

## CWU LIVING HISTORY PROJECT

Colin Condit

### (Transcription of Tape 1, Side 1)

LL: We are interviewing Colin Condit, who retired from the Psychology Department at Central. The interviewer is Larry Lowther, and Jean Putnam is operating the machines. Colin, before we get into your career at Central, would you give us a little personal background about where you were born and grew up, and something about your family and education, and any career you had before Central?

CC: Well I was born in Nelson, British Columbia. My father had migrated from New Jersey to the West coast, and ended up in Vancouver where he met my mother. And we spent – he was transferred back into the United States for the job he was in, and eventually we ended up in Spokane, where I grew up. And I have an older brother, now deceased, and a sister, a wife, Margaret, and three children, all of whom are – one of whom is a Central graduate, and another who is a graduate from University of Washington and the Law School, and a daughter who has, I think, two quarters here, and then went into television news and general journalistic career.

I – my time was pretty much that of pre WWII. I grew up in Depression Spokane, and spent four years of my life in the Marine Corps. I was in Guadalcanal, in Georgia, and I was in North China at the end of the War. I – as a result of the War I did some flying, and after the War I spent part time, between degrees and teaching school, as a commercial pilot. A lot of it in Sheridan, Alaska, and some of it in Montana and Idaho, and most of it in the state of Washington. And I was a High School Principal, and I left the Tacoma Public Schools to come over here. I left [inaudible] – I was Administrative Director of Cooperative Education Services. Let's see – I'm a duly licensed psychologist in the state of Washington, or I was before I –

LL: Where did you take your degrees?

CC: Oh! Yeah, I got my Bachelor's from University of Washington, and a Master's from Pullman University, and my PhD from Washington State.

LL: And how did you get to Central, and in what year?

CC: Oh, oh – I came in 1965, and the job that I had in Tacoma was a – um – a job that was planned as a terminal job as soon as we got the local school districts involved in Special Education and hiring their own psych people, and what not. And when the job had expended itself, I moved over here and joined the Psych department.

JP: How did you end up here? Did somebody contact you, or did you contact someone?

CC: Well, I – yes. I knew Alan Jacobsen from the previous contacts, and I liked the program he had established here in School Psychology, and when the opportunity – one opportunity left and the other opportunity presented itself I called him up, and that was the beginning of it.

LL: Okay. Were you replacing a faculty member, or was this a new position?

CC: I think this was a new position. I'm not sure. You'd have to ask Elmore.

LL: Okay, and what was your academic assignment when you got to Central?

CC: I was primarily concerned with courses in Human Growth and Development, and in the graduate program in School Psychology, and that progressed pretty much all of my tenure years. As time went on and I became Director of the program, then I was involved almost exclusively in graduate work.

LL: But did you work with Teacher Training program at all?

CC: Um, I – I taught – occasionally I taught, I think it was guidance courses for the Ed department during the summer as part of my assignment – summer assignment, and of course then I spent a good deal of my time working with the certification which went through the State Department of Public Instruction. So my contact with the public schools continued, not within the University, but itself [inaudible] for a number of years, and actually it related to the institution because I was involved in the – in maintaining the program as far as credentials were concerned.

LL: All right. You were brought in as an Assistant –

CC: Associate.

LL: Associate Professor, Okay. And when did you retire?

CC: Nineteen sixty-five.

LL: No, that's when you got here. When –

CC: Oh! Retired in '83.

LL: And at what rank?

CC: Professor.

LL: Professor, okay. And did you teach in any department other than your – than the Psych department?

CC: No. Just occasionally for an education. We also had some courses that both departments taught – we overlapped a bit.

LL: Were there any particular problems that you recall during your tenure at Central that stand out in your mind?

CC: Well, uh – I – you know, life's full of problems, and we had problems facing us every day, so I don't – one of the more interesting things that we were involved in was the anti-War movement during the Viet Nam war, and the – also the establishment of the Consortium of the School of Psychology was a kind of a benchmark, in a way, for me personally. It meant that we had to work with school people, and State Department of Public Instruction people, and Psychologists in terms of establishing the Consortium method of credentialing graduates, which I think was a pretty good program at the time.

LL: That was during the Seventies, wasn't it?

CC: That was during the early Seventies, yes.

LL: And what was your role in establishing the Consortium?

CC: I guess as one of the main members representing University. Eldon Jacobsen was another one. I think Ted Noman was in it for a while, and another one was Jim Klou. [Inaudible, could be Dick Becks?] was in this.

LL: And the Consortium consisted of the Central and other four-year colleges?

CC: At one point it also included Western Washington, and it included representatives from the – from the Tacoma School District, representatives from the Division of School Psychology, and representatives – one representative from the State Department of Public Instruction.

LL: And what was the purpose of the Consortium?

CC: The purpose of the Consortium was to – uh – was to develop a standard for the credentialing of school psychologists and school counselors, and it was felt at the time that this could best be done if we had people in the field who were practicing, if we had people from the State Department of Public Instruction who were responsible for credentialing, and if we had some representatives from the Universities who were involved in training, so that everyone had a say, in terms of the professional groups in the credentialing program, and more than that, it was – wasn't a passive group. When it was done, it was a very active group. We met every month. We uh – at the end of every quarter, when people who finished with the program had to have an oral examination by everybody – not just the college people, but by everybody. We had a three-year program beyond the initial level of certification which followed the candidate over three years, and they had to appear again for a second oral examination based on what the group did [inaudible] every month. So every candidate had an individual program during that particular time, and I think it was a very excellent thing. They've since dropped it. It was expensive. It was time-consuming. But it seemed to me to be the best example of the meeting of people who were in the field and doing the work, and people who were responsible for credentialing, and people who were responsible for training. It was a very, very good program.

JP: Would you say that they dropped the school credentialing, or did they drop – they just dropped the Consortium?

CC: They just dropped the Consortium.

JP: Okay, but they – but we still went on to credential school counselors?

CC: Oh yes, oh yes. Yes, their credentialing continues, and they just simply dropped the Consortium idea.

JP: Okay.

CC: It was time consuming. It took time and money.

LL: And so individual institutions do their own credentialing, then?

CC: Yes.

LL: But you said that the Consortium was establishing standards. Are those standards still in effect, do you know?

CC: Well, they – yes and no, you know. It's a different approach now. Before, the State Department would actually credential the candidate. They had to go, and they had to pass, and the main body had to say this person is ready for his initial certificate or his continuing certificate, so it was a very active kind of group.

LL: They represented different institutions operating at different levels. Was it difficult getting agreement among them?

CC: The big struggles were the initial, primarily, in terms of determining what everybody felt was necessary to come out and start functioning as a school psychologist. And it led to, among other things, not only to credentialing, but it led to more school-based academic experiences, it led to internships, um – it was a good program. I'm very proud that I was part of it.

LL: You don't know when it was dropped, do you? The Consortium?

CC: I think it was dropped in '85, somewhere in there.

LL: Shortly after you retired.

CC: Yeah. But Gene Johnson can tell you, because he was – he was involved with the changes.

LL: Okay. You mentioned also that you were involved in the anti Viet Nam war movement. Was that a movement – as far as Ellensburg was concerned – was that a movement that was sparked primarily by college people?

CC: Well, I – uh – I think college people were – were mainstay, were, you know, the main group that were involved, but not entirely. We had ranchers that were involved. We had townspeople that were involved. We had several physicians that were involved. It was a group that, I think, felt that there were some real moral problems with the Viet Nam war.

LL: Was it a formally organized group, or a kind of informal association?

CC: Well, I guess it was mostly informal, but we did get together. I forget whose name we applied to ourselves. I think it was the Citizens Against the War in Viet Nam, or something like that. And basically we got into the politics. We took over, as a matter of fact, the Democratic Party in the county. We felt that we had to move into active politics if we were going to make our point. We developed initiatives, and did a lot of things around town. We interviewed people with definite kind of things in mind.

LL: Were there any demonstrations?

CC: Oh, we were in demonstrations – local demonstrations.

LL: Marches?

CC: Yes, we were in that.

LL: Were there many students involved?

CC: Yeah, a large number of students.

LL: And did this anti-war sentiment – did it impact the University, or the college, at that time, in any way?

CC: Oh yes. It had a profound effect, I think, on what was going on. The best person, really, to answer that, as far as administration, is Jim Brooks. Yes, I would say that very definitely it had an impact. It certainly had an impact on my life, and there were some political repercussions, too, that came down through the University to me.

LL: In what way were they manifested?

CC: Uh – by a letter from Senator Jackson to the President of the University at that time.

LL: You mean protesting your participation?

CC: Yes, protesting –

LL: You specifically, or were there others?

CC: Oh, there were others. We had a Democrat meeting at my house at the time that Senator Jackson was here, and I don't know whether you were there or not that night, but we had three big people who were very vociferous in taking down Senator Jackson, and then we had a meeting that evening with the Democrats, and it was very tense. So the letter came from Senator Jackson to –

LL: To President Brooks?

CC: Yes.

LL: Okay. Do you recall, in connection with this movement, a student strike on campus? One day strike?

CC: Yeah, I seem to do.

LL: Was that following the Kent State affair? The invasion of Cambodia? Or do you know what it was – intention was?

CC: No, I really can't trace that down. There were so many meetings with the students. I know that they showed up at the Senate, which I was involved with at the time, and um – there was also – I think it was kind of a tangential arrangement, but we had some symposiums during those early years that I was here, and I think that they were really a hallmark of a first-class school. I'm sorry to see them disappear. I guess they got to be expensive, but they also got to be a political headache, I think, for the University, because we had a lot of right-wingers that were aiming local newspaper articles against it, and claiming – one of them claimed, I think, that the Symposium was a hotbed of Communism at the time, and on, and blaming the War – what was happening over there – on those of us who opposed the War. I've always thought it ironic, personally, that I was screamed at as a coward and whatnot walking around town, and I had spent four years of my life in the Marine Corps, and seen active engagement, and felt that the War was necessary, but felt that this war was very unnecessary and corrupt, and illegal, and immoral, and I never changed that opinion.

LL: Okay. Was that the time that Ron Sims was President of the student body?

CC: Yes, I think so.

LL: Do you know whether he was involved in the anti-war movement?

CC: He was, but I have more of a feeling that his role was tangential. He wasn't – I didn't see him as being actively involved.

LL: Okay.

CC: But he may have been, and I mean – because he may have been involved differently than I was involved. But we had a number of students who were – became active in the Democratic party at the time as a result of our activities.

LL: Okay. Let me get back to your academic work. Did you have any involvement in the development of curriculum for the Psych Department?

CC: Only in terms of the program I was involved in. And um – and a lot of it was simply technical work – changing course numbers, and sometimes adding courses, and getting courses on the books, and then getting – putting them into action. I don't remember personally developing a course from the ground up. Frankly, it was more handling the expansion of what we already had.

LL: You were here from 1965-1983. What was your impression of the students at that time. That is, did you notice any change in the kind or quality of students?

CC: Uh, I don't think, really. I think it was a kind of an interesting time, because I know that they had a lot of people – a lot of students on campus during the anti – anti – during the Viet Nam war days that were people that kind of were hangers-on. They would go to school, but they always seemed to be on the periphery, kind of like birds sitting on the fence.

LL: Kind of professional students?

CC: Yeah, professional students, and one of them was – I had a little appellation for them. I called them people who can't get out of town. And the best one was a young man who had been here for eight years, and he was within five or ten credits of graduation, and then he would either blow up with his major professor, or he would change majors and start all over again.

LL: Okay. Now do you think that part of that might have been motivated by a desire just to keep the college deferment?

CC: Oh, I'm sure of it. And in some cases, because I know that the birds flew after the war was over. But as far as the quality is concerned, um, it was interesting when I first began to teach, and I was – being a psychologist, I was in love for a while with the normal curve, and I discovered that the students I had formed kind of a bi-modal curve. There was overlap, and – but there were two definite peaks, and I came to the conclusion that we had one group of students on campus that could make it at any University, and we had another group on campus that were here because maybe this was the school that they could get into, where they couldn't get into the University of Washington. And I'm not putting anybody down. I think of this – that was just my own private observation. I think on the whole, um, I'm as impressed today with the kids going to school as at any time, and I think we have some good people there.

LL: Did you have the feeling that fairly high academic standards were maintained?

CC: Well, let's see. I think that as a result of the Viet Nam war, and the general stress that was felt, and the revolt – general revolt that we had, that grades became kind of less important, or became – it was easier to get a B than it was previous to that time, and there seemed to be more activity to get the students actively involved in the grading faculty, as well. And I think that there's some good things about that. So I'm really not sure of what that did, ultimately, to standards. And again, now, I would have to have a long discussion with you about standards before I made any final discussion or observation on that. But there was a period of time in which there was some changing going on, and – with the result of the – I think, of the general revolt of the time.

LL: Okay. Um, how about the issue of diversity on campus? Did you – during your tenure, did you note any increase in the diversity of the student body or the faculty?

CC: It came, again, rather slowly, but for instance in my graduate program – the Counseling in School Psychology – it was primarily male. For every ten males we'd have going through, there might be one female. By the middle 1970s it was about half and half, and then it began to move towards older women – women, a lot of whom were divorced and had one or two children, and maybe be thirty to thirty-five, forty years of age going through the program. And then, after I left and the lady who – I don't know what this says about me, but the lady that became the leader of the program after that – the number of females increased, and the number of males went down. And I talked to – last year I gave a talk on the history of hypnosis to one of the graduate groups in our department, and there was all women. I think there were two males. There was about 15 people there – 15 students – they're all women. We had two males there. I think that's quite a remarkable shift. Then the other thing I've noticed, that when we first came over – I think there was – the only Black students we had on campus were basketball players, and they were in the minority. I think there was one Black family – prominent family in Cle Elum – Cravens, who are still up there, and I think there was one Black family that lived in town. I don't think – uh, I don't know whether they're still here or not. But then I've just watched that change as the number of African Americans increased, and come up, and then I've seen the programs that have included the Japanese, the Chinese, the Eastern Europeans – in fact, we have a graduate – undergraduate student living with us who's a Bosnian Serb, and doing undergraduate work here. So I think the diversity – now I'm not that close to the faculty – know how that's changed – but as far as the University is concerned – vast difference. And I guess that's like it's been generally in Universities along the coast. I understand there's almost 50% or better than 50% now of the students at Berkeley are Asians. So it's a – there's been some big changes, I think, just over these brief two years.

LL: Now let me ask you about your impressions of your department, the Psychology Department. Were you satisfied with the quality of work that was done by that Department, and the different kinds of fields that were covered?

CC: I, uh – there was a – you know, there's always a spirited argument going on between those who classified themselves as scientists and those of us who classified ourselves as more professional types of public feeling [healing?], but in the – I think in the long run for me, that was one of the things that appealed to me about the department, was the differences within the department itself – the people who took the [inaudible] sides one way or the other on this or that issue. I really enjoyed the Psych Department. I enjoyed my tenure here very much, and I think that goes for me, too, as far as the rest of the faculty was concerned. I've had, you know – been on various committees with people from different departments, and I've been associated one way or the other on campus, and it's been – for me it's been a very lively institution.

LL: It was a congenial department?

CC: I – you know, we certainly had our ups and downs, and congeniality means that you can argue against one another as well –

LL: And remain friends.

CC: And remain friends, and – you know, take sides when you have to. I don't – I think part of the nice part about life is the conflict we have, and it's a hell of a note for a psychologist to say, but I believe it.

LL: Were there any outstanding issues in the department that you recall that you had to wrestle with?

CC: Well, it – I don't know about outstanding issues. I think one of the might have been – one of them happened when we got too big to exist in Black Hall and we had to make our own building, and we were split between Black Hall and the old hospital on Fourth Avenue there, and that seemed to split the so-called experimental group away from the practitioner group. And then getting together – I – by that time I had a NIMH [inaudible]. I was back in the University of North Carolina. But during that year the groups got together, and they planned that new building, and it welded everybody back together again. And we made

places for experimental people, we made places for the practitioner people, and the downstairs we established the clinic downstairs, and then, um, Roger Fouts came in with the chimps and we had them there for a while, and now he's got his own building. But it – for me, that was kind of the crucible that fired us all together. And um, uh –

LL: It kind of united you?

CC: It kind of united us, and I think we began to realize that we were important to one another. At least, that was my feeling – that – you know, I was the great admirer of Terry DeVietti because he [inaudible], and he did what he said he was going to do, and I liked what he was doing. And I think it – all the work of the experimentals – experimentalists – basically had some profound affect on those of us who were practicing. And I think the practitioners kind of in a way carried the department, because we had the greater number of students. So you know, there's some real practical reasons there to remain together. But I think there was some teaching going on among us.

LL: But you did see a great deal of tension, then, between the researchers and the practitioners?

CC: No, I think a rivalry went on, but I think there began to be an increasing kind of a respect for one another that may have not existed as much before, because we were separated – physically separated because of this business of being part in Black Hall and part down at the old hospital. So I always – that is one of the main things, I think, that occurred during my tenure on campus.

LL: How about the leadership in the department? Are there any that stand out in your mind as particularly effective leaders?

CC: Well, I – you know, those that have moved into leadership positions, I think, filled them very well. I think that, for one, that as least as far as the practitioner group is concerned, they all – Eldon Jacobsen has a lot of – we have to give him a lot of credit for initially establishing programs along a – along a clinical line. Um, there have been others who came in that really carried it on, among them myself, and Jim Klone, and Jenelle Bell, and John Seldon. I think they've all played a role, and I – as I – what I understand – I'm not close to the department any more, but from what I understand, that still goes on.

LL: Did you ever serve as Chair of the department?

CC: No. I was Director of the clinic downstairs for several years, and the Director of the School of Psych program, and – but actually I was also involved in the conference over there – very much involved.

LL: Okay. You served on the campus-wide committees. Do you recall which committees you served on, and –

CC: Yeah – I've forgotten. I was on the Code Committee for a while. I was on the Faculty Grievance Committee, and that was – we had a couple of bellwether cases on campus that had to deal – one of them had to deal with collegiality. The – oh, I – I – that was a very interesting time for me. I served on the Senate for a term, and that was during the Viet Nam thing. That was interesting, too, because that – you know, you got a sense of the total faculty. I think the collegial issue was the Charles Stastny case, and um – and another one had to deal with whether a person in Economics could go up to Professor rank without a PhD, because it had been established that that wasn't required in the particular division. So those were the kind of issues that were very interesting to sit in on.

LL: To you recall the details of the Stastny case?

CC: Yes, I do.

LL: Can you just outline those for us?

CC: Well, it's a – um – he had – the thing that brought the case to a head was that he had gone to – to the Tel Aviv University – I think the Tel Aviv University, and had not shown up on campus for the beginning of the fall quarter, and was two weeks late or something, and had been warned ahead of time that he couldn't do that, and that brought the case to a head. Um – and it was appealed to the Grievance Committee, which I was the Chair at the time, and um – and the – of course all the evidence that passed was sealed, and was for the privy of the University and Charles Stastny, and us in committee. So I'm not sure how much I can talk about that, but it had to deal with collegiality in the sense of whether a professor could leave the campus to go someplace else and not attend to his duties on campus.

LL: Had he had the permission of his Chair?

CC: No, he hadn't had the permission of the Chair, and [inaudible] it came up, there had been several occasions on which he'd been late doing the same thing. One time it was in Mexico, and – uh – there's one other time that the Department – the Department Chair found himself unable to [inaudible] him.

LL: How did the Grievance Committee rule? Did it rule against him?

CC: Yes, it did. Yeah.

LL: Charles Stastny sort of had the reputation of being a left-leaning professor on campus. Did that play a role in this, that you know of?

CC: No. And it was too bad, because he was – you know, personally I liked Charlie. He'd been at the house many times. And he [inaudible] primarily responsible for starting the – oh, what is it called? Um, um – getting old. [Laughter] Uh – I'll think of it in a second. But anyway, he – I think if Charlie was left-leaning it was more in talk than being out on the firing lines. Yeah.

LL: Are there any members of your department that stand out in your mind as outstanding individuals?

CC: Well, I'd have to – I would have to say that Terry DeVietti was one in the experimental field that's still involved, that stands out simply because, as I mentioned, he came to campus to do certain things, and he did them, and he published. That was his goal. Um, I – but I – you know, everybody contributed to – put one person above another I find very difficult. I liked Don Shupe because he was an excellent teacher, I thought, and he gave the department the benefit of knowledge of statistics and statistical design, and I found myself constantly tramping down to his door and pounding on it to get help. Um – Roger Fouts is another one that – you know – is a unique personality, and um – I had less to do with Roger because I – it's a different field – it's not of my interest, but the work that he's doing is important. Um, I think that those of us – those of us who were involved in the clinical end of things were more publicly involved – more concerned with outcomes for students.

I mentioned Eldon Jacobsen before. He should be mentioned, because he was kind of a – developed and started the whole thing. But I can go down each one of the faculty members and I can tell you some of the contributions each one of them made, but these are just some of the people that stand out. But I can – Max Zwanziger was a tremendous reader – you know – he had more stuff at his fingertips than you could shake a stick at. Um – you had some guy in design – he did – he could look at it for a minute, and he could begin to tell you what was wrong with it – what you needed to do with it, and uh – to make it work. Um, [Inaudible] Warren Street is – Warren was a good teacher – a good solid teacher. He and Don did a lot of the early work that – with some of the data processing stuff that we had, and they also designed and wrote programs which were excellent. I use them all the time.

LL: Don originated the Gerontology Program, didn't he?

CC: Yes.

LL: Was that under the Psych Department?

CC: Yes, but I didn't – I really didn't have a – I can't speak to that [inaudible], I'm not too good with that. I'm just thinking of these people now as individuals, and how – how they affected the – affected me.

LL: What would you say was your greatest contribution to the University?

CC: I don't know. I think the – my involvement with the Consortium group, probably. That was very, very demanding in terms of time. It was something that the people who do research and write papers don't quite understand, that you can spend hours on programs that dealt with certification.

LL: Let me go down just a list of things, and give me your reaction to them. Some of them you may not want to make any comment on, but others you might. The faculty salary schedule.

CC: Well this was a professional bone of contention. In the Marine Corps we had an expression, you know – choosing up sides and smelling armpits – and that's what some of this thing seemed to be, you know, where we graded one another every quarter, then nobody spoke to one another for the first eight weeks, and some of them not till Spring quarter. But, uh – and I'm overdoing that a little bit, but I'm also not overdoing it. I – my feeling about the salary schedule is that public schools had it all over us. They really had a schedule that they followed, and if you did certain things you'd remain on the schedule, and if you didn't, you didn't remain on the schedule. But it was consistent from one year to the next, to the next, and you kind of knew where you stood all the time. This was – schedule here was more like a popularity contest to the extent that – in my mind, at least – that the Dean decided what was important, and if you lived up to what he decided what was important, then, you know, you were recognized. And I got very discouraged after a while, and for a while I just dropped out of it and didn't maintain records, or anything else, until I got to realize that all I'd done is kicking myself in the teeth. But that was – that was something that I don't know whether it's ever been resolved. It really was a thing that affected faculty morale, as far as our department was concerned.

LL: Was there a good deal of talk, while you were here, about merit pay?

CC: Yes.

LL: And what's your reaction to that concept?

CC: Well again, you see, you have to determine what's meritorious and what is not, and how you measure it, and how you don't, and whether it's – whether you're meritorious in terms of one person and not in terms of another, and – I have difficulty with merit, and I have difficulty with it as a scientist as well as a human being responding to it. I really don't see the methodology behind it at all.

LL: Okay. The Faculty Code.

CC: Well, the Faculty Code seemed to be secure until we needed to RIF people, and then it didn't seem to be secure. And I've never really determined whether the Faculty Code – what the Faculty Code really means as far as the faculty is concerned, as far as collegiality is concerned, as far as the relationship with Administration is concerned – how much power it really gives the faculty, and how much power it – I think it helps – the Code helps. There has to be a code. But I was never quite sure to what extent it would supply when things got rough.

LL: Did you have any feelings about Faculty Unions or collective bargaining?

CC: Well, my feeling generally about unions is that if you don't have them, you don't go anyplace. And I recall being – when I was in public school work – the – I think it was in 1952, something around there, that the teachers were on the verge of revolt around the State –

## (Transcription of Tape 1, Side 2)

CC: Nobody would listen to you unless you were willing to get out there and struggle. And then that reminded me of the Marine Corps, and it reminded me of everything else in my life that I've done, whether getting an education or whatever the hell it was, that you – that you do have to come together at some point and decide what your objectives are, and they've got to be solid because if you don't have solid objectives, then you're talked out of your objectives real fast by somebody else who's got another agenda. There's got to be some give, but there's got to be some demands, too.

LL: Did you have time to take part in any of the faculty organizations?

CC: No. I really moved off campus – I think the Charles Stastny affair brought – brought the union into more open conflict with the Administration at that particular time. I'm not exactly sure of that, but I think so. Because I think that they took the side of Stastny in some instances, like – uh –

LL: I think the union's role was to help the cost of defense. The rationale was that every member was entitled to a defense.

CC: Yeah, that's right. I do remember that now. I don't – I never became – I could never understand what ARP – AAUP was all about. I belonged for a while, but it seemed to be kind of a group that got together and didn't do anything.

LL: Were you involved in AFT, or – what was it? The National Association of Professors – it was affiliated with the NEA.

CC: No. No, I avoided that. Never – I was a member of the NEA, but I [inaudible].

LL: Okay. [Inaudible]?

CC: I felt secure about that. I think that – and maybe tenure gives you that, I don't know. But I feel like – I never felt that anybody was trying to push me into any kind of a choir, or was [inaudible] what was polite to say and what was not polite to say, and what I should think and what I shouldn't think. I think the University atmosphere is very, very positive, as far as I'm concerned, on that issue.

LL: The Board of Trustees.

CC: Well, you know, I've never been in a – in a top [tough?] position with the Trustees or the Administration here on campus. I think when the days came that they were RIFing people, it must have been a tough job, you know, trying to mitigate things but yet realizing maybe that somebody had to go because they couldn't be paid for. The problem really is that things change all the time, and I guess maybe that's what's affected the Code, too, in a way. You can't expect life to stand still and everything be hunky dory just because they've decided that it would be hunky dory. I don't know what else to say about that.

LL: The legislature.

CC: Well, the legislature has been, by and large, conservative. At times for the colleges and universities, and at times, you know, against. I've had a real powerful feeling at the end of the – for

instance at the end of the Viet Nam war that there was a group that was out to get us because of our activity, and I've never been able to prove that, but you could almost taste it.

LL: Do you feel that they supported the University adequately financially?

CC: I think they were beginning to peck away at us financially and every other way they could to get us. I think the – you know, by and large the legislature is confused about higher Ed, and – I don't know why we call it higher Ed. I think teaching elementary school is as high as it can go. But I think by and large, you know, that they recognize that we make a contribution.

LL: The town/gown relationship.

CC: For me, that moves from the ridiculous to the sublime. I mean, you know, I look at all this business about them pissing and moaning about the students having their kiosk and selling pizza here, and it's just absolutely asinine. And it moves from that silly standpoint to really some substantial interactions between town and gown that I've been a part of, as a matter of fact. I've been on the planning commission for a number of years, and so I see some very positive aspects, too, and I've watched this town/gown stuff from the University of Washington to New York City and Columbia, although they were involved in all kinds of things there, too. I'm not surprised at this.

LL: Were you – you said you were on the planning commission – that's City Planning Commission?

CC: Yes.

LL: And this was, of course, in addition to everything you were doing on campus.

CC: Yeah.

LL: Why did you want to get on the City Planning Commission?

CC: Well basically I was interested in the Growth Management Act as it came along. This was post – actually post-retirement.

LL: Oh, this was after you had retired?

CC: Yes.

LL: Okay, Okay.

CC: And the development of the new, comprehensive plan, which I was involved with.

LL: Was that the City, or the County?

CC: This was City.

LL: This was City, Okay.

CC: And continued in that role. But you know, we've established the – outside of just what I've done, we've established internships now between departments and businesses in town, we've had interns with the City government, and [inaudible] interns. It's this kind of thing that, you know, that I speak of when I speak of the more positive sorts of things going on. And the recognition that, you know, that faculty

members aren't only those people up there – they're part of the citizens here, too. They spend money around town, and most people will recognize that.

LL: Okay. Long-range planning?

CC: I don't know what's going on now. I felt kind of that – well – there was some long-range planning that went on. There was – you know, there was the building code [inaudible] that the Psych Department was involved with.

LL: Did they have five-year plans, also, for the – you know – academic departments and so on? Do you remember any of that?

CC: No, I really don't. What I do remember is that we were constantly upgrading what we were doing all the time, and part of it was because that we – at least my end of it was possibly involved off campus as well as people on campus. So I – you know, I don't – I can't say five-year to five-year program as something that was formalized in my mind, but something that was potentially acted on. That's part of my reminiscence [inaudible].

LL: How about faculty/administration collegiality?

CC: I think overall, for me, it was very positive. That's what I really liked about my stay here. It's been – really been a very unique experience for me. It was something I'd never done before. When you're in public schools, you know, it isn't the department that appoints the Principal or the school teachers in the building that appoint the Principal like we do with the Department Chair. This was new to me, and I thought it was great. I liked the give and take, and like I say, I learned to appreciate that, and loved to go down to TI [inaudible] and watch them [inaudible] a trash can [inaudible] – went down and helped them mold the plastic, and got involved peripherally with [inaudible] airplanes. And you know, and the faculty is engaged in all kinds of stuff – not the Departmental stuff, you know. Everybody that I know of has had a range of things that they enjoy doing and did to make it interesting.

LL: Jean, did you have any further questions?

JP: No. I think that we [inaudible].

LL: Did you have anything that we haven't covered that you particularly wanted to put on the record?

CC: One thing, I think, and I don't know how to get back to it, but that is the Symposium, where we collected brains from around the world and brought them on campus, and we had brains from all of the States and our State coming, and not just big names. I remember [inaudible], the candy manufacturer in Tacoma would come. He'd been one of our school directors in Tacoma. And people that – people that I remember – [Stokely] Carmichael, um – [inaudible], and he and his bodyguard that went on campus, and I remember the Irishman – um – Connor Cruse O'Brien – my daughter interviewed him years later on an interview she did with [inaudible].

LL: Did he remember his time here, or did she ask him about that?

CC: She didn't know about it. I had said – I said if he's a [inaudible], I'd contact Connor Cruse O'Brien, so she did, but she hadn't realized that he was in our house one time. The other thing, too, that I appreciate is that becoming involved, and becoming involved in politics down through the years. We've had any number of people. It's – really, you know, helped make our society – they've been in the house with us, on campus – I can't even begin to enumerate them all. It's a very – to me, it's a very rich community. I don't care whether you're from [inaudible, sounds like "Snack Tacker"], or University

of Washington, or Central Washington University, or any other University, it's a group of very [inaudible] people.

LL: Were you involved in the planning of the Symposium in any way?

CC: No. No, I gave berths to Anthony Canedo, and who is this man in –

LL: Political Science?

CC: Political Science, yeah. Can't think of his name. [Elwyn Odell]

LL: Did you feel that the Symposia really did much for the students, or was it something that mostly faculty and townspeople participated in?

CC: I can't talk for the students, but the students that came into our house and sat in our front room with the people like Connor Cruse O'Brien and many other people – and the faculty, who I think got closer to students as a result of the interaction of this – probably a lot of them left campus, for all I know, because they'd found something they'd rather do at home. But there was an awful lot of students who were involved, and I think it was for everybody, and I think it was for the community, as well.

LL: I seem to recall that when the Symposia were finally dropped, one of the arguments given for terminating it was that not enough students really participated – that they used the opportunity to take off someplace.

CC: I think the main reason is it got politically hot. The schools are notoriously conservative.

LL: All right, well – thank you very much, Colin, for this interview.

CC: Thank you.