

UNCG CENTENNIAL ORAL HISTORY PROJECT COLLECTION

INTERVIEWEE: M. Elaine Burgess

INTERVIEWER: William Link

DATE: November 8, 1990

[Begin Side A]

WL: I'd like to start by asking you to remember the first occasion that you came to this campus and the sort of initial impressions you might have had when you first came here. In doing—in answering that question, maybe you could provide a little bit of context about your background and what brought you here—how—what educational or personal or social forces brought you to this campus and what impact—what impressions you had of Woman's College of [the University of] North Carolina when you first arrived?

EB: Well, you want to know the absolute first time I saw the campus in passing or my first contact that was a professional contact?

WL: First—yeah, right—the latter, I guess, the first time.

EB: I guess the first—aside from having driven through Greensboro at some point years before was—the first time was when I was brought over for a job interview to spend the day with the faculty, the department. I had been—since I did my doctoral work at [the University of North Carolina at] Chapel Hill, I had heard things about the college, and what I'd heard had been quite positive because I had many of my graduate faculty members tell me that Woman's College was—did perhaps the best job at that time with its undergraduate majors. It gave them attention, and it had a fine staff, et cetera. Whereas Chapel Hill and some of the other schools were more interested in graduate students, and at that time they felt that it was stronger than Wake Forest [University] certainly.

Now my background is from the Pacific Northwest. That's where I was born and raised and attended as an undergraduate, so I came—I had—between my undergraduate days and graduate school, I had held positions at the University of Hawaii and the University of Connecticut, and then I came from Connecticut to the South—to North Carolina for graduate school, so I'd been here. I was in my fourth year when I came, and I had thought I would return to the Far West and had been offered a position in a state university out there, but the president [chancellor] of the Woman's College was a man by the name of Gordon Blackwell with whom I'd had a graduate course my first year at Chapel Hill. And then he was tapped to come here and then up here to Florida State [University]. And between Dr. Blackwell and the Institute for Research and Social Science at Chapel Hill, they put together a package and offered me so that I would be teaching here, but would be able, at least for the first several years, to be half time doing—as a research associate there.

And I think that attracted me. There was a project coming in, and a research grant coming in, and I think maybe that's what made me decide. But I enjoyed my introduction that day. I remember quite vividly—and I remember the final part of it, going over to what was then, you know, where the faculty—what we call the faculty building, whatever it is.

WL: Faculty Center?

EB: That used to be a student coke place.

WL: Soda shop.

EB: Yeah, Soda Shop. They didn't have a—I guess they didn't have a soda shop in Elliott [Hall, student center] then. And I remember we sat there for some time after the formal part, and it was a small department. There were just three or four of us that first year, although it was one of the oldest of the departments in the college. It was founded—I think history and then sociology and social sciences, but it had always been small.

And the other thing that I remember is that there was a very nice cocktail party at the home of Dr. Lyda Gordon Shivers, who was the chair at that time. Dr. Shivers was a very lovely, gracious Mississippian—the first woman from Mississippi to receive her law degree. In Mississippi her father was a judge someplace, and she also—then she came up to Chapel Hill and received a PhD in sociology, and she was interested in crime and delinquency.

She had a cocktail party there late afternoon, so that I could meet some of the other faculty. And they were very gracious and charming people, and I thought, "Well, this is kind of a nice, you know, community," so I went back and I talked with everybody, and the chair of the department at Chapel Hill didn't want me to take it. And my advisor wanted—thought it would be a swell thing to do, so I was being tugged. The department chairman wanted me to go take the position in the large research-oriented university because, of course, that's what they wanted. But anyway—and I talked to the senior faculty who'd be working on the project that they were putting together, and so finally I decided I'd come. And so I just had this sort of a snapshot sense of the place. I did—you know, because I hadn't spent any time over here at all, but I felt comfortable with the people.

Oh, and I had met several graduates in the interim in my time in Chapel Hill who—a lot of the women that I was meeting were professionals or were going on had been UNCG [The University of North Carolina at Greensboro] grads, and they were quite fine, you know, so this sort of supported the things that I heard casually the faculty saying about the Woman's College at that time. So that's it. Nothing dramatic. [laughs]

WL: Tell me more about the department. You say it was a small department, the sociology department.

EB: It was sociology and anthropology.

WL: Yeah, yeah.

EB: And we had a—and we had a chap who had a PhD from Ohio State University. And I forget where Richard [unclear] did his work. He had been a journalist and then gone back to get his

PhD at one of the very strong schools in anthropology. He was a super scholar. And Dr. Shivers, of course, that I mentioned. And then I came in. Dean [Mereb] Mossman, of course, was on the faculty, on this faculty, and was still teaching a course every semester. Although she was—when I started, she was dean of faculty and then she became the first vice chancellor for academic affairs. And they had some part-time people I've forgotten. They also had had some other faculty earlier who became quite well known, quite outstanding in their field. So, you know, I felt even though it was small that it had kind of pretty good substance to it.

WL: Mereb Mossman—was she involved in your interview when you first arrived?

EB: Oh yes, yeah. She was dean of faculty so, yeah, I had a lengthy interview with her. Then she was there at the cocktail party, so I then met her informally. She was very easy and very [hesitates]—I thought—I always found her to be a superb administrator. Now, like all administrators, you've got those who are detractors and her supporters. And, in retrospect, I think she's even a more superb administrator than I thought at the time. And I don't know many administrators that don't have those who dislike them, but I at no time ever felt that I couldn't, no matter what it was, get an appointment very quickly to go into her office and blow off steam, whether I was a young assistant professor without tenure or what. And I used to get mad because I didn't think she was paying enough attention to some of the social sciences. You know we all want more, but I really always had great respect for her, and that began at the very beginning. My initial contact was a positive contact. So I hadn't been here very long before I was filled in to that decade before, which had been fairly—not fairly, but very acrimonious.

WL: Right.

EB: I was so glad that that was past, [laughs] but some of those scars—wounds—were still lingering, but I didn't pay any attention to that.

WL: Were there still divisions in the faculty?

EB: I think, you know, when you're just fresh out, and you're just kind of getting your feet, you're not sure, but I felt tensions those first maybe first two or three years in the faculty council that I later didn't. There were people that no matter what they recommended, there was another group that would vote them down. And I'm thinking now of Warren Ashby [philosophy professor and founding director of the residential college], another person that I had great respect for and got to work with in honors and other things over the years. There was that early period when no matter what Warren might say, there was a group that would veto it, including a major in philosophy. I couldn't believe one group had blocked philosophy major on a liberal arts campus when—but apparently Warren had taken a stand that he felt was a fair stand, and there were those who didn't—I use that as an example. I mean there were other things, and I don't mean just to pick Warren out, but I don't think Warren would mind if I used him because again, you know, I respected him so much and found himself to be so absolutely fair-minded all the time. So there was some of that. I think there were other lingering things. I think there were lingering angers with Miss Mossman

that's—on some people's part.

WL: Which lingered on? I gather there—as you say, there were people I talked to, and I've talked to a number of people either were very, very much admirers of her or tends to be a group of detractors—

EB: Oh, yeah.

WL: I guess that's natural, but she does—

EB: Oh yeah, in a sense polar. I think that there was some of this with the dean of women [Katherine Taylor, dean of students] too, who was very powerful when I first came. And indeed I found her very difficult myself. I found—I felt she was unfair often with students. That was just my perception. Again, she has people who, you know, would support her to the hilt. But I think some of the animosity there probably—there was a—you know, you could go around, and as I say, I wasn't that aware, but you can't help but pick some of it up if it's the second most powerful administrator or if it's somebody who is really as first rate as Warren Ashby was. You sensed, "What's going on here?" But in a little while, I didn't get that so much. There was a lot of attempt to try to protect one's own turf as far as any changes in curriculum for a while, but then I began to get a feeling that this opened—and it might have been that you got a change in some of the personnel, and sometimes that makes a difference. So that by the mid-sixties, I really got a feeling of kind of a—I'd walk down the campus, and I'd get a really warm feeling and I'd—you knew everybody, and you'd stop and talk. Now we got—very soon got a new president, as you know, and he came in with some ideas to change things and did, and stirred the pot. It probably needed stirring.

WL: This is [Chancellor] Singletary?

EB: This is Otis, yeah.

WL: Yeah.

EB: And the best thing that Otis did was, I think, to bring [James B.] Jim Ferguson [became chancellor] in as his vice—first as the dean of graduate school and then into—I don't know what he moved him into—something. But anyway—

WL: He was acting chancellor.

EB: Oh he—yeah, when Otis went to Washington [DC].

WL: Right.

EB: I'm sure that he said, "Let's let Jim do that job."

WL: Yeah. Let's get back to Gordon Blackwell some more.

EB: Okay.

WL: You worked with him. I suppose he was here—

EB: He wasn't here at all. He was here that spring that I was hired, but he went—

WL: He was gone by then.

EB: —in August went to Florida State [University].

WL: Oh, I see.

EB: So I never was under him.

WL: And didn't know him that well?

EB: Well, I had a graduate course with him my first semester at Chapel Hill. It—one of three professors teaching a special course in research methodologies, so I knew him that way.

WL: Director of the Institute [for Research in Social Science].

EB: Yeah, but I did not know him in other—another capacity.

WL: Yeah. This is probably a very unfair question, but I wonder what kind of impact you think he had here?

EB: I don't think he was here very long. Do you?

WL: Wasn't here long enough. No.

EB: I think what he—. Oh, I think what he did is probably exactly what [William C.] Bill Friday [president of University of North Carolina System] wanted. He came in as a southern gentleman and kind of put the lid on all this—which it needed it because I think it had gone on and on, and I think Bill Friday was probably—had about enough of it. [laughs]

WL: Yeah.

EB: Because [Edward Kidder] Graham, [Jr.] had gone, and it just kept going, and I think maybe Gordon was—might have been selected to do that job before he went on. That's just—I don't have any proof of that. That's just was my hunch.

WL: Yeah, yeah.

EB: So I don't think aside from that that he had much—

WL: How would you describe his personality—Gordon Blackwell? This might be another unfair

question.

EB: Ooh. It's hard for me to remember.

WL: You said he's a southern gentleman. Was he courtly?

EB: He's a very—yeah, a very good looking—I thought always handsome and, you know, dressed very carefully and gave you the—he had the trappings, I think, you know, of a southern intellectual tradition. I suspect that he could be a very tough administrator. I don't know. I mean I have no notion. I think he was fairly conservative, but, you know, I don't know in that short time what to tell you. I just don't—he wasn't like Otis. Otis came in, you know, phew—[laughs] Daddy Rabbit was all gung ho. Very different.

WL: Yeah. Between Gordon Blackwell and Otis Singletary there was an acting chancellor, [William] Whatley Pierson, who came in twice as acting chancellor, once between Graham and Blackwell and then between Blackwell and Singletary. Maybe you don't remember him, but I was wondering—

EB: Well, I might have been gone.

WL: You might have been gone. This was '62, I believe.

EB: No, I would have been here.

WL: Yeah. He didn't make much of an impact, I guess.

EB: No.

WL: There was a one-year period—

EB: Only that he married—later that the head of the math department married him, I think. That's the only thing I remember. Yeah, I think I forget her name. She was very powerful on campus, and she ran McIver Building with an iron hand. The whole—and I mean the whole building. If she said you were supposed to do this, you didn't do it.

WL: Are you thinking of Donald Anderson?

EB: Oh, I'm thinking of Donald Anderson. Was he the one?

WL: Yeah, Anne.

EB: Anne. Well, who's Whatley Pierson? I haven't the foggiest—

WL: W. W. Pierson. He was dean of the graduate school over at Chapel Hill.

EB: Are you sure it wasn't Don Anderson that came over and did this?

WL: He was vice president under Bill Friday.

EB: Yes, okay, yeah, sure. Yeah, okay, that's right. Well, then I don't know who Whatley Pierson was.

WL: Yeah.

EB: That was. [laughs] I missed it. No, I don't remember.

WL: Yeah.

EB: Isn't that funny?

WL: Where was—tell me about the physical location of the sociology and anthropology. This building didn't exist.

EB: No, we were on the third floor of McIver [Building].

WL: McIver. The—

EB: We were on the—or we had the wing—you go up the elevator, okay. And our bailiwick went around to the corridor that takes you across over at the ark.

WL: Yeah.

EB: And then down to oh, what was his name—there was just one office and that was classics—Frank.

WL: Frank Lane?

EB: Frank's office, okay.

WL: Yeah.

EB: And that—and the seminar rooms and so forth in that were sociology and anthro, and then from—then down from there were colleagues in romance languages, I think.

WL: How did sociology fit into the college curriculum? Did it—were there any required courses that—did you have large classes? Were they—?

EB: Yeah, I did. For the size of that student body, my classes were large. They were larger than a lot of my friends were having. Certainly than my friends in history were having—sixty-five students in introductory freshman American history. They were large because there were some things that required them.

I'm not sure, you know. I think we were always, you know, kind of working to get

more inclusion of social sciences and political science and then geography as it came. Because traditionally, particularly in the South, history sort of had the control of that bailiwick.

The—as I say, the advantage that we had was that it was one of the—it is one of the oldest programs on the campus. I wrote a little history—one of those thousands of times we have to do a five-year plan, so I went over and I dug all—everything out of the library that they could find for me going clear back. So it was something like 1914, 1915 that we began to offer courses and bring faculty in. And there was an early time when we had a College of Arts and Sciences with social sciences and so on, and then that was done away with—but anyway, I don't—I can't quite remember. I think, you know, there were social science requirements beyond the history requirements in the curriculum. I'd have to go back and look. I just don't remember, except that I always had big classes.

WL: Oh yeah.

EB: And we always had lots of majors. And during those early years, we had awfully good students, lots of student leaders, and well—one of my first students has been mayor pro tem of High Point. She's a beautiful woman—

WL: Who was that?

EB: —in her forties. Betsy—what's her name? [Becky Rhodes Smothers, class of 1961]. She's on the council again over there. Oh, I just saw her not long ago. I can't think of it. Of course, Dorothy [Kendall] Kearns [Class of 1953, MEd 1974] was a major, but she was before my time. But they were young women who've done very well. All of those women, like Emily Harris [Preyer, Class of 1939, honorary degree 1977], student body president my first year, Emily Harris [sic] [Herring] Wilson [Class of 1961]. They were good—awfully good young women—just very able.

WL: How would you—student life in that period? Let's say in 1960, '61, '62 seemed to have had a unique set of characteristics to it, unique traditions and unique habits that they followed—customs that were followed. Indeed, looking at 1960 and comparing thirty years later with 1990, student life seems to have been radically different, a radically different environment student life. Is that true?

EB: Yeah, yes, no. I think the—much of the sixties, certainly the first half of the sixties maybe till we were getting into '67. Well, although they brought fellows in in '64, it didn't really impact. But we began to then get some student unrest, and that thing that happened in the late sixties, '68, '69.

But I would say that what I found was closer to what they had had for the last—since the forties. The gals still had all sorts of rules and regulations about wearing apparel. You know, if they had jeans on, they had to have covered, and they couldn't go to class in them. You had to be dressed, and you couldn't do this and you couldn't do that. And there were still penalties for being caught drinking. There were all sorts of penalties, and for reasons why you could be sanctioned in one way or another. And I suppose I was here, and I heard—because I began to serve on as a faculty advisor for this or that group. The

beginnings of the sense of disquiet the young women had with all these super *in loco parentis*. I mean, it's really—and so those early days were much more traditional where there was a firm hand and the dean of women just could put in a lot of controls.

I think this was something—I had a sense that—I didn't know whether it was Dr. Singletary—it was two strong-willed people fighting each other, or whether he thought that there was too much tightness. Certainly I think Jim Ferguson was much more concerned about a lighter touch. And I don't think that ever bothered Mossman. I never felt that it bothered her one whit—that she was quite comfortable with the loosening. But that came at the latter part of the decade. Really began to see the change. You just couldn't do that. This—the kids were certainly not radical as they were at the University of Kansas or at [University of California at] Berkeley or the University of Washington or Cornell [University] or Columbia [University] or all those other places. But in their own way, they were mouthing off and doing all those things. [laughs]

WL: Yeah. Did you notice that in the classroom or the—?

EB: I began to see a change, yes, in the classroom. There was—moving into the late sixties, early seventies, a lot more yeastiness and a lot more talking and a lot more going on. There were some exciting times, and students were interested in meeting in faculty homes and going into lots of things that were happening.

I was teaching race relations. Of course, that was the only course for years and years on this campus that had anything to do with black-white relations, and I remember having a class of seventy students that semester and invited anyone from A&T [North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University] that wanted to come. And that included a young man by the name of Nelson Johnson [civil rights activist, minister, member of Communist Workers Party], who is their vice president. You probably may know. He's been involved in one way or another. And I invited a rabbi who preceded [Arnold] Trask [Temple Emanuel, Greensboro], but he was equally good, and I invited some former students, black and white, who were doing graduate work at Chapel Hill. And the kids—they didn't go home. They just stayed. It went on and on, you know, and they just were full of it.

And that was—and it was the same way in the classroom. The class period would end, and they would just go on and on. That of course was an appropriate course, but it was happening in others too during that time. I thought it was a tremendously exciting, yeasty time, I really did. And the kids were terrific.

Now a little bit later as we got into the seventies, we got into a pattern that was not uncommon from Stanford [University] to Harvard [University] and all these places in between, and that is the attacking—the ugly period of name calling, racist, and this and that. And we got a little bit of that. And I got a little bit of that.

WL: As a sociologist, sociologist of race, I wonder if you'd mind sort of going back to when you first arrived here and talk about the presence of black students and the subject of race on this campus and how, if at all, that changed over, say, the course of that ten years—1960 to '70. There must not have been very many black students.

EB: Just a handful when I first came.

WL: Was that course—I presume that course wasn't taught?

EB: Oh yeah, that course had been in—as I say, it's the only one that was on the—

WL: It was on the books when you got here.

EB: On the books and had been for some time, and it had been taught, I think most recently, by my good friend, Richard [unclear] in anthropology, but he was happy to turn it over to me. He said, "That's not my—I'm a cultural anthropologist, not that." But I had—from the outset I had—I always had two or three of those black students, at the minimum, in my various classes. Some of them were majors. But those who weren't, of course, were interested in finding something they could feel attached to.

The first two years I didn't get to know the black students very well. They were—then they were very highly selective, of course, and I think one of them I think I did have in class is—she—I went to the McIver program workshops. I went to the first morning, first day this fall, and she was chairing it. I don't know whether she's an alumni officer or the chairman of that program, but she's a very, very attractive black woman, and she was a student here in '60, '61. And she's one that was in a class that I didn't get to know because it was a sizeable class. It wasn't a race relations class, by the way. It was something else.

WL: Yeah.

EB: Now, early on some of those youngsters felt comfortable about—because we talked, and when you're young, a young faculty, it's—you get rapport. And often after class I'd walk over with them to the soda shop, and we'd sit on the steps and have a coke and keep talking about whatever. Soon some of those black students along with some of the white students that had been—they had befriended, either in class or in the dorms, would come into the office and hang around the offices after class, so I got to know them. So that they felt pretty comfortable. So I picked up—we began to pick up things. Of course, the administration had, as you probably have been told, segregated the first black students in the dorms. Well, they resented that very, very much, of course. And then—

WL: That was still the case in—

EB: Well, I think it was probably still the case my first year or so—that I think that stopped soon after I came. I didn't hear any more of that. I sometimes heard concerns or hurt feelings because when they would walk across campus, particularly in the week—. And sometimes the gals' boyfriends who'd come on campus would make racist comments to them, and that was kind of hard to take. I think that they felt a sense of isolation, because there was such a small number of them. And I think they were always happy to find a faculty member or another white student that could join this small group, so they felt like they weren't being surrounded by the enemy. It was kind of hard.

But these were, for the most part, very able youngsters who—a lot of them went on to graduate work. I had one young, beautiful young woman. She was an English major. Diane Oliver [class of 1964]. She received a fellowship to continue. She went into creative writing. And she—I think she studied with Bob Watson [Robert Watson, English professor],

that group, and they saw that she got a good, good scholarship to Iowa. And she had her first short story published in the *Red Clay Reader*. Shortly thereafter she was killed in an accident there. I had her. She took two courses from me just because I gave her a chance to feel something about being black. So there was a—there were good people.

I remember then early on—I don't know, I had a—the beginning of some of the demonstrations when Otis was still on campus, so what would it be—pre-'65? I forget when he went up to Washington. Anyway, A&T was demonstrating and some—a few of our black students went, and one particularly feisty one went, and she was thrown in jail. And she was thrown in jail at the beginning of our final exam week, and she got messages to me by way of her roommate, a young student who was a major (and a very good one) that got a fellowship to Washington University in St. Louis to work on her doctorate. Anyway, Gwen gave me word, and I remember going over to the dean of something, who was at that time Laura Anderton [associate dean, College of Arts & Sciences, biology professor]. I forget Laura did that for a couple of years. You know who Laura is?

WL: Yes.

EB: She may have been the first dean of—academic dean or something. Anyway, I went to Laura, and I said, "Laura, I've got a student. She's a senior. She should not be penalized. She's in jail for standing on what she believes because all the kids who were—it was passive resistance, and she went in. I want to be able to either give her her exam, if she's going to be in there for several days. If she wants to take it then, I'll wait and waive it and not turn in a—." So she said that she—that sounded reasonable, and she'd check with Otis. I don't think Otis was very happy, but I said, "Laura, if you say 'no' to me, I won't take it. I won't accept 'no.' There's no way I will accept 'no,' and I want you to tell the president I will not accept 'no.'" So, I don't know what they thought I could do, but [laughs] you know, I might have called the *Greensboro Daily News*, who knows. But anyway that worked out. And I didn't give her the exam the kids had. I asked her to use that experience in jail to tell me how she as a black student at a white college was relating what was going on. It was terrific. So there were these kinds of things.

WL: Who was that student? Do you remember?

EB: I can see her, but I can't pull it. I'd have to go back to my roll books which are all under here and pull it out. I just can't think of it. Her roommate was Gwen Jones, and I can think of several of them, but—

WL: I'd be interested in knowing her name, since I didn't realize there were any students from here that participated there. There were, in addition to her—

EB: Oh yeah. Oh well, in addition to that, I gave students permission to use—to put their picket signs in the corners of the seminar room that I used in McIver [Building] for both for my research methods and my race relations because they would go after—one of the classes was an afternoon class out at about 3:00 [p.m.], and they would go directly there down to the corner to picket, and they didn't have any place to put them. And I said, "Well, sure you can put them here." And another time after class—

WL: This was picketing actually the segregated facilities—

EB: The facilities—

WL: —right here on Tate Street?

EB: —on the corner. And another day they said, "Dr. B, would you do something for us?" And I said, "If I can." Said, "Would you take a—the whole class down to the Apple House for coke after class?" I said, "Sure." And then I smiled and I said, "Okay, I got it." Because there were three blacks in there, so we all went, and we sat down, and they first ignored us and then finally somebody came over and started talking. I said, "Before you say anything, I'm a member of the faculty. This is my class. If you don't serve all of us, I will be sure to let every faculty member know and every student know that this place is off limits." So they served us and that was—that broke it.

WL: You desegregated it?

EB: Yeah, it was easy, you know. Then the—but the kids were the ones that were doing it. They were brave. And they were so disciplined because they were frightened 'cause the Ku Klux Klan would come rolling up. And they were never in danger, but they didn't know. You know, those early days—those young Southern gals. That was a pretty big step. So there was a little of that going on, and I got to see it. And I was, you know, I felt they did a nice job. And they organized it.

WL: Did the numbers, I gather the numbers of black students increased by the end of the decade.

EB: Yeah, yes, each year.

WL: So let's say by the late 1960s, there's—although not a large number of black students, significantly larger than had been.

EB: Yeah. I—you know, because the total student body still was what—we were growing from 2,500 to 3,500 to 4,000, so there were always black students—were always a presence in McIver Building because of the programs that were over there. They were all taking history; they were all taking language; they would take, electing to take, they were taking English; they were taking poli[tical] sci[ence]; they were taking soc[iology]; they were taking anthro[pology]. So there were—I saw probably more than maybe some disciplines, you know. I don't know what they were seeing in home ec[onomics], for example.

But they began—they continued to grow. And they began to be—to voice their anger, and then when I returned from the University of Kansas, they had just developed, organized their Neo-Black Society. And their first president had been a young black student I'd had before I left as a freshman. She was a senior. I'd had her in a freshman honors section, and she asked—she was an art major. But she asked Dean Mossman, Vice Chancellor Mossman if I—if she could get permission to ask me to direct her senior thesis in which she wanted to combine her art with kind of a social commentary about what was

happening. And so Dean Mossman wrote me at Kansas before I had returned—when I had already told the chancellor I would and asked me if I would do that, and I said I would, and so I did that. And that was a very exciting thing. And that Neo-Black Society was the beginning of a new kind of tension then. They were fining themselves, and sometimes they wouldn't speak [laughs] to the whites, and they were segregating themselves somewhat over at the commons and so—but that was when they were beginning to find their voice as they moved into the seventies.

WL: The Neo-Black Society was organized as a sort of an expression of—?

EB: Black caucus.

WL: Black caucus?

EB: Expression of—

WL: Consciousness?

EB: Consciousness, black power, black pride, “black is beautiful,” soul—the whole gamut of strategies that had begun to emerge within the black community, particularly among the young.

WL: Were you—did you—were you here after the cafeteria strike? Did you—?

EB: Yes.

WL: —you returned after that?

EB: No, no, I was here.

WL: Oh, during it?

EB: I got back just as it started, yeah.

WL: What do you remember about that?

EB: I remember walking the campus at night with [James B.] Jim Allen [Presbyterian campus minister, vice chancellor of student affairs], Warren Ashby [philosophy professor], some of the students—Shirley Flynn [dean of students for residence life], who was the—I think—I don't know whether she was the dean of women back then. Some of the other people—we were on a committee the chancellor had appointed to analyze race relations on campus. That was hard to do. It wasn't a good thing. [laughs] But anyway we had a meeting in the library, and then we went out. I remember that night. And I remember during the day, you know, trying to be sure that things didn't get out of hand, particularly because the police kept wanting to come onto campus. We didn't want them on campus. That wasn't what was needed. But I remember that well.

WL: Was there much of a campus police force at that point?

EB: No.

WL: Yeah.

EB: A few campus cops. I bet four, maybe. And they'd been around forever, you know.

WL: Yeah.

EB: Kind of typical. And I remember the committee that Jim Ferguson appointed: Harriet Kupferer [anthropology professor, Class of 1943] and [Robert] Bob Calhoon [history professor] and Henry Frye [chief justice, NC Supreme Court, first African American justice], I forget who else. It was a good group, and I can remember they were in there meeting morning, noon and night. And then I talked to one of them, you know, afterward to see what was going on.

WL: These—a similar sort of thing was happening on a lot of the campuses in North Carolina.

EB: Yes, Chapel Hill.

WL: Chapel Hill.

EB: Very much involved. I don't know what was that much was going on in Raleigh, but that could be simply because I wasn't paying any attention. I always knew what was going on in Mecca, in Chapel Hill [laughs] and here.

WL: And A&T, of course.

EB: Well, of course, A&T. And of course, A&T—what was happening here was not separate from what was happening there, as you well know. We had a lot of those people working our food service that were A&T kids, I think, and plus probably some of the catalysts were from the Nelson Johnsons over there saying, "Hey why don't you guys get on the stick. Don't you see what's happening—hat the state doesn't even have a minimum wage? They're not even paying national minimum wage," all this. And in effect kind of fired the guys up. And I suspect that some of those kids from over there were over here helping organize. It would be very odd if they weren't. I mean—that was—of course, that's the name of the game.

WL: How would you describe the conflict over the—the conflict involving the strike? There seems to be more than—there were certainly more than two parties involved. Correct me if I'm wrong, but there seems there were a lot of students who were sympathetic perhaps to the strikers.

EB: Yes.

WL: The strikers themselves, the administration, the ARA [Food Service], managing—

EB: Yes.

WL: —and there were perhaps the people in the city who wanted all this campus turbulence to be settled to an extent. I mean to the extent that they were involved at all. How did these—all these groups work together?

EB: Well, the students that probably didn't care one way or the other were fairly irrelevant at that moment. They didn't—they weren't out there trying to do anything to stop those students, and you—your leaders came from your student government. The student body president ran the what's her name?

WL: Bryant.

EB: What?

WL: Randi Bryant [Class of 1969].

EB: Right, yeah, Randi Bryant was out there. And one of the things that we hoped is that Randi would keep her head on her shoulders. [laughs] No, for a while the students perceived Jim, who was the epitome of the administration, as the enemy. And, of course, Jim was not the enemy. Jim was the one that had to pull the groups that you mentioned together to be sure they were meshing. And it was a slow process. You know, it wasn't—it couldn't be done just overnight. He had to—but he did act. He acted very fast. He put in a first-rate group of people—

[End Tape 1, Side A, Begin Side B]

EB: —afraid there might be a little damage to Foust [Building] that one night, and then they were going to march on Jim and get kind of a—I think—I guess they did march on Jim and Frances [Jim's wife]. But they finally, I think, realized that he wasn't blocking anything they were doing. He was trying to organize. And you had to deal with ARA. Was it—were we with ARA then? I've forgotten.

WL: Yes.

EB: We had to deal with them, and there were also some state laws involved and we had to get that going. And I think as a whole it went fairly rapidly, and I don't think—it just seemed like a long time—three or four or five days. The townspeople, I don't know what they thought. I was—everybody who cared were so involved with what was happening here that we didn't pay any attention.

WL: Yeah.

EB: My recollection is that the newspaper was sympathetic—that there wasn't anything. But then I've found from the moment I got here that that paper had a sympathetic, very sympathetic voice to race relations. In fact, I was told when I first went to Chapel Hill that, at that time (I don't know that they'd say it today.), but at that time the *Greensboro Daily News* was one of the best state papers. That they thought it was a good, solid paper—been run well. It was still not owned by an outside group, but—and I think it still is a good paper, but I think it was better then. So that would be the only thing I would know from the outside, and I think they were was quite sympathetic.

WL: The cafeteria strike has been described by some people as Jim Ferguson's greatest challenge. Do you think that's an overstatement, or was it perhaps the greatest crisis of his chancellorship? Is that accurate, or do you think this was a case in which his rather distinctive leadership abilities came to the fore, or—

EB: I don't think that it was his greatest challenge. It certainly was his most volatile, emotional challenge. I think Jim faced a lot of different kinds of challenges. I think this was a hard one for him because here's a person who devoted his life to the cause of racial equality, and I think it always hurts—I remember how it hurts when somehow—suddenly out there somebody's perceiving you as some kind of a racist or bigot simply because you're not just jumping and ranting and raving, you know, instead of trying to think things through. So in that sense, maybe, it was heart wrenching for him, but I think Jim faced an awful lot of challenges over his tenure of various kinds that weren't as dramatic.

WL: Such as?

EB: Well, gosh. [laughs] I think the whole problem of growth and change in new directions was a major challenge for him and attempting to keep this a community of scholars while it grew. I think that was major challenge, and I think he did that well. That cause I think was lost soon after—began to be lost soon after he stepped down.

He was challenged to continue a job for a number of years while his wife, Frances, was in and out with cancer, and they had been a terrific team, and that was very difficult. And he never showed it, and he, at the same time, he had his first bout of surgery that ultimately led to the cancer that he died of. Those were challenges that he faced, and we didn't see—he was just there for us.

So there are lots of different kinds of challenges he faced. I suppose one of the greatest criticisms of Jim was that he didn't get enough money out of the budget for us, but in retrospect I think he did a lot better than has been done. And the other thing is that he was so highly respected by Bill Friday, the whole university administration, the whole state. I mean, he was a real intellect, a real man of education.

WL: He seemed to have a close relationship with Bill Friday.

EB: Oh, very, very close, and the legacy that he left, if we had followed it, could have made a real difference. I mean the groundwork was there. But yeah, the race thing was a hard one

for him. But he had others, and he handled them well.

WL: I wonder to what extent someone like Bill Friday would have contact with this institution, with Woman's College or UNCG. We—nowadays as a faculty member, I came into this university here in 1981. I gather that the president of the university, Bill Friday, and then later [C.D.] Spangler occupied a different position, say, thirty years ago. It was more of a regular presence or—

EB: Oh you mean Bill Friday?

WL: Bill Friday, yeah.

EB: Yes, oh yes.

WL: Was he on campus a lot? Did you see him?

EB: Yes. He came periodically and spoke to us in faculty meeting over some major issue. I remember the—following the '64 opening he came and talked with us about the blueprints for the three campuses that would be major research grant and advanced degree granting institutions and how that would work. As I say, the blueprint was there, and Jim Ferguson helped set it. We just, you know, we lost out. We lost our preeminence as the three Triangle, big brother, little brother and little sister and—but we had it under Jim. And he very often was here for Commencement. Not until the eighties did he begin to get substitutes, or no longer he came.

WL: Did he—he must have known a lot of the faculty here too?

EB: Bill?

WL: Bill, yeah.

EB: I expect he did. Yeah, I imagine he did.

WL: That doesn't seem to be Spangler's style at all, really.

EB: No, I don't think Spangler's ever been over here for a faculty or a Commencement, anything like that that I know of.

WL: I think he was over here once last spring.

EB: Was he? See I wasn't here so I—

WL: Yeah.

EB: —I have to be careful to say never because [laughs] when you're in and out with leaves of various kinds you miss out.

WL: Yeah.

EB: So I, you know—and I think all those other administrators in the Consolidated [System of the] University [of North Carolina] office had strong ties—like Don Anderson [vice president, Consolidated System of the University of North Carolina] and all those—and were friends, and I suspect there was some socializing back and forth, you know, from time to time. So that was a strength for the campus in those days.

WL: Did you have any kind of—coming in the early sixties, did you perceive that this was a place—institution that was undergoing a transition? Was there a feeling on the part of—perhaps even anxiety—on the part of the faculty about what—?

EB: I think there—I didn't, of course. I didn't. It was imperceptible, but I think there was some anxiety of a few of the old faculty when Otis had been here a couple of years and was stirring things up a little bit, and I think it quieted down. I think the—I noticed it when Jim asked me to come back because they were beginning the big move in ours, and they had brought in—were bringing in some very fine people: Wayne Thompson [sociology department] from Cornell [University], the chair, and [Edward William] Bill Noland [University Distinguished Professor of Sociology] was one of—a Burlington professor, and Dean Mossman gave me the go ahead to call my good friend, Joe Himes [sociology professor], and see if he might be interested in coming over as a Alumni professor, and he was. They began the graduate program and began to see history grow its graduate program, and English, and psych[ology], and those kinds of things then were really big steps that were coming in the seventies. Whether that frightened some people—a lot of people were unhappy about the making it coed—

WL: Yeah, yeah.

EB: —but that was—we didn't have any say. We didn't have any say. That was just, you know, the new law. [laughs]

WL: Yeah.

EB: You couldn't have state universities where they were sex segregated. And I suppose I remain neutral on that. I had gone all my life to coed colleges and universities, so it wasn't anything new to me. But I really respected the feeling—the special quality of women and men's campuses, and I just—but I just, you know, thought, what, you can't get exercised. That's foolish.

WL: Yeah. Did—tell me more about Otis Singletary. And he had, I gather, a somewhat controversial style that, again, tended to either attract people to him or—I gather he had a lot of supporters. I mean, I've talked to plenty of people who were great admirers of him. Maybe they are in retrospect more than they were then.

EB: Probably.

WL: Did he stir things up to the extent that he alienated faculty?

EB: I don't know that he was stirring faculty up, but he sure—stirring some of the administration up probably, and I think he stirred a few programs up. I think he thought there were some things that could be cut out or consolidated and so on to make way for other things. And I think he wanted the emphasis to grow on academic excellence, and he encouraged publication and that might have looked like he was playing favorites for some. He was willing to go to some lengths to keep faculty that he wanted here, and that may have caused some little acrimony—I don't know. His style—he's such a handsome dog—but he wanted—he was—he didn't have patience. He didn't suffer fools. He wanted things to move and he wanted them to go his way, but that didn't mean you couldn't make your case—that he wouldn't listen. That wasn't true. But I think he was a very ambitious guy, and there was a lot—he got all things going, and then he popped off to Washington for that thing, and back and forth and that probably upset some faculty. I think there are those faculty who had not been here long who probably saw him as a really terrific potential for change, but he wouldn't have stayed here no matter whether he'd gone to Washington or not. He was—this was a stepping stone for him and that makes perfect sense. He was a young man with great abilities, and he went from here back to [University of] Texas for a higher position, and then to [University of] Kentucky. He's had a few—taken a few lumps at Kentucky—

WL: Yes.

EB: —over the years. But he didn't—this wasn't going to be just a nice little Southern liberal arts campus. “You're going to publish. If you're going to publish, I'll see if I can get some money to underwrite the university press that's going to do it for you. If you're going to do this, and you're being—beginning to get some feelers about other jobs, I'll see if I can get you that raise and rank and get you a little salary increment—bigger.” In those days, we didn't go through—the rules of governance were a little bit different, you know.

WL: So these things were done informally, were they?

EB: Yeah, well, they had the various committee structures, but the—it was quite easy to manipulate those, I suppose. Anyway, he probably was considered confrontational by some. But others I think felt this is just what the doctor ordered.

WL: The department of sociology became the department of sociology at some point along here, breaking away from—

EB: Oh, the sociology and anthropology?

WL: Yeah.

EB: That came under Alvin Scaff [Excellence professor of sociology and anthropology], who was the—had come to us—he had been the dean of graduate school at Iowa State [University], and he came here wanting to get back into straight soc, and he was a terrific guy. Again, I was on leave [laughs] the year this happened. And I don't know what it was. I guess it was a squabble over who got the next faculty position in a faculty meeting because

at that time we were getting a lot of faculty positions. Everybody was growing and quite a bit. I think most of us have shrunk from those—the heyday of the late sixties through to the end of [Chancellor] Jim's [Ferguson] tenure. He was really pushing to get that. He did a terrific job of getting salaries up, being competitive to bring in strong candidates. Those were the days when we didn't have to—every position didn't have to be filled with a beginning assistant—that we had money to hire good name people. We could get them and things like that. And I think it came over probably—that split in the department came finally over that, and I think Alvin just thought well, the best way to do this is just let there be—I'm not sure that was smart. I've talked with Harriet Kupferer [anthropology professor and department head] about this a few times, but the other people in anthro wanted it, and I don't think either of us have blossomed as much as we'd like to get it together, but that's okay. This same thing happened to poli sci and history. They were ready, and they'd been together for years and years.

WL: When did you move into Graham Building? That must have been a major change.

EB: That was—well, that was completed in—It was—. Wayne Thompson was brought in to head the [sociology] department from Cornell. He had—he was a full professor at Cornell and had been the head of their research institute. That's the kind of person that Jim was attracting—really some good people. And Wayne got here before we finished it because he was able to make some changes. It must have been 1970 we moved in here. Both McIver and Graham [buildings] suffer from the rabbit warren syndrome for these things that I didn't see repeated in the Ferguson. My colleagues in that thing over there have decent—but—

WL: The cinder block—

EB: Yeah, but I think there was a choice. If your money is never as much as you need, you choose to either lay new brick walks and elaborate facades or you put the money into the academic, and I think Jim did this. We had more money for buying films, for bringing in—we had funds to bring in visiting, distinguished professors. I know they brought a marvelous guy in for a semester from the University of Rhodesia. Other departments did too—visiting dignitaries. So as far as I was concerned, I could live in this kind of thing if you had the other kinds of things with students and stuff.

WL: He was a very faculty-oriented sort of person?

EB: He was very faculty-, very academic-oriented.

WL: And so rather than facilities, he was concerned with—

EB: No, and also the size of the administration didn't just burgeon, triple, quadruple. It was a pretty sensible size, and you knew what the administration office's role was and what they were doing instead of—you know. So, you know as I saw it, those were the best of times, and I saw it again last year when I was on a very, very wealthy, very fine liberal arts campus. The administration remains in some kind of sensible size, and the faculty and the students get the big goodies, and there's a sense of a community of scholars, and the

president is approachable, and other administrators are and they're concerned about ideas. I think we've grown and kind of lost some of that. That's—

WL: Do you think that's a function of size, or—

EB: Well—

WL: —of style of leadership?

EB: I think it's style of leadership. I don't think size—it has to be size. I think that we've got a different style. We've got different goals. They're not idea—academic-idea oriented. The intellectual climate of the administration is nil, as far as I'm concerned. They're interested in appearances, interested in making the campus more attractive from their lights. They've been very interested in building business administration in their ties, way out of proportion to what the rest of the campus is getting. And that's not just unique to this campus, but it's tragic for this campus, I think, because it's take [sic] a long time. I think that as a consequence we've brought in a great number of very mediocre kinds of people in administrative positions. God knows what three-fourths of them are doing, but they're doing something, and I don't think that the faculty's particularly respected.

WL: As much as it was?

EB: Oh, no, no. And I don't see departments getting any the kinds of funds for enrichment that we once had. Just get nothing. Our budget isn't—the budget—I don't know what history gets, but I'm sure that if you compare what you were getting in 1972, 3, 4, it wouldn't be anything like is certainly true here.

WL: In terms of—?

EB: Compare—you know, you've got to look in terms of get it in perspective. Number of students, number of faculty. But this is happening in a lot of places, I think.

WL: Yeah.

EB: Higher education has gone through a lot of convolutions, some trauma. Maybe we could be on our way to a new phase, I hope.

WL: Do you think the—what sorts of things occurred in the transition from Mereb Mossman to Stanley Jones [vice chancellors for academic affairs]? And I gather Chancellor Ferguson must have delegated a considerable amount of authority, and that's a very powerful position.

EB: To Mossman and Jones?

WL: Yeah. To Mossman and Jones' position.

EB: Yes, and I've never thought of it, but in retrospect I didn't see that much. They were very

different, and I could get madder than the dickens at Stan. I was on his committee—selection committee, too. [laughs] But he was firmly committed to quality education, to higher education. He was firmly committed to the state university systems. He saw this system in this state as a very honorable thing. They both used Paula Osborne [Andris, class of 1944], who was the connecting link through many generations as their administrative assistant. She knew things about what had to happen when they didn't. Just as the woman that went out when Jim retired as his administrative assistant had known through a number of persons. Those two were such—there were such continuity, so that I didn't—

I never thought of it as a matter of style, perhaps, but as far as policy. Now we were growing and under Stan, we were growing pretty rapidly, doing a lot of hiring. He seemed to want more hands-on on some things, and he was delegating authority to the first dean of the College of Arts and Science since modern time. And so you were getting—that was one new layer, but it was necessary because of the size of the college. So there was some feeling that we had to go through a few more bits of bureaucratic red tape than we did, but it was nothing, really. So I don't really—I don't see that—

WL: So Stanley Jones wasn't really interested in building up a bureaucratic empire?

EB: No, I don't think so.

WL: Yeah.

EB: I never felt that. He didn't have five thousand assistant associate things. We had same—we had the head—[Dr. John W.] Kennedy, who was the head of the graduate stuff.

WL: Right.

EB: And we had Bob [?], but I think we did—I don't think, I think the dean of college was in place before Stan came in. I don't remember a lot of building up. There might have been a few more assistants or secretaries, but there wasn't a big—he was interested in making—he wanted to bring in good people, and you had to fight and you had to make your case. But I—

WL: Do you think—I've heard specific criticisms of Ferguson have been—to the extent that there have been criticisms—have been directed toward the question of facilities and deterioration of facilities that took place. There's also been a good deal of criticism about Henry Ferguson and the way he ran business affairs. How would you react to that? In other words, in shifting off all the resources to faculty, the physical plant—

EB: Well, that isn't quite fair because I remember the budget requests that went in for plant. And they were there. The requests for—to upgrade the dorms, or upgrade this, or to do that. We got the budget through in the new wing on the library, the money for this building; the money for the Ferguson Building was on the books. The money for some of the renovation of education may have been on the books too. But by that time, we were—we weren't just competing with Raleigh [North Carolina State University] and Chapel Hill.

Now, remember what Bob Scott—when Bob Scott was governor, he did a terrible

thing. He threw everything into the kitchen sink and said this is what it's going to be now. So you then had suddenly you had the university at [UNC] Charlotte and [UNC] Asheville and [UNC] Wilmington and East Carolina [University]—very, very aggressive, taking funds that had—we might have had a better crack it, you see.

WL: Yeah.

EB: So this was a really difficult time. So I don't know how much to say that—it wasn't that Jim wasn't paying attention and that he wasn't getting stuff ready to move along. The Ben Cone [Cone Mills family] gift [with wife Anne, named building that houses Weatherspoon Art Gallery] on that came by way of Jim. It didn't come by way of the present administration. He wouldn't—Ben wouldn't have given the present administration two cents. That was already in the pipeline. So you have to see what was happening, and then these things take time. But yeah, he didn't probably—well, he was only charging us something like ten dollars or twelve dollars to park. And he was putting—when he put the new parking lots, he didn't think that we needed to be charged the money—that that would take care of it. Well, what are we paying now? I don't know, a hundred [dollars] and something?

WL: Yeah, a hundred and twenty [dollars].

EB: And the community is now very angry because they have to—are charged if they come up for something.

WL: Yeah.

EB: I never heard of such stupidity. I don't know a university in America that does that. Henry Ferguson, like all—so I'm going to say, Jim put students and faculty first. Facilities for academic were high and probably didn't get as much money as if he'd been a loud mouth, coming up there and banging around. But he kept getting stuff, and then it got harder to get.

Henry—yeah, nobody ever had anything good to say about him. I don't—but I've been on five campuses, and I've never heard anything—anybody say too much [laughs] and people who had to work closely with Henry now say Henry was bad, but the present—what's his name?—[Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs] Dick Drake [Fred]—is horrible. [laughs] So what are you going to say? I don't know.

WL: Yeah, there are always complaints, I suppose. That's the kind of position that does receive a lot.

EB: Yeah. Henry was tightfisted, but we didn't hear rumors constantly of money disappearing and some slush funds and money being taken away from—as we hear now. Whether it's coming from the infirmary or a million dollars disappears or this or that or whatever. So you know, I can't answer that. It's just—I don't think the business—I don't know who was here before, but I don't think he's any more popular, and I never heard anything good about Chapel Hill or [laughs] about Kansas, so I can't say.

WL: I gather your view of the campus in the last thirty years has been of decline. Do you think

the campus has declined? In what respects has it declined? In what respects has it improved?

EB: Okay. I think that—I think there has been a real decline in the quality of students that we now attract. I think that began by the late seventies to become obvious and is continued. I think that the—except I think there probably lots of young faculty like you that just bop along like I did when I came. But I think there's a lot more discontent within faculty than there once was—a real, real discontent.

I stopped—when I dashed—I've been working at home trying to get some stuff ready to fax to South Africa, so I didn't even change clothes. I hope you don't mind. But I stopped at the credit union to do some business, and I ran into a colleague from romance languages, and we chatted. All I said was, "How you doing? Are you keeping out of trouble?" And boy, I mean, you know—and the administration. That didn't use to be—you know. You say, "How you doing? You keeping out of trouble?" You might have a fun conversation, but I get that a lot. When I get to—when I got back, I was—I'd had such a terrific year, I kept saying, "I don't want to hear it. Just don't talk about it." [laughs] You know, because—so I feel that in that sense there's a lot of dissatisfaction. I think they're a lot more uptight, there's a lot more confusion about expectations and I don't know anybody that has much pride right now in our representatives. I mean there might be indifference, but there's not.

I felt proud when I'd go out in the community because the community respected people. You know, I don't get that sense at all now. They respected the university; they respected the faculty; they respected the leaders. I think there has really been a decline in the stress on academic excellence. That didn't have to happen.

There's been a misplaced stress on athletics. In God's name, all this state needs is another big athletic program. Now I'm not talking about facilities for the kids. They should have all the facilities we can afford, if they've got equal facilities for their chemistry and all that stuff. But I find that sad because we don't have the resources that we need, and I think those are misplaced too. And I—there's no person fonder of college football than me. I adore it. [laughs] And I adore good basketball being played, but I don't see this thrust has been helpful any more than I see the thrust to make a School of Business Administration as big as the College of Arts and Science.

WL: That's all part of a larger—

EB: Totally misplaced values or what is a good university about. I have a friend in the art department. I'll just tell you this, maybe just give you. And my friend said one day, "I had the most interesting dream last night. I had drawn a new painting of the college. It was all of these little people walking to work with their little black lunch pails. And they were going over to work on these little VWs [Volkswagens], and they're being observed by all these faceless people in suits." She said, "We—I said I feel like the administration thinks of us as the labor force working on students, little VWs." [laughs] And I said, "You really are Freudian." [laughs] I think there is some of that sense—a lot of that sense among some faculty, not all.

WL: That they've become a kind of proletariat?

EB: Yeah, that they're really not—that they're really just—. So that does make for a less than happy campus. It is reflected very, very much in the lack of faculty participation in faculty governance. We have lost—this was one of the strongest faculty bodies I've ever been privileged to be a part of at one time. And we have practically no say. We just—a lot of what we do is just show.

WL: When you first were here did the faculty participate in it and were cohesive and had an impact?

EB: It didn't have to be cohesive, but, boy, they participated, throughout the sixties and well into the seventies. And we had—everybody had a say so, and we fought through on all sorts of things. We—faculty made major decisions about all sorts of things ultimately.

WL: But it was sort of a hierarchal system too, wasn't it? A—very strong dictatorial heads often?

EB: Yeah, but they didn't control faculty council; they didn't control faculty.

WL: The faculty council was another arena?

EB: Yeah. They didn't—at the council they only had one vote. Yes, I think that—but you still have that. You can still get a department head who can block this or that, just as you get your dean who blocks. All you have to do is serve on the university promotion and tenure committee to see what happens from department to college to school to the university to the president—the chancellor—to see whether or not it's working. Once in a while you will still get one of those. You could get that. Yeah, [Richard] Dick Bardolph [history department head] had probably a lot more clout than Allen [Trelease, history department head] has in history.

WL: Right.

EB: And in that sense it's been better.

WL: And they were sort of heads for life, weren't they?

EB: Well, I don't know. I didn't pay attention.

WL: That's an exaggeration, but they were heads for a long time. They were—

EB: Yeah, but that wasn't—Jim didn't put that in, and that continued under the present one because we—this department suffered under a head that I would have liked to chopped off. Took us—agonized, we couldn't get any help from [Chancellor William] Moran. So that even though now they rotate four—possibly four more, or variance of that, I think. Like in our department, we're doing the different model now. People are taking it for two years [laughs] to see if they can stand it.

WL: No one wants it.

EB: Well, that's I think that's a better—that's an onerous, just a nonsense job.

WL: It's a healthy sign to see people—I mean, you want someone to have it who doesn't want it, I guess, really.

EB: Yeah. This—and this is a problem that varies from campus to campus. And I think some—as I say, I think some departments did have this sort of problem. I never felt it here until just—from 1980 to '86 or '87 is when I felt it. And, see, that's a whole different time. But faculty committees really had something to do, say, be heard. Curriculum committee wasn't manipulated by the administration, as it very much can be manipulated now if they want to. Very much faculty controlled. As I say, the faculty council, which was the faculty as a whole, was open and—[laughs] I can remember going home at seven at night sometimes—they would go on. But I always felt like the faculty had something to say, and as I say, most recent time, I haven't been on the current type of faculty council, which is representative. You know, I served on two different terms for six years, but it hasn't—it's just sort of a kind of a sounding board. It doesn't seem to do much.

WL: And you think faculty are more passive generally than they were?

EB: Oh yes. Well, I don't think our younger faculty—one, are interested in doing all this committee stuff, this service gets in the way because the pressure is there to publish—

WL: Right.

EB: —to get your promotion and tenure. It's a different kettle of fish. And they're just interested in their thing. It's a—there isn't an encouragement to—for us to kind of pull together. Too many other constraints. So it's different. I don't think it had to be. I don't think that climate had to be quite what it is, but that's what it is. I sure understand it, and I don't think—I think a lot of faculty, younger faculty, would be more interested in us getting a good basketball team than they are in anything that's happening in faculty governance.

[End of Interview]