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HS: Today is February 5, 1997. I’m Helen Smith, and today we are interviewing John Utzinger, retired professor from Central. Okay John, we’d like you to start with a little bit of personal background up until the time you came to Central.

JU: Okay. I was born and raised pretty much in Wisconsin – southern Wisconsin – and when I was ready to graduate from high school we moved to California, and so I went to college at Occidental College in California – Los Angeles. When I graduated from Occi I decided to continue my graduate work at the University of Washington. I was – I got my MA degree in 1955 in Philosophy, and my PhD in 1959 from the same school, and immediately after that, in 1959 I was hired by Hope College in Michigan to teach Philosophy and some Psychology courses. It was there that I met my future wife, who was one of my students at Hope College, and we were married in 1962. Then the following year I didn’t really like the Midwest, and my parents had been – everybody else was here in Washington, and so I was very happy when I was hired at Central. So I brought my wife, and we arrived here in the fall of 1963, where I became the second man in the Philosophy Department after Chester Keller. We weren’t a department at that time. We were part of the Psychology Department. But shortly after that – I think a year or two after that we were able to hire a third Philosopher, and then right after that we became a separate department. So I was in on pretty much the very beginning of the Philosophy program here at Central, and I was in on the expansion and development of the Philosophy to what we have. We I think reached our largest number of faculty in the Department around the early 70s. Our department had between eight and ten members at that point.

HS: So you really were in on the ground floor. You had a chance to watch the whole thing grow.

JU: Yeah.

HS: You came in ’63, and just for the record how long were you here? When did you retire?

JU: I retired exactly 30 years later in 1993, when I went on phased retirement. I taught two years just in the fall after that, and that’s my – pretty much my position now. I’m thinking very seriously of going on full retirement next year, depending on my health. Anyway, I’m doing pretty good.

HS: Have you enjoyed the phased retirement?

JU: Yes I have, very much.

HS: Well when you came, what was your academic assignment and your beginning rank?

JU: I was hired as an Assistant Professor, and I was to teach all of the other courses in the department that Dr. Keller wasn’t teaching. I was – I was promoted a couple years later to Associate Professor, and I remained Associate Professor until about a couple of years before I retired – went on phased retirement – 1993. And during all those years I was primarily responsible for teaching the History of Philosophy, and I taught all three – actually all four of our History courses. My main area of interests were Ethics, and Social and Political Philosophy, but I also – every year we had the assignment of teaching a lot of students in the Beginning Logic course, and – which became a requirement for graduation – one of the requirements for graduation in the 60s or early 70s, along with a Math course. So our Logic assignments were pretty heavy. I was teaching classes of 80 students in Introduction to Logic.
HS: Did you find that – when that became a required course, it would seem to me that you would have a lot of terrified students in there. Did you find that to be true, or not?

JU: I could judge the level of terror – the smell of fear – but as soon as they got to know me, I think if they were terrified, they’d think I – one of my jobs, I thought, was to lessen that kind of fear, and I had a lot more – I think I had a lower level of fear than a Math professor would have, because logic was something that nobody – not many people care about, at least when it comes to high schools. I didn’t – I didn’t [inaudible] too much.

HS: Good. I’m glad to hear –

JU: I actually found a lot of – probably one of the most fun courses I taught, and the students really seemed to be getting some practical value in it.

HS: Now you mentioned Psychology courses. When you were here, did you teach any Psychology as well?

JU: No. No. I was very happy to leave Hope because of that.

HS: So here you were teaching in your field.

JU: I was – yes. I was allowed a great deal of latitude and freedom to choose the courses that I wanted to teach, so I felt I was very liberated when I came out to Central.

HS: That must have been gratifying, professionally, to you.

JU: Yes. There are a whole bunch of other reasons why I felt liberated when I came back here, which maybe we’ll get into later.

HS: While we’re in the area of working – people that you worked with, which administrators and faculty do you remember that were important leaders while you were teaching here?

JU: When I came here Jim Brooks was President. He had just come a couple of years before I came, and he was young and very enthusiastic President. I liked him pretty much right off the bat, and I was very gratified to see that he was at least partially responsible for the initiation of the Symposium – the all-college Symposium which I was extremely impressed with. This kind of set the tone of my entire first decade of teaching here at Central. And so President Brooks was one of the very – I think very influential leaders at that point.

Two other people that I have particularly good memories of are Dean Charles McCann, who became, I think, Provost or Dean of one of the – College of Arts and Sciences – I don’t know what the [inaudible] were, but he was a really wonderful guy, good scholar, and also was a good poker player, and I was very sorry when he was hired away to become a developer of the Evergreen State College, which he then became the President of. When I visited over there not too long ago I noticed they named the main boulevard going through campus McCann Boulevard.

HS: So he was appreciated there as well, obviously.

JU: And another administrator which I liked very much was Eldon Jacobson, who was named to be acting President one year, wasn’t he?

HS: Yes, he was.
JU: I don’t know why – Jim Brooks must have been on Sabbatical or something. But anyway Jake was head of the Psychology Division at that point and I got to know him quite well because we were part of his division for a couple of years before we became our own Philosophy Department. Jake was a wonderful guy – soft spoken and really very, very bright, and he knew how to [inaudible] people, and he was very [inaudible].

HS: With a keen mind.

JU: And then another fellow that I didn’t – he didn’t stay very long after I came was Don Beckwith, who left here to become President of the University at Reno – University of Nevada at Reno. And these administrators were during the Sixties in that old atmosphere of collegiality – maybe that’s not the right word, but – well, a good relationship between the administration and the faculty, and the students which, I think, characterized the Sixties more than it’s been [inaudible] in the Seventies or Eighties.

HS: So you feel that during that difficult time it wasn’t just – since we were kind of in an outback out here that kept us away from too much turmoil, but some of the administrative leadership? Is that what you’re saying?

JU: I’m not sure I really understand the question.

HS: During all that time of turmoil, it seems to me that you’re saying that these people kept our school on more of an even track than some of the schools where it blew up.

JU: Oh, okay. If you mean by that that their relationship with the faculty were less adversarial I think that’s true. I didn’t get any sense at all of having the administration as an adversary during the whole Sixties scene when we were talking about having speakers on campus that were extremely controversial. We were talking about having student strikes, we were talking about moratorium – Viet Nam moratorium in the late Sixties, we were talking about all kinds of informal faculty and student events – parties and all kinds of things like that. They were – at least in my feeling, they were part of the – honestly they weren’t – mother and dad thing, keep us in line.

HS: Any others? Now you’ve mentioned those administrators – before I go on. I don’t want to cut you off if you have other people in mind that you wanted to mention.

JU: No, that’s okay.

HS: All right.

JU: Most of the people I became close with are my fellow faculty.

HS: What about problems? Now you said how good the atmosphere was – what about problems that existed between the teaching faculty and administration?

JU: Well as I said, I really didn’t perceive any kind of adversarial relationships or problems.

HS: Great.

JU: I was given a great – our whole department was encouraged to grow. It was encouraged to create our own curriculum, and we were given nice, adequate budget for travel so we could attend the conferences of the American Philosophical Association. Some of my really good memories were traveling with my colleagues to Honolulu or San Francisco, to Los Angeles, to Vancouver.
HS: You’re describing Utopia, it sounds like.

JU: Well I don’t think it was Utopia, but I certainly didn’t notice any of the violent confrontations that were happening at Berkeley or Columbia. Of course our students didn’t occupy the administration – didn’t have to get dragged out by the police, or anything like that.

HS: What about any problems between students and faculty at this time? Was it also fairly –

JU: As far as I can tell, there wasn’t a lot of [inaudible – sounds like “_______ love”]. There may have been individual cases, but [inaudible].

HS: Certainly not campus-wide.

JU: Right. I think the faculty was young. I arrived here, I was 32, 33, and even though some of the students at Berkeley couldn’t trust anybody over 30, I think they made allowances for someone who –

A lot of my colleagues had been hired around the time I was. I came in with a fairly large class, and during the Sixties there were lots of new faculty hired, and they were young too. I think most of them sided with the students.

HS: It seemed to be a time of great – kind of almost excitement.

JU: It was extremely exciting, and I would say in spite of the fact that there were a lot of serious national and international problems, namely the Viet Nam War and the Civil Rights movement which we, I think – I thought we were pretty heavily engaged in even though we weren’t in the mainstream of everything. In spite of those things, I thought – I think back on the Sixties with a great deal of pleasure because it was an exciting thing. I could sense that there was a change taking place in American culture – American society – and I almost – I felt I was part of that.

HS: Did you feel that you had academic freedom when you taught here at Central?

JU: Absolutely. I had – compared to the college where I was teaching in Michigan, this was a completely open University, and I have no – I have no sense of any kind of pressure to teach or not to teach anything I wanted to.

HS: That must have been exhilarating.

JU: Yes, yes. It was also wonderful social freedom here. The college I was teaching at was an extremely Calvinistic college where there was a lot of pressure to conform – religious and social anger – and when I came here, there was none of that.

HS: What about the relationship with people in the town of Ellensburg? Now you’ve mentioned the sense of social solidarity on campus. Was – did that feeling go across boundaries to the town people?

JU: I think so. I was talking to an old friend just yesterday about it. She was a member of the – she was a reporter from the Daily Record, and aside for a couple of run-ins with one of the brief editors of that newspaper during some of the student protest marches, I didn’t feel that the townspeople had any kind of – we didn’t have any kind of conflict at all with them. Now when I moved back, I – I think – well, I didn’t have much of a sense that we didn’t do very many things with them. I mean, I didn’t have too many friends that weren’t part of the campus community, but I didn’t have any sense that there was any town/gown conflict at all. I had a feeling, in fact, just from looking at the neighbors and so forth, I had a feeling that the town was really happy with the University during the Sixties and Seventies, at least.
HS: Several townspeople got a little exercised that they were going to have Gus Hall come speak on campus and things like that, but –

JU: Yeah, that was before I came.

HS: Hmm, that would be right. What about the Faculty Senate, did you ever serve on that or do you have a comment about the –

JU: I was a member of Faculty Senate for maybe four years, off and on.

HS: What did you think of it as a body? Powerful? Innocuous?

JU: No, I wouldn’t say it had any power at all. It was sort of a committee for working on curriculum and coaching – things like that. We didn’t have any – any kind of – as far as I can see any real decision making power at all.

HS: So was it not a satisfying experience?

JU: No, it was very – we dealt with matters that were extremely nuts and bolts sort of stuff. There were some serious debates about some certain things like – on one occasion, at any rate, I remember that there was a serious battle brewing between the Senate and President Garrity, who came after President Brooks. I can’t remember the precise details, and I don’t think anything came of it. In all, I thought the Faculty Senate was a more of a debating society. We didn’t debate much about anything of real import.

HS: Did you resent the time you had to spend on it, then?

JU: Oh, I didn’t resent it because I knew somebody had to do it, and our department had to be represented, but I – I gritted my teeth and did my duty.

HS: You did your work. A lot of academic people have a great deal to say about publish or perish. It is such a big item on many campuses. Would you comment on that?

JU: I didn’t feel any pressure to publish. I did feel that there was a – tied to the promotion and the salary raise there were expectations that I do some scholarly work outside of teaching, and I felt pressured to do that. I remember I read a paper at the American Philosophical Association Conference one year, and I never liked doing that sort of thing. Some of my colleagues loved that – [inaudible] Philosophy fields, but I never liked to give papers at conferences. But I did. I did a couple of things like that – put on some – hosted some Symposia Colloquia at which I presented papers, and I thought that this would sort of make up for all those [inaudible]. I didn’t feel any pressure, as such, to publish, and I never did.

HS: You didn’t feel that you were ever penalized for not having –

JU: Well, I – I may have been not promoted – well, I – I’m not sure. I have the feeling that I did not become promoted to professor because I hadn’t had any papers published in Philosophy journals.

HS: So you personally felt that your teaching was the important part of your work as a professor.

JU: Yeah, yeah. And all the research that needed to go into being a good teacher – keeping up the [inaudible], or keeping the courses fresh. That was a pretty full-time job as far as I can tell, and one of the reasons I liked Central is you didn’t feel you were going to get fired for not publishing an article every three years.
That has to be comforting.

Yes.

Less stress.

That’s right.

What about hiring policies at Central?

Uh, I – I just can’t say anything about that except for my own department, and I know that through the Seventies – maybe to the middle of the Seventies we were extremely encouraged by the whole administration and the – whatever the other powers be to develop a good Philosophy program and to hire good people. And that’s what we did until attrition started taking place, and I don’t know exactly when it started – I don’t know the figures right now, but at this point we only have, I think, five full-time members of the faculty in our department and our people that are retiring, like myself, as a rule are not getting – we have not been replaced. We had the first new person we’ve ever added to our department was two years ago.

Now can you help us, for the record, try to establish why you feel that happened? Because you have described earlier hiring more and more, and getting this really effective department. What do you think happened?

I think there was a change in administration. President Brooks stepped down in 1976.

And that is where it predominantly –

And [inaudible], yeah. And after that point, nobody new was added, and [inaudible] of our young people had to leave because they didn’t have their PhDs. They had to go back, some of them, and do [inaudible] at the town, and so forth. At any rate, we finally leveled out at about six people –

From a high of how many?

From a high of maybe eight, or even ten. I’d have to look at the records. So at that point until all the way through ’93, I think we kind of had a plateau – six full-time members of the department.

Was that distressing to you professionally?

Uh, I don’t know if distressing is the right word. I was – I was kind of disappointed that we weren’t [unclear, could be “going to see new blood”] in the department, and we were all getting pretty set in our ways around the late part of the Eighties, and people at that point were starting to concern themselves more with their own advancements than with anything to do with the good of the whole campus community. I think generally this – this – I saw this happening as the Seventies wound down into the Eighties and into the Nineties. I think [inaudible] see people becoming more concerned with their own careers than with the [inaudible] advancement of the campus community.

Let’s talk for a minute about students now. We’ve pretty well talked about your colleagues. Give us a feeling about how well prepared you found those students coming in for the college experience. Did you find them well prepared compared to other students you had had in other places?

[Inaudible] like comparing them to the students I had at Michigan and when I was a TA at University of Washington. I think we got pretty much the same kind of students from the same kind of
educational background when I was – back in the Fifties when I was a TA at the UW, and then [inaudible] we got here, the people – the students that majored in Philosophy tend to be somewhat better students and more motivated than maybe some of the general run of the students at Central. I wasn’t unduly impressed with any kind of poor preparation.

HS: You didn’t feel you had to do any remedial work?

JU: Not – in general I didn’t feel that way. Of course, ever so often –

HS: Oh sure.

JU: But then just maybe in the last five or six years I was teaching I began to notice a decline in the quality of preparation – in the quality of the writing, in the quality of the –

HS: This would be in the mid-Eighties?

JU: Yeah. And I attribute that to television and too much chicken.

HS: Too much chicken.

JU: Yeah. The other day I was talking to a teacher from the – who teaches middle school now in Yakima. She said she heard an expert come in and explain why the students were so bad today – so restless – and they had figures to show it was television and the estrogen that you take when you eat the amount of chicken that everyone eats. We’re destroying the brains of the students – the young kids.

HS: Well let’s get a research project on that.

JU: She was kind of bemused by that theory, but there are people that are saying this, and – she blames the parents who were out – came of age during the Sixties and all the cultural change.

HS: Interesting.

JU: But I think chicken and television is what [inaudible].

HS: Over these years, now, you indeed obviously have made contributions to your department. Would you elaborate on what you think you specifically have contributed?

JU: Well it’s hard. The curriculum – the Philosophy curriculum – I think I developed a couple of very good new courses that [inaudible]. I [inaudible] became, towards the end of the Sixties, very much interested in the Social and Political Philosophy and developed a very good course in that area, and I also developed a course in the [inaudible] history classroom sequence in 19th Century Philosophy which had not been really my main area of interest in my early education, but I developed a very good course – exciting course in 19th Century Philosophy. Then in the Eighties I became interested in trying to do something with our Logic course, which was becoming really boring to me, and it was – the students could tell that you weren’t too excited about teaching it, so they stopped –
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[Inaudible] by a Philosopher down in California by the name of Richard Paul, at Sonoma State University, and I attended some of his international critical thinking conferences out there in the Eighties, and then came back here and tried – with my colleagues to try and do some changing of our Logic courses – to try and infuse a broader kind of approach to Logic than just nuts and bolts fiddling around with
symbols. Trying to get the students to think critically about what they read and what they hear, and relate what they’re learning in terms of skills – to try to evaluate the BS that they’re getting in our whole society. I did some innovation with my Logic course, and some of that rubbed off on my colleagues, also. And I spent a Sabbatical – one whole quarter – down studying with Richard Paul, and engaged with his program at Sonoma State, which was very rewarding. So I think those are the main areas where [inaudible].

I also was instrumental – not particularly linked with our department’s mission, but I worked in the Eighties on the University-wide organization which was called Union of Concerned Educators for – which developed in response to what we thought were alarming developments in the Reagan administration with Cold War activities. And a lot of nuclear fear was being generated around the country, and Star Wars program was being touted as a shield to save America from the wicked Russians, and so forth, and we saw United States foreign policy getting closer, and closer, and closer to a nuclear confrontation with the Russians, and so 25 or 30 people of the faculty formed the nucleus of a group of people which we thought should be similar to the Union of Concerned Scientists to try to do something to bring us back from nuclear confrontation with the Russians. And so I was really happy to be part of that group along with my friend Elwyn Odell, and my other good friend David Burk, and some of the other people in the Political Science and Philosophy departments that were involved with that.

And then I participated in the presenting of a number of Philosophy Department Colloquia – papers and discussions which were very popular. I think the Philosophy Department as a whole has been pretty strong in doing that kind of thing – outreach to [inaudible] people, inviting them to come and see what’s going on in Philosophy. So I think those are probably my major contributions.

HS: After you did your revision on your Logic course, were you able to, if not measure, at least observe difference in attitudes of students? Higher level of interest, perhaps?

JU: Yes. I think so. It was a subtle thing, but I did – at least I had more fun teaching the course, and I got the students more involved in their own education, which is one of the goals of the [inaudible] movement. In my lecture – it’s a cornerstone, I guess, getting the students instead of being passive recipients of material being presented by the man – the sage on the stage – getting students involved in their own education. Thinking for themselves.

HS: That has to be particularly gratifying to you, then.

JU: It has.

HS: To notice that you were becoming bored with a course, and having done something about it, and to be able to see some results.

JU: Yes.

HS: What about campus committees or unions?

JU: I was a fairly active member of the AFT chapter on our campus for a number of years.

HS: And describe that for our listener.

JU: That was the American Federation of Teachers, the nationwide union for faculty, which was an affiliate of the AFLCIO, and I was Vice President, and I was President one year, and we had a small chapter here, but I think it was very active. We never succeeded in our real goal, which is still pending – getting recognized as a collective bargaining union for the faculty.
HS: So you feel that you were not effective? Or just not as effective as you had hoped to be?

JU: Well I think that given the climate of opinion in the late Seventies and Eighties, during the Reagan years, we weren’t as effective as we wanted to be, but we did our best.

HS: So that’s all we can ask, right? You were always a faculty member, not ever an administrator, is that correct?

JU: Yeah, I – one year I sat in for Chester Keller when he went on leave, and I was the Chair for that year. I think it was ’64.

HS: Was that a satisfying experience?

JU: Yeah, it was fun. I never had any aspirations to be in a formative chair or any kind of an administrator. I was very happy being faculty dealing with students rather than dealing with politics.

HS: Well the core of your life is the students and your interaction with the students. On that area, often times there are faculty members on campus – especially recently, when a lot of remedial courses have been introduced – who feel there are certain programs that just have no place on a college campus. Have you ever had any feelings about that on our campus?

JU: [Inaudible]. That question opens up the whole topic of what is the purpose of the University.

HS: Well go ahead and pursue that.

JU: I don’t –

HS: You don’t want to. [Laughs]

JU: I don’t want to spend my whole time discussing that issue, because that’s a really big one. That has to do with how a university functions in a free society, and what our business is. Are we in the business of socializing students? Are we in the business of training students? Do we – do we build professional people or are we in the business of educating them? So this is one of the things that I got really excited about in the [inaudible] programs that I was working on. If we’re just a training school, then that’s one thing, and I’m not interested in that. We’ve got a lot of great technical schools to train people to run computers and do that sort of thing, but I’m interested in getting students to develop standards by which they can criticize the direction in which our whole society is going.

HS: Hmm. So you’ve actually [inaudible] attitude about that.

JU: Yeah, and ask questions about the basic meanings of their lives. What are their lives for? What are we doing here? What is the whole function of all this busy-work? We’re busy doing all kinds of things. We’re building a Science temple out here next door, and then I was wondering about that. Why are we doing that? Is it really making any difference to the quality of our lives? Is it going to help us heal our fragmented communities? Is it going get a lot of government money here to do a lot of projects which don’t have any impact on the quality of our community?

HS: All right, well said. What have we not covered here that you want to talk about about your time at Central? Perhaps something that wasn’t on the original question sheet at all.

JU: Well, I was – I was tempted to quote something that I got in a letter from Herb Lake the other day – one of my old buddies back in the Sixties, and he writes letters to people and puts little stickers in
them. And this letter I got the other day had a little sticker that said, “The best thing about the good old days is that we were neither good, nor old.” And I was thinking about that – thinking that the best days of my college career were the Sixties, as things were getting really exciting, changes were taking place, the students were experimenting with all kinds of different lifestyles, we were having – I remember one of the big events of the year was the Art Department’s Prima Vera party which took place out in the hills above the Yakima River, and it lasted all day, and all night. They barbecued a pig, they barbecued half a steer, we had music, singing, dancing, other [inaudible]. Faculty and students alike would do this. The other thing was that, it was the [inaudible] for both faculty and students was the [inaudible] river race every year. And this got bigger and bigger until finally the Sheriff’s put an end to it. That was another big event.

HS: Now you’re talking about actually floating on the river?

JU: We’re talking about – yeah. We all started from the Fork bridge, and you could have any kind of flotation device you wanted. Most people had inner tubes, but I remember some of our student friends had a [inaudible] Indian tribe called the Finales, and they always got together and created a wonderful boat for the race. I think one year they had a huge Indian war canoe. Then we floated from the Fork River Bridge down to the Kiwanis Park, which is now closed, and there the tab was to have barbecue hot dogs, and then there’s a movie, case of beer, and the festivities would go on until the Sheriff’s Department closed us down.

HS: I think it was Rotary Park, wasn’t it?

JU: Yeah, Rotary Park. It was the park and sort of a little campground by the river. Just before the [inaudible] falls. And some of the townspeople would join us. And I remember going over the falls with Reed Murray – Dr. Murray – who was a friend of a lot of us. I think he enjoyed being with faculty more than he enjoyed some of his Physician comrades. Things like that. We had a big dance hall out on the edge of town called The Ranch, and every Wednesday and Friday night there would be live music, or recorded music and faculty and students would go out and dance together. Things like that colored the Sixties and Seventies, and that sort of thing kind of petered out in the Seventies. I think it’s inevitable, [inaudible].

HS: But there must still be a young group coming up. Are they not doing that?

JU: I think they are, but there’s so few young faculty that it doesn’t really –

HS: The graying of the Central faculty, you feel, is detrimental to the institution.

JU: Well in a way I do, yeah.

HS: New blood is important. We need also to have for our record any of your family who have attended Central.

JU: [Inaudible – both speaking at once] my older daughter, Marissa, did take some courses here when we had to leave PLU because of her health. She did take some courses here. My youngest daughter – younger daughter Andrea is just finishing up her Master’s degree in Clinical Psychology at our Psychology Department, so that’s –

HS: What about your wife? Tell us a little bit about your wife.

JU: My wife finished up some of her requirements for her K-12 teaching certificate here in Washington here, and took some classes from the History and Math – Science and Math Departments, and she also was working with Ann May of Clinical Psychology for a while, but she [unclear – could be “didn’t like the,” or “did a lot of the”] Psychology Department.
HS: And she was a teacher in our local schools.

JU: And she taught at local schools for a couple years, until she started having – she started having children, you know. After that, she was pretty much full-time parent until just very recently in 1991, when she was fortunate to be hired as the Testing Supervisor for the University, and she’s now currently doing that full time.

HS: So she is full time here at Central.

JU: Yeah, absolutely. It’s very good for me because I get to stay onto her health insurance.

HS: Anything that we’ve missed, before we close? Do you want to check your notes and see if there’s something that you want to [inaudible]?

JU: Yeah, I think a couple of my students I still keep in contact with.

HS: Tell us about them.

JU: Members of the Pagawees, which was a group of pretty rowdy, but pretty – really good young men.

HS: How are you spelling that?

JU: Well I would tell you the story of the Pagawee Indian Tribe, but I don’t – how much time do we have? At any rate, during the Sixties there was a big – there was a lot of political stuff about, you know, the civil rights meeting. There was a movement to take a Negro for lunch – stuff like this – and so they were very amused by this, and they put an ad in the college newspaper saying “Members of the Pagawee Indian Tribe would like to also have good relations with some of the white students on campus, so we’re available for being taken for lunch,” and they gave their telephone number, and so forth, and they even actually had some calls from students – take an Indian – take a Pagawee for lunch.

But anyway, one of these young men – a couple of them – were drafted early in the Viet Nam war. One of them was a Major and the other was a Minor. Don Owens went through Officer’s Candidate School and arrived in Viet Nam. Three days after he arrived he was sent out on patrol and he stepped on a land mine, or got shot by some kind of incoming mortar shell and was very severely wounded in the leg and part of his arm was very, very badly injured. Sent right home again, recovered pretty well, came back, married a very beautiful young English instructor from Central, and he is now – then he went to the University of Washington Law School, and he’s now a very successful attorney up in Anacortes.

Another – and I see him every once in a while – another very good friend is Cap Brown, who also went to Law School after he graduated from Central and he’s now a very successful attorney in Fairbanks, Alaska. [Inaudible]. Another is Brent Neville who’s a English teacher and a football coach in Cle Elum, and he and his wife invite us up to barbecues every once in a while, and we really enjoy [inaudible] with them. And then one of our – of my other Philosophy students is John [inaudible]. He was a conscientious objector during the Viet Nam War, and I wrote many, many letters for him, but he finally got that status and had to do two years of alternative service at PLU and some other places, and finally after that he went to graduate school at Tulane, got his PhD in Philosophy [inaudible]. Never – this is during the time that teaching positions were very tight – never actually got a job as a faculty – college teacher. Taught in a number of other schools, and he’s now working for the State of Oregon, but the Philosophy and formal education professional [?] and I see him every year. Our families get together, and so –

That’s one of the most rewarding things, I think, looking back on my teaching career, is to be in touch with some of these students.
HS: It’s very obvious that you are a student-oriented professor. That comes across very clearly. If you have nothing other to add, we certainly thank you, John. We think, of course, that it’s very, very important to get these memories of Central on tape, and we thank you for your time. I would hesitate to ask a Philosophy professor to, in two minutes, give us his general philosophy of education, or Central, but you have the final parting shot. Are you going to leave it with TV and chicken?

JU: I think I’ll leave with TV and chicken.

HS: All right. Thank you very, very much, John.

JU: Thank you.