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EC: Dr. Behle, let's start out by getting a little of your background; if you can tell us where you were born, when; something of your youth and early schooling.

WB: Well, I'm a native Utahn, born in Salt Lake City, on the 13th of May, 1909. So I am now 74, going on 75. I went to the neighborhood school, which was the Oquirrh, on Fourth East between Third and Fourth South, which incidentally, has turned out quite a number of distinguished people. Then I went to the Bryant Junior High and then to East High, where I graduated in 1928. Actually, I missed a year because of sickness. When I got through at East, I proceeded to the University of Utah, arriving here as a freshman in the fall of 1928. My family background favors medicine. My father was a prominent physician and surgeon, and before him, his father practiced medicine in Salt Lake. So it was kind of the family dictate that I would follow along that line. I had no special preference, but I did so and entered the pre-med curriculum. But it wasn't long before I encountered, as many others have, the difficulty of mathematics. I have no aptitude for that. [laughter] Without math, you don't do very well in chemistry and physics. Pretty soon I realized that medicine was not for me, but still had no plans, so I fell back on zoology, which was attractive.

EC: Did you come under the influence of a particular professor up here
who may have had some influence on your decision in this direction?

There were actually several. If there was one person I had to name, it would be Ralph Chamberlin who was the chairman of the department, and a power on the campus; in my opinion, an intellectual giant. I was attracted to him. But there were others like Walter P. Cottam and W.W. Newby and Angus M. Woodbury—the whole group that I became very intimate with. Incidentally, Dr. Newby was relatively new, I think maybe it was about his second year.

Let's see, I believe he came in about 1927.

Yes. Well, anyway, I took comparative anatomy with Kim Newby and I thought he was an inspiring teacher. And I think surely he must have had a subtle influence on me. I just proceeded with a zoology major and a botany minor until I got my bachelor of arts degree—this would be 1932. But because of this year of sickness in high school, I was out of step with my peers; everybody else I knew from high school graduated in 1931. And so I came along about 1932. Actually though, I made up that year I lost in high school. Still, without any well-defined goals, I continued to take courses and decided to go on for a master's degree. I finished the work for the A.B. at the end of the winter quarter, and then I got permission to count the courses for the spring, summer and fall for the master's. So I ended up with a master's degree just about Christmas of 1932.

Didn't this also involve completion of a thesis?

Yes.
EC: And what was the subject of your thesis?

WB: This is sort of an interesting story. The subject was *The Bird Rookeries of the Islands of Great Salt Lake*, but I arrived at that by a very devious route. I had a great interest in boating, and in the Great Salt Lake. And as we were exploring, we came to some of the small islands, like Egg Island and Hat or Bird Island, and saw there old nests of herons and cormorants which intrigued me. I couldn't find very much information on them, so I just decided that I would make a survey of the bird life of Great Salt Lake. Ostensibly, I was working under Dr. Woodbury, but actually he was in Zion Canyon where he was a naturalist for many summers, and so I worked under Dr. Chamberlin. He was my advisor that summer. Well, I wrote up the results and presented them as a thesis in zoology, just about Christmastime. However, the degree wasn't granted until the following June. So 1933 was when I got my M.A.

EC: The book published by University Press on the *Bird Life of Great Salt Lake* then was an outgrowth of your master's?

WB: Yes, but that was many years later, but it sat at the press for about ten years, and so it was almost out of date when it was finally published in 1958. But you are right. This was an outgrowth of that early work. Incidentally, I gathered up all the copies that I could of my thesis and destroyed them [laughter] except the one which you have in special collections in the library. It was kind of amateurish. I think by the time the book got published, it was much more refined.
EC: I think many of us feel that way about our master's.

WB: Yeah. Well, then there's another aspect, namely that my career was entirely unplanned. It was a fortuitous sort of thing. I was attracted to ornithology because of this thesis, but I still didn't know what I really wanted to do. Kim Newby went down to the Stanford Marine Station for several summers, working on his Ph.D degree, and one summer he met an old friend from Kansas, Bill Burke, who told him about a new program being instituted at the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, at the University of California at Berkeley. They had a patron there, Annie M. Alexander, who periodically came through with funds. And she had decided with Dr. Grinnell, who was the director, to have a research assistantship in birds and one in mammals. This was a pilot program to train people in these areas. So, Kim, knowing of my interest in birds, suggested I apply, which I did. I was very pleasantly surprised when there was a little nibble of inquiry, and then the director who was on his way east to a meeting stopped off here to interview me. And then later I got the job. So I left here on the day after Christmas of 1932 and arrived in Berkeley the next day—took the train—and with suitcase in hand, arrived at the museum and met Dr. Grinnell again. After the initial overtures of conversation, he said, "When do you want to start work?" Well, I said, "Immediately. As soon as I get a place to stay." And I said, "I have no idea where I want to stay. Do you have any suggestions?" He said, "Well, try the International House." And so I carried my
suitcase across the Berkeley campus. They had an opening and within two hours I was back in the museum and started to work. They had just received a shipment of salted water birds from.

EC: Salted?

WB: Yes, salted. They had been cured by salt; they had been captured by the natives up in Alaska, I guess they were Aleuts, and had been salted down and then they were shipped to the museum.

EC: What did they do to the feathers?

WB: Nothing, nothing at all. But anyway, for the next several weeks, my task was to prepare these specimens, which meant soaking them in water; degreasing them by scraping off as much fat as you could and then soaking them in carbon tetrachloride and then after they were relaxed and degreased, preparing them as flat study skins.

EC: Let me interrupt here, when you mentioned carbon tetrachloride—of course, now it's absolutely verboten. What about it at that time? Did anyone have any indication of the harmful effects?

WB: No, no they didn't.

EC: Have you experienced any health problems as a result of your use of carbon tetrachloride?

WB: No, there was no thought of that. The single purpose was to get rid of the grease, and that was a most effective solvent, so we used it. Incidentally, in the museum, they fumigated with another deadly substance, carbon disulphide, which was hazardous to health and also was a fire hazard. Why that museum didn't go sky-high,
WB: I'll never know. And I really think it had an effect on me. They finally ceased to use it after two or three people passed out, but...

EC: The carbon tetrachloride or the gas?

WB: No, I'm speaking now of the carbon disulphide. They use it as a solvent in the rubber plants where they have had some very dire effects on peoples' health. I couldn't be sure, but a certain tremor and instability, which I've had ever since, I think may go back to the constant inhalation of both the carbon tet and the carbon disulphide for several years. They still don't have a very good fumigant. Most museums, although it's illegal, still use carbon disulphide, or else they use something equally noxious, which is paradichlorbenzine. This is a perennial problem.

EC: Let me ask one question. When you went there, at that time, were you aware of a Willard D. Thompson scholarship?

WB: Yes.

EC: Did you apply?

WB: No, I did not because I had a position.

EC: Your employment?

WB: Yes. This assistantship included a modest stipend and a waiver of tuition. One of my students later did receive a Thompson scholarship. At the time there was a corner on it, in biology though, at Logan. Datus Hammond, Eldon Gardner and several others seemed to have an inside track there. I think it wasn't until my student, Bob Selander, got it that it ever went to anybody at the University
WB: Of Utah.
EC: I had it there.
WB: Oh, did you?
EC: For two years.
WB: Uh huh. So that was my introduction to Berkeley, and then after four years...
EC: Let me interrupt one more time. You're talking about Grinnell? Well, the great author and explorer?
WB: Well, he was a remote relative of George Bird Grinnell...
EC: Oh, okay.
WB: ...who was the early authority on Indians.
EC: Yes.
WB: Now, well Joseph Grinnell was a great author, but his was highly technical stuff—systematics and distribution of birds and mammals. He was without a peer in that regard, but he was not the early popular writer named Grinnell. Well, I was going to say, I finally got my Ph.D. at Berkeley and that was in the spring of 1937. So I was there a little better than four years. And then, as luck would have it, I got a chance to come back to Utah. But let me back up and say that when I left Utah, to go out into the brave new world, I was never coming back. [laughter]
EC: Let me ask a question in connection with this. Now, I think your background is non-LDS?
WB: Yes, that's right.
EC: Would this influence have been decisive in your feelings?
Well, my background was in part, LDS, and in part, non-LDS. No, it was just that I didn't want to come back. I thought I'd outgrown Utah, but after two years of the fog and the rain, I would have crawled back. I just couldn't stand it down there. And as luck would have it--this is another break--there was an opening at Utah just about the time I got through with my Ph.D. So, in the middle of the summer, late June, I arrived back in Salt Lake. I think I made history at Berkeley because I got my degree, I got a job, and our first son was born all about the same time.

In depression years? In depression years. This caused quite a stir among my associates there, so I lucked out in many respects.

Did you know any Utahns down there?

Quite a few, yes. I belonged to a boy scout troop, troop 51, and there were a lot of the alumni of that troop that ended up in the east bay area, or San Francisco. And once a year we would get together at a reunion. And then there were people in the department from Utah--like Datus Hammond, whom I mentioned, from Logan, and we roomed together, and Jack Christenson, also from the Utah State Agricultural College. I knew quite a lot of Utahns.

Leland Creer, and some of those who proceeded you?

No, no, I didn't know them. The people mentioned were in my own area, plus the boy scout group. I had an interesting experience coming back to the U. of U. campus. I think my contract called for me to be on the campus the first of July. And on that day I
arrived on the campus and I was walking up the steps of the Park Building, when President George Thomas came out of the building. I was simply astounded because he greeted me by name, and asked how our new-born son was, whom we had brought across the desert at three weeks of age. Now, I don't know what kind of a grapevine he had that he would know me, and that he would know about my son. I think maybe Mrs. A.L. Gorham, who was on the board of regents, and who was a close friend of my mother, may have, in casual conversation or something, mentioned that.

Well, let me interrupt here. Do you think this was typical of George Thomas? Was he aware of personal problems of the faculty and so on? Did he take a personal interest in them?

Very much. I think he had a personal interest and was also the type of man who just had his fingers on everything. He knew what was going on on the campus and he guided things with a very forceful hand. And I'm sure, I was checked out very carefully before I was ever chosen.

What was the process at that time of your appointment?

I presume that the department head had to initiate the procedure. And then it was fed into the administration and finally was ruled on by the board of regents. The institution was small enough that a lot of those details were handled by the top echelon, rather than lower down at the department level. So I returned to Utah, very grateful to return to Zion, even though I wasn't LDS.
What was the size of the department at that time?

The department consisted of, oh, probably of six or eight faculty members, and how many majors there were, I would just hazard a guess—maybe 35 or 40. Dr. Chamberlin was in the process of building up the department. I mentioned earlier, I think, that he was a power on the campus. And he had a way with President Thomas, and got pretty much what he wanted. He had come back from Harvard and had built up the department to a remarkable degree by the time I arrived here. It continued to grow until he retired in about 1948. But in addition to Kim Newby, there was Lucille Rice, and Maynard Johnson, A. M. Woodbury, Vernon Fisk in Botany, and I think Dr. Cottam came after I was a student.

He came from BYU... did he not?

From BYU, yes. I don't recall a date precisely, but I would gather about 1930. And even Dr. Woodbury was relatively new. I think he'd only been here a year or two. And he had been away at Berkeley; incidentally, I think maybe this is one of the reasons why I got in at Berkeley, because he had been there the year before and probably endorsed me with a personal note, you see, to Dr. Grinnell.

What about Steve Durrant? Was he later than you or contemporary to you?

No, well, he was several years older, but he was a contemporary. He had been on L.D.S mission, and started out at the U. of U. in languages. He had a flair for French. He, too, came under the influence of Kim Newby. Dr. Newby got him to shift into zoology. So Steve, as a senior, was taking zoology courses when I was
probably a junior. And so we were colleagues. And then later, Steve went away to Minnesota, and that was before I departed. So Steve was a contemporary, but older.

What about Professor Stephens? I can't think of his first name?

Fayette?

Yes Fayette.

He came in quite a lot later. He previously held a position with the state in agriculture. He was a Cornell student.

Flowers, where did he come in?

Seville Flowers came, I think, in 1936. He had taught in Carbon County High School. He was on the staff when I came back in 1937. I had met him during that summer that I was working on my master's thesis. He was up here working on mosses.

And Rees.

Don Rees was here—a very youthful Don Rees in those days. But I think he was, maybe a third or fourth year instructor—and was developing into kind of the right hand of Dr. Chamberlin at that time. And of course, later he succeeded him as chairman of the department. But that's another story—the evolution of the headship of the department.

Did you come in as an assistant professor?

No, I was an instructor, but before that...

...You came with a Ph.D., normally didn't people come in as an assistant professor with a Ph.D.?

I came in as an instructor with a Ph.D. and I served as an instructor for four years. In those days, you didn't obtain tenure within
a year or a full professorship upon arrival as many have in recent
years. Dr. Chamberlin kind of held the lid on promotions. And this
brings up an interesting story. I don't know whether you want it
for your oral history, but after four years in a responsible position
of heading the general biology program, I thought I should be
promoted. My name was not even submitted, but Steve Durrant's was.
I was provoked at this, and protested. Dr. Chamberlin wasn't
approachable. So I went over his head. I went directly to the dean,
who was Ephriam E. Erickson. This antagonized Dr. Chamberlin no
end.

Let's see, now dean of what at that time? What was the set up?

Well, the biology department was then in the college of Arts and
Sciences.

I see.

Erickson was dean of the college. So I went to Dr. Erickson and
explained what I thought was an oversight, and he supported me
against Chamberlin, which was very surprising. And this became a
cause-célèbre, it went right up to the regents. And unbeknown
to me at that time, an aunt of mine, Jessie Harroun, who was the
assistant to the superintendent of the Salt Lake City schools, put
a little pressure on. She contacted some of her former students
like Thornton "Spider" Morris, who was on the regents. And so
finally, the result was that both Steve and I were promoted to
assistant professor at the same time. Well, that should have been
done in the first place.
Was this partly because there was really no set procedure?
Partly yes, certainly. But also, partly because the department heads in those days were dictators.

Yeah.
And they did pretty much what they chose.
There was no consultation at all?
No.

There was collegiality--there was none in existence?
Not a bit. The system was very unfair, because in some departments, everybody was a full professor--like in music, while in medicine, they had a tradition that only one man in the department was to be full professor. And chemistry had another criterion, you see. So, it was just a very strange procedure.

What about tenure at this time? What was the situation there?
Nobody thought very much of tenure. I didn't know such a thing existed. I didn't know from one year to the next whether I would be retained. And I even went so far as to get a job at the University of New Mexico at Albuquerque before I found out from Chamberlin that I would continue another year. It was a very, as I say, dictatorial sort of thing, and Dr. Chamberlin kept his cards to his chest--you never knew. And he would play one person against another. He was always playing Newby against Rees, Behle against Durrant, Gaufin against Edmonds. And this went on all through the years. The business of tenure and protocol for promotions all came in much later. So I suffered in the early days
from lack of that. The interesting thing about Dr. Chamberlin is that we retained our cordial relations and never discussed these things. They were always kind of under the table. And I remember another experience. I came here with the responsibility of developing the general education course. I can't take any credit for having initiated it; that had been done in the interval that I was away. But I came back with instructions to develop it and take charge. The first year of the course, the year before I came here, there had been a quasi-laboratory experience, but no one knew anything about it. There were no records. Dr. Cottam had gone away, and I couldn't find out what had been going on. So I had to devise new exercises. And later I wrote a lab manual. I put my name on it as author. Well, this offended somebody—whether it was Rees or Woodbury or Chamberlin, I don't know—but Bastian Grundman, who was the director of the press, told me many years later that he was ordered by Dr. Chamberlin to tear off the covers of five hundred copies of this lab manual and put on a new cover. Suddenly the manual was authored by the staff and then was a five-page introduction spelling out all the details of the development of that course. Well, again, we never discussed it. [Laughter] These things came to pass. And then there was a third instance of clashing with Dr. Chamberlin. When he was about to retire, he and Dr. Rees and Dr. Woodbury got together and decided to change things. The thinking was that if you had several departments you would have greater representation on the faculty council and you would get
more funds, which would mean more majors and building up the
departments. Kim Newby and myself, Dr. Cottam and others were
opposed to this. So we had a caucus and discussed strategy. Well,
it was perfectly open, in an open meeting—students going by
could see us talking, hear us talking. But anyway, Dr. Chamberlin
didn't like that one bit. And as far as my personal relations go,
there were some reprisals. I still have in my possession a little
card giving my teaching assignments one quarter. It was about
twice what anybody else had. This was in the post-war period,
when we had thousands of students and we were using the Annex for
classrooms as well as the biology building. He had me go up to
the Annex at eight o'clock; at nine o'clock, down on the lower
campus; ten o'clock, back up there. I made two round trips a day.
And I had to walk. There were no busses or anything. And so on an
asphalt path, I went across what was formerly an alfalfa field...

EC: The polo field?

WB: No, just open space. And I was reminded of Sid Angleman's essay,
"Gone are the Meadowlarks."

EC: Oh, yes.

WB: Because there were meadowlarks then. Well, anyway, my relations
with Dr. Chamberlin were outwardly cordial, but on the other hand,
there was a power struggle going on here.

EC: What about your teaching load at this time? When you first came,
and how did this change over the years? Let's talk about that a
little bit.
My first assignment was nothing but general biology. And I had, I think, two lecture sessions the first quarter and I had labs every afternoon, from one to three, and from three to five, Monday through Friday. And this was my introduction to college teaching. Working up a new course, working up a new lab, I didn't have time to do anything else. I don't think I went to a football game or any other outside activity that first fall. It was really a nightmare. And then, I guess the reason I got here was because I was substituting for people who were away on leave or working for their Ph.D. That first year, Dr. Cottam was away, and Dr. Durrant—really wasn't a doctor then—was away and I had to substitute for them. And one of the courses I had to teach was Spring Flowers of the Wasatch, which was Dr. Cottam's specialty. So I was in a quandary there, although I was a botany minor I wasn't really equipped to fill in this way, but the thing that saved me in this instance was that Bill Flowers had a section at eight o'clock. And I think mine was at eleven. So I would audit Bill Flowers's lecture and then I felt fairly well prepared by the time it was time for my lecture. Well, the second year I stayed, two other people went away. One of those was Margaret Schell. And so I had to teach her parasitology class. Really, it was ridiculous. There was no consideration of whether you were equipped to teach the course. Here was the course that had to have an instructor and you were designated to teach it.

EC: And it was in the department?
In the department, and we were told to teach it. Well, we had a strange member of the faculty at that time, David Tracy Jones. And he undertook to look after the interests of Margaret Schell. And here was this young freshman instructor coming from Berkeley, so he audited my class in parasitology. Well, just his presence there in front of me was traumatic, you see. And anyway, he said he was protecting her interest. Those first two years I had six courses to develop, plus the responsibility of running the general biology, plus all of the laboratory work. It was strenuous.

Would you mind telling us what your salary was? What did they offer you to come here?

I came at the salary of 1800 dollars.

And that was for nine months?

That was for nine months, right. In fact, it wasn't until President Olpin came and we went to a twelve-month system that we began to get a fairly decent salary. Of course, actually you had one quarter off, but they went through the motions of paying you for twelve months.

Now, let me ask one other question. At this time, was there any requirement for you to be involved in research and publication, or were you lucky to survive with your teaching?

Well, there was an understanding that you would do research, but no stated requirement. It was just assumed that you would do research. And I don't think the picture's changed too much since. They do lip service about effective teaching, but they still judge
you on how many papers you publish and how much grant money you bring in. In fact, I think teaching has suffered through the years in favor of this emphasis on research. Yes we did research, but it was largely on the side. You did it because you had a compulsion to do it. And whether you'd have gotten fired if you didn't do it, I don't know, because everybody did research. Of course, Dr. Chamberlin was a widely-rekowned researcher--published hundreds of papers--and so you followed that example. Well anyway, those first years of teaching were strenuous. I think our teaching load was something like fifteen hours a quarter. Nowadays, if they teach eight hours for the full year, that's a heavy load. I think throughout my career, I taught something like sixteen different courses. And when I see what little teaching they do today, I'm just aghast--in terms of our early experience.

I think I spoke to you about this once before. I first knew you, or knew of you, as a boy scout when I came on campus. I think it was during the spring break, there was some kind of a boy scout program, and you were teaching this bird recognition course or something like this in ornithology. Was this extra pay for you, or was it done gratis?

No, no, this was just part of being a public servant. But mention of the scout pow-wow goes way back. My formal experience with the University, going back to 1928, you see, covers about fifty-five years, but I can trace it back four or five years earlier than that, because I, too, came up here for the boy scout pow-wow. Frederick
W. Reynolds was the chairman, or head, whatever you want to call him, of the extension division. And his two sons, Roger and Fred, were in my troop 51. Somehow, he, or others conceived of this boy scout pow-wow and so the extension division...and Reynolds served as the hosts. I don't know exactly when I first came up here, but it was probably about 1924. And so I have recollections of our initial meeting on the top floor of what is now the James E. Talmage building, which was then the museum building. There was the assembly hall, with a stage on the east side, and we would have our orientation meeting there and then go out to various classes taught by people like H. L. Marshall...

The medical Dr. Marshall?

Yes, teaching health. And I think Joshua Paul was then teaching the bird course. And I remember a professor Robert Bradford in mineralogy. I think he was the father of the later Robert Bradford of the same name, and of course, I knew of the greats, like Dr. Fellows that either addressed the group or were on the campus at the time. And so my connections go back a long, long ways. One of the things I think I was blessed with was instructors that were tremendous; not only in the department, like Newby, Cottam, but out of the department. One of the early instructors was Sidney W. Angleman. I took English literature with him when I was a freshman. I had no particular interest in literature, but I was fascinated with Sid. Once I got out of a sick bed and staggered up through the snow just so I could attend his classes.
I wouldn't miss one of those sessions with him. Another one that
I thought was tremendous was Jacob Geerlings, from whom I took
Roman and Greek history. He, like Kim Newby, had only been here
a couple of years and was very youthful and very enthusiastic.
And I remember particularly his illustrated lectures on Greek
architecture. Arthur Beeley in sociology was another one that
attracted me tremendously. I almost became a sociology major. I
was torn between sociology and biology. These were two of the
big men on the campus: Chamberlin and Beeley. And up until I
was practically a senior I didn't know which way I was going,
because I had taken all the courses in both departments. Dr.
Beeley was a penologist, and I took his course on the subject.
About that time they were having a lot of unrest at the Utah
State Prison, which was located down in Sugarhouse in Salt Lake.
And Dr. Beeley and Professor Wahlquist had come up with an idea
to take the pressure off by starting a school in prison for the
prisoners. I was chosen as one of the instructors. Others were
Ernest Burgess and Elmer Smith. And we went down there one
afternoon a week, each of us, to teach a course in the prison.
My assignment was current events, and the Japanese-Russian War
was going on about that time. The prisoners, I think, were just
looking for relief; anything, you know, to get out of their cells.
They were kind of dull, not very receptive, but still it was an
interesting experience, but kind of creepy because you'd go in
through one set of gates and the lock would clank behind you, and
then you'd go through another one after which you were on your
own. And our reward for all that was dinner.

That's the entire pay you got?

That was our pay, and almost invariably, it was bean soup! So
my first teaching experience was a prison, under Beeley and
Dr. Wahlquist.

Let me ask a question here, in connection with your comment
that two of the giants were Beeley and Chamberlin.

Well, two of several.

Yes. Was there considerable rivalry and didn't almost ill-will
develop between the two?

Well, I never experienced it. In addition to Beeley and Chamberlin,
there was Bonner in chemistry who was a power. Neff in English,
Pack in Geology. They were all members of what was then, I guess,
a faculty council and there used to be spirited debates, but I
didn't know of any particular feeling between Beeley and
Chamberlin.

Are you aware that in Chamberlin's history of the University, that
Beeley comes in for very little mention?

Well, I thought Chamberlin's history was very one-sided in many
respects. There were a lot of things that are glossed over.

And it's true that Beeley's not mentioned very much, but anyway,
I liked him. I thought he was tremendous. He had a sociology
club and I was invited to his house, treated like I was a major.
And I think maybe he felt a little chagrined when I finally did
WB: go over into biology. And I also kind of felt like a traitor. But I enjoyed Dr. Beeley. I wanted to take a course on geology with Dr. Pack, but I was usually late registering, because I was working, and so I got frozen out. One time I offered to even sit on the aisle, but he wouldn't let me in. I finally did take a course with him in geology, and I thought he was a very stimulating instructor. But he had his idiosyncracies, one of which was his anti-smoking attitude, and boy, anybody caught smoking was a sure failure in his course. An aggravation to him was that one of the designated smoking areas was back of the Biology Building, and the fumes would drift into his classroom, which infuriated him. There's an interesting bear story that you may or may not have heard. As Chamberlin expanded the department, there were space problems, you see, and he got rid of everybody, for instance Dr. Barlow in psychology on the top floor, west end. The last survivors were the geologists, they had a row of offices on the bottom floor. There was Professor Hintze and Professor Schneider and Professor Pack. Well, little by little they left until Dr. Pack was the last one. Well, a bear died at the zoo, and they called up and asked Dr. Woodbury if he wanted this bear. He said, "Sure." So they brought it down and drove up back of the biology building and dumped it outside Dr. Pack's classroom. Well, Dr. Woodbury was something of a procrastinator, and burdened with classes like all of us, he didn't get to skinning the bear for several days. And it was hot, and the flies came. And the bear
got bloated, and the odors came in. Well, to his dying day, Dr. Pack swore that this was a device to get him out. I don't think it was. By the way, I helped Dr. Woodbury finally skin the bear.

Oh, that must have been a pleasant job.

It was a godawful job. But anyway, Dr. Pack finally departed, and incidentally, I later inherited his office and all of the book shelves that he had built.

Let me ask a question now that may be a little sensitive, but okay, you're talking about your promotion and so on. You said that Steve Durrant was recommended for a promotion, you were not. Steve Durrant, you indicated, was a returned missionary. Ralph Chamberlin had a Mormon background and so on. Do you think religion had some role in this at all?

No, I don't. There was about a fifty-fifty ratio in the department of Mormons and non-Mormons. I don't think religion had a part of this. I think Durrant, without a question, was a favorite of Dr. Chamberlin, as was Dr. Rees. I think it was just a matter of favoritism.

I see. Well, what about the University as a whole? Have you noted some preference given for appointments because of religious affiliation? In Wally Stegner's book, Mormon Country, he talks about Earl Douglas being considered for the Deseret Professor, but Pack being appointed in preference to Douglas--partly because of, he thought, his religious affiliation. Have you seen some of this
on campus?

No, I haven't. I have heard that it existed, but certainly it did not in the biology department—I can only speak for our area. No, I think religion was not a factor. Of course, you spoke of Dr. Chamberlin's background. He clashed very early with the Mormon Church over this business of evolution and was forced out of BYU, for the church didn't like his teaching of evolution. He wrote that little book, which was a pioneering book on evolution. No, I don't think religion came in the U of U biology department. Some other teachers that I was influenced by was Professor Bearnson in economics, from whom I earned my first A. And I think that was because I made an investigation of pickle co-op.

Pickle co-op? [laughter]

Pickle co-op. I interviewed all the people involved and wrote the project up. It must have impressed him.

Let me interrupt here. Now, in the depression years they started something called "Self-Help Cooperatives." Would this have been one of those things?

I think it was, yes.

Oh, yes.

And there were others in the gasoline and dairying business.

Now, was this in Salt Lake City, this pickle co-op?

No, it was located down south, in Utah Valley.

Aw, yes.

And it was one of the early cooperatives, probably born out of
the depression, but then it may have been an offspring of the early United Order, for all I know, because this concept had survived. Well, then Professor Unzler in German, was another one that I was much impressed by. I took all his courses, and he used to fascinate us with his accounts of his European adventures. I wanted very much to take a course in philosophy from Dr. Erickson, and signed up, but instead, the substitute was Waldemar Reed, who at that time was a very youthful teaching assistant. I kind of suffered there, because I was a rather shy, retiring individual, and this course was patronized by football players. They very quickly got into the idea that you would get a good grade if you would participate in the discussion. I held back and they did all the talking. But anyway, I appreciated that experience with Waldemar Reed, who later became one of the greats on the campus in the field of philosophy. I wanted to take a course in anthropology from the other Professor Kerr—there was one in English and one in anthropology.

EC: Oh, let's see. Walter Kerr was in French, languages.

WB: I'm thinking of his brother. Yeah, Walter Kerr was in languages. Well, anyway, Professor Kerr died and they had a Dr. Mills from Ogden, as substitute. Well, I took all of his courses.

(Start of side 2)

EC: Okay, Dr. Behle, you were talking about some of the courses that you were interested in.

WB: Well, it was a regret that I didn't ever have a personal contact
with Professor Kerr in anthropology. And then another one that I recall very fondly was Levi Edgar Young. Professor Young's forte was Western History, and that was a field that I had a strong interest in. But I was also attracted to Dr. Young as an individual. Frequently after class, we'd go into his office and visit. And I was much impressed with his sentimentality, because almost invariably at noon, he would call his wife. And they would have a very pleasant little conversation.

EC: Wasn't he a department all by himself? The department of Western History?

WB: He was sort of a one-man department, that's right. Two of his very lovely daughters, whom I knew also, took all the anthropology courses from Dr. Mills. One of the highlights of my memories was a trip to the Deseret Museum. Dr. Young had two hats, at least, professor of history and head of the museum, the Deseret Museum, down on Temple Square. I was much impressed with his two desks, and his two roles. And of course, he took us behind the scenes and that stands out. He also used to give mimeographed handouts in his classes, summarizing the early explorers and where they went and when and why and all that. And this impressed me. And later, I adopted that technique. I had a teaching habit, maybe it was a fault, of talking too fast. And so I compensated by preparing these handouts that would serve as kind of a guide. Another one was Ogilvie in bacteriology. He, too, was a rapid fire commentator, but he had handouts. Those two individuals
impressed me greatly. And so I was fortunate to have had student contacts with all of these people, and the interesting thing is that later many of them became very close friends—like Jacob Geerlings. We were in a bridge group together, I taught his children. When I was a ranger naturalist at Grand Canyon he came down one summer with his family and camped out, and we visited. I got to be fairly close with Sid Angleman, in connection with the general education program. So those are my early experiences with teachers outside the department. As far as my student associates, they were largely in the biology department, and it was mostly the pre-med group. Many of the prominent doctors of later years in Salt Lake were my student associates. People like Hiram Reishman and Ulrich Bryner, Ray Rumell, although some of them were advanced a year or two ahead of me. In the zoology group, in addition to Steve Durrant, whom we've mentioned, there was Elmer Berry, who was a student of mollusks, and Dorothy Naylor and Lowell Woodbury—they later married. Betty Knight was a teaching assistant and Ernest Miner. It was a very close-knit group. One of the novelties, or innovations of Dr. Chamberlin was to create a biology fraternity. You know, he was a student of Greek and Latin, for he needed these terms to apply to the spiders and millipedes and centipedes that he'd described. And so he called this early group the Pi Zeta Phi. I never knew exactly what the symbol meant... but anyway, it sounded very good. And so we had a very active biology group. And then after that had been
under way for several years, we applied to a national society for affiliation—the Phi Sigma Biological Society. I didn't have a great deal to do with that application, but I happened to be the president of the Pi Zeta Phi group when we joined the national. And so I had to preside at the installation ceremony. We had to have two sponsors. Dr. Schell, who had come from Berkeley, was a member. And so she acted as one. And the only other one in the state was up at Logan, a Howard Dorst, in entomology. So we got him to be a sponsor and come down for the installation. The installing officer was Paul B. Sears, who later became an eminent ecologist. Well, we had corresponded and knew when he was coming, and he came by train, but we didn't know what he looked like. And he didn't know us. So we (Dr. Schell and I) took the big symbol of Phi Sigma and walked up and down the station platform and he spied it and came over and we got together. We had a very fine installation down at the Newhouse Hotel. Another little bit of sentiment, I remember it was Valentines' Day and he sent a valentine to his wife by telegraph. I never forgot that. Anything else of these early days that you want to know?

Well, one thing I think we want to talk about is the emphasis upon teaching in the biology department then as opposed to now. What has been the transition and what are your views about it?

Well, it's to Dr. Chamberlin's credit that he did emphasize teaching, even though he was a pre-eminent researcher. And another one of his developments was to create a pioneering general biology course. I don't know of any other institution that got into this as early as Utah.
And I believe, wasn't this a requirement? It seems to me when I was a freshman, it was a requirement to take this general biology?

This again, reflects Dr. Chamberlin's influence. They had these group requirements, there were four of them, and one was the biological sciences, and you had to have twelve hours in each one. Well, he went one step farther--you had to have four of those twelve hours that were laboratory.

Yes, I remember dissecting frogs, etc.

And so he emphasized the lab work as well as the broad, general education coverage. And as I mentioned, we did have a very heavy teaching load, and everybody took part in the general biology, as well as their specialty areas. And there were full professors involved; it wasn't just consigned to teaching assistants.

What are your views about that?

Well I think that was excellent. When I later assumed the headship of the program, I insisted that this be done, and right up to the bitter end, before the days of television, we had live presentations by full professors, who ostensibly, were the most effective teachers. This wasn't always the case; there were some people who were dull in class. But at least they had the name and you got a personal association. I think the beginning of the end came with the advent of television. Even during the war years, when we were running through as many as three thousand students in general biology, we handled them on a personal basis. Gosh, we were running lab, and lecture sessions, all through the day, multiple sections every hour
and we handled them. And then later, they started canned-TV, where they ran the tapes day after day, hour after hour, and it became very dull.

EC: Who were some of the pioneers in this TV, in biology?

WB: Well, by that time I'd become discouraged and had gotten out; I could see it coming. I didn't want to have any involvement in it. When I gave up as the director of biology general education, Lewis T. Neilson, was hand-picked, as my successor, and he had the burden of working up the television. He had to supervise the cutting of the tapes and getting people to present the subject matter. But the trouble was that once they were cut, they were scarcely ever modified, whether they were good or bad, they just went on and on, day in and day out, and it got to be very sterile.

EC: This is when the TA program became important in not letting the professor meet the students?

WB: Well, that came in a little later. I suppose there was an economic factor—it was cheaper. I don't really recall that any TAs gave the lectures. They handled the laboratory work.

EC: I see.

WB: But even in the early days, even in the lab we had full professors handling the lab. At least they would give the introduction and then maybe they would fade away and let the TAs take over. But, we did emphasize quality instruction, broad coverage, and at least in the department, we also insisted that our majors be well-rounded. And I think our students would compete with other students in any
WB: institution. Today, as I look at it, people are very narrow. They go down one channel, to their own specialty area with very little exposure elsewhere. The laboratory work for the general courses is virtually gone. And the field work, which we used to emphasize, is pretty well gone. In fact, I would say the whole general education program, at least in biology, is pretty well shot-down.

EC: Where is the emphasis today?

WB: Research, grant money. The teaching role is very minimal. There are a few people that still insist on teaching, because they love to teach. And they are tolerated. But, the newcomers, they don't teach. Most of them don't want to teach, and the few efforts to make them teach have been so horrible that they let them stay in their laboratories and do research.

EC: Now, when did the Ph.D. program come here and what brought it about, and what effect did that have on the department?

WB: Well, I think it goes back to the building that accompanied President Olpin's arrival on the campus. In Dr. Chamberlin's day, the emphasis was on the master's and the theses presented for the master's degree were very often the equivalent of Ph.D. theses at other institutions. The Ph.D. program came in after the war, and gradually it got so that the master's degree was kind of belittled. And finally, most people just bypassed it. They used to go through the A.B., the M.A., or M.S., and then to the Ph.D. But now you usually go from a bachelor's right directly to the
Ph.D. I don't know precisely what happened here, but there was a change—the phasing out of the emphasis on teaching, and the building up of the research aspect. I think the zenith of this came when the department was restructured and they brought in Carl Gordon Lark as department head and promised him the world in terms of resources. And this I trace back to President Fletcher. I think when he came here, he decided to get on what you might call the DNA-RNA bandwagon. This unraveling of the gene, you know, the spiral Watson crick model. And I think he pretty well had in mind when he came here what he wanted, because he chose John Spikes to head up the area, and then later—and this is a long story—we got Lark in here. And so, little by little, the teaching went down; research went up.

Now was Lyttle of the old school, and this is why he was eased out or what?

No, he came in quite a bit later. There's another story in here that we haven't touched on. We got pretty close to it earlier. When Dr. Chamberlin was nearing retirement, he and Rees and Woodbury decided to restructure the department. And so they came up, despite the protests of Newby, Cottam, Behle and others, with this idea of a biology division, with five departments of what used to be our biology department. It was a case of everybody being a general. They carved up the pie, so to speak. It was a natural that Cottam should be head of the department of botany. And I think it made sense that Kim Newby shoud be selected to head up the
genetics, and build up that area. But it was certainly an artifi­ciality to divide zoology into two departments, invertebrate zoology and vertebrate zoology and then reward Dr. Rees with the headship of invertebrate zoology, and Dr. Woodbury with the headship of the vertebrate zoology. And then, I guess as kind of an afterthought, they brought me in as the head of the department of general biology to handle the general education program, where we had gained quite a lot of notoriety. Initially, we had one man in physiology, Dr. Spikes. He was the last man to be hired by Dr. Chamberlin. And so he was placed under me in general biology. Bob Vickery is the first one that I hired. And he later affiliated with Kim Newby as the genetics built up. Well, this went on for several years and was partly successful. It was a division, and in addition to the biology area, they tried to bring in the Medical School because there were the departments of anatomy, bacteriology and physiology there. Well, this didn't work. The people in medicine just ignored us, with the exception of Dr. Horace Davenport, who was chosen as the first head of the Division of Biology. After this choice was made, I remember Met Wilson calling me in one day and saying, "We need some secretarial help." And I misinterpreted him and I said, "We certainly do. We've been shorthanded in secretaries for 20 years." And he said, "I don't mean that kind of secretary. I mean an executive secretary for the division. We want you to serve in that capacity." So I did, and I wore the hat then of being the executive secretary of the division and the hat of being head of the general biology department.

EC: And now has the outgrowth of this been a full-time manager?
He's not a professor, but sort of an administrative assistant in biology?

Yeah, exactly.

Yes, I see.

We progressed later to a point where we had really a professional manager there to relieve the department heads of the administrative burden, so they could do their research. But Davenport was very fine. He brought in a different viewpoint, and there were factions, as I mentioned, in the biology division. He was able to smooth things over. All got along fairly well. Some day I'll turn over to your archives all the minutes of those early meetings that will sketch the history. When Dr. Davenport decided he had had enough, Dr. Rees was chosen to be the head of the division. By his time the medical aspect had entirely faded out. Dr. Rees carried on for several years, with the several departments in biology per se and then the amalgamation process started. Pretty soon the two zoology departments joined as one zoology. And then I reorganized the area and did away with my own department. I couldn't see any sense to having a department of general biology. Maybe it was kind of a face-saving deal, but I was given the title of director of general biology, with full status as a department head. So we now had three departments, and continued for several more years. And then the geneticists could see that the future was in the newly-developing molecular biology area, so they joined forces with the physiologists, and then the botanists began to see that this is
where the future development was and the money. And so they merged as one biology department. And this left just the zoologists outstanding. And the administration kept working on us and working on us and working on us, and we resisted. And finally, one day, (I'm sure George Edmonds was sort of bought off—he was acting head—) He said, "Won't you consider a merger?" We were weary, and said, "Yeah, we'll consider it." But we were tricked, because the very next day it was announced that the zoology people had decided to merge, so we were all back together again now as one big biology department. Well, about that time was where Lyttle came in, and others. And so then we started off on a new chapter in biology.

Well, aren't there any specialists today, like you in ornithology, Steven Durrant in mammals and so on? Is there none of that anymore?

Well, I would say just the reverse. Everybody is now a specialist. There are few generalists.

Uh huh. But a different kind of specialty?

But a very different kind of specialty. The old specialty groups of general education, like you mentioned—Durrant in mammalogy, and Behle in ornithology—they're pretty well gone. But, now you've got specialists in neural biology, etc., and the embryology that Kim Newby used to teach is now very little different than anatomy. Gosh, they're all chemical biologists, biochemists. So, they're very much specialists.

Now, it's not clear in my mind exactly how this ties in with the
medical school, because as I've talked to so many people, who
were so well-acquainted with Kim Newby because of his program,
and Steven Durrant, I think he was teaching anatomy or something. . .

Yeah, Steve had comparative anatomy. And Kim Newby had the
embryology.

Now did they have some kind of an appointment in the medical
program at all?

Well, not formally, but informally they were very much part of it,
because they taught all the pre-med students, and helped in the
selection process, through their recommendations. They were both
made honorary members, or some kind of a title, to express thanks
on the part of the medical school, too, but I don't think there
was ever any formal appointment. In those days, the premedical
curriculum involved a lot of anatomy and embryology and all that's
pretty well faded away now, too.

Now, Dr. Hashimoto. Was his appointment in biology?

No, he taught anatomy in the medical school.

Nothing in biology?

It was human anatomy, no he never had any affiliation with the
biology department. But Steve and Kim, through teaching comparative
anatomy and vertebrate embryology, prepared the people for medical
courses.

Let's just reminisce a little, you've been here a long time. You
mentioned your admiration for George Thomas. Let's have you give
us your views on other chief administrators of the University and
EC: how you've seen this change--both in, perhaps, the selections of the president and how, and what influence they may have on the administration even of a department.

WB: Well, I think George Thomas really built the University and made it a university. When he retired, as I recall, there was quite a lot of concern about his successor, and the regents couldn't agree. And finally, Leroy Cowles was chosen as kind of a compromise candidate. I liked Professor Cowles. I really got my start under him, in terms of the University administration. And he was outstanding, I think, in terms of the general education program as head of the lower division. And of course, Sid Angleman carried on the general education program after him. But I think everybody kind of agreed that Dr. Cowles was an interim president, which gave them time to select A. Ray Olpin. My feelings about Dr. Olpin are somewhat ambivalent. When he came here, he was rather arrogant, and I don't think he knew very much about the functioning of the University. And I think he ran rough-shod over traditional protocol. And he did things and said things that kind of alienated the faculty, but he learned very quickly and mended his fences and at the end, I think he was a highly-respected administrator.

EC: Now, let me ask you here. Was not the tenure system as we know it today brought in under Olpin?

WB: Yes, this was one of his achievements. And I think it was to Dr. Olpin's credit that he brought in a great many scholars and
surrounded himself with them as deans. Henry Eyring, of course, comes to mind, but many, many others. And so they really, again, built a great university. We progressed in a way, from a small-time city college to a recognized university under Olpin's direction. I have ambivalent feelings, too, about James Fletcher. I blame him for the demise--this is a personal note of biology as I knew it. I don't object to his building up this new area, but I didn't see why he had to tear down another area in evolutionary biology, ecology, and systematics--where we had already reached international renown. All that was just wiped out. Fletcher was rather aloof, and he certainly alienated downtown people.

Oh, he's the one that brought in the proliferation of the vice-presidents?

Yes, and with Fletcher you had to go through channels to get to him. And I guess from the administration standpoint, this was probably to the good, because it freed the president to do his fund-raising and that sort of thing. I think you've got to give Fletcher credit for the great building spree in terms of physical plant. Because he raised funds and influenced the Legislature, and gosh, there was this tremendous building boom during his tenure. Fred Embry was another kind of an interim appointment, something like President Cowles. I think he was a very brilliant person, but there was not in my opinion--any great leadership during that three or four--year interval. And then I think they got a very fine man in David Pierpont Gardner, who mended the fences and
restored confidence of the downtown people that Fletcher had kind of alienated, and I think we've had a period of ten years of continued growth.

Let me ask you something about the selection process. Now, at what point did the faculty begin to participate in the selection of the president, and to what extent have their wishes been recognized?

I think probably it came about the time that President Olpin was chosen, because at that time, as I recall, they did have a committee and they did interview people on the campus. They called them in and got an expression of opinion. How much influence they had, I don't know. In the case of James Fletcher, I think the faculty was not in favor of him, and I think they just brushed aside faculty opinion and brought him in anyway. But at least there was the beginning of a democratic way of doing things; up to the time it'd been almost entirely the board of regents that made the decision. I think a similar thing has occurred with the student body. They initially were ignored and then little-by-little, especially in late years, they have become a voice in the affairs of the University.

Even to the extent of having committeemen in the selection process.

Yes, representation in the committees and on the board of regents.

And I think this has been a very wholesome thing.

How do you feel about in this regard the students' evaluations of professors, on their teaching performance?
Well, on the face of it, it's a good idea, but it just doesn't work out. I think a lot of the evaluation was nitpicking. Instead of evaluating a professor's work or his influence on students, they would criticize little mannerisms or dress or something like that. I think it has improved, but in the early stages, when they filled out these questionnaires, I don't think there were very good value judgments. And I particularly objected to publishing the results of the evaluations, because this, in my opinion, led to kind of a popularity contest. I think this was the beginning of the downtrend of high standards of grading practices. Of course, correlated with that, was the pass-fail system. And a few other things. But little-by-little, we reached a low peak. Now I think we're beginning to come up again. Coming back to the student grading, I was on a committee to devise a questionnaire, and I think after that initial failure, in my opinion, it has improved. And I think today with the student advisory committees, you do get a clue as to the effectiveness of teaching.

What about, I know I sat in on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, and I know the students had a considerable influence in tenure and promotion.

Yeah.

Do you feel this was to the good?

I was on the same committee and in my day, there was no input at all from students. Now, I understand there is. And I think this is good. It probably routs out some misfits and ostensibly,
emphasizes good teaching, but I think maybe the exception to that would be in biology—I can't speak of other areas.

I have seen some very, what I would say, responsible, qualified students giving input that was beneficial in arriving at a decision whether a man was doing his job.

I think in the main it has been beneficial, but speaking of my own area—biology—I don't think there's been too much input. I won't say that the committees haven't been effective—the students' committees—but I just have a feeling that they're brushed aside by the administration.

One thing, we don't have a lot of time left—I was impressed in talking with some of the professors, like Kim Newby, of early cohesiveness of the faculty. And now, I don't perceive this. I don't see that there is an interfaculty relationship now that existed, say, when you and Kim and some of the others were active. Is this a proper observation or not?

I think it is very proper. And certainly coincides with my experience. Of course, I think this is partly correlated with the growth of the institutions. In those early days, when you had a student body of maybe 3600 and a couple hundred faculty members, everybody knew everybody. Now, with 24,000, it's very different. About 1500 on the teaching staff. But somewhere along the line, we lost track of the esprit de corps—it used to be expected of you to attend the president's receptions and to support every aspect of the University. And now, I get the impression that there's
WB: indifference. And again I can only speak of our department, but people couldn't care less about professional societies, they don't go to social functions. They dress, some of them, like bums. And the whole picture's changed.

EC: With a consequent effect on the students, who are emulating their teachers?

WB: I can remember when we were told to wear coats in the laboratory. Gosh, now they come in, unshaven, unkempt; it's just appalling to me—brought up under the old system, to see the situation today. Now, of course, you can't cut too wide a swath. There's some people that are impeccable in their dress, and others who just look like tramps.

EC: What, now looking back over a number of years' affiliation with the University, what are some of the outstanding events that you have seen, and you have been associated with? Some of those memorable things that stick in your mind?

WB: I think perhaps the most outstanding thing to me was the early general education program—first under the leadership of Professor Cowles and then under Sid Angleman. I think we really pioneered there and had one of the most effective programs you'd find anywhere in the country. And you had dedicated individuals, not only Sid, but in each of the areas, that provided guidance. And I think with Sid's demise, that kind of marked the end of the peak. And then it was kind of downhill. And today, I think the general education program is very weak, compared to what it was in those
days. This, I would pick out as a most important thing. Another thing has been the pre-eminence of the University in certain fields of research. Of course, medicine comes to mind initially, but engineering and the sciences in general; biology and chemistry and physics. This has done a lot to bring recognition. But on the other side, I think you've got to appreciate the growth of the humanities; dance, ballet, music. I think the University has a very strong position there. So, we've seen the growth of the true University with many disciplines pushed here. It's been a slow evolution, but I think we've arrived.

Uh huh. Your feelings about athletics and what role they used to play on campus and now what role? And is this for the good or the bad of the University?

From the public relations standpoint, they're a must. From an academic standpoint, they leave much to be desired. Having served for many years on the credits and admissions committees I can attest to the many cases where athletes that were not prepared were brought here without even consulting anybody. And sometimes we pulled the chestnuts out of the fire for them, sometimes we let them dangle slowly in the wind. But I'm ambivalent here; I think you need an athletic program. You have got to get public support. But on the other hand, I think academic standards have kind of gone down. This is one case where I think Sid Angleman stood out again. He was all for academic standards. And he would not give one inch, in terms of letting down the bars for athletes. Well, that's my
WB: attitude there.

EC: In the beginning we talked about some of your colleagues. Are there other people on campus that you look upon as being really outstanding faculty members internationally or nationally that you have had close association with?

WB: Well now, that last qualification kind of rules it all out, because I've not had close association. Henry Eyring, of course, was an outstanding individual, but I just knew him kind of casually. I think Dean Heiner in pharmacy was outstanding. He certainly built that area up. At an early time, Bonner in chemistry. Parmalee in physics was a superb teacher.

EC: I believe he insisted right up to the last to teach the beginning physics, did he not?

WB: Yes, yes, he always favored that. And even long after retirement, came back to teach beginning physics. I think Leo Provost was another individual who was very effective in connection with the academic year institutes and, of course, he shared that with Tom Parmalee. But before that, he was associated with the Army Specialized Training Program during the war. He ran that. Another one that I respect greatly is A. LaDrew Jenson. I was long associated with him on the faculty regulations committee and later the A.A.U.P. and then the credit union. And I think people haven't really appreciated his worth. He was a tenacious individual. He was like a bulldog. He got hold of a thing and he would never let loose, and finally you just got sick of the whole thing. And yet you look back and
he was kind of the watchdog of the faculty against the administrators. People like Olpin, who initially knew nothing about how a university functions. And LaDrew Jenson as the czar of the faculty regulations committee kept the thing on the track. There was animosity, of course, but you have to give him credit. And when I was president of the local chapter of the A.A.U.P., LaDrew Jenson fought the battles for us there for tenure and salary raises and against administrative fiat. And then later, he was instrumental in establishing the credit union, and was responsible for our getting on the social security and all these things. But because of his personality, people have kind of overlooked that aspect. Jesse Jennings is another one that we should mention in connection with his own research and building up the anthropology department and the early history of the natural history museum, a tradition carried on by Don Hague. Well, these are some of the people whom I regard as outstanding in the faculty.

Some of the people I have interviewed have been a little critical of the administration and the medical people in their buildup of the medical school and the huge expenditure for the hospital. While it draws attention to the University, especially in view of the artificial organs program, still the feeling exists that it robs the rest of the University from maybe the funds that they deserve. What are your feelings on this?

I don't feel that way. They have their own budget. Again, it's good public relations. I don't think the medical school has ever
actively participated in faculty affairs. They've been kind of a power unto themselves up there on the hill. But I don't think they have, in any sense, weakened the rest of the University, or robbed the University of funds. I think that is not valid criticism. Someone observed that Fletcher even proposed selling the hospital up there, that it was too much of a burden for the University to bear and so this would be one way to get University-wide funds. [Laughter] I don't know, maybe about that time it became a line item in the budget. But certainly, our new president is in a good position there, with his former affiliation with the medical school and now president of the University. I think the medical school has benefitted us all. There's something, and this is more of a personal thing I think, I'm aware of your long affiliation and support of the Utah Academy. And then we saw it go into decline, and I believe it's coming back a little bit, is it not? Their proceedings, of course it's a new publication, but what are your feelings on that, and to what extent were you encouraged by your department to affiliate with the Utah Academy? This goes back to my earlier comments that in the early days, you were expected and encouraged to participate in everything. So if they had a meeting on the campus of the academy, you went. And then little by little, as in the case of many other professional societies, there has been indifference. I'm just appalled now at how little the University is represented on the programs at
their annual meeting. I think you're right, that the academy blossomed and then it began to decline. It's an interesting observation that in the early days, much of the leadership of the academy was provided by biologists, by Vascoe Tanner down at BYU and then a whole succession of others. Little by little, the sciences lost their hold and today you've got people in the humanities running the thing. And I personally did not like the idea of changing the proceedings of the Utah Academy of Sciences to the encyclical. I think it lost its identity and, of course, as this came about, there was greater emphasis on the humanities and less on the sciences. So today, although it is still called the Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters I think it's mostly Arts and Letters. And this I don't like. But it's part of the times. I hope it's coming back. They're still a couple of years behind on their journal, and I don't think the programs are as varied as they used to be, and they only are held once a year instead of twice, and instead of a two-day session it's boiled down to a Friday afternoon session. Hopefully it will survive, but this decline is true of academies all over the country. The affiliation now seems to be, at least in scientific circles, with your area of specialty. If you're a protozoologist, you go to the protozoology meetings. And general academies are just kind of shunned. And the Utah Academy has really never had funds to put out a first-class organ, a publication, and it just kind of watered down.
Okay, since your retirement you've been involved in your own research with looking forward to publication on the Great Salt Lake. What else?

Well, the Great Salt Lake is very much on the back burner, so to speak. I've at last found time, with retirement, to do the things I've wanted to do. It's kind of interesting, looking back on my career, that I considered myself a teacher first and administrator second and a researcher third. Well, it's the research aspect that's giving me the greatest recognition. And even though I was lukewarm to start with, having been bitten by the bug I have not been able to shake it. I guess I'm a compulsive individual and I keep inventing new and more projects, and I doubt, really, whether I'm going to live long enough to get back to my first love of history, because I've got this compulsion to finish with ornithology. Well, I've got about three projects in the mill now, and hopefully we'll get them out of the way within the next two years and then I can get back to the Great Salt Lake, which is largely history. If I had to go back and do it all over again, if I had a planned career instead of the one I have described, I think I would go into western history. I would like to have been what David Miller was. I've done a little historical work on the side. I wrote a biography of my father and interwoven with this was a history of medicine in Utah and a history of St. Mark's Hospital. And I've written a few historical articles on my exploits like going down the Colorado River, and the mystery bird out here
in the Great Salt Lake Desert. But maybe someday I'll get back to history. My Great Salt Lake manuscript is a labor of love. I've been working on it for over 50 years now.