

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: 270-058, 059

Interviewee: Robert T. Pantzer

Interviewer: Annie Pontrelli

Date of Interview: July 9, 1991

Project: University of Montana Centennial Oral History Project

Annie Pontrelli: This is Annie Pontrelli interviewing Robert Pantzer on July 9, 1991. Bob, why don't you go ahead and tell me what you had told me just a few minutes ago as far as your history with the university.

Robert Pantzer: Fine, Annie. Mine, I think, is somewhat unique in that I had kind of three phases of university. My wife and I, she joins (unintelligible) because she was with me through it all. I met her here as a freshman in 1936. She was a Butte girl, and I came from Lewiston. We were here through four years of school. I finished in business in 1940. I went into law school, working part time, and we were married in 1941, the fall of '41. World War Two was coming on, we were pretty sure of that. We hadn't planned to marry otherwise, I guess, that early. But at any rate, we were here then, and I went into law school in 1941. Along came Pearl Harbor and I had a reserve commission from the University of Montana as an ROTC student. Went off to the infantry in World War Two to the Pacific. So that ended that particular phase, Annie.

The next one is after the war—after World War Two—which we survived. I came back and re-entered law school. I'd had five years of law school in before that, and re-entered law school in late '45 and finished up in 1947. Went off to northern Montana and then to central Montana and practiced law.

Then in 1957, '58 year, we returned to the University of Montana when Carl McFarland was on the job and became an administrative vice president, doing what he said, "Practical work out here." I was on that job for eight years, and then by a strange set of circumstances, I believe, became president in 1966 and stayed on through the summer or through July of 1974, when I finished here.

So we had three spasms, or three periods of time—each different—at the university. Partly as a student, partly as an employee. Graduated from law school in 1947, the spring of 1947, so we have many memories, both Ann and I, have many memories of this institution, which are keen and they're wonderful.

You asked, I think, in talking with me before this (unintelligible) asked me about observations and social attitudes and that sort of thing during our time at the university. I have to say again, that has to be focused upon three different sets of vision that we had. Our days in 1936 through (unintelligible) World War Two, the (unintelligible) of World War Two, I think, I call the good old days—the traditional days. The days when the boys wore sport coats and nice trousers, and the girls wore beautiful sweaters and that sort of thing. It was a day when we went to the various parties and events of the Student Union building, which is now the old art building, which has

the old theater attached to it. There were the copper, silver, and gold rooms on the third floor of that building. Every weekend, those were occupied with various parties.

Those were the days when the sororities and fraternities would serenade the sororities and sing on weekend nights. (Unintelligible). Those, I guess I can say also are the days when we had the co-ed prom. The girls invited the boys to go to a great party they put on. We always wore tuxedos. There was a Barrister's Ball. The boys invited the girls to go to that. There was so much social days in, some would say, a snooty sort of a way. The old days of going to college. The sororities and the fraternities had Sunday teas periodically. I don't particularly enjoy teas, but it's good for your soul and it helps you to learn a little about living. The days we had seated service in the residence halls for dining. That's assigned tables. Your manners at the table were rather closely watched. That seems silly today, but part of the education of (unintelligible) we understood then was that sort of thing. There, and in the fraternities and the sorority houses and the residence halls, we had several different women in the community who were schooled in this sort of thing and came periodically to tell us how to use your knife and fork and spoon, how to pass the various plates around, so you could do it in the highest of society if you ever needed to and became vice president of the corporation, or just to teach your children what to do.

Those days are gone. I'm talking too much about that, possibly. But those we call the good old days. Enrollment about 1,800—small enrollment. Almost all of the students went fully four years. When I was about a sophomore, there was one married couple on the campus, you know very well. Finding people at that time, you thought surely, they must have had to have gotten married, but that's not true. The only married couple. At that time, if you were a girl, you had to go to the dean's office and get permission to be married if you were going to continue in school at the University of Montana. If you didn't have permission, if you were married, you no longer could attend the University of Montana.

At that time, you had six quarters of required physical education—men and women—freshman and sophomore year. Six quarters. All men had to take basic two years of ROTC, Reserve Officers' Training Corps. You wanted to go on for two more years, you could apply for it to get a commission. Those were the interesting things that went on at that time. It was a stodgy sort of existence in a sense, but there we...I think, Annie, the thing I look at—and this is an oldster talking about it and talking about it with a great deal of pleasure—there, I believe, is where we got the great loyalty to the University of Montana. This was our school. We had no expectation to go off to other schools. This was the place we'd go to school. We expected to go for four years unless we went to professional school elsewhere or graduate school—that was it. Different from the next phase. Am I taking too much time?

AP: Not at all.

RP: All right, let's go to the next one that I think is interesting to us, maybe to no one else. I came back after World War Two. Then had a wife, my wife Ann, and we had two children. I had

a part-time job. I was on the G.I. Bill, if you know what that is. People of my age would. You would receive money from Uncle Sam to go to school—a modest amount. I'd had malaria very severely in the Pacific, and had 50 percent disability from malaria. I would pass out periodically if I wasn't (unintelligible) quarters thereafter in law school from that disease. Went back to law school where I think everyone in the class, everyone was a veteran—Air Force, Army, Marine, or Navy. Almost all of them were married. Almost all of them had children. We were now a bunch of veterans growing old, partly worn out, military clothing. Most of us were both. Looked like renegades. I think we frightened the faculty and other people. They wondered what would take place when the veterans would come back who had been fighting people and shooting at people.

I came back to law school and I think my class then...The law school then went four quarters a year. It's never done that before or since. Right around the clock to service those people who had gone off to the military. My class, I think, most of them had been freshman with me. We now came back, and either sophomores or juniors, depending on how long we had been in the military. I finished up in the spring of 1947, and went to Chester, Montana, of all places. If you don't know Chester, you should go there sometime—a wonderful bunch of people. As a county attorney were there was a vacancy of country attorney-ship.

I concluded that I couldn't get a job with a law firm, as they did in those days they worked for practically nothing. But because I had a wife and children, (unintelligible) four of us, thought we'd like to eat. That did give us a little bit of income. I was away and went over to Livingston, Montana, and practiced law thereafter, and in 1957, '58, came back to the University of Montana now as an employee, as a vice president in main hall under President Carl McFarland who I admired greatly. Worked away at the job in all kinds of activity and then became president in 1966 until 1974. That was a whole different phase. Now we weren't students. Now we were working with students. Now we were seeing a whole different situation.

Going back to the period after World War Two, it had all changed. It had all changed in seven years. Everyone had gone except women and 4Fs. 4Fs plainly, were just people, as you probably know, who had physical disabilities and couldn't go into the military. They stayed on in school. There had been a naval program here for young people going into the navy in the University of Montana on a federal kind of grant situation to get an educational program during their time in the navy. Then we all came back. Everything changed. Most of the people now were married, where they never had been before. Many had children who lived in rather unspeakable basements all throughout Missoula. Most of us know more basements in Missoula than first floors. We had a wonderful time, had a great rapport with one another. Those social function things I talked about earlier, they didn't exist much anymore. They were out of the way. We were all busy trying to get our education completed and go off and do the sort of things we had to do because we were now all older and we had careers to look into and some of the fun and frivolity of the earlier days were gone for us. But still, young freshmen were coming on, and we were certainly far distant from them. I think they looked at us as very weird types of people, and we looked at them as very immature.

Now, coming back to the University in an administrative post, I found it all changed once again. What used to be what I thought people having lots of fun and enjoying life, not worrying about all kinds of problems of the world, in just a few years our student body was spending more time worrying about the environment, worrying about war, worrying about all kinds of things. In my mind, they didn't really have much fun. They had no worry about how they looked or how they acted. Scared the willikins out of their own families that they were bearded. Wore very peculiar dress—awfully, awfully, sometimes, dirty old clothing. Nice people, but hard to understand about all kinds of people.

Of course, we at the University, myself and my colleagues and the faculty, were frequently charged with causing all of this. We had nothing to do with it, of course. It was taking place all over the country as we now know, but it was a whole different university once again. Attitudes changed, people worrying about things. People willing to confront anyone about anything. Students very upset about anything that was called the establishment. Anyone who ran anything and operated under the administrative (unintelligible) was suspect. So it was a whole different time.

Well, I think that at least gets us started on some of the things we've been talking about. I think that from our standpoint, my wife and I, now we're back here. We came back to Montana just this year. Had been in California after I left the University. I worked for a law firm in southern California, and then we went to northern California just north of San Francisco and retired there. Then decided this last year, you know, it might be time to come back to Missoula in spite of the fact that California is a wonderful place. We had many friends there. Montana is very hard to leave for all of us, and we're glad to be back. Now (unintelligible) out here at the University, I think we find them very good. Things are looking up.

AP: What are some of those observations?

RP: Our observations, it seems to us are that what students have kind of come back to a little like, what I call, the good old days. Some of the problems of the world still exist, but they don't seem to be in the forefront as much as they were in the Vietnam days. The University is doing an excellent job it seems to me in the educational program. Far too little resources, just terribly, poorly funded. That part is sorrowful to us, but with the university students, we observed them and the bit that we get to know some of them are the kind of people you look around and say, "Golly, those could be back in our time." It's a wonderful thing to observe.

AP: Were you facing the same kinds of restraints on funding and resources during your administration?

RP: I guess we didn't recognize it as much, and I think the budgets for the institution were better, not because of me, but during my time they were better than they have been since. Just a happenstance. Montana's economy has not been overly pleasant for many, many years as

you probably know. Montana has not grown, and most of Montanans rather it wouldn't grow. It's still about the population when I was in high school in the early '30s, and I somehow, strangely used to think by now, it'd certainly be a state of 10 to 15 million people. (Unintelligible) a million. We're just losing a congressman for the first time. We had two and now we're losing one. I guess the point is that it just hasn't progressed that much, and there is so much need to have the kind of a university we've always had here. It needs money. Money isn't everything, but it does need money. In fact its salaries are just abysmal, just terrible. The administrators are also...People in Montana understand this. Legislators understand it. It's very difficult to determine what to do about getting the funds to fund institutions of this type. The University, overall, if you take the entire budget of Montana institutions—the university system—I think gets its fair share, but its fair share (unintelligible) to do the job that should be done. The thing that is difficult about it is that it needs more if it's going to continue to be a university of the type it's always been in the past. It's been an extremely fine university in the past, and if it goes wrong as it's going now in cutting programs...Now they're talking about downsizing, whatever that means. That means cutting out a lot of things that I think should be here, and most people do. They have to do something. Where President Dennison now is faced this kind of a problem, which is terrifying for a person to come and try to have a progressive program, and now having to reduce that program. Certainly, some things can grow and (unintelligible) go very far. Pretty soon they will not have a university. They better rename it. Call it Montana College. Something like that. Nothing wrong with just being Montana College. It won't be a university anymore in the sense that our peer institutions will view it as a university and accreditation people and on and on and on. I'm saying much too much about that.

AP: No, you aren't. That's great.

RP: I look back...I think you had a question in talking to me about this earlier about several things that I think are extremely appropriate to discuss just quickly about the University's past. When I came as a freshman, and for a number of years before that and some number after that, every freshman came and was required to take two survey courses. There were four survey-type courses offered. You had the survey of humanities. You had it in the social sciences. You had to have one of those two. You could choose. You had it in the physical sciences—physics, mathematics, chemistry—and you had it in the biological sciences—biology, zoology, and so forth. You had one of the sciences and one of the others—each a five credit course. You took that your freshman year, that's ten credits. Besides that, there was a requirement for English—three credits—that took thirteen. Then you had either a foreign language or a mathematics course—three credits. That took you up to 16. You had a credit for physical education, you had a credit for ROTC—that took you up to 18 credits. That would graduate you in four years. Those survey courses, why I dwell upon them, gave you a (unintelligible) presentation of those general subjects that I will never forget. Professors from all the areas. I took the survey of humanities and biological sciences. In humanities, for instance, you would have a professor coming in from history, the foreign languages, in art, literature—on and on all through the humanities. Twenty to twenty-five different professors coming in to those courses for freshmen. Excellent! I think just excellent. Required you to take some things that otherwise

you would not have taken. You know, all of us would rather just take those courses we would like. Some of them we don't like we should take anyway because those are the courses we need. Those went down the tubes I don't even know when, when the curriculum changed (unintelligible). I think that, in general, was a loss to this institution. I might not have one faculty member out here (unintelligible), but I will (unintelligible).

The university has had, Annie, such marvelous faculty people. I couldn't (unintelligible) this. I think when it started was...One of the problems the University has always had—the University of Montana—(unintelligible) were in the early days, they brought in people from great institutions, people who had been educated at Yale, and Harvard, and Stanford, and in California, and all over the place. Brought them in here because they were willing to live (unintelligible) in a small area and this kind of environment. Never otherwise (unintelligible). They were loyal. Many of them stayed years and years and years during my time, before my time, and after my time. Few institutions, I think, in the west had that great of faculty. I believe that. Much of that, is the fine fact (unintelligible). Much of that has been lost because the emphasis is different and the attitude is different. The desires are different. People have learned that they're just not planning to live here in (unintelligible) environment, blue sky, ski slopes without high salaries. Finally, faculty members learned about salaries, which is unfortunate.

AP: That is definitely a problem.

RP: Well, we had fine teachers and it's just one of the things that's made this institution so great. It is great, but it's caused a problem. Those people came with fervent attitudes about freedoms, freedoms in what they taught. Some taught openly in their classrooms in subjects on matters that the general public didn't want to (unintelligible) the nature of that teaching.

AP: Such as?

RP: They may have been talking about...Today would be that which could be said is worthwhile in the Communist program. There are some things (unintelligible). Some people think it's detestable to even raise that kind of (unintelligible). Matters of religious backgrounds, matters of human freedoms, civil rights starts way back in those days, which the general public did not really understand. It all happened in Missoula (unintelligible). Thereby Missoula and in the countryside (unintelligible). My god! What have we brought upon us with this kind of institution? (Unintelligible sentence)

Well, now what else did you ask me?

AP: Well, I know a couple of the things that I jotted down just in reading Merriam's book about your years. I would be interested in knowing what your personal philosophy or approach was as you started your presidency. I know there were certain challenges that occurred in the presidency before you, and I guess, did you have a general philosophy or approach?

RP: Well, I like I always say, one was to stay alive and not be fired, you know. It's interesting. I think anyone that takes on any job has certain aspirations, certainly, or he shouldn't be on the job. Or he wouldn't allow himself to have a job. But I think my reaction was, I think, fairly mundane in a sense. I had great regard, as you just heard me mention, for the faculty here at the University of Montana—the excellence of that faculty and it's dedication to the educational pursuits of students. My hope was to, at least, retain that throughout the institution. Most sincerely to, at any time we brought in other faculty people, we bring in one who was just as capable as that one who left, deceased—or better. So that we would retain that type of institution (unintelligible). Library, too. Library and the tools. We (unintelligible). That, I think, was my fervent hope. I also had hoped that the institution could continue to be a very open institution, that teachers could teach what they thought they should teach in their subjects without recrimination, without threat of losing their job because something they taught might not appeal to someone out in the public who thought it shouldn't be taught. Teachers here, (unintelligible). There should be no subject here that can't be discussed and can't be taught. If it's a subject worthy of knowledge, it should be before young students.

I recall the days, President McFarland (unintelligible) this while I was here. He was criticized sorely for bringing in some speakers—speakers with peculiar notions, let us say. Speakers who were radicals on the whole public scene. I was with him by the time he had to go before the Board of Education, now the Regents, to explain why he had invited certain speakers to the campus who would dirty the minds of our poor students. He said, “Well, that's what this is about. Students should be able to hear everything. Not agree with it, but hear everything. That's what learning is about.”

He even had at that time, Annie...and I've been a member of the American Legion. It's an organization that's done a great, great many wonderful things in America. We had the local American Legion post insisting that they have a committee who would review anyone that we'd have as a speaker for their approval before they'd be allowed to come to the University to speak. What a censorship. McFarland fought that tooth and nail and was criticized sorely for it in some quarters. That's the sort of thing that I felt that, always felt, needed to be maintained in the institution. If it's going to be a university, it had to be a university. Now and then, I've heard a parent say, “My god, I sent my daughter to the university, and she came home at the end of the first year and she had changed.”

Your response should be, “Wouldn't you expect that if you sent her away to get an education of some small amount?” That's the point, though. That's really the key point of what a university's all about. (Unintelligible), particularly in an agrarian state like Montana. Montana (unintelligible)—farm, ranch community. A lot of people not understanding this. A lot of people believing you should send a student to college and that kid should learn how to run a tractor and grow wheat and clerk in a store, and all of this other foolishness should not spoil this poor mind. So I suppose that that was my mission, and it's a kind of a one that created problems during the Vietnam period. I had, there were people, alumni, friends, phone me and wrote me

letters that people should be thrown out of school because they were disruptive and they were allowing demonstrating and they went on a strike as they did one year for about a week. Because they were unusual, they were dangerous, and they were radical. (Unintelligible sentence)

AP: How did you handle it? How did you respond to those kinds of—

RP: Not very well. (augh) If you lived on the campus where the people were and you realized what was going on and their attitudes and why they were and the reason that they were. They were upset about that which was taking place in their nation. They knew more about it, surely, than all of the old students when you get right down to it. Tried to roll with the punches, I guess they used to say. Tried to be sympathetic, tried to be understanding. Tried not to lecture people. They don't want to hear some lecture from me. Tried to keep them in school if they could, keep them from becoming so despondent that it (unintelligible) that difficult things would occur. Not an easy job. Interesting job, but not easy. At that time, for a period of years, you probably know this, for two or three years buildings were being burned down at college campuses. You wondered when it was going to happen here. The worst we had here is we had a waste paper basket burned in the ROTC building with a window knocked out. The shock when that occurred (unintelligible).

AP: Were there a lot of demonstrations on campus?

RP: Not that many. Montana, we didn't have as many as lots of places. We had some, of course. We had a week strike where people (unintelligible) up and down, carrying banners and singing songs and building fires on the Oval and stuff like that. You didn't know where it was going to go. What might take place, what might arise out of it.

AP: Was it primarily students, or was it staff?

RP: Students. Sometimes a faculty (unintelligible) of course then people, of course, would have been fired in those days. Some did it with real sincerity, and some didn't. Very difficult to tell which was which. Very peculiar times, very peculiar times. Somewhat terrifying. People weren't having fun.

AP: That was the Vietnam War that's for sure. This is something you've already talked a little bit about, but one of the things that I jotted down was how would you describe the attitude amongst the faculty and the students during your presidency? I know you already really have touched upon a lot of that, especially during the Vietnam War years, but would you have any other observations or insights about that?

RP: Well, I think the faculty, during those trying years I've been mentioning now, in the main, and you can't generalize that much I suppose, there are some who virtually dropped out from (unintelligible). I know several faculty members who were very skilled in some discipline, in

some field, several, who just dropped out and kind of wandered in the hills. Just left their jobs, finally just left the University. Finally got so caught up in the whole thing themselves that they just couldn't (unintelligible). But in general, broad main, faculty people at the University of Montana did much, oh, a great amount to keep students as calm as they could, listen them out, do all kinds of things even to the extent of having meetings in the evenings to talk of some problems of was—out and beyond their course work. (Unintelligible) to get the feeling of tempering of attitudes, getting students to realize, "Look, you're still college students. Don't let this whole world-wide problem take away your good years when you need them so badly for your own projects." A lot of students also dropped out, just walked away. Went and lived in the hills. Some never returned to do anything worthwhile. At that time, when you got into drugs...We didn't have any drugs in, what I call those good old days, and I don't think there was a marijuana cigarette smoked—really, I don't—from 1936 to '41 on this campus. A lot of beer consumed, but during those Vietnam days is when you got into the drugs: marijuana, the pot, and all that business. Partly through frustrations, partly defiance.

AP: Were there a lot of drug-related incidents which occurred on campus that you had to deal with?

RP: Not really that many, but there was a full knowledge that was going on. See if no one tells on anyone else, it's pretty hard to really determine that something is taking place with one group of individuals. No one rats on anyone else. They didn't in those days—to their credit, I guess. We'd have investigations by public authorities—federal and state--periodically. Here and elsewhere on this or that occurrence. Nothing very often came of it (unintelligible). On the other hand, on occasion I have been in some room of some party at the University at that time, and I learned what marijuana smelled like. You know? You know, don't you? A little like alfalfa. I could tell right away what was going on in there, but you couldn't see anything happening. Maybe I should've (unintelligible).

AP: I don't know.

RP: I don't either.

AP: Tell me about how *The Book* came about.

RP: I don't know that much. *The Book* came about...You mean the one rating of faculty?

AP: Right, the evaluations.

RP: I think that came about—

AP: In the '60s sometime.

RP: Yes. You see, the faculty and the departments, during my time at the University and before and for some time afterwards and some of that has changed, had a program of faculty evaluation for promotion and for salary increases, which then made recommendations to the president as to all faculty through the departments. A rather intricate program written. Many didn't believe that they were being treated adequately out of that evaluation situation. I mean faculty themselves believed that they weren't being treated fairly, believed that the evaluation wasn't well taken, believed that, "My peers, how do they know how well I'm teaching, how well I do this and this and this?" It was very difficult, very difficult I've learned. Very difficult for anyone to evaluate one's teaching, because really you don't ethically—from the standpoint of academic freedom—you don't go into someone's classroom and sit around review him all the time. That's his classroom. Well, at any rate, rising out of that general methodology some faculty people complained, students complained. Some students got the attitude that some faculty members were being favored and others weren't. Now came along the idea, ah, the people who can determine the teaching are the students. They're being taught. That may or may not be true. I've had a couple...Going back, I had a law professor, I remember (unintelligible).

[End of Tape 1]

[Tape 2, Side A]

RP: —talking about teachers, that law professor I was talking about was not very articulate, didn't do a very good job presenting his material with the reading of novels for flamboyance and interest, didn't have a very exciting presentation. That which he presented was well done and it was correct. It just wasn't a lot of fluff, however. Well to go back to your question. So students, through the Associated Students, decided the thing to do was have an evaluation by the students. They went about that with *The Book*. Now would the faculty and the department chairman or the deans, the president, vice-presidents pay much heed to that book? Yes and no, in some cases yes, in some cases no. Did all of the students in the class do the evaluating? Well no, some didn't care. On and on, and so finally some would say, "Well, *The Book*." Well that's fine, students, yes. The students who did the evaluating for *The Book* were zealots. They are out to promote their prof, the guy that they drank beer with and ate pizzas with over at Shakey's. I'm not going to pay heed to people who are evaluating based on those kind of notions. It's not objective. That really is how *The Book* came about. Does it still exist out here right now? I don't know, I doubt it. I think it went by the wayside because of the sort of thing that I was saying. It just was not believed to be that worthy of attention. The evaluation wasn't that objective and in some classes a very few people would evaluate, in others no one would, others hundreds would, based upon a promotion on the part of a few students to promote some professors.

AP: I've seen *The Book*, too.

RP: It isn't well done. I never did think it was very well done. I don't know your reaction, but I didn't think it was very well done. As a president, frankly, I didn't pay much heed to it. We had the peers, we had the department chairman, we had the deans, they are the people who are involved in that process. They are the people you expect do the evaluating of their teachers. They don't always do it properly, possibly. I'm confident there are some ills in even that system. There is no easy way to evaluate a teacher. But at least it's that best that we had and probably the best that exists today. Thereby I think *The Book* was a passing fancy. For a year or two even now, people would get up to make a speech, read from *The Book* about some professor that he heard had only got a 300 dollar raise, and the guy across the hall got a 400 dollar raise. He read about this in some bidding meeting someplace about how horrible it was because the other guy had not been evaluated as well.

AP: What did you see as the biggest challenges during your presidency?

RP: Well I suppose a president of a public institution; I think (unfortunately) he's expected to be educationally sound. I say unfortunately because so frequently so many of his duties involve almost everything other than a purely educational program—athletic program, physical plant, [to see] all the sidewalks are taken care of, on and on and on.

I suppose the biggest challenge is putting all of those together and trying keep some kind of a balance of that which is important. A lot of faculty people who periodically, here and

elsewhere, will rise up every now and then and say, "Oh don't put money into the lawns. Let the lawns go to the bow wows, we need the money for books." Then if the lawns are brown and there is no water going on them, then you get letters from faculty members or campus idiots saying, "Our campus looks hideous! How could we ever expect anyone to want to go to school here because of its turf?" Those are the kinds of challenges when you say what are the challenges. The challenges are trying to keep some balance out of it so that the whole institution is getting its share of attention. Recognizing, sure recognizing, that it's an educational institution. The reason it's here is to educate young people into some search, to find new sources of knowledge. True that's the purpose, but it needs the tools to do it. Not just library books. It still needs to have heat in the classroom. You can't teach a kid that's so cold he can hardly sit in the darn place. So all of those things have to be looked at and I think that's kind of the challenge that probably most presidents have. They can say lofty things. I've heard presidents talk a lot, you have to and others—say lofty things—all day long in this place until you're sick and tired of it. Until it is I'll never be satisfied. Well that's fine, it's interesting, but it's hogwash. Very difficult to say what really was the "real" mission. I think the mission—it's kind of commonplace to say it this way—is to keep the whole thing alive.

AP: Well, there were some significant changes, during your presidency. I know just from looking over my notes, I know Mike Mansfield gave the first lecture in the series on international relations, which is ongoing now—

RP: Yes!

AP: I know that the Adult Indian Training Program was set up, [and] there were several research and outside projects which took place.

RP: That's right. You asked me a question a short time back. We had an Affiliated School of Religion at the University. That's what it was called The Affiliated School of Religion. The reason it was "affiliated" and so designated was that it was not publicly supported [with] tax funds—on that old view, that old theory, and that old notion—the division of church and state. That religion, and that which talked about religion, and that which was taught about religion, should not be paid for by public funds because that would violate that whole concept of that provision. So, [for] years and years and years the Affiliated School of Religion was paid for from contributed funds, some from church groups some from individuals. They would have about one part time minister who directed the program. There were a limited number of religious type courses taught, frequently for no credit, for the same reason. That support had lessened and lessened and lessened over the years. When I came on and was by no great feel of courage on my part, I don't mean it that way at all, but by the persuasion of some faculty people who had a keen interest in this whole program I was persuaded, having practiced law and I understood a little about this, that so long as a religious program and religious teaching went on, it didn't really promote some *one* religion or some *one* religious attitude. It was an objective type program about religion not religions.

My goodness the world had religions from the start—the Aztecs maybe, Adam and Eve maybe. Goodness, it's a matter that people should learn something about. Why can't that be my reaction, and I was persuaded by faculty to go along that line that was why can't that be a program that is funded just as history, philosophy, English, so forth, a bona fide area of studies? So we took the gigantic leap of going to the Board of Regents and saying the Affiliated School is gone down the tubes, it's over with. We can no longer have that type of a program at the University, which is really not capable of doing what it should be doing, and really call it a "program" which is of importance to the students and expect people to volunteer their services to assist with it and not give any credit. So we formed a Department of Religious Studies. Good grief! That created some problems right away of course. Around the countryside there were those people who still wanted to contend that the Constitution of Montana and the United States Constitution forbid that. All of these arguments came up that went along, went along, oh, I guess until just a few years ago. Certain facets of it still exist, but the department itself, I think, was abolished maybe two years ago when they had another downsizing. It went along without any great problem of being funded fully by tax dollars and I think did a very creditable job for students, too. That I think was the sort of thing that created problems for me because a lot of people didn't agree with this.

Black Studies, you know about that. That came on during those hot days when people were saying, "Why aren't we learning something about the Blacks?" There's been discrimination going on all the time all these years, and we don't even have anyone at this institution that a black teacher talking about the heritage of black people. Nothing. What we have is probably incorrect. Might have been. Reform. Not just at this school, all kinds of reform over a period of years in programs of black studies. We brought Ulysses Doss in. He is a good man, an excellent person. Got him in. There again, my goodness, I get letters! "What are you trying to do? This is not Mississippi," you know. Well, that went along as a fairly viable program I think for, oh maybe a decade and slowly the support for it subsided and that's understandable. I think Ulysses Doss is here teaching in the humanities area—much the same courses.

Those are the kind of things you say, what is the problem of a president when things like that come on, under different, and under unusual, and not where people understand, and should be aired before you [the president] get the problem. Those kind of areas...some aren't successful. I think this was while it was in existence, I think the religious studies program certainly was, it was positive and people think very well. There are always people who would rather not have it around. It takes money to fund a department. Faculty people, while they are excellent faculty, they have the same kinds of reaction we all do. You know, if there are three of you in the family and one kid gets all the nice clothing a couple of other kids aren't going to like it. It's just that simple.

AP: Now, I know the Native Americans also had some significance.

RP: Yes, and I think that probably was more a thing about that area of activity at the University and it still continues, as you know, and has been reasonable successful. I suggest reasonably

because, you know, if you are trying to cover problems that existed for generations. You can't be (unintelligible) a couple of courses in a department. But I suppose it has been, and will be, and shall continue to be, a very viable program at the University of Montana for the natural reason we have all these tribes in the state, Native Americans who live here, seven [reservations] of them. My goodness, if you view it that way, why shouldn't an institution like this have that kind of a program. Very appropriately I think, I think we still haven't overcome problems at all. I have a daughter who is a nurse, a public health nurse, in a county in Eastern Montana, right on an Indian reservation. The problems they have in just the health of Indians and their culture, they aren't much ahead of what they were 100 years ago, really. There aren't many, there aren't that many Indians coming, finally, to the University of Montana for instance as there should be in the light of all students we have here and all the Indians who could come. [They] just haven't gotten around to the point yet [to here] much interest in college education. But, as it goes on, it might increase immeasurably.

AP: Tell me more about the Adult Indian Training program that was set up.

RP: Well, the intention was courses for Indians, Native Americans, to bring themselves into the modern age, [and] bring themselves into a position of employment to overcome their minority situation, [also] to bring them to the point that they understood education for themselves and their own children. So they were brought in and some of these were successful, some not. They studied various skills, vocational type of work. Some of this changed almost every year. [It was] hard. Here they were on a college campus and, in many cases, they weren't that acceptable to the general student body, or to put it the other way, they didn't want to accept the general student body that much. It's a whole different form of living for them which made it difficult. It hasn't been overcome yet in my opinion, it still goes on. It has been an attempt, only partially successful. You can't overcome some of the problems that Native Americans or Blacks [experience but] give them a few years and maybe several generations. Of course we are all impatient. We're impatient on college campuses we want to cure all those things in the next 24 hours if we can—cure all of the ills that we have. Sometimes it just doesn't work that way. That worked in part: only in part though.

AP: Bob, one of the things that I know occurred during your time was just the students wanting to abolish the ROTC program or at least not having academic credit for those courses. Why don't you tell me a little bit about how that came about?

RP: Well, that came about during the late '60s. It came about by virtue of the Vietnam War. It came about as part of the attitude that we were doing too much to promote warfare: we were spending too much time and money and resources and people in killing other people. All of those things rolled in [and] brought about the attitude, "Hah, how does it happen we have at the University a Reserve Officers Training program for the United States Army?" The horror of it all! That became immediately a springboard for saying, "That being true, let's abolish the program." Well, as against that, was years and years of background of history at the University of Montana—all over the country in our types of schools—these kinds of programs in

cooperation with the United States of America. In our defense we should be training college young people to become officers in the military because where can they better be trained? We learned that in World War Two. A great majority of the officers in World War Two were ROTC graduates. We probably wouldn't have hardly won the war without them: really, just almost literally. Therefore the great clash. It wasn't a clash of military against non-military, it was a clash between the attitude of training people to kill other people, as against we are trying to train people so we can defend our own country. We have always had the right to defend our own country and our people. I asked, "Don't you want to do that?"

"Well yes, but not this way" [was the answer]. Of course these things become very irrational, very irrational! People become very heated. The two sides of the question become just almost impossible; the regular army officer on one side screaming what should be done, as against some student over here who sees nothing but terror and killing from that program. That's what it was all about, and it was all over, not just here at the University of Montana. You know the theatre [in] the old student union building? One afternoon it was just jammed. I imagine there might have been 1,500 to 1,800 people in the place. We had a regular debate going on among faculty and students on, "Should ROTC continue at the University of Montana?" I was over there. It ended up about the end of the day [with] kind of a voice vote—the yeas and the nays. It was about equal. The raised hands—it was about equal. It adjourned with no action at all. No action taken. Within a week you didn't hear about it anymore.

AP: Did it just become a moot point?

RP: Pretty much so. I think it still exists a little, I think you can find, I think if you wanted to rage about at the University about any hour you can get someone who wants to abolish the ROTC for the same reasons. But the thing it did do, not only here but elsewhere, it did bring about—or cemented—the notion that there be no required ROTC. See when I went to school as a freshman, in your freshman and sophomore years you had to be in the ROTC unless you played in the band. Men. Males. That was a requirement for graduation. It brought about the abolition of that [it was] no longer [a] requirement. Finally, we don't even have the first two years at all. Now it's just voluntary officer training, small numbers, that's it. But I suppose if you wanted to, you could heat it up, start up with that argument all over again. They even wanted to abolish Fort Missoula of all things.

AP: Oh, really?

RP: Yes, certain people did at that time. [They said], "Well, while we are at it let's just abolish Fort Missoula. I don't know why they need that."

AP: What was the argument?

RP: Well, it's military and as long as it's military, we don't want it and we don't need it. Seems irrational, but irrational things occur, even with great minds.

AP: Well, and I know we had already briefly discussed this off the tape, but why don't you tell me a little bit about some of the research and outside projects which took place during your tenure? We specifically talked about the Yellow Bay Biological Station up at Flathead and the reoccurrence of that program.

RP: During that time there was a considerable amount of research activity going on at the Forest Experiment Station, Lubrecht Forest. You know where that is?

AP: Right.

RP: That was developing a great amount of Forestry Research at that time: [and] it has been since. I think it came to the fore at that time. In the wildlife area, the Craigheads. You know who the Craigheads are?

AP: Yes.

RP: Well, the Craighead's program...John and Frank Craighead. John was on our staff, Frank was not. Frank was, I think he was with the University of Oklahoma, but worked with his brother John on the grizzly bear research. Remember that?

AP Yes.

RP: That became very popular for students in the wildlife area. Graduates are all over the world out of that program, working with the Craigheads. Then in the biological sciences we had lots and lots of activity going on in microbiology. Professor Jim Nakamura (still a professor out here just works part time) was doing considerable research in very sophisticated microbiology research activities that were funded by the National Institutes of Health. I would be loath to even try to explain because I can't really pronounce even some of the terms. But we forget [that] research is just not in the sciences is it? Ross Toole over in history [was] writing. A very interesting professor who died of cancer several years back. An excellent writer and regarded as such over the whole country as a historian in western history.

Clancy Gordon in botany was conducting a great amount of research, part of it having to do with up around Columbia Falls on the edges of Glacier Park—an area up there where the trees were dying all across those mountains. He was the one that concluded that pollution coming from all kinds of sources was causing it at that point. Of course much of his [research] related to some of the logging activity up in that part of the world. Of course he became a professor [whom] all kinds of people wanted to fire too because, of course, he now was in the way of people making a living from timbering. Those were areas of research that loom up in my mind as being popular, but others were known for being unique and far reaching at that time out—

AP: Any other areas of research?

RP: Well, the Bureau of Business and Economic Research is a facility doing research in the welfare of Montana as you probably know. Just in recent years, more and more and more, every week or so, you see something coming out of the Bureau of Business Economic Research talking about employment, employment rates, economy, so forth and so forth. People [are] citing it. I've noticed where some the banking interests are citing it. Excellent!

AP: Bob, why don't you go ahead and tell me a little bit about the Blouin incident?

RP: All right, Blouin. Denny Blouin, Dennault Blouin, was a young instructor in English. Kind of an insignificant type of guy really, but a good scholar, too. I can't remember the year, it makes no difference anyway. In a summer session class, he was teaching he used a writing entitled *Student as a Nigger*. That's been around. It was a vicious type of a piece and a fair amount of profanity and a lot of words and phrases that most people dislike seeing in print. A student in the class objected to the kind of thing being presented as an English class, and the question arose whether Blouin had a right to use this as part of his course materials or didn't have a right. It became a big question of academic freedom. That's really the sort of thing that comes up every now and then and it will again. It always will. If you live long enough, it will come up here again with something, different thing, different subject, different reason, different time. So the question arose, "What about this?"

It was brought to my attention, and I asked our academic vice president to look into what was being done with this particular writing, how it was being used, how did it relate to the course he was teaching? He was teaching, incidentally a course in creative writing. What creative writing is, you see, isn't that well defined. I got a report back that so far as he was concerned, it was repulsive. It was the sort of thing that he would not like to have used; it was the sort of thing that the department chairman in English would rather had not been used: the sort of thing that the course could have taken place without it being used: but that this was graduate course, these were not freshmen students, these were graduate students, master's degree students. In that kind of a class in that subject, by this professor along with all other materials he used, would he have a right to use this one? If he didn't have a right to use this one, how many others can't he use? If he can't, pretty soon you telling him what he is going to teach. So, low and behold, do I remember the Blouin case? Indeed I do! It blew out in all of the papers; of course, the media discussed it in all forms. Properly, it was a subject of interest, I'll tell you. I suppose that the Blouin affair, I must have gotten no less than 500 letters—no less than 500 letters and probably 200 or 300 phone calls. From all the way from, "That this fellow should be promoted he is one of the finest teachers you have ever heard of," to "That he should be ground up disposed of in an ash can!" This was in the summer. We went along and the class closed. We heard not from any other student. One student in the class, a woman student, her father happened to be the head of the Army ROTC at the University of Montana. He raised hell, to put it bluntly. When I went to the first meeting in the fall of the Board of Regents, about the first thing that occurred was, "We want to hear about Mr. Blouin."

I had to get up, make a determination of what I wanted to do, and I said, "Have you been to Mr. Blouin? You have the right to. I will not abuse him, and others will not abuse him. He had academic freedom and I was not planning to fire him." I must say that it was an issue that was not very much fun.

AP: Were they ready to string you up?

RP: Oh yes, indeed, they were. Not really, I say that not really in all fairness. If you had read this *Student as a Nigger*, Annie, I don't think you'd have cared for it. [Not] very many people would have. These Regents, lay people, probably in general didn't know much about creative writing, didn't know much about the teaching of this subject. I have to say they stayed with me. Finally, it went around the room for half hour—various discussions. I had a private meeting with the governor about it. Finally they just said, "Let's get off the subject, there are other things."

AP: That was it?

RP: That was it.

AP: There was no more discussion about it?

AP: No there wasn't. Oh, following that of course some people rose up and said they felt he should be thrown out and that ended it.

AP: Professor Blouin continued on?

RP: Blouin stayed throughout that year and left and I've never heard of him since.

AP: Is that right?

RP: That's right.

AP: Did he continue using that book?

RP: Well, no. No course he had other subjects, this was the only graduate class if had. He was an interesting fellow. He was leaving at the end of the school year. He phoned and said, "Can I have an appointment with you?" I'd never met the guy, I didn't know him from Adam's off ox. You know a young instructor just in there (unintelligible). I said sure, so he came over, he came in the office and he says, "I'm ashamed, I've caused you so much trouble,"

I said, "Well, it has been an interesting year hasn't it?"

He said, "Oh, god, I'm ashamed. I'd do it again."

I said, "I know you would, and I'd do the same thing again. I don't know why, but I'd do the same thing again."

He said, "You defended me, I thought I was just shot, literally shot." He was a nice little guy, little fellow mild mannered and bright. I think he had his doctor's degree from one of the Ivy League schools—Brown or one of the others. Very, very able, but all that from a one or two page thing. It just about ruined his career. I don't know after he left here where he went because the outburst, of course, would have followed him. Most schools wouldn't have cared. I mean, if he had gone back to Harvard they would have hired him, they don't worry about that sort of thing. Some schools wouldn't though. That's the interesting part of it. Is my kid going to a classroom with a lot of repulsive type of material here at the university or shouldn't he? Are we going to protect him from that? Is he going to be a really an educated person? Is he going to understand what it is all about? Really? Look what's going on today. When I came to school, Annie, in 1936—my wife and I talked about it—do you think the word sex would've been used on the campus anywhere? Oh no! Oh no. Abortion discussed in detail? Oh no! God no! If a girl became pregnant she left the campus and she was in shame for the rest of her days. Really. I know girls who were thrown out of sororities and that sort of thing.

AP: Times have changed.

RP: Times have changed. As times changed that shouldn't have happened at a university, you know. Really the way a university just has to be is have courage enough to say, "Nothing on proof could have prevented the blocking the future (unintelligible). As repulsive as it may be. Now a lot of people argue with that notion, and there are a lot of schools don't follow that argument. I could cite some and I shall not...a number of higher educational institutions that I know of. Lots of things could be brought into question. I know of some myself, but I won't mention any. (unintelligible). The trouble with it is everyone doesn't agree with what I am saying, you see.

AP: You always did the (unintelligible).

RP: Indeed so, indeed so. Problems of *The Kaimin*. You know *The Kaimin* don't you, Annie? Some of the most difficult problems I had, and others had before me, were things that were written by students in *The Kaimin* castigating the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, and the governor, and the attorney general, and United States senators, and everything else. You had people say, "Why they can't do that."

They'd say, "The hell we can't. That's a student newspaper, it's an independent newspaper." Sure, I'd rather not have it printed. It's not going to hurt anyone. Year in and year out, I don't know how *The Kaimin* has been in recent years. I haven't paid any attention since I've been back here this last year, but I can't even remember the incidents, but it's when I was president and the then advisor to *The Kaimin* was Professor Dugan, Ed Dugan, of the School of Journalism. Maybe you know him? Excellent man. Ed is a fine gentleman, a bright guy, good

man. Ed Dugan—three or four times he came over. I knew him very well and have known him for many years. He'd come into the office—he always wore his glasses like this, down over his nose—and he'd say, "I'm over here to say something. *The Kaimin* are going to print this kind of an article tomorrow" and he says, "You're going to hear a lot of bad things about it, I know that, I know that, Mr. President."

I'd say, "Well Ed, what are you going to do about it?"

He'd say, "Not a damn thing. I tried to tell them they shouldn't do it, but they're going to do it." (laughs) Are you going to interview him?

AP: Yes, he's on my list.

RP: That's good. Are you going to interview Nate Blumberg?

AP: He's on my list.

RP: He's one that you should. He's an interesting man. I think he's living up the Flathead at Bigfork. He was the former dean of Journalism.

AP: Well, one other incident that just kind of touched my attention was an event which occurred in 1972. You may or may not want to discuss this, but that was the incident with two university administrators and two coaches who were indicted by a grand jury and charged with conspiring to use federal funds illegally. It sounds like they pretty much were all let off. Maybe you could tell me a little bit about what happened.

RP: Well, it's a long story. You know what work study is, the work study program, any student qualifying has an opportunity to be gainfully employed under the work study federal program. In the athletic department, they were utilizing the work study program and with the knowledge of the director of loans, (the loan program) and working with university athletes. I didn't know this at the time. An athlete was working on some job and paid [out of] the work study program. They had him endorse the check back to them and they put it in the fund for paying grants—in-aid for athletes. They weren't retaining money themselves. Along came the federal authorities and audited that program and found that case.

AP: Yes, but did the audit occur just out of the blue, or did somebody—

RP: Oh, no. No, there were whistle blowers, that's right. Somebody had it in for a coach or somebody and they were audited and it turned out that they did indeed say that this was going on. This was not legal under federal laws. The university was required to pay back the portion of that money that went for these purposes, which we did. Rising out of that, and I don't remember the actual text of the charge—the actual indictment rising out of that—the head football coach [and] vice-president Mitchell—the administrative vice-president who had

general charge of the athletic program overall (the athletic director reported to him)—were indicted on a charge of conspiring. There's the key, conspiring to utilize those funds for the welfare of the university's athletic program and in violation of the laws of the United States. There was a trial and all of those people were found not guilty, not guilty of the charge. I think in the trial it was shown that they had used it, [the money] that way, but there was no conspiracy to defraud the government. Well, of course, that tarnished them and it created problems, and once again I had letters from jocks who were just willing to rouse the people and take on this athletic department and condemned the not the (unintelligible). The other side thought that these guys all ought to be shot at sunrise. It's never in between, it's—

[Loud background noise; unintelligible]

RP: —then every now and then I'd make periodic inquiries about it. This is pretty serious stuff, you know. They were subject to prison sentences. Not easy stuff. Well, that's the end of that exciting story.

AP: Well, how much of a time frame did that occur in?

RP: Oh I think it went on in the vicinity of six or eight months from the time they started investigating. It was in Federal Court down here in the United States Court.

AP: Were they able to stay on at the University or were they allowed leave?

RP: Yes. No they were found not guilty, and they were agreeing that they had used this inappropriately, but—

AP: They were cleared.

RP: That's right. But it wasn't fun. Those are the kinds of things you spend more time on this anything else. That sort of thing and the Blouin sort of thing. You could devote hours and hours and hours and days and nights and days and nights.

[End of Tape 2, Side A]

[Tape 2, Side B]

AP: If you were to go back in time—

RP: I'd continue practicing law. (laughs)

AP: Is that right?

RP: No, no I enjoyed it.

AP: Would you change anything? Would you approach anything differently? Would you relive any particular time?

RP: I guess not much. It might indicate that I was pretty inept when you get right down to it, but I don't think that I would have changed anything. I had a pretty fervent view of what I thought a university was about. I'd been around very skilled faculty people for a number of years, and I'd been a vice-president. I'd learned a lot about what people thought about this and I'd been in meetings discussing matters like academic freedom, what it was all about and done some studying in that regard. So [with] the sorts of things [that were] troublesome, I think that I'd have done the same thing over again, the same way. I think I would have defended Blouin again. I think he deserved being defended. I think he was a damn fool, seriously. I think it was foolish on his part to use that kind of material in a classroom when he didn't have to do it. I think he did it—he was an audacious sort of a man—to prove that he had a right to use it, more than a need to use it, which is poor judgment. His judgment was lousy. But you see that isn't how you judge a faculty person, whether his general judgment is any good. If he knows his subject and presents it, although he does it in an audacious manner, he may be a fine faculty member. He might be a complete damn fool about everything else. Really. You know some like that. (laughs)

AP: Is there anything else that you would want to add, any insights, observations, particular memories that would be a sort of a history that you would like to share?

RP: Well, I think not so much other than to say something I've already said a bit about I guess; I don't want to belabor that point. Sometimes I was very sorry for young people during the '60s, when this Vietnam business was all going on. [It was] the time of their life when they should be having a lot of fun, to go to school and have a lot of fun. I did, when I talk of the good old days, we had a lot of fun out of it. We enjoyed it. We didn't have the attitude we were going to cure the world; we were really going to go about our business. Mostly we were broke, [those were] the depression days, and we liked the University very much. Most of us realized that we were (unintelligible) and most of it was because of the University. But we enjoyed it! We enjoyed the social functions, the work, and campus organizations. You know, we had big bonfires before the football games. Went around with trucks all over Missoula to get cardboard boxes that would be piled as high as some of these buildings out here. Silly stuff, but it was fun. We were out

there to show our school spirit. I think that that's what I would like to say: sometimes, I think even now, I don't think the students out here are having as good a time as we had way back. I really don't believe they are. They're trudging to class, looking grim about it all and they're fretting around what they are going to be 50 years from now. What the hell difference does it make? I mean, they should be having fun; too, they really should be having fun. We went to dances and all kinds of (unintelligible). Now they go to rock concerts. Good God. It's all right, too, but I just, really, Annie, I just don't think that students are having as much fun as they should at that age. Annie, you're going to have a grim life for years as you go along afterwards. Lots of responsibility. I think college students ought to do the work, yes, be responsible enough to do some studying and get the most they can out of the courses, but at the same time, having some associations, meeting people, falling in and out of love three or four times, you know, being hauled home drunk a couple of times, doing all of the kind of hideous things you can't do later. Really! You're not going to get to do some of those things in later life and that is what I think is missing somehow. It's an outlandish observation on my part. I think right now, as we walk across the campus and talk to some students, I think it's kind of coming back. I think there's more of a feeling of enjoying the University a bit more than they did for some of the past years.

The University will be here long after you are and I'm gone. I'm sure it will be. What kind of a place it will be is difficult to tell. I sometimes don't think we have the loyalty in the faculty that we had in my day. Because I'm different, I'm changed, I view it differently. I've gotten to be old, I've become a fuddy-duddy in a sense, what I didn't think was important ten years ago I find important now. What I thought about responsibility 25 years ago is different from the way I do now. Very difficult as we go along (unintelligible). It's very difficult in my opinion, to really to evaluate that which took place 25 years ago. Was that really the proper thing, the way it should have been? Sometimes I puzzle over that. I think we fiddled around with the curriculum out here, all of the discomfort arising out of the Vietnam war. Every time a kid had an idea, we started a new course. We tried to make everyone an environmental lawyer, and everyone an environmental engineer, and all this stuff. They all wanted to be environmental, but they didn't take any law. Do you know what I mean? Yet we let a lot of students tell these institutions what they should be doing, what [they should be] teaching. They didn't know anything about teaching, did they? We did that. Warped curriculum matters out here and all over the country in all kinds of ways, non-grades, you know all that business.

AP: Pass, fail system?

RP: Pass, fail, all kinds of things we did. But people said, "Well, grades don't count." It isn't true always that a grade really reflects that which a person knows, but it does count. We worked that out and threw a lot of stuff out of the way. Here we are out here right now, right here and now at this time, it's been three or four times already at this institution, we are now going from the quarter system to the semester system. We'll be in the semester system, I predict, maybe ten, maybe 15, maybe 20 years out here. Whatever you don't have you are going to want available. (Unintelligible sentence). Do you see any reason why we should do this? Give us more

of this, and more of that, and more of the other. Then later I don't like it, that isn't true, we'd better go back the way we were doing it because that was better. That sort of thing is a thing where a university is difficult in terms of what is taking place because it's fragile. A university is fragile. It isn't like the local bank downtown that doesn't say anything and it's all going to be sturdy. Hell, no! Somebody doesn't like the way it is and all of a sudden a whole program goes down the tubes. I don't know that I said anything except to say that it is a fragile institution. You say, "Would I do about the same thing?" I think the fact that it [the university] came through and is still in existence after I got done is just plain good fortune. (unintelligible)

[Discussion of Rudy Autio about the grizzly bear and reactions.]

RP: He is a good guy, too.

AP Yes, he is, just very down to earth.

RP: Yes, a good guy, a fine guy. So then on the grizzly bear.

[Unintelligible section]

RP: He didn't tell you this I know, because he didn't know this I don't think. We got the grizzly bear out there, we had it dedicated and I was at the dedication, and a whole pile of people were out there. It was a nice, beautiful day in the fall. It was homecoming. At the next faculty meeting, a general faculty meeting, someone got up and says, "We can't buy books! We can't take a trip to our association meeting! We can't do this! We can't do that! But we can put up a goddam old grizzly bear out there in the oval!" (laughs)

AP: Really?

RP: Oh yes, and a lot of them hollered, "Hear, hear." and "That's right!" Then some guy got up and says, "Well, you boobs, that grizzly bear is going to be here when you're all gone, and they're still going to be worshipping that damn thing!" (laughs)

I got into the act then, I say, "You know one thing you forgot is Rudy Autio didn't get anything for doing it. He did it for his own love and at our request. He didn't make any money out of it. We got almost all of the material from three or four different outfits in Montana who gave it to us. It didn't cost any of you a thing, but they weren't going to send you to any goddamn meeting anywhere, anyhow." (laughs)

AP: Anything else, Bob?

RP: Oh, no, I've taken too much of your time and I don't think I've helped you very much.

[End of Interview]