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Hewitt: I am speaking this afternoon with Dr. Jack Moore, Professor of American Studies, as part of the USF Silver Anniversary Oral History Project. Can you tell me first of all what was your first contact with USF and what made you decide to come here?

Moore: I came here in 1962 and the reasons that I came here are twofold. One was financial. I was unhappy where I was, at Washington and Lee University, although it was a good experience in many ways, but I wasn't really earning enough money. It's a private institution and it was obvious that I wasn't going to make that much. I really never wanted to make alot of money, but I wanted to be able to buy a chair or something like that. The other reason was, and I discovered more of this after I got down here, it was at that time you had the idea that USF was a very experimental school; it was very innovative and they were very open to professors performing in various ways. It was a much smaller campus. There were about two thousand people when I came down here in '62. But the major thing was that it was a dual appointment. I taught American literature and I taught in the Humanities department also. Most of the contracts at that time, as a matter of fact, you had to specify at least two areas of interest. So it was clearly interdisciplinary and I had always liked that approach because I had various interests, and it seemed to me that it was a school that was growing and if it grew in that direction it would be a very fascinating place to be. It no longer is that kind of school. It is a very standard state university as far as I can tell. It has really lost that feeling of experimentation and innovation. I think part of it is because it is just so big and it is technically difficult to do alot programs that you might like to present.
At that time if you had a course you felt you wanted to teach, you would just say that you would like to teach a course like Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* or you would like to examine this city in American painting or American literature. There was a lot more freewheeling going on. It was much easier to do stuff like that. I really enjoyed that. The faculty then was different too because they were the kinds of people who also wanted to have those sorts of varied interests.

Hewitt: Did you teach in the College of Basic Studies?

Moore: No. Well, my contract was a liberal arts contract. That is kind of revealing too because when I came down here I was told that I could either sign on in the College of Basic Studies or the College of Liberal Arts. I just had an instinctive response. I knew the College of Basic Studies was concerned with the first two years of general education. Incidentally, it was one of the finest programs that they lost here. It was a terrific program. Students going through that program were going through a liberal arts college experience, which they aren't anymore. But from the teachers standpoint, I had the feeling that Basic Studies, this is going to be associated with the first two years, at some point there is going to be a division here between Basic Studies and the major part of the University. I felt for career reasons that it would be better to be associated with the last two years of liberal arts than the first two years. So my contract was in fact ... I was a member of the College of Liberal Arts. Anyone, however, in my department, which was the English department, a lot of your time is teaching freshman English. That was in the College of Basic Studies. So you would be teaching in both programs. My contract was in the Liberal Arts. And, incidentally, that did turn out to be a wise move
because over the years a fairly wide salary discrepancy developed between
the College of Basic Studies and the Liberal Arts College for the reasons of
the personalities of the deans involved, but also for reasons that eventu-
ally the Basic Studies people got associated with . . . These were teachers,
and alot of people with M.A.s, Ph.D.s, and alot of people who didn't do
research, whereas the Liberal Arts got a little bit more associated with
"well these are the people that are doing research and functioning in other
ways." In fact when they finally phased out the College of Basic Studies,
it was discovered that alot were teaching the same courses and doing the
same sorts of things. The real difference was in the salaries that they
were making. Basic Studies people got alot less.

Hewitt: You came in 1962 and you mentioned that you came partly because this was
suppose to be an innovative, experimental university. Was that just on the
heels of the Johns Committee investigation?

Moore: We drive down; I had no money at all. We had a van. We rented a moving van
ourselves. At that time I guess we had three children. I was 28 or 29
years old. We came down here and first of all between what is now the
interstate and our university here, there were two buildings. One was the
University Restaurant and one was a motel, where there is now a gas station.
It was called the Campus View Motel. Those were the only two buildings
between Nebraska Avenue and the university. We stayed at the motel the
first night here. I didn't have enough money to pay for moving. All I had
was a letter from President Allen welcoming me to the campus. So I took
that letter and went over to the bank, which was the Northside Bank, and
went to the president of the bank and showed him this letter that I had and
asked for a loan. He said yes. So it was a much more personal kind of
thing then. After the first night in the motel I got the paper and the Johns Committee report was published. Of course one of the reasons I had left Washington and Lee was this conservative area and I always had the feeling that I would never quite fit in. I wasn't a first family Virginian and I wasn't conservative in politics. I liked it, but I felt like a northerner. I felt like some pushy northerner. So I came down here, and the first thing I see is this committee report coming out that a professor had been in the home of a homosexual and stuff like that. It was depressing because I just couldn't connect with it. I just couldn't comprehend that people would think that way. I had lived in the south for years, but it was a vicious committee that had done a series of real jobs on various institutions and they were very detrimental to the evolution of the school. The question that some of us talk about that have been through those years is whether President Allen was in fact a good president to have considering the climate. We all thought that you should have somebody . . . Robert Hutchins, University of Chicago, once said to me that "this report is alot of nonsense, you are a petty minded people. We will teach what we want to teach and don't talk to me about censorship in the schools and you shouldn't teach the Naked and the Dead or Catcher in the Rye. That is really asinine." That is where most of the faculty were coming from. The faculty, at that time, was a much smaller faculty, but it was a different kind of faculty. They were people that were coming down here because it was an innovative school. They were willing to take that risk. They were at that stage in their career where they could take risks. So the faculty tended to be fairly young and kind of energetic and interested in new ideas. So the faculty was not your southern university faculty. They were not people who had grown up with southern morals. So there was a real distinction between
the attitude of the university and the attitude in the surrounding area. The question was if Allen was a good president. You could read it either way. He never really said, "Look, what you found here is ridiculous. This is a place where you have to study ideas and we're not to consider whether these ideas are from the left or from the right." He really never did that. He had kind eyes and spoke easily but what he said did not always impress those of us who were here. He was a quietly working person and extremely conservative himself. That is not what we wanted. That was not the energetic, dynamic spokesman that we wanted him to be. However, that kind of person that we wanted might have very well been destructive to the university. You never know. He might have been too outspoken. He enabled the university to grow. You can't argue in the physical sense with the direction that it took. And it may have been, politically, that the administration, whoever was running it, was the proper one for that time. Grebstein was a good friend of mine. We came here the same year. We were both in American literature. At that time he was a senior scholar. He had written a book. I thought, "Oh my gosh, this man has written a book! This is really great." And when he was told that he could no longer teach, I was really stunned. That came about a month later. The committee report had been done before I came. It was just released when I came. It was hard to comprehend exactly what that meant, but to have a friend of yours suddenly removed from the classroom because of what was an idiotic issue, it was just unbelievable that they would censor a person for this and prohibit him from operating. This was difficult to comprehend. It was kind of scary in that sense because it was like some hand that had suddenly come from the sky and plucked the guy that was sitting next to you, that you had been talking to,
out of his chair, and he would no longer perform as a professor. That was not at all pleasant from that aspect.

Hewitt: When you actually removed yourself somewhat from all of the difficulties politically that USF was in at that time, did you feel like the faculty, in those early years, had really had input into developing experimental programs and innovative courses? How much influence did they really have in those programs?

Moore: Allen, or whoever was in control of Allen, was pretty much in control of the school in the final sense, and you were never sure of what he would do. Every so often he would do something, I found and most of my colleagues found, to be incredibly authoritarian and oppressive. But he didn't do it consistently. Looking back on it now, what Allen really did, and I am using Allen to represent the whole administration, the good thing was, it seems to me... actually the professors ran the academic programs. Dean Cooper of the College of Liberal Arts and Dean Martin of the College of Basic Studies didn't have authoritarian-type personalities at all and they were mainly teachers. They had come up through teaching. They had only become administrators later in their careers, so I think they were more teacher oriented. Martin was an early '60s type liberal which meant a late '60s type of conservatism. But in Education, he would have been considered a liberal. He would have admired the policies of Hutchins in Chicago, though he might not have necessarily duplicated them. And the feeling that you had pretty much was that if you wanted to do something with a course you had a pretty good chance of doing it. It was mainly at a personal level. Every so often with Allen a thunderbolt would come down and a decision would be made and it was just irrational and the faculty had no determination over it. One of
the members of the English department at that time, a professor, was denied tenure even though he was one of the best teachers and a kind of a scholar, certainly in those days he was a scholar. We had a meeting with Allen about why this person was denied tenure. I remember Allen said it was because he wasn't a team member. I asked him what he meant by a team member. He said that anyone who is an educator and had their degrees and so forth knows what it means to support the team and be a team member. I told him that I had my Ph.D. now and I didn't know what he meant about being a team member in that sense. I asked him whose team he was talking about. He would never really go any further with that. That was his explanation and that was all that we ever got. The guy was denied tenure and that was it. On the other hand, there were some faculty there that were having personal problems. Allen was very understanding about those kinds of things. He would go out of his way to go out and help them take the time off and to get back on their feet. You never could be certain of Allen. But the question was to what extent did the faculty feel that they had control of what was going on. At the time, you had the feeling that it was very little. I'm talking about retrospect. At the time my friends always felt that we were embattled; we were beleaguered. It was always us against Allen. But looking back on it, what I can see now is that educationally, we were in large degree permitted to do very much what we wanted to do. The state legislature and the upper administration now exert, in all kinds of ways, influence over your curriculum. One did not feel that at all. What they did exert influence over would be things like if you used a novel that said "shit" or something like that. Then you might get some flack. But in terms of setting up programs or teaching specific courses, there was alot more experimentation and innovation. Looking back again, I can see that it was much more in the
hands of the faculty because the faculty was a much smaller body then. You could operate on a much more personal level much more easily. If you know your way around the school you can still operate to a degree on a personal level, but it is difficult and you just don't know the people. The feeling of experimentation, teaching a course here and there, teaching in Humanities or American Idea . . . these were courses that were funded. They were introductory courses mainly, but persons such as myself might teach in Humanities for example. I taught a course on "The City in American Life." I taught a little bit of music, art, literature, and so forth. I taught the American Idea which was mainly an introduction to American Civilization and a discussion about current political problems. I could also teach my standard courses in American literature in the renaissance period or something like that. Now that is very difficult and in fact it is impossible to do now.

Hewitt: Since you had taught at Washington and Lee before coming here and had experience with students at a private, older university, what was your impression of the students here initially at USF?

Moore: I had taught at the University of North Carolina and the University of West Virginia also at that time. I would say that they were equivalent to what I had at West Virginia more than at North Carolina because I think North Carolina is a better school. I'm not sure how much it is better in terms of the students who are there the first two years. I was not impressed. I was not impressed with the academic caliber of the students. And also like most places in the south and maybe even in the north, they lacked, to a great extent, a kind of intellectual sophistication. What you had then, on the one hand the great majority of students who lacked the sophistication, and
the minority of the students for whom the light of the intellect was some
kind of an esoteric crusade and feelings of great specialness on the part of
these students as though they were of the chosen few. I had come from a
very good high school and went to a very good undergraduate school where it
was more or less assumed that you could combine the life of the intellect,
go to a baseball game, read the local newspaper and do a variety of those
things. But here I sense that there were two very distinct categories: the
"yahoos" and a few of the splendid people up on top.

Hewitt: I guess the fact that there wasn't a football team here was negative in some
ways?

Moore: Very much indicative of that. I think one of the real problems the school
has never really surmounted and I think is further away now from surmounting
than it was in the beginning--there was never any sense of school spirit.
There was a little bit more in the beginning--there was spirit in the sense
of cohesiveness because there were so few students. In large part they were
taking the same courses. I'm sure other people have mentioned this to you.
There was a set book. You had a book and you could just assume that every-
one in the University was studying that book from a different perspective.
Well, it never really quite worked out exactly as they had intended it.
There was a little bit of a spirit there of coherence. There was a feeling
of coherence if not a spirit. As the University has gotten larger, well,
it's like the architectural layout here. This is the most bland kind of
layout imaginable. There are few interesting buildings. It is spread out
all over. That was the doing of President Allen. I was used to these nice
compact schools like the University of North Carolina which only spread out
when they had to. You had a feeling, when you were going to the library,
you were crossing paths with the chemistry students or something like that. Here, everything seems distant. There is kind of a bland quality to the students. I always had the feeling... I can't imagine a kid in high school saying that he has always wanted to go to the University of South Florida. The fact may be that when students say things like that, that they want to go to these schools for the wrong reasons because they do have a football team or something like that. On the other hand, if I had my ideal university I would want a place that you could have a sense of tradition and a continuity of intellectual integrity. I don't really feel that here. Everything is dissipated throughout the University. I don't think all big universities have exactly that. There is no focus to this place.

Hewitt: It seems originally that at least the focus for the administrators who wrote the first manuals and missions for the University, that part of the focus really was experimentation and teaching?

Moore: Yes, they really did have high ideals and they really did try. It was possible, I think at a certain point in the history of the University, to create a really distinctive school here and I suspect that that was in the latter years of Allen's term. But that came during the '60s and that was a period of great turbulence. There was a lot of change in the University and I think that we missed the boat.

Hewitt: What do you think were the forces that started to reshape what had started out as an innovative university into a fairly conventional, big state university?

Moore: I'm afraid that I just think that it's inevitable. I think unless you have a very clear concept of what it is that you want to do, things will get out
of control the larger the school gets. The other thing that happened, to me at least, was the school became the center of a great deal more political interest. They said at the beginning there was this political interest in terms of censorship or something like that. They really were not concerned with the running of the school and the curriculum and things like that. Now, in many ways, what happens each year, the state legislature determines that the kind of directions that we go here. I think that has been a very destructive influence upon the University. I talk with friends at other state universities and they say that it isn't an uncommon situation. I just think that it got too big too fast. There is another thing here and I think that this is important. They wanted to get big. Numbers have always been very important here. Every university president I have ever had to deal with has emphasized growth either in terms of the number of students or in terms of the buildings they put up here. I remember once President Allen actually telling us how many yards of sewage line had been laid in the University. In one sense that is important, but in another sense it is totally unimportant. I think that was counterproductive. They really never did try to say that size wasn't important but quality and innovative programs were. Of course, the larger you get the more the administrators control the university.

Hewitt: Now you mentioned a couple of times the effect of the late '60s. To what extent was there political activism in the late '60s on the part of the students or the faculty and how do you think that affected USF?

Moore: In fact a student of mine is doing his master's essay now on student activism in the '60s. There was considerable activism here. It came later than in some other schools, but it was clearly here. It was a very broad based
movement. It was not strongly connected with what was then perceived as something of a more radical outside organization. There was never any strong SDS group here for example. But beginning around '67, there was a fairly strong activist movement which manifested itself in various ways. I was the head of it at one time. I was in charge of it one time. When I came back from Africa, in '69, there was a march on Washington that year and we took two train cars filled with students from the University up to Washington to demonstrate. Prior to that there was a march on the Pentagon. Some of the students went up there from here. So it was a fascinating period. I don't look back upon it with pleasure. I think it was a very dangerous period in American life and I can see that now more than then. I think what we as protesters did was necessary to do. I think that there were some things along with that that were kind of destructive to American life, at least on the campus, in a temporary sense. I was always caught in the middle. I would say I'm fairly traditional academically though I like innovative programs. I think, yes, you should get your Ph.D.; yes, you should know your area; yes, you should be a scholar, going over to the library and reading books, taking notes and subjecting your ideas to the criticism of others. I remember an essay at the time. It was very popular. It was reprinted so frequently. It was called "The Student as Nigger." Students were not niggers. Students were not black people. Some of the students wanted to feel as though they were niggers. They wanted to feel as though they were black people. They wanted to feel as though they really were oppressed. Now, they really weren't oppressed. They were a terrifyingly privileged class. They were so safe here at the University and they had so much authority here in the University compared to what they would have outside. But there was a kind of breaking beyond certain boundaries at
that time in the '60s. That was maybe good in the sense of showing the possibilities and opening new doors. But in another sense it was really dangerous. I think of it like the San Francisco rock scene with all the splendid colors and how lovely it was. Young girls and boys going around with their bodies in the sun and so forth. But at the same time when there was a questioning of authority, there was a stupid anti-authoritarianism. There was a kind of fascism there or an undercurrent fascism-type movement.

I was reading the biography of Jim Morrison. Morrison had some very bad ideas and people would follow his ideas. I think in the '60s there were impulses set loose there that probably, in the long run, shouldn't have been set loose. The result in academia was mixed. I never did think, for example, that students should take over the universities. You would have funny things like you would come into class and the student would ask why they were sitting in rows. I would say that I didn't care if they sat in rows, that it really didn't make any difference to me, but in fact, that they had to do their homework in here. They would ask why I got to select the books and they didn't. That didn't happen with me, but with a friend of mine. Every so often you would get situations like that. It was a very small minority. I always remember the picture of the black student revolt at Cornell University. There was a picture of a guy holding a rifle in his hand standing on the steps of the library. The university president was going to institute some black studies courses. Well, they should have had black studies courses. Blacks are very maltreated on campus. When I came here there were like three black students on the campus and their credentials had to be certified by the Board of Regents, that is they were very carefully screened. That was totally wrong, but at the same time to dictate procedure when you are holding a rifle in your hand. I mean rifles are
dangerous. Rifles really do kill people. So I was leery of that wing of the movement while politically I was very much in sympathy with most of the directions. So it was a very turbulent time and it was a very dangerous time. I saw the breakup of so many social units and so many of my friends. A dinner party was given for us the first time we went to Africa, and there were like 10-12 couples there. I think within five years all of our friends were divorced. That is not an atypical situation. I'm not saying the '60s caused that. A lot of things happened during that period. But there was a kind of a social breakdown, and we are paying for it now by the terribly conservative mood in the country. I'm totally out of sympathy with them, but I can see it as a result of things that people saw. They want to be safe, they want their homes, and they don't want people roaming the streets with long hair and stuff like that.

Hewitt: You mentioned the popularity of students trying to compare themselves to blacks and thinking of themselves in terms of oppression. Yet at USF itself, there were very few black students. What kind of relationship was there at USF between the campus and the black community? Was there an attempt to recruit more blacks either as students or as faculty?

Moore: Not really. Civil rights was an issue. I think I would be safer relating this to my own career than generalizing. I now teach a course on "Racism in America." I have some black students in that. I taught a lot more courses where I had black students. I knew most of the black students on campus. I taught a course called "Black Poetry and Fiction." One year we took the class and protested the ABC Liquor Lounges. This was after the 1964 Civil Rights Act had been passed, but it was before 1968. Most people didn't realize that the Civil Rights Act only said that you had to serve blacks if
you had a restaurant, but if you had a bar that you didn't have to. We discovered in class that the ABC Liquor Lounge ... blacks could go in there and buy bottles, but they couldn't go into the back where the lounge was to sit down and have a drink. So I decided to see what we could do about this. So we picked a couple of lounges and protested. There again I was always very traditional. We couldn't take class time for this. I gave credit for one paper if they wrote up their experiences as a result of this. So we went down and we picketed, some white students and some black students. My classes were sometimes 50/50, black and white. Sometimes it got pretty hectic because of the ... the white students that took the courses tended to be liberal types or they thought they were. They really didn't understand the position of the black students, and also at a certain point they would give up to the black students and they would no longer question the black students. Anyway, we went down and protested. We set up a meeting with the then mayor of Tampa, Mayor Greco. You had the feeling that you could do those kinds of things then. I felt closer to the students. I don't teach as much as I did then. I'm chairman here and so I administrate. So maybe it's because I'm older. I have the feeling that the faculty generally isn't as close to the students as they were. So we went down. There were a number of us. I remember when there were two great, strong black guys, myself and a young white coed woman down there. We told Mayor Greco the situation and he said that the law doesn't say that they have to serve him, but he would see. He knew the owner of the ABC Liquor lounges and he would try to do something about it. Ultimately they were integrated before they were legally obligated to. What he had to do with that I'm not sure. The thing that interested me was what Greco also tried to do. He tried to make some kind of arrangement to see the young coed. He went down
and it was very clearly one of his objectives. He figured he knew hippies and she was a hippie. She was there with a couple of black guys and a wild, bearded professor, so he was trying to set up some sort of a meeting with her. So you could do those kinds of interesting things. There was never any great closeness between the black community and the University. The University wasn't part of the black experience whatsoever. I'm not aware of any strong attempts to recruit black faculty at that time. When the first demonstrations took place down here was the year I came down here. It was in '62. Students picketed the University Restaurant because they wouldn't serve blacks. The owner said that if he integrated he would lose his business and that there would be alot of fights. Places were simply not integrated at that time. Blacks could not go to drive-ins in Tampa. Blacks could only go to theaters in Tampa that were black like the Lincoln Theater. If a theater had a balcony, the blacks could attend because that is where they could sit. But the students picketed. Scaglioni said that he would build a separate room that would be integrated and it would be for the students. Then he said that the students should clean up their own act because the University wasn't integrated. He was right. The black employees all sat in one section in the University Center. There were no black faculty that you could speak of. What I'm saying is, as far as I know, the University Center wasn't integrated. The blacks, either by fiat or inner knowledge, knew that they were delegated to one section.

Hewitt: The period where most of this campus activism was occurring, from the late '60's to the early '70s was also the period in which there was a major transition in the University administration.
Moore: Those were very hectic years. Allen left and then Harris Dean was acting president. He was very good. He might have made a difference had he been here longer. He knew the local ways better than Allen. He was a much brighter man. He was an old boy himself. But he was a kind of a liberal thinker for his time and was open to innovation, but he was only in for two years. Then Smith came in. I was in and out of this University at that time. I was going over to Africa, so I never really knew Smith. He was the only one of the group that I really never got to know. The big difference came with Mackey, or maybe it came before Mackey in those interim two-year periods when there was no real continuity of administration. The University ceased becoming what it had been certainly noticeably during those years and became this big, big place. It hasn't really gotten that much bigger since Mackey's days it seems to me, but it has gotten bigger. It's a difference in degree and not in kind.

Hewitt: Now you served on the Presidential Advisory Committee under Mackey. Did you feel like you had the same sort of input then . . . ?

Moore: No, not on the committee. I must say that I had more openings to tell people what I thought at that time. I think other faculty would . . . I think they would probably agree. I was in a pretty good situation. I knew Mackey and Mackey knew me. There were more avenues open. I don't think that these advisory committees functioned in a very helpful way. Carl Riggs also had a committee, and I think he really used his to a greater extent then Mackey did.

Hewitt: When you had more access, is that compared to Allen or compared to now?
Moore: Certainly compared to now. You know there are different kinds of access. There is access when you call somebody and say that you would like to have an appointment with them at 2:30 next week or there is a committee to examine this issue. But there is access of a sort where you somehow during the week or during the month you meet people, talk to them, and exchange ideas. That is the kind of access I'm talking about. Now there was a lot of that during the Allen administration. But now if something happens, you don't know what or who to get angry at... You know if your annoyed, who do you get annoyed at? You have maybe Greg O'Brien or your dean or your chair and things like that, but you know you have a vague feeling that somewhere over there Brown is operating and a... I don't mean to say that I never see him. I talk to him occasionally, but I don't really have any sense of contact with the fellow. Mackey, I think, had a very clear idea of where he wanted this school to go. I think he had a very clear idea of where he wanted to take himself and I think the school was a vehicle for that. There is nothing necessarily wrong with that. He has then steadily moved up in terms of salary and prestige. I think that he is at a plateau now. He was supposed to be president of the University of Hawaii, but the legislature wouldn't vote him the money that he had been promised so he is not going there. But no, I think he was very much in command. I think he was a prototypical bureaucrat.

Hewitt: You were involved with the faculty senate as well. What was the inspiration for having the faculty senate?

Moore: I'm sure that was Allen's and Harris Dean's and Dean Cooper's. Most of the people that Allen surrounded himself with would have been called liberals at that time. Allen himself really was not. He was a very conservative
person. I don't think a person of any great imaginative vision. I think Mrs. Allen probably shaped the University more than . . . And I have no . . . But she was a very strong woman. Another history that could be written could be "wives of the presidents". I think she was a very strong force in John Allen's life and I think she had a strong grip on the University, almost as strong a grip as he did. He was conservative. The others were more liberal. I think that they figured that the University has got to have a senate and faculty input, so I think that they are all very . . . But, there again I remember very clearly the day I was on the senate. I wouldn't be in the senate. I dropped out of that kind of university politics years ago because I just didn't feel that matters of significance . . . They may have been discussed, but they got lost. It's just like we want input from here. You get lost in this University now with people that are giving input and providing information. But I can remember the University Senate then. The senate at the beginning had faculty, staff and students on it. So it was called the All University Senate. I don't know if I was ever really happy with it because the interests of the groups were not the same. It was kind of playing at "we were all in this thing together," but you know that the students are not in it in the same way the faculty are in it. At any rate, there was the All University Senate and I do remember, very distinctly, Allen coming in one day and saying that he had decided to change the constitution of the senate and he presented a new constitution. Then he started reading this thing, and I was just appalled that he would have such a lack of insight and in fact it was a little more liberal of a document than it had been before. But then he would just come in without asking the faculty senate to do it themselves. They had rules then which I think they still have now that senators couldn't repeat in
office. I said that really isn't it something that the faculty themselves should determine? I could never understand why a group of grown adults who are disciplined educators presumably, should not be given charge of their own affairs, at least at that level. So he was a little paternalistic about that. Towards the latter end of his career I think he really lost grip of what was going on here at the University. He got to be a liability to people who supported him. I think that is what happened. I think it was kind of sad, but inevitable. I can remember people gloating about Allen's resignation. I remember one of the last things he did before he resigned was that he had turned down my tenure. I was going to be promoted to full professor and he had denied this. The reason that he gave was that he thought of me as a beatnik. The "beats" were like the 1950s. It was like calling somebody a "jazz baby" or something like that. I used to run the Lectures Series here. It was so much fun. When I say I ran the Lecture Series, that is what I mean. I ran the Lecture Series. I didn't have to consult with anybody. What I essentially did was that I brought in people that I thought would be interesting that I read about or heard about. And I also tried to bring them in so they could stay a few days. So I almost never hired... Like they get all these big name speakers for ten thousand dollars. In those days you couldn't pay that much for anybody. But like I heard of Julian Bond. He had just been elected to the state legislature in Georgia. This was in the early '60s. I mean there were jerks that gave me this thing. I was just a punk nobody, but the guy that had been running it left and I had been interested in it, so he asked if I wanted to do it. So they gave me this whole thing. So I wrote Bond and asked if he could come down here and he said he would. I brought down James Farmer. He was the first black speaker on campus. That shows you how backwards we were. Then
there was Paul Goodman. All these people, like New-York-Review-of-Books-type people. So I was bringing those people in. I brought in Justice Douglass of the Supreme Court. Of course Allen was very dubious about alot of these people because they were presenting ideas that were very much different from his. Before I left I brought in a bishop from South Africa who had just been thrown out of South Africa to speak about apartheid. This was back in the '60s. Then I left and went to Africa. As soon as I left Allen removed me from office and replaced me with a committee.

Hewitt: Why did Allen think you were a beatnik?

Moore: He thought I was a beatnik because I was inviting all these people here. Also, you couldn't have alcohol on campus then. So we would have the dinners like for . . . It was really observed. Justice Douglass was coming in. And I would go to the airport and pick these . . . I loved it! I got to meet all these great people. I knew that for the really important people, Allen would have dinners for them. It was for people that he had heard of. Of course Justice Douglass wanted a drink or something. Well the campus was absolutely dry. Even the dinners that were catered by Morrisons. So I would meet these people before hand, and we would take them out for drinks. Another thing he said was that I was always late to these dinners. The reason I was late was that we were going out having drinks. And he also said . . . The incident with the pig which is a long story . . . it was a stupid thing, but it was kind of revealing about the '60s. We were driving along here one day and I saw a student carrying a pig being taken away by the police. The student had been walking down one of the classrooms with a pig, very quietly. He had a sign that said, "Today's pig is tomorrows bacon," which meant that police were pigs and so forth. I never liked
police being called pigs. I thought that was no way to accomplish things. Anyway police are working-class people just like anyone else and presumably you are understanding of their position. But the campus security, this was toward the late '60s, had taken this guy over to the Dean of Student Affairs, saying that he was causing a disturbance. He wasn't causing a disturbance. I saw it as symbolic free speech. He was minding his own business when he was walking down the hallway. They took away his ID and they took away his wallet. So I had come along and I saw this happening. In those days, that was exactly the kind of thing I would get agitated about. So I followed them over to the Administration building and I asked what they were doing and why they were taking this person here. They said something about the sign. Well, he wasn't disturbing anybody. I told them that they were the ones that were disturbing people. So we were then ushered into Dean Wunderlik's office. Now Wunderlik is Dean of Student Affairs. He was a disciplinary dean is what he was. There was me, the dean, the student and the pig. And we started this discussion of free speech and I was quoting Locke on free speech and where your rights go to. Every so often the pig would join in with a growl. It had its ludicrous aspects, but it was also a kind of thing that if you were really careful about your career, you wouldn't really involve yourself. Partly because it was ludicrous, but partly because it was the fact that the police were doing their jobs and so on. Word of that got back to Allen that I defended the rights of a student with a pig. At any rate, he later rescinded his denial of tenure to me. He really had to. I guess the point is that you had the sense that things were operating on a human scale at that time. I don't idealize John Allen at all. I respect him a little. But there were real
people there that you saw frequently and had contact with. Now I am here in my office and they are over there.

Hewitt: Let me ask you . . . in some sense I assume that this actually was part of your answer to the next question, but since we have only two or three minutes of tape left . . . when you think back over the years that you have been here since 1962, what would you say have been the most important changes at the University, either positive or negative?

Moore: Well, just the sheer size. It has gotten so big and so, in one sense, uncontrollable, so amorphous, and so lacking in coherence. That to me has been the major change. All of that is negative. I'm sure that there have been positive changes that have occurred and if I could think of them I would tell you. I don't want to idealize the good old days. The good old days were not all that good. There was alot of friction and alot of illegal things being done to faculty. I'm just saying the changes have been mainly those of size and the kinds of things that a change in size brings about. You might say maturity, I suppose. Maybe maturity is something good to attain, but it is lacking in the excitement of the early years. When you had a protest in the early years, you took your protest directly to the source of the problem. You didn't go through channels. There weren't necessarily channels. Now that is bad probably that there weren't channels. Bad things happened because there weren't channels. On the other hand, you had that sort of personal redress, or at least the opportunity to confront people that you no longer have. So I would say that was the biggest change. The size and what size brings about. It has become much less humanistically oriented. That is the second change. It's much more of a technical school now. The College of Engineering and the Medical School are the areas that
have grown most. What I would have considered really the liberal arts has really... and its significance in the University... has shrunk considerably.

Hewitt: Well thank you very much for letting us hear about some of the early excitement before we got to be a big conventional state university.