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WM: Well, Hal, I've given you an outline of where you are going with this and you've made a few notes. So how about the question being where you were born, when you were born, and something about your early education.

HG: Okay. I was born in Ephraim, Utah, on October 19, 1907. I am a descendant of pioneers. My grandfather was very early in the history of Ephraim. Ephraim was settled in 1854, and my father was born there in 1859. They were both named Peter; Peter senior and Peter junior. My early schooling consisted of going to the public schools in Ephraim and graduating from Ephraim High School with a brief interlude in the winter of 1920-21, when I attended the Long Beach Polytechnic High School and then returned to Ephraim. My main interest, as I recall—that's a long time ago—but I believe my main interest was literature. I also participated in the lead in the high school play. I was student body president during the year of 1924 and '25. I had always wanted to attend the University of Utah, although I think it would have been natural for me, and logical for me, to attend
Snow College. But because of family problems that arose—my father was ill, and I was living with my brother and his young wife, and I had family in Salt Lake City, and consequently my mother came to Salt Lake and rented half of a duplex on North Main Street, and I think she did that partly so I could attend the University of Utah. That lasted one year, and then I had to move in with my sisters because the program of taking in boarders and roomers was too much for my mother.

WM: Too much for your mother to endure.

HG: Right. She was in her sixties. She was, incidentally, kind—I was kind of a phenomenon because my mother was forty-seven years old when I was born and my father was forty-eight.

I came here with the intention of majoring in English. But during my sophomore year, early in the fall, I made a part in the Varsity Play, as they were called in those days, and the dynamic nature of participating in plays—I had participated in a lot of plays during my sophomore year, not only the Varsity Play but play production plays and others, caused me to change over to speech from English.

WM: And this was under Maud May Babcock?

HG: This was under Maud May Babcock and Joseph Smith.
years, and as an offshoot of that I met my wife there, because she was one of my good students and participated in my plays. She was just under fifteen at the time when I first met her. When I gave her a role in what we called, down there, the School Play. I taught there two years, and then I decided that I was beginning to talk like a high school student [laughter] with the vocabulary that they have and thought I should go on to do some graduate work. I selected Northwestern University which was, at that time, undoubtedly the leading department—it was actually a School of Speech—in the United States. And I am sure it is still considered to be the leading department or School of Speech in the entire nation. It took me one year to acquire the master's degree at Northwestern. It was a combination degree in interpretation and theatre because my thesis topic was exceptional: outstanding interpretations of the role of Shylock on the English-speaking stage.

WM: Before you go any further on this, I would like to know if there was some influence in your life, having worked under and for Maud May Babcock. Did she make you decide that you wanted to go on for an advanced degree, be a university teacher rather than a high
school teacher?

HG: No, I think I had that in mind. I think I had that in mind from the time I was in high school. Yes, I can certainly give her a great deal of credit for pushing me on, because she was very good to me. Not only very good, but very kind. Miss Babcock could be stern, but she was always kind to me, although she was also very pointed when I needed to have a finger pointed at me. But I had a very good teacher of literature in high school. He was the principal of the high school. He didn't teach me much grammar, but he taught me to love good literature because he read a lot of it aloud. So I think that's where I got my start.

WM: Must have helped you a great deal when you were up here and taking interpretation classes that you already had read extensively.

HG: Well, I hadn't done much reading, but I did play in the school play at Ephraim High School. He didn't have us read aloud, but he was a good reader.

WM: He enjoyed reading to you.

HG: Yes, that's the way I think a lot of literature should be taught. He made me enjoy it by reading it aloud.

WM: Well then, when you were at Northwestern, you got your M.A. in one year, and you graduated in--what
year was that?

HG: It was 1932. And it was an M.S., Winn, instead of an M.A. I took forty hours of languages as an undergraduate student at the University. But at Northwestern, I took all speech. Consequently, it was an M.S.

WM: I see. And was it following this degree that you started teaching at Utah State?

HG: No. No, I taught--this was in the middle of the depression.

WM: Yes, 1932.

HG: And the last year I taught at Ephraim, of those first two years, I had a salary of $1350. Cost me $1100 to get my masters degree at Northwestern. And I came back to Utah and taught at Carbon County High School for $1100.

WM: Looks like you lost a little.

HG: I lost a little.

WM: Getting an M.S.

HG: But I had a good time and prices went down and $1100 was enough for a single man to have a lot of fun on. After that year at Carbon County High School in Price, I agreed to help my brother become a turkey pioneer in Sanpete County. I chipped in $500 out of that $1100 to buy, to help buy a flock of fifteen
hundred turkeys. And then I agreed to teach at Ephraim High School that year, because in the meantime, while I was herding turkeys, I'd also fallen in love with one of my former students, Afton Christensen, and when they offered me a job to come back to Ephraim, I did so for that reason. For those reasons, really.

WM: Well, how did the turkey business go? Did you--?

HG: Terrible. [Laughter] No, they were not organized then to market profitably. We made a little money but not much. But it has developed now so that you may know that Sanpete County is the tenth largest turkey raising county in the United States.

WM: I hope your brother profited from that.

HG: No, he didn't profit much because--although it did help. He was the main force in getting the turkey processing plant in Ephraim, and because of that, he was made manager of the plant. But he also contracted ulcers, and in 1937 he was on the floor of the turkey plant after they began their season of processing and his ulcer perforated and within two or three days he died. Died the day after my birthday, which was October the 19th, 1937.

WM: Well then, if you left the turkey business, you decided that education was really your forte.
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WM: By '41, that was just prior to World War II.

HG: Right.

WM: But you did get a job?

HG: Oh, I went back to Utah State. Incidentally, I got the job at Utah State in the summer of 1936. I saved enough money out of my $850 salary at Purdue University for half a year to go to the Olympic Games in Berlin, Germany, and while I was there, I received a cablegram from my sister in which she said, "Would you accept a job at Utah State Agricultural College at a salary of $2000 year?" and I cabled back, "Yes." I did not apply for the job, it was offered to me.

WM: And $2000 must sounded like a--

HG: A big salary.

WM: A glorious salary. [Laughter]

HG: When I arrived at Utah State I had no money. I had no shoes. I'd spent the summer in Germany with one pair of shoes that I bought for five dollars before I left. They were worn out and I was putting newspaper in the bottom of the shoes. So within the first two or three days I was there, I went to the secretary of the institution and said, "Can you pay me my salary a little ahead of time?" And he turned to his secretary and said, "Write out Doctor Greaves's salary, or Mr. Greaves's salary, for his first check"--my salary
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commenced on July first—and the check was for five hundred dollars and some odd dollars and cents. I couldn't believe that I had that much money. I bought two pairs of shoes.

WM: How extravagant of you.

HG: Cost me sixteen dollars.

WM: Well then, if you left in 1936, your first year of teaching at Utah State, and obtained your degree in '41, you must have had what, a leave of absence or—

HG: Yes, I taught there for four years and then it was suggested by the dean and by the president of Utah State that I go back and complete the doctorate with the probability that I would return to Utah State as chairman of the department. I've always felt a little bit put out by what happened subsequently. Because after my year at Wisconsin, when I did finish the degree, I was not appointed head of the department.

WM: But you did plan and expected to return to Utah State?

HG: Yes. Right. I taught there all the rest of—well, all year of 1941 and '42 and up until November 30, 1942, when I enlisted in the Navy. I spent three years in the Navy, then returned to Utah State on November the first, 1945, and taught there during that year.
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WM: Well, let's talk first a little bit about your Navy experience then. What—you were an officer? Lieutenant J.G. or full lieutenant, what?

HG: I went in as a first class petty officer because I enlisted.

WM: Oh, really?

HG: They had no offerings as an officer, to speak of, especially in the field of speech. So I enlisted, because I'd received a notice from the Army that I would soon be drafted. So this enabled me to go in at a higher level, as a first class petty officer. I applied for a commission the following summer—I was eligible to apply after six months—and received the commission in September of 1943.

WM: What kind of responsibilities were yours, then, as a commissioned officer?

HG: I was immediately sent overseas to the South Pacific and I ended up on Guadalcanal. You'll recall that Guadalcanal was the place where the Japanese advance towards Australia was stopped. But I arrived there after the fighting had ceased. And it became a staging point, main staging point, for the invasion of islands to the north. But the island was declared secure—that means no more fighting. Safe.

WM: Safe.
HG: I arrived there about November 4th, 1943, and since I had no Navy training, specifically, it was only my general education, and the amount of it, that landed me in Intelligence. I couldn't fit into Operations or Plans or Meteorology or Communications because I had no Navy training. I knew nothing, or very little, about mathematics. It turned out to be lucky, because my job was to report on the progress of the American war against Japanese shipping and aircraft in the South Pacific, so I had a great deal of intelligence material that I could study every day and make about a five, ten, or fifteen minute report to the senior officers—I was an Ensign at this time—on the progress of the war against the Japanese. I stayed there for exactly one year, and during the last month that I was on Guadalcanal I was asked if I would study all of the intelligence material I could get my hands on, on the battle for Guadalcanal. This was a tremendously interesting job and I made seven reports during the last month that I was there.

WM: And the records started to be retained there on Guadalcanal for—

HG: Well, it was a gathering place for intelligence that was shipped from the intelligence center on Pearl
Harbor and also in Washington, D.C. So there were just—I was going to say tons—many, many, many pounds of material, intimate details of how the campaign, both on land at Guadalcanal, on sea and in the air.

WM: So you made seven summarizing reports of material.

HG: Right, seven talks that were probably fifteen or twenty minutes long, each. And then, almost a year after I arrived on Guadalcanal I was returned to the United States. And I spent my last nine months in the Navy on active duty as librarian and historian for that particular base at Tongue Point in Astoria, Oregon, where we were training crews to maintain the American patrol plane called the PBM. So I fitted in. I fitted in to work with what my education had equipped me for, both on Guadalcanal and at Tongue Point.

WM: You were very fortunate you had the experience behind you, because that was a real interruption for anybody who—well, no matter what business they were in, but you needed to keep current with your communication skills so that you could return and be a teacher. Where did you go from there?

HG: Well, I returned to Utah State. Finished out the year there. Then received an offer to come down to the
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University of Utah, and since I thought the opportunities in speech were better at the State University than at the State Agricultural Land Grant College, I came to Utah.

WM: This offer was given to you by--?

HG: It was given to me by Dr. Lowell Lees who, incidentally, received his master's degree at Northwestern the same day I did. As a matter of fact, we set kind of a record because three University of Utah students received their master's degrees at Northwestern on the same day. The third was Doctor Royal Garff.

WM: Oh, yes. I know him too. So that's great. Okay. Then if you accepted the offer, and this was to teach in the Speech Department, University of Utah, under the chairmanship of Dr. C. Lowell Lees, this was 1943, he was new to the chairmanship.

HG: No, this was 1946.

WM: After the war, excuse me. What kind of responsibilities were you given as a teacher here? What kind of classes did you specialize in?

HG: Well, shall I say what I started with or what I covered during my career?

WM: Well, let's start with the first ones and then how it changed.
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HG: Well, I started teaching some public speaking—that is, the elementary public speaking—some interpretation, a course called Background and Materials for Interpretation which was also the name of a course that both Lowell and I had had at Northwestern University. But at the University of Utah, where he had instigated this course, it was really a course in comparative literature, which both of us minored in at the University of Wisconsin, under the renowned professor Philo Buck. So I taught comparative literature for that first, oh, three or four years. I taught some modern poetry, both British and American because that had become a love of mine when I was an undergraduate student at the University of Utah.

WM: Was this the interpretation of modern poetry?

HG: Yes.

WM: You had to keep that emphasis because you were in the Speech Department, not English Department.

HG: Right. Yes. This, incidentally, I have listed later on in my notes as one of my failures because the course died out—not a very heavy registration—maybe after five or six or seven years. But I loved the course. And I also quit the comparative literature course because I thought it had no place in the
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Speech Department.

WM: At the time when Dr. Lees came to the university, the theatre season was so-so. Dying out, I suppose, I've heard from other people I've interviewed.

HG: I think that's an exaggeration, Winn. That is my own opinion.

WM: Is that right?

HG: I think Gail Plummer did a great deal to keep it alive.

WM: But they told me that Dr. Lees brought such excitement to it to increase the number of plays, the offerings, the type of thing that you were doing.

HG: I'm sure that's true because he was a tremendously energetic person.

WM: I wondered if you participated in some of that.

HG: Yes, the first year I was here, as soon as the school year began, I was assigned to direct Soldiers Wife in the Playbox Theatre, as it was called, but it was really the little theatre in the basement of Kingsbury Hall. Right. And also that year I directed the Centennial Opera, Blossom Time, and Dr. Lees was responsible for my getting that commission. And that was a wonderful experience.

WM: Tell us about that one.

HG: Let me tell you first about my other experience in
the University Theatre because I withdrew from it in 1948. I directed the next year the winner of the Centennial Play writing contest which was called Deseret and was written by a young man from Idaho who had previously won the same kind of contest for the state centennial celebration of Iowa. His name was Don Liljenquist and we presented that also in the Playbox in Kingsbury Hall, but moved it up onto the main stage for one extra performance. Now Blossom Time was one of the most enjoyable and one of the most arduous academic and theatre chores that I ever became involved in, because we had to run two casts, had to have two casts for it; that is, two persons for every role because we were to tour the entire state and not every person who worked downtown or worked someplace else could make every performance. So we trained forty-three people for the various roles and for the chorus, and then we had an orchestra of about ten people. We started our try-outs just after Thanksgiving and finished them during the month of December; started the rehearsals about the first of January and presented the first performance in Morgan on the first of March. We completed the run in my old town of Logan on the day after Memorial Day that year; that was the
fifty-fourth performance.

We had no place to rehearse regularly; we rehearsed some of the time in the Lafayette School, which is no longer operable as a school, across, as you recall, from the Church Office Building down on North Temple.

WM: Yes.

HG: At times we rehearsed in the Horticulture Building on the State Fair Grounds where there was no heat, and this was in January, February. I can remember coming home so tired after the dress rehearsals that one night I was invited to my sister's to eat Sunday night supper or dinner, that I was so tired that I fell asleep at the table.

WM: That sounds like an awful lot of play productions that I have heard about or witnessed myself, so I know how arduous they can be. You travelled weekends only because the people were--

HG: No, we travelled weekends mainly, but to get into the southern part of the state, that is, around Fillmore, Kanab, Cedar City, the members of the cast—at least enough of them could plan ahead far enough to take off a full week during the month of April—a week that involved Easter, I recall. I could not go on that trip, but the music director, Vernon Lee Master
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had to go along because he had to direct the whole process of the singing and the orchestra playing. They played eleven performances in six days. They had one scheduled for Saturday afternoon at Fillmore, but I recall that they cancelled it because it was the day before Easter and they figured that the young people would be out in the hills having their Easter celebration.

WM: So you had buses to transport you?

HG: We travelled in two buses that belonged to the Lewis Stage Lines. Yes.

WM: What about your costumes, your scenery?

HG: They fixed up the rear of one of the buses so that they could hang the costumes on racks and also the luggage compartment of the two buses—luggage compartments under the bus were large enough so that the orchestra instruments could be stored there.

WM: You had a cast of, what, forty people or more?

HG: All together, there were forty-three people in the cast and the chorus, plus two dancers, Ralph Cannon and Jennie Lee. Ralph Cannon was the director of the dancing.

WM: Well, that was a highlight for you. Probably one of the largest productions that you did at that time.

HG: Oh, yes. Yes, it was probably the largest.
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WM: And you felt it was successful?

HG: Well, it was produced more than any of the others. More than any of the three plays. Yes, it was very successful. At that time it had a budget—oh, we guessed at about $50,000, and I think we spent $50,000, somewhere around that.

WM: Probably.

HG: Paid the cast a little bit. Paid the main singers twelve dollars a performance, fifteen dollars for two in one day. I got a set sum. Both Vernon and I received twelve hundred dollars for all this work.

WM: Well, I think you were underpaid.

HG: That's what we thought, [laughter] but it was enjoyable. Perhaps I should mention one other large production that I was involved in, and this was the semi-centennial presentation for Utah State when I taught up there. This was in 1938. Long before I arrived there they had chosen Drinkwater's, John Drinkwater's play, Abraham Lincoln to be the semi-centennial production. They chose that play because it was Abraham Lincoln who signed the Morrill Act that founded the Land Grant Colleges in the United States.

WM: I see.

HG: So the play was chosen long before I arrived there.
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It was to have been directed by the head of the department, but about a month before it was scheduled to be presented, he became ill and they drafted me to finish out the—I had to cast it, direct it, in a month. It was a tough job.

WM: That's too much, too soon.

HG: Yeah, much too fast.

WM: And we are about to the end of this first side of the tape, so we will turn it over to the other side.

[end of side one]

This is the second side of tape one, and we are talking with Dr. Hal Greaves from the Communication Department of the University of Utah. We were just speaking of the production of Abraham Lincoln that in one month's time had to be cast, directed, produced. And we've agreed that this was far too swift to do anything really creditable. Did you feel like you had done a good job even though you were pressured for time?

HG: Oh, not particularly, Winn. I felt that we had a few very good actors. The dean of the School of Arts and Sciences had been cast as Abraham Lincoln and he had been a student at the University of Utah majoring in English, but also he studied under Miss Babcock and he was a good reader.
WM: Remember his name?

HG: He was the renowned Dean, Doctor N. A. Pederson. The name is spelled P-e-d-e-r-s-o-n. He was a very fine teacher. And a fine person to work with. And then I was able to draft—I recall that I felt the task of having try-outs was more than could be encompassed in that period of time and so I went to the president, Dr. E. G. Peterson. P-e-t-e-r-s-o-n.

WM: The father of the present president.

HG: The father of President Chase Peterson, right. And I asked him if there was some way I could get faculty members to participate in this play. And he said, "You tell me who you want and I'll requisition them."

[Laughter] So I selected, oh, perhaps eight or ten members of the faculty and the president wrote them letters and said, "Dr. Greaves, Mr. Greaves wants you to be in the Abraham Lincoln Play." Some of them were quite good.

WM: Good.

HG: And then the rest, of course, were students. But by today's standards, it would not have been called a good production. By those standards then, perhaps passable. We had no scene designer; nobody there to build a set, or sets of scenery. So, I contacted my niece in Salt Lake City who had also majored in
speech, and she knew a young lady by the name of Alice Woolf who was very good at that--Alice Bartlett at that time. Later she married John Woolf. And Alice came up and designed sets of scenery. I forget how many we needed--three or four. And she built them and decorated them and Katherine Hall, my niece, came with her. These two ladies worked there for perhaps two weeks and didn't receive a single dime of compensation. Paid their own expenses. We may have paid Alice a little money. I'm not sure.

WM: It's funny. The love of theatre makes you do an awfully lot of things.

HG: That is absolutely correct. Right. Right.

WM: In your courses here at the University of Utah, you saw a lot of changes from when you first started teaching. What kinds of things did you teach that you felt really successful, you got a lot of enrollment, was your main interest?

HG: Let me just mention the range of courses that I taught, Winn. I've already mentioned the public speaking, the interpretation, the modern poetry, the comparative literature. My Ph.D. was in rhetoric and public address. I had a very--although I loved interpretation--I had a very strong conviction that more could be accomplished with the general student
body in public speaking and public address than in interpretation, because more people could be improved in their speaking than as artists.

WM: Yes.

HG: Now, this I've said in kind of a confused way. But I've always thought of the field of speech and communication as being comprised of three worlds. The world of those who are especially talented—these would include actors, debaters, radio announcers, oral interpreters, good readers of great literature—and then those that are handicapped at the bottom of the scale. And then that large segment, maybe eighty per cent of the student body or the general population, that can receive benefit from developing the courage and the skills involved in giving little talks to themselves or to—not to themselves but to small groups—sometimes called when there are two people involved, diadic communication. Or to larger audiences. This is where I felt the most good could be accomplished, even though I liked interpretation immensely. Then I liked acting immensely, too.

WM: Did you have to influence anyone to give you that opportunity to help those classes to grow? Increase?

HG: No, not at all. Because Dr. Lees was successful in
his early years here, perhaps his first year, in getting Speech One, which was a public speaking course, required of all freshmen so that the registration in that elementary course was already built in. Now, if you ask me what course I enjoyed teaching more than any other course, you may be surprised at the answer.

WM: Is it going to be Speech One?

HG: No. It's going to be Basic Communication.

WM: Well.

HG: Now this was a program that was instigated in 1949 and it was quite popular throughout the entire United States. It consisted of a combined course in English and Speech, or in the four elements of the communication process; that is, reading, writing, speaking, and listening. I liked it for two reasons. I had background—I had a heavy background in English as well as my speech major as an undergraduate. I took—I audited courses in the English Department at the University of Wisconsin, and had comparative literature as my minor; and while I was at Northwestern I took courses in the School of Speech that involved quite a lot of literature. So it fitted in with my training. Then the second major, big reason why I liked to teach it was that the
enrollment in the Basic Communication courses consisted of the top thirty per cent of the freshman class based on tests that were given for entrance into the English program.

WM: So you got the brighter students.

HG: Got the brighter students and they were just wonderful. I see doctors, lawyers scattered around town who were my good students in Basic Communication. As a matter of fact, our—one of our representatives to Congress, Jim Hanson—ah, was not in the Basic Communication class but he was in class a level above that, and Dan Marriott also was in a class just a level above Basic Communication. But I do see a lot of my Basic Communication students being very successful around town.

WM: Well, that's one of the rewards of being a teacher, isn't it? Seeing what happens to your students?

HG: Right. Right. The reward is there more than it is in the pocketbook.

WM: That's true.

HG: Should we talk about that or should we forget about that?

WM: Let's talk about that. I think that is a very good thing, because by the time somebody is using this, salaries will not be at all what you were receiving.
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HG: They are not that already.
WM: That's true.
HG: The increase in the salary level at the University in
the ten years I've been retired has been very
significant. My salary when I retired, would it be
pertinent?
WM: Oh, yes.
HG: It was $18,750 after twenty-nine years.
WM: And head of the department?
HG: And head of the department for eight of the last
thirteen years I was here. I was chairman of the
department from 1961 to '69.
WM: And full professor.
HG: Full professor since 1951. Right. Now there should be
added to that, of course, the perquisites which
made it the equivalent of perhaps $22,000. But now
they tell me they can hire, perhaps, if they get
somebody who doesn't make too many demands, an
assistant professor for that amount of money. But it
was enough.
WM: Well, it probably went further than today's dollar
does.
HG: Oh, yes. There's no question about that.
WM: I'm very glad too, as you are, that the University
has improved considerably.
HG: I am too. Because it has improved the University.
WM: Yes.
HG: Right.
WM: Well then, you were, ah, promoted from--what did you become, an instructor?
HG: No, I came as an assistant professor.
WM: You received your promotions and you received your tenure.
HG: Yes, I received associate professor after one year and, ah, professor after three more years. I became professor in 1951. Incidentally, I didn't finish going over the different courses I taught.
WM: Good.
HG: Shall we go back to that a little bit?
WM: You bet.
HG: I got wrapped up in my rhapsody statement about Basic Communication. In 1951 I started two courses that I had not taught prior to that time. The first was called Introduction to Graduate Research in Speech and I taught that until we had a change in the department structure by the merger with journalism in 1972, so I taught it for about eleven or twelve years. And that was a good course. I liked that. Ah, I made it heavily a writing course because so many students who come to graduate work need training
in writing before they write their theses. And then the other course that I started in 1951 was the course to train teachers to teach in high school. That consisted of—it was first a five hour course which included the training in both classroom teaching and the directing of extracurricular activities. Later, we separated it into two separate courses. But I taught that until 1964 when my duties as chairman of the department made me feel that I was not doing an adequate job, and I asked for another teacher. And we brought in a former student of ours from our department and also from Northwestern by the name of Emanuel Kerikas, and he was a specialist in speech pedagogy and he took over the course and taught it for five or six years at which time he left the department.

WM: When did you become head of the department?


WM: In '61. Ah, at the time you were teaching at the University under C. Lowell Lees, he was head of the department, theatre and speech department as one. Then there was a split.

HG: Right.

WM: What were the events that led up to making a separation of those departments?
HG: Perhaps I should preface my statement about that with the inclusion of speech pathology and audiology in that Speech Department. There were the three divisions.

WM: Yes.

HG: Theater, what we call general speech, which consisted of rhetoric and public address and interpretation, and then speech pathology and audiology.

WM: Yes.

HG: I would say that the main—my personal reason for favoring that split was that the emphasis was very heavily on theatre work. And I felt that the Department of Speech ought to have much more emphasis on what I called the more utilitarian aspects of speech work which included, of course, public speaking. And one of my very specific reasons for feeling that that split needed to take place was that so many of the teachers of this public speaking course, which supplied the great bulk of the registration for the department, required of all freshmen you remember—it was the bread and butter course. And nearly all of the teachers for that course were actors or trainees in theatre. This was because of Dr. Lees's tremendous ambition for the department—for a department in the theatre. So there
were some of us who became discontented and I certainly was one of them. Ah, you recall earlier I did make the statement that I withdrew from the theatre program in 1948, and I withdrew partly because I felt that Dr. Lees tried to and succeeded in dominating and making the decisions altogether. More than was warranted.

WM: Then who was instrumental in the university administration in talking to people coming to the decision that breaking up the department was the most successful way?

HG: At that time Jack Adamson was the dean. But prior to Jack becoming dean, ah, Dr. Boyer Jarvis, who is still in the department, was acting dean and he favored the split and he was a very close friend of Vice President McMurrin, Sterling McMurrin, and he urged the split on McMurrin. I wrote a letter to McMurrin and I prefer not to mention who else did that.

WM: That's fine.

HG: I think that is their business, not mine to make public. Ah, but McMurrin was shortly appointed U.S. Commissioner of Education and he was succeeded by Daniel Dykstra. And when he went to Washington soon afterwards, Dr. Jarvis followed him because they were
very close friends, and Jarvis was immensely effective at handling details that Dr. McMurrin didn't have time to handle. I think this is fair to say. He is still very effective in handling many of the details of the University. So at the time the split was made, the administrators who engineered it outside of the speech department were Dean Jack Adamson and Vice President Daniel Dykstra.

WM: Was it with the understanding that you would chair the department, or was that something that was decided after the split was made?

HG: That was decided after the split was made, or at that time. I think it's only fair to say that it was not an appointment. It was an election.

WM: Of the faculty of the--

HG: Of the faculty of the Department of Speech, yes.

WM: How was the division made? Ah, who was to go in what department and who was to stay in the Speech Department?

HG: I think I could safely say that the--oh, I think fourteen or fifteen faculty members were given a choice.

WM: I see.

HG: And as I recall, eleven of them elected to remain with speech and three elected to go with Dr. Lees.
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This would make fifteen. I believe that's about right.

WM: So that, ah, it wasn't a matter of selecting--you stay, you go--

HG: No.

WM: It was a matter of where can they best fit in and do their best?

HG: Oh yes. Well, some of the, many of the, most of the people who stayed in speech would not have been at all successful in theatre because they were not trained for theatre. Those who stayed with theatre were those who were trained for it.

WM: I see. Then, ah, you were, you say, not an appointment, but elected by your co-workers?

HG: And then appointed, of course.

WM: So that you headed the department. What changes did you attempt to make? How did you organize it? How did you take care of just the business of preparing a department to function?

HG: Well, ah, I don't know quite how to answer that, Winn. Of course we had to—we were faced with the task of acquiring teachers for these large numbers of sections in Speech One. Ah, as I recall we started out with somewhere between twenty-five and thirty sections a quarter. And this meant that we had to
have some teaching assistants. We didn't have them that first year, so we used members of the theatre faculty who had taught Speech One, and some of the teaching assistants in the theatre to fill in some of those gaps, and then we really called old time speech majors from around the city and valley to come here and teach. For example, former Governor Herbert Maw, who had been in the Speech Department when he was at the University of Utah as, ah--on the faculty, came here and taught for one full year at 7:45 in the morning.

WM: Oh my.

HG: For the compensation of one dollar per year. Now he made that concession because he said, "I can't accept more than that because it would interfere with my retirement." He had already served two terms as governor. But he came up here to do that.

WM: Well, that's love of teaching.

HG: Yes. Yes.

WM: But, that was one of your major problems. You had budget problems because before you'd worked under one budget, now you had split. Ah, I'm trying to see what way two departments grew out of one and where the problems are in making both of them independent of each other.
HG: I just don't recall how the budget was split. Because the split took place late enough in the year that the budget had been approved. Now, Dr. Lees—as much as I disagreed with him on many of the points that led up to the split, was quite generous in saying that all of the equipment budget could remain with the new department—that is, the Department of Speech. Ah, of course the Department of Theatre was assigned to an entirely different college, College of Fine Arts. The Theatre Department retained the old equipment.

WM: But the audiology stayed with you.

HG: Audiology and speech pathology, yes, we had—

WM: Was there a question whether the interpretation should go with the Theatre Department?

HG: Not a very strong question. It came up later. Ah, but I argued that I felt that interpretation was more of an educational endeavor, needed more by teachers of speech, than it was an entertainment endeavor, and I felt the stress in the theatre at that time was very heavily on entertainment. It has become much more educational since that time.

WM: Preparing people almost to be professionals rather than educated human beings?

HG: Putting on a lot of plays and getting audiences to come and see them—that was the stress. It's quite
different now, I think, since it has gone fully professional under Dr. Keith Engar. It's changed almost as much as it changed during the years that Dr. Lees was there.

WM: What do you feel, as now head of the department, was the most successful thing that you were able to bring to them?

HG: Well, I believe the first year there was an air of contentment because there had been a great deal of discontent prior to 1961. As a matter of fact, we had what was called a reorganization in 1955, but that faded away because Dr. Lees was skillful enough to still keep very much in control of everything, including the budget. Ah, I think that the restlessness that had pervaded the department subsided to a considerable extent. Then we were gradually able to, within a year or maybe two years, eliminate the concession we had made to the Department of Theatre assistants so that we did not have to have them teach our public speaking courses. This enabled us to enlarge our corps of teaching assistants and also we were able to enlarge our faculty during the eight years I was chairman by an average of one new faculty member every second year. So this helped us to stress, ah, the graduate
work. It helped us to provide stronger teaching in some of the courses above the level of Speech One and a considerable number of—well, I think we had as many as fifteen, sixteen, seventeen teaching assistants in that Speech One program.

WM: And you were still offering a Ph.D in speech?

HG: Yes. Now our graduate program was not very heavy. It has since that time, since 1970, it has become very strong and this is—oh, I can take just a trivial amount of credit for that because I saw along about 1966 and '67 that there was a move throughout the country to move into what is called communication, and communication, of course, is much broader than speech because it trains people to fit into positions in the professional world, in the business world, in the industrial world, in all segments of society as well as all levels of society. Ah, during the early years of the speech/theatre programs throughout the country, the main outlet for their trainees was in education, but the coming of communication has greatly broadened those opportunities. And I should give the new department some full credit for what's been done. Well, we did get a start on it the last two years I was chairman, because we hired in 1968 Doctor Don Faules who had been trained at Ohio State
University and had been Associate Director of the Communications Research Laboratory at the University of Ohio in Athens. A very strong man, and he came in in 1968 and immediately went about setting up a communication research laboratory. He took charge of the speech, the basic speech program which was by then not called Speech One but Speech 101. We went on to the 100 to 600 level of classifications. Ah, the next year, to assist Dr. Faules—he had wonderful success that first year—the next year we were able to bring in another young man, also trained at Ohio State University, who just got his degree that year, by the name of Dr. Dennis Alexander. They were the nucleus of our very, very strong Department of Communication—communication theory and process organizational communication, behavioral communication, and so forth today.

WM: It has changed considerably.

HG: Oh, it's changed tremendously, yes. And one thing, (I'm not very happy about this) I'm a little bit sorrowful about the fact that I think our present department does neglect the teaching of oral interpretation too much, because that was our main contact with great literature. And it seems to me that to anybody teaching speech and communication,
it's a serious loss. But I must acknowledge, and I think that I should announce here, too, that shifting onto such a heavy emphasis in communication has enabled the present department to achieve national ranking. Because about three or four years ago when an evaluation made by peer departments throughout the country—not by accreditation societies but by peer departments—the University of Utah Department of Communication—and I should also make it clear here that journalism has been added to the department since—well, in 1972, so journalism should get a lot of credit here. But in this peer evaluation throughout the nation, our Department of Communication ranked tenth.

WM: I think that is splendid.

HG: Which is a very, very, very fine achievement.

WM: That's very high, very good.

HG: The only university in the West to be in the top ten. The closest was Washington. And Washington, I think, was about thirteenth—much higher than Colorado. As a matter of fact, the graduate program at Colorado has been dropped. Much higher than Arizona, although Arizona exceeded us in the rankings in interpretation because of our de-emphasis on it.

WM: You felt like you had administration support all the
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HG: I felt I had good administration support, yes. And we had Adamson as dean; ah, Dr. John Spikes who was a scientist and eminent faculty member, very helpful. And after Dr. Spikes—well, Dr. Canning preceded Spikes, I believe, for one year. He said he really didn't care to be dean. He was assistant to Jack Adamson. Adamson, Canning, Spikes, and then Alfred Cane from the Department of History, and I just felt that I had very fine rapport with Dr. Cane.
WM: We're coming close to the end. We may have five minutes here. Are there some things that you'd like to talk about that I haven't asked?
HG: I thought we were to have two hours instead of one.
WM: We certainly may have. I've got another tape and we're glad to go on, [laughter] if you feel like there are some things that--
HG: Well, Winnie, I made some notes which I've hardly looked at, so maybe there are some things here that I'd like to mention. Incidentally, the Basic Communications course that I liked so much lasted only thirteen years. I think it would still be a viable course if you--
WM: Why did it phase out?
HG: Oh, I think I know why it phased out.
WM: What was that?

HG: That was that the people who were trained in English did not want to teach the Speech part of it, and the people who were trained in Speech did not want to teach the English part of it.

WM: They didn't have the training for both?

HG: Too broad, too broad. There were three of us in our department who were pretty much the backbone of our contribution to the faculty. Ah, Dr. Wanda Thomas, Gail Plummer, and myself.

WM: But they just couldn't stand it.

HG: Most of the others didn't want to teach the English part of it. I think that was the main drawback, yes. But I still think it is a very viable ideal to work toward, to favor. But I think it's pretty much died out throughout the country. You asked me to mention some exceptional colleagues. I think Dr. Lees was an exceptional person. Gail Plummer, I thought, was a wonderful man and a fine teacher and great citizen of the city. Dr. Joseph Catmull was a tremendous help to me, ah, because I needed a lot of advice and he was always reliable and he was always there.

WM: That was a question that I would have. His being an actor and one in interpretation, were you pleased that he chose to stay with the Speech Department?
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HG: Oh, delighted.

WM: Because he would be able to teach your interpretation?

HG: Absolutely delighted. And I think that Dr. Catmull
favored interpretation more than he did acting. I
think he was reaching near the, coming close to the
end of his ambitions to be on the stage.

WM: I see.

HG: He had more than once spoken to me, "Well, this will
be my last stage appearance." [laughter] This was
many years ago. "I'm getting tired of it." Louise
Hill Howe Mallonee, I should mention because of her
great artistry.

WM: And we'll come back to that in just a moment. We're
about to the end of this tape.

[First tape ends, second tape begins]

WM: This is tape number two of an interview with Dr.
Halbert Greaves. This is the Everett L. Cooley Oral
History Project and we're in the Eccles Room of the
Marriott Library.

We've been talking about his department
chairmanship of Speech and Communication. He was
telling us of the Communication Department, how the
accreditation committee assigned it tenth place in
the entire United States, and the background for
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this was started at least the last few years when Dr. Greaves was head of the department.

Dr. Greaves, had you felt that when you were head of the Speech Department and you made your last two faculty appointments of Dr. Faules and Dr. Alexander, that speech as you knew it was dying out and going in other directions and you needed to keep up with the changes?

HG: Well, I didn't think speech was dying out as we knew it. I felt that rhetoric and public address would always retain a strong part, and I didn't anticipate the withering-on-the-vine of interpretation, although I should have seen that because it had happened at other institutions, but I did feel that there was a very powerful need to broaden the base into communication theory and process. Yes, that was one of my— I remember one year at the first faculty meeting we held in the fall, I said, "I have three major goals in mind for the year." And one of them was to get somebody on to the faculty to commence a communication program. And I must give credit here to Dr. Richard Rieke who came in in 1970. There was one year when we did not have a chairman of the department, because I resigned in 1969 and a chairman of the committee was in charge of the department. The
chairman of the committee who had the title of Acting Department Head was Dr. Merlin Mecham. And incidentally, one of the nice things that I did for the department the first year that I was here was to bring Dr. Mecham in for speech pathology and audiology. But Dr. Mecham was a very good scholar. He had a fine book to his credit, and he restored a considerable amount of tranquillity to the speech pathology area. But, during that interim year, 1969-70, we sought a new department chairman. And Dr. Richard Rieke then became the chairman. And I think he should get a lot of credit for attracting other people here, and I think Dr. Faules should continue to get a lot of credit, and Dr. Malcolm Sillars, who is nationally renowned. As a matter of fact, he has just in the past two or three years served as president of the Speech Communication Association, which is the large, national communication association, and has now recently, just this year, been elected president of the Western. So he steps down from the national president to Western's president. The fourth member of the University of Utah faculty, incidentally, who has served as president of the Western or who will have served as president of the Western
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Association—the first was Joseph Smith. I was the second in 1965. Dr. Aubrey Fisher of the present faculty was president a year ago, and Dr. Malcolm Sillars will be president in a couple of years.

WM: That's unusual to take four from one university for a national organization.

HG: Not national. This is the Western.

WM: Oh, excuse me.

HG: But, the university has also had three presidents of the national association—Miss Babcock, and Joseph Smith, and Malcolm Sillars. Ah, do you want to ask me a question about the University of Utah presidents?

WM: Yes, I think that's—

HG: I'm not going to say very much, but—

WM: Next appropriate one. You've worked under a number of them. Ah, tell us the changes that you saw, the influence that you felt that they had on campus, and perhaps in your department.

HG: I prodded you into that, Winn, because I wanted to pay my respects to Dr. A. Ray Olpin. Of course I knew him better than the others because he was president of the university when I was appointed chairman, and he was here longer than the others were. And I felt that he had as good a view of what a well-rounded university ought to be as anybody I've
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ever known.

WM: And yet, he was a scientist.

HG: And yet, he was a scientist. I thought he was a marvelous president for the period of time during which he served; he came here—well, just prior to the end of the World War, and then, of course, he was here for that extensive expansion after the Second World War. Now I didn't know the others all that well. I thought that Dr. Fletcher was a very brilliant man. I thought he leaned a little bit too heavily into science and neglected the humanities and the arts, maybe, a little bit too much. President Gardner I hardly knew. He certainly impressed me as being a dynamic and a very brilliant person, and one who could make decisive decisions quickly and effectively. I always admired the integrity and the ambitions of President Emery during the two years that he was president of the university.

Now, if I may branch out a little bit, I had some extracurricular activities while I was in the department. You have on your outline that you graciously supplied to me a month ago, whether I had any notable achievements. I mentioned some that I think helped the department. I was State Chairman of the American Legion National High School Oratorical
Contest for almost fifteen years. I liked that little outside chore because over the nation at that time—this was between say, 1948 and 1962—somewhere between three hundred thousand and five hundred thousand young high school students would study the American Constitution. Now they didn't give good orations, but they probably learned more about the constitution by studying for this oratorical contest than they did in the classroom. I served also—since I was state contest chairman for that long period of time, it also led me into being chairman of the four state finals about four times, for the twelve state finals once, and chairman for the national finals once—that was in 1962. After that time, I gave up that assignment. I served as president—I served in all three of the highest offices in the Western Speech Association. Second Vice President, First Vice President, and President in 1965. And then in 1977, I had my last executive position with the Western Association when I was president of the Executives Club. The Executives Club is an organization for former officers of the Western Association. I also would like to take a little credit for the year I served as president of the Professors Emeritis Club at the University.
Because I discovered through a poll that had been taken by Dr. Carl Christensen, who was president two years before I was, and he polled to see just what the incomes of the one hundred forty, approximately, professors emeritis on the campus was. Some of them had an annual income as low as four thousand dollars. I think that there was about seven percent who reported that small—

WM: This was their retirement income?

HG: Retirement income. Then up as high as somewhere around twenty percent had a retirement income of around seven thousand.

WM: This is all sources.

HG: As I recall, all sources. And I thought, "What a pity that these teachers who retired long before I did had so little income." So it occurred to me that perhaps the administration would allow us to raise some money or give us money for amenities, and so I went to Dr. R. J. Snow, who was the personal assistant to President Gardner; talked it over with him and he said, "Of course, I agree with you. But I think you ought not try to raise money. Let me talk to the deans and see if we can get a budget for you. How much of a budget would you like?" And I put down three or four categories in which we would need a
little money. And any time I mentioned two or three hundred dollars, he would say, "Yes, we'll try to get a little more than that. We'll try to get a little more than that." We asked for a thousand dollars, and he got for us that first year--this was in 1978--fifteen hundred. I don't know what--you're vice president now, and you know what it is now.

WM: Two thousand now.

HG: It's a little bit more. Two thousand. And I think that has done a great deal, not only to provide amenities by subsidizing social affairs and cultural and recreational events for the emeritis, but it has made it attractive for the club to attract good people, strong leaders as president and vice president as you are; secretary-treasurer as you were last year--which were you?

WM: Secretary.

HG: Secretary last year. So I think we've had a strong group of officers each year, ever since we've had that budget.

WM: I didn't realize--ah, of course I guess I should have remembered, but I didn't remember that it was under your presidency that this budget was possible.

HG: I didn't get to use any of it. But I was responsible for getting it. Right. There was one thing that I
never did quite understand, that in the 1964-65 edition of *Who's Who in America* my name was solicited and I was listed in that edition, but I had not been particularly noteworthy, I thought, in education. I had not yet been elected president of Western. I'd been elected chairman of the department. I had a fellowship with Mountain States Telephone during the summer of 1961. I had taught in the Air Force in 1948, but I felt that my personal achievements as an educator and a military officer were not enough to entitle me to be listed in the *Who's Who*, and yet I was not unwilling to accept that citation.

I've been retired for ten years, and I'm not entirely qualified to comment on either the university or the department today. In fact, I think I'm only lightly qualified. But I am delighted with the progress of both the university and the department. As I mentioned the evaluation of the department, and I think that anyone who knows, oh, even a fair amount about the rating of the University of Utah would agree that its rating has gone up rather steadily ever since World War II, has continued to go up in different ways under each new president. Some of the things that I disliked the last two or three years that I taught—or maybe
the last five years that I taught—and when I think of this, I think of a statement that Dr. Jack Adamson made. I hold Jack Adamson up as one of the brightest men I think I ever knew at the University.

WM: One who was sensitive.

HG: Yes, indeed. And one of the best educated.

WM: Yes.

HG: And a very bright person. But he made a statement not too many years before he died, that if he had it to do again, he would not choose to be an educator or perhaps a teacher. I never knew why, because he was so good. But there were things that I disliked during the last, say five years that I taught. I think the teacher evaluation in theory is a very good thing. I did not like the way it was handled at the University of Utah because I thought it could put into the minds of the students maybe some idea that they didn't have to have as much respect for the teacher as I felt they should have.

WM: Yes.

HG: I'm not going to explain why, because everybody knows what the system was. And I was also told by some very good students that they knew other good students who, as soon as the evaluation book was put out in the library for student access, that a lot of students
would run to see who gave the highest grades and then register for courses with those teachers.

WM: Because they wanted a high grade point average.

HG: They wanted to have a good grade point average. And this, of course, helped to contribute to the grade inflation which became, in my--this is my own phrase--I think a national scandal. Because even at an institution as great as the University of Wisconsin, and if I can make a side remark here, I would say that I used the word great in connection with Wisconsin partly because between the years 1910 and 1970, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education, the University of Wisconsin granted more Ph.D.s than any other university in the nation.

WM: No matter what subject--

HG: In all subject areas. And their grade point average, also reported in one of these national periodicals, was up about as high as it was at the University of Utah. Around B, maybe B-, maybe a little higher than B with the upperclassmen. Even--of course Harvard you'd expect it to be harder, but at Harvard it was even higher than it was at Wisconsin. So the grade inflation I thought did a great disservice to higher education. I also disapproved very strongly of giving a student permission to withdraw during the ninth
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week of the course in order to avoid getting a grade below C-.

WM: Yes, when they felt they were shaky.

HG: When they felt they were shaky, they could quit the course, yeah. Now this to me was, would not have much encouragement to set high standards.

WM: How did you feel about the pass/fail?

HG: I didn't like the pass/fail any more than I did the late withdrawal. Ah, and I did not like the idea that students could CLEP out of as much as forty-five hours of credit by passing their exams high after they left high school. As a matter of fact, in the next to the last year that I taught, I had a very bright young lady in class, in a mid-level course in public speaking. She was the best student in the class of about fifteen, I thought. And one day after class, she stopped after class and we talked a little bit and we talked about this matter of grade inflation, of CLEPing out, of late withdrawal, of credit/no credit. And she said, "Well, I CLEPed out of"--I think it was forty-five hours, maybe a little more then forty-five hours--"and I could take forty-five credit/no-credit, which means I could get a bachelor's degree by really studying for about one hundred and five, maybe a hundred and ten hours of
credit." Whereas, when I was a student, I felt that I
had to study for a hundred eighty-three hours. And
then, I still remember her phrase. She said, "I think
it's ridiculous."

WM: Good for her. But she probably came to that only
after the fact. And found that she needed it and
probably very proud of the fact that she was able to
CLEP out. I've heard students say that they are very
proud that they have succeeded in that way.

HG: Right. If I could see Diane again, I'd like to ask
her how many credits she accumulated before she
graduated. My guess is that it would be over the one
hundred eighty three because she was curious, and she
would like to take more.

You have on your little list here the issue of
religion. And I want to say that the issue of
religion at the University of Utah never troubled me
at all, except for one very unpleasant incident. And
that is what I call--well, I shouldn't call it
that, but say I call it that because that's what it
was. It was the Centennial Pen editorial which
appeared in one of our local newspapers after the
Centennial Pen was published in March, I think it
was, of 1950. It was an editorial that criticized the
Centennial Pen very vigorously for including in this
centennial issue, ah, pieces that had been written--one short story for example, by authors that the dominant church disapproved of. Now they weren't against--the articles were not anti-church. They were by authors who later came into disrepute. And there was a very derogatory editorial that appeared on the front page of the newspaper. Now that gives it a great deal more prominence than it would have on the editorial page. Ah, this to me was a very serious mistake for the newspaper to make. And I will give credit to the President of the Church, because he was out of town at the time, and I was given to understand that when he returned to Salt Lake and discovered what had been done and how this had deeply hurt the President of the University and other people at the University, he came personally to the office of the president with tears in his eyes and apologized for that editorial. So it was somebody below the level of the highest General Authorities who had had this editorial printed. Otherwise, I think the issue of academic freedom has been very, very strongly defended by the presidents of this university in a situation where the dominant church might have at one time or another or maybe two times or two other times caused just the opposite to
be the case.

WM: Probably in the beginning of the university most of the people, of course, I imagine eighty, ninety percent of the people who were in the valley were members of the Latter-day Saints church.

HG: Oh, yes. I'm sure. And I think that all of the presidents of the university have been members of the L.D.S. church. And I think it's greatly to their credit and greatly to the credit of the Church that they have allowed, one or both, advocated one very fine university in the state to maintain this great academic freedom. It is to the credit of the Church as well as the presidents of the university.

WM: Now in your hiring your faculty, you never had to at any time consider whether they were of the dominant faith or whether--


WM: It was always the abilities rather than the--?

HG: Right.

WM: So many feel that they want to return to Zion. I've heard that phrase over and over again.

HG: Right. Right. I'd wanted to. I'm grateful that I did.

WM: But that was never an influential feeling that you had?
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HG: Never.

WM: Or that you would make your choices on that basis. But did you ever feel that you were discriminated against by those who were non-Mormon in the faculty?

HG: No. No. I don't think so. I think there might be a few snide remarks made now and then, but not actual discrimination. I think perhaps more now than before the University has become so large and so cosmopolitan. Ah, but I don't think that was ever an issue. Not as far as I could see.

You also mentioned something that I do want to comment on. The treatment of women in our department and at the 'U' in general. I hope that the women have caught up by now and received what is commonly called equal pay for equal work. I think it was not true some years ago. I've cited a couple of instances, ah, that are only general, but when I'd get the budget forms to fill out, we had two very fine lady teachers in our faculty, Dr. Thomas and Mrs. Mallonee, Mrs. Louise Hill Mallonee, two among our strongest teachers. And I'd try to sneak up their salary a little bit above the percentage that was suggested from the higher authorities; ah, maybe a percent a year and more than once it would get cut back someplace.
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WM: You'd pass it on to your dean or vice-president?

HG: Someplace it would be cut back. So I think that women were discriminated against a long time ago, about twenty years ago when I was chairman.

WM: But as a department head, you were trying to equalize it even then.

HG: I knew I couldn't equalize it. But I saw that it was there. Because these ladies got less money than, say, one or two men who I thought were less effective teachers. I knew I couldn't equalize it; all I hoped to do was move it up toward their level.

WM: What about when you were making appointments of new faculty members? Did you ever appoint a woman?

HG: No. No. Oh, yes, yes we did. Ah, the second year, but I was teaching at the Naval Postgraduate School that summer and a new teacher was needed in pathology and audiology and it was left up to Dr. Mecham to find someone. He found a lady who had just recently acquired her Ph.D. from Stanford University. And he hired her. I don't recall the salary. I hope it was fair. She left the university after only--she became discontented, she was a malcontent. I prefer not to mention her name because she led a tragic existence. She left the university at the end of two quarters. I think there may have been another one appointed in
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speech pathology and audiology but only in a minor capacity.

WM: Didn't you ever have women apply when you were making choices?

HG: Yes, we did have women apply. Ah, the year we appointed--I forget, it was in 1969, we had--well, we had two or three women apply for a position in interpretation. Yes, now I recall. Two or three applied and the position was obtained by Dr. Clyde Vinson.

WM: Oh, yes.

HG: We did make an offer. We made an offer to both of the young ladies, but we didn't make them very strong offers, because--

WM: You were not competitive in salary.

HG: Not competitive in salary. Ah, we made one an offer of more money than the other because she was older and more experienced. But she said she could get more at Florida State. I said, "Well, we have to sell environment here, and we think our environment is better." But she didn't accept what we offered. And then we hired Clyde Vinson.

WM: But you never knowingly, or can recall that if you had a choice between a man and a woman who may have been equally qualified, the job was offered to the
man?

HG: No. No. No, I don't think so.

WM: And did you ever feel that you, in assigning pay increases, that though you were trying to bring women up a percent at a time, were you conscious of giving a higher pay increase to a man because maybe he had a large family he was supporting?

HG: No, no. That didn't enter my mind.

WM: I've heard that story time and time again, too.

HG: No, no. That didn't enter my mind. As a matter of fact, I don't believe we had the strong, big-family man on the faculty.

WM: In your department.

HG: They had their families, but not up to eight and nine children like some of them have now. Shall I mention one little chore that I performed after I retired?

WM: Fine.

HG: For three years, from July 1st, 1978, until July 1st, 1981, I was a staff writer for the Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration. This is a subsidiary organization of the Speech Communication Association. Puts out a good bulletin, incidentally. And I was asked if I would write a "For Your Information" section for it. And this led me to read
a lot in the Chronicle of Higher Education and various other periodicals about education and even in news periodicals, and it was a job out of which some of the information I've given you about some of the evaluations, for example, came. But it was tedious. And it was a lot of work and I was getting into my early seventies, so I quit in 1981 at which time I was seventy-three.

WM: However, it does seem that they have recognized the quality of work that you did and are still capable of doing, or they never would have asked you.

HG: Well, I think that Dr. Rieke recommended me to Robert Hall who is the editor back in Washington, D.C., headquarters. And I thought, well, give it a try. Oh yes, they liked it. They liked it.

WM: Have you written articles, books?

HG: I did have a note on that, Winn, here. Because I think I should confess that I was not a book writer.

WM: A book lover but not a writer.

HG: I was much more a reader than a writer. I wrote one monograph which I called Persuasion in a Theocracy. I dug it out of my doctoral dissertation. My doctoral dissertation dealt with public speaking. This was the title of the dissertation, Public Speaking in Utah 1847 to 1869. Now most people who hear this or read
it will recognize that 1869 was a logical place to stop because that was the year the railroad came to Utah. So we were not isolated as we had been prior to that time, and that's when Dr. Neff's very fine book on the history of Utah terminated, in 1869. And I wrote this monograph on--out of that thesis. And I had three or four articles that came out of the thesis that were published in The Utah Humanities and later in the The Western Humanities Review. And I had one or two appear in Quarterly Journal of Speech, but I was certainly not a prolific writer.

WM: We are coming to the end of the tape. Are there some things that you have in your notes or anything that, ah, you feel that you would like to say that we have not discussed?

HG: Well, you asked me about good teachers. Maybe I should just generalize for a minute, because I'm writing, when I get ambition enough, my personal recollections for my granddaughter to read. [Laughter] It's going to be too long for anybody else to take any interest in it, if I ever finish it. But I did compare teachers on the undergraduate level with those on the graduate level. I felt that the teachers I had at the graduate level at Northwestern were, in general, superior to many of the teachers I
had on the undergraduate level, but not all of them. I thought Miss Babcock was a very strong teacher. Dr. Sherman Neff in English, I just thought he was a great teacher. And I had other fine teachers too at the University. Northwestern was a great year for me because I was fresh out of teaching in high school and I was motivated. There the teaching was superb. I thought it was much less so at Wisconsin.

WM: And let's turn this tape over then.

[End of Side One of Tape Two]

WM: This is the second side of Tape Two. And Dr. Greaves was telling us how he was rating the various teachers that he had had in his educational career. And you've just said something very interesting, while we've been turning this tape, about Wisconsin. Would you like to tell us again while we've got the tape recording?

HG: I went to Wisconsin with a great deal of anticipation, of course, to get my doctorate and partly because I enjoyed it there at Northwestern so much. That was perhaps the highlight as far as personal enjoyment of a year of schooling was concerned in my graduate career. I don't—I wouldn't say that it was any higher in its exhilaration—is that all right?—in its exhilaration effect than my
sophomore year at the University of Utah when I first started to participate in the plays. That was a marvelous year. And the year at Northwestern was a marvelous year, partly because of the great motivation I had, but I also had the wonderful teacher, Lew Sarett. The dean of the school was a tremendously interesting teacher although he never prepared a lecture. He was just an interesting teacher because he was a stimulating teacher, and a stimulating person. Yes, Ralph Dennis. Now, Lew Sarett was a poet. And he taught—oddly enough, he did teach prosody which was, perhaps, as enjoyable a course as I ever took anywhere at any time. And forms of public address; he taught speech pedagogy and persuasion, and he was perhaps the most noted teacher at Northwestern. But the lady who taught the advanced interpretation courses was a lovely person and a fine teacher. Her name was Isabelle Lovedale. Ralph Dennis was a good teacher because he was such an interesting person and such a worldly person. At the University of Wisconsin, my three favorite teachers were my major professor, Dr. Henry Ewbank, because he was such a wonderful person to work with; I wrote my dissertation with him and there was never a word of any disagreement that was unpleasant in any way,
nothing critical. Even if he criticized, he made it pleasant. The great teacher of interpretation at Wisconsin was Gertrude Johnson. And interestingly enough, she asked me one day, when she had asked me to read in public one of the programs that she sponsored, who my teachers had been at the University of Utah. And when I mentioned Miss Babcock, she said, "Oh, she was a fine teacher." She didn't think so highly of one of the teachers I had at Northwestern. She was a very outspoken woman. And then the chairman of the department of comparative literature—it was a small department—but Dr. Philo Buck I think was well known throughout the nation. As a matter of fact, he spent one summer, at least, teaching at the University of Utah. And I believe one summer at Utah State. These were my three main teachers at Wisconsin.

WM: And each name that you've mentioned, I remember the textbooks that they wrote. I don't know that they are used anymore, but these people were certainly the major speech figures at that time.

HG: They were. That's right.

WM: You were fortunate to have studied under them.

HG: Right.

WM: Would your guess be that you've had a number of
students who have gone on to be, maybe, teachers themselves, and look back fondly on their university years here at the University of Utah?

HG: Oh, yes. I'm sure.

WM: Do they come back and visit you every once in awhile?

HG: No.

WM: Do you hear about them?

HG: Yes, sometimes.

WM: This is one way a teacher knows. It's a reward for the years that you have been a teacher.

HG: Yes, here last week I went to a golden wedding anniversary, and there was a young man there who was the son, incidentally, of a member of the faculty in the College of Education. He had a tough time in his course. Not because the course was hard enough, but because he was a poor student. He must have had emotional problems of one kind or another. But, I gave him an incomplete and outlined for him what he'd need to do to work off that incomplete; he came back the next quarter and completed at least twice as much as I had outlined. Well, he was at this golden wedding and introduced me to a friend and commented on how much he had enjoyed the classwork that I'd had with him. And I've had other students do that. One that I recall with particular pleasure was a young
man who was a student at Utah State in 1936, the first year I taught there. He was a good actor. He was in the Varsity Play, and he was also in the semi-centennial play two years later. Well, really, the end of the second year, 1938, in June—the name is DeLos Lusk and he lives in Sugar City, Idaho. I had not seen him since he left Utah State in 1938; and in 1972 he called me at my home and invited me to have dinner, or lunch, with him and his wife. And then he told me how much he had enjoyed the instruction—

WM: Isn't that amazing?

HG: —he got out of my plays. And I don't know that he had any of my classes. But he said one thing, that he learned by being in the plays. I had him in other plays too, probably three or four all together. He said, "If you're going to have a play, you have to deal with a great deal of precision," something like that. Have to be very precise where people walk, what they do, how they stand, and—

WM: And good, clear speech so you can be heard.

HG: And I heard from DeLos several times. I keep in touch with him.

WM: Those are the rewards.

HG: Well, Winn, maybe we've said enough.
WM: There's one thing that I've never asked. In fact it isn't even on our list. Did you take some sabbaticals?

HG: Ah. I am glad you thought of that.

WM: Because there must be something that you have done that you would like to share with us.

HG: No, no, because I had only one quarter of sabbatical in twenty-nine years of teaching.

WM: I know of people looking forward every seven years to being able to take some time off.

HG: Well, this is something--I don't hold this against President Olpin at all, but the sabbatical was eliminated during the early years of his presidency. And I can still remember why he advocated eliminating it. He said, "It's a tough budget year." This was a statement that he made in faculty meeting, as it was called at that time. "It's a very tough budget year. We hope that we can get raises for you. But if we do, we will need to eliminate the sabbatical." So we got all, I suppose the faculty in general, got higher raises that year than they would have received had they not eliminated the sabbatical. Then it was restored--this could have been, say in 1948 or 1949--and the sabbatical was not a part of the university program until Jack Adamson advocated bringing it back.
in '63 or '64 or '65, somewhere around there.

WM: He was a very intellectual man, that Dr. Adamson.

HG: I may have passed up one when I was eligible for it for some reason, but I was eligible and did take it in the spring quarter of 1968. But that was at a time when they were debating, in Faculty Council, whether the Speech I requirement for freshmen should be eliminated, so I couldn't leave town. I stayed here.

WM: Oh, no. You had to be there to fight it.

HG: Right. And this was the quarter during which I wrote the monograph called *Persuasion in Theocracy*. I wrote the monograph during that quarter. That was the only sabbatical I had in twenty-nine years.

WM: Did you have others in your department who requested it and you were able to grant sabbaticals for them?

HG: Yes. I can't remember specifically who, but several.

WM: But you yourself were unable to take them. Did you always feel a responsibility of running your department or doing your job that made you decide that you would not even apply?

HG: I don't recall whether I did that or not, Winn. I may have been eligible, maybe, say in '62, '63, and '64, somewhere through that era, but I also had an offer to teach at the Naval Postgraduate School, it's called NAVAL, in Monterey, California. And that was
such an attractive position, and the only time in the
twenty-one years I was in the Navy that I worked in
my specialty of teaching speech so I--

WM: So you had to take that.

HG: Maybe that crowded out a sabbatical, I'm not sure.

WM: I appreciate your coming, taking your time talking to
us, Hal.

HG: I've enjoyed it, Winn.

WM: I've enjoyed it very much too. Learned an awfully lot
about you I didn't know before.

HG: I hope you don't find ten thousand grammatical errors
that I've made in the remarks. [Laughter]

WM: No, and you probably hear just as many from me, so it
was just fine. Thank you, Hal.

HG: Thank you.