus, and we had some healthy and spirited disagreements over political issues and things of the sort, which I thought made it very enjoyable for me.

Very early in my involvement in university affairs, I—as a political scientist—was asked to comment on politics a great deal. I began to be occasionally interviewed on local radio stations, notably KGBO, when Don Weston was the news director for KBGO and his frequent guests commented on elections. A great many people in Missoula know me, as the guy who said things on radio and television about politics and are, of course, unaware of my other university career activities. This gave me some community visibility. I made my first political speech on television in 1956 when Missoula's first television station was just getting started, and the studio was on TV Mountain. We had to drive up to the top of TV Mountain in four-wheel-drive in order for me

to make the speech on behalf of Harriet Miller, who was a candidate for public instruction. That was in 1956 so that was the way television got its start in Missoula was things like that.

AP: You had mentioned some of the people who had made an impact on you, or were significant for whatever reason. Maybe you have some other thoughts?

TP: I think we had, in the 1950s and the early '60s, probably the best association of faculty. Not necessarily the largest but quality faculty that I have known. This is no reflection on subsequent people that the likes of Leslie Fiedler were around then, who was nationally known. He had a faculty room where coffee was available, where you could sit down and talk with the likes of Leslie Fiedler, who was well known around the country when I arrived in Chicago.

AP: Tell me more about Dr. Fiedler.

TP: He was a professor of English, and he was a very controversial person but extremely intelligent. One of the greatest lecturers we've ever had on campus, I think. Nationally known critic, well-known author, and very stimulating person to have around.

I could tell you one story about Fiedler and [Carl] McFarland. I don't know whether this is publishable or not, but during the McFarland era, departmental chairpersons as they are called now—then chairmen, we didn't use the word chairperson—were chosen through a process of departmental vote. The president had deemed...We came to the departmental meeting and the president looked at the ballots and then announced who was the chairman, as it were. It's kind of an election process once you saw the results. On this particular occasion to succeed—incidentally one of the other grand old men that I didn't mention earlier for whom I have infinite respect—Harold G. Merriam, who was retiring as a professor of English, and the departmental meeting was to choose a successor. As I recall the story, every man with one exception voted for Leslie Fiedler. McFarland didn't like Fiedler very much so he chose another person who received only one vote. This shows how arbitrary authoritarians can be at times. I remember some of us saying after hearing about that election, "Is this the new democracy on campus?" Things like this were known about fairly rapidly, and people felt free to comment and criticize and things of this sort so that, eventually, the English Department got it all sorted out. The person who was chosen was not very acceptable and lasted only a relatively short time.

In the '50s and early '60s, people like Merriam, Evan Marvin (?) in Philosophy. Schallenberger in Physics, Archie Murrell in Mathematics—I mentioned Philip, Tony Atkinson (?)—were some of the well-established, older people when I came. Some of them over the years are...people like Mel Redd and Oscar Hammond in History were a little older than I was. (unintelligible) but then he left the University in the 1960s (unintelligible).

I was the first chairman of the separate political science department in the late '50s, one of my great frustrations was being able to hold on to talented people in those days because the market was much better. It was more of a seller's market than a buyer's market. People like

(unintelligible) Wisconsin, (unintelligible) went to Georgetown and Washington and (unintelligible). We had other talented people briefly who left us for more alluring pastures at that time.

One thing I observed over the years about faculty personnel was that some of my friends who left Missoula and left the University discovered later on that they really wanted to come back. I was chairman for seven years before I asked to be relieved. I thought that five years was long enough for anybody to be department chairman, but it took a couple of extra years for me to give up the job. I spent all of my time telling people that had left and burned their bridges behind them why they couldn't come back because there was open (unintelligible). I learned that if you leave Missoula you might discover that you really want to come back. It's very difficult to come back a second time. It does happen occasionally, but quite a few people among my colleagues regretted leaving later on, which I thought (unintelligible).

I don't mean to imply that there weren't a lot of talented people later. We had people like (unintelligible). English for example, here for a while we had people like Richard Hugo, the poet, well known much later. He and I became pretty good friends. The sciences has always had their share of talented people. I didn't get to know the scientists so well in the later years, but some very talented people in fields like microbiology. Forestry School has always had some talented faculty. Journalism has always been very well (unintelligible) school and has had its share of successful leaders.

AP: What were some of the activities you were involved in? I know you've already mentioned a couple of those but—

TP: As far as campus was concerned, I mentioned being involved in the Faculty Senate and being the departmental chairman, but I got interested in local and community politics fairly early. In 1958, I was elected to the local school board—the Missoula Elementary School Board—and I served two terms and spent two years as chairman of the board.

In 1960, I was concluding my three years on the Missoula Community Chest Board, forerunner of the present United Way. Missoula had never had a successful community chest fundraiser drive up to 1960, and as chairman of the board, I was determined that we were going to be even better. I decided to get the most talented drive chairman I could possibly find (unintelligible) Lloyd Shermer (?) who was publishing *The Missoulian* for a while and he's now the president of the lead newspapers. I had just been in town a short time, and I persuaded him to share the drive with another dynamic official First National Bank (unintelligible). He got a professional fundraiser for the first time. The board got pretty excited about the drive, and I was very happy to be associated with the first successful community chest drive in post-war history in Missoula and also to be instrumental in helping to get the United Way connection (unintelligible) at that same time. So my school board and community chest, early on, were very exciting activities.

Later on, in the mid-'60s, in 1964, as a political scientist I was at a meeting in Salt Lake City, a distinguished political scientist there had a little gadget called a Votomatic. I had never seen one before, and it was a punch-card voting machine—small voting machine. You could have a ballot form on there and use IBM-tabulating punch cards in a special arrangement to vote for whomever you wish. Then these cards could be (unintelligible) later on. After the 1964 election, which I followed very closely, it took 24 hours to count paper ballots, and the commissioners were thinking about changing the voting machines. I convinced them to adopt the Votomatic. We had to get some special legislation from the legislature in 1965 and further legislation in 1967, but we finally got the Votomatic (unintelligible) in Missoula. That was a long...My involvement in that, I was chair of the Elections Committee from 1964 until 1974, for ten years, when I resigned after the death of my first wife.

Then I was later still associated with elections, but I learned a great deal about introduction of technology in something like this. The Clerk and Recorder's Office at that time was not sufficiently staffed with adequate personnel to deal with the situation so the new technology (unintelligible). We had a requirement for rotating ballots, for example, so in the 1968 election, names were rotated to different areas. The problem with the computer was not articulated with the rotation, so the early returns coming in showed that Richard Nixon, who was the Republican candidate for president, carrying the traditional Democratic precincts and Hubert Humphrey, who was the Democratic candidate, carrying the Republican ones. It was obvious that a monumental error had been made in the rotation. We were haunted in the early years by those kinds of mistakes, which the personnel who actually took care of the details of administering it were not trying to handle but we gradually learned to master. Now Missoula uses a successor to Votomatic, the optical scan system, for effective voting purposes, but that was on the early, early educational efforts.

In the 1970s, I was involved with the late (unintelligible) Johnson, who had a grant foundation in developing the 9-1-1 system for Missoula and was chairman of the advisory committee that had recommended the establishment of 9-1-1, which has become, since then, of course a significant force for emergencies of all kinds. I'm very happy to have been associated with that.

In the mid-1970s, I served on the City Commission of Local Government and spent a great deal of my career in Missoula championing the cause of local government reform. In the early 1950s, I worked very hard, with the late John Toole and others, in getting the city management plan adopted in Missoula. It was in effect in 1955 to 1958. We had two city managers, and neither of them worked out very well. I thought it was a very excellent plan but the voters, by a narrow margin, rejected it in 1958 so we switched in 1959 to the (unintelligible) council government which we've had ever since.

So, I was involved in the '50s with the committee in South Missoula in getting about 4,000 people annexed to the city. As a non-city resident at the time, I think it was the largest annexation Missoula ever got involuntarily. Most recently, we got a larger annexation in many areas, but it was kind of a forced situation involving the need to be on the sewer.

So those are some of the things. I worked unsuccessfully for city-county consolidation in 1976 and again in 1983. I was on committees in both of those elections and closely involved in those campaigns.

Along the way I ran for the state senate a couple of times in 1978 and 1988. Both occasions, I ran as a Republican Moderate against the well-entrenched Democratic office-holders and lost both elections to Bill Norman in '78 and Fred Van Valkenburg in 1988. Both of them were in the 300- to 400-vote margins so they were fairly close, but I learned that close (unintelligible) for things like that in politics.

My most recent crusade would be as a member of the National Committee on the Constitutional System, which has made some proposals which were (unintelligible) of the Constitution of 1987 or significant reforms to our American Constitution to strengthen our government. So far those have languished. There have been a few hearings with the Senate with very little noise, but we hope that if there was a crisis at some time at least we would have a (unintelligible).

One of my interesting involvements in the late '60s early '70s was with the committee headed by Dean Arnold Bolle in the School of Forestry on the Bitterroot National Forest. I was a member of that committee which issued a reclamation on clear-cutting in the Bitterroot, became an early part of the environmental movement. I don't think of myself as a gung-ho environmentalist, but I've always supported the idea of sound practices in all areas (unintelligible). I was very happy to be part of that process, which launched, to some extent, the environmental movement.

Later when I was in Washington on my first sabbatical in 1970, '71, I was studying environmental interest groups in Washington, and I found that a lot of doors were open to me because I had been associated with the Bolle Report, which was thought of in those days as a significant breakthrough in thinking about forest management. Began a process of which some practices like clear-cutting were greatly modified and so forth.

AP: What was your philosophy or your vision or your attitude in your approach to teaching?

TP: Well I guess I always thought of myself as not as a liberal or a conservative, more as a centrist, as a pragmatic realist. I wanted students to be aware of the reality of politics. I felt that politics was a very essential part of the democratic society, and I especially wanted them to see that their...politics is often differences of opinion. I produced a class called Political (unintelligible) 1958—originally called (unintelligible) Politics—in which students had a chance to examine the different interests in American society and realize that a lot of the political differences that arise come from the fact that different interests such as labor and business and agriculture and many other specialized interests that content over policy matters which inevitably, of course complicates the situation. I saw this as part of the reality of our system. It

always struck me that our system was not designed to maximize the democratic decision, maybe, in the sense that the majority rules but other in the way of protecting minority rights so that we could not move very rapidly with the separation of powers. The president, the Congress, Supreme Courts are all the same thing at the state levels so that things move very slowly.

What I found in the '70s, among young students in the '70s, was impatience. They felt that they wanted instant change, and I tried to make clear to them that, much as I agreed with and shared their feelings about change, that our system was designed to make things happen very slowly and that they just had to be patient and realize that revolutionary change—rapid change such as is possible in Britain in the parliamentary system—is simply not possible in the American system. I think a lot of the revolutionary ferment that (unintelligible) and bothers other societies, is diffused somewhat in ours. I often feel frustrated that things move very slowly, but I think that I've tried to emphasize that in American politics that this is the system that we chose.

In Montana, one of my colleagues in Montana has suggested that the people in Montana want a great many things the government can't provide, that they're reluctant to make the government in Montana the authority to provide those things. I think that's very true, but my vision was always one of broadening the democratic values. I really supported the idea of equal rights, civil rights for minority groups. I, in my church, was appointed in the 1950s to a committee to eliminate segregation in the Methodist church. I was involved in the 1950s in that and wrote an article on it in '60-something. The first Civil Rights Act of 196, strongly supporting and upholding the idea of voting rights for minorities and expanding the suffrage to minorities and all groups of American society. Those are some of the things that I believed in very strongly over the years—very deep faith in democracy. As Churchill said, "Democracy is the worst system of government except all others."

AP: What were some of your goals as a teacher? You may have already answered some of that too, and then, later years as a chairman of the department?

TP: Well, I think I've always felt it important to get people to not simply know the facts. It's important to know some of the facts, but it's more important to understand. In high school, you learn the how and what, and in college you learn the why. I always thought that was very important. That if you want to be a scientist, you have to explain why things behave as they do. Political science, of course, is far from anything to do with exact science, but nevertheless, you try to offer explanations for why things work the way they do. This is one thing I think is very important. Also I think it's very important to know that there are different points of view, and as a chairman, I supported the idea of a department in which there were liberal and conservative points of view.

I felt it was very healthy to have divergent, different styles of teaching in the department, never to insist on any one particular way of doing things because I felt that different students were

attracted to different types of personalities and so on, which, of course, turns out to be the case. So the idea of flexibility and (unintelligible) maximum freedom, the high standards of the strong emphasis on...we always have political science until—

[End of Tape 1, Side B]

[Tape 2, Side A]

TP: —so that students had an opportunity to explain their thinking and not simply to regurgitate facts. I always thought it very important for students to know what the text said, to know what was said in class, but to be able to integrate this with their own thinking. And I always felt that students were entitled to opinions different from my own. All I asked was that they be prepared to explain and justify their particular opinion and not simply differ for the sake of difference but I welcome divergent points of view. As I reflect on it, a great many of my former students with whom I was on very good terms have gone on to distinguished political careers or legal careers with divergent points of view and so on, so I feel it is a good relationship in that sense. But the importance to me was also to see that, in the University one does not learn everything that one reads but one learns a way of learning, one learns to think, one learns to write, to express oneself and master the language and to become aware of the great divergences that exist in society. The thought being that later on one will be better equipped to live and to deal with society. I think still, as I thought during my 40 years before, that basically the large education in the social sciences, the humanities, the sciences and mathematics and foreign languages is the best kind of undergraduate education for any student, because technologies change, obviously.

Speaking of changing technologies, the first computer in the United States came on line the year I joined the University faculty, in 1951. We had bought our first computer at the University in 1964. Now almost all my colleagues have their own computer operations hooked up with the mainframe and this would have been unthinkable 40 years ago. The technology's changed a great deal, we can do problems that took a long time like regressive equations for example, linear programming, some of the equations would have taken literally month or years to work out by pencil now it can be done in seconds with computers and so on. Mathematics programs are now possible for analyzing a great deal of data that was not possible at all at that time so that even though the technology is changing. I still think that the basic mastery or understanding of the underlying values or underlying principles of knowledge are extremely important.

AP: If you had the chance to go back in time what would you differently or what memory or experience would you want to relive?

TP: Well, I guess one very memorable occasion was the optimistic feeling I had when I first arrived. There is no substitute for that beautiful feeling that you have it within your power to change the world and then you realize later on that no matter what you do, you have only minimal impacts upon changing the world. So that in retrospect I realized that I was involved in a number of innovations over the years but those efforts are very modest compared with the problems that we confront. So that I think that I probably was a little more structured person in the early years and much less appreciative of the diversity, much less appreciative of the compassion, the (unintelligible) feeling side of personality. I think if I could go back I would emphasize that side of things a little more than I did probably early on and would not assume

that the intellectual dimension is the only dimension (affirming that the cognitive is very important) but I think the (unintelligible) feeling of the heart as it were, is also a consideration and probably that developing close human relations ties with students being more, perhaps more, open and less of a demander of achievement.

I was more motivated in the earlier years by intellectual achievement ideas. I think that I gradually evolved into a more flexible person who appreciated that diversity and remember well what the dean at Yale once said to his faculty, to pay close attention to your A and B students because they'll be your future scholars and teachers and professional people but pay close attention to your C students also because they will endow those of the future. Sometimes the C students in college are the ones who turn out remarkably well too in society and if I could have found some way to, in the early years, of motivating some of those, especially young men, not so much young women because women seem to be more highly motivated in college, undergraduate college years, than men. It takes men, it takes the average man a couple years to find out that he has to work a little harder in college. The fact I spent quite a bit of time in my later years trying to redeem some lost youth situations with students, very successfully, but it was possible to start over again and go on. I'm very happy to say that it is never too late to retrace your steps and straighten things out and I was happy to be involved with a lot of students like those. I enjoyed advising students, very much over the years. In regard that advising was one of my contributions to students, it was very important. By trying to not say what they should do, but trying to find out what they wanted to do and give them some advice as to how they might best achieve the end they wanted to achieve. That sounds a little idealistic but I didn't always, in the real world, achieve that but at least that was what I thought about all the time that I wouldn't want to recreate a hundred or a thousand or ten thousand students and (unintelligible) was willing to find ways to bring out their own values and their own perspectives in the most effective way and to try to find the resources that they had, could be developed and ways that reaching these goals most effectively, whatever that may be.

AP: What advice would you give to today's University teachers or students?

TP: Well one thing I would say to everyone is that the old Spanish saying, "It is later than you think," that you have less time than you think and to find ways of hitting the ground running, to use an old expression, to start early, to do what you want, and to try to see as clearly as you can what your goals are, and first to enjoy life but to realize that if you wish later on in life to be in a certain position its very...there is no time like youth in which to enjoy the great classics, the great music, the great literature and to absorb as much of the good stuff as you can while you're still young and to not totally fritter away your time, although it's important to have fun too. I'm saying a compromise between being a total grind or a nerd on the one hand and being a total prodigal son or prodigal daughter on the other hand so that you can get some benefit. And to seek diversity in the faculty and not simply to try to find people whose points of view agree with your own, but try to be challenged by people of different points of view, try to sample courses in different areas as much as possible.

AP: Any other observations or insights or memories that you have to share?

TP: Well one thing that I remember about Missoula and the university is that it's always a great place to come back to. I've traveled a good deal, I spent years in (unintelligible) on sabbaticals and this is always a good place to come back to, it's almost a unique place, it's just about optimum in all respects, the only thing it lacks is the kind of economy and resources necessary to support adequately the kind of environment that we have. So it's regrettable in that respect but there are tradeoffs involved and as my old friend Earl Miller said, "You won't get rich here but you won't starve to death." And I have been very fortunate to have known over the years a great many friends in the faculty, a great many students whose careers I've subsequently followed, a great many people in the community with whom I've worked on projects and I have fond memories of my 30 years with my late first wife, Katie, whose death in 1974 was a shattering experience for me. Fortunately I regained my senses with my second marriage to Moira, as, who gradually moved to Montana, with whom I've lived with for the last 16 years and realized there is a second chance in life. Those are, I guess I remember the good things and forget the irritations along the way. I'm sure that there were plenty of those, there were times when the administration didn't seem to work very well or when little temporary inconveniences existed but basically it's been a very good 40 years and there is very little that I would change if I were required. I guess that's about it.

One important experience that I had during a long period of time was association with a group called the School for Public Administration or later the School for Administrative Leadership. This was a group of faculty from related areas such as forestry, psychology, interpersonal communication, sociology, and political science and economics who worked very closely in the month of February with a group of about 30 resource managers, mainly from the Forest Service but also from the Bureau of Land Management, from some park agencies, and from state resource management agencies. We tried in this time to acquaint managers who were essentially technicians who were specialists with broader concerns of management, public policy and things of this sort. One very useful aspect of the exchange was that each autumn, for about ten days, the group went on a field trip so that those of us who served on the, what we called S.A.L., School for Administrative Leadership faculty, went on tours of national forests, national parks, and I managed with my association with the group to cover most of the Northwest and get into most of the national forests, and quite a few parks and quite a few resource areas around the country and also to some extent to the Southeast. One year our group went to Alaska also, so it was a fairly wide ranging experience and an extremely good example of I think of University resources being used to foster and improve management in the government agencies. I enjoyed that as I'm sure my colleagues did very much.

[End of Interview]